Sergio Casali, *Virgilio, Eneide 2, Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2017, 392 pp., ISBN 978-88-7642-572-1.

This edition bodes well for the new series 'Syllabus' intended for university students and initiated by professor Gianpiero Rosati at the Scuola Normale in Pisa. Sergio Casali's edition of Aeneid 2 has been a pleasure to read for this reviewer. The commentary part comprises ca. 250 pages, which is less than half the size of Horsfall's commentary on the same book (2008), but with no essential loss of information.

The text is presented with an excellent critical apparatus based on what is known today about the transmission, much like the app. crit. in Richard Tarrant's edition of the Twelfth Book. A useful thing about the new edition is the tabled survey of 22 readings in relation to the most important predecessors, Mynors, Geymonat, Horsfall and Conte (p. 41-42). The great editorial project of the Spanish Alma Mater team (2009) could have been added to the list with profit. In that case, there would have been only three deviations from Casali's edition to record (at lines 187, 347 and 727).

In addition, Casali has provided his edition with a 32 pages long introduction: «*Eneide* 2 e la tradizione precedente» which is excellently fit for a careful study before proceeding to the text itself and its commentary. In this essay, Vergil's version is analysed on the basis of our somewhat fragmentary knowledge concerning the preceding tradition about the fall of Troy. The three parts which constitute Vergil's account are being paraphrased to serve as comparison with the previous tradition. In this way, we can easily perceive how cleverly the Roman poet has navigated in order to give a logical interpretation of the hero's behaviour during the downfall of his city and how well Vergil has succeeded in defending him against the negative views previously attached to his escape and survival. Not least successful is Casali's treatment of the stratagem used by the Trojan defenders during the *nyctomachia* whereby they donned the clothes and weapons of the Greeks (Introd. p. 26) misled by the dubious character Coroebus, the suitor of Cassandra, who almost took command over Aeneas' band. This was soon to have catastrophic effects (386 ff.).

The commentary itself is carried out with much diligence and care. There is everywhere an excellent mastery of the philological tradition equal to what can be seen in Horsfall's commentary. In particular, Casali is attentive towards the most recent scholarly contributions. He is in general a commentator to be trusted on various points of interpretation. Where doubts are called for he is careful to review the alternatives involved. Thus the commentary will be a useful work of reference for all readers of the Second Book.

This can for example be seen from Casali's discussion of a notorious line like 255 *tacitae per amica silentia lunae*. Casali begins by saying that *silentia* points to the night as topically silent and that *amica* may be taken as enallage to *lunae* (because the moon is showing the way). He adopts Henry's and Horsfall's interpretation: "nobody sees them (the Greeks) except the moon which does not reveal what it sees." This is followed by a discussion of the tradition about the moonlight in the course of the nocturnal combats and fighting. A lengthy note on the meaning of *luna silens* in agricultural contexts shows itself to be of little relevance. The comment on line 255 (and many others) could in my view have been organized in a way better suited to the needs of readers of different competence. To begin with, the preferred interpretation should be highlighted, less relevant discussions and learned supplements could be dealt with by means of another typography to signal matters *in usum doctorum*.

There is no more dominant critical issue in the whole Aeneid than that caused by the so-called Helen episode (567-588). The passage is dealt with scrupulously already in the Introduction (p. 30 f.). Casali considers it rightly as "(quasi) sicuramente non virgiliano". Nevertheless, he includes the lines in the text as the great majority of editors has done before him. I for one sympathize with Horsfall's decision to exclude this passage from the running text and to deal with it as an appendix. I think that the whole discussion of the episode will benefit from this by raising the question whether anything will be missed from the resulting continuous text and if so, how a lacuna should be defined. Is there, then, a seamless transition from 566 to 589? In other words, is the following acceptable Latin? *Deseruere omnes defessi, et corpora saltu/ ad terram misere aut ignibus dedere,* (566)*/ cum mihi se, non ante oculis tam clara, videndam* (589)*/ obtulit et pura per noctem in luce refulsit/ alma parens, confessa deam qualisque videri/caelicolis et quanta solet, dextraque prehensum/ continuit roseoque haec insuper addidit ore*. Casali argues that "il *cum inversum* in 589 non sembra potersi connettere a quanto precede". I once held the same opinion having examined all instances of *cum inversum* in Vergil. But I have eventually changed my opinion for two reasons. First of all, the perfects of the main clause preceding the *cum inversum* are of the *perfectum praesens* type (also called logical or resultative perfect) describing a situation which has started previously and is persisting in the present time, the latter fact being essential in the context: e.g. *abii* "I went away <and was no longer there>"; at 2.324 *venit summa dies*: "the last day has come <and is there now as our present reality>." At 565-566 the comrades-in-arms have left Aeneas, have flung themselves to the ground and into the fire <leaving Aeneas behind alone>. In this light, a continuation like *Iamque adeo super unus eram* (567) is in fact superfluous as the main clause for the following *cum inversum*. We should also bear in mind that a *cum inversum* can be used in more cases than after imperfects (respectively

praesens historicum) (for examples see my *Vergiliana* (2017) p. 164). From a linguistic and syntactical point of view, then, there is nothing wrong with the sequence of lines above. As to the transition from the concern about the father and the family 562 b-563 (*subiit deserta Creusa / et direpta domus et parvi casus Iuli*) followed by the epiphany of Venus, it seems to me quite natural. Any intrusion of another impulse or act of volition is bound to disturb the concern awakened in Aeneas for his family. The divine epiphany serves to transform his concern into a decision. The reference of Venus to Helen and Paris takes account of the *prima causa* for the whole war. Venus holds Aeneas back to prevent him from further action against the Greeks. This does not entail, however, that Aeneas was on the point of initiating such an action in a lacuna.

I take the opportunity to oppose the commentator on a couple of further points where I have already signalled my own position, namely on 121 and 433f. (cf. *Vergiliana* (2017), 156f. and 160f.).

Whereas Casali accepts one conjecture in the Second Book, *ardere* for *audere* at 347, he defends *parent* at 121 ("si chiedino a chi i fati preparino morte"), a problem already addressed by Servius (cf. *TLL s.v. paro* II B 422. 78-82). The result is, as can be seen, a harsh ellipsis. To avoid this and save the meaning 'oracle' for *fata* (*OLD s.v. fatum* 1) Hofman Peerlkamp conjectured *quid*. An oracle is never specific in the way required by the reading cui fata (subj.) parent. If we instead assume the meaning of *fata* to be 'fate', that is 'death', we can either think that 'they' (the Greeks or Ulixes et Calchas) are the subjects for *parent*, or allow the conjecture *paret* with Apollo as subject. An overwhelming material is in favour of *paret*, cf. for *fata parare alicui* cf. Val.Fl. 1.648 f., Stat. *Theb*. 5.714 (for *p. mortem* cf. Cic. *Milo* 19; Ov. *met*. 10.348; Luc. 5.773; 7.470; Tac. *Ann*. 13.1.1; 15.61.2); *p. letum* Lucr. 6.1229; Ov. *Ibis* 355; *met*. 15.762f., [Sen.] *Octavia* 619f.; Statius 5.660; *p. finem* Lucr. 1.551; *p. exitium* Enn *sc*. 167V, Sil. 11.576; Tac. *Hist*. 4.58.1). I am accordingly in no doubt that sg. *paret* is much to be preferred.

Casali adopts Peerlkamp's punctuation involving inverted *et* and *Danaum* going with *manu* at 433-4. My point is that this word order is very tortuous and that any listening ear would be much confused having *fata* as the closest noun after *Danaum*. Therefore, it is much to be preferred to take *Danaum* with *tela* and *vices* and accept the combination of the concrete *tela* with the abstract *vices*.

Egil Kraggerud
University of Oslo
egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no