

P. Vergili Maronis Opera, edita anno MCMLXXIII iterum recensuit MARIUS GEYMONAT, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2008, pp. XXXVI-786. ISBN 978-88-8498-375-6, € 85,00.

The publication of a new edition of the works of Virgil by Mario Geymonat (G.) is, it goes without saying, excellent news for readers, students and scholars. The special status of the texts in question and the singular – and quite justified – veneration in which they have continued to be held over the centuries oblige us to express our gratitude to an author who first embarked upon his edition decades ago and now presents us with a comprehensive revision of his work. That said, the reader should not, however, expect a new edition in the strict sense of the term, since the text and apparatus criticus published here are *identical* to those which appeared in 1973. However, by using asterisks in the margins G. draws our attention to a new chapter of *Addenda & corrigenda* (pp. 707-784) listing all the new contents aimed at improving and enriching the Virgilian text and, complementarily, the critical apparatus and the *Index nominum* (pp. 669-706) which accompanied the first edition. It is therefore in these pages of the present edition that the bulk of the new contributions are to be found.

Needless to say, this is not a convenient procedure for the reader, who is faced with the by-no-means easy task of trying to “reconstruct” the new presentation of the text. This can be more easily forgiven when it affects reading tools such as the apparatus criticus and the index, but it is hard to imagine one absorbed in the reading of Virgil to respond to such calls.

The *praefatio* (pp. V-XVIII), symbolically dated exactly 35 years after the previous version, contains essentially the same text, but in the end some variations of style have been imposed upon it along with the addition, always in the form of notes, of certain important bibliographical references such as the works by

Munk Olsen on the Carolingian manuscripts, to cite but one basic study. The last paragraph, consisting of just nine lines, is in fact the only really new one, the only one in which the author allows himself to refer to his 1973 edition, in regard to which he states that he has proceeded as follows: “nunc plurima servavi, pauca correxi vel addidi”. The sources on which he has based himself for these improvements – he adds – have been the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, which was published in the intervening period, and certain works that have appeared since then, with express mention of a dozen or so scholars of undoubted importance in the field of Virgilian studies. In short it is the greater volume and number of notes that explains why the new *praefatio* occupies only one more page than the previous version.

The *praefatio* therefore has the same line and structure as in 1973, and the criteria for the edition are also identical (pp. XII-XIV). As a result, we do not deal with any of this here: *non bis in idem*. It is, however, true that the literal repetition of the previous arguments seems to imply that no new findings are to be expected from the codices already used in 1973, and it is clear from the new information actually presented in the notes (*uid.* e.g. n. 41 on the thesis of E. Courtney [*BICS* 28, 1981, 13-29 and 46, 2002-2003, 189-194] regarding a possible archetype) that the author upholds the same convictions as he did back then with regard to the transmission of Virgil's work. On the other hand, since we are dealing in this *praefatio* with such slight typographical modifications, the reader might have welcomed a little more attention on the part of the printers with a view to avoiding unfortunate breaks in the layout of the notes (*uid.* nn. 3, 8, 13 and 20).

Pp. XIX-XXXVI are devoted to the *Conspectus codicum et subsidiorum*. Here, too, the same structure and virtually the same text are preserved from the previous edition, although the changes in this case are introduced into the body of the text itself and not by means of the foot notes.

One of the few changes regarding the *codices antiquiores* lies in the recognition (p. XVIII) of a new hand **M^x**, but precisely in order to point to an unidentifiable corrector of this extremely

important manuscript. Of greater significance is the incorporation into codex γ (s. IX, and, in passing, on p. XXIV the new erratum ‘Guelferbitanus’ ought to be corrected), which is important as an apograph of **P**, just as **a** is of **R**, of the Göttingen fragment (*Bibl. Univ., App. Dipl. 10 E Mapp. I, 28*), a folio containing the text of *georg.* 2.53–260. Among the other *recentiores* (pp. XXII–XXIV, where G. has included due reference to the works of Munk Olsen), there is an important addition of the mid 9th century *Hamburgensis Scrin. 52, k*, and of the oldest one preserved in Spain (s. XI), the *Ausonensis 197* from the Archivo Capitular of Vic, **o**, with which G. became familiar thanks to the collation by M. Librán published in the present journal (9, 2005, 22–73), the readings of which constitute a fairly significant proportion of the new information offered in the *Addenda*. A further new incorporation is that of the 9th century codex **x** (*Montepessulanus Fac. Med. 253*). Another new feature (p. XXIV) is the convention *libri* for “codices omnes qui nobis pervenerunt”.

To the previous list of *Fragmenta papyracea vel membranacea*, which included the series Π_1 – Π_{18} , are now added 11 new documents, three of which are *tabulae ceratae* (Π_{20} , Π_{24} and Π_{29}) and another a number of *ostraca* (Π_{28}), documents of great importance for their very early dating (1st to 2nd centuries AD for these last four, 1st to 6th centuries for the papyri) but of limited usefulness because of the meagre contribution of their testimony. In a few cases there has been some bibliographical updating (Π_6 , Π_8 , Π_{12}).

The last list, that of the *Subsidia* (pp. XXVII–XXXVI), offers some new data (e.g. *Alcesta*, *CLA*, *EV*, *Flor.*, *Hos.*, *IVM*, *MO*, *Pack*³, *PCM*, *Solin.*) and the editions of some of those that had already appeared are updated or completed (*uid.* e.g. *Anth. Lat.*, *Asper*, *v. Don.*, *Eus.* [former *Euseb.*], *Il. Lat.*, *Macrob.*, *Non.*, *Philarg.*, *ps. Probus*, *schol. Bern.*, *schol. Pers.*, *schol. Stat.*, *schol. Ver.*, *Serv.*, *Ter. Maur.*, *tit. Pomp.*, *Vegetius*), although the – in my opinion, dispensable – abbreviations of the ancient Latin authors cited in the apparatus are maintained (and there is even the odd addition, such as *Petr.*).

The changes introduced into the body of the work (I do not consider here those affecting the *Index nominum*) are not

all of equal importance, just as those which most interest the reader, that is, those that affect the Virgilian text, are not equally important. In fact, many of the corrections introduced refer to previous typographical errors, and in this G. reveals signs of praiseworthy zeal in a textual editor.

See the following passages: *ecl.* 3.95; 8.28a (the silence surrounding this change in the apparatus criticus suggests that already in the previous edition G. would have preferred to bracket the line); *georg.* 1.200 (a case of excessive zeal on the part of G., since the comma he now proposes after *referri* was already present in 1973, although it was scarcely visible as a result of a printing defect; there are other striking cases at *Aen.* 9.534, where the presence of the period which is now restored after *fenestras* could be inferred from the following capital, or in the correction of the page number (!) '589'); 4.453 (cf. a similar case at *Aen.* 11.798); *Aen.* 1.530 (elimination of a character in bold: similar examples in 1.738; 2.15; 5.347; 10.497-8 [or at 7.48, with a character in italics]); 1.637 (*ad* > *at*, a particularly opportune correction, in that the erratum could lead to the inappropriate association *Ad domus*); 2.767; 2.774; 3.340; 5.367; 5.543; 5.771; 6.367; 11.796.

Other corrections to the text affect orthographical matters, a question to which G. undoubtedly shows he gives the greatest of importance (*uid.* pp. XVI-XVII of the *praefatio*). Thus, at *georg.* 1.38 (and cf. *Aen.* 6.441) *campos* > *Campos*, and at 2.470 *bovum* > *boum*.

A substantial proportion of the changes introduced into the text concerns punctuation, although most of them are examples of non-critical punctuation, that is, of the type that does not affect the syntactic relationships between the different elements but rather the manner and rhythm of the recitation.

In general these are acceptable and even welcome changes, as when they lighten an overly grammatical and leaden punctuation of the 1973 text (see, e.g., *ecl.* 2.23: *Canto*,_⸗ *quae solitus*...; *Aen.* 2.350 *quae sit* ... *fortuna*,_⸗ *videtis*). Other examples at *ecl.* 1.12; 2.19; 2.23; 2.42; 2.68; 3.9; 3.49; 5.19; 5.64 (cf. *Aen.* 6.721); 6.44; 6.48; 8.43; 8.61; 9.42; *georg.* 1.170-171; 4.357; *Aen.*

1.67; 1.178; 1.548; 1.592; 1.754; 6.701; 10.115 (consistent with 9.106); 11.892. There are other passages I do not find quite so convincing, but it is, after all, legitimate for any editor to transmit to his or her readers a given *tempo* in the recitation of the text and in the ordering of the different elements in each line: *ecl.* 3.29; 5.70; 6.46; 9.37; *georg.* 2.102 (*transierim, Rhodia, et tumidis, Bumaste, racemis*: the last three commas are eliminated, perhaps a somewhat harsh decision in the case of the one following *Rhodia*, and cf. *Aen.* 10.186, where the reading *Cunere et paucis comitate* is now adopted); *Aen.* 6.826; 7.691; 8.20.

Although it is not strictly a matter of punctuation, the grouping of the text into thematic or situational *blocks* also comes legitimately within the remit of the editor. In this case G. has chosen to reorganize two passages of the *Aeneid*: 1.130-2, where l. 131 now opens the following block, and 1.479, which now opens a new block.

More interesting, in my opinion, are the 7 passages where G. decides to vary punctuation that can be considered critical, all from the *Aeneid*:

At 1.315-6 he opts to abandon Heyne's proposal (followed, among others, by Forbiger, Ribbeck, Conington, Sabbadini and, most recently, Goold) to place a comma after *arma*, thus dissociating *Spartanae* from *uirginis*. More in accordance with Virgilian style, undoubtedly, is the new punctuation adopted, that of Mynors, which postpones the comma until after *Spartanae*, producing an interesting enjambment. At 1.708-9 G. chooses to align himself with Forbiger, Ribbeck, Conington and Sabbadini (the last-mentioned of whom even sets off a new block at l. 709) in placing strong punctuation after *pictis* (and consequently changing *convenere*; into *convenere*), a change in which I fail to see substantial advantages over the previous punctuation, that of Mynors (to all effects followed by Goold), which through the elimination of any pause after *pictis* enables the subject of *mirantur* to be placed dramatically on the scene by linking it to the syntagm *toris iussi discumbere pictis*. In 3.318-9 I would

have preferred to see G. abandon *Andromachen*, the minority reading in the manuscripts and among editors, in favour of the vocative *Andromache*, but at least he now improves his text by getting rid of the extremely harsh – if not openly aberrant – comma previously placed after *revisit*. In 5.317-8 G. adopts the punctuation proposed by Williams and accepted by Mynors and Goold, replacing the strong pause which most editors had after *signant* with a comma, thus converting *simul...signant* into a subordinate clause of the following main clause (for another proposal, *uid. Dyson CQ* 48, 1998, 569-72). To support this he cites parallels in the *Aeneid* such as 3.630-5 and 9.644-6, to which I would add 6.412-3 (and probably also 11.827-30 and 12.442-5), and also in *georg.* 4.231-5. At 6.882-3 he chooses – quite rightly, in my view – to follow the proposal by Shackleton Bailey (*HSP* 99, 1986, 199-205), who believes that *tu Marcellus eris* cannot be interpreted as the apodosis of the previous clause, *si qua fata aspera rumpas* (this was already inferred from Wagner's punctuation, *rumpas!*, which was a great improvement on the comma of previous editions), but that we should understand there to be an aposiopesis after the subordinate clause. More debatable is the return at 8.270-1 to the punctuation of Ribbeck, among others (*sacri. / Hanc*), which leaves a very harsh clause *hanc ... statuit*, its subject unclear. Mynors, by contrast, eliminated all punctuation after *sacri*, enabling *statuit* to have as double subject *Potitius auctor / et ... custos*, although there is concordance only with the latter, a phenomenon sufficiently well attested in Virgilian *usus*. Nor, finally, is it easy to decide whether G. is right or wrong to eliminate the comma after *iubae* in 9.810, a proposal going back to Mynors' edition and also accepted by Goold. G. is probably wise to get rid of it, not so much because of any intrinsic lack of validity – in form or substance – in Mynors' proposal as because, first of all, the vulnerability of Turnus' head has already been mentioned by Virgil in 809-10 and, secondly and above all, Virgil is particularly fond of this type of unresolvable ambiguity (we are

talking, after all, of an author who leaves no room for categorical solutions) which can best be reflected through the absence of commas (for this reason, for example, I would be in favour of punctuating *ferabant / suppliciter tristes* at 1.480-1).

We finally come to the new readings G. has adopted in his text, a total of 27 choices which, in general, are duly explained by the corresponding change in the apparatus criticus.

They are as follows: *ecl.* 2.12 *me cum* > *mecum* (the change in this case is not accompanied by any explanation, although it is probably unnecessary); *georg.* 1.334 *plangunt* > *plangit*; 2.174 *artem* > *artis*; 2.302 *olea* > *oleae* (apparently based on new arguments presented by Barchiesi, whose contribution, however, remains unidentified. A similar case can be seen at 2.365 *acies* > *acie*); 2.332 *germina* > *gramina*; *Aen.* 1.271 *muniet* > *moeniet* (perhaps a correct choice: *uid.* Harrison's commentary on 10.24); 2.349-50 *audendi ... certast qui* > *audentem ... certa sequi* (G. distances himself, quite rightly, in my opinion, from the ingenious conjecture by Sabbadini, although he continues to attribute somewhat too categorically the reading *audentem* to ms. P); 2.727 (7.703) *exagmine* > *ex agmine* (in both cases a modicum of justification for his change would have been in order); 2.739 *lapsa* > *lassa* (the improvement would, in my view, have been more complete had it been accompanied by the elimination of the question mark proposed by Ladewig after *resedit*: cf. e.g. 6.779-80); 3.686 *nei* > *ni*; 4.315 *aliud* > *aliut* (cf. 8.49); 4.552 *Sychaeo* > *Sychaei es*; 4.641 *celebrabat* > *celerabat* (perhaps convinced by Perutelli [*MD* 42, 1999, 187-97], G. has opted for this improvement, backed by Virgilian *usus* [cf. 5.609 and also 1.656, 3.666, 8.90, 9.378, 10.249] and supported in fact by the parallel of *Apul. met.* 6.14, as he now admits [having previously cited it as support for *celebrabat*]. It is a pity that G. did not also bring himself to recover the enallage *studio ... anili!*); 7.175 *haec* > *hae*; 7.773 *Phoebigenam* > *poenigenam*; 9.146 *quis* > *qui* (but cf. e.g. 6.561 [and cf. in turn e.g. 6.865]); 9.236 *soluti* > *sepulti* (against the weight of the manuscripts and perhaps against the

convention of epic: cf. 9.189); 10.186 *Cunare et paucis comitate*, > *Cunere et paucis comitate*; 10.303 *vadi* > *vadis* (to the list of those newly in favour of this reading should have been added Courtney, *BICS* 28, 1981, 25, who opportunely compares 1.112); 10.673 *quosque* > *quosne* (a good example of the value of the indirect transmission); 10.705 *creat: Paris* > *Parin: Paris* (a difficult passage indeed: Bentley's proposal seems suspect to me precisely because he resolves the thorny problem without letting me discern the genesis of the "corruption" *creat*); 10.754 *insidiis*, > *insignis* (the defence of *insignis*, attributed both here and in Harrison's commentary to Williams, is at least as early as the commentary by Conington; this reading is supported by the parallel of 9.572); 10.805 *arce* > *arte*; 12.641 *ne nostrum* > *nostrum ne*.

There is insufficient space here for a detailed analysis of the new contributions to the critical apparatus. Suffice to say that they represent a gift for scholars, and this in spite of the fact that the apparatus of the 1973 edition was probably the most useful to have been published to date. This critical apparatus is therefore the corrected and expanded version of the former, a treasure trove of information accessible to all who are interested in the transmission of the text of Virgil.

It is inevitable in such a complex task that the odd *lapsus* should have slipped through, though these are certainly exceptional occurrences in what is, beyond all shadow of doubt, a meticulous revision of a meticulous edition. A couple of examples will suffice here: in the apparatus criticus for 6.743-4 G. painstakingly notes that he has missed a comma after the name "*Herrmann*"; he proceeds to correct the mistake, at the same time introducing another one in the anthroponym: "*Hermann*," (and while he was at it he could have introduced a reference to the article by W.A. Camps, *AJPh* 94, 1973, 131-46 [145-6]). Of more significance is a change to the apparatus such as the one brought about in reference to 6.96: G. chooses to eliminate his previous reference to the codices of Seneca (*epist.* 82.18) for the reading *qua*, when in fact this reading appears in the

odd *recentior* (and is defended by some editors on these grounds), while *quam* is the paradosis of the *antiquiores* (QVP). Nor – to take one last example – is the correction introduced into the apparatus for 6.586 valid: G. takes the trouble to correct a punctuation sign but fails to report Ladewig's change of opinion regarding this line in the course of his various editions.

In short, what we have here is a great new addition to the catalogue of published classical texts: a reference edition of Virgil's works and an invitation to permanent debate on them.

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA
UNIVERSIDAD DE HUELVA. HUM-04375 / HUM-1019
(lrivero@uhu.es)

