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/bni070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may not be right: 'a retreat safe (*tuti*) from discovery or surprise', ideal for an ambush, rather than a 'safe place for retreat', surely not a part of Turnus' tactical thinking at this juncture. If I were to argue for *receptus*, I might start from Stat. *Theb.* 7.443.

The following criticisms should not be taken to detract from my overall admiration for H.'s achievement. The inclusion of a translation has not (despite p. xviii) always forced a hard enough look at knotty points of usage and meaning: e.g. silence on the difficulty, aired by Conington, of the prepositional phrase at **653** *in tergum pulsa*. H. pays much attention to Virgilian repetitions, and their significance or otherwise, but does not always highlight important parallels inside or outside the *Aeneid*: e.g. **147** *maestam incendunt clamoribus urbem*: cf. 9.500 *illam incendentem luctus* (Euryalus' mother). **254** *ignota lacessere bella*: with the hint of the end of a Golden Age cf. 8.113 *ignotas temptare uias* (with other allusions to the Argo). **367** *desolauimus agros*: cf. (as do both Serv. and Tib. Don.) 8.8 *latos uastant cultoribus agros*. **307** *nec uicti possunt absistere ferro*: no acknowledgement that this is part of the great nexus of the *nec quom capta capi* theme in the poem; other commentators cite highly relevant words put in the mouth of Hannibal by Livy and Horace. This is odd, given H.'s perceptive discussion elsewhere of Hannibalic allusion in the *Aeneid*, but perhaps in keeping with the statement in the 'Introduction' that '11 is a markedly un-Augustan book, requiring virtually no concern with these readers' "political baggage" '. Yet H. is good on the presence of late Republican rhetoric and politics in the Council of Latins, and also on hints in the funeral of Pallas both of the funeral of Marcellus, and of a convergence of funeral and triumphal procession of increasing importance for the principate (see 29–99, 79, 82, 84 nn.—but the only way to put those notes together is by doggedly reading all the way through). H.'s resistance to the hunt for 'contemporary meaning' is strongest in the case of Camilla. Attention to 'the whole long and rich iconography of Amazons firing to the rear' (654 n.) does not stop me from feeling that the Parthian shot would have been an inevitable part of the '"intellectual baggage" with which Virgil's original readers faced the text' (p. xix). This, together with (i) the strong characterization of Chloreus as an oriental barbarian, a Parthian cataphract (amply documented at 770 n.), and (ii) the uncanny sense that Camilla fights a series of doubles (see the evidence in 675, 680, 782 nn.), reinforces my conviction that the representation of Camilla is deeply bound up with Augustan images of the eastern barbarian. H. is determined to repress the (for many readers) insistent links between Camilla and Dido (not in the list on p. 314 of 'other female figures with whom C[amilla] has most persuasively been compared'). Possibly more important in the note on **823** '*Acca soror*' than an instance from Vindolanda of *soror* used as 'an affectionate salutation by unrelated women' is the aural echo of an address to a real sister at 4.9 '*Anna soror*'. H., with Conington, does note a parallel between the perfect verbs used by the dying Dido (4.653 *uixi . . . peregi*) and the dying Camilla (11.823 *hactenus . . . potui*). H.'s willingness or reluctance to 'flirt with recent critical trends' (p. xix) is not always predictable, nor are the chances of particular interpretative fads finding houseroom with or without a censorial *nota*.

Occasional imprecisions or misprisions may betray haste: e.g. **33** *ibat*: Enn. *Ann.* 502 *it atrum campis agmen* and *Aen.* 7.624 *pars pedes ire parat campis* (where H. himself glosses 'of the advance to battle') are unpersuasively adduced for a sense 'was on active service'. **124** Aeneas' physical size is not at issue: he is 'great in fame, greater in arms' in the sense that his deeds exceed his reputation. **393–4** the interesting suggestion that Turnus uses oracular language is undermined by the fact that he seems to be talking about his past exploits (the 'curious future' [Page] *uidebit* may be influenced by 393 *arguet*). **671** neither of the parallels is for *suffodio* in the (non-existent?) sense

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'hamstring'. Translation and commentary are not always in step: **61** and **76** *supremum . . . honorem* are translated respectively as 'last rites' and 'last honour'; at 76 n. we are told that *supremum* has different senses, 'highest' (of the honours paid to Pallas) at 76. Separate notes can repeat or be at odds with each other: e.g. **213** and **214** on the repetition in *praediuitis . . . praecipuus*. H. can misreport others' commentaries and even his own. It is a shame that such a monument of learning and percipience is marred by such a crop of misprints and unverified references. For his *Aeneid* 3, already well underway, one gathers, H. might also note that the heavy use of bold makes it difficult to pick out line-numbers of the lemmata; the problem might be eased by indentation, and reference could be further expedited by including line-numbers in the running heads.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford PHILIP HARDIE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni070

DULCE, SED PERICULOSUM?

D. WEST: *Horace* Odes *III*. Dulce Periculum. Pp. xxvi + 280. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £50 (Paper, £19.99). ISBN: 0-19-872164-1 (0-19-872165-X pbk).

David West's commentary on the third book of the *Odes* follows the model of its predecessors (*Odes* I [Oxford, 1995]; *Odes* II [Oxford, 1998]) by offering a text, a parallel verse translation, and an interpretative essay, normally quite brief, on each poem. There is the usual sort of introduction, a bibliography more substantial than those of the earlier volumes, and an index of topics. An innovation is the inclusion at the end of the discussion of most poems of a section entitled 'Other Views', where W. provides gobbets from the critical work of other scholars. This move is explained in the foreword (p. v) as a response to a concern that a commentary of this type must inevitably seem dogmatic (must it?); W. wishes to assure readers that he recognizes that the *Odes* are open to a wide range of interpretative opinions, some of which he considers 'profoundly learned and just'. Yet throughout the commentary W. seems to want to close down interpretation, in a manner which has drawn criticism before; while there appears to be an awareness, then, that in the past his readings of Horace have been found too exclusionary, in fact his approach in this volume, though softened in tone (we have got beyond the broadside against theory, especially intertextual theory, found in the *Odes* II commentary, pp. 46–9), is fundamentally unchanged. Still, one must be glad of an explicit recognition that the author's own readings of the poems are not necessarily 'the answer'; and the inclusion in the 'Other Views' on 3.13 of Ralph Hexter's statement that 'For West, "you read him your way, I'll read him his" is no joke' (p. 122) even points to a sense of self-irony (though Hexter's article[1] is, curiously, omitted from the List of Works Cited).

Unlike W.'s commentaries on *Odes* I and II, this volume was not written under the influence of Nisbet and Hubbard (or Nisbet and Rudd, whose anticipated commentary on *Odes* III W. admits [p. 5] to having caused him some anxious moments). But it inevitably challenges comparison with Gordon Williams [Wms]'

[1]R. Hexter, '*O fons Bandusiae*: Blood and Water in Horace, *Odes* 3. 13', in M. Whitby, P. R. Hardie, M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), pp. 131–9 (p. 134 for passage quoted).

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni070 Published online by Cambridge University Press