

Citation style

Kraggerud, Egil: Rezension über: Gian Biagio Conte, Virgilian Parerga. Textual Criticism and Stylistic Analysis, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021, in: Exemplaria Classica, 26 (2022), S. 333-338, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v26.7422>, heruntergeladen über Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Kommentars vollauf: Seine Erläuterungen sind für den Experten sowohl erhellend als auch anregend, für den nicht so weit fortgeschrittenen Leser bietet K. aber auch genügend eher basale Hilfen. Daß K. mit seinem Kommentar ein ausnehmend breites Spektrum verschiedenster Aspekte von Ciceros *Miloniana* auf dem aktuellen Stand der Forschung ausgewogen erfaßt und sprachlich ansprechend präsentiert, soll hier im Fazit nochmals betont werden. Um es mit Goethes Theaterdirektor im *Faust* auf den Punkt zu bringen: „Wer vieles bringt, wird manchem etwas bringen; und jeder geht zufrieden aus dem Haus.“

MARC STEINMANN
Independent Scholar. Gießen
marcsteinmann@web.de

GIAN BIAGIO CONTE, *Virgilian Parerga: textual criticism and stylistic analysis*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2021, pp. vii+128, \$91.99, ISBN 978-3-11-070395-5.

This book is slender in appearance but full of wisdom based on experience as one would expect from the editor of Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. Insofar one might regard it as an addition to his *Critical Notes on Virgil* (De Gruyter 2016) by offering us further comments on his choices in his two Vergil editions. The book consists of nine chapters, two of which are centred on famous editors of Vergil: Nicolaus Heinsius (1620–1681), Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812), Otto Ribbeck (1827–1898) and Remigio Sabbadini (1850–1934), another chapter deals with readings found in more recent manuscripts, that is mainly Carolingian manuscripts, one on four textual issues (A. 9.85-6; 9.79; 10.366-7 and 12.218), one on syntactic coordination (parataxis), one on A. 4.436, one on the Gates of Sleep (6.893-8) and one containing an addendum with little bearing on the issues in Vergil's texts. The book is well equipped with bibliography, index of names and index locorum. Unconditionally I will praise the chapters focusing on the achievements and deficiencies of Heinsius, Heyne, Ribbeck and Sabbadini. Conte points to their strengths (in particular Heinsius and Heyne) and to their weaknesses (in particular Ribbeck and Sabbadini). His examples are well-chosen and the present reviewer can in general subscribe to his judgments.

From time to time, there are illuminating comments on well-known scholarly disagreements. Conte's reading of *G.* 1.383-7 is particularly successful in diagnosing *infundere* at 385 as a descriptive infinitive. At A. 4.166 he favours convincingly in my view the reading *primae Tellus et pronuba Iuno/ dant signum*. After the publication of the *editio altera* of his *Aeneis* in 2019 Conte, inspired by Heinsius, has had second thoughts on 10.883 *inde aliud super atque aliud figitque volatque*. The case he is now making for *volutatqu(e)/ ingenti gyro* seems likely to be accepted by future editors. Moreover, seldom as palinodes are among editors, Conte deserves credit in this case for his indefatigable pursuit of truth.

aetherias Italo commixtus sanguine surget,
 Silvius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles

One of Heinsius' most brilliant conjectures is *luci* instead of *lucis*. This conjecture was of course known to Horsfall who wrote (Commentary, 523): "The correction to *luci* (Heinsius) is only too easy, though entirely unsupported." Conte defends *lucis* finding in the "original Virgilian *iunctura*" "an archaic flavour" reminding him of Lucretian formulas like *in luminis oras*. His interpretative rendering is that Silvius occupies the "closest place among those who are about to see the light of day". I have published my defence of Heinsius' idea on p. 237 in my *Vergiliana* and I see no reason to abandon my recommendation of it. For me *lucis loca* is a place belonging to the light of day, whereas Silvius occupies a place in Hades that *is closest to the light of day (loca proxima ... luci)*.

A. 9.77-9 (Conte pp. 60-1).

Quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris
 avertit? Tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis?
 Dicite: Prisca fides facta, sed fama perennis.

Conte writes: "... *sed* appears the sole possible reading as soon as one notices the contrast between *prisca* and *perennis*, and especially between *fides* and *facta*", whereby Conte is claiming that *priscus* denotes "something that once was *and is no more* [my italics]". I can see no basis for the latter assertion. When the poet exclaims in despair: *heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello / dextera!* (6.878), that *fides*, albeit in another sense, is surely an abiding quality. The treatment of 9.79 in *TLL* (10.2.1375.23f.) is problematic with its warning *ne ad l. 64 trahas, prohibet antithesis* where the lexicographer has correctly placed obvious parallels like *Sil. 3.8 prisca fides adytis longo servatur ab aevo* and *Stat. Theb. 1.509 prisca fides tripodum*. There is nothing in these quotations to indicate that men's trust in the mentioned oracular shrines is no longer valid or non-existing. Conte's addition "and is no more" seems accordingly deduced from the alleged antithesis *sed fama perennis*. If no more than the first part of line 79 had been transmitted one would without doubt have said that this *fides* of old functions as a strong support for the account about to follow. The *fama* next mentioned in the line cannot mean that its function is to define "what is left of a *fides* threatened by contemporary disbelief". On the contrary, the *fides* of old has become a cherished tradition that fully merits its epithet *perennis* ('everlasting'). Conte ends by paraphrasing the transmitted sentence by almost effacing the adversative character: "in ancient times the deed was believed to have happened, but the memory still survives."

One may legitimately ask: What does the poet intend to convey by invoking the muses, something he so rarely resorts to? Least of all his intention can be to undermine his own account in the following. In my view, the invocation

“Ebenso kann auch das historische Perfekt st. des Plusquamperfects gebraucht werden, indem die vor einer anderen Handlung der Vergangenheit vergangene Handlung nur einfach als eine vergangene bezeichnet und das zeitliche Verhältnis der Handlungen zu einander dem Urteile des Lesers oder Zuhörers überlassen wird.”

Unum quod rebus egenis refers of course to the following main sentence.

EGIL KRAGGERUD
 Universitetet i Oslo
 egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no

FRANCESCO GINELLI, *Cornelius Nepos: The Commanders of the Fifth Century BCE*. Introduction, Text, and Commentary, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2022, 368 pp., £145.00, ISBN 978-0-19-883613-1.

Der vorliegende Kommentar zu den ersten acht Feldherrenviten des Cornelius Nepos (*Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Pausanias, Cimon, Lysander, Alcibiades, Thrasybulus*) stellt eine überarbeitete, aus dem Italienischen ins Englische übersetzte und insbesondere stark gekürzte Version der Dissertationsschrift dar, mit der Francesco Ginelli (G.) im Jahr 2016 an der Universität Verona promoviert worden ist. Als Leitlinie dieser Überarbeitung nennt G. folgende Zielsetzung: „Exhaustive treatment [...] is avoided in order to present a practical book intended to serve as an introduction to further studies. Notes primarily address philological issues, explain stylistic and grammatical peculiarities, and approach historical themes“ (viii). Diese erfreulich konservative Ausrichtung setzt G. – so viel sei bereits einleitend bemerkt – mit großer Konsequenz um: An den textkritisch umstrittenen Stellen des Textes fällt G. ein eigenständiges und in aller Regel nachvollziehbar begründetes Urteil; immer wieder werden die einschlägigen Wörterbücher und Grammatiken, darüber hinaus aber auch zahlreiche weiterführende linguistische Untersuchungen angeführt, die den Benutzer des Kommentars über auffällige (und weniger auffällige) Eigenheiten der von Nepos verwendeten Sprache orientieren; der Vergleich sowohl mit den von Nepos benutzten Quellen als auch mit modernen historischen Studien veranschaulicht Schwerpunktsetzungen und Aussageabsichten des Biographen im Hinblick auf sein zeitgenössisches Publikum.

Die Einleitung, mit der G. seinen Kommentar eröffnet, beginnt wenig spektakulär mit einigen Bemerkungen zu Leben und Werk des Cornelius Nepos, die die Forschungsgeschichte zu Autorschaft, Biographie (mit Schwerpunkt auf der Herkunft) und Werkchronologie referieren, bevor G. in einer einprägsamen Sentenz, die einem Nepos alle Ehre gemacht hätte, ein wahrscheinlich treffendes – wenn auch bestenfalls ex negativo belegbares – Charakterbild zeichnet: „In