

NOTES

1. op.cit., p.166.
2. above, pp. 19-24.
3. op.cit., p.168.
4. Plutarch, Antonius, 2.1.
5. ibid., 4.1.
6. Q.Curtius, H.A., 8.10.1.
7. op.cit., p.170.

BOOK REVIEWS

P. VERGILI MARONIS OPERA recognovit R.A.B.MYNORS.
Oxford Classical Texts. Clarendon Press, 1969. pp.xvi + 452.
90p.(18s.) net.

"After nearly seventy years of frontline service", says the cover jacket of the new Oxford Text, "the plates of the old one are worn out". They can hardly be said to have lost face before the text itself. Sir Arthur Hirtzel was a scholar of poor natural judgment. He was easily seduced by fashionable German novelties (proffered by Ladewig and Deuticke, Hoffman and Gütling). He venerated his great predecessors, like Bentley and Madvig, with so little discrimination that he often laid them under contribution when they were patently "aiming in haste at the wrong target". It was high time for a new edition, worn plates or no.

Professor Mynors brings to his task a lifetime's study of manuscripts and the problems of textual transmission: it is here that we look first for a new contribution; and if, after a long cool look, we find an improvement in presentation rather than a gain in knowledge, we must remember the unique position of Virgil among classical authors. The intense interest taken in him from the time his literary executors published the Aeneid has caused his text to be the best attested of classical authors; but that same interest produced such a brisk traffic in comparing MSS and collecting variants, that it is extremely difficult to distinguish different streams of the tradition.

Of the eight primary MSS of Virgil, three (M,P and R) are reasonably complete, five (A,B,F,G and V) are fragments only. None has been recollated for the new edition, and it is unlikely that any new information of value for the text would have come to light after the monumental labours of Ribbeck and Sabbadini (and the important corrections of H.R.Fairclough in TAPA 63 (1932) 205-29 and M.Geymonat in Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo 29.3 (1966).) All eight MSS were dated by Sabbadini to the fourth or fifth century; for five of them (A,B,G,P,V), however, Mynors inclines to a later date within this range

than Sabbadini. The relationship between them is still unknown.

The text depends essentially on M, P and R, but P has lost thirty two folia and R seventy seven. Hirtzel (praef.v) drew attention to the intimate relationship between R and the Bern MS a, and Sabbadini (praef.27) to that between P and Guelferbytanus Gudianus lat. 2^o.70(γ) which he used where P was defective. Mynors takes the next rationalising step, and having verified the descent of a and γ from R and P (after correction) respectively, uses them as suffects where their ancestors are defective (and they now appear in the rubric of "MSS available" at the beginning of each section of the apparatus).

Completely new ground is broken in the new edition with ninth century MSS. Professor Mynors has been active in Paris - and in Bern too. In these two places are concentrated most of the nine MSS whose readings are now reported for the first time (a,b, and c had been used by Ribbeck, and p, of the late eighth century, by Sabbadini). Mynors detects a family likeness in a group of three of them (d,h,t) and in a group of four (a(a^o), e,u,v), but the laborious work which might prove a family connection has not been undertaken. The unanimous or majority consensus of ninth century MSS (excluding γ) is, for the sake of brevity, designated ω; and here, "in no few places" says Mynors, the genuine text is better preserved than in the primary MSS. The pulse quickens. Hirtzel (praef.v, note 2), cited thirteen places where "truth or probability" seemed to him to be preserved by the minuscule MSS (not exclusively ninth century). Of these readings, five are not considered true by Mynors (Aen.1,455; 6,609; 10,673; 11,654; 12,221); three are already to be found in the Servian commentary (Ecl.1, 12; Aen.1, 193; 9,455); one (Aen. 8,244) is discovered to be the original reading of M; one (Georg. 2,22) is supplied by γ as suffect for the defective P. Two only survive (Aen.9,657 and 11,382). When we turn to Mynors' own apparatus for the first half of the Aeneid, we discover fourteen places where the reading accepted in the text derives from (a) minuscule MS(S). If we discount spelling confusions (de/di-, Aen.2,398; 6,734; propior/proprior Aen. 3,531), and readings anticipated by the Servian commentary (Aen. 2, 387; 6,20), we find only two which depend on ninth century MSS (Aen.6, 96; 6.801; add, if one can have an "authentic" reading in a spurious line, Aen.6, 242). This is a depressingly small gain from the ninth century MSS, and no gain for the text of Virgil (both readings were known to and accepted by Ribbeck). But, granted that true ninth century readings are few in number, what of their status? Mynors reminds us that the scholars of this age of the Carolingian renaissance were learned; he adds that they almost certainly had access to ancient MSS of Virgil now lost. We are invited to believe that here we may perhaps be viewing the sparse but precious relics of a lost Virgilian Atlantis. We might be persuaded by just one example of a true reading unlikely to be within the conjectural ability of a Carolingian scholar (who may well not have read anything in his life except in Latin). It seems doubtful whether any such can be found, or whether the nine MSS used for the first time can teach us anything except that a small number of easy corrections were communicated by scholars to their friends in the ninth as in any other century.

MSS later than the ninth century are deemed by Mynors unable to contribute much, because they are so full of, amongst other things, corrections.

If anyone should think that a correction made after the ninth century is less valuable per se, he has only to consult Mynors' apparatus to the first half of the Aeneid to be disabused. Five readings (at Aen. 4,217; 5,522; 5, 573; 6,254; 6,900) are adopted for the text from recentiores (as compared with the two, mentioned above, from ninth century MSS). (An interesting casualty of the embargo on post-ninth century MSS is the Prague MS (λ), now discovered to be two centuries later than was thought).

As regards the apparatus criticus: (1) the most notable change, as remarked above, is in the reporting of ninth-century MSS; in Aen.8, for instance, there are seventeen such readings (from ninth-century MSS alone), of which none is a serious contestant against the accepted reading, and none is ever likely to appear in any text. (2) Details of primary MSS misreported by Ribbeck (and so by Hirtzel) are corrected (e.g. the schedae Veronenses rescriptae (V) begin for Aen.8 at line 14 not line 15; at Aen.8, 115 fatus is the reading of P, not of R). (3) The apparatus is usually but not always helpful in citing the reference to the similar passage elsewhere in Virgil which is the probable source of a variant reading. So e.g. at Aen. 8, 527 increpat, we can be fairly sure that the ninth-century intonat derived ultimately from Aen. 9, 709. But that variant was already known to Servius, and such interchanges had no doubt already taken place in the text before the date of our primary witnesses. So if, eight lines before (Aen. 8, 519), we had been informed that nomine Pallas (M ω Servius) is also the ending of line 121 of the same book, we might be less inclined than Mynors to prefer nomine to munere (PRb). (4) The indirect tradition (citations chiefly by grammarians, lexicographers and commentators) is much more fully documented. There are some interesting sidelights on the transmission: a variant in the primary MSS was already known to a scribbler at Pompeii three centuries or so earlier (Ecl.2, 56); papyri of the fifth century reveal (as papyri often do) a corruption of the truth preserved on parchment (at e.g. Aen. 4, 459). There are however some inaccuracies: e.g. Aen.8,581 is cited by Servius on Aen.9,480 not 9, 482). (5) Not least important for the user of a selective apparatus is the elimination of the unconsidered trifles picked up by Hirtzel (of the type cumulatum munere mittam Kloucek, Aen. 4, 436), and the incorporation of important and good suggestions, some promoted to the text for the first time.

In the quality of the text itself, the taste and judgment of its editor make it a great advance on the old OCT. Protests against Hirtzel's edition have intermittently been made. Most notably, in their editions of Aeneid II and IV, and III and V respectively, Professor R.G.Austin and Mr. R.D.Williams together registered a total of thirty one disagreements (from minor orthographic matters to crucial questions of reading and punctuation) with the old OCT; in sixteen cases the reading they would have preferred is preferred also by Mynors. In Aen. 8 I note the following changes. (1) The punctuation of lines 90, 532 and 533 is undoubtedly correct and a return to sanity. (2) Different readings are adopted at 108 and 223 (both certainly right), 512 (probably right), 75 (uncompelling), 519 (probably wrong). (3) In four places Mynors agrees with Hirtzel where, although delicate problems are involved, a change would arguably have been for the better (lines 205, 555, 633, 672). (4) Two conjectures are adopted for text (211 raptor Wakefield; 588 it Markland), neither is indispensably required, both are what one would wish Virgil to have written.

Other noteworthy conjectures adopted for the text occur at Aen.3, 684f. (Heinsius and Nisbet); Aen. 5, 505 (Slater, recommended by Mackail); Aen.9, 579 (Housman), Aen. 10, 366 (Madvig); Aen. 11, 173 (Bentley); Aen.12, 218 (Schrader). In these places the text ails seriously and Mynors adopts the best remedy available. The editor's duty is to present an intelligible text wherever possible, and even if he thinks that a certain conjecture falls short of absolute certainty, it is better to accept it (especially in a "standard" series) than dither on an obelus. Both the obeli in Hirtzel's text have now disappeared (Aen. 7, 543, and 10, 186); a new one, the only one, has appeared at Aen. 2, 587, where the text depends not on the primary MSS of Virgil, but of Servius). (The Helen episode of Aen. 2, 567 - 588 is printed in the text as is customary. This was the right thing to do while the battle over its authenticity still rages. It was even more right to relegate the prefatory verses Ille ego qui quondam ... to the preface; whatever their origin, nobody sensitive to epic tradition could want the Aeneid to begin with anything but Arma virumque).

Nothing is said in the new OCT's preface about orthography (not even the usual perfunctory remark about being above such things). The briefest explanation of why e.g. the primary MSS' (-) uo- (in e.g. uolneret, diuom) is standardised to (-) uu-, and of why the terminations of Greek proper names have sometimes Greek and sometimes Latin forms, would have been welcome. It is a comparatively unimportant matter, but of interest to students of sound-patterns and sound-effects.

A few misprints hit the eye (apparatus at Aen. 6, 898; text at Aen.4, 91-2); hopefully they will be corrected in an edition bound to be used by many examining boards.

The above remarks must be regarded not as a review but as a record of first impressions. A work of this size and importance has to be lived with. It shows every sign of improving with acquaintance.

Bedford College,
London.

P.T. EDEN.

George E. Duckworth: VERGIL AND CLASSICAL HEXAMETER POETRY: A STUDY
IN METRICAL VARIETY.
(University of Michigan Press, 1969.
Pp. ix + 167, \$7.50).

Flexibility of the texture of the hexameter verse is produced by the variation of a number of features. Professor Duckworth has selected the choice of spondee or dactyl in each of the first four positions in the verse and made a statistical study of the incidence of the resulting sixteen variants of the verse-form. He excludes from consideration verses with fifth-foot spondee - an omission which can be justified by their rarity and the added complexity of statistics if such verses were admitted. More attention is paid to Vergil than to other poets, and the Vergilian hexameter is taken as the peak of Latin hexametric composition, but Duckworth has also considered the rest of

hexameter poetry, from Ennius to Claudian, with not inconsiderable labour and care. It is his intention to obtain a statistical index of the choices of Latin poets and thus to produce a "finger-print" of the style of each poet. Such a characterisation is of interest in itself and should, if accurate, greatly assist the solution of problems of disputed authorship. Part I of the book, together with appended statistical tables, is devoted to the exposition of the statistical basis and findings; the longer Part II draws on these data to illustrate a history of the development of the Latin hexameter.

General interest will be more speedily aroused by his discussions in the second part of his work (which also is the easier part to read). Using his statistical studies, he takes the hexameter of Early Latin to be less Homeric than the Augustan hexameter. He gives to Cicero a prominent place in the development of the hexameter, for, if we accept his premises, Cicero's verse represents an advance on Lucretian technique in the direction of Vergilian technique. Horace is shown to have developed his hexameter technique continually, although Duckworth is properly modest in claiming only a secondary importance for metrical arguments in assigning a late date to the Ars Poetica. Regrettably, such caution is not always evident. In considering Vergil, he is able to distinguish the 'Messianic' Eclogue IV from the remaining eclogues on metrical grounds alone, and he offers reasons for concluding that Aeneid X-XII did not reach the same stage of revision as the preceding nine books. He considers in some detail the metrics of the Appendix Vergiliana and concludes that the Culex and Moretum are probably works of Vergil's youth, whereas the Ciris and Dirae are definitely non-Vergilian and the Aetna is probably a work of the second quarter of the first century A.D. Amongst post-Augustan poets, he finds two distinguishable tendencies: the imitation of Vergil, whose followers have a more spondaic hexameter; and the imitation of Ovid, with hexameters of greater dactylic content.

But his conclusions spring from his earlier statistical exposition, and this requires rather fuller examination. It is not clear to what extent Duckworth believes the selection of variants to have been under the conscious control of the poet. He does not discuss this question at all, but there is some unevenness throughout his work since at times he considers that he is dealing with something unalterable (hence his finger-print analogy) and at times he shows what he clearly thinks to be conscious development in individual poets. Unfortunately, the lack of decision here casts doubt upon one of the uses of the statistical tool - the detection of forgery: for if the variation considered is subject to close control, it can only be used for the detection of poor forgers. Moreover, the ascription to the poet of complete control leads one to seek literary rather than mathematical conditions of differentiation, as Duckworth himself does when he allows his own literary sensibilities to obtrude (to the reader's advantage) in Part II.

Whatever the cause, the statistics adduced, and the statistical tables assembled with such care, do demonstrate differences between poets and within the work of individuals. It is indeed useful to have assembled comparative tables of variation in the hexametric composition of a large number of poets. It is useful too to have indicated some of the contextual restrictions on the repetition of an identical pattern in successive lines (R), or after an interval

of one or two lines (NR). Duckworth shows that in the case of R and NR there are notable differences in the sensitivity of poets to the repetition, illustrated most clearly by the variation of homodyne and heterodyne in the fourth foot. In the Aeneid, Duckworth finds that Vergil introduced a change of stress in the fourth foot where the metrical pattern was repeated in 45 per cent of cases, whereas a change of fourth-foot stress in successive lines elsewhere is found only in 37 per cent of cases. His comparative tables show that Catullus notably lacked this sensitivity. It is here that Duckworth is at his best, since he is able to demonstrate a structurally significant variation which is also clearly motivated and statistically assured. But here too the disadvantage of concentration on one variable becomes obvious. Duckworth is by no means unconscious of other variables, but the complexity of statistical data which took account of all variables seems to have led him to leave them aside. Thus he has little to say about the phrasing of verse and caesurae, and little to say about the localisation of word types, except the post-caesural molossus which produces fourth-foot homodyne and spondee.

The author's principal efforts are directed to the establishment of the percentage of occurrence in all verses of the poet's most common variant of the sixteen possible, of the cumulative percentage of the four most favoured patterns, and again of the eight most favoured patterns. His principal, although not sole, instrument of further analysis is the percentage of the first eight patterns. He is thus able to make simple direct comparisons between poets. But one must doubt the real validity of the selection of the first eight, which is a purely arbitrary choice. It is nowhere demonstrated that there is a significant break between the relative frequency of the eighth and ninth patterns in a single poet, let alone in all, and thus the criterion is blunter than it need be. If each pattern occurred randomly, each should occur (over an infinite number of verses) in 6.25 per cent of lines. In this context, the occurrence in the Aeneid of the favourite pattern (ds) in 14.39 per cent is obviously significant, occurring 2.3 times as often as in a random sample. But further than this, one really needs some index of the absolute occurrence of each other variant, so that a real profile of the work of each poet may be observed. From this, it should be possible to select, not the favourite four or eight patterns in frequency, but those patterns, however few or many, which occur with significant frequency, and also those which fail to occur so clearly that their absence is significant. Such an enumeration must, of course, make comparison between poets rather more complicated than Duckworth's solution, since it is not certain that we shall find the same number of significant patterns in each poet. It is moreover open to the objection that a non-mathematical criterion of significance must be introduced: for patterns five to eight in Vergil Duckworth's figures show us an average frequency of 6.46 per cent, suggesting a clustering of variants close to the random sample index of 6.25 per cent; it is highly probable that inspection would not reveal a cut-off point for significance on statistical grounds alone. Sampling error should also be considered, and the author has made no allowance for this in his work.

The statistical validity of the study of the parameters of variation within arbitrarily selected passages of sixteen lines appears sounder: Duckworth considers how many different variants occur in each section of sixteen lines, where the theoretical maximum is sixteen, and produces average numbers per sixteen-line unit for each poet. The resulting index is a useful guide to

the flexibility of poets.

As a whole, this book may stimulate some interesting discussion of the development of the hexameter form, and it provides a useful starting point towards a closer mathematical study of Latin poetry. However, in my opinion, it is as yet insufficiently refined in its approach to statistical methods to command complete assent, and the author seems to regard figures in themselves as significant. Yet the book must be carefully studied by any scholar wishing to consider in future the modes of variation of the Latin hexameter.

Queen Mary College,
London.

D.W.BLACK.

VIRGIL : THE VOYAGE OF AENEAS

by D.A.S. John and A.F. Turberfield (Macmillan, 15s.Od.)

The Voyage of Aeneas is a new translation of Aeneid 1-6 by two Classics masters.

The Introduction (23pp.) gives the usual information about Virgil's Life and Works, etc.

The translation (147 pp.) occupies over half the volume. Divided into paragraphs, with frequent headings, this is very readable. Even the most common passages have an uncommon ring (e.g. "here also they shed tears for suffering").

The Notes (81 pp.), all on subject matter, explaining the allusions, are very full, and could perhaps be compared with those in Pope's Homer.

The three maps are adequate, if somewhat crowded.

The Index (disappointingly) is confined to proper names mentioned in the notes, but actually gives cumbersome references to the translation.

With many new translations of Virgil, the reader often feels "I have read this somewhere before". This translation has an air of unfamiliarity, and should go down well e.g. in courses demanding a knowledge of Latin Literature in Translation. A translation of Books 7-12 on similar lines would be welcome.

D.W.B.

LAND OF THE EAGLES

by Kenneth McLeish. (Longman, 18s.Od.).

Mr. McLeish has already published one version of the Aeneid under the title The Story of Aeneas (Longman, 8s.Od.). Land of the Eagles was specially written for younger readers (age 11-14).

Basically it is a much-condensed retelling of the Aeneid in chronological

order from the Wooden Horse to the Death of Turnus. But to gain immediacy it is told in the first person by Iulus (Ascanius), who is imagined to be 14 when the story begins.

The volume is divided into three "books" - "Troy" (i.e. Aeneid 2), "Carthage" (i.e. Aeneid 1, 3 and 4), and "The Land of the Eagles" (i.e. Aeneid 6-12). Thus, in spite of the title, only one third of the action takes place in Italy.

To suit his purpose, Mr. McLeish makes several changes (e.g. Anchises is killed in Carthage, Aeneas discovers Dido's death before he leaves) and several cuts (e.g. the whole of book five and most of book six). The supernatural is minimised - there is no visit to the Underworld and no personal appearance of the gods.

The story is well written, and the map and illustrations (by Graham Humphrey) add interest. A volume eminently suitable for the school library.

D.W.B.

AENEAS, SICILY AND ROME by KARL GALINSKY. Princeton University Press and O.U.P., 1970. £6.

THE GEORGICS OF VIRGIL : A CRITICAL SURVEY by L.P. Wilkinson. C.U.P., 1969. £4.

THE NATURE OF ROMAN POETRY by Gordon Williams, O.U.P. Paperback, 1970. 10/-.

Mr. Galinsky's book considers the visual data from antiquity concerning the legend of Aeneas. Valiant warrior, accomplice in the abduction of Helen, fugitive from burning Troy or founder of Rome, Aeneas in all his roles appears in ancient sculpture and wall painting, on coins, vases, lamps, mirrors and gems. Mr. Galinsky examines how far Aeneas was a familiar character to the Greeks and Romans, what qualities in him commanded admiration, and how his legend was employed in imperial propaganda. At the same time he looks at what is known of the legend in the literary, historical and religious traditions of antiquity. The book is remarkably well illustrated.

As an illumination of the background to the Aeneid this work will prove very valuable. On Aeneas in Virgil, Galinsky suggests that the poet was not simply working upon an already crystallised characterisation but actually helped to form the image of 'pius Aeneas'. Considerable space is given to discussion of the legend's background in Sicily, Etruria and Latium, and of the adoption of this foundation legend at Rome. The last chapter compares the Venus and Aeneas reliefs of the Augustan Altar of Peace as the culminating development of the legend in art with Virgil's epic, the corresponding poetic culmination. Not the least interesting feature of this book is its demonstration of how compelling a figure Aeneas was to the ancient imagination.

We have known for long that Mr. Wilkinson was meditating a work on 'the

best poem of the best poet'. The long wait has been worth it. This full-length study, the first such on the Georgics in English, correctly sees the purpose of the poem to be not so much the instruction of farmers as the delight of readers. It is the first poem in the whole of literature in which the chief source of pleasure lies in description. The literary, philosophical, political and agricultural aspects of the poem are carefully treated, and there is an excellent chapter on the Nachleben of the Georgics. Rounding off the book are seven appendices, the second of which treats with proper scepticism the 'numerical schematism' which has been obsessing some scholars, while the fourth gives a good conspectus of recent literature on the problem of the Aristaeus epyllion (more fully discussed on pp.108-120). Wilkinson suggests that Virgil would have thought an aition for 'Bugonia' a suitable ending for a poem on bees, Aristaeus a suitable hero for this aition, and epyllion a suitable form for it. The poet would have looked for a contrasting story to inset in his epyllion, but why Orpheus was chosen is a matter for speculation, as is also to what extent the Orpheus passage or the Aristaeus epyllion carries symbolic meaning for the interpretation of the Georgics as a whole.

It is good to have this book. What we now need is a full-dress commentary in English.

Last year we reviewed in these pages Gordon Williams's Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry. This year we welcome the paperback version in abbreviated and simplified form. Every sixth-form library should acquire a copy.

Queen Mary College,
University of London.

H. MacL. Currie.



