

case while also providing a detailed philological and stylistic analysis of Cicero's language and argumentation. The resulting work constitutes a worthy addition to the list of new commentaries on the hitherto neglected corpus of Cicero's *post reditum* orations.

ANTHONY CORBEILL
University of Virginia
corbeill@virginia.edu

LEE M. FRATANTUONO, R. ALDEN SMITH, *Virgil, Aeneid 4: Text, Translation, Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplements 462, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2022, xi+982 pp. \$280.00, ISBN 978-90-04-52143-8.

This commentary on Vergil's *Aeneid* 4 for the *Mnemosyne Supplements* series is the fruit of the third collaboration between Fratantuono (who is primarily responsible for the commentary) and Smith (introduction, text, and translation). As the authors point out in the preface (XI), they are planning to produce a commentary on *Aeneid* 9. Their first two commentaries for the same series were devoted to Books 5 (2015) and 8 (2018) and, while these books reach the length of roughly 800 pages each, the present volume goes generously beyond it. In a sense, this is to be expected given the wealth of scholarship devoted to *Aeneid* 4, admittedly one of the most popular books of Vergil's epos.

The volume opens with a helpful introduction that gives an overview of the interpretative trends on *Aeneid* 4. It also discusses various points such as the tripartite structure of Book 4 and its position within the economy of the *Aeneid*, the unfinished status of Vergil's revision, the characterisation of Aeneas and of Dido, the main intertextual and intratextual allusions, and the Augustan socio-political context as well as the analogy between Dido and Cleopatra. The introduction is followed by a succinct note on the manuscripts (38-42), and then by the text accompanied by a parallel translation into English. The text offered follows the same format as the commentaries on Books 5 and 8 and is provided by a rich critical apparatus. Smith and Fratantuono explain that they inspected afresh the manuscripts that previous editors credited with textual value (41) and, in so doing, they were often able to correct misreported readings. This is no small accomplishment and they should be thanked for their efforts. Nonetheless, readers with different skills and knowledge of the *Aeneid* will use this commentary, and it would have been useful to offer (perhaps in an appendix) a more detailed description of the witnesses discussing their classification than the information available in the note on the manuscripts. A similar point about accessibility should be made about the apparatus. This follows the same approach as in Geymonat's essentially positive apparatus (1973 = 2008, rev. ed.), and some of the readings reported are mere corruptions rather than significant variants. This makes one wonder whether

a significantly slimmer apparatus supplemented by an *appendix critica* at the end, reporting in detail all the textual information Smith and Fratantuono gathered, would have been more helpful. Furthermore, given that so many readings are offered, one would have expected to find somewhere a *conspectus siglorum* rather than having to check Geymonat's edition to understand, for instance, that the siglum **M**⁶ indicates a corrector possibly from the Carolingian period who annotates MS Florence, *Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, Plut. 39.1.

The translation, by Smith, tries to capture the sense of the original as closely as possible, though e.g. *cerva* at *Aen.* 4.69 could have more precisely been translated as 'doe' rather than 'deer'; this would have made the analogy between the wounded animal and Dido more evident. I should also mention at least one significant ambiguity in *Aen.* 4.54, which is printed twice accepting both the reading *his dictis incensum animum inflammavit amore* (4.54a), defended by Smith in "Dido's Already Enflamed Love", *QUCC* 127, 2021, 185-91, and *his dictis impenso animum flammavit amore* (4.54b). The translation 'she enflamed Dido's soul with love' seems closer to 4.54b but *impenso* is left out. The commentary *ad loc.* offers a balanced synopsis of the textual positions on this line without attempting to settle the issue.

The commentary itself is a trove of information on Book 4. Following the format of the other Vergil commentaries from the same series, the plot summary of a sequence is given at the start, and then the commentary proceeds with an extensive examination of every line. The lemmas are thorough and care has been put into including different interpretations, of which there is no shortage, as well as assessing stylistic features and possible internal and external allusions. Some readers—I think particularly of undergraduate students, but also advanced readers—may find the plethora of details frustrating to navigate through: for example, when commenting on the recurrence of a certain collocation, it may have been sufficient to offer a couple of examples rather than quoting extensively several *loci similes*, especially if they are mere lists from later authors drawing on Vergil, rather than earlier parallels that are worth exploring at length. This is followed by a bibliography and three indexes (*locorum*, *nominum*, and *rerum*).

Some observations on the commentary: one would have expected a discussion of the broken syntax at 4.333-5 in Aeneas' reply to Dido and how it may reflect Aeneas' unease, caught red-handed as the Trojans secretly prepare the fleet. That Dido resorting to *magicæ artes* in *Aen.* 4.493 could evoke some exoticism that connects Dido to Cleopatra seems far-fetched. The commentary on *Aen.* 4.569-70 *varium et mutabile semper / femina*, a rather misogynist maxim that concludes Mercury's speech to Aeneas, does not lay enough emphasis on the rhetorical colour of the passage. Mercury ends his speech with an ἐπιφώνημα, as a good orator would, and his words ought to be taken with this rhetorical context in mind. Indeed, it is tempting to follow Austin's commentary *ad loc.*, arguing that Mercury may well be distorting—if not altogether confecting—the truth here and in 4.563, when he tells Aeneas that Dido was preparing deceptions and

impious crimes against him. These minor points I have raised do not detract from the quality of the book.

On balance, this volume is monumental in size and scope. While a better arrangement of the textual information and a more concise approach in the commentary would have made this volume more accessible, Fratantuono and Smith should be thanked for another important contribution to our understanding of the *Aeneid*.

LEONARDO COSTANTINI
University of Bristol
eu20184@bristol.ac.uk

VITTORIO HÖSLE, *Ovids Enzyklopädie der Liebe. Formen des Eros, Reihenfolge der Liebesgeschichten, Geschichtsphilosophie und metapoetische Dichtung in den ‚Metamorphosen‘*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2020, 288 pp., 48,00 €, ISBN 978-3-8253-4722-2.

Alcuni anni fa ha avuto una qualche risonanza, soprattutto tra gli studiosi italiani, la polemica suscitata dalla recensione di Walter Lapini (*BMCRev* 2017.08.12) a un libro su Lucrezio di uno storico della scienza, Marco Beretta, che, a parere del recensore, avrebbe commesso numerosi errori, anche banalmente di latino; un commentatore anonimo aveva difeso l'autore del libro con il curioso argomento per il quale egli avrebbe «approcciato Lucrezio dal punto di vista dello storico della scienza (disciplina da lui insegnata) e non di latinista», suscitando l'ovvia replica di un altro commentatore anonimo: «Se io mi “approccio” alla matematica da filologo classico, ignorando però i presupposti epistemologici della medesima, non posso pretendere che 2+2 faccia 5» (nel momento in cui scrivo, il dibattito, sintomatico dei nostri tempi, non è più visualizzabile online; ma Lapini è poi tornato sull'argomento in un articolo-recensione molto più ampio pubblicato sul *GCFI*, serie VII, 13, 2017, 589-608).

Questo libro sulle *Metamorfosi* scritto da un filosofo, Vittorio Höhle, dimostra invece come sia possibile, in effetti, scrivere un eccellente saggio sull'interpretazione di un'opera poetica antica senza essere degli specialisti in senso stretto; e il fatto che l'Autore – nipote e padre di latinisti: rispettivamente Mario Geymonat (suo zio) e Paul Höhle (senza Umlaut) – non sia nuovo a studi di questo tipo, essendosi occupato in passato, tra le altre cose, dei tragici greci (ma anche di Dante, Goethe, Éric Rohmer e Woody Allen), non fa che aumentare l'ammirazione nei suoi confronti (il legame tematico di questo volume con alcuni dei lavori precedenti è esplicitato nella premessa, a p. 1).

Il libro presenta una nuova interpretazione complessiva del poema ovidiano, che si ricollega, in parte, alla lettura di Brooks Otis delle *Metamorfosi* come «epic of love» (*Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge 1966, 1970²), ma sviluppandola