on producing a version of the past which is useful for the future, rather than on the narrative structure. So, for example, Aeneas' 'terque quaterque beati' speech looks to how the Trojans will be remembered in the future, as well as back to the Trojan War (77–8); the emphasis on memory in Evander's tour of Pallanteum suggests that Rome too 'might have some mnemonic connections with the Trojan past' (55); contrary to most scholars' readings, S. argues that Aeneas finds some value for Helenus and Andromache in their static commemoration of Troy at Buthrotum, even though he distances himself from it (86–92); and he instructs Ascanius not to forget Trojan values in the future (161–7), even as Juno militates to consign Troy to oblivion (171–8). Aeneas and the narrator are complicit in establishing the *Lusus Troiae* as a commemorative ritual practised in Augustan Rome, a social memory that the poem's readers can enjoy of the games' origins (136). Here as elsewhere, the usefulness of troubled recent history for Virgil's readers remains on the margins of S.'s discussion (16–20). The reader is left to wonder whether the characters' memory negotiations offer hope for the uncertain future of the Augustan Principate after the trauma of the civil wars.

A great strength of Quint's reading is his integration of the ubiquitous Homeric allusion into a Freudian narratological model which has points of reference in Roman history. S. is perfectly aware that many episodes in the *Aeneid* replay the Trojan past (e.g. 51 n. 72, 178 n. 63), and he does invoke contrasts and comparisons with Homer at appropriate points (e.g. Helen's amnesiac drug (80–1); Priam's appeal to Achilles to remember Peleus (180–1)); but to my mind, he vastly underplays the literary and rhetorical potential of his subject by not considering focalized reminiscences of Homeric or cyclic epic as acts of memory. These would have fitted well with, and enriched, the book, as the allusions are often emotionally charged and sometimes hotly contested plot-drivers, whether spoken by a divine or human character, or by the narrator himself.

While I was persuaded by much of this book's contents, I found the writing difficult to follow: the prose is energetic, but too often obscure. Clearer and more crafted argumentation would have been in order, especially in the transitions between abstract discussion and textual application. This said, S. sheds welcome new light on his subject.

*University College, London* FIACHRA MAC GÓRÁIN
f.macgorain@ucl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000143

N. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL,* AENEID *6: A COMMENTARY* (2 vols). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2013. Pp. xl + 706. ISBN 9783110229905. €169.95/US$238.00.

Undaunted and relentless, the 'commentators' commentator', as De Gruyter's back cover dubs its recent acquisition, has given birth to the fifth tome of his series, the one book that was even 'beyond' Austin (xxvii). Unsurprisingly for Nicholas Horsfall's readers, his *Aen.* 6 is almost as intimidating as Virgil's: H. writes 'in the shadow of Norden' (Appendix 3, 645–54) and in the wake of La Cerda and Henry as a vehement *defensor Vergilii*; and from this perspective, H.6 is in clear continuity with its Brill siblings 7, 11, 3 and 2. Yet this time the book's contents are a perfect match for the commentary: this is a labyrinth of soluble and insoluble riddles, of gold-sparkling discoveries tinkling through Sibylline notes; its impressive use of previous scholarship will take you indeed *in antiquam siluam* from which the *profani* are apparently recommended to hold back from the very beginning (ix; wrongly, I reckon, since both the translation and the grammatical and stylistic notes actually make an extremely helpful tool for undergraduates).

Virtues and vices of H.'s commentaries are familiar. Alongside impressive erudition, encyclopaedic afflatus and brilliant specific solutions, H. also remains faithful to his idiosyncrasies: elliptical expressions and convoluted structures, insertion of personal notes, the crisp treatment of the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (since H.6 has seen the light at the same time as the new *Virgil Encyclopedia*, contributors may now start to shiver, wondering what treatment — if any — *VE* shall receive alongside *EV* in the next H.) and the dismissal of many younger Virgilians, for which they 'might now begin to grasp the reason(s) why' (639). As previously, the commentary is packed with contributions passed over in silence that H. invites experts to notice (xxxix), so that it can easily become an unpleasant 'spot the absentee' game for readers — and indeed reviewers. Treatment of scholarship, in its form at least, is sometimes dictated by personal relationships (with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no one reproached as harshly as H. himself), as emphasized by passing notes and a fascinating biographical appendix of H.'s story with *Aen.* 6 (Appendix 2, 631–43).

The commentary as usual includes an exhaustive treatment at virtually every point (the only exception being 6.700–2, treated at H.2.792–4) and twenty dense digressions on specific passages, the most noteworthy of them perhaps SC (Sibyl(s) and Cave(s), 70–84), the GB (The Golden Bough, 152–7) and the PH (the Parade of Heroes, 510–19). Among recurrent positions are the view of Book 6 as 'a masterpiece of eschatological *bricolage*' (xxv–vi); the rejection of the straightforward identification of the Sibyl's cave with Maiuri's 'Antro'; of Norden's reading of augural connotations in Aeneas' quest for the GB; of D'Arms', Segal's, Dyson's and Thomas' links between the GB's resistance and Aeneas' disobedience to the Sibyl's orders; the conviction of the chronological priority of *G.* 4 over *Aen.* 6; the teleological nature of Book 6 as a climactic ascent towards the PH; the scepticism towards Zetzel's, Hardie's and Feeney's readings of the PH; the certainty of an influence of Augustus' *laudatio funebris* on Marcellus on Virgil. To these one may add H.'s well-known and more than sharable positions that the *Aeneid* should not be read according to the argument 'Virgil would have corrected this had he lived' (although he is certain that two versions of Palinurus in Books 5 and 6 'would never have coexisted after a final revision' (276)) and that Virgil's alleged inventions are always based on and surrounded by complex erudition.

The single notes refreshingly emphasize some neglected aspects (for example, the comic tones of the Sibyl's dialogue with Charon, Cicero's influence on Virgil, Virgil's careful reading of Plato), yet others seem to be overlooked, especially when it comes to intertextual dialogue. Among the texts whose relationship to Book 6 I was hoping H. would enlighten for us were Horace's *C.* 1.12 and especially Pindar's *Ol.* 2 — yet neither of them is deemed worthy of a substantial discussion. The indebtedness of Book 6 to Lucretius, who surfaces constantly in the *loci paralleli* but is strangely absent from the introductory list of sources, is highlighted at pivotal points in the narrative, but does not deserve an organic treatment. Among the characters, I strangely found Dido the one analysed in less depth: I was surprised to see H. raising doubts about the parallels between Dido and Pasiphae at 6.26 (89), and I was expecting a note on the connection between the mysterious identity of the *sacerdos* at 6.244 (whom I am not at all convinced 'could … be an anonymous Trojan priest' (219)) and the equally ambiguous *sacerdos* of 4.509; in the Underworld, H. does not discuss the parallels between Helen and Dido most evident in the Bacchic rites (cf. 6.517 and 4.300–3 with Krummen, *Poetica* 36 (2004), who also points out a similarity between Dido and Helen in the mention of the Eurota at 1.498) and I suspect that a parallel between Eriphyle (6.445) and Dido may be found in the shared model of Clytemnestra. Furthermore, the anachronism implied in Aeneas' arrival at Cumae (66) could have been coupled with the similar anachronism of Aeneas arriving at Carthage, also recollected by the parallel between 6.6–7 and 1.174–6. Generally, readers may also be let down by some of H.'s readings 'in the light of history': for example, in his comprehensive list of questions related to 6.460 (345), he does not signpost the Egyptian context of Berenice in relation to the Dido/Cleopatra allegory. Allusions to the civil wars are recognized (Deiphobus' mutilation, 345; nn. on 6.560 *quae scelerum facies* and 612–13 *arma … impia*), yet I was puzzled by the need to pin down some identifications as if they must equate to 'modern' sinners (I find the idea that Cleopatra is the *dominum* of 6.621 especially bizarre), on which I was also surprised not to find a reference to the beginning of Lucr., *DRN* 3.

H.'s text differs from Mynors' in seventeen instances: eleven involve punctuation (at least three relevant, 6.122, 750–1 and 713, the latter a brilliant suggestion by Michael Reeve; at 430 and 882 the translation does not follow H.'s preferred punctuation), three text (664 *alios* to Mynors' *aliquos* even though the corruption from *aliquos* is easier to explain; 746 *reliquit* to *relinquit*; 806 follows Henry in reading *uirtute extendere uires* rather than *uirtutem extendere factis*) and three orthography (848 and 862 prefer the spelling *uoltus* to *uultus*; 893 does not allow *somni* a capital S, highlighting H.'s preference for the Gates of Dreams rather than Sleep); the n. at 242 incorrectly assigns *Aornon* to Mynors' edition. Yet the commentary reveals further objections: in four lines (512, 516, 827, 869) the *lectio* preferred in the commentary does not match the agreement with Mynors apparently professed by the text, and the endorsement of Conte's brief lacuna after 601 is not shown in the text.

As often noted for the Brill volumes, the copy-editing does not do justice to the author and his work, yet I suspect it has deteriorated from the previous standards: if A. Hardie found around forty misprints in H.11 (*BMCR* 2004.05.03), I counted no fewer than 170, most of them involving punctuation (among which the wild use of brackets to which H.'s readers are by now accustomed), but also misprints in the Latin text (6.41 *Teucros* and the whole of line 729 are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

missing, *Caeneus* should be in 449, not 448), untranslated lines (28, *caeca* in 30, 326, *nuper* in 338, *et funere mersit acerbo* in 429, 510, *acceleremus* in 630, 729, 758), misprints in English, Latin, Italian and French, some wrong references and slips of the author (my favourite in 98, where Catullus' *leptotes* seems transferred to Virgil's Underworld: *caeco* (>*tenui*) *uestigia filo*). I am not the first to claim that it is a shame to see H.'s monumental work in such a poor editorial shape.

Now that we are into the second tetrad, and that we see both references and objections to H.'s previous commentaries unavoidably increase in each latest volume of H., one cannot help but wonder what the whole of H.'s *Aeneid* shall look like. In the meanwhile, we are promised H.1, which I for one shall await impatiently. And this is not just because of these volumes' immediate usefulness. In the ever increasingly hectic and injudicious world of REF-oriented academia, H.'s work continues to refresh Virgilians with some of the fundamental yet too easily forgotten lessons: the importance of grasping the grammar and style of an author who sets up his own rules; the 'unhelpful myth' (xxxix) of bibliographical comprehensiveness; the warning not to rely solely on the contributions of *recentiores* (who are sometimes *deteriores*); the ultimate unreliability of digital word searches; and the unavoidable reality that the increasing entrenchment of today's scholars into their own specialized fields is no match for good commentaries.

*University of Glasgow* ELENA GIUSTI
egiusti382@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000544

P. HARDIE, *THE LAST TROJAN HERO: A CULTURAL HISTORY OF VIRGIL'S* AENEID. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014. Pp. ix + 249, 8 pls, 39 illus. ISBN 9781780762470. £25.00.

At first sight, the subtitle of this book suggests an impossible task — to write a cultural history of one of the foundation texts of Western civilization in fewer than 250 pages. Philip Hardie outlines the challenge of the book, designed as a companion volume to Edith Hall's *The Return of Ulysses* (2008), in an Introduction which sets the tone of the whole enterprise in the glorious breadth and depth of its material. This analysis of Virgilian reception opens by evoking Virgil's presence in the Americas and Australia; from the reverse of the US one-dollar bill to the mottos of the state of Oklahoma, the Brazilian state of Minos Gerais and the city of Melbourne, Australia, there is abundant evidence of Virgil's fundamental importance to a wide range of civilizations. Yet his presence within these new worlds is haunted by the sorrows and injustices of colonization. From the start, therefore, H. alerts us both to the global appeal of the *Aeneid*, but also the dark ambivalence that haunts the work and its reception. It is entirely appropriate that the Introduction should conclude with Walt Whitman's words from his poem 'Song of Myself': 'Do I contradict myself?/ Very well then I contradict myself. (I am large, I contain multitudes.)'

These multitudes are further explored in nine subsequent chapters which are organized thematically — 'Underworlds', '"La donna è mobile": Versions of Dido', 'The Many Faces of Aeneas', 'Empire and Nation', '*Imperium sine fine:* The *Aeneid* and Christianity', 'The *Aeneid* and New Worlds', 'Parody and Burlesque', and 'Art and Landscape'. As we might have anticipated, there is lucid and probing discussion of Dante, Milton and Tennyson within the 'Underworlds' chapter, but through a series of sensitive and close readings, H. also evokes the ways in which the Virgilian underworld informed Freud's thinking, chilled Claudio's visions of death in *Measure for Measure* and haunted the work of Berlioz and Petrarch. This survey of Underworlds leads us from Lucan to Eavan Boland, from Silius Italicus to Heaney.

Petrarch also features in the chapter devoted to receptions of Dido. Here again H. reminds us of the *Aeneid*'s ambivalence, as Petrarchan poetry draws upon the image of Dido to evoke both her beautiful face, but also the way in which this beauty is distorted by grief and anguish into 'raging fury'. The Dido chapter also indicates the importance of the *Aeneid* to women's history, not least to those women who have found themselves in positions of literary authority or political leadership, such as Christine de Pizan, Elizabeth I or Rosario Castellano, a Mexican feminist icon. It is appropriate that the following chapter, devoted to Aeneas, should probe the different manifestations of heroism that have gained prestige at different times. H. points out that there have been surprisingly few studies devoted exclusively to Aeneas, though it is clear from his analysis that a study of the reception of Aeneas would offer valuable insights into what different ages and cultures prize in their constructions of masculinity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000544 Published online by Cambridge University Press