

50 *forma*. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship is better served, but I note the absence of *Am.* 1.7.55 *aut* Lee, 2.5.4 *in* Ker, 9.2 *seditione* Hall (the complementary conjecture in 9.1 is, however, mentioned), 2.19.20 *simulans* Goold, 3.13.29 *ora* Madvig, *Med.* 35 *iungendus* Goold, *Ars* 1.515 *lingula* Palmer, 3.61 *educitis* Housman (with *uernos* Heinsius, and *etiannum* MSS).

Lections likewise which merit a mention are not to be found in K2. Most can be extracted from Burman's 'Variorum' edition of 1727 (particularly attractive among which are *Am.* 3.2.67 *faueas* and *Ars* 3.776 *accipienda*); the Hamilton MS supplies a further five: *Am.* 1.1.17 *successit*, 2.3.10 *tuenda*, 9b.37 *missae*, 3.6.72 *fremente*, 12.20 *maluerim* (this last surely right).

Among numerous substantial divergences by the text of K2 from the text of Burman, there are not a few, I think, where the true reading remains confined to K's apparatus criticus: e.g. (in *Am.* 1 only) 1.2.6 *tacita*, 27 *iuuenes capti*, 52 *uincit*, 7.24 *utilius*, 9.6 *toro*, 13.36 *fabula* (vigorously commended by Goold).

There are a number of places where K2's apparatus criticus is at variance with the text. At *Am.* 2.11.40, for instance, the text reads *uenti spirent*, but *uenti spirent* comes not first but fourth out of five items in the apparatus criticus; for similar instances see *Am.* 2.17.11, 3.3.45, *Med.* 85, 92, *Ars* 1.338. At *Am.* 3.6.85 and *Ars* 1.414, 427, and 709 there is no entry at all in the apparatus criticus when there should be.

Finally, various miscellaneous comments. *Am.* 1.4.7 *desino* looks good and right; 10.27 K2's conjecture does not convince; 13.39 can one embrace *manibus*? (the question has been asked previously by Goold and Lee); 2.7.25 I do not understand the causal *quod erat*. Surely *quae tam*?; 3.11.32 *nunc* is Bentley's conjecture—the MSS give *sum*; *Ars* 1.114 *petita* surely; 255 *uelis* (not *Bais*) appeals; 2.91 is unelided *atque* tolerable?; 3.327 Munari attributes *nablia* not *nubila* to Y. At *Am.* 2.4.11 K2 following K1 following Munari (1951) assigns *in humum* to Timpanaro when it had in fact first been postulated by Heinsius.

Sheffield

J. B. HALL

G. BRUGNOLI, C. SANTINI: *L'Additamentum Aldinum di Silio Italico*. (Bollettino dei Classici, Supplement 14.) Pp. 112. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1995. Paper, L. 60,000.

At 8.44–231 Silius tells the story of Anna, but there is a large gap in the transmitted text, as Petrus Marsus for one observed in his edition of 1483. In 1508 Iacobus Constantius filled the gap by publishing in a critical miscellany eighty-four lines that he says his teacher Baptista Guarinus, who died in 1503, claimed to have received *e Gallia*. Whether Silius wrote the lines, and if so how they might have survived, has been much debated. Delz in his Teubner edition of 1987 rejected them, and in my review, *CR* 103 (1989), 216, I came over to his side. Santini, who also reviewed it, did not; and Brugnoli, who had been finding echoes of Silius in Dante, has since argued that Walter of Châtillon in his *Alexandreis* and Petrarch in his *Africa* echo the new lines no less than the rest.

The same argument, with more material, occupies the longest chapter of this book. As regards the new lines (pp. 71–2), I am quite unconvinced, and the rest of the chapter abounds in frivolities such as echoes of a final *s* or of two identical letters in an unrelated word. In his monograph on the classical models for the *Alexandreis*, Zwierlein cites only two passages of Silius and does not suggest that Walter read them. Martellotti justly said that if Petrarch could have read the *Punica* he would probably not have written his *Africa*, and the current authority on *Africa*, Vincenzo Fera, has said at least twice that he did not know it.

The only new argument in the book occupies Chapter II, where they try to show that the *Imitationstechnik* (their term) is the same as elsewhere in the story of Anna. Neither in the body of the chapter nor in the ugly language of its preamble could I find any means of distinguishing between Silius and Constantius (or some other humanist), either of whom was bound to make ample use of *Aeneid* 4 and *Fasti* 3.523–656.

It would have been some compensation if they had revealed more about Constantius and his background. What approaches, for instance, does he adopt elsewhere in the miscellany? Is it relevant that he lectured on *Fasti*, or that his father Antonius published a commentary on it? Can Baptista Guarinus be shown to have received anything at all *e Gallia*?

Instead, apart from saying fairly enough that Delz should have been just as ready to emend

away faults in the new lines as in others, they offer nothing new in their poorly arranged introductory chapter except a horrible conjecture by Brugnoli in 204, *optatum Latium tandem potura cruorem* (Latii ed. 1508; Latii ed. Ald. 1523), and a multiple misinterpretation of the two sentences that Constantius appends to the new lines, which mean 'I would gladly have added a number of emendations and supplements had not my learned friend Petrus Marsus shown me last year some notes ready for printing: it would have been unthinkable to steal his thunder' (Sabbadini, whom they contradict, was right). Their false statement that Constantius translated into Latin an Italian poem on war is not new but comes from Ricciardi's entry in the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*. They also fail to discuss the other line that Constantius supplied, 224a, which they bracket in their text (p. 8) but take to have stood in the manuscript from which the passage of eighty-one lines might have been recovered (p. 50).

As they kindly sent me a copy, I am sorry to repay them by concluding that *nesciunt quod male cessit relinquere*.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

M. D. REEVE

J. GEORGE: *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems: Translated with Notes and Introduction*. (Translated Texts for Historians, 23.) Pp. xxv + 156, 1 fig., 1 map. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996. Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 0-85323-179-6.

*TTH* marches on, and has no doubt acquired many non-specialist readers as it spreads over more and more of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. This volume is one of two on Venantius: a companion volume, on his sacred and ecclesiastical writings, is mentioned. It is a varied and attractive collection of over seventy poems, ranging from one 'about the cook who took the poet's boat' to some on bigger fry like King Chilperic. The Merovingian period is not the easiest to feel at home in, but G. is well aware of the difficulty, and the division of material between her introduction, the notes to each poem, and the biographical notes on pages 123–32 will be helpful to any who are challenged in this respect; and there is also her very useful monograph of 1992. The introductory material includes a genealogical table, a map, a sketch of the poet's life and writings, and notes on this selection. There is also a valuable paragraph showing G.'s awareness that 'lack of familiarity with the cultural roots of a text like this can make it inaccessible to many a modern student' and making an (unnecessary) plea to the classicist or Biblical scholar not to be impatient at any detail in her commentary that they may find elementary. As for the first point, it could be taken a little further, so that references like Ovid *Pont.*, or even Virgil *Georg.*, could be illumined somewhat. In her bibliography G. has sought to cite translations where they exist; translations of at least Horace and Prudentius could have been added.

In the first line of the first poem translated G. uses the word 'main' for *pelagus*, with a helpful note saying that the use of such a style is a compliment to the recipient; no doubt this applies also to epitaph and panegyric and other genres represented here. In general the style used in her close translations follows suit. I had a few quibbles. One is a personal allergy to the use of the word 'base' in the sense of 'disgraceful'. In 6.1.11 'suited in its couplings' (of a bird) why not the technical term 'bonding', with perhaps 'united by' for *aptus*? In 4.26.100 perhaps 'what will souls say . . .?' (cf. *quid sum miser tunc dicturus* in the later *Dies Irae*), and in 4.28.13 'so that you would be amazed that she was (in fact) a young woman'. In 3.13.40 is not the sense of *stat* in fact 'will stand forth' (at the last day)? A few Virgilian points: on p. 2 n. 5, *Aen.* 9.59, not 11.59; for the lilies/roses motif (p. 30 n. 33) *Aen.* 12.68–9 is the *locus classicus*. In 4.17.9 ('Beauty, where do you hurry me . . .') does this owe something to Virg. *Aen.* 6.845? These are small matters; my overall impression was that this is a very accessible and informative presentation of one side of this little known poet.

Glasgow

R. P. H. GREEN