

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA - JUAN A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA - MIRYAM LIBRÁN MORENO - ANTONIO RAMÍREZ DE VERGER (eds.), Virgilio, *Eneida I* (libros I-III). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas. Alma Mater, Colección de autores griegos y latinos, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas - Tirant Lo Blanch, 2009, pp. CCXVI + 150+150, ISBN 978-84-00-08831-6.

The presence of Vergil in the culture of the Iberian peninsula is concentrated in two periods in particular: the references in Seneca and Quintilian, a few decades after the poet's death, and the frequent echoes of Vergil in literary and philological texts from the Spanish Golden Age (including Cervantes); one thinks especially of the monumental commentary by the Jesuit Juan Luis de la Cerda, published in a variety of editions before the definitive one of 1612-1619, still – and justly so – a reference for serious scholars of Vergil. In the centuries that have followed, Vergil has been studied in Spain, without producing philological contributions of particular distinction; that is until the publication last year in Madrid of this elegant new edition which makes full and rigorous use of recent advances in international classical philology.

The brief *Prefacio* (IX-XI) opens with a satisfied *felicitas*: “Presentar un nuevo Virgilio a los lectores es un reto enorme al tiempo que un enorme placer”. The tone and content become immediately serious: “por encima de todo cuenta con la venerable monumentalidad de una tradición manuscrita excepcional, con códices y papiros escritos en una época en que la literatura latina aún seguía dando frutos importantes”. One of the problems with putting together a Vergilian text is the abundance of sources, and these Spanish scholars rightly boast that their edition takes proper account of the “más antiguo manuscrito de Virgilio conservado en nuestro país, colacionado y utilizado por primera vez” (i.e. the *codex Ausonensis 197*, Archivo Capitular of Vic, early 11th century).

Before the Latin text of the *Aeneid*, with a clear Spanish translation and a sober but attentive commentary, the volume offers a 216-pages introduction. This opens with the biography of the poet by Suetonius-Donatus, in the Latin text of Hardie and Brugnoli-Stok, along with a careful translation of it (XIII-XXXI). There follows a description of the *Bucolics* (XXXII-XL), including a brief account of their structure and their ancient Greek sources (first of all Theocritus, Callimachus and Aratus). One might have expected here some kind of opinion on changes between the original edition of the individual *Eclogues* and the complete collection (the thesis put forward by Otto Skutsch in *HSPH* 74, 1970), but I imagine that the authors will return to such questions in the volume which will be dedicated specifically to the *Eclogues*.

The pages dedicated to the *Georgics* (XL-XLVIII) are – correctly, to my mind – sceptical about the rumours in the ancient world about two different

editions of the fourth book, with the Aristeus epyllion replacing a supposed encomium to Gallus. Here again, I look forward to more thoroughly argued explanations in the volume dedicated to this work.

The Introduction goes on to consider Vergil's Greek models (XLVIII-LI), and in particular the Alexandrinism of the *Aeneid*, a theme close to the hearts of the Harvard school (Wendell Clausen and Richard Thomas), also dealt with in a number of contributions by Nicholas Horsfall. Certainly, "la dependencia de Virgilio de modelos narrativos anteriores no detrae de su originalidad como poeta... De hecho, la intertextualidad, en manos de Virgilio, es una de las herramientas de mayor poder evocador para comunicar ideas y lograr la colaboración activa del lector en la búsqueda del significado de su poema" (LII-LIII). Attention is then given to the presence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in Vergil (LVII-LXXXV), a critical problem already examined more than a century ago in *Virgils epische Technik* by Richard Heinze (1903).

There follows a series of short chapters, which, among other things, demonstrate a careful reading of the Italian *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (6 big volumes, 1984-1991). These chapters deal with *the structure of the Aeneid* (LXXXV-XCV), a close examination of all twelve books; *the heroes and heroines of the Aeneid* (XCV-CXII), with a stimulating account of the main heroes of the poem, from the negative characters (Turnus and Mezentius), to adolescents, aged figures, women (characterized by several different kinds of love: maternal, fraternal, conjugal, and for the motherland). The chapter on *style, language and meter* (CXIII-CLVIII) also makes use of the most recent bibliography, where proper treatment is given to Vergil's attention to sound, including examples of alliteration and assonance, as well as some observations on scholarly gaps ("la lengua de las *Geórgicas* es seguramente la menos conocida y estudiada", CXLIII). The discussion of meter examines the rare irregularities, signs of a profound neoteric and alexandrine influence (I am certain of this especially in the case of *Buc.* 2.24, a line which I wrote about in *MCR* 13-14, 1978-79, and again in the *Addenda* to my second edition). This critical section finishes with an able chapter on Vergil's influence on Ovid and on the Neronian and post-Neronian epic: *Ovid, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Statius and Silius Italicus* (CLVIII-CLXVIII).

The edition then moves to a list of papyri and of the main ancient and medieval codices, starting with Gellius' memory of a manuscript "*qui fuerit ex domo atque familia Vergilii*" (CLXIX). The description of the codices *antiquiores*, in *capitalis rustica* and *quadrata*, includes observations on their contemporary and later correctors, even if these splendid manuscripts are given too-early a date: I myself believe that the *Palatinus codex* is not from the fourth or fifth century, but from the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth, that the *Sangallensis* palimpsest is from the sixth and not the fifth century, and that the *Veronensis codex* was produced in Italy and not in France, even though its later writing is of the Luxeuil type (I have written about this, supported by the palaeographer Fabio Troncarelli, in *Nuncius*' 24, 2009, 27-8). And the beautiful but alas inaccurate *codex Augusteus* dates from the sixth, certainly not the fifth century.

There is ample information on Carolingian manuscripts of Vergil, with a full description of the *Ausonensian* codex, the oldest one of Spanish origin (CLXXXI-CLXXXII). A list of papyrus fragments containing the *Aeneid* is carefully compiled (CLXXXII-CXLXXXV). These consist largely of lists of words for use in schools, and the only item of real interest seems to be the word *noris* at *Aeneid* 4.423 in the *Colt 1 papyrus* (favoured by, among others, Baehrens, myself and Goold: CLXXXV).

There follows a critical list of Renaissance editions, starting from the first one in 1469, with particular attention paid to the excellent edition of Juan Luis de la Cerda “la edición del insigne toledano destaca más por el comentario en latín que por el texto” (CLXXXVIII). There follow specific accounts of the editions of Heinsius, Burman, Heyne, as well as on the philological ones editions of Ribbeck, Sabbadini, Mynors and my own two (1973 and 2008, CXC-CXCII). After these pages it comes a “selecta bibliografía fundamental”, rightly taking as its starting point the Italian *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (CXCII-CCI).

The strictly philological section of this new Spanish edition follows, preceded (CCIII-CCXVI) by a list of the editions and commentaries cited in the footnotes, including the *conspectus codicum*, the *Subsidia*, and the testimonies of the *prae-prooemium* to the *Aeneid* and of other lines transmitted to us only indirectly (after *Aeneid* 3.204 and 6.289).

The first book, like the second and third, is preceded by a *synopsis* in prose, indicating the parts dedicated to various subjects: however this is not one of those *Decasticha* which one finds in some medieval versions, starting with the *codex Romanus* of the 6th century, and traditionally misattributed to Ovid (from this point on, the numbering of the pages is double and switches from Roman to Arabic: 3).

The four autobiographical lines of the so-called *prae-prooemium* are correctly considered to be spurious (4), despite the fact that they count La Cerda among their defenders. The same goes for the so-called Helen Episode (2.567-8, pp. 85-6), still considered to be mostly original by Gian Biagio Conte in his recent Teubner edition (2009), and for the four lines dedicated to the navigation of Cape Maleas added at 3.204 (p. 116). This philological rigour is to be shared in most cases, even if the reasoning is not always adequately spelled out (for example, line 1.426 ought to have been cited in square brackets also in the place where the manuscripts place it, rather than only in the transposed location before 1.369 preferred by some modern editors and scholars).

The Latin text is full of traps, and there are some important points on which the Spanish edition diverges, with good reasons, from my own: e.g. *Lavinaeque* at 1.2, *alta* at 1.427, *ampla* at 2.503, *teneam* at 3.686, *actus* at 3.708 (changes to my edition in the intervening time are also noted: at 2.349 *audentem* in my 2008 edition, formerly *audenti* in the earlier one of 1973).

Among the notable features of the Spanish text, I would like to highlight the treatment of *punctuation*, which as we know did not exist in the ancient codices, but introduced by quotations and commentators, and which here is often modelled on that of La Cerda (e.g. the omission, well justified, at 1.480-1;

or the reference to a *distinctio* after *petitis*, that La Cerda wanted at 3.253; and the well-argued omission of a *distinctio* after *poscas* at 3.456). There are also additions to the already ample apparatus to my editions, such as the possible correction of *illa* for *ipsa* at 1.42, with the information about who suggested it and who criticized it (*quo* for *qua* in Goold at 1.83; *sidera* for *litora* in La Cerda at 1.86; *aras* for *aram* in La Cerda at 2.223; *adgnovit* defended by Horsfall 2006 at 3.82; *monumenta* by Heinsius and Goold at 3.100; *aspergine* at 3.534, preferred by La Cerda, Mynors and Perret). There are careful explanations: for example, *aeria* for *aetheria* at 1.547 is not only generically from Lachmann, but “Lachmann ad Lucr. 3.405”, and *consita* for *concita* at 3.127, as preferred by the Spanish editors, is also approved by Heinsius, Goold, Horsfall. There are very few typos: a colon one line down in the apparatus at 3.111, absent references, such as one to my 1970 article on *Acme*, which is referred to in content at 3.360.

The footnotes to the translation are also interesting, with quotations in the original from Homer and other Greek poets, comprehensive and appropriate references to ancient commentators (principally Servius, always carefully distinguished from *Servius Auctus* or *Danielinus*), Ennius, Lucretius, Horace, Macrobius, as well as to modern texts, such as the Spanish proverb “al filo de la navaja” for 1.672. There are also cases in which the discussion is longer, such as at 2.322 (“se trata de un verso cuya interpretación ha sido ampliamente discutida desde antiguo”), 3.12 (*Magni di*), 3.93 (*Dardanidae duri*), or 3.296 (*Pyrrhi*).

The love and interest for Vergil, the abundance and accuracy of information in the introduction, the apparatus and notes, the reliability and seriousness in putting together the Latin text, all convince me that we will always consult this Spanish volume with great attention in the future. For now, I look forward with confidence to the completion of the other volumes, and hope that this new Spanish edition will also include the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics*. Heartiest congratulations!

MARIO GEYMONAT
 Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia
 geym@unive.it