Lucretius is predominantly anti-Lucretian. That is a very different outlook on this symbiosis from the traditional one, which (improbably) imagines a respectful Virgil, content with second place. So, in Chapter 6, for instance ('The Wonders of the Natural World'), 'many passages [of Virgil; none are cited] are designed (more or less explicitly) to arouse the sense of wonder which Lucretius' poem set out to suppress' (p. 198). Though again, typically, the ground shifts beneath our feet, as we read on the same page that 'at the same time, the poet [Lucretius] frequently conveys a strong sense of awe and admiration before the majesty of the natural world'. One might also question whether Virgilian *miratio*—for instance, the grotesquely grafted tree 'marveling' at fruit that is not its own (2.80–2)—is not more sinister than G. allows, as some of us have argued. We also miss in this chapter sufficient recognition of the place of Theophrastus, who appears in a few footnotes, but who is demonstrably the model for the first third of *G.* 2. Or in Chapter 7 ('The Cosmic Battlefield: Warfare and Military Imagery'), one of the stronger and more persuasive demonstrations of the presence of Lucretius, where Virgil, by presenting war in agricultural terms, and vice versa, is shown to problematize the Lucretian separation of the contemplative observer of nature (not, however, precisely a farmer) and the non-Epicurean warrior. Chapter 5 ('Labor Improbus') is a fifty-page disquisition on *labor* in Lucretian, Virgilian, and generally Roman thought, looking at it in each of the books, as both an agricultural and a poetic concept. G. claims and argues that the term is neither and both positive and negative, with which most would agree. Given the length and title of this chapter, however, the reader is surely entitled to a translation of the notorious lines on which every interpreter of the *Georgics* is now bound to declare herself, that is, 1.145–6 *labor omnia uicit | improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas*. Any study that refuses to translate these lines cannot expect to be persuasive in any broader way.

This has been a frustrating book to review (hence the delay, for which I apologize). There is nothing wrong with a degree of indeterminacy; poetry cannot easily be confined to unitary meanings. But G., though obviously of high intelligence, focuses with excessive intensity on the relationship of these two poets, taking it as given that there is a constant intertextuality, but not always sustaining convincing arguments, and not just on the level of the allusion, where Farrell is still the surer and more precise guide. In the end, G.'s *Georgics* is one with which I feel large degrees of compatibility. Despite the stance in her opening pages, she is substantially in tune with American criticism of the 1980s and 1990s, incorporated in many details of her book with implicit or tacit acknowledgement. In all of this, G.'s book is sharply distinct from the positivist works of Cramer, Jenkyns, and Morgan, towards whom her preface seems so oddly deferential, given her ultimate emphasis on indeterminacy and ambivalence.

Harvard University RICHARD F. THOMAS

THE *AENEID* AND APOLLONIUS

D. NELIS: *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius.* (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 239.) Pp. xii + 519. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 2001. Cased, £70. ISBN: 0-905205-97-9.

This is the kind of book that one might have thought two men could not produce today, such men as men are now, nor even four stalwart youths, nor even twice six

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well-chosen scholars, such Latinists as the earth now produces. I borrow my words, of course, from *Iliad* 12.447–9, *Argonautica* 3.1366–77, and *Aeneid* 12.899–900. Damien Nelis, now Professor of Latin at Trinity College Dublin, has managed to survive the utter recklessness of writing a dissertation in the 1980s on the vast topic of the relationship between the *Aeneid* and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes, and has now produced an admirable volume that every Virgilian scholar will need to read and keep constantly in mind for all future research and teaching. This ambitious and painstakingly revised dissertation establishes in full and convincing detail that Virgil's debt to Apollonius was even more extensive than Heinze, Otis, or Clausen have argued. After my own first glance at the number and extent of the borrowings from Apollonius attributed to Virgil by N., I was skeptical, and ready to see any number of them as vague and improbable. But to read this book closely is to see that N. has been careful, reasonable, and convincing on almost every point.

The book has ten chapters: between thoughtful introductory and concluding chapters N. moves in order through the *Aeneid*, discussing 'The Voyage from Troy to Carthage', 'The Arrival and Reception in Carthage', 'Dido', 'Sicily', 'Cumae, Caieta, Circe and the Tiber', 'Latium', 'Pallanteum', and 'Turnus'. The end matter includes fifty-six pages of 'Tables of Correspondence' between passages in the two poems, comparable to the 156 pages of correspondences between Virgil and Homer in Knauer's *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964). Knauer is an obvious and intimidating predecessor and model, against whom N. matches up surprisingly well. N.'s forty-two-page bibliography is thorough and appropriately polyglot, and concise but well-ordered footnotes throughout the book provide a wealth of information about recent scholarship on the *Aeneid*. The influence of the book's publisher, the distinguished Latinist Francis Cairns, is probably evident both in N.'s meticulous and extensive scholarly references, and in the extremely good airing that Cairns's own views of the *Aeneid* are given. But at all times there is a generous citation of different views on controversial topics, as is appropriate for a book designed to be useful for a good long while.

To give some sense of the book within a limited space, I focus on *Aeneid* 4, long a focus of comparisons between Virgil and Apollonius. N. makes numerous interesting observations, not all of them startlingly new in isolation, but certain in the aggregate to have an impact on our reading of the book: that the rôle of Iarbas is to some extent like that of Aeetes (p. 152); that the speech of Medea to Jason in *Arg*. 4.355–90 is not just an inert source of material for some of Dido's words, as most commentators suggest, but a signficant intertext for Dido's claim of marriage to Aeneas (p. 160); that Virgil makes us think of Medea's plans for suicide in *Arg*. 3.785–90 as we read of Dido's plans, even though Medea's plans were thwarted by Hera, and Dido's permitted by Juno (p. 167); that in the use of magic in *Aeneid* 4 Virgil simultaneously imitates Apollonius, Theocritus, and his own earlier imitation of Theocritus in *Eclogue* 2 (N. calls this 'two-tier allusion involving self-reference').

To focus on one argument from *Aeneid* 4 in more detail, I note N.'s claim (again not entirely new, but elaborated in great and convincing detail) that not only Apollonius' Jason and Medea story, but also that poet's story of Jason and Hypsipyle in *Arg*. 1, serves as a model for the Aeneas and Dido story. Jason at *Arg*. 1.721–68 wears an elaborately decorated purple cloak during his visit to Hypsipyle, which is one of several models in life and literature recalled by Aeneas' cloak at *Aen.* 4.262–4 (p.158; the model is noted by Pease ad loc., but not by Austin). Aeneas' reply to Dido at *Aen.* 4.331–61 recalls both Jason's speech to Medea at *Arg*. 4.395–409, and his words to Hypsipyle in *Arg*. 1.900–9 (pp. 162–5). Allusions like this mean that the story of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jason and Hypsipyle can be seen as a model of how the Dido–Aeneas episode could have ended sadly, but not tragically—perhaps if Aeneas had had as ready a supply of wheedling words as did Jason. Further, when Dido says at 327 that she wishes she had a child by Aeneas, a *parvulus Aeneas*, we should think not only of *Torquatus . . . parvulus* at Catullus 61.209, but also of how Hypsipyle at *Arg.* 1.897–8 mentions the possibility of having a child by Jason—and in fact she does (pp. 161, 181). This kind of recognition of multiple, sometimes contradictory models enriches our reading of the text. Hypsipyle's child is not mentioned in the recent treatment of J. S. C. Eidinow, 'Dido, Aeneas, and Iulus: Heirship and Obligation in *Aeneid* 4', *CQ* 53 (2003), 260–7, whose discussion of what is being suggested about heirs to Aeneas and to Caesar is thus impoverished: complex intertextuality of the type produced by N.'s detailed research at times gives us a much less stable text than some scholars want to find in the *Aeneid*.

This is not to claim that N. breaks much new ground theoretically. Apart from the basic claims of Apollonian influence, N.'s own views of the significance of Virgil's use of Apollonius and the consequences it should have for intepretation of the poem are fairly cautious, in a way that is probably appropriate, as I noted above, for a work designed to be useful for a long time to scholars of varying assumptions about the poems and poets involved. Time has not been kind, after all, to some of Knauer's more general theories about the way Homeric models function in the *Aeneid*: it is the vast quantity of judiciously presented information that has proved uniquely valuable. And N.'s book should certainly be a stimulus for future research, as Knauer was. Some of this research can be more adventurous in analyzing the literary and cultural siginificance of Virgil's debt to Apollonius. But even in matters of detail, for all its thoroughness, N.'s book leaves considerable room for discussion and development. The reference to heavy wagons in Homer, Apollonius, and Virgil, with which I began this review, is listed in N.'s 'Tables of Correspondence', but not discussed in his text; nor was it treated by Clausen, whose *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley, 1987) has now been revised and expanded as *Vergil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion and Ideology* (Munich and Leipzig, 2002), and who discusses many of the nearby passages in Virgil but not this one.

Many Virgilians will read this book with the disturbing sense that after having gotten used to the dominance of Homer and the choice contributions of Callimachus and Apollonius, we have to change the way we view the poem. The scholar is almost like a sailor or fisherman who has carefully learned the tides, only to look up and see a second moon in the sky (perhaps one that we can only see dimly, through the clouds) exerting its pull on the world's waters. This would mean, of course, that everything has changed.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill JAMES J. O'HARA

DIDO THE EPICUREAN?

E. ADLER: *Vergil's Empire. Political Thought in the* Aeneid. Pp. xviii + 345. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. Paper, £22.95. ISBN: 0-7425-2167-2.

More than almost any other Greek or Latin poem, the *Aeneid* has tempted generations of scholars into the belief that an allegorical 'key' is needed to unlock its

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.374 Published online by Cambridge University Press