ABSTRACT

Six Textual Variants in the Fifth Book of the *Aeneid*

Jarrod Perry Tunnell

Director: R. Alden Smith, Ph. D

The textual tradition of the *Aeneid*, while less variable than that of other works, contains many discrepancies among the manuscripts that scholars use to form critical editions and determine Virgil's original text. Transcribing manuscripts is tedious work, and errors have entered into the textual tradition through this laborious process. The decisions that editors make when choosing among variants for critical editions directly affect the text that scholars use to interpret Virgil, thereby influencing our understanding of the text. In my thesis, I analyze some of these especially problematic textual variants in Book 5 of the *Aeneid* and argue for which variants seem the most reasonable given the Virgilian textual tradition and the context of each variant within the epic.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS

_____

Dr. Alden Smith, Classics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM

_____

Dr. Andrew Wisely, Director

Date:_____

SIX TEXTUAL VARIANTS IN THE FIFTH BOOK OF THE *AENEID*

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Honors Program

By

Jarrod Perry Tunnell

Waco, Texas

May 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank Dr. Brent Froberg for his overwhelming support that went beyond what should be expected from any thesis reader. Although this thesis focuses primarily on the Latin text of the *Aeneid*, through Dr. Froberg's revisions I learned a great deal about writing stylistically, a valuable skill for any discipline. Second, I would like to thank Dr. David Lyle Jeffrey for being a reader for my thesis and for teaching me so much about art, literature, philosophy, and the Bible. His classes have influenced me in innumerable ways, and I will cherish what he has taught me for the rest of my life. Third, I would like to thank Dr. Alden Smith for serving as my thesis director and for caring so deeply about his students. He has taught me everything that I know about Latin, and I could not have completed this thesis without his guidance. Last but not least, I would like to thank all of my friends who supported me and prayed for me along the way. The journey was long, but it was bearable because of them.

INTRODUCTION

Forming any sort of critical edition of an ancient text requires many decisions

regarding the reliability and accuracy of the manuscripts used. Virgil's corpus originally

existed in the form of rolls passed down through painstakingly hand-copied vellum

(calfskin) rolls. Such rolls as were originally used consisted of a uolumen, or "roll" from

the Latin "uoluo," made of vellum or papyrus wrapped around an umbilicus, or "dowel."

Vellum was more expensive than papyrus, but, due to its durability and the ability of each

"leaf" to be folded into distinct front-and-back pages, it became the material of choice

when available. Through the difficult, lengthy process of hand-making copies of vellum

texts, errors frequently appear in many manuscripts. Any editor must decide which

manuscripts are the most reliable, a process called recension, and then correct errors that

exist even in the most accurate manuscripts, a process called emendation. After about

300 AD, the use of the codex became widespread through the preference of Christians for

the codices over scrolls. This shift happened rather abruptly, and all of the surviving

manuscripts of Virgil are codices, the earliest among them originating in the fourth

century. [1]

The textual tradition of Virgil includes seven important manuscripts that

originated at an estimated date prior to the eighth century, and two that originated in the

eighth century. These earliest seven manuscripts are the Mediceus (M), the Codex

---

[1] Alden Smith, *Virgil*, (Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 150-2. The first half of my introduction is largely based on the work of Alden Smith and Marius Geymonat on the Virgilian textual tradition.

Palatinus (P), the Codex Romanus (R), the shedae Vaticanai (F), the Codex Veronensis XL (V), the Vergilius Sangalliensis (G), and the Augusteus (A). The two manuscripts that originate in the eighth century and are designated with lower-case letters because of their later date of composition are *m,* housed in Munich, and *p,* housed in Paris. In addition to these nine manuscripts, several other manuscripts date from the ninth and tenth centuries, and have ω to designate their consensus.[2]

The Mediceus (M), old and mostly complete, contains Virgil's entire corpus except for the first *quaternio* and one page, and it has rustic capital letter forms, the oldest kind of majuscule writing. This manuscript resides in the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana in Florence, although for a time it was in the Bobbio monastery near Piacenza, whence the abbot took it to Rome. An inscription on the manuscript from consul Furcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius dates the manuscript prior to April 21, 494, the date included on the inscription, and the manuscript was likely compiled earlier in the fifth century. The Mediceus contains annotations from Pomponius Letus who used it to write his commentary.[3]

The Codex Palatinus (P) is practically complete and has large, ornate rustic capitals. This manuscript resides in the Vatican library, although it was previously in Heidelberg's Palatine Library, whence it received its name, and it was written perhaps around 500 AD. Three ancient editors, known as P^1, P^2, and P^3 made corrections, which modern editions include in superscript notation when citing them. The Palatinus contains many antiquated forms (olli for illi, gnatus for natus, quoi for cui), which suggest an early

---

[2] Smith, *Virgil*, 156-7; Marius Geymonat, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 4th ed. (Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2008), XIX-XXII.

[3] Smith, *Virgil*, 153; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XIX.

date for the manuscript; in addition to some paleographical features that similarly hint at an early composition. [4]

The Codex Romanus (R) is old and accurate, although the original editor appears to have changed some of the words as if he were the poet himself. Even though incomplete, it contains some rarer passages, including the end of the third eclogue and much of the fourth. R has rustic capitals similar to the Palatinus, which might even originate from the same workshop. Abbreviations in the manuscript indicate that its composition was after the fifth century, and a line from Priscian's translation of Dionysius Periegetes inserted into the manuscript points to a composition date around the turn of the sixth century. R has nineteen illustrations that differ from the Vatican manuscript, and the loss of some pages in the manuscript appears to be due to heavy use.[5]

The schedae Vaticanae (F), the oldest manuscript, dating to a time in the fourth century, is written in rustic capitals, and it contains sections of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. F resides in the Vatican, and it has seventy-five "sheets" with twenty-one verses each and a series of fifty ancient miniatures. The styles of the miniatures suggest that the drawings were based on originals from the time of the Severan dynasty around 193-211 AD. Our first records of the manuscript come from the time when Giovannni Ponatano held the manuscript in the fifteenth century, and Torquato Bembo, son of Cardinal Pietro Bembo, held it by 1579, from whom it went to the papal library in 1602.[6]

---

[4] Smith, Virgil, 153; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XIX.

[5] Smith, Virgil, 154; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XX.

[6] Smith, Virgil, 154; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XX-XXI.

The Codex Veronensis XL (V) is partially preserved, written in rustic capitals, and dates to the fifth century. Often called the Schedae Rescriptae Veronenses, **V** resides in Verona's Biblioteca Capitolare. As "Rescriptae" suggests, the text was erased and written over, and in this case Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* is the later writing written over the Virgilian text. This kind of a document, with its first text's ink scraped off, is called a palimpsest, and various techniques using ultraviolet light and magnifying glasses, among other things, are used to provide information about the original writing. The Virgilian text's rustic script was written at Bobbio by a French abbot, while the *Moralia* is in Luxeuil minuscule. The Virgilian text came to Verona about a century after its composition, and one of the editors might even have been Boethius. The palimpsest mostly consists of the *Aeneid*, although it also contains portions of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* in twelve folios. A nineteenth century chemical reagent unfortunately limited the scope of the document further, causing damage to the document and making some passages difficult to read. The Virgilian text has many qualities indicative of a school edition, because each page contains large margins, only thirteen verses, and few abbreviations, unlike some more ornate texts.[7]

The Vergilius Sangalliensis (G) is much more fragmentary than the previous texts described because this codex was dismantled and used for binding other books. It dates from the sixth century, contains ornate script more box-like in nature than rustic capitals, known as square capitals, and resides in the Stiftsbibliothek of St Gallen. Its script indicates that it was a "coffee-table" edition, and it would perhaps have contained Virgil's entire corpus, although fewer than four hundred verses now remain. Some

---

[7] Smith, Virgil, 154-5; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXI-XXII.

copies of this text were used to make a copy of the Vulgate in the twelfth century in the St Gall Monastery, suggesting that the remaining fragments that we have were in the monastery by that time.[8]

The Augusteus (A), also fragmentary, contains only seven pages from the Georgics, and it similarly has square capitals. Four of its pages are in the Vatican while the other three are in Berlin. Possibly dating in the sixth century, A originally contained the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics*, and it is the oldest manuscript with ornamental initials. The manuscript contains the editions of Fulvius Ursinus, a librarian to the Farnese family, and the translated inscription, "Claudius Puteanus gave this as a gift to Fulvius Ursinus" is on the first page. Before the Vatican, the German state library held the four pages of the Augusteus until the nineteenth century.[9]

The Munich manuscript (*m*) is the first of two important eighth-century fragmentary manuscripts. It has thirty-three lines of antique capitals per page, and was intended for private use. The manuscript was recovered from twelfth-century bindings of other books, and the original manuscript may have been written in northern Italy. The earliest known residence of *m* is Tegernsee.[10]

The Paris manuscript (*p)* is the other eighth-century manuscript, and it was copied in Germany. Some of the fragments still extant consist of the opening of Book I and the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, the latter of which contains important variant readings. The

---

[8] Smith, Virgil, 155; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXI.

[9] Smith, Virgil, 155; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XX.

[10] Smith, Virgil, 156; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXII.

script of this manuscript is very small and written in two columns; each page has about thirty-five lines.[11]

As the last group of important manuscripts, ω designates the consensus of the significant manuscripts from the ninth and tenth centuries. The Gudianus Lat. 2º 70, called the Guelferbytanus (Wolfenbüttel γ), is the most important manuscript in this group because it contains some sections that are unclear in the Palatinus, from which it may be an indirect descendant. Beginning in the ninth century, Virgil's works started becoming widespread as the Italian Renaissance gained momentum.[12]

In addition to these manuscripts, ancient commentators on Virgil preserve some of his writings in their works. Collectively, these works form the *testimonia* of Virgil's text, and Lucius Annaeus Seneca (4-65 A.D.), Servius (4th-5th century A.D.), Tiberius Claudius Donatus (4th-5th century A.D.) are a few of these important witnesses.[13] These commentators provide a window into the critical reception of Virgil's work in the half century after he wrote, but they come with their own unique textual difficulties, upon whose witness this thesis places little weight. For my work on Book 5 of the *Aeneid*, I shall make reference mostly to the Mediceus, Palatinus, Romanus, *p, ω*, and *γ*, because these manuscripts contain the pertinent passages of Book 5 that I analyze. Dr. Smith and I collated an exact replica of the codex Mediceus, but for the other manuscripts I shall rely on the witness of other scholars.

---

[11] Smith, Virgil, 157; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXII.

[12] Smith, Virgil, 156-7; Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXIII-XXIV.

[13] Geymonat, ed., *Opera*, XXIII-XXIV.

This thesis offers six different passages from Book 5 with lines containing highly disputed variants. To choose which variants to analyze, Dr. Smith and I collated six critical editions of the *Aeneid*: Ribbeck's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Goelzer's *Virgile Énéide*, Sabbadini's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Mynors' *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Geymonat's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera,* and Conte's *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*. I have selected six variants over which two or more of these editors disagree and for which sufficient interpretive and textual evidence exists to make a claim.

Ribbeck's *Opera,* first published between 1854 and 1860, is the earliest of the critical editions that I use. The first edition of his *Opera* contained "copious critical commentary" and an "elaborate Prolegomena,"[14] although the edition that I used contains only a short preface, Virgil's text, variant readings, and notes on the testimonia. Also, "its critical commentary has been pruned of everything not absolutely necessary to fix the text of the poet."[15] Ribbeck's text is the first work that systematically analyzed and justified the validity of manuscripts instead of merely counting the number of manuscripts that support a certain reading, a practice used prior to Ribbeck.[16] Most modern editors follow Ribbeck's example. Although Ribbeck's work was so seminal, he included many "theories and confectures which seriously detracted from the worth of his text."[17] Because of this practice, his name is "connected by most people with a number of

---

[14] F. Haverfield, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Otto Ribbeck. *The Classical Review* 10, no. 8 (1896): 399.

[15] Ibid. 399

[16] Ibid. 399

[17] Ibid. 399

bad emendations rather than with a gigantic improvement of the text of Virgil."[18] The more recent edition removes many of these conjectures, making the text more concise.

The first edition of Sabbadini's *Opera* was published in 1930, and at the time both Sandbach and Mustard proclaimed it to be the best published edition to date.[19] Sabadini is more cautious than Ribbeck, producing according to Sandbach an "*apparatus* which appears to be more accurate, though less complete, than that of Ribbeck."[20] For his edition, Sabbadini himself "collated the five great MSS. A, F, M, P, R," noting where ancient editors of the text have made corrections.[21] Of these manuscripts, Sabbadini ascribes to P the highest importance, to R more importance than modern editors typically ascribe to it, and to M less importance than modern editors ascribe.[22] He also thinks that, "Virgil was much more fond of asyndeton, anacoluthon, and pleonastic use of *que* than his copyists were."[23] In addition to collating manuscripts and correcting some of Ribbeck's less cautionary emendations, Sabbadini notes a rich amount of the *testimonia* of grammarians and glossaries when appropriate.[24]

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] F. Sandbach, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Remigius Sabbadini, *The Classical Review* 46, no. 1 (1932): 26; and W. Mustard, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Remigius Sabbadini, *The American Journal of Philology* 52, no. 1 (1931): 90.

[20] Sandbach, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* , 26.

[21] Mustard, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 90.

[22] Ibid. 90

[23] Sandbach, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera,* 27.

[24] Ibid. 27

Goelzer's *Énéide* was first published in 1926, and it is the only one of these editions to contain the Latin text with a translation on the opposing page, in this case French. Mackail describes the text as "wholly excellent," containing "a sufficient and…accurate *apparatus criticus.*"[25] The introduction contains two section, the first pertaining to the "object, contents, and the spirit of the *Aeneid*" by Bellessort, and the second containing a history of the *Aeneid*'s textual tradition by Goelzer.[26] For Goelzer, M, P, and R are the most important manuscripts; they "complete and control each other, and reach a sufficient approximation" of the original text.[27] When choosing whether or not to use another editor's interpretive conjecture, he usually edits conservatively, often remarking "damnat temere" in his *apparatus criticus*.[28]

Mynors published his *Opera* in 1969 as the new Oxford Text of Virgil. His text relies on Ribbeck and Sabbadini for their collations of M, P, and R, and he includes Geymonat's work on G and V.[29] Mynors looks at only some of the later manuscripts, although he thinks that "they have more historical than textual value," and he distills the *testimonia* provided by Ribbeck in useful ways.[30] Unlike more conservative editors,

---

[25] J. Mackail, Review of *Virgile: Eneide, Livres I.-VI by Henri Goelzer, The Classical Review* 41, no. 1 (1927): 25.

[26] Ibid. 25

[27] Henri Goelzer, ed., *Énéide*, 8. éd. (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1956), XXIX. Translated from the French.

[28] Mackail, Review of *Virgile: Eneide*, 25.

[29] W.Maguinness, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by R. A. B. Mynors, *The Classical Review* 21, no. 2 (1971): 198.

[30] Ibid. 198; E. Kenney, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by R. A. B. Mynors, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 60 (1970): 259.

Mynors is willing to accept a fair amount of interpretive conjectures, printing about 20 or so.[31] Overall, he produces a thoughtful text that is mostly devoid of excess information.

Geymonat's *Opera*, first published it in 1972, is the most thorough of the six editions. For his edition, he checked "dubious readings" in the earliest manuscripts, and he "recollated G, V, *a*, and *n*," while also adding to the *testimonia*.[32] He often cites the conjectures and articles of other scholars, an effort that some readers might find unnecessary, but his citations are particularly useful for a study such as mine, because they explain the editorial reception of the passage. For some passages of high dispute, he also justifies his reasoning for his choice in the *aparatus criticus*. The scale and detail of his *Opera* make it the most useful edition of Vergil for work involving textual criticism, and his introduction succinctly describes the Virgilian textual tradition.

The latest edition of the six is Conte's *Aeneis*, which provides little new information to Virgilian textual scholarship. Conte is "better known as a literary than as a textual critic," although his text "is only slightly less conservative than that of Mynors."[33] Although scholars criticize Conte's work for its lack of invention, they do not question his thoughtfulness or his ability to interpret Vergil's texts critically. In the end, Conte provides a "lucid and accessible"[34] version of the *Aeneid.* My thesis takes these six

---

[31] R. Boerma, Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera (O. C. T.)*, by R. A. B. Mynors. *Mnemosyne* 26, no. 1 (1973): 85.

[32] D. West, Review of *The Aeneid of Virgil and P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by R. D. Williams and Marius Geymonat. *The Classical Review* 26, no. 1 (1976): 35.

[33] David Mankin, Review of *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*, by G. B. Conte. *Religious Studies Review* 38, no. 2 (June 2012): 90.

[34] Ibid. 90

editions into account, defines the reasons that they appear to vary in certain passages, analyzes context of each passage in light of the textual tradition, and argues for six different readings in Book 5 of the *Aeneid*.

CHAPTER ONE

Note on Line 162

The opening contest in Book 5 of the *Aeneid* is a boat race between Cloanthus, Gyas, Mnestheus, and Sergesthus. Gyas starts out in the lead, but his helmsmen, Menoetes, disregards his orders to steer close to the rock that serves at the meta for the race, and Cloanthus passes them. In his speech to Menoetes, Gyas says,

> "Quo tantum mihi dexter abis? huc derige *gressum*;
> litus ama, et laeva stringat sine palmula cautes;
> altum alii teneant."[1] (*Aen.* 5.162-4)
> ["Why do you turn so far to the right? Steer the course there; hug the shore, and let the left oars graze the shore; let the others take the deep sea"]

Regarding the first line, editors vary between using *gressum* and *cursum*, even though the textual tradition highly favors *gressum*. Mynors, Geymonat, and Conte favor *cursum*, a reading supported by *p*, *ω*, Seneca, Tiberius, and the first editor of the Mediceus. On the other hand, Ribbeck, Goezler, and Sabadini favor *gressum*, supported by the Mediceus, the Romanus, and the Palatinus.

The main difference between *gressum* and *cursum* in the present context is one of nuance. *Gressus* is from *gradior*, and it means "a stepping, going, step, course, way."[2] *Cursus*, on the other hand, comes from *curro*, and it means "a running (on foot, on a

_____

[1] Remigius Sabbadini, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Vol. 2. (Rome: Typis Regiae Officinae Polygraphicae, 1930), 142.

[2] Charlton T.Lewis, ed., *A Latin Dictionary: Lewis and Short*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), 830.

horse, chariot, ship, etc.), a course, way, march, passage, voyage, journey, etc."[3] With

respect to the boat race, *gressum* implies a slow and carefully executed path towards the

meta, while *cursum* implies a hurried approach.

There seem to be two prominent reasons why editors choose *cursum* over

gressum: that *gressum* is not regularly associated with sailing, and that *cursum* better

portrays Gyas' reckless character.   Regarding the former, Luis Garcia claims that Aulus

Gellius uses *gressum* to refer to the action of boats in his *History*.[4] As Garcia says, citing

fragments 98 and 104-105 of the first section of Gellius's *History*, Gellius uses the

participle *transgressos* (having stepped across) to refer to a group of people who are

crossing the sea, and he uses the participle *progressas* (having gone forth) to refer to the

boats that the people use to sail across the sea.[5] Among other things concerning *gressum*

and its use in reference to ships, Gellius says,

> Propterea negant aput scriptorem idoneum aut nauium 'transgressum'
> reperiri posse aut pro transfretatione 'transgressum'. (6) Sed quaero ego,
> cur non. sicuti 'cursus' nauium recte dici solet. ita 'transgressus' etiam
> navibus factus dici possit? praesertim cum breuitas tam angusti fretus.[6]
> [Therefore, they deny unto the apt writer that "having stepped across"
> ("transgressum") is able to be found either concerning ships or in
> reference to passing over a narrow sea. (6) But I ask, "why not?" Just as
> "a voyage" is rightly proper to be said of ships. So, since "having stepped
> across" ("transgressus") is used, is it possible for it to be said of ships? It
> is especially apt when a narrow channel is so short.]

---

[3] Ibid. 503

[4] Luis Garcia, "Nota Critica A Verg., Aen. V 162-3," *Emerita* no. 77 (December
2009): 331–34.

[5] Ibid. 332-3 quoting Gellius

[6] Ibid. 332-3 quoting Gellius

Garcia's explanation for the existence of *cursum* in the later textual tradition is that "*cursum* no es otra cosa que su benalizacion;" for him, *gressum* is part of the "imagen de la que Virgilio añade viveza a las palabras que Gias lanza a Menetes."[7] Garcia appears to be right on both of these accounts, although he does not address the importance of using *gressum* in this scene beyond ornamentation. Due to the heavy support for *gressum* in the textual tradition, *cursum* probably appears in the later tradition because it is the more common word used to describe sailing. In addition, if one should accept *cursum* as the word in the original text, there is no easy way to explain how *gressum* became part of the textual tradition. As the *lectio difficilior*,[8] *gressum* seems to be the preferred choice over *cursum*.

In addition to the textual tradition, Virgil's allusion to Homer's chariot race in Book 23 of the *Iliad* gives a literary reason why Vergil would choose to use *gressum* over *cursum*. The games in Book 5 of the *Aeneid* closely resemble the games that Achilles holds for Patroclus's death in Book 23 of the *Iliad*, and Virgil replaces Homer's chariot race with his boat race. Before the chariot race in the *Iliad*, Nestor councils his son, Antilochus, using advice that Virgil will allude to through the mouth of Gyas:

> There's a dead tree-stump standing six feet high…
> Now, in any event, swift Achilles makes it
> his turning-post. And you must hug it close
> as you haul your team and chariot round but you
> in your tight-strung car, you lean to the left yourself,
> just a bit as you whip your right-hand horse, hard,

---

[7] Ibid. 332

[8] "The more difficult reading." If a reading is more difficult, it is harder to imagine how a scribe would write such a reading of his own choice, unless he made a mistake in transcription. Sometimes, if a reading is difficult enough, scribes will emend what the author originally wrote to an easier reading. Depending on the context, the more difficult reading should be given more weight for these reasons.

> shout him on, slacken your grip and give him rein.
> But make your left horse hug that post so close
> the hub of your well-tuned wheel will almost seem
> to scrape the rock—just careful not to graze it!
> You'll maim your team, you'll smash your car to pieces.
> A joy to your rivals, rank disgrace to yourself…
> So keep your head my boy, be on the lookout.[9]

Gyas echoes many parts of Nestor's speech, and *gressum* more closely imitates the ethos of Nestor's advice to his son. While Gyas reveals that he is ill-tempered and reckless when he throws Menoetes overboard, he does not appear so at first. The advice that he gives to Menoetes appears to be sound, at least upon one's initial reading of the text, especially because Cloanthus uses the same strategy that Gyas outlines to scrape between the meta and Gyas's ship. The term *gressum* gives the impression that Menoetes should approach the rock as if he were walking or tiptoeing up to it, as opposed to rushing towards it. Because it is unusual to use *gressum* with respect to ships, Virgil perhaps is emphasizing the careful nature of Gyas's advice, coupled with the allusion to Nestor, whereas *cursum* does not have the same care associated with it. So, *gressum* helps to characterize Gyas and strengthen his reversal from skillful commander to reckless buffoon. The use of *gressum* strengthens the initial ethos of Gyas and does more than act merely as ornamental language, as Garcia suggests. The textual tradition heavily supports *gressum;* other Latin writing establishes the possibility of using *gredior* with respect to ships; and *gressum* is the *lectio difficilior*, while also portraying an ethos that coincides with Virgil's allusion to Nestor. For these reasons, *gressum* appears to be a stronger choice than *cursum*. The main reasons that some scholars choose *cursum* over *gressum* appears to be that *gressum* is a strange word to use with ships and that *cursum*

---

[9] Robert Fagles, trans., *The Iliad*, (New York, N.Y., U.S.A: Viking, 1990), 23.371-89.

better coincides with Gyas's character, but Gellius's *History* satisfies the first objection to *gressum*, and the allusion to Nestor satisfies the latter objection, because *gressum* functions within Virgil's initial portrayal of Gyas's ethos.

CHAPTER TWO

Note on Line 451

In the third competition of Book 5, Entellus spars with the younger Dares. This competition juxtaposes the strength and experience of Entellus against the quickness and skill of Dares. In the midst of the fight, Dares dodges one of Entellus's blows and sends Entellus falling to the ground. The crowd rages, and Acestes, pitying his friend, helps Entellus up from the ground. The Latin in this section is as follows:

> Consurgunt studiis Teucri et Trinacria pubes;
> it clamor caelo, *primusque* accurrit Acestes,
> aequaevumque ab humo miserans attollit amicum.[1] (*Aen.* 5.450-2)
> [The Teucrians and the Trinacrian men stand up in excitement;
> the noise reaches the heaven, and Acenstes first hurries,
> and pitying his coeval friend he lifts him from the ground.]

In this section, the textual tradition varies in line 451, and the Palatinus, Romanus, Veronensis XL, *ω*, and *γ* contain *primusque*, while the Mediceus and *p* contain only *primus* in the middle of the line. With respect to the editorial reception of this line, Ribbeck, Goelzer, Mynors, and Conte favor *primusque*, while Sabbadini and Geymonat favor *primus*.

Part of the difficulty in deciding between whether or not to include *que* in this line is that it has little effect on the meaning of the sentence. Whether or not one includes the *que*, both the crowd's cheering and Acestes' hurrying can appear to happen simultaneously. Also, both the crowds cheering and Acestes' hurrying are in the same

---

[1] Otto Ribbeck, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, (Chicago: Ares, 1985), 445.

line, and so the two actions are juxtaposed regardless of whether they are connected by *que*, although *que* adds more continuity.

While Sabadini and Geymonat's preference for *primus* holds less weight in the textual tradition, their choice appears to coincide better with the flow of the line. The second half of line 451 (*primusque* accurrit Acestes) and line 452 (aequaevumque ab humo miserans attollit amicum) are connected with a *que*, and Acestes is the subject of both of these clauses. The first half line 451, on the other hand, is a completely separate thought and concerns the noise that the audience makes. Lines 450 through 452 contrast the action of the crowd and that of Acestes, making *primus* appear to be a slightly more logical choice with respect to the context of the line.

The textual tradition, however, heavily supports *primusque,* and in this section of the text the codex Mediceus contains many errors that lessen its credibility. The Mediceus reads,

> *in* clamor caelo *primus* accurrit Acestes
> *aequuumque* ab *huno* miserans attollit amicum
> at non tardatus *iasu* neque territus heros[2] (*Aen.* 5.451-3 my emphasis)

All critical editions of the *Aeneid* agree that *in* should be *it*, that *aequuumque* should be *aequaeuumque,* that *huno* should be *humo*, and that *iasu* should be *casu*. Excluding whether *primus* should be *primusque*, there are four errors in these three lines, and one of those errors is in the same line as *primus*. This frequency of error in only three lines occurs rarely in the Mediceus, and it should make one cautious when relying on the Mediceus for support regarding these lines. The transcriber, while he was writing these lines, appears to have been much less cautious and precise in his transcription.

[2] Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, ed., *Il Codice Mediceo Di Virgilio*, (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1931)

Therefore, the textual tradition supports *primusque* more strongly than it appears to at first glance, because the Mediceus does not strongly support *primus*.

The consonance of line 451 also supports *primusque*, because the spondaic line contains many harsh "c" sounds: "it clamor caelo, primusque accurrit Acestes." Both line 451 and 452 are spondaic lines, so Virgil appears to be putting a significant emphasis on their rhythm and sound to imitate the noise of the crowd and the intensity of this moment in the fight. While the consonance of the line does not offer strong evidence in support for *primusque*, because the consonance does not significantly change the meaning or the flow of the line, it does show that Virgil could be intentionally using *que* to fit into the sound of the line. Although *primus* may seem to be a slightly more logical choice syntactically, because it supports better the contrast between the crowd and Acestes, *primusque* seems to be the better overall choice because of the consonance of the line and the strong support of the textual tradition.

CHAPTER THREE

Note on Line 573

In Book 5 of the *Aeneid*, after Ascanius leads the other boys around in a display

of horsemanship and exhibition of arms, Acestes' young men ride out upon their horses:

> certera *Trinacrii* pubes senioris Acestae
> fertur equis.[1] (*Aen.* 5.573-4)
> [The remaining young men of Trinacrian elder Acestes
> are carried by his horses.]

In line 573, the Palatinus and the Romanus both contain *Trinacrii*, the Mediceus contains

Trinacrae, and the editors of the Palatinus and Mediceus along with *p, ω*, and *γ* contain

Trinacriae. In the critical editions of the *Aeneid*, however, Mynors and Conte add

another variation of *Trinacrii* to the mix, when they claim that the reading should be

Trinacriis, a reading without support from the textual tradition. Of the other scholars,

Ribbeck follows the Palatinus and Romanus with *Trinacrii*; and Goelzer, Sabbadini, and

Geymonat follow some of the later manuscripts and editors of the Palatinus and

Mediceus with *Trinacriae*.

From this variant tradition among the critical editions of the text, three main

options for the ending of *Trinacrii* remain: *-ii, -iae,* and *–iis*. *Trinacrae* has the same

function as *Trinacriae*, and *Trinacriae* with the "i" before the suffix appears to be the

main form of the word, because no proceeding manuscripts use *Trinacrae* and because

the Mediceus contains the form *Trinacriae* earlier in line 555. A minor manuscript, *a*,

contains *Trinacria*, but this form is obviously an error in the textual tradition, because

---

[1] Otto Ribbeck, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, (Chicago: Ares, 1985), 452.

none of the oldest manuscripts contains this form, and such a form would be an easy scribal error, especially because it agrees with the words *Certera* and *pubes* surrounding it.

The reading *Trinacriae* proves syntactically to be the simplest contested reading of this line. With this form, the line reads: "The remaining youth of Trinacria are borne by the horses of elder Acestes." *Trinacriae* serves as a descriptive or possessive genitive over the *pubes*, which means that "senioris Acestae ought to be a possessive genitive with *equis*. The difficulty with this reading, however, is that Virgil seems to be contrasting Acestes with Aeneas and Ascanius, because Acestes is described as *senior*. This reading has only Acestes possessing the horses, a circumstance that adequately contrasts him with Dido, who has given Ascanius his horse, information we gather from the preceding lines, but a significant comparison appears to be among Acestes, Aeneas, and Ascanius.

With the reading *Trinacriis*, Conte and Mynors claim that *Trinacriis* should agree with *equis*, and that *senioris Acestae* should be a genitive of possession with *pubes*. This reading of *Trinacriis* is quite attractive literarily, because the reader has just encountered two instances where the narrator describes a horse by its origin. In lines 565 and 566, Polites has a Thracian horse, and in line 571 Ascanius has a Sidonian horse, given to him by Dido. So, it seems that Virgil would continue in this section to contrast the places that the horses are from. The new translation with *Trinacriis* is, "The remaining youth of elder Acestes are borne by the Trinacrian horses," and this reading contrasts *senior* Acestes with Aeneas and Ascanius, while it also contrasts the origin of their horses with the horses of Polites and Ascanius. That this reading does not occur in any of the manuscripts is its main weakness. In a review of Mynor's text, Maguinness says, "it is

good to see that…Mynors (unlike Sabbadini) can leave well alone by following most editors in adopting from the *recentiores* the unquestionably right reading *Trinacriis*."[2] The phrase "unquestionably right," however appears to be a rather strong claim for a reading that has no support from manuscripts before the 12th century and likely arose from a scribal emendation.

The majority reading of the manuscripts, on the other hand, has *Trinacrii* agreeing with *senioris Acestae*, and it appears to be the strongest reading. At first glance, this reading seems to imply the translation: "The remaining young men of Trinacrian elder Acestes are born by horses." Yet, if one uses the genitive to possess both the men and the horses, one gets this translation: "The remaining young men of Trinacrian elder Acestes are born by his horses." Due to the context of the story, because Ascanius and the other boys from Aeneas's crew have just ridden out, *Acestae* should certainly be a genitive of possession with *pubes* in this reading, because Virgil is clearly distinguishing the Sicilian boys from the Trojan boys in this sentence. *Acestae* also has very close proximity to *equis*, however, and so it is possible that it could be a genitive of possession with both *pubes* and *equis*. This reading combines some of the benefits of *Trinacriae* and *Trinacriis*, because it contrasts "senior" Acestes with Aeneas, Ascanius, and Dido. In addition, by modifying *Acestae* instead of *equis*, this reading of *Trinacrii* associates Sicily with these horses while not implying that they are all from Sicily. Aeneas's horses appear to come from different parts of the world, and Acestes' horses might originally come from elsewhere too. Because none of the manuscripts supports the reading

---

[1] W. S. Maguinness, "A New Text of Virgil." *The Classical Review* 21, no. 2. New Series (June 1, 1971): 199.

Trinacriis, editors add a large assumption concerning these horses, because this reading

implies that all of the horses are from Sicily.

Trinacrii, while not without its problems, because it requires the reader to use

Acestae as a genitive of possession with both *pubes* and *equis*, appears to be the strongest

reading. It is the *lectio difficilior*, it is best supported by the textual tradition, and it

provides some of the benefits of the other readings. As shown by Conte and Mynors,

editors want to have Trinacria modify the horses even to the point that they are willing to

support a reading that the oldest manuscripts do not contain. As a choice, *Trinacrii*

allows the reader to associate Trinacria with the horses through the possession of Acestes,

and thus satisfies this desire of Conte and Mynors. Seneca and Tiberius also support the

Trinacrii reading, showing that it was at least an acceptable reading for people of Virgil's

time. If none of these readings leaves an editor completely satisfied, one should

remember that *fertur equis* is only a half line. Virgil likely intended to go back and finish

this line, as John Sparrow notes.[3] Incomplete, this line might contain syntactic and

literary problems that are not so common as those in the rest of the *Aeneid*.

---

[3] John Sparrow, *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931), 34.

CHAPTER FOUR

Note on Line 768

After the women relax their fury, incited in them by Juno, and after Aeneas

confers with Acestes to let those remain who are reluctant to travel to Italy, Aeneas and

his crew prepare for departure. Everyone travelling on to Italy seems firmly resolved to

weather the remaining journey:

> Ipsae iam matres, ipsi, quibus aspera quondam
> uisa maris facies et non tolerabile *numen*,
> ire uolunt, omnemque fugae perferre laborem.[1] (*Aen.* 5.767-9)
> [Now, the mothers and men themselves, to whom once the face of the sea
> appeared cruel and *divine will* appeared intolerable, wish to go to bear
> through the entire labor of their flight]

In this section, the oldest manuscripts actually have three different variants at the end of

line 768. The Palatinus, an editor of the Mediceus, and *ω*, and *γ* have *numen*, the

Mediceus has *nomen*, and the Romanus has *caelum*. Goelzer and Mynors follow the

reading *numen*, while Ribbeck, Sabbadini, Geymonat, and Conte follow the reading

nomen, and no one follows the reading *caelum*.

The different translations that these variant reading support are all fairly similar,

because they all have a neuter nominative noun that agrees with an implied *visum est* that

has *tolerabile* as its predicate adjective. The main syntactical difference among the

readings is that *nomen* requires that the *maris* also function as a possessive genitive with

maris as well as with "facies." In the context of this line, *numen* could potentially mean

"the divine will, the will of power of the gods, divine sway," a meaning that seems most

---

[1] Henri Goelzer, ed., *Énéide*, 8. éd. (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"
1956), 157.

likely, or "divinity, deity, divine majesty."[2] For *nomen*, the relevant definitions are "a name, appellation," or "fame, repute, reputation, renown."[3] Williams compiles uses in a way that encompasses both of these meanings, for he thinks that it means "the very mention of it," as the in "the very mention of the sea."[4] Lastly, *caelum* could mean either "the sky heaven, the heavens, the vault of heaven," or "the air, sky, atmosphere, temperature, climate, weather," and the latter nuance seems superior in this case.[5] The translation that uses *numen* is shown above. For the reading *nomen*, this translation follows: "Now, the mothers and men themselves, to whom once the face of the sea appeared cruel and the *name of the sea* appeared intolerable, wish to go to bear through the entire labor of their flight." Finally, for the reading *caelum*, the translation is: "Now, the mothers and men themselves, to whom once the face of the sea appeared cruel and the sky appeared intolerable, wish to go to bear through the entire labor of their flight."

Of the three variations, *caelum* appears to be the most unlikely, because both of the other variations are similar to each other in spelling, differing only in one letter, and so probably either *numen* or *nomen* is the original and that the other originated due to a single-letter scribal error. Between *numen* and *nomen*, the former appears to be the more likely reading. Although *nomen* is the *lectio difficilior* (it is odd that the men and women

---

[2] Charlton Lewis, ed., *A Latin Dictionary: Lewis and Short*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), 1224-5.

[3] Ibid. 1213-4

[4] R. D. Williams, ed., *Aeneid V*, (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1981), 186.

[5] Lewis ed. *A Latin Dictionary*, 263.

would say that the name of the sea is intolerable at this point in the *Aeneid*),[6] this reading

still makes enough sense that a scribe would probably not change the word to *numen* on

these grounds. This single-letter mistake is small enough that it conceivably arose from

thoughtless error rather than from thoughtful consideration of the meaning of the words

in the context of the poem.

The reading *numen* would have much greater significance in the context of Book

5 than *nomen*, because line 768 comes after Jupiter saves Aeneas's ships with rain and

just before Venus pleads with Neptune to let Aeneas travel safely to Italy. The divine

will of the gods is prevalent in this narrative context. The name of the sea, on the other

hand, does not fit well into the context of the narrative, because the face of the sea is

already mentioned, and the sea's name does not seem so relevant as does the face of the

sea or the will of the gods. For these reasons, *numen* appears to be a stronger reading

than *nomen* or *caelum*.

---

[6] Williams prefers "to accept *nomen*, the original reading of *M*, in the sense 'the very mention of it'." Williams, ed., *Aeneid V*, 186. While this interpretation does coincide nicely with the imagery of *facies*, *numen* does not typically have this connotation.

CHAPTER FIVE

Note on Lines 777-8

Toward the end of Book 5, Aeneas sets sail with the remainder of his people after

he allows some of them to stay with Acestes instead of travelling with him to Italy. The

description of the beginning of Aeneas's sea voyage from Sicily to Italy occurs between a

description of his offerings to the gods and Venus's plea to Neptune for the safety of

Aeneas's journey:

> Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis.
> Certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.[1] (5.777-8)
> [The wind surges astern following the travelling ships.
> Competitively the comrades strike the sea and sweep the surface.]

These lines carry a fascinating manuscript history. In the Mediceus, Romanus, and ω,

these lines are in the same order as shown above, but in the Palatinus and γ the lines are

inverted, putting line 778 before line777. Ribbeck, Mynors, Geymonat, and Conte follow

the reading of the Palatinus and γ, putting line 778 before line 777, while Goelzer and

Sabadini follow the Mediceus, Romanus, and ω, keeping the order shown above. In

addition to the variant textual tradition, some scholars claim that one or both of these

lines do not belong as part of Virgil's original text, because these lines have direct

parallels in Book 3, and one or both of these lines were later inserted into Book 5 by

editors. Because of the textual tradition and the scholarship on interpolation, my

argument will be two-fold: I will first demonstrate that these lines do not appear to be

---

[1] Remigius Sabbadini , ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Vol. 2. (Rome: Typis
Regiae Officinae Polygraphicae, 1930), 168.

interpolations, and then I will show that the most logical order of the lines should be as shown above, with 777 before 778.

While all of the manuscripts contain both verses 777 and 778, both Hans-Christian Günther and M. Reeve claim that that one of the verses was not in the original text, although they differ on which line they consider an addition. Günther argues that line 777 is an interpolation, while Reeve claims that 778 is the interpolation. Günther says,

> We see one testimony of concordance interpolation by verse conversion in verse 777 of Book V.
>
> [Prosequitur Surgens a puppi uentus euntis;] certatim socii ferunt mare et Aequora uerrunt.
>
> …Favorable wind is only obtained in verse 816 by Neptune's intervention, and only in 828 (Iubet Ocius omnis / attolli malos, intendi bracchia carduelis) does Aeneas set sail. Book V line 777 is taken verbatim from III.290 and V.778 from III.130. Vergil does not have any two literally repeated verses anywhere else in the *Aeneid*.[2]

M. Reeve, on the other hand, chooses to put line 778 in Italics in the version of *Virgil Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid 1-6* that G. Goold revises.[3] Commenting on Reeve and Günther, Berti says that

> The proposal is certainly attractive, because, in addition to solving the problem of meaning, if you think that a verse was added in the margin and then inserted in two different positions depending on the codices, it would easily explain the genesis of the discrepancy in the textual tradition.[4]

---

[2] Hans-Christian Günther, "Zwei Binneninterpolationen Im Zehnten Buch Der 'Aeneis' Und Das Problem Der Konkordanzinterpolation." *Hermes* 124, no. 2 (January 1, 1996): 206-7. Translated from the German.

[3] G. P. Goold, ed., Rushton Fairclough, trans., *Virgil*, (The Loeb Classical Library : Latin Authors 63. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999), 524.

[4] Emanuele Berti, "Nota a Verg. Aen. 5, 777-778." *Materiali E Discussioni per L'analisi Dei Testi Classici*, no. 59 (January 1, 2008): 202. Translated from the Italian.

The prospect that one of these verses might be an interpolation offers a solution that could explain much of the confusion surrounding these two lines. The current theory taken up by the majority of editors is that both lines are original and that 777 should go after 778, but this theory does not account for why the verses are copies of verses from Book 3, nor does it explain why 777 comes before 778 in the Mediceus and Romanus.

While having verses that directly copy other verses is odd, however, the verses do not appear to be concordance interpolations, because they do not fit the usual circumstances under which such interpolations occur, and because the plot does appear to have a gap that would call for an editor to make such an interpolation. John Foley describes concordance interpolations, although he discusses them with respect to Greek literature:

> S. West (1967, 11) makes the telling point that the early papyri are characterized by a high proportion not of substituted but of *additional* lines, and these additions are not random but of a particular kind:
>> The proportion depends partly on the context: passages containing many *versus iterati* ... or a summary of a typical scene described elsewhere in greater detail ... attracted plus-verses, while a passage for which there are no close parallels elsewhere in Homer was likely to remain free from them. Concordance interpolation exercised a powerful attraction: thus a line or group of lines which follow a particular formula in one place are inserted after it in another passage where they may be rather less suitable. (pp. 12-13) [5]
>
> This "concordance interpolation," as West calls it, belies the existence of a still-fluid vestige of oral tradition, perhaps by this point exclusively the possession of rhapsodes (or even schoolmasters) who could read and write but had committed much of Homer to memory. [6]

---

[5] Stephanie West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer.* (Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen Der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Für Forschung Des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Sonderreihe. Köln, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967), 12-13.

[6] John Foley, *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 25.

From Foley's description, the main characteristics of concordance interpolations are that they are additions to the text, that they come from a more elaborated version of a typical formula, and that they arise from an oral tradition. Since Virgil's texts do not participate in the same oral tradition as do Homer's texts, lines 777 and 778 cannot be a product of oral tradition in the same way that Homer's text are. Thus, a concordance interpolation is suspect from the start and needs strong evidence to be proved. I shall forego analyzing this third characteristic for the meantime, however, for the sake of showing the incompatibility of the other two characteristics with respect to lines 777 and 778.

In reference to the first characteristic of concordance interpolations, neither of these lines appears to be an addition, because all of the manuscripts contain both of these lines. If either of the lines were an addition, one would expect a variant tradition within the manuscripts that does not contain one of the lines. As Foley writes regarding Homeric texts,

> The papyri argue that, even while Aristarchus and his fellow scholars labored over the editing of their manuscripts, others outside the mainstream of textual transmission—but still very much a part of the traditional context—were performing and recording versions of Homer faithful to the overarching tradition yet couched…in slightly different "words."[7] (Foley 25)

In this case, the papyri hint that an interpolation might have occurred. Without variants in the Homeric papyri, scholars might not know that certain lines are concordance interpolations. The textual tradition of the *Aeneid*, while sometimes inverting lines 777 and 778, has both of these lines in every manuscript.

---

[7] Foley. *Traditional Oral Epic*, 25.

In addition, within the context of the lines in Book 5, no evidence shows that either of these lines needed to be interpolated and added into the text. If both of the lines are needed for the plot to move forward, then one could argue that the scribes noticed that the plot is incomplete and added one of these lines to fix the lacuna in the plot. The lines come after Aeneas makes offerings to the gods and before Venus makes her plea to Neptune:

> Ipse, caput tonsae foliis evinctus olivae,
> stans procul in prora pateram tenet, extaque salsos
> proiicit in fluctus ac vina liquentia fundit.
> Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis.
> Certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.
> At Venus interea Neptunum exercita curis
> adloquitur, talesque effundit pectore questus: (*Aen.* 5.774-80)
> [He himself, bound about the head with leaves of cut olive trees, standing away in the prow holds the bowl, and throws the entrails into the salty waves and pours out the liquid wine. The wind surges astern following the travelling ships.
> Competitively the comrades strike the sea and sweep the surface. But meanwhile Venus worn out by cares addresses Neptune, and pours such complaints from her heart:]

The description of the offerings that Aeneas makes to the gods does not need both lines 777 and 778 to move the plot forward to sailing. Either of these lines could be omitted, and the reader would still know that Aeneas and his men depart in their ships. Similarly, the narrative about Venus functions effectively for the plot of the story regardless of whether either 777 or 778 are omitted. Besides sailing, neither of these lines contains any explicit action that the narrator appears to contrast with Venus's action.

Günther, instead of claiming that 777 is added because the narrative lacks something, claims that 777 appears to be an interpolation because it is superfluous and seems to contradict later parts of the story. He argues that "Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis" implies that there is already favorable wind, a notion that contradicts the

fact that Neptune settles the seas and that Aeneas puts up his sails only later. While line

777 is odd in its present context, it does not actually conflict directly the later narrative.

Rather, it merely states that the wind carries the ship along its course. Neptune brings

peace and calm to the sea, and thus he brings "favorable winds," because violent wind

may not be favorable, even though it may be blowing in the proper direction. Because

the sky is stormy before Neptune calms it, Aeneas may wait to put up his sails, even

though the wind blows in the proper direction. Reeve does not offer an explanation for

why he thinks that 778 might not be part of Virgil's original text other than the fact that it

has a parallel in Book 3. Line 778 does not appear to conflict with the later narrative at

all, and so it does not appear to be a problematic line in this way.

These lines also do not appear to come from a more elaborated version of a

typical formula, because they do not appear next to each other anywhere else in the

Aeneid. These lines both have parallels in Book 3, but both of the lines occur

individually in their respective contexts. Each line is sufficient in its own context, and

neither III.130 or III.290 has any other line surrounding it that describes the propulsion of

the boat:

> hortantur socii, Cretam proavosque petamus.
> *Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis*
> et tandem antiquis Curetum adlabimur oris. (*Aen.* 3.129-31 my emphasis)
> [The comrades urge: "Let us seek Crete and our forefathers." The wind
> surges astern following the travelling ships and finally we glide to the
> ancient shores of Curetes.]
>
> Linquere tum portus iubeo et considere transtris;
> *certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.*
> Protinus aërias Phaeacum abscondimus arces. (*Aen.* 3.289-91 my
> emphasis)
> [I order them to leave the harbor and to sit down on the rowers' seats;
> competitively the comrades strike the sea and sweep the surface. Soon we
> leave behind the high citadels of the Phaeacians.]

It is difficult to imagine how either of these lines would become closely associated

enough that an editor would choose to put the two together in Book 5 where only one of

them might have been originally. Lines 777 and 778 do not appear to be additions; they

do not appear to part of a typical formula; and they do not come out of an oral tradition

like that of Homer. These lines do not appear to be concordance interpolations, or at least

they are not concordance interpolations in any sort of way resembling that of Homeric

concordance interpolations. Both of the lines appear to be authentic.

Because the authenticity of these lines has been established, the remaining task is

to show that it is more logical to put 777 before 778. While the textual tradition more

strongly supports having 777 before 778, the majority of the critical editions on the

Aeneid claim that 777 should go after 778. The apparent reasoning that the majority of

editors put 778 before 777 is that "no one uses oars while the wind carries them".[8] This

reasoning would be convincing if one isolated these two lines from the rest of the *Aeneid*.

Indeed, it is strange that one would describe the action of the wind picking up and

carrying the boat before one describes the action of the rowers. In addition, Berti claims

that the *Odyssey* provides a parallel that supports the inverted line order:

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆα κιὼν ὤτρυνον ἑταίρους
> αὐτούς τ᾽ ἀμβαίνειν ἀνά τε πρυμνήσια λῦσαι.
> οἱ δ᾽ αἶψ᾽ εἴσβαινον καὶ ἐπὶ κληῖσι καθῖζον.
> ἑξῆς δ᾽ ἑζόμενοι πολιὴν ἅλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς.
> ἡμῖν δ᾽ αὖ κατόπισθε νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο
> ἴκμενον οὖρον ἵει πλησίστιον, ἐσθλὸν ἑταῖρον,
> Κίρκη εὐπλόκαμος, δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήεσσα. (*Odyssey* 12.144-150)
> [But I, going upon the ships, urged my very comrades to go up and loosen
> the stern cables. Forthwith, they went and sat upon the oarlocks. Each in
> order, having sat down, they struck the grey sea with their oars. On the

---

[8] Marius Geymonat, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 364. Translated from the
Latin phrase, "sed remis utitur nemo dum spirat ventus."

other hand, behind us the voiceful, fair-tressed goddess Circe sent a travelling wind, a good companion, filling the sail of our dark-prowed ship.]

Lines 778 and 777 closely resemble this passage from the *Odyssey*, and they could be a condensed form of this passage. Berti argues that Virgil often imitates Homer and that Virgil is likely doing such a thing in lines 778 and 777.[9] Yet, while Geymonat's reasoning recognizes that putting 778 before 777 appears more logical, and Berti shows that such an order has its precedent in Homer, neither of these scholars analyzes lines 777 and 778 with respect to their direct reference to two different passages in Book 3. Because of these references, I argue that it is more logical to have line 777 before line778, because this order supports what Virgil appears to be doing literarily with respect to these direct references to Book 3. The order of the original numbering of these lines is important because these lines and Venus's subsequent conversation with Neptune all allude to previous journeys that end only at an establishment of a new Troy. These references occur in the same order in which the *Aeneid* depicts the events that they reference, implying that Aeneas and his men would find only another new Troy and not a new Rome without Venus's plea to Neptune and the sacrifice of Palinurus.

V.177 parallels III.130; V.178 parallels III.290; and both of these lines in Book 3 describe Aeneas's ship as it heads toward a place that has or will have a city like a new Troy. Aeneas is telling his story to Dido in Book 3, and so these lines come from the mouth of Aeneas himself. In Book 3, line 130 occurs as Aeneas and his men are on their way to Crete:

> hortantur socii: "Cretam proavosque petamus!"
> *Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis*

---

[9] Berti, "Nota a Verg. Aen. 5, 777-778," 205.

et tandem antiquis Curetum adlabimur oris.
Ergo avidus muros optatae molior urbis,
Pergameamque voco, et laetam cognomine gentem
hortor amare focos arcemque attollere tectis.
[The crews raise the cheer: 'On to Crete and our forefathers!'
A wind rising astern attends us as we sail,
and at last we glide up to the ancient shores of the Curetes.
Eagerly, therefore, I work on the walls of my chosen city, call it
Pergamum, and urge my people, who rejoice at the old name,
to love their hearths and build a citadel with lofty roof.]

He tells Dido that, after hearing a rumor that the shores of Crete are abandoned and ripe for the taking, he and his comrades depart for Crete, and they build a city called Pergamum. This city appears to look to the past and the name even signifies that is supposed to be a new Troy, since Pergamum is the name of the citadel of Troy. Aeneas and his men cannot dwell in such a city because the gods will not allow it, and many of Aeneas's people die of a plague until they leave Crete.

In III.290, Aeneas and company are not headed directly to a new Troy, but they are sailing to an island where they hear of the kingdom of Helenus, to which they go shortly afterwards:

Linquere tum portus iubeo et considere transtris:
certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.
Protinus aërias Phaeacum abscondimus arces,
litoraque Epiri legimus portuque subimus
Chaonio, et celsam Buthroti accedimus urbem.
Hic incredibilis rerum fama occupat auris,
Priamiden Helenum Graias regnare per urbes,
coniugio Aeacidae Pyrrhi sceptrisque potitum,
et patrio Andromachen iterum cessisse marito. (*Aen.* 3.289-97)
[Then I bid them quit the harbor and man the benches; with rival strokes
my comrades lash the sea and sweep the waters. Soon we lose from sight
the towering heights of the Phaeacian, skirt the shores of Epirus, enter the
Chaonian harbor, and draw near Buthrotum's lofty city. There the rumor
of a tale beyond belief fills our ears, that Priam's son, Helenus, is reigning
over Greek cities, having won the wife and kingdom of Pyrrhus, son of
Achilles, and that Andromache has again passed to a husband of her own
race.]

Helenus later describes their city as a Pergamum and an Ilion citadel in line 335: "Pergamaque Iliacamque iugis hanc addidit arcem" (*Aen.* 3.336). Here, Aeneas learns that he will need to sail past Charybdis and Scylla.

In addition to the fact that both of these passages precede Aeneas's journey to some sort of new Troy where he cannot dwell, their contexts closely resemble the context of lines 777 and 778. In Book 3, before Aeneas sails to Crete, his father Anchises sacrifices to the Gods in lines III.117-20. Similarly, Aeneas and his men make offerings to the Gods in lines V.772-776. On the other hand, before Aeneas sails to the place where they will hear of Helenus's kingdom, Aeneas's comrades engage in athletic contests, although these games are specifically games of Troy: "Iliacis celebramus litora ludis" (*Aen.* 3.280). Book 5, line 778 appears at the end of an entire book describing the contests of Aeneas's men.

Revealingly, Book 5 also contains an account of a journey to a new Troy to which Virgil alludes in the lines following line 778. The Trojans sail to Sicily at the beginning of Book 5, and Acestes makes a new Troy on Sicily just before Aeneas departs. At the beginning of Book 5, Palinurus explicitly says that Neptune is the cause of the weather that forces the Trojans to land on Sicily, and the end of Book 5 clearly alludes to the beginning of Book 5. In lines 816-26 Neptune's calming the sky and the waves implies that the sea and sky resemble their appearances at the beginning of Book 5 when the clouds and waves caused Palinurus to sail Aeneas's ship to Sicily. This last allusion clearly establishes a chronological sequence between these allusions that all refer to journeys that end in an establishment of a new Troy. *Aeneid* V.777 alludes to III.130;

V.778 alludes to III. 290; and the narrative after V.778 alludes to the beginning of Book 5.

By alluding to these passages, Virgil implies that this journey that Aeneas is embarking on could be exactly like those other journeys that Aeneas describes to Dido in Book 3, and that this journey could again result in Aeneas and his men settling in a land that is merely a new Troy. This interpretation gives additional meaning to Venus and Neptune's conversation, because their conversation comes immediately after line 778, while the storm that Neptune has yet to calm is brewing. Virgil even contrasts lines 777 and 778 with Venus and Neptune's conversation:

> Prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis.
> Certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.
> At Venus interea Neptunum exercita curis
> adloquitur, talesque effundit pectore questus: (*Aen.* 5.777-80)
> [The wind surges astern following the travelling ships.
> Competitively the comrades strike the sea and sweep the surface. But
> meanwhile Venus, worn out by cares, addresses Neptune, and pours such
> complaints from her heart:]

The *at* explicitly contrasts the action of the rowers with Venus's plea to Neptune. In general, *at* serves as a conjunction adding a "different but entirely opposite thought," as in "moreover" or "but yet," or it can add an entirely opposite thought, as in "but," or "but indeed." [10] The latter definition appears to be the more relevant to its context in this section of Book 5. In light of the references to Book 3 and the beginning of Book 5, the *at* also implies that Venus's plea and Neptune's acceptance of Palinurus's life for the lives of the rest of Aeneas's men are what make this new journey different from the previous journeys described in Book 3 and Book 5.

---

[10] Charlton Lewis, ed., *A Latin Dictionary: Lewis and Short*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), 185-7.

The testimony of the textual tradition and these allusions to Book 3 and Book 5 make it reasonably clear that putting 777 before 778 is the more logical reading. The passage that line 777 refers to in Book 3 comes before the passage that line 778 refers to, and Virgil seems to mimic this order to establish a chronology that the end of Book 5 completes. In addition, because the allusions of these two lines appear to be so significant to understanding the context of Venus's plea to Neptune, Virgil might intend for the literal narrative of these lines to appear odd, though not necessarily contradictory, so that the reader will look for the implicit meaning of these lines. As shown in Book 3, Virgil needs only one line to describe a departing ship. Indeed, both line 777 and line 778 stand alone for that purpose in their respective passages in Book 3, so at least one of these lines is superfluous in its current context if one considers only the literal meaning of both of these lines.

In addition to being the *lectio difficilior*, the claim that Virgil intended for line 777 to come before line 778 also offers and explanation for the deviations in the textual tradition and the scholarship that claims that one of these lines might be a concordance interpolation. The scribe who transcribed the Palatinus could have had the same thoughts that our modern editors have had regarding the order of these two lines, and he could have switched the order of these two verses on the same grounds, because he might not have known that these lines directly refer to Book 3. He might also have been aware of the passage from the *Odyssey* that Berti claims parallels lines 777 and 778, and he could have switched the lines to parallel Homer. Indeed, the transcriber instead of Virgil could be directly imitating Homer. Regarding the Mediceus and Romanus, unless Virgil intended for line 777 to precede line 778, it is hard to imagine how these lines would

come to be in this order in both of these manuscripts, while it is easy to imagine how the

Palatinus might deviate from a prior tradition and invert these lines. Therefore, even

though the line order contained by the Mediceus and Romanus is odd, it appears to reflect

the logical order, given the textual tradition and the implicit meaning of Virgil's

references to Book 3 and the beginning of Book 5.

CHAPTER SIX

Note on Line 851

At the end of Book 5, Somnus envelops Palinurus, Aeneas's helmsman, and flings

him into the sea as a result of Neptune's agreement with Venus that one should die for

the rest of Aeneas's crew. While Somnus tries to take Palinurus from his post, Palinurus

says:

> "Aenean credam (quid enim?) fallacibus auris
> et *caelo,* totiens deceptus fraude sereni?"[1] (*Aen.* 5.850-1)
> [How, indeed, can I entrust Aeneas to deceitful winds and to the sky,
> myself having been deceived often by the fraud of a clear sky?]

In the second line, Ribbeck, Goelzer, Sabbadini, and Geymonat choose to use *caelo,*

while Conte and Mynors choose *caeli.* From the manuscripts, the Palatinus and *γ* support

the former reading *caelo,* while the Mediceus, Romanus, and *ω* support the reading *caeli.*

The difference between these two readings is one of implied punctuation and

clarity of syntax. With the reading *caelo,* an implied break in thought occurs after *caelo,*

and *credam* takes *caelo* as its second indirect object, the first being *auris.* In addition,

sereni becomes a substantive for *sereni caeli* and is a possessive genitive with *fraude.* A

strong caesura occurs between *caelo* and *totiens,* and so the change in thought between

"Aenean…caelo" and "deceptus fraude sereni" naturally flows with the scansion. This

translation for this reading is shown above.

With the reading *caeli,* on the other hand, the *et* functions to connect lines 50 and

51 as two complete sentences. *Deceptus* becomes a perfect, passive, indicative verb with

---

[1] Marius Geymonat, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 4th ed. (Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2008), 368.

an implied *sum*, and *caeli* agrees with *sereni*, and again both function as a possessive

genitive with *fraude*. This reading translates thus: "How, indeed, can I entrust Aeneas to

deceitful winds, since even I have been often been deceived by a clear sky?" In this case

the *et* must function outside of its usual range of meaning, because it must function as an

explanatory conjunction, describing the condition under which Palinurus asks his

question.

Of the two readings, *caelo* appears to be stronger, even though it has less support

from the textual tradition. It is a better reading because both Servius and Tiberius support

it;[2] it makes much more syntactical sense; it accounts for the discrepancy in the textual

tradition; and its position and function in the line are more natural to everyday speech.

With respect to the *testamenta*, the fact that both Servius and Tiberius support the reading

caelo means that it was a common enough reading in the late fourth to fifth century that

both of them accept it.

Regarding syntax, *caelo* allows for *et* to have its usual meaning, because line 850

begins a question, and the reading *caelo* allows the second line to be subsidiary to this

question. With *caeli*, on the other hand, *et* seems to connect two clauses: one that is a

question, and one that is a statement. In this reading, the sentence would flow better if *et*

would be eliminated entirely and the *deceptus* could function as a participle without an

implied *sum*. Of all the meanings of *et*, none of them seems to function as a transition

that would readily connect a sentence with a question to a sentence without a question.

Sidgwick tries to reconcile this odd use of *et* in his commentary:

---

[2] Geymonat, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 368.

850. *fallacibiis auris* must be dative after *credam*, and not ablative with *deceptus*; otherwise *credam* has no dative, and *quid enim* is awkwardly last in the sentence. That being so what is *et*?

The fact probably is that (as often happens in V.) the construction has become obscured by elaboration. The thought is: "why should I trust Aeneas to the deceitful breezes and the deceitful sea?" The last four words are however further elaborated into the line before us, 851.

Construe : 'Why should I trust Aeneas to the treacherous winds, and the sky whose false promise has so often fooled me?'[3]

Revealingly, even though his text contains *caeli*, through his attempt to explain how *et* functions he interprets the sentence as if it had *caelo*. In addition, in his explanation of the syntax of *et*, he says that *et* obscures the construction of the sentence. With the reading *caelo*, there is a clear sentence construction.

The textual tradition indicates that the original reading *caelo* would better explain how *caeli* comes to be in some manuscripts, because it appears to assimilate the cases of *caelo* and *sereni*. As a substantive, *sereni* stands for *sereni caeli* in the *caelo* reading already, and so it would not be difficult for a scribe to think that *caelo* should agree with *sereni* and assimilate the two. The transition from *caeli* to *caelo* would not come so naturally, because the scribe would have to add a dative singular into a sentence where only a dative plural exists.

An additional reason to support *caelo* as the better reading is that it does not require that two words agree with each other that are separated by three other words in a dialogue. In the dialogue between Somnus and Palinurus, no other line contains a modifier more than one word apart from the word that it modifies:

'Iaside Palinure, ferunt *ipsa aequora* classem,
aequatae spirant *aurae*: datur hora quieti.
pone caput, *fessosque oculos* furare labori.
ipse ego paulisper pro te *tua munera* inibo.'

---

[3] Arthur Sidgwick, ed., *Aeneidos liber 5,* (Cambridge: University Press, 1892), 75.

cui vix attollens Palinurus lumina fatur:
'mene *salis placidi* uultum *fluctusque quietos*
ignorare iubes? mene *huic* confidere *monstro*?
Aenean credam (quid enim?) *fallacibus auris*
et *caeli*, totiens deceptus fraude *sereni*?'[4] (*Aen.* 5.843-51 my emphasis)

Palinurus is portrayed trying to keep himself awake in this dialogue, and he is horrified at

the thought of leaving Aeneas to steer the ship himself, because the sky is so treacherous.

Thus he is not trying to wax poetic. The distance between *caeli* and *sereni* is out of place

in common dialogue. For all of these reasons, *caelo* appears to be the stronger reading.

---

[4] Gian Conte, ed., *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*, (Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 2011), 157.

CONCLUSION

While reviewing sources for my thesis, I had the fortune of working with a facsimile of the codex Mediceus. Through working with this copy of the manuscript, I saw a glimpse of the labor that scribes and scholars have undertaken throughout the centuries to pass down and establish versions of Virgil's texts as we have them today. The process of transcription for such manuscripts was long and cumbersome, and people took great pains to keep them from corruption. Scholars throughout the years then collated these manuscripts, an arduous task in itself. Finally and only after transcription, preservation, and collation, today's scholars can analyze these manuscripts in light of the best information, both literary and historical, that we have available.

Virgilian scholars have been analyzing manuscripts of the *Aeneid* to discern what Virgil originally wrote since the time of his first editors. In the context of this ancient conversation, I put forth my arguments in chapters one through six knowing that some of these textual problems may never be solved definitively. New manuscript evidence or new interpretive ideas could illuminate Virgil's text in a fresh way and add further clarity or complicate readings that have been established or long debated.

In summary of my claims, in Chapter One I argue for the use of *gressum* over *cursum* for line 162. All of the oldest manuscripts support *gressum*, the *lectio difficilior*. Although participles of the verb *gredior* are not typically associated with ships, some writings by Gellius show that it is possible to use these participles in such ways. The use of *gressum* in the context of line 162 also coincides with Virgil's allusion to Book 23 of

the *Iliad* where Nestor gives advice to his son. Gyas's use of *gressum* implies that he wants Mnestheus to take a careful, calculated course near to the rocks, so the use of g*ressum* complements the ethos evoked by the allusion.

In my second chapter, I weigh the readings *primusque* and *primus* in line 451. While *primus* fits well within the context of the line, I argue that *primusque* is the stronger reading. The Mediceus is the only one of the oldest manuscripts that supports *primus*, and it contains many errors surrounding this line. In addition to the strong support from the manuscript tradition, the sound of *Primusque* also coincides with the consonance of the harsh "c" sounds that are present in line 451.

Line 573 has three different readings that scholars debate: *Trinacrii*, *Trinacriae*, and *Trinacriis*. In my third chapter, I ague that *Trinacrii* is the strongest of the variants because of the weighty support of the oldest manuscripts and because, by modifying *Acestae*, it can associate both Acestes' men and their horses with Trinacria, if one takes *Acestae* to modify both *pubes* and *equis*. *Trinacriae* is not so strong a reading within the context of the line, and *Trinacriis* has no support from the manuscript tradition.

In Chapter Four, I argue for the reading, *numen,* in line 768. Within the context of Book Five, *numen* appears to be a more logical choice than *nomen* because of the strong presence of divine will in this book. While *nomen* is the *lectio difficilior*, it still makes logical sense within the line, and the error needed to cause such a variant reading would be small and would likely occur through thoughtless error rather than through thoughtful reflection and emendation.

Chapter Five presents the most significant variant in my thesis, and I argue that the original order of line 777 before line 778 is a stronger reading than putting line 778

before 777. Lines 777 and 778 both directly parallel lines in Book Three, and these lines in their respective contexts in Book Three occur before Aeneas travels to a new Troy instead of to a new Rome. The passage to which line 777 refers in Book 3 comes before the passage to which 778 refers, and Virgil seems to mimic this order to establish a chronology that the end of Book 5 completes. At the end of Book Five, Venus's conversation with Neptune and the appearance of the sea imply that Aeneas would merely reach a new Troy and not a new Rome if Neptune did not take Palinurus as a sacrifice for the rest of Aeneas's men.

Finally, in Chapter Six I argue for the reading *caelo* over the reading *caeli* in line 851. *Caelo* allows for the syntax of the sentence to flow smoothly, and as the *lectio difficilior*, it also explains the origin of *caeli*. While *caeli* has more support from the manuscript tradition, scribes could have assimilated *caeli* to agree with the *sereni* present in the same line. If *caelo* was not the original reading, a scribe would have to add an additional case into the sentence to achieve this reading, making *caelo* the more likely original.

While scholarly conversation over these lines of the *Aenied* does not end with my thesis, I hope that my arguments contribute to this conversation in a meaningful way that will affect how students and scholars read Book Five. Through my thesis, I also hope that some readers will come to a greater appreciation of the labor and debate involved in producing the editions of Virgil that we have today. Even though schoolbook versions of Virgil's text may appear clean and definitive, scholarly conversation exists behind every line. People must first understand this conversation so that they do not accept the words of the text uncritically at face value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berti, Emanuele. "Nota a Verg. Aen. 5, 777-778." *Materiali E Discussioni per L'analisi Dei Testi Classici*, no. 59 (January 1, 2008): 201–6.

Boerma, R. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera (O. C. T.)*, by R. A. B. Mynors. *Mnemosyne* 26, no. 1 (1973): 84–88.

Foley, John M. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Garcia, Luis. "Nota Critica A Verg., Aen. V 162-3." *Emerita*, no. 77 (December 2009): 331–34.

Günther, Hans-Christian. "Zwei Binneninterpolationen Im Zehnten Buch Der 'Aeneis' Und Das Problem Der Konkordanzinterpolation." *Hermes* 124, no. 2 (January 1, 1996): 205–19.

Haverfield, F. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Otto Ribbeck. *The Classical Review* 10, no. 8 (1896): 399.

Homer. *The Iliad*. Translated by Robert Fagles. New York, N.Y., U.S.A: Viking, 1990.

Horsfall, Nicholas. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Marius Geymonat. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 273–74.

Kenney, E. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by R. A. B. Mynors. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 60 (1970): 259–61.

Lewis, Charlton T., ed. *A Latin Dictionary: Lewis and Short*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.

Liberman, Gauthier. Review of *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*, by Gian Conte. *The Classical Review* 62, no. 1 (2012): 149–51.

Mackail, J. Review of *Virgile: Eneide, Livres I.-VI*, by Henri Goelzer. *The Classical Review* 41, no. 1 (1927): 25–26.

Maguinness, W. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by R. A. B. Mynors. *The Classical Review* 21, no. 2 (1971): 197–200.

Maguinness, W. S. "A New Text of Virgil." *The Classical Review* 21, no. 2. New Series (June 1, 1971): 197–200.

Mankin, David. Review of *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*, by G. B. Conte. *Religious Studies Review* 38, no. 2 (June 2012): 90.

Maro, Publius Vergilius. *Aeneid V*. Edited by R. D. Williams. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1981.

———. *Aeneidos liber 5*. Edited by Arthur Sidgwick. Cambridge: University Press, 1892.

———. *Énéide*. Edited by Henri Goelzer. 8. éd. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1956.

———. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Edited by Remigius Sabbadini. Vol. 2. Rome: Typis Regiae Officinae Polygraphicae, 1930.

———. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Edited by R. A. B. Mynors. Oxonii (Oxford): E Typographeo Clarendoniano (Clarendon P.), 1969.

———. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Edited by Otto Ribbeck. Chicago: Ares, 1985.

———. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Edited by Marius Geymonat. 4th ed. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2008.

———. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*. Edited by Gian Conte. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 2011.

———. *Virgil*. Edited by G. P. Goold. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Rev. ed. The Loeb Classical Library : Latin Authors 63. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Mustard, W. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Remigius Sabbadini. *The American Journal of Philology* 52, no. 1 (1931): 90–91.

Sandbach, F. Review of *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Remigius Sabbadini. *The Classical Review* 46, no. 1 (1932): 26–28.

Smith, Alden. *Virgil*. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Sparrow, John. *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.

Stégen, Guillaume, and R. A. B. Mynors. "Opera by P. Vergili Maronis." *Latomus* 30, no. 1 (January 1, 1971): 170–72.

Virgil. *Il Codice Mediceo Di Virgilio*. Edited by Biblioteca medicea laurenziana. Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1931.

West, D. Review of *The Aeneid of Virgil and P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, by Marius Geymonat and R. D. Williams. *The Classical Review* 26, no. 1 (1976): 34–36.

West, Stephanie. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer.* Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen Der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Für Forschung Des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Sonderreihe. Köln, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967.