book's topographical, artistic, and processional spectacles; these also give her the opportunity to discuss the nature of *ecphrasis*, and its contribution to the interpretative process. Beye points to the significance of the Alexandrian aesthetic and particularly of Apollonius (and in more readily digestible form for the average undergraduate than D. Nelis, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* [Leeds, 2001], to which it might serve as introduction). In doing so he discusses questions of intertextuality; and although his treatment here is sometimes unclear (if allusion, which he rejects, falls prey to the intentional fallacy, and intertextuality is 'the better term', how does it help then to claim that the poem is original in that 'the narrator, by constant allusion or borrowing, directs the reader to a realm of intertextuality'?), it can serve to introduce more thorough discussions.

Some themes surface in several essays: one of these is the significance of Virgil's treatment of women in the poem. This is addressed as the principal theme of Nugent's essay (in the second, general, part of the volume), in which she examines the oppositional point of view apparently presented by the *Aeneid*'s women, while admitting the difficulty of evaluating that opposition. It also features largely, as one would expect, in Spence's paper on *Aen.* 4; she concludes that the book grants power to a voice, Dido's Junonian voice, denigrated elsewhere in the epic, thus also framing her discussion in the context of the volume's continuing interest in the location of authority in the poem. Farrell's essay ('*Aeneid* 5: Poetry and Parenthood') gives some emphasis to the prominence of the maternal voice in the poem, demonstrating that although focus on the issue of paternity brings out the importance of Aeneas' relationship with, and loss of, his father for the development of his character, it obscures the wider issue of parenthood and the true significance of the hero's mother for his mission. Anderson on *Aen.* 11 pays careful attention to Camilla as a focus of sympathy.

Miles, on the *Aeneid* as foundation story, also deserves particular attention; emphasizing the place of the poem 'among a variety of views about Roman cultural identity and in the debate over who were the true Romans', it well reminds the reader of the significance of the poet's choices.

The book is nicely produced, and all quotations are translated (since the volume is designed for use with either Mynors's Oxford edition or Mandelbaum's translation). I noticed only one significant misprint (*insana* for *insano* in *Aen.* 6.135 [p. 113]), and one error (in *Aen.* 1, Juno bribes Aeolus, not Neptune [p. 169]).

Merton College, Oxford J. S. C. EIDINOW

VIRGILIAN BATTLE SCENES

P. MAZZOCCHINI: *Forme e significati della narrazione bellica nell' epos virgiliano. I cataloghi degli uccisi e le morti minori dell'Eneide.* Pp. 437. Fasano: Schena Editore, 2000. Paper, L. 50,000. ISBN: 88-8229-201-0.

In line with the reduced interest to most readers of the second half of the *Aeneid*, there has been relatively little research into the battle scenes and lists of slain, much less than in the case of the *Iliad*, and even there discussion of this aspect has been meagre. Mazzocchini endeavours to fill the gap. Following the views of writers on the *Iliad*, he divides the lists of those killed in battle into (i) those occurring in the *aristeiai* of single heroes and (ii) those recording a succession of different victors,

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.61 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whether from the same side or alternating between the two sides. To these he adds (iii) some atypical examples, in which there is confusion of (i) and (ii).

(i) The catalogues of the slain in the *aristeiai* in 9–12 take up half the book, involving Turnus, Aeneas, Pallas, Mezentius, Camilla. An unusual feature here is provided by a pair of sequences where a secondary *aristeia* by a warrior from the other side is either attached to the main one (Clausus in 10.345–52 pendent to Aeneas) or even inserted within it (Halaesus in 10.411–20 within the feats of Pallas).

(ii) The second section (pp. 203–42) is very brief, containing only three passages: the notorious 10.747–54 ('Caedicus Alcathoum obtruncat, Sacrator Hydaspen', etc.), in which only ingenious deduction, based on the long observed principle that Greek- or oriental-sounding names indicate Trojans, Latin-sounding names Italians, informs the reader that all the victors except the last are on the Italian side; 12.266–310, the breaking of the truce by Tolumnius, followed by three brutal killings, alternating Latin/Trojan/Latin according to M. (the victors are Messapus, Corynaeus, and Alsus); and 12.458–63, when Aeneas and his aides-de-camp march forth, all the victors on this occasion naturally being Trojan. M. sees perfectly clearly (pp. 14–15, 211) that in these passages the detail of the list aims to represent the current state of the battle, continuous killing by members of the same side showing that they are defeating the enemy, while balanced alternation shows that the battle is even. So it is in the *Iliad*, Virgil's model.

(iii) The most interesting sequences are left: the initial assault on the Trojan camp at 9.544–89; the simultaneous, but spatially separate, *aristeiai* of Aeneas and Turnus at 12.500–47; a catalogue of Trojan victims in the confused night fighting at 2.424–30, which carefully reflects their naming at the beginning of the action at 318–46; and the rampage of Nisus and Euryalus in the Latin camp at 9.314–50. The most intricate of these is the first, 9.544–89, on which M. is outstandingly good. The Trojans are above, defending their camp from the wall, the Latins attacking from below. After a burning tower collapses, leading to the public deaths of two Trojans, young Helenor and Lycus, the latter killed by the rampant Turnus, the central sequence begins with the success of a Trojan commander, Ilioneus, known to us from Books 1 and 7, and more easily remembered because we have heard him speak on both occasions, and ends with an utterly confusing killing by another Trojan commander called Capys, who was named in 1 and 2 but may not be so clearly in our minds. The final killing is by Mezentius, of a handsome youth, the unnamed son of Arcens, who balances Helenor at the beginning. Thus the outer frame is varied, but carefully ring-composed: Turnus, Ilioneus, . . . Capys, Mezentius. In the middle (571–5) comes a brief list of names followed by a catalogue of victims of Turnus. The interesting line, parallel in difficulty of identification to 10.747 quoted above ('Caedicus Alcathoum obtruncat, Sacrator Hydaspen'), is 571 'Emathiona Liger, Corynaeum sternit Asilas'. We feel that we would like to know which side these men were on. M. says that the victors are Italian, and no doubt he is right. Emathion does not appear elsewhere, but Liger recurs as an opponent of Aeneas at 10.576; a Corynaeus is named on two other occasions, at 6.228 and 12.298, both Trojan, if, as seems probable, M. is right about the latter (see above), and one other Asilas (10.175), a leader of the Etruscans who have not yet arrived. Whether two later references to 'fortis Asilas' (12.127 and 550) refer to the presumed Italian of our present line or the later arrived Etruscan is an ambiguity so contrived that it seems intentional. Paratore describes all this as an incredible confusion. The new *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, following Merguet's *Lexicon*, claims that both Asilas and Corynaeus are Trojan (!). We could do without these uncertainties. Then, at 573, a Trojan kills an enemy and is immediately himself killed by Turnus, who adds six more

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.61 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to his score. In sum, a brief *aristeia* of Turnus is placed within an overall alternating list, indicating a generally balanced state of the battle.

The book ends with some interesting observations and several indexes, including one of proper names. M. himself is less interested in the individuals than in poetic composition and narrative skill. He writes extended line-by-line commentaries on each selected passage with clarity and conviction, often pleasingly superior and ironical about the assertions of others. He quotes parallels from Ennius' *Annals* freely, although it is surprising that he does so from Vahlen (1903) rather than Skutsch (1985). He knows the *Iliad* well, but his printed Greek is shaky, and passing comments on the greater work betray a strangely old-fashioned analytical viewpoint. Misprints are by no means rare.

University College London M. M. WILLCOCK

PSYCHOANALYSING PROPERTIUS

M. JANAN: *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Pp. xi + 244. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2001. Cased, £30 (Paper, £12.50). ISBN: 0-520-22318-7 (0-520-22321-7 pbk).

Let us grant for the moment that there are eternal truths and that they are knowable. What is to be gained by reading literature in their light? For Janan, the explanatory value of Lacan's psychoanalytic theory lies in providing a framework for making sense out of apparent contradiction. This is a huge gain for understanding Propertius, as for Catullus, the subject of her first book, because these authors are fraught with inconsistencies (and textual problems) that test the limits of reason. J. persuasively shows how we need not choose between interpretive dichotomies, but that such alternatives structure some larger question, whether about gender or a particularity of the poetry. Her expansion, via Slavoj Zizek, of the range of discussion from eroticism to national identity shows that psychoanalysis is useful for more than sexuality and love poetry, but I have reservations. J.'s Propertius does not differ substantially from her Catullus because she is using the same critical moves. Would Lacan be as good for the *Eclogues*, say, or the *Aeneid*, as it is for erotic poetry? I in fact think he would, provided that the text were to test the theory as much as vice versa.

The difficulty of J.'s position is that in unmasking the partial and contingent aspects of masculinist universalism, she espouses a feminist perspective that turns out to be equally, if paradoxically, universalizing. The redefinition offers an advance in helping take account of the inevitable contradictions of those who would characterize the complex world, but in the end adopts a similar position of knowing superiority—hence the common criticism that Lacanians are dogmatic and that Lacan himself was patriarchal. The primary difference from blind masculinist self-assurance lies, I would think, in the self-consciousness of the interpreter: the Lacanian knows that attempts to create sense belong to the realm of the Symbolic, that the Real will inevitably slip through the cracks of the sense-making, and the attempt will necessarily falter. My question for the Lacanian literary critic, then, is: what escapes the interpretive system itself, since it perforce belongs to the Symbolic? What in Propertius does not fit the system? Lacan's own writings through their very difficulty embody a struggle between

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.61 Published online by Cambridge University Press