

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA – JUAN A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA – MIRYAM LIBRÁN MORENO – ANTONIO RAMÍREZ DE VERGER (eds.), Virgilio, *Eneida II* (libros IV–VI), *III* (libros VII–IX), *IV* (libros X–XII; índices de José A. Bellido Díaz). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas. Alma Mater, Colección de autores griegos y latinos, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas – Tirant Lo Blanch, 2011, pp. xxviii + 179+179 (Vol. II), xxiv + 176+176 (Vol. III), xxiii + 194+395 (Vol. IV), ISBN 978-84-00-08830-9 (Obra completa), ISBN 978-84-00-09283-2 (Vol. II), ISBN 978-84-00-09339-6 (Vol. III), ISBN 978-84-00-09340-2 (Vol. IV).

Only a few months after the publication of the above three volumes, Mario Geymonat, Emeritus Professor of Università ca' Foscari, Venice, and reviewer of the first volume in this series in *Exemplaria Classica* (14, 2010, 353–356) died on the 17th of February 2012. Both the team of editors behind this project and the readers of *Exemplaria Classica* lost a reviewer who was singularly well equipped for the task of evaluating the whole enterprise. At a very young age for an editor of Vergil Geymonat had renewed the famous Vergil edition of Remigio Sabbadini (1850–1934) who in 1930 after a lifetime's devotion to Vergil's text and its explication presented the best edition of Vergil so far after Otto Ribbeck's. Sabbadini's edition had afterwards been taken into the Corpus Paravianum by Luigi Castiglioni. Geymonat's edition from 1973 set, however, a new standard by its palaeographic diligence and rigour and by the copious reports on variants and conjectures. Not least Geymonat will be remembered among Vergilians for his findings in the palimpsest V. As a reviewer Geymonat had a generous and open mind and in particular the not self-evident ability to learn from colleagues and change his own positions accordingly. In his review of the first volume of the Spanish *Eneida* he mentions in particular *teneam* (in stead of *teneant*) at 3. 686 (also adopted by Mynors and Conti) and four other readings where the Spanish team had convinced him: *Lavinaque* at 1.2 (with e.g. Goold), *alta* at 1.427 and *actus* at 3. 708 (with Mynors) and *ampla* at 2.503 (with Austin). Typical of Geymonat's unassuming personality is that he did not make a point of cases where he must have been of another opinion than the team. Such cases would anyway be easy to spot for those who cared.

The present reviewer can offer the deceased colleague no better honour than to repeat his congratulations with which he ended his review and to emphasize the ever-present conviction when reviewing a brand new text of Vergil: It would take a lifetime to evaluate adequately and justly an edition like this. What the present reviewer hopefully can achieve after some weeks'

company with the edition is only to scrape at the surface and put forward a few ideas that are not so much criticism of the present project as suggestions which future editors may or may not choose to take into account.

First of all a few words should be said about all four volumes taken as a whole: Already by their exterior the volumes are conspicuous by their quality: in binding, typography and paper. One fourth, three *libri* at a time, are united in each volume with the original text 'in fronte' as the Italians say and with the critical apparatus at the bottom. A Spanish translation accompanies the text on the opposite page and below there is a commentary keyed to the translation. At times we find a good quantitative correspondence between the left hand side and the right hand side, but often – and necessarily as a consequence of this kind of disposition – there will be more or less blank space on the left hand side due to the surplus created by the commentary. The indices (on which see some comments below) are put in pages of three columns in the last volume (200 pages altogether).

A distinctive and unusual feature not commented on by Geymonat in his review is the collective team of editors behind the project. The team consists of four in principle equal participants. As can be expected there has been from the start a division of tasks between them: Antonio Ramírez de Verger established a text and an apparatus to build on and proceed from, Luis Rivero García did most of the translation (I-IV and VII-XII), Miryam Librán Moreno prepared the running commentary and Juan A. Estévez Sola, who took part in the translation of Book VI, was responsible for manuscript research, scrutiny of editions and indirect testimonies. The introduction to the edition reflects these apportionments. The team has met regularly to discussions and decisions. In short we get the impression that a sort of intense and extensive seminar has preceded the publication. But as we know nothing about the kind of discussions and about possible tensions and disagreements we have to look to the finished product only.

We have not only to do with four volumes and four co-editors, but also with four parts that invite individual evaluation and separate comments: 1) An 'Introducción' in vol. I that could well have been a separate monograph is, as it seems, excellently fit for students of Vergil at the university level. I at least know no quite comparable book containing so much concise and up-to-date information about the poet and his poems. 2) Then there is a highly competent edition of Vergil's text with critical apparatus and 3) a translation and 4) a running commentary (with indices). It is therefore to be hoped that the edition could exercise a much wider influence in the future than may now be the case if a publisher in the Anglo-Saxon market could have at least the essential parts of it (Introduction, Commentary, Indices) translated into English. This would be a boon to Vergil scholars across the world and help to bring them closer together. As it is, the text with its apparatus should be recognised as deserving an obvious place on the shelves in classical reading rooms and university libraries everywhere.

Apparatus criticus: I begin with that part of the project which I deem to be the most original and valuable contribution to Vergilian studies in the whole project. The way to present the critical apparatus as part of an ancient text has been extremely long in the making, as we all know, and still improvements can be made to the concept. In this edition the *apparatus criticus* differs considerably from those in the other Vergil editions at hand: as to size it is between that of Geymonat (1973) and that of Conte (2009). To mention only a random sample: The apparatus of Conte to 4. 1-100 counts 28 lines, that of Geymonat 117, whereas the Spanish team has 74. The apparatus of Geymonat was one intended more for textual critics and editors than for the average user who would have little or no interest in manuscript details, Conte, on the other hand, seeks often, but with variable success, to formulate concise and decisive arguments for his textual choices. In both respects our team steers successfully a middle course; at most a 'sed cf.' or a 'lege' with references signals their opinion. The real novelty of the apparatus is, however, to be found in the copious reports about the choices made by previous editors and critics. This alone ensures this edition a place in the forefront among to-day's editions. The mustering of previous editions is very impressive reaching from the 1514 Aldina edition of Naugerius (Andrea Navagero: cf. G. Mambelli, *Gli annali delle edizioni Virgiliane* no. 124) to Conte 2009 (an edition that appeared after the publication of vol. I). Particularly useful is the registration of De la Cerda's readings (1612). Future Vergilians will of course have better access to rare editions via the internet, but our edition will anyway save them from time-consuming search. Not always is a mention deserved so one could at times wish a more differentiated selection of editions, perhaps with the discrete use of an asterisk where an editor audaciously has departed from unanimous forerunners. In other respects as well I have noted a painstaking registration of conjectural activity, e.g. of Cunningham's, Peerlkamp's and Bährens' considerable output. Not often does the team insert a *fortasse recte* in their apparatus. Some seeding of conjectures is in my opinion to be recommended for future editors, not least when the documentation threatens to obfuscate the more valuable contributions. If say only a tenth of Peerlkamp's conjectures (most often in the form *Peerlkamp in notis*) deserves more serious consideration a good solution would be to curb the superabundance of conjectures and establish an *appendix critica* as relief to an overburdened *apparatus criticus* (see my recommendation in *SO* 80, 2005, 41 ff.).

An excellent improvement on the traditional form of the *app. crit.* is no doubt the team's use of a bold bullet (•) between the items, markings that easily catch our eye. (These bullets are not necessary, however, before the well displayed line numbers in bold.)

Constitutio textus: As to the text itself, a prime concern of a reviewer will be to compare it with its rivals in the market. My reference will accordingly above all be Gian Biagio Conte's Teubner edition which was too close in time for the present project to influence it more than superficially it seems. 'Competitors' among serious readers of Vergil are also the editions of Geymonat (1973¹, 2008²), Fairclough – Goold (1999 – 2000), Perret (1977-1980) and Mynors (1969) in addition to a number of commentaries by various scholars.

First of all: the text is free from misprints, at least as far as I have been able to discern. I have only noted the trifle that *Rex* at 7.45 should have been written with small *r* according to the editorial principles. The team has understandably adjusted the orthography of *Nesaie* at 5.826 to reflect that of Homer, but a note on the orthography of the manuscripts is missing. And the same line 5.826 is not repeated from *G.* 4.338, but interpolated in the *Georgics* from the *Aeneid*.

The text is structured with more frequent sectionizing than is found in Conte's edition. In accordance with the useful and well organized synopsis introducing each book, the main sections of the text are easy to see set off as they are by the use of a blank line.

The good choices of editors among variants and their recourse to conjecture if needed are of course essential qualities whenever a new edition is being evaluated. As the reviewer has had only a limited time to ponder upon these choices I will refrain from being too definitive on individual issues. That is not to say, however, that the team's text has left me indifferent in the matter.

I have observed a good many choices with which I wholly sympathize and where the team's reading should have priority over Conte's. I think that *conubii* is excellent at 4.168 (which none of my reference texts have, but which is found in *V* and in Naugerius and De la Cerda!). I also believe with the team that *praecipites vigilate* belong together at 4.573; and *ambigu-umve* at 5.326 seems obvious to me. Likewise *odoratum lauris* should not be doubted at 6.658; *haud* at 9.283 would be my choice as well; and an exclamation mark of approval is well deserved in the margin of *repertam* at 4.692; *hunc iuxta* at 7.649 is also a eureka; *insidiis* at 10.754 (in stead of *insignis*) is now ably defended also by De Paolis in *Paideia* 66, 2011, 565f.

As a matter of course I am in doubt in many cases and find that some choices should have a second thought: the choice of *primum* (in stead of *primus*) at 6.819, *poenigenam* (in stead of *Phoebigenam*) at 7.773, *in medio* (instead of Markland's brilliant conjecture *it medio*) at 8.588, *ille* (in stead of *illa* with *R*) at 9. 481; *funera* (in stead of Bembo's *funere*) at 9.486.

It is not only the Devil who is in the details, but also the good editor of texts. In that respect much praise should be accorded to our team. *Orthography* may seem a minor issue in a new edition; it falls too easily into

the indifferent bag of *quisquilliae*. Nonetheless I want to praise the team for not writing *moer-* in stead of *mur-* in the later books (10.24 & 26; 11.382). Some tricky cases remain on the agenda, however: the team prefers *vires* (acc. pl.) at 5.680, but *viris* at 6.114, and *vires* again at 6.771. And why *tres* at 10.350, but *tris* at line 351? I for one would not put too much faith in our manuscripts, however much one appreciates the information provided by Valerius Probus (cf. Gellius 13.21). The team writes regularly *pennus* in stead of *pinnus* (Conte). I am not so sure. If Fedeli is right in finding an anagram at Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.3 (cf. *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina liber IV* ed. P. Fedeli a I. Ciccarelli, Firenze 2008, 124) – which seems convincing – then Horace wrote *pinnus*, and probably Vergil as well.

Punctuation was rightly praised by Geymonat after the appearance of vol. I. No doubt such questions will be more prominent in future editions of Vergil. Punctuation, wisely used, is a means at our modern disposal to bring ancient *scriptura* closer to the viva voce situation that must always be a kind of virtual ideal to strive after. Perhaps it would have been a good thing to discuss principles and practise as part of the discussion of textual matters. Much considerate thought is displayed in that respect by our team, and I seldom disagree.

We find much good use of three dots (...) to signal a sort of *aposiopesis*: 4.76; 603; 8.403; 9.51; 10.67 (and some more). I disagree only concerning the famous line 6.882 (*heu miserande puer! si qua fata aspera rumpas ...*) where I sympathize with Conte's exclamation mark. The comma is mostly put to good use, e.g. in all cases where *heu* is involved (not at 6.882 however) where we also usually find the exclamation mark and further at 6.705; 7.156; 8.141; 9.17; 405, to mention only some random examples. In some cases, a comma is indispensable, like at 5.317 (*simul ultima signant, ...*). In other cases the team has wisely refrained from commas (see e.g. 4.84; 4.136) as it is mostly unnecessary to encapsulate an abl. abs. within commas. But in some cases, the comma would have eased our understanding, e.g. at 5.262 (*loricam .../ donat habere viro decus et tutamen in armis*) or at 9.91 (how is *ullo* to be understood?) whereas I would not have put it at 6.122 after *Thesea* – a famous query.

I also believe that the use of parentheses will be more discussed in future editions. In some cases our team uses dashes or commas in stead of parenthesis to good effect: 6.84-85; 7.197-200; 11.548-9, to mention only a few examples. In other cases a little more discernment would have been appropriate if one believes as I do that a parenthesis should primarily be used when some minor point is added. A good illustration can be found in the most famous passage in all Vergil: compare the use of parenthesis at 847f. *excudent alii spirantia mollius aera/ (credo equidem)* [indeed, parenthetical!] with its use at 851f. *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento/ (hae tibi erunt artes)* [which least of all is an aside remark by the poet!].

Colon. Its use to-day is often rather arbitrary, if not pointless. When it is used to mark an asyndeton, especially an asyndeton causale, the colon is an excellent thing, e.g. 4.23; 6.850; 7.300; 9.291.

Capital letters are found more often in this edition than in Conte's. It is not difficult to agree with our team when they write e.g. *Penates* with capital P. Or when they print *Genitor* with a capital G when Jupiter is meant: 9.630; 727, or when *Genitrix* means Magna Mater at 10.234 and *Ignipotens* means Vulcanus at 8. 414, but there may be difficult border cases: At 10.466 *Genitor* is Hercules' father, not our common heavenly Father. *Mavortis ... Campus* at 12.200 is a good example of a definite place name, but if we accept *Lugentes Campi* (6.441) and *Fortunata Nemora* (6.639) with capital letters, why *sedes beatae* with small letters? Or why *Maeandro* at 5.251 when it does not signify the river?

The use of *italics* seems mostly to follow the principle that when a name serves as a predicative, then italics are used: 4.172; 5.116-122 (but italicized *Italus Mnestheus* at line 117 is awkward); 602; 718; 6.234; 7.63; 411 & 412; 777; 8.322 & 324; 331; 338; 344 (but not 345!); 358; 422; 9.388; 10.166; 195; 209; 11.105; 543; 12.134; 824-27; 845. I do not find this practice quite convincing. It affects the visual impact of the written page in a slightly disconcerting way.

We find much good use of the *exclamation mark*, but which criteria should there be? To look only at the Sixth Book: 172; 188 & 189 and 465 are good cases with highly charged feelings involved, but the Sibyl's *acceleremus* at 6.630 has no exclamation mark, whereas 7.301 has one, and so on. One wonders which criteria decide its use.

Much remains to be done in this field in order to bring the written text somewhat closer to a recital situation. An interesting point in the *Aeneid* from that point of view is for example the team's text: *fremit "arma" iuventus* at 11.453. No doubt the quotation marks brings an auditive side to our attention in a way which the ancients would have appreciated.

Some more critical remarks: I for one cannot share the quotation marks at 6.573-74 dividing the passage between direct speech from the Sibyl and comments from the poet. I would give it all to the Sibyl. I am not always at the first glance sure about what the team means by its varying practice concerning some more or less indubitable interpolations in the text: 4.273 (italics, no brackets); 5.595 (italics, brackets); 778 (italics, brackets); 6.242 (italics, brackets); 8.46 (no italics, brackets); 12.232 (italics, no brackets); 612-613 (italics, brackets). Is there a uniform standard?

Interpretatio: The commentary – a substantial part of the new edition – would have deserved a review of its own. What I have done is to see how a recent Anglo-American commentary, that of James O'Hara (*Vergil, Aeneid*

Book 4, Newburyport 2011), has dealt with the task in comparison with the commentary included in the Spanish edition. Both commentaries seem generally to be not only on a reassuring, but at times even excellent level presenting us constantly with well-informed and fresh observations. The Spanish commentary is not least helpful by its copious parallels, quoting passages that might have inspired or influenced Vergil or just reminding us of the common background. Of course much is said in O'Hara's commentary that is aimed at the learner's situation in particular. For readers of Vergil in translation I guess that the Spanish commentary would be an excellent supplement to middle-sized commentaries if the Greek and Latin quotations had been translated. As it is they are accessible only for a small segment of knowledgeable readers.

Indices: These deserve a word of praise, not least the scrupulous index of cited passages.

Whereas Mynors and Conte often leave their users in the lurch in their *Index nominum*, the Spanish edition has such useful entries as 'Cibele', 'Cleopatra', 'Doride', 'Erifile', 'Esculapio' etc., names which usually are not registered in indices. And the reviewer must mention a personal satisfaction to close his review: I was particularly happy when I saw that Caesar the Dictator was not registered at 1. 286 as he has been both in Mynors' and Conte's *Index Nominum*.

EGIL KRAGGERUD
University of Oslo
egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no

