Richard Hunter - S. P. Oakley (eds.), *Latin literature and its transmission: Papers in honour of Michael Reeve*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016, xiv+366 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-11627-6.

The volume under review contains fourteen papers on Latin literature originally presented at a conference held January 2013 in Cambridge honoring Michael Reeve on his 70th birthday, supplemented by a list of the honorand's publications over a period of nearly fifty years (1967-2015). The focus of the volume and the location of the conference are both tributes to Reeve's "outstanding tenure of the Kennedy Professorship of Latin" (p. xiii) from 1984 to 2007.

The papers, almost equally divided between topics of textual and literary criticism, are arranged in alphabetical order by author surname. For the purposes of this review I have sorted them into two clusters, each chronologically arranged according to the date of the Latin text it treats. As will become obvious, the chronology is nearly as arbitrary as that of the volume itself – where to put the papers on Renaissance criticism and reception? for example – but the clusters themselves, one of papers with a literary focus, the other of papers more concerned with textual matters, may serve the reader's convenience. As it happens, the rearrangement also allows me to begin and end with papers that are particularly attentive to showing how, in the terms of the prefatory blurb, textual and literary criticism are "mutually supportive" (p. i). The volume itself is neatly produced and the occasional images are clear and helpful[1].

At the core of the papers in the first and larger cluster of papers are questions about what should be printed in the text of a Latin author. Yet each of the seven critics frames his (yes, his) investigation differently.

D. H. Berry opens "Neglected and unnoticed additions in the text of three Cicero speeches (*In Verrem* II.5, *Pro Murena*, *Pro Milone*)" (**Chapter 2**) with a Ciceronian epigraph cleverly repurposed for textual criticism: *latius patet … contagio quam quisquam putat* (Cic. *Mur.* 78) and concludes with four sensible criteria for the detection of interpolations in the text of Cicero (p. 21). En route he discusses passages from the three titular speeches (with something on a fourth, *Ver.* 1, in the final footnote), proposing or reviving earlier proposals for excisions. For several of the excisions a plausible origin in a explanatory gloss is proposed: *Ver.* II.5.13 [*quae lautumiae uocantur*],

---

[1] The number of typos that affect the sense is small: *iuueni* for *iuuenci* at Lucr. 2.360 (p. 48), *Aen.* 5.719 *dicti* for *dictis* (p. 63), *Aen.* 10.385 *crudelis* for *crudeli* (p. 67, line 1), Lucr. 5.879-80 *copore* and *aligenis* (p. 125), 11.8.1 should read 11.8.2 (p. 238, line 2).

*Mur.* 43 [*Seruius*], Mil. 96 [*arma*], *Ver.* 1.48 [*hominum*]. A parallel passage supplied by a learned reader underlies, it is suggested, the intrusion of one anaphoric series (*ubi ternis denariis aestimatum frumentum, ubi muli, ubi tabernacula, ubi tot tantaque ornamenta magistratibus et legatis a senatu populoque Romano permissa et data*) in the midst of another (*ubi quaestores, ubi legati,* [...] *denique ubi praefecti, ubi tribuni tui*) at *Ver.* II.5.83; Berry adds *denique* to the material already excised by Ernesti and concludes that in *ubi ternis ... data* we have a previously unknown fragment of Roman oratory[2].

Glosses drawn from Asconius are said to account for some counterproductive or erroneous phrases in the *pro Milone* (27 [*a Lanuuinis*], [*quod erat dictator Lanuui*], [*quae illo ipso die habita est*], 46 [*illo ipso die*], [*cuius iam pridem testimonio Clodius eadem hora Interamnae fuerat et Romae*]). Throughout, Berry evinces little sympathy with editorial reluctance to excise and, on better grounds, with failure to mention excision as a diagnostic repair in the apparatus, and he seems to envisage relegating the surplus text to the apparatus, as in Clark's editions, rather than bracketing it. The result, if put into practice, would minimize the extent to which Cicero's readers are disturbed by signs of the text's transmission.

In "Overlooked manuscript evidence for interpolations in Lucretius? The rubricated lines" (**Chapter 5**) Marcus Deufert makes a new case for the presence of interpolations in Lucretius' *De rerum natura*. More specifically, he argues that a small number of interpolations can be detected. Apropos of nine verses that seem to have been rubricated in the archetype, he suggests that they were accompanied in the pre-archetypal tradition by symbols indicating doubt about authenticity, a legacy of the work of ancient critics and paralleled in the Virgilian tradition[3]. As it happens, most of these verses (and sometimes the passages they introduce or conclude) have been excised or suspected by editors: 2.42-3, 2.706a, 2.710, 3.672a, 3.759, 3.805, 3.905, 3.949; the exception is 3.905. He also builds a new case against the authenticity of 3.949 *atque etiam potius, si numquam sis moriturus*; this entails restoring the transmitted *perges* in 3.948. The first appendix treats thirteen lines for which rubrication is attested only in O, raising doubts about the authenticity of four of them (2.1023, 1.11, 2.887, 2.94). The second appendix treats lines rubricated in O and omitted in Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana S 20.4, a descendant of the *Poggianus*, suggesting that the rubrication in O

---

[2] A parallel passage might also account for the elaborately-phrased surplus text at *Mil.* 46: *cuius iam pridem testimonio Clodius eadem hora Interamnae fuerat et Romae* (on which see below).

[3] For a different explanation of the rubrication see recently D. Butterfield, *The early textual history of Lucretius'* De rerum natura. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 169

was transmitted to the *Poggianus* and misinterpreted by the scribe of the Cesena manuscript, who treated the relevant lines as *tituli*.

In the next paper, David Butterfield's "Some problems in the text and transmission of Lucretius" (**Chapter 3**), we get a glimpse of the future OCT of *De rerum natura*, along with valuable discussions of Lucretian usage on almost every page. The textual problems under consideration here are presented with exemplary clarity and efficiency. They are too numerous to list individually, so I will just sample the types. The first discussion concerns three discrepancies between the doublet 1.926-50 ~ 4.1-25, one of which (1.950 *qua constet compta figura* ~ 4.25 *ac persentis utilitatem*) supports the conclusion that passages are both authentic and properly placed, while the others are emended to *perspicis* (in 4.24, to match 1.949) and *nam* (4.11, to match 1.936) respectively. Butterfield builds a robust case against *dispansae* at 1.306, arguing in favor of Nonius' bland *candenti* (or *candenti in*), but the elaborate explanation for the origin of the homely *dispansae* (p. 39) is not redeemed by the useful digression on medial-line interference from above and below. Physical damage is hypothesized to explain unrelated but proximate problems in 2.919-20, faulty word division the anomalous *at* of 3.1068. The complicated genesis offered for the bizarre line-end of 6.563 is less persuasive than the observation that it supports the placement of the Itali in a line of descent from O (p. 48). For the heifer of 2.356 Butterfield proposes *instat*, excellent in sense, murky (or perhaps mucky?) in origin. These learned disquisitions are presented with a seasoning of wit, sometimes sharpish but mostly entertaining.

We get a more comprehensive, if still preliminary, sketch of another future OCT from Richard Tarrant in "A new critical edition of Horace" (**Chapter 14**). After demonstrating that a new edition is needed, Tarrant shows us some of what we can expect from his. A new collation of post-tenth-century manuscripts will be made, and some results from a new collation of the oldest manuscript, R, are offered here. Doubt is cast on Klingner's classification of the manuscripts, particularly on the integrity of the Ξ family. The new edition will be more hospitable to conjecture than some of its predecessors, and more importantly, its apparatus will be more open to alternatives to what is in the text. However, the transmitted text will occasionally be restored, ee.g., *Odes* 1.4.8 *uisit* and 2.1.21 *audire* (with a nod to Pollio's *recitationes*). As possible interpolations, besides the universally condemned lines found at the head of *Sat.* 1.10 in one branch of the tradition, Tarrant flags one line in the *Ars poetica* (349[4]), two stanzas in the *Odes* (2.16.21-24, 3.11.17-20), and unspecified lines in *Odes* 4.8. Tarrant's plans for the critical apparatus are

---

[4] It would be helpful to indicate the necessity of taking *semper* from 350 *apo koinou* here, since without the adverb of 349 the musical blemish described in 348 is not just habitual, *persaepe*, but unvarying.

illustrated by a three-fold comparison of Klingner, Shackleton Bailey, and Tarrant on *Odes* 1.31. We can expect a thorough (and welcome) rationalization of the sigla. The paper concludes with a discussion of non-authorial features of the tradition, namely, the *tituli* and the arrangement of the collection.

After these two foretastes of eagerly awaited volumes we now turn to a paper that deepens our appreciation of an edition that has been on our shelves for some time. Gian Biagio Conte's "On the text of the *Aeneid*: An editor's experience" (**Chapter 4**) is a collection of notes explaining ten textual choices in the 2009 Teubner edition. In some of them, as in his 2016 book *Critical notes on Virgil: Editing the Teubner text of the* Georgics *and the* Aeneid, with which there is considerable overlap here, he is responding to the critiques of reviewers; bibliographical specifics are given in the book. The notes are arranged according to features pertinent to the editor's explanation or repair of the paradosis. The new punctuation of 9.463 (*suscitat aeratasque acies: in proelia cogit*) is explained, as is the retention of the paradosis at 10.366-7 (*aspera quis natura loci dimittere quando/ suasit equos*). The bracketing of interpolations is defended for 1.380 [*et genus ab Ioue summo*], [4.126], and [9.151], likewise the admission of readings based on indirect tradition at 7.110 (*ille*) and 5.720 (*animum*). The last three notes argue the case for conjectures adopted in the text at 5.326 (*ambiguumue*), 7.543 (*caelo*), and 10.386 (*incautus*; this passage is not discussed in the 2016 book). The point of some of these discussions would be clearer if Conte's text, punctuation, and apparatus were included somewhere in the note. Instead, Mynors' text is cited at the head of each note, accompanied by a selective apparatus. There is no conclusion.

The next paper in this category treats the textual notes of a scholar who did not edit the text he emends here. Simon Malloch's "Acidalius on Tacitus" (**Chapter 11**) is a reclamation project, aiming to rescue the humanist Valens Acidalius and his *Notae* on Tacitus, posthumously published in 1607, from their current obscurity. Malloch focuses on the critical acumen demonstrated in Acidalius' emendations to Lipsius' text of the *Annals*. These are mostly small changes that improve the sense, and some have been adopted by modern editors, including Malloch himself. Excision is a favorite technique: 11.8.2 *unde metus* [*eius*] *in ceteros*; 11.26.1 [*siue*] *fatali uecordia an imminentium periculorum remedium ipsa pericula ratus*; 11.26.2 *flagitii*[*s*] *manifestis*. But there are also some more elaborate fixes, such as the rewriting at 13.32.2 (*quem ouasse de Britanniis retuli* for the second Medicean's *qui ouans se de britanniis rettulit*), outstripped in its alterations by the repair proposed for 14.48.2 (for which I refer you to the paraphrase-resistant pp. 241–2). Repairs involving multiple interventions often imply purposeful innovation at some stage in the transmission, an implication that could be brought more fully into the discussion here. Malloch concludes by arguing the merits of replacing *excusaturos* at 1.59.4 with *excusaturum*, a proposal revived, if not first excogitated, by Acidalius.

The last of the textual papers, S. P. Oakley's "The *editio princeps* of Priscian's *Periegesis* and its relatives" (**Chapter 13**), takes us to down to the sixth century for Priscian and the sixteenth for some of the manuscripts discussed here. It offers an analysis of one family in the manuscript tradition of Priscian's Latin translation of Dionysius' *Periegesis*, aiming to "serve as a practical example of how a rich incunabular tradition may be classified" (p. 264). The family is a sprawling one, with nine independent manuscript witnesses, twenty incunables, and eleven manuscripts dependent on the *editio princeps*; the present chapter has a companion piece elsewhere on the other two families. The analysis is based on a collation of lines 1–214 and selected spots from later in the 1087-line poem; it is suggested, however, that for the incunables at least the results will hold good not just for the poem, one of Priscian's "minor works," but also for the entire corpus (p. 278). Primarily a methodical review of the branches within one family and their interrelations, the paper also offers valuable general observations – on, for example, the differences between the errors characteristic of manuscripts and print editions (p. 277) – and demonstrates the surprising, indeed nearly complete, dependence of Italian incunables on the *editio princeps* (p. 288). This chapter more than any of the others in the collection pays the honorand the compliment of adopting his method and style. Given that the paper offers itself as a example for others to follow, and looking to the future, I will say that I wonder whether continuous prose is the best way to present an extensive transmission process; as I read it I was constantly making diagrams and tables to keep track of things, and I welcomed the "chain" sketched – textually: "a>c>e>f>g>i>j>m>n>s (and conceivably >t)" (p. 288) – by the author in summarizing some of the analysis. The discussion of relationships among the derivative witnesses builds the scaffolding for book history and concludes with a hint of what that history might look like: "It [Ko] is perhaps the first manuscript of an ancient Latin author identified as both deriving from a printed edition and having progeny of its own" (p. 290).

I now turn to the papers that address questions of a more literary nature, beginning with Monica Gale's "*Aliquid putare nugas*: Literary filiation, critical communities and reader-response in Catullus" (**Chapter 6**). Gale surveys Catullus' poems about poetics with an eye less on how poems should be written and more on how they should be read, offering discussions of Catullus 1 (complete with *arido* in line 2 and *patrona uirgo* in line 9) and other poems that pay particular attention to Catullus' construction of his ideal reader and his anxieties about authorial control over the meaning of his works. Poem 1, scrutinized according to Genettian paratextual categories, is shown to advertise and aggrandize the accompanying *libellus* and guide the reader's approach to it. Important themes that emerge from the survey include the literary connoisseurship of poets (poem 1), rival reading strategies

(poem 16), the surrender of irony into the reader's hands (poems 42 and 49), and literary judgement (poems 36, 14, and 22).

In Matthew Leigh's "*Illa domus, illa mihi sedes* – on the interpretation of Catullus 68" (**Chapter 10**) we get an analysis of Catullus 68, with particular attention to the apology in lines 33-40 and the role of the *domus* in unifying the 160-line composition as a verse epistle accompanying the gift of a poem. Leigh begins by stating his position on various problems in the verse epistle of lines 1-40: the complaint of the addressee is taken to be "the outpourings of sentimental youth," in essence a reflection of Catullus' former self (pp. 198-9), *munera ... et Musarum ... et Veneris* are love poems by hendiadys (p. 202), the referent of *scriptorum* is purposefully occluded (p. 204), and the contents of the *capsula* are 68B (p. 206). Passages relevant to the *domus* as both building and family are assembled to show the value and fragility of the *domus* in the world of the poem, which is described as "the story of a sentimental education suddenly interrupted and of the new perspective on people and experience drawn from loss" (p. 214). With the help of *On the sublime* (32.1) the poem's torrent of similes is explained as a representation of passion (p. 216). The addressee and honorand? Mallius (68A) and Allius (68B), with a nod to the suggestive overlay of the two in the elided *me Allius* at 68.41 (p. 220). All points are accompanied by discussion of other interpretative possibilities.

In "Dogs, snakes and heroes: Hybridism and polemic in Lucretius' *De rerum natura*" (**Chapter 7**) Emma Gee explores the intertextual connections between Cicero's *Aratea* and Lucretius *DRN*, aiming to refute Merrill's assertion that they are coincidental and arguing that some them are vehicles of Lucretian polemic against Cicero[5]. More precisely, she suggests that echos of Cicero's "Stoic-orientated text, the *Aratea*" (p. 135) are used to combat – or perhaps parody (p. 136) – misconceptions about the nature of the universe such as the possibility of hybrids and Heracles. The major intertext under consideration in this argument is Cicero's description of the Dog-star (*Arat.* 107-19), bits of which Lucretius repurposes in various discussions of faulty preconceptions. Gee also looks at Lucretian echoes of rationalist arguments against mythology from Palaephatus and Empedocles, and the Euhemerism that makes Epicurus "divine," suggesting that Lucretius may have known a Stoic predecessor to the depiction of the philosopher-hero Heracles that we see in the *Quaestiones Homericae* by a first-century CE Heraclitus (pp. 137-9). She concludes with the proposal that Lucretius' constellation-like Epicurus (3.1-4) appropriates Cicero's description of the constellation Centaur (*Arat.* 450-3) in a sort of "philosophical recycling" (p. 141).

---

[5] Her starting point is W. Merrill, "Lucretius and Cicero's verse" *University of California publications in classical philology* 5, 1921, 143-54.

With Alessandro Barchiesi's "Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus (Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.267-8)" (**Chapter 1**) we move on to Virgil. The paper is a meditation on Jupiter's announcement of the alteration of Ascanius' name from Ilus to Iulus, with particular attention to the efficacy of Jupiter's assertion, which brings into being the change that it announces. The name Iulus, Barchiesi argues, is given to the boy by a great-grandfather acting as his *pater familias*, and the scene initiates the work-around necessitated by Homer's omission of Ascanius from the *Iliad*. According to his reading the scene also adjudicates among the etymologies competing to explain the new name, casting its weight in favor of *Iulus* as a diminutive of *Iouis*. The paper is enlivened by incidental delights such as note 6, in which Barchiesi comments on the "antiquarian polemics" involved in using the adjective *Ilia* in the line about *Ilus*' name change *(Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno)*, a line in which Virgil departs from the mainstream tradition according to which Aeneas was accompanied not by a son but by a daughter – Ilia, in fact – when he arrived in Italy. Another such is the observation (p. 7) that shortly after activating the etymology of Iulus as "little Jupiter" Jupiter calls him *magnus* (*Aen*. 1.288).

"Maritime Maro: Virgil's Fourth *Eclogue* in Renaissance Venice" (**Chapter 9**), by L. B. T. Houghton, is a study of of visual, musical, and literary uses of reminiscences of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* in the Venetian Republic, specifically the *Virgo* (Astraea, with a combination of classical and scriptural attributes), the *Saturnia regna*, the *puer*, the *concordes Parcae*, and above all the phrase *te duce*, so useful for political panegyric (*Ecl*. 4.13). "Reminiscence" is Houghton's term (see, e.g., p. 179), for in some of the works discussed here the connections with the poem are admittedly generic or tenuous. In an interesing "local variant" (p. 185) on this widespread Renaissance trope, some of these Venetian works manage to evoke Eclogue 4 *and* celebrate seafaring, despite its banishment in the original (4.37-9 *Hinc ... / cedet et ipse mari uector nec nautica pinus / mutabit merces*); hence the *double entendre* of the paper's title, "Maritime Maro." Another curious adaptation to the republican context is the use of the golden-age paraphernalia to celebrate selfless (i.e., non-mercenary) friendship (pp. 189-92).

In "On the good ship Ingenium: *Tristia* 1.10" (**Chapter 12**) Llewelyn Morgan highlights Ovid's display of untrammeled *ingenium* in his first book of exile poetry, specifically its trajectory from threatened and suspect in *Tristia* 1.1 to survivor in 1.11, paying particular attention to *Tristia* 1.10, a poem about Ovid's ship and its journey. Morgan argues that the ship's Minervan associations suggest and explain the survival of Ovid's poetic *ingenium*, despite future vicissitudes and past "attempts to make him a non-person" (p. 260). The chapter concludes with some welcome words celebrating the survival of books, beginning, but not ending, with *Tristia* 1.

The placement of the last paper to be discussed, Stephen Heyworth's "Authenticity and other textual problems in *Heroides* 16" (**Chapter 8**), may surprise on two counts. Why does a paper on the *Heroides* follow a paper on the *Tristia*? And why is a paper by the distinguished editor Stephen Heyworth in the literary cluster? The first surprise is Heyworth's, not mine: in this discussion of *Heroides* 16, the letter of Paris, whose authenticity Heyworth accepts, the poem is given a late date, with publication possibly posthumous. The answer to the second question will, I hope, emerge from what follows. Thematic and dictional parallels between *Her.* 16 and Ovid's exile poetry suggest, it is argued in the paper's first section, that the double epistles "comment on [Ovid's] situation as well as that of the characters in whose names they are written" (p. 148). The remaining sections of this substantial paper are devoted to explicating and resolving the problems of the exiguously transmitted verses 16.39-144, in line with the principle made explicit in the paper's final paragraph, namely, that the disputed passage was no less "liable to corruption and indeed interpolation than the rest of the *Heroides*" (p. 170, a principle that needs the rider "provided that the disputed passage was ancient," as is in fact asserted here (e.g., p. 155). In section 2 Heyworth argues that the Treviso edition (*c.* 1475) is an independent source for the (authentic) text of 16.39-144, offering as a new argument against interpolation the implausibility of the scenario required to generate both 16.39-144 and the similarly transmitted 21.145-248. After plunging into the "morass" (p. 156) represented by the much-emended lines 16.38-39, Heyworth emerges with the proposal that the lines were added in two stages to paper over the problems caused by the loss of authentic lines starting at 16.40. It is slightly tendentious to use the awkward vulgate version of the beginning of line 16.145 (*credis et*) to launch an argument against the transition being original (p. 155), since the emended version *crede et* is accepted later (p. 158). It also seems somewhat odd that there should be signs of textual repair *within* the passage that fell out of the main line of transmission – the addition of 16.39 and the patch at 16.144 for "damage incurred by the last line of the lost passage" (p. 159, referring to *inter formosas*) – since physical damage is not explicitly invoked until the paper's last section and the scenario sketched there is neither likely to yield a new hexameter nor particularly compelling per se. Other problems in the disputed passage are removed by excision (16.49-50, as "a rather feeble attempt to mend" a lacunose narrative, and 16.97-98 as "mythological embroidery," pp. 162 and 164 respectively) and emendation (16.79 *audent* for *ardent*). Overall, Heyworth's chapter makes good on the volume's stated aim of showing the literary implications of work by textual critics.

It will be obvious that these summaries provide only a hint of the range and quality of the work elicited here by an opportunity to honor Michael Reeve. The editors note that in *Latin literature and its transmission* "full

justice has not been done ... to his extraordinary achievements as a student of manuscript traditions," and they challenge others to "enter the field" (p. xiv). Judging by this volume, the results of that challenge are eagerly to be awaited.

Cynthia Damon
University of Pennsylvania
cdamon@sas.upenn.edu