REVIEWS/RESENSIES

NEW EDITIONS OF VERGIL

1. P. Vergili Maronis Opera recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. A. B. Mynors. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano MCMLXIX.


76 years ago F. A. Hirtzel published his edition of P. Vergili Maronis Opera in the Oxford series. It very quickly became what one might call a standard edition for both scholars and students because it covered in the convenient pocket-size of the Oxford texts totum Vergilium. Thirteen reprints of Hirtzel's Vergil demonstrated its usefulness and esteem among scholars although O. Ribbeck's Editio Maior of 1854–1860 still was the most reliable and accurate edition. In the meantime, R. Sabbadini published his Editio Romana in 1930 on occasion of the 2000th anniversary of the poet's birth. This edition was later revised by L. Castiglioni in the Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum and superseded Hirtzel's edition because of its fuller apparatus and its more satisfactory text. Subsequently, numerous important contributions to the text and manuscript tradition of Vergil's works have been made which resulted in an unavoidable revision or even replacement of Hirtzel. This has now been achieved by the new edition of Sir Roger Mynors, to whose scholarship we are already indebted for editions of Catullus (1958), Pliny the Younger (1963), and of the XII panegyrici Latini (1964) in the Oxford series and who is also engaged in the forthcoming editions of the Aristotelles Latinus and of Erasmus of Rotterdam which are being published by a team of scholars at the Union Acad. Internationale (Bruges-Paris and Rome) and at the North-Holland Publishing Company (Amsterdam) respectively.

In the Praefatio (V–XVI) Mynors gives an account of the eight manuscripts or remainders of manuscripts which have come down to us from the 4th–6th century, on which his text is mainly based (haec textus fundamenta VII). He does not share Jachmann's extremely sceptic view that our text, as it has come down to us in the mss., is highly corrupt and can never be satisfactory restored. M. however is right in his cautious approach to the indirect transmission of Vergilian verses, for example in Seneca (Ep. 94, 28), Quintilian (9, 3, 8), Columella (9, 9, 6; 2, 10, 11), and Gellius. Gellius, especially, discusses some striking variants in those editions which he could consult (1, 21; 13, 21; 16, 6). Here one can also refer to the numerous Centones Vergiliani which hold a position between direct and indirect transmission, for example those of
Hosidius Geta (Medea), Ausonius (Cento nuptialis), Proba's biblical Cento and the similar ones in CSEL 16, p. 609ff., and the Centones in Buecheler-Riese's Anthologia Latina I 1 (1894), no. 7–18. They are contemporaneous with, sometimes even earlier than the ancient codices of Vergil and may occasionally preserve an original reading (M. quotes only Ausonius' Cento). Leaving aside the commentators and grammarians, O. Ribbeck's conclusions in chapter X of his Prolegomena critica are still valid and have been observed by M. Unlike Hirtzel, Sabbadini and many other editors, M(ynors) for his whole edition also used, where they seemed to offer a better reading than the ancient mss., two 8th century mss. (clm 29005 and Parisinus lat. 7906) and 13 9th century mss. to which he had easy access. Nevertheless, he was not always able to decide whether a particular reading was genuine or just a conjecture of a medieval writer. These medieval mss. he seems to have collated himself—it remains uncertain whether directly or by microfilm—whereas in the ancient mss. he generally relies on Ribbeck's and Sabbadini's apparatus which are based on direct collations.

The text itself is extremely sound and exhibits an optimum of caution and prudence which proves an intimate knowledge of Vergil's sometimes pretentious and artificial language, and a certain independence of judgement which is constantly conscious of our own limitations. M. keeps text and apparatus free from his own conjectures and is very reluctant to clutter up the apparatus with conjectures and readings of other scholars and previous editors. In general, the apparatus is selective and free from orthographic and other minor details which crowd Sabbadini's apparatus.

For the purpose of this review I have compared Ecl. IV–VI; Georg. III–IV, and Aen. V in M. with Hirtzel and Sabbadini, omitting mere details such as cul/quoti, vulgo/volgo, Thetim/-in, miratast/-a est, haud/haut etc. I will briefly discuss some interesting and crucial readings:

Eclogae: 4, 59 dicat: with the mss., Ribbeck and Hirtzel, but Sabbadini's dicet (from Macr. 5, 14, 6) looks quite attractive. 6, 30 miratur: right, mirantur (R, d, e, Rufin. 48, 5, adopted by Sabbadini) is a typical 'correction' of ancient grammarians. 6, 33 ex omnia: in spite of Lucr. 1, 61 less convincing than Hirtzel's exordia, preserved by R, ω (the 13 medieval mss. consulted by M.), and Macr. 6, 2, 22. 6, 40 ignaros: ignotos in P, ω, and Sabbadini looks like normalisation of ignaros in R.

Georgics: 3, 190 accesserit A, M, F², ω, and Hirtzel; acceperit P, R, adopted by Ribbeck (with reference to Ecl. 8, 39) and Sabbadini, has the advantage of a lectio difficilior. 3, 230 pernox: based only on schol. Iuv. 8, 10 surely misses the point: it is a platitude to say that the defeated bull 'inter/dura iacet pernox instrato saxa cubili . . .', whereas pernix reminds the reader of the bull's misfortune in the fight with a stronger rival and, in consequence, of its restless wandering and preparation for revenge, far from the herds, in isolated surroundings. pernix sums up ll. 224ff., whereas pernox does not add any new point to the narrative. 3, 469 serpant M, R, Hirtzel, Ribbeck: preferable to Sabbadini's serpunt (P) because of its final sense. 4, 169 fraglantia F, M, b, c?
h, t, γ: lectio difficilior, perverted into flagrantia in P, a, d, e, f, r, v, Sabbadini. 4, 221 omnis mss. Min. Fel. 19, 2; Aug. c.d.4, 11; Servius: the purpose of Ambrosius' paraphrase of these lines in de off. min. 1, 13 ('per omnia deum ire ipsi adserunt et omnia in virtute eius consistere, vim et maiestatem eius per omnia elementa penetrare, terras caelum maria') is so obvious—sc. the ancient pagan authors, esp. Vergil, were already 'animae Christianae in partibus infidelium'—, the allusion to the present passage is so vague that Peerlkamp's conjecture omnia, although adopted by Ribbeck and Sabbadini, is extremely daring and hardly convincing. 4, 331 validam P, R, w, Arusian. p. 493, 12 Keil: duram of M, adopted by Sabbadini, seems preferable because more emotional. 4, 415 defundit G, d, e, h, v, Sabbadini: Hirtzel's diffundit, preserved in M, b, c, r, γ is not quite appropriate to the situation. 4, 509 antris M, w, γ: astris in R, r, v, adopted by Ribbeck, Sabbadini, and Hirtzel is preferable because of the poetical density of the picture drawn by Vergil, although both are possible and the variant therefore may be rather old.

Aeneid V: 112 talenta F, R, adopted by Ribbeck. The plural is almost certain because of the Homeric model in ψ 269 δών χρυσοῦ τάλαντα. 162 cursum M2, p, w; Sen. de benef. 6, 7; Tib. Don., adopted by Sabbadini; Hirtzel and Ribbeck (with reference to 11, 855 hac derige gressum) read gressum preserved in M, P, R, a, e, v. The decision is difficult, because the identical half-line may be contrasted with a possible variation of the expression by the poet himself to suit the different situation: but cursus here seems to be better because of the naval language (cp. TLL IV 1535, 82ff.; U. Knoche however in TLL VI 2327, 29 quotes Aen. 5, 162 as only reference for gressum in connection with a ship). 512 ara M, R, p, adopted by Sabbadini; Hirtzel may be due to alto at the end of l. 511 (the parallel scene in Homer ψ 861ff. is of no help). 511 decedere mss., adopted by Sabbadini: discedere, preserved in P, r, and Tib. Don. is defended by Ribbeck, Proleg. 294 ('quod de multitudine proprie dicitur') and adopted by Hirtzel, too.

A last remark on those two passages in Vergil which have puzzled most editors (and still do so):

Ecl. 4, 62: M. has qui non risere parenti: This has, at length, been explained as the only possible reading by E. Norden, Die Geburt des Kindes (1924), p. 61ff.

Aen. 2, 567–588, the so-called 'Helen Episode', has been deleted by M.—whether this repudiation is fully justified or not is still under discussion; see the most recent contributions by G. P. Goold in HSCP 74, 1970, 101–168, C. E. Murgia, CSCA 4, 1971, 203ff., G. Highet, The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid (1972) 164ff., and E. Kraggerud in Symb. Osl. 50, 1975, 105ff. The reviewer is in agreement with M. in considering the passage as an un-Vergilian interpolation beyond any doubt.

Assuming that there will always be different opinions on different passages even in such a well-known and thoroughly investigated author as Vergil, many scholars will appreciate M.'s diligent and fair edition: fair also where a final
decision cannot be made. As a critical text it should at least supplant Page's old and deficient edition which is still used at South African universities but has meanwhile been superseded a hundred times and more by better editions among which M.'s deserves one of the top places.

The other edition of works of Vergil to be reviewed here is of a quite different character. Labelled 'Neuausgabe 1970', it is, however, as far as the Bucolics, Georgics, the Catalepton, and the 'Nachwort' are concerned (p. 423–455), a revised and somewhat enlarged 3rd edition of Vergil's pastoral works which was published for the first time in 1944 and again in 1949. The alterations to the 1949 edition are listed on p. 462–464 (22 in the Bucolics, 59 in the Georgics) and p. 533 (26 in the Catalepton). But the new volume offers far more than just a reading text of the three works with a German translation in hexameters (some poems of the Catalepton are rendered in rhythmic prose) and an introduction to Vergil's life and works for a wider group of interested readers. The important new parts of this edition are:

1. A collection of all Vitae Vergilianae as far as they are known today (many of them now published for the first time), edited and translated into German by K. Bayer (p. 211–405).
2. A fairly complete collection of testimonia for Vergil's life and works by his contemporaries and later authors (in chronological order, from Hor. c. 1, 3 till Gellius 17, 10, 2–3) as well as a list of Vergil's own biographical and personal remarks found in the three works (p. 406–422).
3. A large section called 'Anhang' with an extensive variety of different contributions:
   3.1 A list of mss. consulted by the editors directly and in microfilm, copy, or facsimile (p. 460);
   3.2 A selected list of editions from 1534 until 1970 where, however, the heading 'Ausgaben des 15., 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts' is misleading because there is no 15th century edition quoted (p. 460f.);
   3.3 The already mentioned list of textual alterations to the 1949 edition and corrections of some faulty references in the apparatus criticus of editions of the 19th and 20th century (p. 462–466);
   3.4 A detailed and highly interesting study of the codex Guelferbyt警us 70 Gudianus Latinus s. IX = γ (p. 467–488);
   3.5 Some remarks on the origin and nature of bucolic poetry and on Vergil's bucolic poetry, followed by a chronological arrangement of the eclogues and a short characterisation of the individual eclogues (p. 489–528);
   3.6 Some remarks on the sources of the Georgics in addition to the 'Nachwort' which mainly dealt with the Georgics (p. 528–530);
   3.7 A long chapter on the Katalepton with
      3.7.1 a thorough investigation into text and transmission, a description of the main mss., and a description of a commentary on the Catalepton by an unknown humanist between 1476 and 1529 which was discovered by the editors and would appear to be the oldest known commentary on the Catalepton.
3.7.2 interpretatory notes on the individual poems with special discussions of the problems of authorship (p. 603–653);

3.8 A critical study of the Vitae Vergilianiæ by K. Bayer with

3.8.1 a classification of the vitae (p. 654–658),

3.8.2 notes on the individual vitae, including a stemma of each, critical remarks on its text (but without apparatus), a short analysis of its sources, and an evaluation of the information it provides. This pattern (‘Überlieferung, textkritische Bemerkungen, Quellen, Informationswert’) is more or less repeated in the case of all vitae (p. 658–759);

3.8.3 three stemmata showing the proposed affiliation of the vitae (by K. Wieser, H. R. Upson, and K. Bayer), partly a revision of the views expressed in the 1958 edition of the Aeneid (p. 978ff.), and an inquiry into the structure of the Argumenta Bucolicorum, followed by the text of the Argumenta (p. 760–780).

4. An index of names listing all proper names occurring in Bucolics, Georgics, and Catalepton, with a short explanation (p. 781–814).


6. A ‘Literaturverzeichnis’ preceded by a list of abbreviations for periodicals, series and single works and listing 333 authors (often with more than one title) in alphabetical order (p. 840–876).


The overwhelming list of subjects and problems dealt with and the new information and results which they provide to the reader, also show the ambiguous character of this edition: On the one hand the aim of the Tusculum series is to offer a simple reading text, accompanied by a German translation and an introduction for the general reader who still knows some Latin and Greek from school and is interested in ancient literature, but needs the help of a translation for overcoming difficult passages. On the other hand, however, in this volume the reader is given so much scientific and specialised material which is useful for the serious student and scholar only but which annoys the average reader and overtaxes his capacity. That means that the scholar could have done without the first 209 pages containing text and translation, the ‘Nachwort’ which offers no new facts, and the more general remarks on bucolic poetry, while the typical Tusculum reader could do without the scholarly ‘Anhang’ which covers half of the book. This leads to inadequacies and, in spite of all, to gaps which are apparent to the scholar. For the textual history of Bucolics and Georgics he must use the second edition of the Aeneid (1965) in the Tusculum series, also edited by J. and M. Götte. For the textual history of the Catalepton
and the *Vitae Vergiliana* and for the variants of *Bucolics*, *Georgics*, and *Catalepton* he is referred to a Latin edition which is still in preparation. For the textual variants of the *Vitae* one can at present use the first edition of the *Aeneid* (1958) in the Tusculum series, where, however, only 16 *vitae* are collected (p. 866ff.; in the present edition 36). This means that the serious student is forced to use three editions simultaneously when he wants full information on these matters—a situation for which editors and publishers are much to blame.

But apart from this somewhat unfortunate splitting up, the book is a good help for all students of Vergil's bucolic poetry. It is impossible here to give even an abridged discussion of problems and facts which are presented to the reader. So I shall merely finish with some details picked out at random:

p. 469ff. The editors were able to prove that in codex *γ* (*Guelferbytamus 70*) the lines *Geo*. 2, 210–260 are not completely missing as is still maintained by Mynors in the apparatus on l. 212, but 212–234 are on a single folio now in the Göttingen University Library, although its text is worse than the present folio 14 in *γ* (for the missing folio 14 called *γm* by the edd., a new folio—*γ* + —was later inserted, perhaps in the 11th century, but because of a larger handwriting the text reached no further than v. 211).

p. 472 Explanation of folio 5’ or codex *γ*; a photograph of the upper part of this folio is inserted between p. 472 and 473. But there is no indication that the text of p. 471 is interrupted by this explanation and only continued on p. 473, which may at first puzzle the reader.

p. 489ff. A new and important contribution to Vergil's bucolic poetry is the book by E. A. Schmidt, *Poetische Reflexion. Vergils Bukolik* (Munich: W: Fink, 1972). Schmidt tries to interpret the nature of the *Eclogues* as poetical reflexion on the possibility of bucolic poetry after and in competition with Theocritus. Schmidt successfully adapts modern categories of literary criticism, especially H. R. Jauss' model of literary reception (H. R. Jauss, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation*. Frankfurt/M. 1970, I 44–207). As a result, the literary relations of the *Eclogues to Theocritus* *Eidyllia* go beyond the uncritical sphere of mere imitation and become a substantial element of the *Eclogues* themselves. By modifying the reader's expectations concerning the genre 'bucolic poetry', Vergil changes the whole genre and leaves it to the reader to recognize his new type of bucolic poetry against the Theocritean background which is realized in Vergil's poems in quotations and allusions. The following interpretations of *Ecl*. IV, V and VI corroborate both Schmidt's method and thesis, and lead to a new understanding of Vergil's bucolic poetry (cf. also my review in *Gymnasium* 83, 1976, 143ff.).

p. 489 n.3 and 9: biographical notes on Theocritus and Stesichorus—for whom? Useful for the non-specialist, superfluous for the scholar.

p. 490 below: 'mit wachstem Wirkungswollen': the superlative of 'wach' is unusual and sounds ugly.

p. 499 The editors do not know the interesting paper by H. C. Gotoff, 'On the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil', *Philologus* 111, 1967, 66–79 (also missing in the
'Literaturverzeichnis') where the author tries to show that this poem is rather a light, occasional *genethliacon* than a serious and solemn prophecy, 'in a word ... a cheerful and amused response' (p. 76) to Horace's Sixteenth Epode, full of 'mock-grandeur of oracular response' (p. 79). Radke's paper of 1969, quoted extensively on p. 503–518, can only provoke sharp criticism on many points.

p. 541 The Graz Fragment has been freshly collated by R. O. A. M. Lyne in *Wiener Studien* N.F. 6, 1972, 79–92.


p. 850 Lit. Verz. 80: Read ‘Emonds’ instead of ‘Edmonds’.

In spite of some insufficiencies, however, one can say with confidence that the study even of such a well-known and often treated author as Vergil has been put on a new and substantial level by Mynors’ as well as by Göttes’ and Bayer’s editions, and that the scholar will from them derive much benefit and new stimulation for further research.
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