

The treatment of Augustan poetry argues that we are not dealing with modern propaganda in the sense of works intended to arouse particular sorts of political conviction. This has a general plausibility for the overall assessment of works like the *Aeneid*, where moral complexity plays a major role, but again it is difficult to deny the label 'propagandistic' to e.g. the description of the Shield of Aeneas, with its canonising of the distorted Augustan view of the battle of Actium. Here as elsewhere Eich might have engaged more with Syme's famous chapter on 'The Organisation of Opinion' in *The Roman Revolution*, the most prominent presentation of the position he is in some sense attacking, and one would also like to have seen more argument about how patronage affected the politicisation of literature (e.g. more on Maecenas' mysterious role and the work of Peter White) and how ideological elements can be seen in art which match those of literature (here a consideration of the work of Paul Zanker would have been helpful).

The denial of suppressive censorship in the modern sense again has a general plausibility; particularly acute is the point that ancient attempts at censorship could not guarantee the disappearance of offending works and indeed gave them the publicity which some had hitherto lacked. But once again there are significant counter-examples: the evident banning of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* from the libraries of Rome surely makes the same point as modern ideological book-banning, though it was of course unsuccessful in suppressing the work (not least because the ban was imposed perhaps a decade after original publication).

Overall, then, this book does good service in demonstrating the otherness of Roman political culture in its relation to literature, and in showing the limits of the political importance of literature in a society where the political public electorate was largely illiterate (though the lack of importance of the electorate in the imperial period is an important development). It is perhaps too ready to create straw men (no one is going to argue that modern mass media and concerns with the communication of policy are very like the political life at Rome), but also perhaps too schematic in its desire to sever ancient and modern practice: modern politics is more like Roman politics than we think, and the manipulation and promotion of political aims in literature is not just a modern phenomenon. Though explicit testimony of the ideological reception of literature at Rome is commonly lacking, it is hard to believe it did not happen; the work (e.g.) of Shadi Bartsch in *Actors in the Audience* suggests that it may have been in the context of dramatic (re)performance that such elements were most prominently brought to the fore, with audiences more than keen to detect political subtexts.

S.J. Harrison

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplementum 198, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000. xliii + 567 pp. ISBN 90 04 10842 4.

Unlike the first half of the *Aeneid*, the 'Iliadic' books have not until recently been the object of good modern commentaries in English, the few available being either outdated or too short and partial. S. Harrison's commentary on book ten (1991) and P. Hardie's on book nine (1994) seem to have announced a turning point, and this gap in scholarly coverage continues to decrease with this extensive commentary on book seven by Horsfall and another one by the same author, so rumour has it, promised for book eleven. Few scholars can be better equipped to assume the task of producing this much needed commentary on book seven than H., who studied it in his 1971 D.Phil. thesis, and now returns to re-examine it after some thirty years of extensive and invaluable contribution to the study of Roman literature and myth, and of Vergil in particular. Not many more possess the skill and knowledge required to present this commentary with the thorough review it deserves, and the present reviewer, who has occasionally taught the book, and more often just read it for pleasure, cannot count himself among them. This review will therefore concentrate

on what the commentary purports to offer (and what it does not), without getting into too many arguments on particular issues.

Besides some five hundred pages of commentary on the book's 817 lines, H.'s work consists of a short introduction and an *ad lectorem* (which explains some of the author's complex system of typographic symbols), a far too selective list of bibliographical abbreviations (on which see below), the text and a translation on facing pages, and three indices, of English and Latin terms and of Names. In the introduction H. briefly discusses the structure of book 7, its literary sources, Vergilian language, text and transmission (including interpolations, lacunae and transpositions), and concludes with a clear declaration of the purposes he sets for his commentary: focus on language and style, erudite and antiquarian matter, stylistic and thematic sources, and less concern with reception by later Latin authors than in other modern commentaries on the *Aeneid*, since H.'s declared interest lies in the reconstruction of how the book would have been understood by Vergil himself and his contemporary readers rather than by those of later generations. 'I am not alone', H. tells us, 'in believing in the educated Augustan reader; (s)he is a very useful fiction and though we can never be quite sure that we have reconstructed correctly the scholarly and literary filters th[r]ough which these patient, well-read ghosts, raised by our intellects and imaginations, approached the *Aen.*, the very effort of reconstructing their intellectual "baggage" is itself continually rewarding' (p. xxxiii). It is indeed, and H.'s commentary is a magnificent illustration. But it is also a clear pronouncement of the side he takes in some of the most heated debates in contemporary Vergilian interpretation. In many respects this is a side the reviewer shares, being convinced of the privileged position which the reception by the author's contemporary readers should hold in the long history of the *Aeneid* reception (even if at times it is merely a convenient *alias* for 'authorial intention'). Nor am I persuaded by some modern calls to abandon the attempt to reconstruct the reception of ancient readers because of the (unquestionably real) interference of two thousand years of accumulated reading in our ability to approach them. The continuous scholarly effort, suggestions, counter-argumentation, disclosure of our preconceptions, corrections, should by and large bring us ever closer to that aim. But even if we take the object of our study to be the reconstruction of the manner in which the work would have been understood by its contemporary (well-read) readers, can we restrict it to their shared *literary* 'baggage' alone? Can we, for instance, assume the political 'baggage' of these educated Augustan readers, faced with Augustus' revolution and having experienced (and probably taken sides in) a long and acrimonious civil war, to have had no influence on how they interpreted Vergil's ideas? In other words, besides the possible methodological hindrance of having to rely on too tenuous tools of argumentation, do we possess a theoretical justification for eschewing the potential implications of 'further voices' (suppressed, pessimistic, subversive, disturbing) in our reconstruction of Augustan reception? At the end of his short exposé of book 7 in his *Companion to the Study of Virgil* H. concludes: 'So who starts the war? Men (and women), gods (and dogs), all together ... Virgil seems to me at all points to discourage us from reaching any simple answer' (161; cf. 'Those who believe there is a simple answer (either way!) had best not read on', ib. 155). And ambiguity is one concept of those H. calls 'new critics' (not to be confused with the technical meaning of New Criticism, since for H. the term covers critics from a far larger variety of poetic approaches) that he wholeheartedly endorses in this commentary too. But he chooses not to discuss the relation between this characteristic of Vergil's text and the moral and political views of Augustan readers, as if pre-Actium (or Philippi!) persuasions suddenly disappeared and stopped playing a part in their responses to Vergil's handling of the Italian wars (no matter whether these responses do or do not coincide with those of American scholars during the Vietnam war; for further developments of this issue see now the first chapters of R. Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge, 2001)). It is the right of a commentator to take sides in such controversies of Vergilian scholarship, as it is for his readers to define their own views on these issues. I therefore count among the many great merits of this commentary H.'s clear statement of the object of his study in the introduction,

together with his keen awareness of his own stand in modern Vergilian controversies which is manifest throughout the commentary. His deep familiarity with the writings of the 'critics' with whom he disagrees and his willingness to accost seriously the issues they raise (and, for those familiar with H.'s style, in the present work often with surprising kindness) makes disagreeing with his views a challenge and a pleasure.

The text of book 7, printed without a critical apparatus but with marginal signs indicating discussions of Punctuation, Orthography and Text in the commentary, is not revolutionary, and mostly follows Mynors' readings rather than those of the Italian editors. H. notes (p. xxxi) fewer than a score of significant deviations from Mynors' text (not counting points of orthography and punctuation). These are always plausible, and often reflect the author's deep erudition in Italian geography and ancient toponomastic orthography (ll. 801, 630). I gladly embrace his preference of **R**'s *levavit* to the imperfect transmitted by the other MSS at l. 571 (**R** enjoys quite a rehabilitation in H.'s reading), and am quite convinced by his argument for accepting the paradosis *arma* at l. 430 (against Mynors' *arva*). His arguments for accepting *pelago* (dative with *resistit*) *rupes* at l. 586 (**V**'s reading adopted by Mynors against *pelagi* in the rest of the transmission), and for amending *pelagi* to *pelago* in the following line as well (against all the tradition) are quite persuasive and supported by an excellent discussion of Vergilian 'epanalepsis' (a step beyond Wills' *Repetition*), though I am still inclined to retain the genitive in l. 587 if only in order to explain the corruption into *pelagi* in the previous line: H.'s assumed 'scribe who did not realise *pelago* was ind. obj. of *resistit*' would have taken it for an ablative ('superfluous ... though not unvirgilian'), and the genitive with *rupes*, as H. himself shows, is not all that *facilior*. Those looking for a continuation of the debate over *poenigenam* / *Phoebigenam* in line 773 will find it on pages 501-2. But H.'s list of 'significant deviations' does little justice to his critical insight which is manifest in almost 70 (or, counting orthography, 100) discussions of the text in his commentary. These reveal common sense and erudition even when they do no more than support Mynors' readings and expand on his notoriously slender apparatus (see, for instance, a notable defence of *percepit* (**Mγ**) in l. 356 against the standard Latin *concepit* attested in **R**, and of *conversa* (**M**) in l. 543 against *convexa* (**M²γRω** and a long line of ancient scholiasts)).

The commentary is written in the author's familiar cryptic style, and the experience of consulting it often calls to mind H.'s 'peeling the artichoke' metaphor with all its details, from outer leaves to succulent heart ('buono, morbido, succulento', *Alambicco*, 19). Scarcely three successive words without a parenthetical observation; three typefaces; sparing usage of inter-word spaces (but some unaccountable double spaces); asterisci (part of the complex system of grading entries in the *Enciclopedia virgiliana* explained on p. xxxv), and multiplication marks (for the number of occurrences of a word when no Latin numeral adverb is available); a flood of abbreviations, some standard, others listed in the bibliography, and the rest trying the reader's vigilance: **V**. (note the typeface and the dot) for Vergil, **V** — the Veronensis MS (and of course **V** following an Ennian reference for Vahlen); a word cited in the lemma may thereafter be abbreviated by a single letter in bold, so that **R**. at 197 refers to *rates*, **P**. at 277 to *pictis[que]*, and **A**. at 284 to *Aeneadae*, and should not be mistaken for the MSS **R P** and **A**; the frequent geographical **NW** should not be confused with **NW** for Neue & Wagener's *Formenlehre* (not included in any list of abbreviations, but 'those who [are] able and willing to consult them will certainly know such standard abbreviations', p. xxxv), not to mention the occasional misprint (**N**.-**H**. instead of the standard **NH** for Nisbet-Hubbard on p. 189, l. 9). Indeed it was H.'s bibliographical references that finally defeated the graduate students on whom I tried this commentary. H.'s bibliographical list is very selective, and for most abbreviated references within a section one has to consult the introduction to that section, or, if followed by numbers in bold (= line numbers within book 7), the commentary on those lines, so that for a reference to, say, 'Putnam (785, 1970), 412f.=(756, 1995), 106f.' in H.'s comment on line 24 (p. 62) one has to consult either the note to line 785 on p. 508 (a page and a half long; the reference to Putnam's *AJP* article at the end), or the (shorter)

note to line 756 (for his 1995 collected papers). H. and I share the conviction that good indices are essential aids in scholarly works. Why can't we have good comprehensive bibliographies too? (And, with Brill's prices, what difference would twenty or so more pages make?).

To compensate for this, the reader will find in the commentary some of the author's familiar personal tones, anecdotes, pieces of academic folklore (British and Italian), some beautifully phrased *retractationes* ('against the undecided and eventually misguided Horsfall 1971', 'So too, alas, Horsfall 1971', 'pace Horsfall, 1971'), and an occasional touch of humour (e.g. on *Aurora in roseis ... bigis* in line 26 and in the smaller forms of art (but *quadrigata* in Eur. *Tro.* 855 and *Aen.* 6.535): 'less work, less space and more ladylike!').

However, outer leaves removed, the commentary, probably the most extensive one on a single book of the *Aeneid* in English, is not only extremely rich and erudite, but also exceptionally wide in the diversity of approaches to the text. Antiquarian details are of course amply present, together with mythology, Italian geography (ancient and modern), and *realia* (from nautical technique, through baking, weaving, splitting wood and cooking on an open fire, often evoking personal experience). So are also perceptive discussions of Latin syntax and Vergilian style (some remarkably good observations on the difference between modern and ancient requirements of *variatio*), and an attentive ear for alliteration and rhythm. Cases of the *figura etymologica*, a requisite in Vergilian interpretation since O'Hara's *True Names* and Paschalis' *Semantic Relations*, are carefully examined. H. is particularly alert to the contextual provenance of Vergilian terminology, military, historiographic, aetiological and religious language, *Prodigiensprache* and that of the *laudes Romae*, as well as the specific poetic registers of funerary epigram, love elegy, hymns, pastoral, etc. These are all conveniently assembled and easily accessible through the detailed English index. H. tends to interpret such terminology as generic markers (an assimilation of Conte's *Memoria*?) forming part of the poet's complex *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. Thus, on the language of historiography, for instance, he comments: 'V. states his subject matter as an epic poet, but the language used suggests that the manner of his treatment will in some sense be an analysis of how and why civil wars begin', *ad* 37-45(5); cf. *ad* 475-539). It could, perhaps, also be taken as a marker of credibility in contrast to the 'distancing formulae' used to mark myth (see index s.v., to which should be added 735, and seven more passages out of the nine mentioned there). In other instances Vergil's choice of terminology may invite different lines of interpretation as, for instance, when Ilioneus applies the language of *laudes Romae* to describe the past greatness of Troy (H. on *extremo ... Olympo*, l. 218: 'The adj. is elusive until read in an Augustan panegyric key'). And these are just a few examples of the interpretative value of H.'s thorough discussions of the linguistic registers Vergil employs.

When it comes to Vergil's literary 'baggage', few can vie with H.'s ability to point out echoes of earlier literature (both Latin and Greek), and his well known insistence on the poet's indebtedness to literary prose (historiography and mythography in particular) proves to be particularly apt for book 7. H. usually interprets Vergil's use of previous authors in terms of 'source' (of information or narrative elements as, for instance, in the detailed analysis of the relation of Euripides' *Lyssa* to Vergil's *Allecto*, *ad* 323-40, 341-72, 373-405, 557), rather than as active allusions which may modify the reader's understanding of the text. His handling of imagery similarly refrains from bold interpretation. As he has explained in *Companion* 111ff., H. regards imagery and symbolism as rooted in the poet's reading, 'and the implications of that imagery can only therefore be comprehended after a close study of that image's history and use in other authors' (ib. 112). This approach is put to exemplary use in the commentary, for instance in the notes explaining *atraque ... | horrescit strictis seges ensibus* (ll. 525-6) by AR 3.1354ff. (the sown men), and *latrantibus undis* (l. 588) by the barking of Scylla's dogs. But H. is also attentive to the semantic field of Vergil's metaphoric language and to his complex employment of 'linked imagery'. Thus, an accumulation of agricultural metaphors is noted *ad* 329, 338, 339, 525-6, 551 (though with nothing of Lyne's interpretation of this sequence in *Words and the Poet*, pp. 141-3), as is the ambivalent

force of flame and fire imagery as symbols of both marriage and war (319ff., 388, 397, 456ff.); so also are the structural functions of linked imagery, as for instance the contribution of water imagery to the development of the three Allecto-scenes (S. Harrison *PLLS* 5 (1985) and H. *ad* 586-90).

The book's structure and development, which have been admirably studied by Heinze, Fraenkel, and others, are given ample consideration both in H.'s introduction (xv-xvii), and within the commentary (e.g. 341-539, 641-817ii) as are also framed scenes (e.g. 259-273), ring composition (index s.v.) and changes in narrative tempo (483, 510, 528-30, 624). Here a pattern of dispersion, analogous to that of the three Allecto-scenes, might have been noted also in the three-portents sequence: the bees portent takes place *in penetralibus* (59), Lavinia's hair catches fire *adolet dum altaria taedis* (71), probably out of doors (H. *ad loc.*), but still within the palace compound, and the portent 'was noised abroad' (Fordyce on *ferri* in l. 78, more specific than H.'s 'This then was called fearful ...'), and finally Faunus' oracle can no longer be kept within the family and spreads throughout the cities of Ausonia (102-105).

Ambivalence (e.g. *ad* 403) and the narrative technique of shifting point of view (sanctioned by Heinze) also find their due place in H.'s commentary and at times he comes very near 'polyphony' and 'further voices' (but not, of course, Parry's 'two'). And among other key notions predominating in recent Vergilian scholarship, H. also devotes special discussions to cases of *ecphrasis*, *apostrophe* and multiple correspondence in similes (index, s.v.).

One line of interpretation H. strongly objects to is the 'metapoetic'. Modern students of Latin literature have perhaps been too keen on reading hidden metapoetic references into their texts, especially when it comes to epic. But invocations (or rather the programmatic *prooemia* in which the invocation proper is normally embedded), are metapoetic by definition, and should be interpreted as such. Furthermore, Vergil's habit of preparing the ground for what is to follow seems to me to legitimise the search for such metapoetic clues in the 36 lines preceding *Nunc age* as well, especially since this is where a reader familiar with AR's *Argonautica* (for instance) might expect a mid-epic invocation (and Vergil's postponement of this element for the reasons adduced by Fraenkel and others should therefore be taken as deliberately frustrating these expectations). One can of course argue over whether Circe's *tenues telae* in line 14 are enough to evoke the poetic ideal of *leptos* or whether the *multa flavus harena* Tiber (l. 31) is close enough to Cal. *Hymn.* 2.108f.: 'Ἀσσυρίοι ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ | λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἔφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει to allude to the 'poetics of mud'. But no matter how many tons of sand the actual Tiber does carry along (H. *ad loc.*), we should assume the poet to be in control of how much of it will colour his description of the *fluvius amoenus*. And, if organic interpretability is a sign to go by, the foregrounding of such metapoetic elements in the section preceding the invocation does seem to suit R. Thomas' interpretation (*PLLS* 5 (1985)) of the mid-epic *prooemion*: with Circean witchcraft one can still adhere to *leptotēs*, but Vergil chooses to make his heroes pass by her seductive singing (for the singing of ancient *femmes fatales*, see H.'s note on l. 12) and sail on to the Tiber mouth and the Italian *horrida bella*, a *maius opus* for which the poet feels he must openly disavow Callimachean poetics. Thus too little Thomas (and perhaps too hasty rejection of Kyriakidis, at least for this section) for my taste.

As for the invocation of Erato, H. accepts the view that in addition to adhering to the Apollonian model Vergil wants to evoke the idea of love at this point when he is about to introduce 'the very presentable widower Aeneas, whom we have known since 2.783 is to find a bride somewhere near the Tiber' (*ad* l. 37), into an Italian kingdom where Lavinia, *iam matura viro, iam plenis nubilis annis* (53) is wooed by many, and in particular by the *pulcherrimus* Turnus (54-6). But as he observes, 'the epic drama that ensues is not fundamentally elegiac or erotic'. Why then did Vergil choose to mislead his readers' expectations? Just to show off his cleverness in 'imitating' the *Argonautica*? Or did he wish the idea of love to remain in his readers' minds ('under erasure' as the 'critics' would say) even after they realise that their expectations for a love story between

Aeneas and Lavinia are not fulfilled? One possible use of narrative elements kept 'under erasure' is to reactivate them in a manner different from the one expected (one of the many meanings of the term 'irony'). And in a sense, just as it lies behind the Punic Wars, *amor* is well rooted among the causes of these *horrida bella*: Amata's *miro amore* (57, without having to go as far as Lyne's evocation of Phaedra); Silvia's love for her stag, Iulus' *laudis amore* (496), Turnus' *amor ferri et scelerata insania belli* (461), and everybody's noble love for kin, country and glory (cf. Allecto's suggestion to kindle the Italians' hearts with *insani Martis amore*, 550; and in the following books, Euryalus' *laudum amore*, 9.197; Camilla's *praedae et spoliolum*, 11.782; the Latin women's *patriae*, 11.892; *amor decernere belli*, 12.282; and *amor* raging together with *pudor*, *insania* and *virtus* in Turnus' heart, 12.667-668.). Since H. is very much aware of the analogy between Aeneas' Italian wars and the Roman civil war (index s.v. and *Alambicco* 106f.), one cannot but admire his resistance of the temptation to touch the potential implications such a grim (and sober) view of the causes of war would have had for Vergil's Augustan readers (I leave it to the readers of *SCI* to decide whether they want to draw the analogy further and perhaps even venture a wild interpretation of the fact that the very first words in H.'s preface to this commentary are 'On the first morning of the Six Day War in 1967 (Mon. 5 June) ... Sir Roger Mynors suggested to me that I write a commentary on *Aeneid* 7').

Thus, even for those inclined to use more radical interpretative techniques, H.'s commentary provides an exceptionally good basis for further study and in spite of his fears lest he be found 'critically underdeveloped' (p. xxiv), I have no doubt that this work will continue to serve as the authoritative study of book 7 for many years and will not be absent from the bibliography of any future study of Vergil (ah, but please let it be listed under 'H' in decent comprehensive bibliographies!).

Amiel Vardi

Jerusalem

Katherine Clarke, *Between Geography and History. Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*, Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. xi + 393 pp. + indices. ISBN 0 19 924003 5.

In den letzten Jahrzehnten ist eine steigende Zahl von interdisziplinären wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen, Kolloquien etc. zu verzeichnen. Dieses Faktum ist ein Indikator dafür, daß das Bewußtsein Platz greift, daß mit dem traditionellen Fächerkanon, der in Europa seit der 'educational revolution'¹ entwickelt worden ist, viele Phänomene der Vergangenheit nur unzureichend erfaßt werden können. Die in der frühen Neuzeit evolutiv verlaufende Standardisierung der Ausbildungsgänge an den Hochschulen war sicherlich ein wichtiger Schritt hin zu einer Anpassung der Universitätsbildung an die Erfordernisse der Moderne. Strenge Arbeitsteilung, Branchenbildung und rigide Lehrpläne sind Begleiterscheinungen dieses Prozesses. Daß die Departementalisierung der Wissenschaften nicht nur Vorteile mit sich bringt, sondern auch Erkenntnismöglichkeiten dadurch verstellen kann, daß sie die Konturen der Disziplinen überbetont, liegt auf der Hand. Einen wichtigen Beitrag zu diesem Problemfeld hat vor kurzem K. Clarke mit ihrer Studie 'Between Geography and History' geleistet. Anhand einer Analyse von drei 'all-encompassing ethnographical, geographical, historical works written in the late Hellenistic period' (193) versucht die Autorin zu zeigen, daß zumindest in der Antike keine klare Trennlinie zwischen den genannten Disziplinen verlief und daß keine Studie, die die Annahme, es habe eine solche Demarkationslinie existiert, zur Prämisse hat, Autoren wie Strabon gerecht werden kann.

C.s Buch zerfällt in zwei große thematische Blöcke. Das erste Kapitel beinhaltet Reflexionen über Geographie, das Untersuchungsgebiet dieser Wissenschaft und ihr Verhältnis zur Geschichte;

¹ Zum Begriff siehe L. Stone, *The Educational Revolution in England, Past and Present* 28, 1964, 41ff.