

what he has written in other writings. One must be cautious with this, because the *Rhetoric* was not written as a scientific book on emotions, and it is possible that the examples and definitions Aristotle brought here only reflect what was relevant to be taught to rhetoricians and not a fair reflection of how Aristotle perceived emotions.

The final point is where Dow's view of emotions departs in an interesting way from most interpretations. While most scholars consider that for Aristotle emotions make things appear in a certain way, Dow goes beyond this and explains that 'passions are pleasures and pains, where these are understood as states with representational contents, and where these contents are taken by the subject to be the way things actually are' (p. 131). This innovation should be considered seriously by those studying Aristotelian emotions since it brings a coherent explanation of the definition of emotions found in *Rhet.* 2.2-11 while at the same time taking into account Aristotle's psychology. Nevertheless, there are two shortcomings. The first issue is that Dow's interpretation seems to assume a single account of all the emotions presented. But while some of them can easily be explained in the context of *phantasia* alone, without the necessity of belief, that is not the case for all emotions. For example, belief seems necessary for friendly feeling, as Aristotle frames it (*Rhet.* 2.4, 1380 b 36-37). The second issue has to do with the recalcitrant emotions. While Dow indicates he is aware of the problem (p. 222) he leaves it open to further investigation. In all fairness, it may indeed belong to a further study and it does not hinder Dow's conclusions.

In short, the book is a welcome contribution to the study of Aristotle, both for its contribution to the interpretation of the *Rhetoric* and — perhaps even more — for its contribution to the study of Aristotelian emotions. He presents his ideas in a well-organized style. The footnotes and references show a clear and detailed knowledge of the subject and its current discussions. The book is a worthy addition to the libraries of classicists and philosophers, and a necessary reference for anyone working on the emotions.

Ricardo Gancz

Bar-Ilan University

Lee M. Fratantuono and R. Alden Smith, *Virgil, Aeneid 5: text, translation and commentary. Mnem.* Suppl.386, Leiden 2015. x + 784 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-30124-5.

For a moment, the appearance of FS (as I shall call the *Aen.5* of Fratantuono and Smith, authors and book alike) seemed to promise the birth of a new scholarly generation, at least in a personal sense, for at p.viii FS proclaim themselves with surabundant enthusiasm followers of my own Virgil commentaries. They go on to cite the reviewer's name with deafening frequency, almost as though to conceal an alarming ignorance (to which we shall have to return) of the wider bibliography. They also promise another volume of commentary, of which more will have to be said. As the explicit model cited by FS, this reviewer finds himself in something of an embarrassment, above all because he has not been read with understanding, nor followed with care. A precise, thoughtful, careful application of my manner of commentary (with perhaps, some simplification of my notorious punctuation and sentence structure) would have been fascinating and would have entailed weeks of care and thought from any serious reviewer. But are FS revealed as competent? Are they stuffed full to the very brim of Virgil and the whole story of Virgilian studies? Do they abound with sound sense and good judgement? To those three questions, this review will not offer a positive answer, nor shall I be able to offer any glow of hope for their projected *Aen.8*. Alas, quite the reverse.

The commentary is defined with almost excessive precision as 'aimed primarily at a scholarly audience ... and to graduate and university students' (p.vii). Given the price, one thinks of library consultation. Above all, we have to consider whether this lofty view that FS express of their public actually squares with the book's intellectual and scholarly realities.

The volume's bulk consists of undisciplined harriolations on the possible meaning of the repetition of a word, or sometimes of two or three successive words. Harvard published Putnam's *Poetry of the Aeneid* in 1966, and almost half a century on, almost all American Virgilians, as the result of a wide, insistent propagation of this manner of reading the *Aeneid*, a manner never once seriously or systematically challenged, will normally believe that this is how the *Aen.* ought to be read. I have never challenged my friend Michael's 'reading', but simply approach Virgil in a different way. The hunt for repetitions is no comfortable partner for the commentator's rigour and self-discipline. Let us be clear: the serious commentator is in the business of creating an instrument of permanent value. I may sit and hold FS, but where is my beloved *genetivus inhaerentiae*? I have no idea; there is no way of finding out, as I feel myself sinking into a flood - deep, not profound - of unconvincing conjectures (*supra*). The happy reviewer is one who learns from the book in hand.

It appears from the preface that this commentary was the product of months, indeed years, of university seminars. That is an old, traditional genesis of such works: note e.g. the publication of Fraenkel's Italian seminars and of the notes members of his Oxford seminars (this reviewer included) have retained. Much the same could be said of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, another teacher of mine, no less alarming and just as excellent, if you could stand the strain. Alas, FS come of a very different tradition, emerging with no sharp cutting edge and not (or not explicitly) drawing upon any deep-rooted stock of scholarly tradition. My deep unease about FS' work lies of course in the detail, and some detail will have to be offered, to justify a general tone of gloom, but with an eye to brevity and selection, because much of the detail is of limited interest; Housman, with his notebook of insults open, is no master to follow at this point: see my recent remarks, *Quad.stor.* 71 (2010), 327-31.

In FS, you will not find quotations from the *Thesaurus* or from *RE* (at v.531, one creeps in), nor, for mythology, from Gruppe, Roscher, or Robert, nor indeed from the other volumes of von Müller's *Handbuch*. For religion, FS quote Latte, not Wissowa: an unacceptable, incomprehensible silence. It is very hard to understand why FS have apparently preferred to remove virtually all the conventional signs of professional reading, seriousness, competence. With dozens (hundreds, indeed) of instances to hand, I limit myself for now to one: at 5.330, FS comment that *madefecerat* is 'rare in poetry'. Not so: you open *TLL* and discover directly that Virgil draws it from Cat.64.368. Why did I check? I suppose because my instinct had been trained; best not to write commentaries otherwise.

The absence (possibly the complete absence; certainly I found none) of Greek is a graver matter. We all believe (at least I thought we did) that Virgil is a kind of appendix to Hellenistic literature, who read the Aratus-scholia over breakfast. Did FS believe that American (university) students were no longer able to cope with a few lines of Greek? That those strange letters would prove an insuperable obstacle? Was it simple reader-friendliness to cite (p. 291) a fragment of Aeschylus from the new Loeb and not from Stefan Radt's exceptional Aeschylus volumes in *TGF*, volumes which have much to teach us all? We are meant to be, in FS' own view, 'a scholarly audience' (p. viii). The unprepared reader has to toil a bit along the way; not everything can be simplified, made easy. FS define (p. viii) the three solid volumes of the *Virgil encyclopedia* ed. R. Thomas and J. Ziolkowski as 'that wonderful treasure'. Is that a judgement we may safely share? I can only refer to my comments, *Hermathena* 192 (2012), pp.102-7. FS avoid criticism and censure: that is a symptom of an intellectual culture determined to protect the student from difficulties and uncertainties. Whether that is the best way to train the budding classicist is another, far wider question.

I cannot really understand why a new commentary on *Aen.*5, hot on the heels of Mynors, Geymonat (two edd.), Conte, and the Madrid team should find it necessary to constitute a text afresh. There is no list of *sigla*, no discussion of the capital mss. (barring a few words on F and V), no discussion of the indirect transmission (and how is the reader to find Dositheus when the

volume number in *Gramm.Lat.* is missing at 5.692?). How is the reader to manage with Schol.Ver. when (s)he is not told *always* to use Lunelli's ed. in preference to Baschera's? How is the poor student to navigate through the reefs of Serv. and Serv.Dan.? No discussion of the problems, and the reference to Goold's classic article is incorrect (p. 567). For that matter, Serv. is entirely neglected by the index. At 5.279, FS cite 'PFest.' in place of 'Paul.exc.Fest.'. No word to explain who those mysterious individuals might be, or of the edd. of Müller and Lindsay. Let us draw a veil over orthography. Better go and look at Conte, or at Ribbeck's *Prolegomena*. Inevitably, FS write 'Erechtheus' (p. 389); have they never heard of Wilhelm Schulze? Would it not have done some good to write briefly of those who toiled to bring some order into the text of Virgil? Of Heyne, Hofman Peerlkamp and Ribbeck? Indeed of Bentley's notes? Not a word of the papyri or of Virgilian studies in antiquity more generally. The admirable index/glossary to Traina's school commentary to *Aen.* 12 (*L'utopia e la storia*, Torino 1997) shows how such material can be presented briefly and clearly.

Between pp.115 and 144 there lies agulf: only at 144 do FS explain the importance of F; in the former passage, the illustrations in F are merely said to derive from 'a ms in the Vatican', and the *argumenta* are cited without explanation. What is the gloss cited at 5.594? I have no idea. How do we distinguish between Tib.Claudius Donatus and Ael.Donatus? Why are we not well advised never to ignore the former even when we are mildly bored? The scrap of information on the ancient roll (p. 10) is the proverbial teaspoon of water for the traveller in the desert.

No surprise at this point to discover spelling mistakes and typographical errors in Latin, French, Dutch, Italian names and words; I made no long and systematic search for instances. FS do not show a good command of English. I do not refer to the conventional variations displayed by users of American English, but rather (e.g.) to n. on 5.129, where the *meta* is called 'a sprig'; that is normally a small shoot of a flower or shrub. Virgil leaves no doubt that he refers to a branch of holm-oak, clearly visible to the oarsmen. These oarsmen, furthermore should be not 'racers' but 'contestants'. And so forth; a melancholy procession. Repeatedly, FS offer adjectival forms of mythological names such as 'Dianic' (p. 366), 'Sirenic' (p. 428) and 'Elissan' (p. 555); these are evitable, distasteful, precious mannerisms.

It is, alas, hardly possible to speak of index and bibliography with restraint: on the trail of my beloved *genetivus inhaerentiae* I discovered twenty passages where undifferentiated genitives of one type or another are discussed. The reader will find references to omissions elsewhere. The bibliography is worse: of simple orthographical and bibliographic errors I have spoken already. Many books and articles are cited in the commentary just by author, with no reference in the bibliography, as though there had once existed a much fuller version. Titles omitted or given incorrectly are evidently a major difficulty to the inexperienced reader. The various editions of Norden's *Aen.6* are run into one untidy, undifferentiated mass; in my commentary, I explained how N.'s addenda and the changes between editions reveal the growth of a masterpiece. Dainotti's book on word-order was included, some months before its publication. Many Virgilians are referred to - in consequence of a clumsy, dogmatic decision - with their first initial, when they are generally known by their second (e.g. D.Williams, P.Wiseman, N.Knauer, O.Lyne), but the besmotered (Chaucer's word) pages of my copy of FS' bibliography contain far graver errors.

Though FS proclaim themselves heirs to my commentaries they offer information, sadly, with uninformed avarice. Let me offer ten types of painful deficiency:

1) On grammar and metre, FS cite unhelpfully a great slew of old school commentaries, but not that by G.Monaco (Firenze 1953); I ran a copy to earth in a private library in Palermo, but the kind owner assured me that a photocopy would not teach me much. LHS is missing, as are the recent guides by G.Maurach, *Lat. Dichtersprache* and *Enchiridion poeticum* and the admirable article in *EV* by W.Görler s.v. *Eneide; la lingua*. Inevitably FS always use 'elision'; their readers should at least be told that scholars prefer 'synaloepha' (really and truly; Fraenkel did, eloquently). On triple alliteration in the second half of the hexameter (after the manner of the

Saturnian), there is some discussion at p. 459, but progress has been made (see my nn. on 2.452 and 7.190).

2) On poetic plurals, it is not enough to cite Cunningham's article in *CPh* 1949; there is an ample 'classic' bibliography (collected in my n. on 7.445) and we have two genuine old treasures, Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen*, 1, 91ss. and Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, 1, 27ss., still to be read with real fascination and delight.

3) On sea-battles as spectacles, a (poor) line is offered at p. 215. See rather the index in D.G.Kyle, *Spectacles of death* (London 1998) and K.C.Coleman's exceptional article, *JRS* 83 (1993), 48-74.

4) On the localisation and allegorical understanding of the Sirens, FS pp.721-3 offer little. For allegory, see rather E.Kaiser, *Mus.Helv.* 21 (1964), 197ss., and on the rocks of the Sirens, pp.80, 274 of my comm. on bk.6, where the unexpected role of Rudolf Nureyev is not obscured.

5) On death, FS cite the unhappy booklet by M.Rivoltella, *Le forme del morire* (Milano 2005), on which vd. the review *Vergilius* 60 (2013), 183f. On the topic as a whole Father Serra Zanetti in *EVs.v. Morte* is exceptional.

6) On the tricky topic of the rivers of the Homeric Troad, the n. on 5.634 is not good; FS could have learned more via the reviewer's n. on 6.88.

7) Why did FS observe (p. 4., n.12) 'relatively little work has been done on Virgilian numerology' when we have at hand the ample, exuberant survey by G.Brugnoli and R.Scarcia, *EV s.v.?*

8) On the *hemistichia*. FS stick doggedly to some antiquarian bibliography (p. 351). Admittedly T.Berres, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 45, 1982) is hardly user-friendly, but H.-C.Günther, *Überlegungen zur Entstehung...* (Göttingen 1996) is brief and brilliant (and often clearly right).

9) On the localisations of Anchises' death, and of the burning of the ships, FS have read a good deal but hardly seem to have grasped the various problems posed by A.'s death: see my n. on 3.708-15, and for the ships, Zurli, *EV* 2, 932, Horsfall, *CQ* 29 (1979), 381f.

10) To conclude with something more solid: FS neglect the rich and complex 'language' of V.'s gestures; see L.Ricottilli, *Gesto e parola* (Bologna 2000). No less neglected, the 'language' of physiology (e.g. 'my heart burns with grief'), much present in my commentaries as a serious interest (indices, s.v. 'physiology'). See still R.B.Onians, *Origins of European thought* (repr. Cambridge 1988); enthusiastic rather than eccentric.

The commentator learns the hard way that there are no short cuts. One has to learn to sit for years immovable, concentrated and probably perspiring, for each commentary undertaken. You wear out eyes, concentration, and probably the seat of your *barbara tegmina crurum* (for *Aen.* has a place even for trousers). FS have already (p. x) plunged into a commentary on the eighth book, a task likely to prove gravely *ultra vires*: bk.8 is hard, rich in problems of religion and topography; issues of the 'Augustan spirit' in *Aen.* are a particular challenge to the commentator's historical and literary understanding. It may be that others too will express doubts like those here presented, for FS do need a different method, system, time-scale, level of accuracy, training, library, and knowledge of languages (not only Latin and Greek). As for the intellectual parentage they claim, I deny it utterly and completely; and reject with dismay the claim here made that FS are in some (incomprehensible) sense my disciples. No, *procul dubio*, they are not, though clearly they think differently.