New Classicists

Issue 1 February 2019

Book Review of *Aeneid 8* by Fratantuono & Smith

Billie Hall

KING'S College LONDON

Funded by the Department of Classics

ISSN 2732-4168

Fratantuono, L. M., and Smith, R. (2018). *Virgil, Aeneid 8*, Leiden, The Netherlands: BRILL.

Reviewed by Billie Hall – Université de Lille

L. M. Fratantuono and R. Alden Smith's commentary on *Aeneid* 8 is Brill's latest addition to its series of magisterial and hefty commentaries on the *Aeneid*. The former of the two authors was responsible for the commentary, the latter for the introduction, text, and facing translation. The intended readership is vague: "… primarily anyone with a love for the poet, though throughout there is an assumption of a relatively good familiarity with the major trends of Vergilian scholarship" (p. vii). However, given that little attention is given to helping the reader understand grammar and syntax, this commentary would not make an ideal first point of reference for an inexperienced reader, even one with a love for the poet.

Smith's translation is in a slightly old-fashioned prose, e.g. *quare agite* (8.273) = "Wherefore, come". Though a facing translation seems common practice for Mnemosyne, some sort of statement regarding translation choices and purpose would have been appreciated, especially since the translation and commentary were undertaken by different scholars. A facing translation ought, in my opinion, to reflect the commentator's interpretation of the text and the commentary to justify the translation choices where necessary. This could have helped at the two places where I would question Smith's translation of *memorare* (neither of which is included in the *Index Verborum*). 8.79: *sic memorat*, which rounds off the poet's narration of Tibernius' visitation, is translated, "Thus he speaks". Fratantuono reminds us that the phrase's use with reference to Dido (1.631) and Nisus and Euryalus (9.324) are ominous parallels. He also tells us that "The verb is Ennian". But he does not question what T.'s speech has to do with memory, which Smith's translation has passed over. Similarly, 8.532: *tum memorat* = "Then he says". Here, F. sends us back to line 79 for the verb, tells us that *tum memorat* is Ennian, this time giving a precise reference, and adds, "cf. 3.181 (with Horsfall)". I am unclear as to why Horsfall is brought into this, since his note on this line, which is in fact 3.182, is to remark that the expression is also used at 8.532. F. comments on 531 that Aeneas recognises *divae promissa parentis* despite no *promissa* having been given by Venus. *Memorat* could have been read as a continuation of this 'inconsistency'; alternatively, a semantic interrogation to reconcile the role of memory with respect to Aeneas' speech could have been interesting; another possibility is that it is not so much Aeneas' literal memory of events within the *Aeneid* that is in question as the reader's intertextual memory of *Iliad* 18.134 ff. that is being triggered. In short, I would have hoped for a more sensitive treatment of Roman memory in a book dedicated to K. Galinsky (p. ix).

As for F.'s commentary, the reader will be pleased to find it very reader-friendly, in comparison with Horsfall's idiosyncratic style, which has dominated Brill's *Aeneid* commentaries. Despite the overall clarity, the commentary is occasionally marred by editorial slips, e.g. 531 prints 'so' rather than 'no'; 626 reports 4.275 as having *Romanque*; 8.627 has 'it' for 'is'. In addition, I felt that too often F. told us that a certain word was characteristic of a certain author without providing a precise reference. For example, for *omnipotens* qualifying *Fortuna* (8.334), he says "Ennian (both epic and tragic)". F. is, however, more comprehensive in then pointing out places where *omnipotens* is employed in Vergil's works. A more serious editorial oversight was leaving out the reference to a scholar whom F. quotes in his comments on *quae prima* (340).

There were times when I was not sure of the flow of ideas in the commentary. The quotation about *quae prima*, which should have been attributed to Fordyce, expresses surprise that Vergil did not include the prophecy in his narrative. F. comments, "The detail is Evander's, admittedly; in the context of an address to Aeneas, it might well remind the Trojan of his father Anchises' mention of the Romans in the eschatological vision of Book 6: *illa incluta Roma* (6.781); *Romanosque tuos* (6.789); *regis Romani* (6.810); *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento* (6.851); *Romana propago* (6.870)". The link which F. makes between the two passages needed greater explanation: I am not sure whether I am to deduce that F. is implying that Carmentis is to Evander what Anchises was to Aeneas in Book 6, and I cannot see the connection between *quae prima* and *Roma*, unfortunately.

I also struggled to follow F.'s train of thought when, within his note on *deus auctor Apollo* (336), he says, "The present description of Apollo is reminiscent of *G.* 3.36, where Apollo is identified as *Troiae Cynthius auctor*: the god is once again an *auctor*, though now not of Troy, but of the Arcadian Pallanteum that rests on the site of the future Rome. The transition from Trojan *patronus* to overseer of the Augustan victory at Actium is well underway, and Evander's mother Carmentis does her part to guide the journey. The linking of Carmentis and Apollo is deeply invested in the language of epic poetry (cf. 340-341 below). Here the title seems to be associated particularly with Apollo's patronage over the Arcadian Evander's settlement at Pallanteum; the prophetic god either inspired the *monita* of Carmentis or offered independent confirmation thereof". My confusion stems in part from F.'s leaving *auctor* untranslated and subsequently his introduction of another term, *patronus*, to describe Apollo's role, without clarifying whether he is referring to the same functions or not. Lewis and Short give 'founder, builder' as the meaning of *auctor* in *G.* 3.36; but this sense is not immediately apparent to me in the *Aeneid* passage, where the term seems foremost to link Apollo to the prophecies guiding Evander. When F. does finally come to explaining the relationship between Apollo and the *monita*, he rightly shows that what Apollo does in connection to them is not exactly clear. 'Inspired' requires, however, further precision: does this mean Apollo was the author of these prophecies, for example? Smith has made his decision, translating, a little freely, *deus auctor Apollo* as "the god Apollo, who inspired her", and thus adding to the confusion regarding F.'s discussion of Apollo's role as overseer/patron.

In addition, F. could have expanded his observation that the Carmentis passage is steeped in epic language by considering the authorial aspect of Apollo, i.e. 'author' as one of *auctor*'s denotations here. Moreover, F. counts the *Aeneid*'s poet himself in the list of characters called *vates* but does not mention the problem of the functions of both poet and prophet coming under the single word *vates*. He tells us, "The vatic god *par excellence* is Apollo (cf. 6.12); the mention of *auctor Apollo* at 336 heralds the status of Carmentis as a *vatis* [*sic*]", but skips over the polemic around the term e.g. Newman, 1967, absent from the bibliography, who remains crucial on the topic of the status of the Augustan and Vergilian *vates*; Hardie, 1986, pp. 11-22; O'Hara, 1990, p. 176ff. Furthermore, F. does not take into account Gransden's important assertion: "In Carmentis, who first sang the future greatness of the sons of Aeneas and noble Pallanteum", V. thus creates a persona of his own 'vatic' inspiration".

Another connection I would have liked to find raised in the commentary is the one between the Dirae on the shield at 701 and the Fury Allecto of Book 7. F. rightly recognises that Dirae haunted Dido and that Jupiter will send one against Juturna on the battlefield at 12.853, but the goddesses bring to mind in particular, at least for me, Allecto, especially given that the Dirae appear here with Discordia (8.702). He also notes that there are affinities between the Dirae and the Furies, but that Servius observed a division, which may or may not be correct, between them (and the Eumenides). F., though he remarks that "In Book 12, the Dirae are clearly associated with the will of Jupiter", does not mention that Jupiter's use of the Dirae is potentially controversial and destabilises the distinctions between Heaven and Hell in the *Aeneid* (Hardie, 1992, p. 73ff.) and that it complicates the place of *furor* in its world (D. Hershkowitz, 1998, p. 114ff.). For this reason, Smith's translation of *Dirae* as 'Furies' is also problematic. It would be worth reflecting on how the Dirae depicted on the Shield might fit into this scheme.

Occasionally I found F.'s notes too vague. For example, in the middle of his notes on the Dirae, he has as the sentence "*Deum ira*", presumably proffering an explanation for the goddesses' name, but expressed so concisely as to easily be missed by the reader. Moreover, its point might, I think, be lost on a less knowledgeable reader, for whom the etymological link needs spelling out. In any case, an indication of the background to this theory would have been helpful. Again, F. lapses into the laconic on *Gelonos* in 725: the final sentence is "Memories of Alexander". Commenting on *lateri atque umeris* (459), F. begins, "Evander is donning a baldric". This is not exactly what the Latin says, and F. does not state whether he is interpolating. Smith is more accurate in translating, "Then he girds his Tegean sword [*ensem*] to his side and shoulders".

The commentary was at times suggestive when a point merited further analysis. For example, on 333 *me pulsum patria pelagique extrema sequentem*, F. begins, "The verse could have been composed with reference to Aeneas; it is especially noteworthy after the self-identification of Evander as one of the *Itali* (332)". Here there is a slight inaccuracy: though *diximus* is in 332, *Itali* is actually in 331. More to the point, F. does not expound on or explicitly mention the parallel between Aeneas and Evander, though Smith's introduction discusses typology.

The commentary is long, as there is much to say, but there were a few notes that I did not feel added much to our understanding of the text. For example, F. states the obvious at 28 for *in ripa*, commenting, "The ideal location for a visitation from the river god". At 292 he comments, "Half the verse is devoted to the goddess' agent, and half to the divine power herself".

Neither was I persuaded by all of F.'s interpretations. On 79 *geminasque legit de classe biremis*, F. comments, "There is perhaps no particular significance to the detail about the two ships, though it is difficult to think of twins and the Tiber in the same context without giving thought to the infants Romulus and Remus; we may consider the parallels between the imminent appearance of the *Sauprodigium* and the she-wolf and her sucklings at 630 ff. The notion of doubling is itself effectively doubled by the two-banked vessels; a different sort of "twinning" will occur at 130 below, of the two sons of Atreus". He does not comment that this is the case for *gemini custodes … canes* of 461-462, so perhaps 'twinning' is not as obvious as he makes out at 79.

Despite these criticisms, one of the strengths of F.'s commentary, in my opinion, is his respect for earlier commentators, and he brings up some gems from their work. I appreciated that F. shares with us the reaction of an earlier owner of his copy of Page's commentary to P.'s comment on 671. But their integration is not always smooth. For example, commenting on 405, F. tells us that Vergil's language is employed to craft a "deliberately ambivalent narrative of sexual innuendo and implicit comparison of the relative states of Venus and Vulcan, all as prelude to the forging of the arms. Again, all of this is foreign to Homer's parallel account; cf. Apollonius of Rhodius, *Arg*. 4.1111ff". I was expecting F. to expand on the differences between Vergil and these models, but instead the note ended jarringly and confusingly after the mention of the *Argonautica*, with the translation of 405-406 by Gould and Whiteley in their commentary on *Aeneid* 8.

The main qualm I have is the authors' stated intention to avoid polemic (p. viii), which makes a more conservative reading of *Aeneid* 8 than perhaps intended. Coupled with the, sometimes, suggestive nature of F.'s notes, the interpretation of the book comes across as less complicated than it is. For example, I would have liked to see in a commentary on Book 8 more discussion of Vergil and Evander as problematic mythmakers. The same can be said for Smith's introduction, which gives special attention to the triadic structure of the *Aeneid* and of Book 8 in particular: rather than lay out the problems of interpretation head-on, they are introduced only implicitly in his recounting of the narrative of Book 8.

I appreciated that F. prefaced major episodes with a bibliography, and throughout the commentary he has a nice eye/ear for the composition of Vergil's poetry. Lastly, I am not in a position to judge the text itself, though I will comment that the below-text *apparatus criticus* appears to present clearly and thoroughly the findings of F. and S.'s study of all major and minor manuscripts.

References

Fordyce, C. J. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis, Aeneidos, Libri VII-VIII*. Glasgow: Oxford University Press.

Gransden, K. W. 1976. *Virgil, Aeneid, Book VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

--- 1992. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hershkowitz, D. 1998. *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Newman, J. K. 1967. *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Bruxelles: Latomus, Revue d'Études Latines, vol. 89.

O'Hara, J. 1990. *Death and Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.