

Throughout, A. gives admirably clear exposition of the philosophical arguments, with apt analogies and jargon-free language. All Latin and Greek sources are translated, ensuring that the volume will be accessible to audiences outside Classical Studies. And this book has a message for readers outside the academy. For, in A.'s reading, Cicero's treatises insist on a role for philosophy in the real world where political ideals are meant to be more than an unachievable philosophical goal: these ideals are an essential model that can and should be adapted to contingent reality. If this makes Cicero's philosophy more at home among politicians than philosophers, it may not be a bad thing, because a thinking politician (even one who falls short of being a Stoic sage) is better than the alternative.

Indiana University

CYNTHIA J. BANNON  
cbannon@indiana.edu

## CATULLUS 67

PORTUESE (O.) (ed., trans) *Il carme 67 di Catullo*. (Quaderni di 'Paideia' 16.) Pp. 417, ills. Cesena: Stilgraf Editrice, 2013. Paper, €39. ISBN: 978-88-96240-39-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002698

This edition with commentary of Catullus' poem 67 is the latest in the series 'Quaderni di Paideia'. Recently, books by A. Agnesini (ed.), *Il carme 62 di Catullo* (2007) and G. Maggiali (ed.), *Il carme 68 di Catullo* (2009), together with two other important critical surveys (G.G. Biondi [ed.], *Il liber di Catullo. Tradizione, modelli e Fortleben* [2012]; M. Bonvicini, *Il Novus Libellus di Catullo. Trasmissione del testo, problematicità della grafia e dell'interpunzione* [2012]), have been published in the same series. The book is well organised. A large and updated bibliography is followed by an introduction focused on manuscript tradition and literary features of the poem; an extensive line-by-line commentary (pp. 141–317) is preceded by a critical prolegomenon, the *sigla codicum* and the text of the poem; the book is completed by a 'proposta di traduzione', synoptic tables of *variae lectiones* and indexes (*rerum*; modern authors; *locorum*).

P. has benefited from some significant contributions in recent Catullan scholarship. His proposal to remove the initial couplet from the poem, by attaching it to the end of the preceding poem 66, is crucial to our understanding of the poem's structure (cf. pp. 102–6, 141–4, and A. Agnesini, 'Catull. 67, 1 s.: incipit della *Ianua* o explicit della *Coma*?', *Paideia* 66 [2011], 521–40; P. [p. 105] makes no clear distinction between his own and Agnesini's interpretation of this issue). Undoubtedly, there are some striking similarities between Catull. 67.1–2 *o dulci iucunda viro, iucunda parenti / salve* and Call. *Aet.* 4.213.94<sup>a</sup>  $\chi[\alpha\rho\epsilon]$  φίλη τεκέεσσι (τοκέεσσι Lobel): it is very likely that the Latin couplet is the last one in Catullan translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*, and that poem 67 begins with the allocution to the door (67.3 *Ianua, quam Balbo dicunt seruisse benigne*). P. (pp. 76–98) also corroborates his proposal by referring to two Catullan manuscripts, **α** (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2621) and **D** (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Diez. B. Sant. 37): in both of them a later corrector has inserted a similar sign of division (a 'gamma capitularis') between 67.2 and 67.3, in the margin. Additionally, in **OGR** there is no division between poem 66 and 67: Coluccio Salutati provided it in **R**<sup>2</sup>, probably by conjecture, setting the boundary between 66.94 and 67.1; this solution has been adopted in Catullan *vulgata* from the *editio Parmensis* (1473) onwards (p. 97 and nn. 102–3). The *status quaestionis* is carefully reconstructed, and P.'s accurate report of the specific features of **α**<sup>3</sup> and **D**<sup>2</sup> is a

valuable acquisition in itself. Notwithstanding, we still do not have enough evidence to suppose an extra-**OGR** (not extra-**V!**) tradition in later Catullan manuscripts, as suggested (cautiously) by P. (p. 91, cf. also p. 96) and by G.G. Biondi, in a recent, stimulating paper ('Catullo, Sabellico [e dintorni] e ... Giorgio Pasquali. «Recentiores non deteriores»', *Paideia* 68 [2013], 663–88). This point requires further investigation.

The generic patterns of the poem are well analysed. P. (pp. 108–10) is right in reminding us of the importance of an ancient tragic *topos*, represented for example by A. *Ag.* 36–8 or E. *Hipp.* 415–21 (the tragic heroine fears that the door and walls of her house could talk and reveal scandalous secrets). The refined blend of genres (hymn, epithalamium, paraklausithyron) is carefully described: perhaps it would have been appropriate to stress the importance of Roman *occentatio* (cf. line 14 *ad me omnes clamant: ianua, culpa tua est*), cf. E. Fraenkel, 'Two Poems of Catullus', *JRS* 51 (1961), 46–53 (= *Kleine Beitr. z. klass. Philol.* II [1964], 115–29), as the poem is filled with references to Roman folk culture.

The text is established with commendable prudence. P. sets between *crucis* not only line 12 *istius populi ianua qui te* (like D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus* [1997]), but also line 5 *uoto* (*nato* Thomson, conjectured by Froehlich: however, P. assumes that the reading *uoto* is more likely than *nato*) and line 32 *chineia* (*Cycneae* Thomson, conjectured by Voss), where I am not convinced of P.'s defence of *Brixia ... sub positum specula* (neuter *positum* can hardly agree with feminine *Brixia*: P. furnishes inappropriate examples, without explaining the origin of *quam*. *Supposita speculae* is still the best solution, *-ā sp-* is metrically plain in Catullus). At line 33, P. appropriately benefits from a recent, very valuable paper on ancient and medieval names of the Brixian *specula* and river (L. Degiovanni, 'Brixia Catulliana (Catull. 67, 31–34)', *Eikasmós* 24 [2013], 159–83: *Melo* is an ancient and still surviving name of the river Garza. P. is only perhaps too prolix at pp. 268–71, when recollecting and discussing many examples already mentioned by Degiovanni). At line 27, P. reads *unde <unde>*: Thomson adopts the same text (a trivial and very likely haplography is assumed). P.'s defence of line 44 *speret* (*speraret* Thomson) is sound (there are several instances of hiatus at the pentameter's dieresis in Catullus, and P. [p. 297] also quotes 68.158 and 66.48, from the *carmina docta*; 66.48 must be quoted in the form *Iuppiter ut Chalibum omne genus pcreat*).

The commentary mostly deals with textual, interpretative and literary questions; great attention is commendably devoted to the history of the text (although in P.'s detailed account it is sometimes difficult to discern what is actually relevant for establishing the text). The interpretation of the plot raises key questions. In P.'s opinion, the *ianua* says the *domina* has not arrived as a virgin at the house of Verona because she had been raped by the father of her *sponsus*, in Brixia: the *sponsio* had already been celebrated in Brixia, the *nuptiae* took place later in Verona (cf. line 6 *porrecto facta marita sene*), where the couple moved to in order to hush up the scandal (the old *Balbus* at line 3 might be the husband's father, who went earlier to Verona and bought a house for the couple: cf. pp. 246–53). P.'s reconstruction is ingenious, but also complicated and unconvincing. Catullus' language at lines 19–28 presupposes that the girl was already married as she was raped by her father-in-law: he dishonoured his son's bed and house (lines 23–4 *gnati ... cubile / miseram ... domum*). P. assumes that the *sponsio* is legally equipollent to a marriage, but Roman *sponsi* never slept in the same bed and in the same house (I do not understand P.'s interpretation of line 24 *domum*, p. 231: 'è la casa bresciana in cui il *uir* e la *uirgo* vissero prima del trasferimento a Verona'). Along with many other scholars (cf. p. 214), I suggest that *uir prior* at line 20 means 'the former husband': Catullus is alluding to a first marriage, in Brixia, which has been invalidated because of the husband's proclaimed impotence (cf. C. Fayer, *La familia romana* II [2005], pp. 132–3 n. 388). On the other hand, P. carefully reviews the cultural background of the poem: P. cleverly points

out connections with *sermo* and topics of the Latin comic tradition, as well as parodies of epic and tragedy (see above and also, for instance, pp. 221–4, on Catull. 67.21–2 and Hom. *Il.* 3.357–67), although the accumulation of *loci similes* is sometimes redundant and makes it difficult to recognise what material is relevant to a correct interpretation of the poem (see for instance pp. 232–6).

P. provides an useful and accurate edition with commentary, setting up recent improvements in several topics related to Catullus 67; however, some basic problems concerning the text and its interpretation still remain *sub iudice*.

*Università di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale*

ALFREDO M. MORELLI

[alfmorel@unicas.it](mailto:alfmorel@unicas.it)

## ENCYCLOPEDIA VIRGIL

THOMAS (R.F.), ZIOLKOWSKI (J.M.) (edd.) *The Virgil Encyclopedia. Volume I: A–E, Volume II: F–Pe, Volume III: Ph–Z.* With the assistance of A. Bonnell-Freidin, C. Flow, and M.B. Sullivan. Pp. lxxviii + 1525, b/w & colour pls. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley–Blackwell, 2014. Cased, £299, €358.80, US\$495. ISBN: 978-1-4051-5498-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X1400256X

In his new introduction to the translation of E.R. Curtius' monumental *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, first published in 1953 and recently reissued by Princeton University Press, the Renaissance scholar C. Burrow calls it 'one of the three most inspiring works of literary criticism written in the twentieth century' (the other two being Auerbach's *Mimesis* and Kermode's *Sense of an Ending*). This is because it shows 'why literary study matters, and why it is intellectually, and perhaps also politically, important for the critic not to be bound to a single place or time', and because of 'its unifying passion for an idea of Western literature'. For Curtius Virgil was at something like the centre for that idea, as being what T.S. Eliot called 'the classic of all Europe', a view strongly reaffirmed in Kermode's *The Classic*. That is what I think chiefly justifies Wiley–Blackwell's decision to publish a *Virgil Encyclopedia* (hereafter *VE*), and that of its editors to take the crucial decision to include in it 'everything of importance that enters into Virgil, that is in Virgil, and that comes out from Virgil into literature, art, and music'. The sheer extent of the emphasis on reception differentiates it from the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (modelled on the great *Enciclopedia Dantesca*) to whose often fuller and more learned discussions on the ancient material scholars and those with good Italian will still want to return. The new work may not be 'bound to a single place' but there is some (acknowledged) narrowing to an Anglo-American Anglophone world and its priorities (more on this in a moment). One justification might be that, for the West today, English has, at least for the time being, assumed the place of Latin as the universal language.

As one often does with such works, I turned first to entries on Virgilian topics on which I myself chanced to be working, both as it happened topics in reception: those on Shakespeare and Tennyson. Both proved to be perfectly serviceable if not quite outstanding, with useful pointers to further reading (another matter to which I will be returning). The one on Shakespeare (which includes most of the principal intertextualities with Virgil, but does not warn readers that many scholars now attribute to Peele some of the