an increased willingness in comparison both with Epicurus himself and also Lucretius to use Democritus as an authority for various substantive, predominantly ethical, arguments. Certainly, Democritus does seem to figure prominently in *De morte*, for example, but these texts are notoriously difficult to interpret and just how much is being attributed to Democritus is not always clear. It is also debatable whether Lucretius is less keen on his atomist ancestor than is Philodemus. Apart from the explicit and apparently approving mention of Democritus at 3.1039–41, a case can be certainly be made, for example, for seeing echoes of Democritus B191 in the proem of *DRN* 2.

Of the pieces devoted to a single author, perhaps the most interesting is by James Porter: 'Lucretius and the poetics of void'. Here, Porter explores how Lucretius' handling of bodies and void operates both at the level of 'physics', of atomist *physiologia*, and at an ethical level, where the *corpus* concerned is the body of a person and the void is the annihilation of death. What follows from this is a challenging reading of the whole poem which takes in themes from the last sections of Book 3, on death, and discussions of earthquakes and plagues from the final book. It is not an account which will persuade everyone and it is certainly possible to question some of Porter's more extravagant claims. For example, one might wonder where in his account of the alienation of the reader from the reality of atoms and void is there still room for the Epicureans' claim that all perceptions are true. Nevertheless, there is good reason to welcome Porter's reminder that there is little if anything in Lucretius' poem which is not aimed at changing the pupil psychologically and ethically for the better. And he shows what results can be achieved by thinking about the *DRN* as a whole.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge JAMES WARREN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni068

AENEID VII

N. HORSFALL: *Virgil,* Aeneid *7. A Commentary.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 198.) Pp. xliv + 567. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-10842-4.

Horsfall raises, in passing and not very seriously, the question of the sort of commentary, if any, that Virgil might have envisaged: 'V. never writes with prosy commentators in mind' (760, with reference to the inappropriateness of the phrase *liquidi . . . lacus* for Lake Fucinus). Virgil will not have written for commentators; but he wrote in a context of commentaries, which he himself used, especially on Homer. H. wants to set before the reader of his commentary 'the educated Augustan reader'; more specifically to reconstruct 'the scholarly and literary filters' through which such readers approached the *Aeneid* (p. xxxii; also p. xxi and the commentary, e.g. 31). He envisages Augustan readers interested in mythology, aetiology, and etymology ('the chalcenteric Augustan reader', p. 417), and in questions in Homer (e.g. on *uina coronant*, 147). He might fairly say that this text did as it does present its readers explicitly with myth, history, and topography, in language with its own history. But he is also aware that antiquarian tradition is often secondary to epic tradition (174), and that the antique in the text may be patina (188); and he recognizes the limits of reconstruction, e.g. of genealogies (pp. 146–7 on Latinus) or of topography (e.g. p. 421, on toponyms in the Catalogue). He says less of the Augustan reader's moral filters; he has written well of them elsewhere (on *Aeneid* 12).

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But he does keep in view for example the question of war guilt through a series of notes from *aduena . . . / . . . exercitus*, 38–9, and *urbes/ . . . longa placidas in pace*, 45–6, to *pastoralem . . . myrtum*, 817 (with a little salt: 'expressions of shock at this brutal invasion of an Arcadian idyll . . . are . . . themselves in part a brutal (if historically comprehensible) modern invasion of an unresolved Virgilian ambiguity').

The introduction, after an analysis of the structure of *Aen.* 7, surveys and summarizes two large topics of the commentary, Virgil's sources and models, including his use of other genres, and his language and style, especially the antecedents of his lexicon. H. also surveys, in stimulating fretfulness (p. xxvii), a number of questions about the transmission of the text. The commentary itself is especially rich in those areas in which H. has contributed largely to the study of Virgil and of the Roman scholarly tradition over more than thirty years: myth and mythography, *Realien*, religion, topography (for which it would have been useful in this book of Italy to have at least one map). He has turned more recently to Virgil's language and style, and in both the introduction (pp. xxi–xxvi) and the commentary he offers much on 'prose', military language, history, tragedy, 'colloquialism', particular authors (Ennius, Lucretius), figures (especially enallage, of adjectives, and hypallage, of the 'direction' of verbs), and certain peculiarities of style (e.g. euphuism especially in 111–15; see G. S. Kirk's provocative comparison of Homer and Virgil in the similar scene, 1.210–17, in *Homer and the Oral Tradition* [Cambridge, 1976], pp. 89–91). As H. says, there is much work to be done, more than is possible in a commentary even on a large scale; for example, *attigit* in 662, before it can be read as 'distinctly flat and prosy', needs to be compared with the other uses of the verb in Virgil (especially in *Aen.* 5.797 and 6.829), and also with *tetigissent* in 4.658, from Cat. 64.171–2, which echoes in turn 75, *attigit iniusti regis Gortynia templa* (the verb is already in Pacuvius and Accius in another sense). 'Coinage' (see the English index) needs definition and description from case to case; for example, compare H. on *nubigena* (674) with Norden (on 6.141), who cites among other formations *terrigena* (Lucr. 5.1411,1427; the verse in Cic. *Div.* 2.133 is perhaps *ad hoc*). The question is worth asking, not for the answer itself, which is impossible, but for the attention it requires to the characteristics of the word or class of words. The types of compounds in *-gena*/*-genus* are one point in the debate about the text at 773, where H. defends vigorously his preference for *poenigenam* over *Phoebigenam*. He persuaded S. Timpanaro, *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta* (Florence, 2001), pp. 64–6; but it is perhaps worth noting that the first element in *poenigena*, whether as action or event, is apparently unique in compounds in *-gena* (see the classification in J. André, *RPh* 47 [1973], 20, and for *-genus*, 24–8; H.'s useful addition to the bibliography in *EV*, *composti nominali*).

For the Virgil reader's literary filters H. also offers excellent analyses of his reworking of Homer and of Apollonius, and a finely cautious assessment of the case of Ennius (pp. xix–xx; with a successfully compressed evaluation of arguments about Discordia, pp. 354–6). Readers of the commentary, like those of most or all commentaries, will make their own reconstructions. The form of the note on 295, which divides Virgil's text, obscures the extent of Virgil's reference to Ennius' significant lines *Ann.* 344–5 Sk. (Macrobius; much more certain than an echo of *Sc.* 288 J., where *incendere* is apparently metaphorical). For tragedy in *Aen.* 7 the material is perhaps too much for the form of a commentary. H. summarizes well in his introduction, pp. xviii–xix, and on 323–40, 341–72, 373–405, 421–34; but the reader has to work hard to place e.g. Aeschylus' *Xantriae* in the context of Virgil's reference to tragedy as he suggests. H. also analyses Virgil's use of patterns of thought and forms of narrative of history (37–45, 45–57), foundation literature (107–47), ecphrasis (601).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Virgil's use of Homer in the invocation of the Muses in 641–6 he goes further than Fraenkel, and finds the self-conscious historian; too much further, perhaps; the terms of 645, *meministis enim, diuae, et memorare potestis*, are still, as he says well himself, the thought of Hes. *Th.* 53–4.

Commentaries are often awkward instruments for their users' many and various purposes; but serious users of this commentary with a little of its author's enthusiasm and energy will find it indispensable for an understanding not only of *Aen.* 7 but of the whole poem.

Some particulars from one section of text: **621** *impulit . . . portas*: H. seeks comparable language: perhaps 1.81–2 *montem/impulit in latus* (Aeolus), an action of similar significance in a pattern of relations between *Aen.* 7 and *Aen.* 1. **647** *init bellum*: H. cites Lucretius and historical prose; add 11.912. **649** *quo pulchrior non alter fuit*: 'Homeric heroes can be ugly' (656 'prettier than Homer's Achaeans'); but Thersites and Dolon are not heroes in the ordinary sense (Kirk on *Il.* 2.212, 216, Hainsworth on 10.316).

University of Auckland W. R. BARNES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni069

AENEID XI

N. HORSFALL: *Virgil,* Aeneid *11. A Commentary.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 244.) Pp. xxviii + 505. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €110, US$128. ISBN: 90-04-12934-0.

Nicholas Horsfall places Virgilians further in his debt with another massive commentary to follow his *Aeneid* 7 (2000). On a book notably under-supplied with good modern commentary, but one on which he himself has already published much, H. again lavishes his formidable learning and unrivalled familiarity with Virgilian scholarship. In the usually self-effacing genre of commentary, H.'s is one of the most personal of scholarly voices, at once expansive and telegraphic, given to an often cryptic judgementalism on the secondary literature. It is not an easy book to use, although H. has done something to make his systems of bibliographical reference more navigable, in response to reviews of *Aeneid* 7. The order of exposition often means that the user has to pay careful attention to find the really important point or parallel. Parenthetical comment can be elliptical to the point of opacity. By a policy decision overlaps with material in *Aeneid* 7 are not repeated at length, not the only respect in which optimal use of the volume presupposes ready access to a large reference library.

But the intrepid Theseus will be richly rewarded. H. is an unfailingly expert guide to Virgil's use of literary and antiquarian sources (as a matter of policy, there is very little on V.'s influence: but imitations of V. are often useful in revealing how some of his expert readers understood the text: e.g. the use of *bellipotens* at Stat. *Theb.* 2.716 might have a bearing on the textual issue at **11.7**); systematically excellent on style and register (especially useful for the understudied speeches in the Council of Latins); on V.'s relationship to prose, and in particular historiographical, usage (the Sallustian Drances); on the limits of V.'s use of technical religious language; alert and open to semantic and syntactic ambiguities.

The text differs significantly in only two places from Mynors' 1972 OCT. H.'s advocacy at **527** of (Mynors') *receptus* does make me wonder whether *recessus* (M^2R)

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni069 Published online by Cambridge University Press