

EGIL KRAGGERUD: *Vergiliana: Critical Studies on the Texts of Publius Vergilius Maro*. Routledge, London – New York 2017. ISBN (hardback) 978-1-138-20134-7; ISBN (paperback) 978-0-367-89020-9; ISBN (e-book) 978-1-315-51209-9. XVI, 363 pp. GBP 100.

This volume brings together over one hundred critical notes on Vergil's poetry by the Norwegian scholar Egil Kraggerud. As the author states in his Preface, this book is not his collected papers on Vergil but a collection of his Vergilian studies in an updated form. This means that the book includes both previously published papers, some of them in partly new or changed forms, and some new, unpublished papers. Of the papers, 22 are devoted to the *Bucolics*, 7 to the *Georgics* and 80 to the *Aeneid*. There is also a useful introduction to conjectural criticism, including a list of other scholars' conjectures (20) defended by Kraggerud as well as his own conjectures (24, of which 4 are on *Ecl.*, 3 on *G.* and 17 on *A.*).

Most of the papers deal with textual criticism, but there are also some discussions of the right meaning of certain words. The papers are mostly short notes (2–4 pages); among the more extensive ones are a paper on the introductory part (lines 1–12) of *Ecl.* 6, "On the genesis of Vergil's earliest poetry" and a paper on *G. I. 83*, "What does prefixed *in-* mean?" This carefully edited volume would have been more convenient for the reader if the footnotes had been placed after each paper.

The author discusses emendations and conjectures made by several twentieth century scholars (especially W. Clausen, G. B. Conte, M. Geymonat, G. P. Goold, N. Horsfall and R. A. Mynors), but along with them, he often refers to earlier nineteenth and even eighteenth century scholars. Like Nicholas Horsfall in his great commentaries, Kraggerud has found useful material in the studies of the leading classical scholar of the late eighteenth century, Christian Gottlob Heyne. But it is interesting to see how adequate comments and useful ideas can be found even in school editions. Kraggerud refers to Otto Daniel Fibiger's and G. F. V. Lund's Danish editions of the *Aeneid* for schools as well as to Søren Bruun Bugge's Norwegian school edition of the *Eclogues* (I wonder if it is not just a mere coincidence that the Norwegian author Bernt Lie has given the name Bugge to the Latin teacher in his juvenile book *Svend Bidevind*). Kraggerud's papers also show how the studies of Roman literature and Latin language have flourished in the Nordic countries.

As examples of Kraggerud's critical notes, I have chosen one passage from each of Vergil's three works. In *Ecl.* 5.38 the unanimous form in the MSS is *purpureo narcisso*. However, some scholars, relying on the grammarian Diomedes, prefer the feminine form *purpurea*, which is clearly the *lectio difficilior*. According to Kraggerud, Theocritus' lines 1.132–136 must have been in Vergil's mind when he wrote the *Eclogues*; in line 1.133 Theocritus used exceptionally the feminine form as the epithet of narcissus (καλὰ ναρκίσσος). Kraggerud's conclusion is that the feminine form in Vergil is "a sign of the bucolic form and points to the *aemulatio* with Theocritus". However, when Kraggerud writes: "Vergil seems in fact to criticize Theocritus for stating that the outcome of Daphnis' death could well be that even thorny plants would bloom with fair flowers," it could also be appropriate to

use the masculine form of narcissus – as opposed to Theocritus. In my opinion it is an exaggeration to say that the feminine form of a word which is usually masculine would be a sign of the bucolic genre.

In his extensive discussion of G. 1.71–83 and particularly of the word *inaratae* (line 83), Kraggerud rejects the usual interpretation of *inarata terra* as “the unploughed earth” and has replaced it with “the ploughed land”. I must here confine myself only to some of Kraggerud’s arguments. The detailed study of the prefix *in* shows that in poetry, in the works Horace and Ovid, *inaratus* is a verbal adjective, prefixed by the negative particle. Looking at the agricultural treatises of Cato and Varro and some later sources shows that *inaratus*, which in poetry would be a verbal adjective meaning ‘unploughed’, could also be the past participle of the verb *inarare* ‘to plough’. Kraggerud takes into account also the larger context. In G.1.71–83 Vergil speaks of two different methods of farming, fallowing and rotation. The former method is discussed in 71–72 and the latter in 73–82. If the interpretation of line 83 as “the unploughed land” is correct, it would suit better lines 71–73 than the previous lines 73–82, which raises the question why Vergil would return to fallowing after his discussion on rotation. Kraggerud’s interpretation, which has its only predecessor in Emil Glaser’s short note in *Philologus* in 1873, seems to be convincing. In addition to Kraggerud’s information about Glaser, I would like to mention that he was also the author of the monograph *Publius Vergilius Maro als Naturdichter und Theist: Kritische und ästhetische Einleitung zu Vergils Bukolika und Georgika* (1880).

In A. 6.588 (in the story of Salmoneus) the usual reading is *mediaeque per Elidis urbem*, while Kraggerud prefers the reading *mediamque per Elidis urbem*. He enumerates several passages from Ovid and other authors, who have *media* as the epithet of *urbs* (*mediam per urbem*, *media in urbe*, etc.). Kraggerud argues that the adjective *media* given to Elis is without any obvious function. He also asks: “/.../ where could Salmoneus better display his blasphemous insolence than in the middle of some major city?” But would not Salmoneus’ insolence be even greater if one recalls that Salmonia, the city of Salmoneus, is situated in mid-Elis?

Along with such problems of the forms of words (*purpureo* ~ *purpurea*, *mediae* ~ *mediam*), Kraggerud’s interests range from punctuation and capital letters to the problems of right words (*ad auras* ~ *ad auris*) and the forms of names (*Panopes* ~ *Panopeus*). His critical notes use good judgement and extensive knowledge. He has fittingly expressed his critical principles at the beginning of his analysis of A. 1.462: “Just as it is a wise thing not to reply immediately to new theories, it is likewise good to give oneself ample time for sober reflection and assessment before approving of traditional dogmas in print.”

Vergiliana is an important and useful addition to Vergilian studies, contributing especially to the everlasting debate on textual problems and showing the diversity of the problems involved. At the same time it provides the reader with useful glimpses into the history of Vergilian scholarship.

H. K. Riikonen
University of Helsinki