

VERGIL, *AENEID* 6: A NEW COMMENTARY

NICHOLAS HORSFALL, *Virgil, Aeneid 6. A Commentary*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013. 2 vols.: Pp. xl + 706. ISBN 978-3-11-022990-5.

After books 7 (2000), 11 (2003), 3 (2006) and 2 (2008), all with Brill, we have H(orsfall), now with De Gruyter, on book 6 of the *Aeneid*, a book which for its variety and riches presents perhaps a greater challenge to the commentator than any other of the poem. This is also the book where the present-day commentator confronts head-on one of the all-time greats of classical commentary of the modern age, Eduard Norden's *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI* (ed. 1, 1903, ed. 3, 1927). H. is constantly in the company of the shade of Norden as he traces his own path through Virgil's book of the dead, and he summarizes his own account of the resulting dialogue in an Appendix, 'In the shadow of Eduard Norden'. R. G. Austin's 1977 commentary in the 'Oxford reds' is also a frequent presence: H.'s generous references to Austin in the body of the commentary rather belie the characterization in the Introduction (p. xxvii) of the ailing Austin as one whose 'natural conservatism had taken on a rather sad and tired appearance' in this the last of his commentaries. Not up to Austin's *Aeneid* 2, but still a work of enduring value.

It would be wrong to talk of autopilot, since H. always engages vigorously with each lemma and problem, but the virtues and foibles of the commentary are instantly recognisable from the previous four volumes. A massive erudition, probably unequalled among the living, in all branches of Virgilian scholarship, impelled by a love for the author that goes back fifty years to school-days (there is something of an elegiac tone in the frequent allusions to *temps perdu* and in the recollections of Virgilians no longer with us); a refusal to take any *idée reçue* or interpretative commonplace for granted; a keen nose for linguistic register and for the frequent oddities in Virgil's Latin, and an openness to semantic and syntactic ambiguities. While many of the notes have contours similar to discussions in Norden and Austin, H.'s comprehensive mastery of scholarship on Virgil and Latin language and literature in the nearly 40 years since Austin make H.'s *Aeneid* 6 a totally *aggiornato* read: major contributions fully integrated include Damien Nelis' *Virgil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodes*, J. J. O'Hara's work on etymological play, and Eleanor Dickey's *Latin forms of address*, invaluable for assessing the tone of interchanges between characters

On the deficit side, despite the admonitions of previous reviewers, H. is unrepentant in the constant chatter of approval or disapproval for entries in the *Thesaurus* and *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, and we are usually not told what the grounds for such value judgements are. This is not a commentary designed to be used as a free-standing tool: as a matter of policy H. does not repeat the content of notes contained in his previous commentaries (700-2, repeated verbatim from 2.792-4, an extreme example, where three whole lines go without detailed verbal comment), and fully to understand the continuous dialogue with the commentaries of others it is often necessary to refer to them. This is the kind of book for which the bookwheel might have been invented. Where a significant parallel is quoted in full in another commentary, H. often gives a bare reference (whereas my own practice as a commentator is to quote the important parallels, and give references for (a selection of) the less important, regardless of what earlier commentators have quoted). In a number of places discussion of topics that have attracted the attention of other scholars and commentators is curtailed with a peremptory 'This is not the place ...' There is method in the bibliographical system, but it is labyrinthine, and on more than one occasion I gave up the attempt to follow the clue. In introductory sections, rather than presenting an ordered argument or structured presentation of the issues, H. has a habit of giving a numbered list of points, often loosely related. Some notes need to be tightened and streamlined. There is occasional unintentional repetition, and a sprinkling of typos (for which H. takes Norden to task!).

I note some of the overall features of H.'s approach to Virgilian studies. There is a healthy scepticism on a variety of issues: on the accuracy of Virgil's topography, and on the possibility of mapping in detail the movements of the Trojans between various points of the landscape around Cumae; on the extent of Virgil's use of the technical language of religion and ritual, which H. views as largely an illusory obsession of the late-antique commentators (see e.g. 191, 197 nn.); an almost total scepticism on the truthfulness of anything in the ancient lives of Virgil. H. shows an Anglo-Saxon tolerance when it comes to inconsistencies in the text, which he would not see invariably as signs of incompleteness. H. agrees with Norden and Austin that 211 *cunctantem* of the Golden Bough, at the point when Aeneas plucks it, is not at odds with the Sibyl's promise at 146 that *ipse uolens facilisque sequetur*; H.'s refusal to see a contradiction in this instance is part of his general antipathy to 'Harvard School' readings. By contrast H. these days shows something like a relish for metapoetical possibilities (e.g. 88, 185). He is much less ready than some commentators to cite parallels from post-Virgilian texts, but the early reception of Virgil is a part of the wider tradition of commentary and interpretation, and may be valuable evidence for the modern commentator (for an example see my note on line 283 below).

H. sets himself apart from Norden in his unwillingness to see traces of Ennius at every turn, and also in his scepticism as to the possible presence of Jewish elements in the eschatology of *Aeneid* 6 (the question of Jewish elements in *Eclogue* 4 is a different matter). H. gives us less than Norden on the rhetoric of Virgilian speeches, the artistic arrangement of verse paragraphs, word order and sound-effects. Through a series of notes giving general surveys of particular figures and linguistic features Norden cumulatively provides substantial elements of a Virgilian poetics; Norden in 1903 shared Richard Heinze's missionary zeal to demonstrate the greatness of Virgil as a poet.

After an 'Introduction' which is more by way of a tabulation under various headings than a full and integrated introduction to the book, there follows, as in earlier volumes, a text without apparatus, but with marginal signs indicating notes in the commentary on points of text, orthography and punctuation, together with a workmanlike facing prose translation. Line 729 is inexplicably missing in the Latin text, and also in the facing translation, which shows other signs of, it may be, haste, in the form of words left untranslated, and translations at odds with interpretative choices made in the commentary. The following caught my eye, and are not the harvest of a systematic reading of the translation against the Latin: 8 'water' is not a close translation of *flumina*. 11 *magnam* is omitted in the translation. 132 *atro* omitted in the translation. 152 *sedibus hunc refer ... suis* 'put him in his due resting-place', not 'return him' (he hasn't yet been in his resting-place). 195 'favoured' not a close translation of *pinguem*. 223-4 *subiectam ... facem* 'the torch(es) applied under (the pyre)', not 'torches pointing downwards'. Most of 326-7 is omitted in the translation. 335 *simul* omitted in the translation. 371 *saltem* is translated closely with *in morte*, in contradiction to the note in the commentary. 477 *molitur* is translated as plural. 515 *super ... uenit* is translated 'came into', but glossed as 'came down on top of' in the commentary. 567 *castigatque* translated as 'he punishes', but glossed as 'reprimands, dresses down' in the commentary. 575 punctuated with a question mark in the text, with a full stop in the translation. 595 'Titans' a slip for 'Tityos'. 664 'They made others ...', as if this line refers to *pii uates et Phoebos digna locuti*, rather than to a new group. 679 *penitus* omitted in the translation. 848 (*credo equidem*) omitted in the translation. 884-5 *spargam* and *accumulem* are both translated as futures, while the commentary argues that *s.*, like *a.*, is subjunctive.

Detailed notes on the commentary follow (by line numbers, unless preceded by 'p(p)'):

4 Suet. *Claud.* 20.3 is an inexact parallel for *ancora fundabat nauis*, since Suetonius is talking about making firm a mass resting on the bottom of the sea.

7 H. doesn't raise the question of whether *lignatio* or hunting for game is

here described, and it's not clear to me how H. does take the clause. Norden and Austin are both clearer here, as often.

28 *sed enim*: brief mention of the archaism is in place, although no doubt we get full details if we refer to H. on 2.164.

30 *opere in tanto*: since H. is open to the idea that Daedalus is like a poet, one might note the use of *opus* to refer to a literary 'work' (*OLD* 9c).

44: 4.173 is not an example of *ruo* used of *fama*.

45 *uentum erat*: the report of Austin should go with the following lemma, *ad limen*.

49 I'm not convinced that this particular use of *tument* activates a wave metaphor (as Norden would also have it); there are many examples at *OLD* 3a where the image of a wave is not required. Here the idea of swelling seems to be picked up in *maiorque uideri*, at the risk of a rather grotesque image (was this line on Lucan's mind at *Bell. civ.* 9.793 *miscens cuncta tumor; toto iam corpore maior?*).

52-3 Given the anthropomorphic hint in *attonitae ... ora domus*, does *dehiscent* hint at the *hiatus* of a human or animal mouth? One thinks of the Orcus at Bomarzo, and cf. *Aen.* 6.273 *faucibus Orci*.

71 At Ov. *Met.* 11.593 *penetralia Somni* does not refer to a sacred space.

p. 119 The lemmata from v. 80 are a duplicate of those at the bottom of p. 118.

88 *nec Dorica castra*: the Homeric Achaean camp finds a correspondence in the Trojan camp, besieged in book 9, as well as in the Latins' army, just as (in my view) *alius Achilles* refers to both Turnus and Aeneas (all part of the Sibyl's oracular ambiguity). But I'm not sure that I see what H. is saying in his note on *nec Dorica castra*.

102 *et ... quierunt*: cf. also Cat. 63.38 *abit in quiete molli rabidus furor animi*.

116 *orans*: is this in fact an instance of the archaic sense 'speak' of *orare*? At 10.96 Juno is making a public 'oration'; at 4.437 Dido has been 'beseeching' her sister. 7.446 is perhaps the only clear example of the archaic sense. In this line 'speaking' seems otiose before *mandata dabat*.

134 'L.: 393, 8.296, Prop. 4.3.15 ...': an example of an unhelpfully terse lemma. 'L.' is short for '[Stygios] lacus' in the head-lemma: that does not strain the reader unduly, but you have to look up the citations to realise that 'L.' stands for '*lacus* used of infernal bodies of water'.

p. 161, last line (on v. 141): for '*cui datur*' read '*cuiquam datur*', as in Austin, cited for the point.

159 *uestigia figit*: I find the sense 'plant footsteps' (as they go on their way) preferable to 'stop'. The instances of *u. pressit* are not strong evidence for the sense of *u. figit*, and I am tempted to see in the whole clause, *paribus curis uestigia figit*, a suggestion that Achates keeps pace with Aeneas, *pari passu*, as well as being in lockstep with his thought processes.

177 *festinant flentes*: 'The partic. discreetly adds a first sign of emotional reaction' reads oddly after 175 *fremebant*.

193 *maternas agnouit auis*: perhaps worth including a cross-reference to 1.405-6 *matrem | agnouit*, especially since there Venus has just drawn her son's attention to a bird omen.

195-6 *pinguem diues opacat | ramus humum*: there seems to be more wordplay than H. allows for between the richness of gold and 'rich' soils: note *OLD diues* 2a '(of land) rich in produce, fertile', and cf. Ov. *Fasti* 1.689-90 *neque pinguior aequo | diuitiis pereat luxuriosa suis [seges]*.

206 *fronde ... noua* may hint at a magical spring, after 205 *brumali frigore*: cf. the contrast between the chills of autumn and the sunnier climes of *terris ... apricis* in the simile at 309-12. Random checking of the parallels cited for *fronde noua* shows that for Ov. *F.* 1.138 read 3.138, and for AA 2.199 read 1.299.

227 The evidence cited seems clearly to indicate that *fauilla* refers to ashes, whether of the body or of the other combustibles of the pyre; *OLD* does not distinguish between 'ash' and 'remains', and Pliny *Nat.* 19.19 *corporis fauillam ab reliquo separant cinere* uses *fauilla* to distinguish between the 'ashes' of the body and the ashes left by the rest of the pyre.

264 That the 'silence' of *umbraeque silentes* 'suggests inability to communicate in human speech' (as opposed to the squeaking, etc., attributed to ghosts) seems counter-intuitive. *silentes* is often a word for 'the dead', and I know of no instances of *silens* used in the sense of *infans* 'inarticulate'.

268-72 Under 268 *sola sub nocte* H. mocks Austin's 'singular' (so H) suggestion that the nocturnal draining of colour from the world 'reads like a personal experience by the poet in his country days' (Austin on 272); the suggestion is in fact owed to Norden (p. 211), 'der italische Bauernsohn kannte die Wälder'. H. may be right that literature is more important than life, but the crucial intertext is not the Odyssean passage cited by H. on 268, but *Lucr.* 2.795-8, cited by H. on 271. This is an example of the desirability of integrating notes scattered over different lemmata.

274 *cubilia* is most simply taken of 'beds, couches', although Austin also thinks of 'bedrooms'.

280-1 The ascription to *Discordia* of the snaky locks of the Furies perhaps looks forward to the close relationship in the next book between Allecto and Ennius' *Discordia*.

283 Ov. *Met.* 11.613-14 *hunc circa passim uarias imitantia formas | somnia uana iacent* (cited by Austin) suggests that Ovid took Virgil's *uulgo* in the sense *passim*. Ovid's reading deserves as much, if not more attention, than the contributions of Servius and the later commentators; an example where H.'s reluctance to cite post-Virgilian parallels leads to impoverishment.

285 'A fine generalizing conclusion to this section of the list': rather Austin on 285 ff. 'A new grouping'.

291 In the note here H. does appear to see an inconsistency between 260, where the Sibyl instructs Aeneas to draw his sword, and her warning here not to use it against the shadowy monsters, while the note on 260 seeks to explain away an inconsistency only apparent.

292 The strikingly odd use of *uita* in *tenuis sine corpore uitas* (the shadowy monstrous creatures at the entrance to the Underworld) seems not to have struck the commentators. Elsewhere, however, H. is commendably alert to the problems of corporeality in the Underworld.

312 *terris immittit apricis*: I think *immitto* here is just ‘send to’ (*OLD* 1a, where this example is to be found), rather than ‘let loose in’.

351 Austin is misreported.

388-96 There is no note on 325-30, a ghost reference.

388 *armatus*: the Servius quote needs to be given in full to make sense: *ac si diceret* [sc. Charon], *nihil pium molitur armatus*.

426-547 (p. 318) There is surely no doubt at all that *Lugentes campi* refers only to the place of those who died for love (as H. acknowledges on 442 *hic quos ... peredit*), and not to all the categories of dead covered in 426-547.

440-9 (p. 332) *Euadnenque et Pasiphaen* at 447 is not an ‘alliterative linked pair’.

456 *uerus ... nuntius*: I have some comment on *nuntius* and *fama* in *Rumour and renown* (Cambridge 2012) 355, with n. 62.

473 *coniunx ubi pristinus*: I’d prefer to keep both senses, ‘of long ago’ and ‘previous’ (to Aeneas) in play. The division over whether what happened in the cave was or was not *coniugium* continues; one might also consider the possibility that *coniunx pristinus* is focalized through Dido herself. The issue of what Aeneas was/is to Dido, and what she to him continues in line 475 *nec minus Aeneas casu percussus iniquo*: after the verb *aequat* (*aequatque Sychaeus amorem*) *nec minus* is a bit more than just a transition-formula, and *iniquo* is in tension with *aequat*.

493 *hiantis* must refer just to the Greeks (of whose number we have been told that only *pars* turn tail at the sight of Aeneas), and not to the Trojans.

p. 362 Aeneas does not encounter Misenus in the Underworld.

494 ff. The links between this vision of a mangled son of Priam and Aeneas’ dream-vision of the mangled Hector in book 2 bear emphasizing; the two visions taken together could be said to frame the history of Aeneas’ reluctance to detach himself from his Trojan past, from which he will move on when he meets Anchises in the Elysian Fields. Line 494 *Atque hic Priamiden laniatum corpore toto* might introduce a second vision of Hector, before we reach *Deiphobum* at the beginning of the next line. The Ennian Cassandra’s prophetic vision of the mutilated Hector *o lux Troiae, germane Hector, quid ita cum tuo lacerato corpore, miser, aut qui te sic respectantibus tractauere nobis* (69-71 Jocelyn), cited by Macrobius as the

model for Aeneas' address to Hector at 2.281 ff., also looks like a model for the present passage (so Norden): cf. 494 *laniatum corpore toto*, 501 *quis tam crudelis optavit sumere poenas*. See H. on 6.546 for another connection between the scenes in books 2 and 6.

532-3 *pelagine uenis erroribus actus | an monitu diuum?*: for the alternatives, by chance or by design, cf. 7.213-18 (Ilioneus to Latinus) *nec fluctibus actos | atra subegit hiems uestris succedere terris ... consilio ... adferimur*.

534 *tristis sine sole domos*: [Aesch.] PV 453 ἐν μυχῶϊς ἀνηλίοις is not the best of the tragic parallels adduced by Norden and Austin.

535-6 H. seems to follow Austin in thinking that Aeneas and the Sibyl judge the passage of time in the Underworld by somehow observing the sun's passage in the sky, but this epic description of time is firmly in the mouth of the objective narrator. We are not told what means the Sibyl has to keep track of time.

542 It is more natural to take *malorum* as 'evildoers' (as H. has it in his translation) rather than as genitive of *mala*.

p. 391, 4 up For 'A triple wall surrounded by a wall' read '... surrounding a wall'.

565 I am not persuaded, as is H, by Weber's argument that *perque omnia duxit* refers to a verbal exposition by Hecate to Deiphobe of the contents of Tartarus, rather than a physical tour. *sed* in 564 is a strong adversative, capable of making an exception to the rule expressed in the previous line that no chaste person may enter Tartarus. At 888 *Anchises natum per singula duxit* seems to refer to a physical tour (cf. 886 *uagantur*).

571 *quatit* can hardly mean 'brandish' with *insontis* as object; she 'hurries them along' with her whip. The parallel at 12.337-9 makes an equestrian metaphor probable.

580-2 It is more natural to take *hic ... hic ...* as referring to two groups both of which the Sibyl has seen herself ('Here also I saw', as H. translates the second *hic*).

594 *immani turbine*: 12.531-2 *praecipitem scopulo atque ingentis turbine saxi | excutit* favours taking *i. t.* here of the thunderbolt rather than of the person of Salmoneus as he fell.

599-600 *habitatque sub alto | pectore*: Virgil's cultivation of 'das Grausige' (so Norden) in the description of Tityos may go further if what is here envisaged is the behaviour of vultures in getting right inside a carcass to take their fill.

612-13 *quique arma secuti | impia*: if the allusion is to the slaves who fought with Sextus Pompeius, there will be a pointed reference to Sextus' claim to *pietas* as his especial virtue (so A. Powell in H.-P. Stahl (ed.) *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan epic and political context* (London 1998) 88).

p. 437 n. 2 There are no women (or 'variable') in Tartarus (as opposed to

the regions of the Underworld that we encounter before Tartarus).

641 *solemque suum, sua sidera norunt*: the idea that the reflexive adjectives could refer to Aeneas and the Sibyl is surely a non-starter.

647 'Conte surprisingly approves Markland's banal *fidem* for *eadem*' overstates Conte's '*fortasse recte*' in his app. crit. But Markland did draw attention to an awkwardness in the transmitted *eadem*.

652 *defixae hastae*: there is no indication that the heroes have yet realized that they have visitors – Aeneas is still observing from a distance, and the group described at 657-9 have not yet interrupted what they are doing – so this will not be the reason that they have set aside their spears.

681 *recolens*: *OLD* s.v. 4a gives this in the sense of 'go over in one's mind' presumably because there are no other examples in the sense that H. posits of 'review' (in physical presence), which is already conveyed twice over by *lustrabat* and *recensebat*.

684-5 The repetition of *tendentem* and *tetendit* gains in point if one emphasizes the contrast with 1.487 *tendentemque manus Priamum conspexit inermem*: there a father whose gesture will win back only the corpse of his son, here a father and son moving/reaching towards one another and reunited beyond the barrier of death, even if they are to be thwarted of a physical embrace. Likewise 687 *expectata*, introducing a joyous reunion beyond the grave is in contrast with 2.282-3 *quibus Hector ab oris | expectate uenis?*, reunion in a dream with a ghost in a meeting that brings only pain.

703 *in ualle reducta*: the repetition of the phrase at 8.609 is significant, here the setting for a meeting with Aeneas' father and for the major 'prophecy' of the Parade of Heroes, there for a meeting with his mother and the major 'prophecy' of the Shield. More than just 'conventional phrasing'.

719-20 I find it improbable that *sublimis* refers to 'lofty, exalted' souls: what grounds might Aeneas have at this point for supposing that only such souls are condemned to return to bodies?

725 *Titaniaque astra*: given the difficulties with the phrase, I have toyed with the idea of reading *Titanaque et astra* (moon, sun and stars as a tripartite expression summing up the heavenly bodies).

p. 497 I am less certain than is H. that Empedocles was 'not normal reading for V.'. Recent work by various scholars suggests that Empedocles is an important presence in Latin poetry.

781 *illa incluta Roma*: one wonders whether *illa* here functions as a marker of allusion to Enn. *Ann.* 155 *augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est*.

796-7 On Atlas and 'axis' see also P. Hardie, *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 33 (1983) 220-8.

802 *aeripedem*: the transference of bronze hooves to the Cerynean hind is eased by the fact that the beast is already partially metallic, with horns of gold.

816 *nunc quoque iam*: the combination of adverbs seems odd (but nothing in the commentaries). At *Geo.* 2.171 *qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris*, *nunc* may be understood of what Caesar is doing now, in the present day, as opposed to the heroes of past history in the previous lines, and *iam* as going close with *uictor*, ‘already victorious’. At *Ov. Met.* 11.144–5 *nunc quoque iam ueteris percepto semine uenae | arua rigent auro*, *nunc quoque* is the common Ovidian formula for the lasting effects of an aetiological tale, and *iam* goes with *ueteris*. Here after *nunc quoque* there is no need for *iam* to further reinforce *nimum*.

846 For some discussion of the themes of *unus homo* and restoring the *res publica* in this quotation of Ennius, in their interaction with Augustan ideology, see P. Hardie *The epic successors of Virgil* (Cambridge 1993) 4–5.

847–8, 850 If there may be play between *dicent* (850) and *ducent* (848), as H. suggests, is there perhaps also play between *ducent* and *ex-cudent* 847)?

853 *et debellare superbos*: Norden, at least, does not ignore the Livian colouring of *debellare* (‘ein Lieblingswort des Livius’).

869 ‘I am not sure why Mynors prints such an oddity here’ (*nec*, rather than *neque*): neither am I sure why H. prints *nec* in his text.

882 *si qua fata aspera rumpas!* Despite the quite compelling argument for this punctuation, H. translates this clause as if it were the protasis to *tu Marcellus eris*, both in the commentary and in the translation proper.

PHILIP HARDIE
Trinity College, Cambridge
prh1004@cam.ac.uk

