Stephen Harrison's discussion of the Danaid iconography on Pallas' swordbelt in relation to the sculptures of Augustus' Palatine temple is fascinating. A sustained examination of the ideology of the Danaids in Augustan Rome has implications which go beyond Virgil. Harrison also considers the extant contemporary poetic descriptions in Propertius 2.31, Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.73–4 and *Tristia* 3.1.61–2. The fact that, along with *Aeneid* 10.495–505, the language of these passages plays down the fact that the figures are only *representations* supplements the tenor of Harrison's important reading: the threat to stability posed by these incarnations of barbarism therefore appears all the more salient. Another highlight in this volume is Philip Hardie's engagement with the debate between Drances and Turnus in the Council of the Latins—a part of the poem which deserves a good deal more attention than it has so far received. Hardie's rich and sensitive reading of this episode leads us from a historicized reading of the applied rhetoric in the *Aeneid* to a sense of its implications for epic tradition.

David West's mischievous conclusion treats humorous elements towards the *Aeneid*'s close. This piece at times seems to be almost as much devoted to Denis Feeney's work as it is to Virgil's. Of course, the unhappy brief of the volume means that any attempt at a formal editorial conclusion would indeed have been leaden and depressing. So, given his self-imposed dilemma, the editor has done us a favour here: a scholarly account of the politics and comedy of the conversation between Jupiter and Juno must be the best way out of a collection conceived like this.

This book has been carefully printed and produced. All excerpts from Latin and Greek texts which receive significant discussion have been translated, but the positioning of English renderings before the quotations in the original languages is irksome. Leaving aside the ethos unfortunately implicit in giving such priority to English versions, this practice will impede the flow of the contributors' arguments for many readers. As noted above, some of the individual chapters are interesting, and all of them could have been published in reputable periodicals. But somehow the book comes to be less than a sum of its parts, and thus accomplishes something rather unusual: a substantial contribution to Virgilian studies which confirms the critical orthodoxy.

University of Warwick ANDREW LAIRD

ANCIENT VIRGILIANS

†S. TIMPANARO: *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta*. Florence: Olschki, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 88-222-5010-9.

With Sebastiano Timpanaro's recent death we have lost a scholar of towering abilities and remarkably wide interests, a sure support and a true friend to many. Over the fifteen years since he published *Per la storia della filologia virgiliana antica* (*FVA*), he gave much close thought to the issues and problems raised by *FVA* and now goes back over the same ground in helpfully historical sequence, offering us a sort of history of how the text of Virgil was studied down to *c*. 400 A.D., with additional thoughts on (e.g.) author-variants. T. has changed his position a couple of times (astonishingly, he accepts my note on *Aen*. 7.772). Much detail and historical perspective have been added, illuminatingly, but the intellectual novelties are rather limited.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.102 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Unfortunately, T.'s irreproachably restless curiosity led him on to topics where he was as little expert as I am myself on the MSS of Servius. Nor, often, was sound advice taken. Thus Chapter 10, on Virgil's antiquarian studies (internal evidence suggests it was written soon after *FVA* and perhaps in reaction to my *L'epopea in alambicco* [Naples, 1991]). It adds nothing new and tends in general rather to overvalue the poet's antiquarian/topographical studies, among a certain amount of misconceived detail; thus, for example, p. 95 n. 141 misstates Ampolo and ignores Horsfall on the relative positions of Latins and Rutuli.

Inevitably, given the character of *FVA*, this book was doomed to be yet more advanced textual trench-warfare: the issues open to discussion, however significant, were always limited in number, and the new book will not be read in pursuit of scholarly surprises. On 7.543, T. remains (pp. 56–61) enmeshed by strange trivia: that I read *conuersa* is of slight importance; Mynors's strongly put epistolary statement (which I quote) that he saw no problem in *conuersa* will carry much greater weight and I remain quite unable to see that there are any real difficulties in that passage.

The chapter on Hyginus elevates the 'official copy' of the *Aen*. into existence largely by force of repetition (pp. 6–7, 13–9) and the purpose of my alternative explanations (*CR* 1987, 178), advanced purely to show that the 'official copy' could well simply be a mirage, is not clearly perceived. Of course, Hyg. became Palatine librarian, but that alone does not prove he controlled the poet's *Nachlass* (*aliter*, p. 18), if it existed at all after Varius 'published' *Aen*. Fifteen years' thought have led primarily to T. digging bigger, better trenches. Many serious objections to *FVA* have, essentially, been ignored. Thus Gellius is provably, indubitably irreponsible (that is a polite word)—sometimes at least—in his discussion of 'old' MSS he had seen. I repeat that this was shown by Holford-Strevens (*LCM* [1982], pp. 65ff., *Aulus Gellius*, pp. 50–1). At my discussion, *Vergilius* [1995], pp. 57ff., T. might have scoffed. But even the cautious Gamberale had smelt a rat (*Atti . . . Georgiche* [Napoli, 1977], pp. 359ff.). Discussion can no longer treat the text of Gellius as necessarily having evidential value. The perceptions which Zetzel (T.'s special bugbear) advanced of the ancient book-trade's ethics were sometimes exaggerated but remain fundamentally correct. T. remains far too respectful of Gell. and his sources. 'Charlatans' and 'optimists' are words that should have been used more often. It should not be forgotten that T. believed strongly in the Helen-episode and inclined to accept some form of second edition of *G*. 4. This set of mind has to be understood historically and as a whole; T. remains notwithstanding a textual scholar of the greatest delicacy.

The posthumous editing of T.'s MS missed the chance to update and amplify the bibliography where necessary. So e.g. M. McDonnell, *CQ* 46 (1996), 469–91 on copyists in the age of Fronto. 93, on Latinus' withdrawal from the action in Book 7 should have been modified, after my note on verse 616; and p. 142 n. 211 takes no account of the mass of recent Italian palaeographical work on the date of the cod. Romanus (summarized, *Aen*. 7, xxx). But T. is essentially debating with himself and with a small circle of friends (the reviewer included), in opposition to familiar adversaries (Zetzel, Courtney), and no marked widening of perspectives was realistically to be expected. Rather bizarrely, some scholars are referred to with initials and some with the full panoply of their Christian names; intermediate solutions and a vexing variety of errors come as no surprise. Indeed, the book is not in general very accurately printed: p. 68 n. 112 offer *sabaudis* for *subaudis*. A delight in these days of the *nostos* of the ex-exiled royal Sabaudi or Savoia. T. himself after all wrote the classic study of *il lapsus freudiano*. More seriously, though, the informed and careful reader will find

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.102 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many pages of extraordinary learning and perception (note repeated, very skilful application of *utrum in alterum*), cast in remarkably perspicuous, elegant prose.

Stanton St John NICHOLAS HORSFALL

THE PLÉIADE *METAMORPHOSES*

G. PADUANO (trans.), A. PERUTELLI (intro.), L. GALASSO (comm.): *Ovidio: Opere. II:* Le metamorfosi. (Biblioteca della Pléiade 35.) Pp. cxx + 1646. Turin: Einaudi, 2000. Cased, €72.30. ISBN: 88-446-0039-0.

You recognize the spine at once, with its elegant gold gridiron, the hallmark of the series of canonical French authors in the Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. The Italian series includes, fortunately for Ovidians, this indispensable volume, learned, elegant, and useful.

Perutelli's introduction (pp. ix–lxxxi) is entitled 'Il fascino ambiguo del miracolo laico'. There follows a bibliography of nineteen pages, but this is only for works frequently referred to; the commentary alerts the reader to much else that is of more 'local' concern. The Latin text follows Anderson's Teubner, but with some alterations, especially as regards doublets (pp. cxvi–cxx). (By the way, I have detected a modern source of authorial error, the word-processing 'doublet', whereby a writer alters his text but fails to delete all of the original, thus producing just the sort of 'doublet' we find in the *Met*. itself: on p. 1363 an 'uccise' was not deleted after the run of the sentence was changed.) Regrettably, the Einaudi text preserves Anderson's faulty orthography of Greek loanwords (e.g. *cygnus* for *cycnus*) and proper names. Galasso's commentary runs from p. 735 to p. 1610, and the volume is completed with an index of proper names (in their Italian form, and geared to the translation, not the Latin text).

Perutelli surveys the poem under fifteen headings: chief of these is the notion of the marvellous, *mirum* (p. x), which excites wonder in the reader. He also stresses the unconventionality of theme and treatment (a catalogue poem *à outrance*). P. regards this as a triumph for the sort of poetry marginalized by what he somewhat tendentiously calls 'official' Augustan poetry (p. xii). The element of the *mirum* is frequently reconsidered to show, for instance, how it differentiates Ovid from Virgil (p. xiv), how Ovid tries to keep the *mirum* from becoming a *portentum* by plausible and vivid descriptive accounts of processes (pp. xv, xviii, and xxvi, and Section 5 generally), and what constitutes its poetics (Section 11). The essential point is that the *mirum* is more important in the poem than pathos. Other important topics ably introduced are personifications such as Invidia (Section 6) and the delight in the grotesque (it would be a shame if Manfred Fuhrmann's essay on 'Das Grausame' in *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste* [Munich, 1968] were totally forgotten), the tradition of the epyllion (Section 9) and Ovid's cool, Alexandrian manner, his confrontation with Augustan ideology (Section 12), the structure of the poem (Section 14), and finally the *Met*. as mirror of its age (Section 15). This rich, wide-ranging overview might, in translation, form the cornerstone of the next *Oxford Readings in* . . . volume.

Galasso's commentary is masterly, given its compass. Momigliano used to say of the seventeenth-century scholars, 'Lavoravano sodo'. Well, 'Galasso ha lavorato sodo'. He offers prefatory remarks on large sections of text; for instance, pp. 739–41 cover the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.102 Published online by Cambridge University Press