

This, and the fact that the book covers all aspects of Cicero's life, renders it a rich source of knowledge for those who need to be informed about a particular phase of Cicero's activities, say the background of a certain trial. That is not saying that the book could not be read as a whole, for it is written in a pleasant German style and is in fact eminently readable.

Transforming a *RE* article published in 1939 on Cicero as a politician into a biography of Cicero in 1969 is not an easy task, and this is reflected in Gelzer's Preface (p. 3), where he says he is worried about Cicero the *author*, especially the author of philosophical works, possibly not coming into his own as the result of the transformation. Interestingly, the only book which he mentions there is W. Süss, *Cicero. Eine Einführung in seine philosophischen Schriften* (1966), which he clearly likes and which he says has been of "help" ("eine willkommene Hilfe"). In any case, in my view Gelzer's references to Cicero's philosophical oeuvre seem very much to the point (cf., e.g., p. 320ff. on *Laelius*).

In the same preface, Gelzer suggests that he may have missed some books and articles which could have been "worth reading and instructive" ("Lesenswertes und Lehrreiches") and asks to be pardoned on account of his age. However, a look at the interesting list of almost 14 pages of the literature used by Gelzer (for its compilation see above) does not leave the impression that Gelzer has missed a lot, for the list is full of works, covering all aspects of Cicero, published in 1939 or later up till (as far as I can see) 1968 (thus at least the book on Caesar by H. Gesche, p. 376); e.g., on the first page of the list there are 14 works published after the *RE* article and 10 books and articles, mainly those in earlier *RE* volumes, which Gelzer could have used in 1939. The list also includes items mentioned, but not used by Gelzer (cf. p. 321 n. 57 and the list on p. 384).

The book is concluded by the two bibliographies; the chronological table with some important dates (but not, e.g., those of Cicero's speeches); indexes of persons and places (an index of Cicero's works would also have been nice); and two maps. The indexes and the maps are identical with those in the first edition except for the page numbers in the indexes and for the fact that the one-page introduction to the index of persons, with notes on Roman names, on the patrician or plebeian status of some nobles, and some abbreviations used in the index, has for some reason been omitted. But I think we can manage without this introduction and I can thus conclude by once again pointing out that it is very good to have a second edition of this useful book.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki

NICHOLAS HORSFALL, *The Epic Distilled. Studies in the Composition of the Aeneid*. Oxford University Press, 2016. ISBN-978-0-19-875887-7. 160 pp. GBP 55.

Horsfall ("H.") is a well-known authority on Virgil and the author of several splendid commentaries on individual books of the *Aeneid* and of other publications on Virgil, notably of *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (1995), one of the few "companions" that I have found useful and, coming close to the genre of the German-type *Handbuch* (with observations, e.g., on work still to be done), worthy of being called a "companion", unlike many books masquerading as "companions" but in fact just col-

lections of miscellaneous papers of which many could as well have been published, if really in need of being published, in normal scholarly journals.

In 1991, H. published a book in Italian, called *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambiccio*, the title of which must have sounded mysterious to many classicists (*alambiccio* seems to mean something connected to distillation; cf. the title of the book discussed here); in the introduction, the author says that he is going to deal with the “technique and the methods of composition of the *Aeneid*” (p. 10, cf. p. 11, promising a book “sulle tecniche poetiche, le strutture intellettuali, ed i metodi di composizione”). This new book, published 25 years later, seems to have much in common with *Alambiccio* (as H. himself refers to that book), but, as stressed by the author at least twice in the Preface (pp. vii and viii), it is not a translation of it. In *The Epic Distilled* too, H. explains his method (described as “new” on p. 1) and his aims, which essentially consist of applying “an updated form of source-criticism to the twelve books ... only to demonstrate that in the end he was a masterly *bricoleur* [in German that would be ‘Bastler’; there does not seem to be an apposite English translation], that in passage after passage he employed a repeated, recognizable, favoured, complex, distinctive technique ... of cobbling together, of mixing, stitching, blending a striking number of multiple, diverse, identifiable elements, to create a dense and varied effect, in order to challenge the learned reader and to beguile, but also no doubt often enough to confuse, the less expert” (p. 2). The point of the book is, then, to analyze various normally “learned” particulars mentioned by Virgil all over the *Aeneid* (and in some case in the other Virgilian poems) and to try to find out where Virgil had found them.

This aim is illustrated in the beginning of the book by an analysis of various elements of the passage on the Golden Bough in 6.201–211 (pp. 3–10), for instance, of the form of the story, the author stressing that the birds are certainly not augural birds; as for the Golden Bough itself, it is identified as a sort of talisman. This analysis is followed, still in what seems to be an introductory part of the book, by interesting observations on the oracle of Albunea (7.81ff., pp. 11–13) and on the Parade of Heroes (6.756ff., p. 14f.), a passage which is interestingly identified as “an oration designed to persuade Aeneas to proceed into the Trojans’ destined land fully aware of his people’s future”.

The author then moves on (Ch. 2, p. 17ff.) to some observations on Virgil’s sources of information on mythology, geography, various *thaumata*, etc., that is, to libraries and to scholars Virgil may have consulted on certain details (e.g. Aristonicus, an authority on the wanderings of Menelaus, p. 23). In Ch. 3 (p. 31ff.), Horsfall studies Virgil’s learned references and aims to “sketch very roughly a sort of ‘scale of difficulty’ in the poet’s allusions” (p. 33), producing a classification “of some familiar types of Virgilian learning” (p. 34), this classification consisting of (1) cases of “double allusion”, according to the author, an allusion combining a problem and the answer (I found this heading a bit unclear; and note that *matris Acidaliae* in 1.720, noted here, reappears under Mythology on p. 38), (2) Geography, (3) Mythology, (4) History and antiquities; note the observation on p. 40 that Virgil’s departure “from the accepted facts [e.g., when he says that Caesar passed through Monaco – the route taken by Hercules rather than Caesar – on his way to Italy in 49 BC] were meant to be noticed”; (5) “Roman social, legal, and constitutional usage”, i.e., Roman-style behaviour applied to Aeneas (a “proto-Roman”, p. 40; cf. p. 108 and 136 on Trojans as early Romans) and other characters of the *Aeneid*; (6) the anonymous allusion (e.g. G. 4.283, *Arcadii ... magistris; Aen.* 10.470 *tot gnati cecidere deum*); (7) the *insolubilia*, of which there were, according to Servius in 12.74, altogether thirteen.

In the next chapter (Ch. 4, pp. 45ff.), the author studies Virgil's "inventions", i.e., those episodes (e.g., visit to Crete, p. 47) and characters (e.g., 46 n. 6 on Polydorus; 48 and 53ff. on Achae-menides; 56ff. on Camilla), etc. which Virgil has apparently added to the "traditional" accounts; and note the interesting observations (p. 50f.) on the handling, in the description of the Trojans' route, of some stages (Circe, Scylla and Charybdis ...) of Ulysses' travels which Virgil apparently felt he needed to deal with, but did so by using a "narration-by-*prateritio*" technique (51; note the criticism of Virgil, *ibid.*).

Chapter 5 (pp. 61ff.) deals with Virgil's "invention of myth"; the exposition is introduced by remarks on how Virgil may be observed tampering with historical and geographical details. As for Virgil's handling of mythology, once again this is a chapter full of interesting observations, e.g., on Aeneas' wife's name (p. 65f.) or on the Trojans landing not on the *litus Laurens* but near the mouth of the Tiber (p. 69f.). And note (p. 73f.) the "category of myth altered by myth", where we are told, e.g., that the fate of Hippolytus in 7.767 is an echo of the death of Mettus Fufetius as described by Ennius and Livy, or that the death of Troilus in 1.474–8 is "a narrative heir of the Homeric death of Hector". The chapter ends with the assessment that a comprehensive study of the mythological references in the *Aeneid* is needed (p. 75) and with a list of mythological "*insolubilia*" (or "not clearly *solubilia*"; e.g. Evander's connexions with the Atridae, 8.130).

The book goes on with an informative and entertaining chapter 6 on "inconsistencies" and discrepancies (pp. 79ff.). The chapter discusses, or at least enumerates, cases in which the information on a certain detail supplied by Virgil in one place is not consistent with information offered elsewhere, as, e.g., in the case of Latinus, whose grandfather is said to be Picus (himself son of Saturn) in 7.47–9, but the Sun in 12.164; or in the case of Priam, who dies in his palace (2.506ff.) but whose body is then unexpectedly found lying *litore* (2.557). Some of the "inconsistencies" can perhaps be explained; the view of some scholars that Virgil would have corrected everything had he had the time to revise the *Aeneid* is in any case criticized by H.

Chapter 7 (pp. 95ff.) deals with "signposts", a term H. uses of details mentioned by Virgil in order to hint at something about to follow; for instance, Venus wearing the *cothurnus* in 1.337 is meant to suggest (as observed by E. L. Harrison) that the Dido episode will be a tragedy (p. 96). This chapter also includes (p. 101ff.) interesting lists of the ways Virgil is hinting that what follows is going to be in the Homeric or in the tragic mode; the former is indicated, e.g., by the use of epithets of the Homeric type or by lines consisting of names, whereas the tragic mode is indicated, e.g., by messenger speech. The other modes identified by H. are Hellenistic (e.g., aetiologies), "Old Roman" and Antiquarian and Varronian (sometimes overlapping with "Old Roman").

In the next chapter (Ch. 8, pp. 111ff.), the author studies passages in which Virgil, in mentioning a name or a phenomenon (etc.), adds a phrase of the type "as they say", often in order to point out that he is quoting a source which he assumes the learned reader will be able to identify (but the point of *lugentes* in *lugentes campi*; *sic illos nomine dicunt* in 6.441 still remains a mystery, p. 117; for another try at explaining the expression see J. O'Hara, in P. Know & al. [eds.], *They Keep It All Hid: Augustan poetry, its antecedents and reception* [2018], 51ff.), at the same time perhaps hinting at the possibility that he may not agree. But a formula of this type is sometimes also applied to assertions which may be Virgil's inventions (p. 127ff.). The author then goes on in chapter 9 (pp. 135ff.) with anachronisms (e.g., in descriptions of cities and warfare), to conclude with chapter 10 (pp. 145ff., "An

epic of many voices”), a sort of overview of the “spheres of knowledge upon which the poet drew” (p. 145), in addition, that is, to poetic antecedents, etc. In the list on pp. 146ff. we find items such as the animal world, arms and armour, religious rites and language; on the other hand, some topics, e.g., Etruscological knowledge, may have seemed uninteresting to Virgil (p. 150). The chapter ends with an analysis of the various “voices” that one can discern in the passage 6.355–369.

What about this book as a whole? Being a reader and a teacher of Virgil’s writings, rather than a scholar specializing in Virgil, I must say that I found the book most interesting and informative and one which will no doubt be consulted with profit by numerous academics. But as I use the terms “consult” and “academics” rather than “read” and (e.g.) “those interested in Virgil” I am at the same time hinting at the fact that this book is not an easy read and that it cannot really be recommended for, say, students. This is because some features of the author’s style (apparent also in some of his other publications) which is often impressionistic and obscure, for instance, because of the many vague references to other scholars’ work and because of the author’s tendency to extreme conciseness of the exposition; at places one cannot avoid the impression that H. has had to reduce a book of 400 or 500 pages to its present modest size of 160 pages and, moreover, that the book is, because of its compressed style, mainly addressed to a small group of scholars initiated into Virgilian studies of about the same scope as the author’s (this is thus not really a bedside book). As for the references, let me start by saying that the book includes references to so many articles and monographs that it cannot have seemed a good idea to collect them all in a bibliography. But what about mentioning at least work of especial relevance to Virgilian studies in the bibliography? As it is now, the bibliography (p. xiii–xiv) is so meagre that it is only of limited use; one of the scholars most often cited in the book, not always with approval, must be Richard F. Thomas, the author of, e.g., *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, but the only Thomas in the bibliography is E. Thomas, the author of *Essai sur Servius* of 1880 (cited on p. 80 n. 3 and perhaps elsewhere, but in any case only rarely); and even what is mentioned in the bibliography with an abbreviation is not necessarily cited in the text in the same way (e.g. “Gow-Page HE” in the bibliography becomes “*Hell.Epigr.* GP” on p. 23 n. 34; differently on p. 6 n. 21; *EV* becomes *Enc. Virg.* p. 112 n. 5). In the notes to the text, other scholars’ work is often cited in an abbreviated and thus obscure way. I’m sure that “NR” on p. 49 n. 23 and p. 98 n. 17 is the scholar N. Rudd, and that “DS” on the same page n. 17 is the encyclopaedia of Daremberg & Saglio, and I suspect that “Tosi”, cited at least p. 18 n. 7, 61 n. 2 and 80 n. 5, could be the author R. Tosi, *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci* (1988); but I have not yet been able to identify, e.g., the authors Small and Boyd, cited on p. 19 n. 12. Moreover, the use of the book is not made easier by the fact that there is no *index locorum*, but only a shortish index of subjects (p. 157–60; but a *suggestus* is mentioned not only on p. 14 but also on p. 98, and is “source-criticism” really dealt with only on p. 2?). Another distinguishing feature of the book is some striking Italicisms, especially the frequent use of the Italian abbreviations “vd.” and “cit.” and the author’s habit of referring to some colleagues as “friends” (e.g., 32 n. 2; 63 n. 13; 97 n. 12; 119), which would be perfect in Italy but which in my view seems odd in an English-language academic context.

On the other hand, I must admit that this book manages to be charming in many ways; there is a lot of personal touch, and I’m sure a book like this could not have been written by anyone else (note, e.g., p. viii on excellent cigars; p. 61 where H. says he doesn’t remember on which side he was in a debate several decades earlier; p. 148 n. 18, H. being “pleased to be able to leave the details”

of a certain debate to someone else; p. 156 on strong drinks sometimes being helpful to the student of Virgil). There are also many interesting assessments of other scholars' work (but at places also of the author's own, cf. 80 n. 3; 125 n. 64), sometimes positive (e.g., p. 33 n. 8 on Solin; 128 n. 77 on Granger; 138 n. 18 on Polverini; 147 n. 14 on Edwards), but perhaps more often censorious (e.g., p. viii on the *Virgil Encyclopedia*, cf. 47 n. 13; 3 n. 5 on Erren; 47 n. 8 on Vanotti; 63 n. 14 on Zetzel; 77 n. 68 on Clausen; 102 n. 38 on Mazzochini – not “Mazzochini” –, “by no means a good book”; 104 n. 52 on Panoussi; 140 n. 27 on Saunders and Wickert); cf. also, e.g., 24 n. 40 on M. L. West (“below his best”), to be contrasted with p. 25 n. 47 (“much better”). Taking into account this, and the fact that, although there will probably be no one who agrees with everything H. says (I myself am a bit skeptical about a number of H.'s assertions), the book does contain a wealth of information on Virgil and his methods by a scholar who must know about everything about Virgil and Virgilian studies, and will thus be of great use to those interested in one way or another in the *Aeneid*, I must conclude with a positive evaluation of the book.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki

ADDENDUM. Dr. Horsfall has unfortunately passed away on January 1, 2019.

Prisciani: De accentibus. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di CLAUDIO GIAMMONA. *Collectanea grammatica Latina* 12. Weidmann, Hildesheim 2012. ISBN 978-3-515-00404-5. ISSN 0940-2136. 218 pp. EUR 49.80.

The short elementary treatise, entitled *De accentibus* (henceforth *DA*), edited by Claudio Giammona, was highly popular in the Middle Ages, being preserved in some 120 manuscripts from the eleventh to the sixteenth century. Its popularity was based on its false attribution to Priscian (c. 500 AD), and although doubt was cast on its authenticity by several medieval authors, including for instance Alexander Neckam (1157–1217) and Peter Helias (fl. c. 1140), it continued to be attributed to Priscian until the nineteenth century. This short textbook deals with letters, sounds and accents, that is, issues discussed in the first part of Donatus's more advanced grammar, the *Ars maior*. These topics are absent from the *Ars minor*, the most popular elementary textbook in the Middle Ages. Thus, the *DA* would seem to have provided guidelines for pronunciation for elementary grammar teaching based on the *Ars minor*. Focussing on the final syllables, it treats each part of speech in turn, quoting a large number of examples.

Many uncertainties surround this text. The treatise bears the name *De accentibus*, although only the second part deals with prosodic features. This would seem to reflect its composite nature. As regards its authorship, Giammona assumes that it was originally anonymous (p. xxii) and that the attribution to Priscian is based on a false interpretation of a passage in Book XVII of the *Institutiones grammaticae*, where Priscian refers to his *liber de accentibus*. Heinrich Keil (*Grammatici latini III*, 1860) regarded the *DA* as inauthentic, attributing it to the eighth century (p. xxiv). Schoell (*De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia*, 1876) and Luscher (*De Prisciani studiis*