

9.27) will perhaps follow Servius far enough to see some irony in *scopulos ... regna* (272). Students of Virgil's prosody and metrical practice will find matter of interest; although they may want more detail in a few places (e.g. n. 452, 'not that unusual'; see J. Soubiran, *L'Élision dans la poésie latine* [1966], pp. 309–15).

In a long section of his introduction, with its own bibliography, H. very usefully discusses in some detail the process, the order, and the chronology of the composition of the poem, and then the place of Book 3 in the order (pp. xx–xl). H.-C. Günther, following T. Dorandi, argued that those who reported a prose outline of the poem knew as little of Virgil's preparation as we do (*Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Vergil's Aeneis* [1996], pp. 65–6), and H. agrees (p. xxiii). Virgil must have developed a plan or plans of some sort (Günther, p. 66), and likely enough he planned in advance much of the intricate relation of the poem to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (Günther, p. 58, citing Knauer). But it remains to consider the parts of the poem in their particular relations to their contexts and to each other. H. argues that Book 3 was the first to be composed (not in the third person); but he recognises that individual passages will continue to be debated (e.g. *haec erat illa fames* in 7.128 might refer to *fames* in 124; p. xxvii), and he allows that Virgil might have changed passages in Book 3 in the light of what he later wrote (p. xl, n. 96). He observes well that the question is of interest not perhaps so much for itself as for other questions that it raises, concerning, for example, Virgil's construction of 'some sort of order' in his narrative (p. xl). Creusa's information in 2.780–4 remains a problem. The Trojans' initial ignorance of their destination is a theme of colonisation and foundation narratives, as H. explains (pp. xxx–xxxii); and the reader accepts later references to oracles (p. xxx) as *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον* (Cassandra had spoken perhaps only to Anchises, *mihi*, 183). But Creusa's instructions are narrated in real time; the reader does not add them to the past, but must forget them in the present, as the Trojans are apparently unconscious of them in anything they do in the first stages of the voyage (whatever one makes later of 495, 500).

This commentary offers much else, for example on cult and religion, and on poetic vulcanology (n. 570–87); students of Virgil will be very grateful for H.'s work on Book 3, and will be looking forward to his commentary on Book 6, even if they do not expect local recommendations there such as those here of the wines of the Salento ('signs of improvement', n. 400) and the tomatoes of Pachino ('quite outstanding', n. 429).

University of Auckland

W.R. BARNES
wr.barnes@auckland.ac.nz

A COMPLEMENT TO COMPARETTI?

WILSON-OKAMURA (D.S.) *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Pp. xiv + 299, figs, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Cased, £55, US\$95. ISBN: 978-0-521-19812-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001223

There can be few living scholars better qualified to write a volume entitled *Virgil in the Renaissance* than W.-O., tireless bibliographer and presiding genius of the website www.virgil.org. Even so, the task was never going to be an enterprise for the faint-hearted: in the 1920s, it took Vladimiro Zabughin two volumes, together

comprising a little under 800 pages of text and notes, to cover the poet's place in the Italian Renaissance from Dante to Torquato Tasso. W.-O.'s survey, by contrast, which observes no such restriction of nationality, comes in at just over 250 pages of main text, including blank pages between sections. Clearly, something has to give – and indeed from the very beginning of W.-O.'s study, it is hard not to feel that this book is crying out for a subtitle (one possible reason why it does not have one will be suggested below).

What has been sacrificed, then, to enable this vast subject to be handled in such a relatively constricted compass? The first obvious (and acknowledged) omission is any sustained consideration of visual material, which is passed over with a reference to bibliography by Pasquier and Suerbaum (p. 2 with n. 4) and occasional brief allusions elsewhere (see pp. 23 with n. 27, 56, 221, 223, 238). There are two illustrations in the volume (pp. 244, 246; the other so-called illustrations are strictly speaking graphs or diagrams), both woodcuts depicting scenes from Vegio's *Supplement*; and although it may not have been the author's choice, it is somehow symptomatic that the image on the dust jacket is taken not from one of the many lively and attractive Virgilian scenes to be found among manuscripts, early printed editions and *cassoni*, but from the 1896 Kelmscott Chaucer! W.-O. makes it clear, however, that this does not lie within his remit: his opening question is 'What did poets in the Renaissance know – or think they knew – about Virgil, and how did they interpret his major poems?' (p. 1; see also p. 8). Whether that is the same thing as 'Virgil in the Renaissance' *tout court*, and whether in itself it is enough to provide 'a survey, in the best sense, of what readers across Europe thought about Virgil and the meaning of his major poems' (p. 2), must remain a moot point; but even this prescription, as it turns out, requires W.-O. to refine his parameters yet further.

In order to achieve his goal '[t]o construct a survey that is really an overview and not just a collage' (p. 146), W.-O. sets out 'to identify what seems normal, central, common' (p. 9). This immediately raises the question of what was 'normal' in the Renaissance; after all, as W.-O. has already observed, 'not everything that happened during the Renaissance was part of the Renaissance' (p. 8). Almost casually, W.-O. thereby plunges into the historiographical mire that continues to bedevil any serious study of this 'period'. That he is conscious of the perils involved is evident from asides throughout the volume (see pp. 116, 126, 224); but he does not offer a systematic definition of what he understands by the term 'Renaissance' (which turns out to be a highly traditional, though not unreasonable, conception) until pp. 224–5, which is really much too late in the proceedings, given the urgency with which such questions of definition are raised by his methodology. To be fair, W.-O. appears to recognise that his *modus operandi* is open to objection ('To some, the focus on what was normal will seem boring, if not actually misbegotten', p. 9), but he none the less proceeds with his stated aim, and identifies as the most effective method for determining what was 'normal' in Renaissance interpretation of Virgil a study of the production and distribution of the most popular commentaries on the poet's *œuvre* during the period in question: the number of times a commentary was printed 'may be taken to represent the availability of a commentary, and therefore to approximate its influence' (p. 31). The first part of that hypothesis may be unobjectionable, and indeed the painstaking analysis in the two appendices (pp. 252–81) of the relative frequency of publication of commentaries on Virgil is valuable in demonstrating the availability of these exegetical aids in the Renaissance; but one does not have to be a specialist in the history of reading

to object that the ‘therefore’ here does not really follow – statistics on frequency and quantity of publication do not *necessarily* translate into readership or impact (and in fact W.-O. accepts elsewhere that ‘[o]ut of print is not always out of mind’ [p. 36] and observes ‘[t]hat is one of the beautiful things about reading, that we can skip or ignore anything we choose: headnotes, commentaries, introductions, our own marginal notations, anything’ [p. 247] – so why should Renaissance readers have behaved differently?).

The concentration on commentaries that results from this assumption intermittently leads to some strange distortions in the overall picture offered by W.-O.’s panorama. Reviewers are never more irritating than when they take an author to task for not writing the book they themselves would have written (or indeed are currently working on), but I cannot help remarking on W.-O.’s treatment of the fourth *Eclogue*. After citing Christianising responses to the poem on the part of Dante, Lactantius, Constantine and medieval anecdotes (pp. 71–2; see also p. 224), W.-O. remarks ‘[t]he moderns were more cautious’ (p. 72), and mentions the commentators Mancinelli and Badius Ascensius. The information is relevant; but as an account of the rich and varied fortunes of Virgil’s ‘messianic’ eclogue in the European Renaissance, this is scarcely adequate, and its inadequacy must call into question W.-O.’s (over-)emphasis on the commentary tradition, in this case to the exclusion of other Renaissance media. And indeed W.-O. is almost always at his best when enticed away from the pages of his facsimile of the 1544 Giunta edition (as in the brief history of georgic poetry in the Renaissance, pp. 83–5, and the account of the place of Camilla in Renaissance epic, pp. 227–30, 237) or when using it sparingly in combination with a wider range of sources (as in the account of Virgilian *uarietas*, pp. 93–100).

Having said this, the broad outlines and major features of W.-O.’s narrative of Virgil’s reception in the Renaissance seem to be substantially correct. He rightly emphasises the considerable degree of continuity that runs through Virgilian exegesis from antiquity through the Middle Ages to the Renaissance and beyond (pp. 8, 10, 41, 216, 222, 224, 248), and attaches due importance to the part played by the *Roman d’Enéas* (pp. 233, 236, 237–9, 246) and by Vegio’s *Supplement* (pp. 239–47, 248–9) in mediating Virgil’s text for his Renaissance readers and imitators. Perhaps the most striking thesis here is that ‘[w]hat was new ... was not how the *Aeneid* was studied, but how much’ (p. 224; see pp. 216–27), with a renewed interest in the previously neglected second half of the poem. The attention accorded to each of Virgil’s canonical works (along with sporadic observations on the non-canonical works, which passed in the Renaissance for Virgil’s juvenilia) is a particularly welcome feature. W.-O.’s command of the bibliography is evident throughout, though he does little to disguise his own interests: Edmund Spenser and Spenserian scholarship arguably receive disproportionate coverage in this purportedly pan-European survey. The style of writing is both allusive and consciously informal, and will certainly not appeal to everyone; on occasion W.-O.’s jocularity can seem laboured or irrelevant (see especially p. 25, on Nicolaus Erythraeus and Pontanus/Spanmueller [also p. 183]) – but fortunately such *bêtises* are rare after the heavy-going opening chapter on scholarship and publication, where one almost gets the sense that the author is becoming bored with his own material (a point W.-O. himself comes close to admitting, in his remarks on the aridity of the history of scholarship, p. 8).

No one could accuse W.-O. of a lack of ambition: he presents his work more or less explicitly as a sequel to Domenico Comparetti’s *Virgilio nel medio evo*

(first publ. Florence, 1872) – hence, perhaps, the lack of a qualifying subtitle. As Comparetti has become the one volume consulted by those interested in the poet's medieval *Nachleben* (see pp. 1–2), so W.-O.'s aspiration is very clearly for his own study to take its place as the single authoritative volume for this subsequent stage in the history of Virgilianism. Hence his insistence that the constant narrowing of the scope of his investigation will have no significant effect on the possibility of still being able to produce a representative overview ('For these sins of omission no contrition is forthcoming', p. 145). This is a study that makes a very concerted attempt to precondition its own reception – as a classic. Ironically, without this anxiety over self-positioning, it would probably be a better book. It is reassuring, however, that W.-O. acknowledges that '[t]he answers proposed here, even if they find acceptance, are sure to be debated, modified, and (in some cases) abandoned. That is how scholarship progresses' (p. 2).

The standard of production is for the most part admirable, though *omnia vincit amor* (*Ecl.* 10.69) is misquoted on p. 229, and quoted material (including the truncated epigraph from Horace, *Ars poetica* 70–1) occasionally lacks references. Poggio died in 1459, not 1489 (p. 225); the *editio princeps* of Servius appeared around 1470–1, not in 1482 (p. 33; correct in Table 1, p. 32); and the title of MacCormack's book refers to Augustine, not Augustus (p. 176 n. 124; correct elsewhere).

University of Glasgow

L.B.T. HOUGHTON
luke.houghton@glasgow.ac.uk

VIRGIL AS A SET TEXT

WALLACE (A.) *Virgil's Schoolboys. The Poetics of Pedagogy in Renaissance England*. Pp. xvi + 264, ill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Cased, £60, US\$110. ISBN: 978-0-19-959124-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001235

This book belongs to a wave of recent works which consider how early-modern pedagogical practices influenced the reception of classical literature in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Rebecca Bushnell, Jeff Dolven, Lynn Enterline and others have reflected on the psychological and literary consequences of early modern teaching. Although *Virgil's Schoolboys* contributes to these discussions, it also takes on a slightly wider brief. W. considers the way in which Virgil's texts were read, glossed and taught, and how those practices influenced John Milton, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and Edmund Spenser. He also argues that Virgil's own works were themselves conscious of the processes and practices of pedagogy – that they were received, as it were, in ways that they themselves invite. Noting that Quintus Caecilius Epirota is said to have been teaching Virgil's works from 26 B.C., W. suggests that much of Virgil's writing has what he terms a 'pedagogical subplot' (p. 122).

The first chapter shows how Virgilian examples were used in early modern teaching materials, and argues that Virgil became inextricably linked with 'the figure of the loving master', who expounded Virgil's works in order to make them objects of desire. This chapter shows a good grasp of the commentary tradition as well as the major primary and secondary works on the humanist curriculum. The suspicion that W. may at times make the textual life of early modern readers sexier than