

NOTES ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF *AENEID* 11 (APROPOS A RECENT COMMENTARY)*

Scott McGill's commentary on *Aeneid* 11 replaces K.W. Gransden's 1991 green-and-yellow. Gransden's book included 76 pages of commentary; McGill's 214 pages of commentary, pages that are moreover much denser than those of 1991. Already this mere numerical figure makes us understand how McGill's commentary constitutes a huge step forward compared to his predecessor. But it is not just a matter of quantity: McGill's work is better in quality from every angle. It is an excellent work, and, as regards the overall judgment on it, I agree with what Fiachra Mac Góráin says in his review, and in particular with his final words: "this is a welcome and enriching addition to the scholarship on *Aeneid* XI and will be widely consulted by readers at all levels".¹ This is also the first green-and-yellow dedicated to a book of the *Aeneid* that had already been commented on by Nicholas Horsfall (415 pages). McGill manages to make excellent use of Horsfall's commentary, always remaining independent in his choices and judgments, and thus producing a commentary that will be of fundamental help to both students and scholars.

The green-and-yellow series, unlike Horsfall's commentaries, is in fact intended primarily for university students. While fully aware of this fact, and while fully aware of the fact that the series has precise limits in terms of length, in this paper I would like to deal with some passages of book 11 where I really wished it had been possible for McGill to be able to find the space to add a sentence or two to his notes, or not to omit something from his apparatus. The areas to which I will turn my attention are the history of exegesis, the textual-critical discussions, and the contribution that the history of exegesis can make to a better understanding of Virgil's text. I will often find myself saying, "McGill should have added... XYX". I want to clarify that when I say "should", it is understood that I mean if he were writing for a series with a more expansive scope. It is true that sometimes I really want to say that McGill, in this green-and-yellow, would have done well to add a sentence or two, or not to omit something from his apparatus. But in general, my main intent is to demonstrate how a particular attention to the exegetical tradition can be useful for a better understanding of the text of the *Aeneid*. In other words, as I speak of McGill, I am addressing above all those future commentators of the *Aeneid* who will find themselves having more space at their disposal.

* SCOTT MCGILL, ed., *Virgil: Aeneid Book XI*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, 314 pp., £ 22.99, ISBN 978-1-107-41678-9.

¹ *Vergilius* 68, 2022, 206-8. I wish to thank Luigi Galasso, Peter Knox, and Fiachra Mac Góráin, for reading this paper and giving me valuable advice.

McGill's notes do not evince a particular interest in the history of exegesis. The editions of and commentaries on all of the *Aeneid* listed by McGill (p. 282) are the same as those listed by Tarrant in his 2012 commentary on *Aeneid* 12, with one exception: McGill does not refer to La Cerda's commentary.² This would already seem to be a tacit indication of a reduced interest in the exegetical tradition of the *Aeneid* relative to Tarrant, and McGill's critical choices throughout his commentary seem to confirm this.

The text printed by McGill is avowedly based on Conte's 2009 Teubner edition. As for the *apparatus criticus*, as McGill says, it "derives from Conte with a sprinkling of Mynors" (p. 33). McGill follows Tarrant in his 2012 commentary on *Aen.* 12 "in aiming to keep the apparatus brief". To that end, he adopts Tarrant's use of ϕ to signify three or more MSS in the ninth-century tradition, but not the majority (rather than listing the individual MSS). He also uses ^{ac} and ^c for readings of MSS before and after correction, respectively, instead of Conte's wider range of sigla to indicate particular sources for the correction. These choices are entirely appropriate for the purposes of the series. In the following notes, however, we will find something to say about some places in which McGill does not discuss interesting variants in the commentary that are mentioned in his own apparatus, and some places in which he shortens Conte's apparatus in a slightly unsatisfactory way.

Again, I want to emphasize that my notes are in a spirit of dialogue and expansion.

1. My first observation concerns the allusions to the previous tradition in the story of the raising of the trophy of Mezentius that occur at the beginning of the book. McGill is invariably excellent on any question of a literary nature, both in the introduction and in the commentary, and this will be my only observation on that subject.

In the notes to lines 1-28 I feel the lack of some observations that point out how the great importance attributed to the killing of Mezentius at the beginning of *Aen.* 11 alludes to the far greater importance that the killing of Mezentius had in the historiographic tradition, and in particular in the Catonian tradition, in which the war in Latium was divided into three phases: the second of these ended with the death of Turnus and the disappearance of Aeneas, while the third and last ended with the killing of Mezentius, who had become the supreme leader of the Italians, by Ascanius.

The Catonian tradition is conspicuously recalled to the reader's memory in verses 15-16 *haec sunt spolia et de rege superbo / primitiae*. McGill notes: "According to Macrobius 3.5.10-11, *primitiae* alludes to a story told in Cato's *Origines*, that the tyrannical and impious Mezentius demanded the Rutulians offer him the first fruits they usually gave to the gods". It would have been appropriate to give more emphasis to this detail, recalling first of all that Macrobius introduced the reference to the Catonian story to explain (rightly, even if too univocally) the epithet *contemptor diuum* applied to Mezentius in 7.648 (and Horsfall agrees in his commentary *ad loc.*). The story does

² In addition to the commentaries on the single book 11 (Gransden, Horsfall, Fratantuono, Gildenhard-Henderson), the editions of and commentary on the whole *Aeneid* cited are those of Conington, Conte, Geymonat¹, Goold, Henry, Heyne-Wagner, Mackail, Mynors, Page, Paratore, Perret, Ribbeck¹, and Williams. Both Tarrant and McGill would have done well to take into account also Rivero *et al.*

go back to Cato (*FRHist* 5 F9), but it is found, with many variations, even substantial ones, also in many other sources, including Varro.³

The word *primitiae* is used by Virgil precisely for the purpose of recalling to the reader's memory the Catonian tradition he discarded, and thereby suggesting a kind of retaliation: the tyrant who used to claim for himself the first fruits destined for the gods, now finds himself, with his spoils, to be the "first fruits" offered to the god of war. This was already noted, in some way, by Macrobius himself: *hinc pia illa insultatio sacerdotis*: "... haec sunt spolia et de rege superbo primitiae", *ut nomine contumaciae cui poenas luit raptas de eo notaret exuuias*, and it is certainly right (*pace* Horsfall *ad loc.*: "the reversal of Mez. 's *primitiae* does not compel assent").⁴

The reference to the historiographic version of the story of Mezentius activated by *primitiae* alerts the reader to find other allusions to the traditions rejected by Virgil.

(i) When in line 14 Aeneas says *maxima res effecta, uiri*, the reference to *Il.* 22.393 "great glory we have obtained (ἡράμεθα μέγα κῦδος), we have killed Hector luminous" must certainly be pointed out (the comparison was first noted by Ursinus). But the fact that where the Homeric Achilles said μέγα, the Virgilian Aeneas said *maxima* is not accidental. Heyne notes: "simpl. pro magna re peracta"; but on the contrary, *maxima* must maintain its value as an absolute superlative: as the continuation of Aeneas' words (*timor omnis abesto, / quod superest*) clarifies, Mezentius is here the most important enemy, decisive for the outcome of the war. The decisive importance here attributed to the killing of Mezentius is an allusion to the pre-Virgilian legend, in which it was the death of Mezentius, at the hands of Ascanius, that definitively put an end to the war in Latium.

(ii) Shortly before, in 5-8, the language used by Virgil suggests, albeit vaguely, the dedication of the *spolia opima*: in 7-8 *Mezenti ducis exuuias, tibi magne tropaeum / bellipotens*, and 15 *de rege superbo* suggest the idea that Mezentius is the supreme commander of the enemy forces, and the oak chosen for the trophy (5-6 *ingentem quercum ...*) recalls Jupiter Feretrius, to whom the *spolia opima* were offered.⁵ Conington states that the *spolia opima* "could not be won from Mezentius, as he was not the real leader of the enemy", but, on the one hand, in realistic terms, Mezentius can be seen as the supreme commander of that part of the Etruscans arrayed against Aeneas,⁶ on the other hand, in allusive terms, the reference is to the status and situation of Mezentius in the tradition that Virgil rejected.

³ Cf. Varro, *Ant. rer. hum.* II fr. 17 Mirsch; Dion. Hal. 1.65.2; Ov. *fast.* 4.879-96; Verr. Flacc. *fast. Praen.* CIL I² p. 316; Fest. p. 322, 14-17 L.; Plut. *quaest. Rom.* 45; OGR 15.

⁴ Cf. P.F. Burke, Jr., "Mezentius and the First-Fruits", *Vergilius* 20, 1974, 28-9. A. La Penna, "Mezenzio: una tragedia della tirannia e del titanismo antico", *Maia* 32, 1980, 3-30; at 8-9 is also unduly skeptical.

⁵ Cf. McGill himself, who cites, in addition to 10.421-3 (where see Harrison for resonances of *spolia opima*), Liv. 1.10.5-6, "where Romulus lays down the first Roman trophy, offered to Jupiter Feretrius, by an oak tree (sacred to Jupiter) on the Capitol": Romulus dedicates the first *spolia opima* having killed the leader of the Caeninenses (cf. 1.10.4 *regem... obtruncat...; duce hostium occiso*).

⁶ Cf. 10.449, where it is Pallas, as leader of the Arcadians, who hopes to be able to beat Turno *spoliis... raptis... opimis*; see Harrison *ad loc.*

2. At line 18 McGill prints *arma parate, animis et spe praesumite bellum*. This is one of six cases (listed at p. 33) in which McGill differs from Conte in terms of punctuation. Conte prints the line without comma after *parate*, and in his apparatus notes:

18 *animis dist. M²P², Tib.: aut animis aut parate (ita ut sit animis et spe praesumite bellum) dist. Seru.; dicolon abundans esse credo, uerbis κατὰ χιασμόν structis*

McGill records nothing in the apparatus; in the note *ad loc.* he says:

18 ‘prepare your weapons, with courage and hope anticipate the battle’. The punctuation follows Mynors and Horsfall rather than Conte. With *arma parate*, A. orders practical preparations in plain language in a soldierly setting (cf. Sal. *Iug.* 43.3 *arma tela equos ... parare*, Liv. 3.27.4 *dum is arma pararet*, 36.18.1 *arma telaque parant*). For *praesumo + animo/animis*, cf. V. Max. 1.5.3 and Sen. *Ep.* 91.8. For *animis = animose*, cf. 438 and 7.42. The elision in *parate, animis* does not tell against the punctuation; cf. e.g. 364, 392, 441, and 1.13. Different is 491 below, where *animis* belongs to one clause and *spe* to another.

This is a very satisfying note, even if it should also have been remembered, as Conte does, that Servius already knew both punctuations: *ARMA PARATE ANIMIS aut hypallage est pro “armis parate animos”: aut certe est mutanda distinctio, ut sit “animis et spe praesumite bellum”*. This second punctuation then has been much less popular than the first, being preferred only by Burman and Heyne (in his first three editions).

It is not possible to decide in favor of one or the other sense only on the basis of the construction of the line, even if in my opinion the sequence *arma parate animis* is more natural, the chiasmic structure of “theme and variation”, as Conte says in his apparatus (“dicolon abundans esse credo ...”), is more elegant, and Wagner (in Heyne-Wagner) certainly has a point when he says that, if Virgil had wanted to make *animis et spe* understood, he would have written *animisque et spe*.

In favor of *arma parate animis*, however, there are two elements that are given by the context, and that neither Horsfall nor McGill consider:

(i) The point of Aeneas’s speech lies in his command to provide for the burial of his companions: it is not appropriate that he should say that already now the soldiers should engage in the actual preparation of the weapons; instead, they must bury their comrades, but in the meantime (*interea*, 22) they must already keep their minds focused on preparing for battle. It wouldn’t make much sense to say “while you (concretely) prepare your weapons, bury your comrades”. If Aeneas had meant this, he would have ordered that part of the soldiers prepare their weapons and another part provide the funeral honors for the fallen and for Pallas.

(ii) This is confirmed by the continuation of Aeneas’s sentence, which is entirely aimed at considering the *psychological* preparation of the soldiers, and not at all at the material one, with *ne qua mora ignaros ... impediatur* (that is, “so that [when the time comes to go to battle] some delay does not hinder you, catching you unprepared”)

which corresponds to *arma parate animis*, and (*ne*) *segnis ... metu sententia tardet to spe praesumite bellum*.

The passage should be paraphrased, with Wagner³: “animi vestri defixi sint in armis parandis [...], ne, quando pugnandum erit, mora sit in vobis, et ne metus vos segnes reddat, toti estote in cogitatione futuri belli”.⁷

3. 55-7:

haec mea magna fides? at non, Euandre, pudendis	55
uulneribus pulsum aspicias, nec sospite dirum	
optabis nato funus pater.	

In line 56 McGill notes: “*pulsum* ‘routed’”. Among recent editors, Rivero *et al.* are the only ones to record in their apparatus Wakefield’s conjecture *fusum* (proposed in his “notula” *ad loc.*, but not printed in his text). This can be useful to signal to the reader that the use of the verb is slightly peculiar. Wakefield says: “‘*Pulsum vulneribus*’ quis alius dixit? aut quis legitimam esse putet locutionem? Malim ‘*fusum*’, nostris ex conjecturis”. Evidently, he thinks that *pudendis / uulneribus pulsum* = “routed by shameful wounds” is not an appropriate expression,⁸ and wants to substitute it with *pudendis / uulneribus fusum* = “killed by shameful wounds”, as his reference to *Ov. met.* 5.140-1 *Clytiamque Clanique / ... uulnere fudit* makes clear. However, he is well aware of the possibility that *pudendis uulneribus / pulsum* here could have another meaning, that is, “struck by shameful wounds”; he cites [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 208 *letifero stipite pulsus / ... iacuit* (sc. Eurytus), and above all he refers to *Aen.* 11.792-3 *meo dum uulnere ... / pulsa cadat*, which is indeed a precise and unequivocal parallel. It is for this reason – he says – that he does not introduce *fusum* into his text. After all, already Heyne had said that *uulneribus pulsum* = “πληγέντα, percussum”.⁹ I also think that here *pudendis uulneribus / pulsum* = “struck by shameful wounds”, a poetic use (*OLD* s.v. 1a), and I. Reineke, *TLL* 10.1.1017.62ff. rightly catalogues there this passage, while noticing that there is someone who would like it to mean “routed” (1018.1-4).

4. In 78-80 there are various problems:

multaque praeterea Laurentis praemia pugnae	
aggerat et longo praedam iubet ordine duci;	
addit equos et tela quibus spoliauerat hostem.	80

In 80 already Servius was uncertain whether the subject of *spoliauerat* was Aeneas, or rather Pallas (*uel Pallas, uel Aeneas: nam ambigue positum est*), while DSer-

⁷ Consultation of Forbiger would have helped. *arma parate animis* means, of course, “prepare your weapons with your souls”, and not *arma parate animose*, “prepare your weapons with courage/enthusiasm”, as understood instead by Conington, Henry, Page, and Gransden.

⁸ This is confirmed by consultation of *TLL* 10.1.1011.26-41.

⁹ Horsfall’s history of the matter is here unreliable, since he is misled by the erroneous treatment in *EV* s.v. *pello*, 4, 1988, 9-11, at 9. He considers both meanings of *pulsum*, and concludes: “Decision is neither possible nor necessary”.

vius refers to *alii's* opinion that the subject is certainly Pallas, *quia in antiquis disciplinis relatum est, quae quisque uirtute ornamenta consecutus esset, ut ea mortuum eum condecorarent*. McGill, in this vein (but without mentioning Servius), says that “it is preferable to understand an abrupt shift of subject, from A. to Pallas, so that the three-line description of the arms accompanying the cortège closes with those that reflect Pallas’ own *uirtus* and ‘triumphal’ military prowess”.¹⁰ However, I would not have omitted to mention in the apparatus the annotation “80 secl. Ribbeck” which we find in Conte. It could have been usefully preserved, to point out to the reader the particular difficulty of the line.¹¹ Ribbeck¹ *ad loc.*, while bracketing the line, noted: “80 legit Servius, sed deleturus fuisse videtur poeta, ut cuius vice v. 78 sq. et 83 sq. fecerit”, and Ribbeck² added: “an spurius est?”, with a reference to his own *Prolegomena critica*, Leipzig 1866, 86 (“Non dittographiam, sed spurium nunc habeo v. 80”). If the line is authentic, the change of subject from Aeneas (*addit*) to Pallas (*spoliauerat*) seems necessary to make sense of the very idea of “addition”: *addit* indicates that in 80 elements different from those of 78-9 are introduced; therefore, in 78-9 the spoils of war taken by all the Trojans during the previous day’s battle are generally indicated, while *equos et tela* in 80 are the spoils taken by Pallas himself. P.H. Damsté, “Annotationes ad Aeneidem”, *Mnemosyne* 38, 1910, 51-63, at 58-9, proposed moving 80 after 77, also in the view that it refers to the spoils taken by Pallas himself; according to Damsté, this would have the advantage of eliminating what he feels is a slight awkwardness in the passage between 72-7 and 78-9: “Scilicet nunc quidem, postquam Aeneam vestem alteram iuveni induisse, altera caput eius velavisse legimus, inconcinne sequitur: *multaque praeterea* L. p. p. aggerat, quasi permulta iam dedisse”. But *multaque praeterea ... praemia aggerat* does not necessarily have to suggest that the *praemia* are added to others already given in abundance: *multaque praeterea ...* means: furthermore (i.e. besides doing him the honor of veiling him with one of Dido’s robes) Aeneas accumulates many spoils etc.; cf. Horsfall on *praeterea*: “So V. passes (cf. 6.285) from the dressing of the corpse to the ordering of the ceremonial”, even if the comparison with 6.285 is not entirely adequate, as there the *monstra* of 285-9 are more naturally added to the *Somnia* of 282-4; but it is true that, in all other places where it occurs, the line-beginning *multaque praeterea* inaugurates a new subsection (4.464, 7.183).

5. 81-4:

uinxerat et post terga manus, quos mitteret umbris
 inferias, caeso sparsurus sanguine flammam,
 indutosque iubet truncos hostilibus armis
 ipsos ferre duces inimicaque nomina figi.

At 82 McGill records the variant *sparsuros* (“ γ^c et fere ω , Tib.”) in the apparatus, but does not mention it in the commentary. It certainly deserves a little explanation,

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Conington at 78: “These *praemia* seem to be spoils won generally in the battle of the preceding day, distinguished from those won specially by Pallas, which are mentioned v. 80”.

¹¹ McGill omits to point out candidates for deletion mentioned in Conte also at 172 (Brunck: see below), 179-81 (Ribbeck: see below), 607 (Ribbeck), 892b (Brunck).

given that it is printed by Rivero *et al.* Tiberius Claudius Donatus clearly presupposes it in his *interpretatio* (-us V in the lemma): *uinciri praecepit ea ratione, ut rogi Pallantei flammis sua sanguine spargerent*; it was preferred by Heinsius, and was the vulgate reading up to Heyne's third edition ("Sane *sparsuros* [...] elegantius est"; Wagner prints -us). Brunck is among the first to introduce *sparsurus* in the text,¹² with the decisive reference, in the note, to 10.519; cf. in fact 10.517-20:

Sulmone creatos
quattuor hic iuuenes, totidem quos educat Vfens,
uiuientis rapit, inferias quos immolet umbris
captiuoque rogi perfundat (-nt **M**) sanguine flammis. 520

In 10.520 there can be no doubt that *perfundat* is the correct reading, since "[t]he variant *perfundant* gives an unacceptably brusque change of subject after *immolet*" (Harrison *ad loc.*). And it is the echo of 10.520 in 11.82 that guarantees *sparsurus* in the second passage. T. Crane, "A Note on Aeneas' 'Human Sacrifice': *Aeneid* 10.517-20", *CW* 67, 1973-74, 176-7 supports both *perfundant* and *sparsuros*, with no apparent awareness of the difficulty of the change of subject in the first case, and with the only argument, in favor of *sparsuros*, that "the phrase *caeso sparsurus sanguine flammis* can only mean that Aeneas himself is about to sacrifice the captives, but in fact he is merely sending them to king Evander and there is no indication whether or not even he eventually kills them": it is probably to this objection that McGill tacitly, and rightly, replies with his note on *sparsurus*: "while A. does not directly sacrifice the prisoners, V. uses the active participle to lay the deed at his feet: he is the one killing the men, because he is the commander ordering it". Rivero *et al.* print *perfundat* in 10.520, but *sparsuros* in 11.82, referring in the apparatus to Hom. *Il.* 23.181-2 (irrelevant for deciding between *sparsurus* and -os), and to Enn. *Trag.* 296-7 J. *ipse* [sc. Atreus] *summ̄is sax̄is fixus asperis euisceratus, / latere pendens, saxa spargens tabo sanie et sanguine atro*, which can only serve to confirm that *sparsuros* might be linguistically appropriate. The variant *sparsuros* may have been generated by the "difficulty" identified by Crane, as well as by the influence of **M**'s *perfundant* in 10.520. It is also very probable that it responds to a desire to "exculpate" Aeneas, as Horsfall, though not mentioning the variant, seems to hypothesize in a confused note.

6. 85-8:

ducitur infelix aeuo confectus Acoetes, 85
pectora nunc foedans pugnis, nunc unguibus ora,
sternitur et toto proiectus corpore terrae;

ducunt et Rutulo perfusos sanguine currus.

Conte:

87 ante 86 transp. Tib., del. ed. Parmensis an. 1793; post hunc uersum lac. statuit Ribbeck

¹² Independently, Wakefield, too.

McGill notes nothing in the apparatus, but on 87 he says: “and he throws himself down headlong, full-length to the ground”. [...] Ribbeck posits a lacuna after this line, unnecessarily”. It is not enough to say that the lacuna is unnecessary: the reader may wonder *why* Ribbeck (in both of his editions) posited a lacuna after 87 (punctuating with a semicolon at the end of 85), since in his notes McGill does not say anything about any difficulty in the passage, nor does he explain the syntax of 85-8. The difficulty lies in the fact that the coordination of *ducitur* (Acoetes is supported because he is unable to walk alone, 85) with *sternitur* (*et* postposed, 87: Acoetes throws himself to the ground in pain) is not perfectly perspicuous. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena*, 85, in fact, observed: “Non clausit sententiam v. 87, querellas, ni fallor, Acoetis additurus”. Ribbeck is not the first to encounter difficulties in the construing of the passage. Already Tiberius Claudius Donatus read and interpreted a text in which 87 was transposed before 86, but in itself this does not lead to a real improvement of the syntax, unless one corrects at the same time *foedans* in 87 with *foedat*, as proposed in fact by O. Güthling, *Annotationes ad Vergilii Aeneidem*, Diss. Liegnitz 1877, 23-4:

ducitur infelix aevo confectus Acoetes;	85
sternitur et toto proiectus corpore terrae	87
pectora nunc foedat pugnis, nunc unguibus ora.	86
ducunt et Rutulo perfusus sanguine currus. ¹³	88

If you do not want to postulate a lacuna, or emend the text, the only solution will be the one already proposed by Heyne (with a comma at the end of 85, semicolon at the end of 86): “*Sternitur et*; pro, nunc – *nunc* stratus et proiectus humi”. That is: unhappy Acoetes (now) is led along, while he hits his chest and face; and (now) he falls to the ground, lying with his whole body. This solution was rejected by Wagner, who, in the apparatus, took up the words of Heyne (“Versum tamquam inficetum obelo notat Editor Parmensis”),¹⁴ adding: “Inficetus sane, ut antehac distinguebatur; neque enim recte iunguntur *Ducitur* et *sternitur*. Posui comma post *Sternitur*; alteri versus parti deest verbum auxiliare”; thus, putting a comma after *sternitur* and making a finite verb of *proiectus*, also Thiel and Gossrau. But Wagner himself changed his mind, returning to the previous punctuation, and therefore to Heyne’s interpretation, in Wagner³ (“prae doloris impatientia *etiam* proiciit se caputque foedat pulvere”, my emphasis).¹⁵ It is obvious that I am not saying that McGill should have written a complete history of the matter in his note: he should, however, have explained how he wanted this sentence, which has created so much difficulty over the centuries, to be construed. And, of all the proposals, Ribbeck’s idea of the lacuna is not to be underestimated at all.

¹³ This is the text that Güthling prints in his edition. In his dissertation, alternatively, Güthling considered the possibility of deleting 86 and 87.

¹⁴ *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera*, 2 voll., Parmae: in aedibus Palatinis, typis Bodonianis, 1793.

¹⁵ So also Conington: “The meaning evidently is that Acoetes, while being led along, keeps throwing himself on the ground, as Heyne rightly takes it”; but he still admits that “the expression is a little careless”. Wakefield on *Lucr.* 3.895 (vol. 2, London 1797) corrected *sternitur et* in *sternitur ex*; Peerlkamp proposed *sternitur aut*. Henry first proposes, punctuating with a semicolon at the end of 85, that *et* in 87 connects *foedans* to *proiectus* (thus printing *sternitur* in commas); then, however, he seems to accept Heyne’s interpretation.

7. 142-4:

Arcades ad portas ruere et de more uetusto
 funereas rapuere faces; lucet uia longo
 ordine flammaram et late discriminat agros.

McGill translates 144 *late discriminat agros* as “divides the fields a long way”. But “a long way” does not seem the appropriate way to render *late*: the notion of length is expressed here by *longo / ordine*, and *late* refers to the *width* of the light radiated by the torches. Here Gransden’s note (at 143-4) is better: “‘the way is lit up by the long line of torches making a wide path through the fields’: a vivid picture. *late* should be taken with *longo ordine* as a variant of *longe lateque* ‘far and wide’, as at *Georg.* 3.477 *saltus longe lateque uacantis*”. Cf. e.g. Conington: “*late discriminat* seems to mean that the procession as it moves in a bright line along the country casts a light on each side”. McGill was perhaps sidetracked by Horsfall’s translation, also unsatisfactory: “the road was lit with a long line of flames and far away divided the fields in its path”.

8. At 151 *et uia uix tandem uoci laxata dolore est* we have another example of an authoritatively attested variant, mentioned in the apparatus, but completely neglected in the commentary. Conte has the following note:

151 uoci M^X (ex uoces) P^ω, Tib. : uocis P^IRaiγ : om. *Seru. ad Aen.*
 12, 47 dolorest MP (corr. M^A) : dolori est *Seru. ad Aen.* 12, 47; uocis
 ... dolori est *Heinsius non male*

In his apparatus, McGill simplifies it like this:

151 uoci M^cP^{ac}ω, Tib. : uocis P^cRi

From this, however, it is not clear what the original reading of **M** was, that is *uoces*, a reading that clearly points in the direction of *uocis*. Conte also reports that *Seru. ad Aen.* 12.47 omits the word and has the variant *dolori est* at the end of the line, as well as the arrangement of Heinsius *uocis ... dolori est*, which attracts the approval of Conte (“non male”). In the commentary, McGill says:

laxata dolore: *dolore* is a kind of abl. of separation; Evander’s grief abates enough to allow him to speak. Claudian imitates at Claud. *Hon. VI cos.* 265-6 *ergo ubi praeclusae uoci laxata remisit / frena dolor.*

The idea of *dolore* as “a kind of abl. of separation” derives from Horsfall: “here the breathless sobbing of grief (*dolore*; abl. not of cause but if anything of separation) subsides enough to yield passage (*uia laxata*) for breath and speech (*uoci*)”. For *dolore* as an ablative of separation with *laxata*, examples such as Cic. *Tusc.* 1.44 *cum laxati curis sumus*, Cato 7 *libidinum uinculis laxatos* could be cited. So, here the translation would be: “and in the end with difficulty the way to the voice was freed

from the grief". A certain difficulty remains, considering that (i) it would be odd if Virgil were to introduce Evander's speech, which is full of dolor, by first saying that the path for speech had been freed from dolor; and (ii) the expression *uia ... uoci laxata ... est* would seem at first sight to suggest rather the sense of "a way was open to the voice" (this is how *OLD* s.v. *laxo* classifies our passage, under 2 "To lay open, open up (a cavity, passage, outlet, etc.)"; cf. *TLL* 7.2.1072.22-33 for *laxare claustra, portam* sim.), and this would make it more difficult to understand *dolore* as an ablative of separation rather than an ablative of cause. From this, the most widespread explanation of the passage, according to which *dolore* would be ablative of cause with *uix*: "and in the end, with difficulty because of the grief, a way was opened to the voice" (cf. for example Wagner: "prae dolore vix patefacta est via voci ad pronuntianda scilicet, quae ille loqui volebat",¹⁶ Gossrau, Bryce, Page).

By adopting, instead, the solution of Heinsius, *et uia uix tandem uocis laxata dolori est*, the translation would be unequivocal, even if the concept may sound a bit sophisticated (cf. Heyne: "Heinsius etiam argutius quid suspicatur"): "and in the end, with difficulty, the way of the voice was opened to his grief", that is, in the end Evander was able to express his grief not only with gestures, tears and moans (149-50), but also in words (for the pain that "speaks", cf. e.g. *Ov. her.* 12.133 *o iusto desunt sua uerba dolori, met.* 10.506 *nec habent sua uerba dolores*, *Sen. Med.* 139-40 *melius, a melius, dolor / furiose loquere, Phaedr.* 995 *uocem dolori lingua luctificam negat*).¹⁷ The variant *uocis* by itself (i.e., even retaining *dolore*) deserves consideration, and in fact has been printed by various editors, including Jahn, Thiel, Gossrau, Conington, and Mackail.

Conington, while considering each of the readings "sufficiently good", decided in favor of *uocis* on the basis of the comparison with *Lucr.* 6.1148 *ulceribus uocis uia saepta coibat* ("obstructed by sores the way of the voice was blocked"), "as *saepta* contrasts well with *laxata*". The phrase *uocis uia* will also appear (e.g.) in *Ov. met.* 6.355, 14.498, *Sil.* 17.440, and cf. *Aen.* 7.533-4 *udae / uocis iter*, *Ov. met.* 2.830, 9.370, *Ib.* 570, *Stat. Theb.* 7.360-1, *Val. Fl.* 2.455, *Mart.* 11.91.11. Obviously, Virgil could very easily allow himself a banal variation of the phrase as would be the case with *uoci* here, but the certainty of Horsfall ("no doubt as to what V. wrote"), and the silence of McGill, do not appear justified.

Among the later imitations of the line, not limited to the Claudian passage quoted by McGill, [*Quint.*] *decl.* 9.7 *ubi primum lux rediit laxatumque est iter uoci* supports a text with *uoci*. In *Stat. Theb.* 5.606-7 the MSS read: *tandem laxata dolore / uox inuenit iter gemitusque in uerba soluti*; this text corroborates *dolore* as ablative of separation in our passage ("finally the voice, freed from pain, found a way"), but even there Heinsius (on *Ov. her.* 15.113) conjectured *dolori*, followed by most editors, including Hall and Shackleton Bailey ("At last her voice was loosed to find a passage for

¹⁶ P. Wagner, *Lectionum Vergilianarum libellus*, *Philologus* Suppl. 1, Göttingen 1860, 359. Henry seems to misunderstand Wagner's explanation.

¹⁷ An elaboration of Heinsius's arrangement on the basis of these passages was proposed by Peerlkamp: *et sua uix tandem uox est laxata dolori*.

her sorrow and her moans dissolved into words”, Shackleton Bailey). Cf. also Claud. *rapt.* 3.179-80 *postquam suspiria tandem / laxauit frenosque dolor.*

9. 166-8:

quod si immatura manebat
mors gnatum, caesis Volscorum milibus ante
ducentem in Latium Teucros cecidisse iuuabit.

Conte:

168 iuuabit $\text{P}\omega\gamma^1$ (-bat γ), *Seru.* : iuualet $\text{M}\text{b}^2\text{r}^2\gamma^2$, *Tib.* : iuuaere $\text{R}\alpha$

McGill:

168 iuuabit $P\omega$, *Seru.* : iuuabat γ^{ac} : iuuaere R

It is obvious that in McGill’s note the reading of **M** is missing. This is all the more remarkable since the reading of **M**, *iuualet*, enjoyed a certain editorial success, at least in the nineteenth century: Jahn¹, Wagner (in Heyne-Wagner and in his three school editions),¹⁸ Thiel, Peerlkamp, and Gossrau¹ print it. Conington prefers *iuuabit*, noting that with *iuuabit* “the meaning will be that Evander is glad that Pallas has died as joint general of the Trojans, after slaying thousands of the enemy”; with *iuualet*, “Evander will say that he would rather Pallas had died when the Trojan victory was consummated”. He concludes that “[t]here can be little doubt that the former is the more natural expression for the bereaved father, and more in accordance with the lines which follow”. Indeed, if the question is posed in these terms, there can be no doubt that *iuuabit* is the correct reading, as it is not plausible that, in the context, Evander expresses disappointment at what could have happened and did not happen. In reality, Wagner was trying to defend *iuualet* by giving 166-8 a slightly different meaning. According to Wagner, the meaning of Evander’s words would be this: Trojans, I do not want to accuse you or the pact I have made with you; on the contrary, if it was destined for Pallas to die, I would like him to have brought you an even greater advantage; for indeed I would dare to say that nothing could have happened to him more honorable than such a funeral, which was reserved for him by Aeneas and his companions. In other words, 166-8 would express no displeasure on Evander’s part: Evander would say that if Pallas was destined to die, he would even be *happy* if he died (*iuualet* should have a lot of emphasis) – but after leading the Trojans to victory and having killed thousands of enemies. However, this is convoluted and unconvincing.¹⁹ So, I too believe that *iuuabit* is the right reading; however, I believe that **M**’s reading should have been mentioned (certainly in the apparatus!) and briefly discussed in the commentary.

According to Horsfall, “[i]t is hard to explain the origin or defend the sense of **M**’s *iuualet*”. As for its origin, Conington attributes it to “transcriptional confusion” (*B* and *R* could be easily confused in capital script, leading fairly easily to *IUVARET*

¹⁸ Cf. also Wagner, *Lectio*, 359.

¹⁹ Specific objections to Wagner’s interpretation, also of a linguistic nature, in Jahn² (who however, incongruously, prints *iuualet*).

from *IVVABIT*); but it is actually easy to understand that there are also other reasons behind the introduction into the text of *iuaret*: that Evander says that the death of his son, as heroic, will please him may have seemed excessive in the light of his torment; and above all some readers will have been annoyed by the fact that it appears as a fact that Pallas led the Trojans to Latium “having killed thousands of Volsci”, when the Volsci in book 10 had no part in the battle, while they will be introduced later in book 11. Hence the desire to relate Evander’s words to something that was yet to happen.

10. 169-71:

quin ego non alio digner te funere, Palla,
 quam pius Aeneas et quam magni Phryges et quam 170
 Tyrrhenique duces, Tyrrhenum exercitus omnis.

McGill does not report anything in his apparatus; Conte has these notes:

170-171 et² – omnis deleri maluisset Heyne 171 Thyrrhenum]
 equitumque Bentley : Tuscumque Bothe

Conte’s notes point to the serious discomfort that the passage has brought to the interpreters. From McGill’s commentary, which does not mention any of the interventions mentioned by Conte, the difficulty of the passage does not emerge clearly enough. According to Rivero, it is clear that something is not right in these lines, either because of a bad transmission, or because Virgil himself left the text just sketched.²⁰ 170 presents a strange reiteration of the prosaic (*et*) *quam* and a harsh brachylogy; 171 presents the first *-que* of a correlation (*Tyrrhenique*), but not the second, as one would expect – hence the attempts to introduce a plural genitive with *-que* by Bentley (*equitumque*; cf. 598 *Etruscique duces equitumque exercitus omnis*)²¹ and Bothe (*Tuscumque*, which would have been replaced by a gloss).²² Heyne proposed bracketing the last two words of 170 (the only case in Virgil in which a line ends with the words *et quam*) and all of 171. Ribbeck does not bracket them, but, in his second edition, writes in his apparatus “et merito displicent,” with reference to *Prolegomena*, 85, where he blamed line 170 for the expression *magni Phryges* (“Honorifice Teucri, Troiani dicuntur, contemptim ab inimicis Phryges”), suggesting that the only authentic words in the line are *quam pius Aeneas*.

Wagner (in Heyne-Wagner) defended at least 171 referring, for the problem of the “asymmetrical omission of the second *-que*” (Harrison at 10.313-14), to his note on *ecl.* 4.6 *iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna*, where he observed: “Tenendum enim, repetitum vocabulum vel Verbum interdum vim habere repetendae copulae”. There are examples of this construction both with *-que* and with *et*. This is also the ex-

²⁰ L. Rivero García, review of L. Fratantuono, *A Commentary on Aeneid XI*, *Emerita* 79, 2011, 199-202, at 199.

²¹ The conjectures to Virgil of Bentley are found in “Vergilius Benteleianus”, *Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Quedlinburg*, Quedlinburg 1879, 1-8.

²² F.H. Bothe, *Virgilius Virgilianus sive Quaestio de Virgilii locis quibusdam dubiis aut corruptis*, Heidelberg-Speyer 1821, 22.

planation offered by McGill: “the repetition of the proper name [...] takes the place of a balancing second *-que*”. The examples with *-que* cited by Wagner and then taken up by the exegetical tradition, and by McGill, are *Aen.* 7.75-6 *regalisque accensa comas, accensa coronam / insignem gemmis*, 10.313-14 *huic gladio perque aerea suta, / per tunicam squalentem auro latus haurit apertum*, 11.641 *ingentemque animis, ingentem corpore et armis* (we can add 5.602 *Troiaque nunc pueri, Troianum dicitur agmen*). It can (and perhaps should) be debated, however, whether these passages are truly adequate as parallels for 171, where the construction seems more difficult. According to Rivero, for example, these are not true parallels, because in each of the other passages there is a more reasonable explanation (even if he does not elaborate).

11. 172-5:

magna tropaea ferunt quos dat tua dextera leto;
tu quoque nunc stares immanis truncus in armis,
esset par aetas et idem si robur ab annis,
Turne. sed infelix Teucros quid demoror armis? 175

Conte: 172 ferant **PRa?bdinxγ** (corr. γ¹) hunc u. secl. Brunck
173 armis codd., Seru., Tib., Prisc. 16, 11 : aruis Heinsius, Bentley;
truncus in armis i.e. tropaeum ex Turni spoliis constitutum
175 armis] ultra Heinsius

McGill: 172 ferant **PRø** 173 armis codd., Seru., Tib., Prisc. 16, 11 :
aruis Heinsius, Bentley 175 armis] ultra Heinsius

The elimination of Conte’s reference to the deletion of 172 by Brunck is slightly inappropriate, since in the commentary McGill does not say anything that would make the reader understand how problematic the interpretation of this line has been: “Obscura est huius versus sententia” (Heyne).²³ McGill writes: “quos: the antecedent is an understood *eorum*”. I also believe that this is indeed the correct interpretation (so Heyne (dub.), Wagner, and most of the commentators), but for the inexperienced reader it should perhaps have been pointed out that a causal connection with the preceding lines must thus be implied (e.g. *nam*), as on that understanding the line would explain why Evander says that he would not know how to honor his son with a more worthy funeral than Aeneas, the Trojans and the Etruscans are already doing;²⁴ that the line would therefore refer to the trophies already mentioned in 83-4 *indutosque*

²³ Heyne (V.L.) expressed doubts about the authenticity of the line: “Neque sane Virgilianus esse videtur, saltem non satis elaboratus; etsi eo carere sententia vix potest”. Indeed, deleting only line 172, as Brunck did (“Virgilio non satisfactum, quod versus hic longe insulsissimus diversis typis excusus fuerit; prorsus expungi debebat”), is impossible, because its presence is necessarily required by what follows, and in fact Peerlkamp deletes not only 172, but also the following three lines.

²⁴ For this, it would be appropriate to punctuate with a colon at the end of 171, as Rivero *et al.* do.

In adapting Conte's apparatus, McGill chooses to ignore that "179-181 *meritis – imos* secl. Ribbeck". Certainly Conte did not record the deletion proposed by Ribbeck because he considered it a probable solution, and maybe not even a possible one. It is clearly a way to draw the reader's attention to the difficulty that these lines can present to the reader. Ribbeck's motivations and a brief history of the issue can be read in the apparatus of Ribbeck²: "*meritis ... imos spuria esse suspicor: non ... imos inepta esse iudicavit Peerlkampus, ac ne finita quidem est sententia. itaque unum versum excidisse suspicati sunt Brunckius et Heynius*".

The difficulties arose from the misunderstanding of the expression *uitae gaudia*, which was understood as: "the joys of life", that is, with *uitae* as a genitive; in fact, it is a dative, as seen by Wagner in Heyne-Wagner. This is well explained by McGill *ad* 180 *non uitae gaudia quaero*. The note to 181 *perferre*, however, only says: "of bringing news or word (*OLD* 2 b)". In fact, it should be made clear to the reader that the implied object of *perferre* is *gaudia*: "I'm not looking for this joy [i.e. the knowledge that Turnus has been killed by Aeneas] for my life, nor would it be lawful, but to bring it [sc. that joy] to my son in the shades below". If this is not specified, the reader might believe that McGill follows (e.g.) Williams in assuming that "[p]erferre is used absolutely ('make a report', take the news'), not with *gaudia* as its object, as some suggest", which is certainly incorrect. It should also be noted that *quaero* is constructed first with an object complement (*gaudia*) and then with an infinitive clause.

A reference to *Aen.* 4.387 *audiam et haec Manis ueniet mihi fama sub imos* is also missing here, with a note on the Homeric and Pindaric notion that news about the living somehow reaches the dead in the Underworld.

13. On 283-4 *quantus / in clipeum adsurgat*, McGill notes: "'how mightily he rises up to his shield'. The meaning seems to be that A. towers on the battlefield with his shield raised high, which he uses as an offensive weapon, as at 12.712 and 12.724. With the phrase, cf. 9.749 *sublatum alte consurgit in ense* and 12.728-9 *et corpore toto / alte sublatum consurgit Turnus in ense*". McGill recognizes the difficulty of the sentence ("[t]he meaning seems to be..."), but here too a hint at alternative possibilities should perhaps be given. The reference to 12.710-12 and 723-4 goes back to Wagner. Heyne explained the phrase as meaning that Aeneas, raising his shield, threw his spear, evidently having taken a run and as if mid-leap ("at h. 1. in clipeum, quia elato in altum clipeo hastam vibrat: namque is naturalis motus est, et ad corpus tuendum valet"); the rest of line 284, *quo turbine torquat hastam*, would then follow on from *quantus in clipeum adsurgat*. Wagner, on the other hand, believes that the reference is to hand-to-hand battle, in which soldiers used to raise the shield to strike with the sword, "quod multae cominus pugnantium imagines ostendunt", and also to apply pressure with the umbo of the shield itself. Virgil would in that case speak, with a sort of hysteron proteron, first of the hand-to-hand combat, and then of the one from afar with spears. Hence Wagner's reference to the two passages in book 12 which describes the hand-to-hand fight that follows the throwing of the spears. Wagner's interpretation is taken up by Page, who speaks of the shield as "used not merely as a defensive but as an offensive weapon", and then by Williams, according to whom "The shield could be used as an offensive weapon for thrusting". As one can see, along the way the interpreters tend to forget that the main function of the raised

shield is still to defend the body of the attacking soldier, and only secondarily does it also have the function of an offensive weapon. In any case, as we said, a mention of alternative interpretations would be appropriate, also to explain the translation of Horsfall: “Believe one who made trial how mightily he cut at *my* shield on the rise, with what a spin he delivers his spear” (my emphasis), which does not seem consistent with what he says in his note.

14. 354-6:

... nec te ullius uiolentia uincat
 quin natam egregio genero dignisque hymenaeis 355
 des pater, et pacem hanc aeterno foedere iungas.

Conte: **356** iungas **MP**ογ, *Tib.* (cf. *Aen.* 8, 56 al.) : firmes **M^ARakr**,
Seru. hic et ad u. 363 (cf. u. 330)

McGill’s apparatus adapts Conte’s, but eliminates the two observations that Conte makes in parentheses, namely, for *iungas*, “cf. 8.56 al.”, and, for *firmes*, “cf. u. 330”. Surely this kind of annotation may be superfluous in an apparatus such as McGill’s, who has the commentary at his disposal to clarify the textual questions. In the commentary, however, no mention is made of the variant *firmes*. There, the reasoning that Conte implied with his two parentheses should have been explicated. As regards the first parenthesis, namely that, on the one hand, the iunctura *pacem ... iungas*, which could sound slightly “unexpected”, has parallels, at any rate for the general sense of *iungo* = “stipulate”, in the *Aeneid* (cf. precisely 8.56 *foedera iunge*, but also 4.112, 7.546, 12.822), and, as for the sense of *pacem iungere*, there are parallels in Livy (1.1.6 *Latinum pacem cum Aenea, deinde adfinitatem iunxisse tradunt*, and elsewhere: see *TLL* 7.2.660.52ff., 68-70). On the second point, the variant *firmes* is not only apparently more “appropriate” (“*f. firmes, quod longe melius ...*”, Heyne, while printing *iungas*), but also more banal, and therefore *facilior*, and was probably born as a phonic echo of the end of line 330 *foedera firment*; see Wagner’s note in Heyne-Wagner’s apparatus.

15. 357-9:

quod si tantus habet mentes et pectora terror,
 ipsum obtestemur ueniamque oremus ab ipso:
 cedat, ius proprium regi patriaeque remittat.

Conte: **359** cedat *dist.* **M¹**, *Asper ap. Seru.* (“*id est ‘hanc ueniam oremus ut cedat’*” *DSeru.*), *Tib.* : cedat ius *continuat* **P**, *et hanc distinctionem agnoscit DSeru.*

McGill chooses to omit from his apparatus the note of Conte on the punctuation of 359, controversial since ancient times. It would have been better to keep the note, and hint at it in the commentary, since on the one hand various editors preferred not to punctuate after *cedat*, and on the other hand Horsfall’s note demonstrates that to punctuate after *cedat* is in no way necessary. In fact, I would say that for an ancient

reader, it would be difficult to intuit a sense pause after *cedat*. When reading aloud the phrase makes perfect sense until one comes to *remittat*.

No mention in the commentary even of the possibility of intending *ius proprium* not as referring to “his own right”, i.e. Turnus’ right to the bride Lavinia, “but rather to” “their proper rights”, i.e. to give Lavinia in marriage to whomsoever Latinus desires and the people of the country approve” (Williams, my emphasis).²⁷ In the first case, Drances would speak with sarcastic reverence: “give up [what he thinks are] his own rights to king and country”, as McGill basically means, seeing these words of Drances as “a way of bringing out Turnus’ arrogance and presumption”. However, given the extreme delicacy of the question of what exactly Turnus’s “rights” were regarding his marriage to Lavinia – the narrator suggests that Latinus had not formally promised his daughter to Turnus, while Aeneas’s enemies see things differently (Juno at 10.79, Amata at 7.365-6, Allecto at 7.423-4) –, one might think that this could be a bit too risky a move by Drances: with this sarcasm Drances would risk dangerously being misunderstood, both by Turnus and by the listeners; and with him perhaps even Virgil would risk being misunderstood by readers (as demonstrated by Sabbadini’s note: “*ius*, Lavinia era stata promessa prima a Turno”).²⁸ The explanation of *ius proprium* as “their own right”, therefore, cannot be excluded, and even so the words of Drances would have their point: “Invidiose omnia haec dicta sunt, quod petit ab Turno, ut concedat ea, quae non potest ullo iuris nomine sibi vindicare” (Gossrau). It does not seem to me that *patriaegue* would be in this case “incomprehensible” (Horsfall): as Drances can say that Turnus must give back to the king and to the fatherland his own right (which therefore – it follows – would properly belong to the king and to the fatherland), so in the same way, he can say that Turnus must give back to the king and the fatherland their own right.²⁹

16. 415-18:

quamquam o si solitae quicquam uirtutis adesset!	15
ille mihi ante alios fortunatusque laborum	
egregiusque animi, qui, ne quid tale uideret,	
procubuit moriens et humum semel ore momordit.	

McGill: 418 semel *M^oγ*, *Seru.*, *Tib.* : simul *M^{ac}R* : semul *P*

In his note McGill says: “*semel*: corrupted in some MSS to the banal *simul*; it means here ‘once and for all’ (*OLD* 3)”. Although I absolutely agree with the choice of the variant, this is a slightly misleading way of accounting for the manuscript tradition, as the trivialization *simul* is attested not exactly “in some MSS”, but in all late

²⁷ Scholars following this interpretation include Tiberius Claudius Donatus, La Cerda, Heyne, Peerlkamp, Gossrau, Conington, W.W. Fowler, *The Death of Turnus: Observations on the Twelfth Book of the Aeneid*, Oxford 1919, 42, Mackail. Not Page, as Horsfall wrongly says.

²⁸ In *L’Eneide di Virgilio commentata da R. Sabbadini, Libri X, XI e XII*, Torino 1888, 77.

²⁹ *regi patriaeque* had indeed created problems, and Heyne, praised by Brunck and Peerlkamp, had suggested reading *regique patrique* instead: “*patriaegue* quam commode memoretur, non dicam: accipiendum de populo Latinorum et de salute publica” (Heyne); “Ergo sane commode” (Wagner).

antique MSS, being also present in **P** in the archaizing variant *semul*. The latter form should have been explained in the commentary. *simul* is printed by Perret, and *semul* is preferred by some editors (including Ribbeck¹, Sabbadini, and Geymonat), who also print in parallel, instead of *momordit*, *memordit* on the basis of **P**^{ac}, which has *memordet*. These textual choices are evidently intended to enhance a supposed “archaic” lexical patina of Turnus’s speech. Here *simul/semul* should indicate the simultaneity of the fall with the onset of death itself (“celui-là... qui... est tombé mourant, la face contre terre, mordant du même coup le sol de ses dents”, Perret). The meaning, in reality, requires *semel*, “once and for all” (the interpretation of Servius, *semel = cito, confestim* is not justified). As for *memordit* (which McGill does not report in the apparatus), Sabbadini and Geymonat refer to Gell. 6.9.1-15, who cites passages by Ennius, Atta, Nigidius, Laberius, but nevertheless does not cite this presumed Virgilian occurrence of the form (cf. *TLL* 8.1485.5-13).³⁰ Analogous archaic forms are attested by **P** and printed by Sabbadini and Geymonat also at other points of Turnus’s speech, e.g. at 427 *lussit* for *lusit*; 430 *missere* for *misere*; 436 *exossa* for *exosa*.

17. 425-7:

multa dies uariique labor mutabilis aeui	425
rettulit in melius, multos alterna reuisens	
lusit et in solido rursus Fortuna locauit.	

McGill translates 425: “A day and the changeable labor of inconstant time”; to avoid misunderstandings, *dies* should here be better translated as “time” (*OLD* s.v. 10, *TLL* 5.1.1032.50-77), as indeed McGill’s following note implies: “*uariique labor mutabilis aeui* builds upon *dies* in theme and variation”. This should be the correct way of understanding the passage: in this way, Virgil mentions two different things – underlined by the anaphora *multa ... multos* – which can reverse the situation of those in difficulty, namely the action of time and the whim of Fortune. However, the passage presents difficulties that both McGill and Horsfall before him would have done better not to overlook. First of all, “*labor aeui* is difficult”, as Conington says. According to Heyne, “*labor aeui* pro aevo simpliciter cum notione aerumnae, quae in aevo toleratur adiecta; die et aevo, h. e. temporis vicissitudine multae res mortalium in melius mutantur [...]. *labor πόνος*, aerumna, *mutabilis*, in meliorem fortunam mutari solitam”. This reference by Heyne to the presence in *labor aeui* of the concept of the “fatigue”, evidently human, which is accompanied by the “fatigue” of the time that passes by, is developed by Forbiger: “*labor varii aeui* videtur pro aevo, in quo varii labores tolerantur, in quo varia fortuna iactamur, ut sensus sit: Multi labores, qui antea irriti fuerunt, postea tamen optatum habuerunt eventum”. So too Wagner in his three school editions: “*var. l. m. ae.*, labor alio tempore alius, i. e. qui ante irritus fuit, post autem optatum habet eventum”. In this case, the two things that Virgil would oppose would not be so much the passage of time and Fortune, but the effort that

³⁰ *memordit* is approved by S. Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina*, Roma 1978, 124 n. 14. On Sabbadini’s attitude towards Virgilian archaisms, see F. Stok, “Sabbadini editore di Virgilio”, in F. Stok, P. Tomè, eds., *La filologia classica e umanistica di Remigio Sabbadini*, Pisa 2016, 241-58, at 246.

man exerts in the passing of time and Fortune, and this is also Conington's preferred solution. The expression *labor aevi* is unprecedented; the subsequent imitations have a complexity similar to that of Virgil. Val. Fl. 2.618 *aduersi longus labor ... aevi* is cited by Peerlkamp in support of the interpretation of *labor ... aevi* as "the passing of time" ("*labor aevi* est perpetuus ille motus aevi, qui numquam cessat, adeo ut aevum neque stet neque quiescat", that is, the interpretation accepted by McGill),³¹ with the comparison with another passage that Valerius certainly keeps in mind, *Aen.* 3.414-19, cf. 415 *tantum aevi longinqua ualet mutare uetustas*; but also in the passage of Valerius the "fatigue" of time is identified with "the physical activity of the sea that causes erosion" (Smith *ad loc.*).³² Similarly, in Stat. *silu.* 5.1.228-9 *nil longior aetas / carpere, nil aevi poterunt uitare labores* in the "labors of time" that cannot spoil Priscilla's limbs, the notion of the destructive activity of the agents of decomposition is inherent.³³ Perhaps Heyne's explanation is the one that best frames the complexity of Virgil's passage: the notion of time that "struggles" to pass alludes to the "effort" men make in trying to change their situation.

Another difficulty of the passage lies in the exact meaning of 426-7 *multos alterna reuisens / lusit et in solido rursus Fortuna locauit*. It seems quite clear that Virgil, saying *lusit* and *in solido rursus ... locauit* is not referring to two different and opposite actions of Fortune ("Fortune has deceived many [making them from happy, miserable] and then again placed them in safety"),³⁴ but that once again we are faced with a case of "theme and variation" ("Fortune has deceived many [making them from miserable, happy] and [in doing so] has once again placed them in safety").³⁵ However, in this case, Peerlkamp is not entirely wrong in finding it strange that, to refer to a change for the better, Virgil says that *Fortuna multos... / lusit*: "Sed quos *Fortuna* reuiscit, hos reddit beatos, atque adeo non *ludit*. *Ludit eos*, quos secundis rebus gaudentes, subito mutata in miserias detrudit. Nam *lusit* significat *fefellit, decepit*". No one will believe that it is necessary to change, with Peerlkamp, *lusit* into *iuuit*, but, as in many other cases, the difficulty he notices is real. Apparently, Virgil exceptionally used the verb *ludere* with a positive meaning, creating an almost paradoxical phrase, as Heyne noted: "*ludere*, praeter expectationem aliquid inferendo, mutando: plerumque in deterius: h. l. in melius".³⁶

18. 471-2:

(Latinus) multaque se incusat qui non acceperit ultro
Dardanium Aenean generumque ascuerit urbi.

³¹ So also Gossrau.

³² A.H. Smith, *A Commentary on Valerius Flaccus Argonautica II*, D. Phil. thesis, Oxford 1987.

³³ Cf. also Claud. *In Eutrop.* 1.288.

³⁴ Cf. Gossrau; Wagner³: "Fortuna, vices rerum alternans ac modo peior, modo melior veniens, eundem nunc decipit, nunc iuvat"; Conington: "Has first mocked, then restored, *locavit* being the more prominent notion, *lusit* expressing a previous action, such as would be denoted by a past part., were there one in Latin". Thus, apparently, Gransden and Horsfall, who however do not frame the problem as such. Even McGill, without further explanation, understands in this way: "*lusit*: i.e. Fortune has fun with people for a time by making them suffer, before changing course".

³⁵ So (maybe), La Cerda (in Expl.): "[Fortuna] *ludit* cum mortalibus *locans* in solido, quem prius *deiecerat*".

³⁶ Here I also feel the lack of a note on *in solido ... locauit*.

Mynors: 471 *ultro*] *fortasse ante* (*A.* xii 612) 472 *urbi*]
fort. ultro (xii 613)

Conte: 471 *ultro*] *ante suspic. Mynors cl. Aen. 12, 612* 472 *urbi*] *ul-*
tro suspic. Mynors cl. Aen. 12, 613

McGill: 471 *ultro*] *ante suspic. Mynors* 472 *urbi*] *ultra suspic.*
Mynors

After 12.611 some ninth-century MSS insert 11.471-2, but with *ultra* instead of *ante* and *ultra* instead of *urbi*; the two repeated lines are unanimously excised by modern editors. Although Mynors does not make his reasoning explicit, he is evidently bothered by *generumque asciverit urbi* in 472: once it is suggested to replace *urbi* with the impeccable *ultra* of 12.613, the replacement of *ultra* in the previous line with *ante* of 12.612 follows by consequence. That this is the reason for Mynors' proposal is all the more clear if we consider the fact that *urbi* was already a problem for the exegetical tradition: it had disturbed Heyne and Peerlkamp,³⁷ while Wagner had defended it with reference to 7.367 *si gener externa petitur de gente Latinis* (and so Conington, "the city and the king being identified").³⁸

McGill reproduces Conte's annotations, but cuts out the references to Book 12, and says nothing in the commentary. Thus, the reader is left completely in the dark as to what Mynors' motives might have been in proposing his two corrections.

19. 526-9:

hanc super in speculis summoque in uertice montis
 planities ignota iacet tutique receptus,
 seu dextra laeuaque uelis occurrere pugnae
 siue instare iugis et grandia uoluerit saxa.

Conte: receptus **MP ω γ ¹** (-ptis γ), *Seru., Tib.* : recessus **M^ARaj**,
 "male quidam" *ap. Seru.*

McGill: receptus *M^{ac}P ω* : receptis γ^{ac} : *Seru., Tib.* : recessus *M^CRj*

At 527 the MSS are divided. McGill, without valid reason, fails to mention that the v.l. *recessus* was known to Servius, and rejected by him. This is all the more inappropriate precisely because, as we will now see, Servius's note is highly relevant to the discussion of the textual problem.

³⁷ Heyne: "Erit adeo *urbi*, in urbis ac regni utilitatem. Parum commode. Suspicio fuisse *qui non acceperit ultra / Dardanium Aenean generumque adsciverit: urbis / praefodiunt alii portas*. Sic utique lenior procedit oratio"; Peerlkamp: "Equidem Virgilii puto: *qui non adsciverit ultra / Dardanium Aenean generum, atque acceperit urbi* [...] *Urbi* accipere, pro *urbe* accipere, est antiquioris formae". Ribbeck¹ followed Peerlkamp by simply writing *adsciverit* in 471 and *acceperit* in 472, while Ribbeck² goes back to the reading of the codices.

³⁸ Further discussion in Forbiger *ad loc.*

receptus (only here in Virgil) was the vulgate reading up to Heyne-Wagner. *recessus* is defended by Wagner who prints it in Heyne-Wagner and in his own three school editions; after him, and convinced by him, Peerlkamp, Gossrau, Conington, and Forbiger among others print it; Fratantuono approves it. In the twentieth century, *receptus* becomes the vulgate reading again.³⁹ Why does Wagner prefer *recessus* to the vulgate *receptus*? Wagner maintains that “*Receptus dicitur locus, quo quis ex periculo aut fuga se recipit; recessus est locus secretior et ab hominum conspectu remotus, ubi bene lateas; idque ipsum vult Turnus. Nec quae sequuntur, Seu — saxa, convenient voc. receptus, quippe quae ad impetum faciendum, non ad salutem fuga pariendam spectent*”. In other words, *receptus* is a military technical term to indicate “withdrawal, retreat” (*OLD* s.v. 2), so much so that *receptui signum dare*, *receptui signum canere*, or sim. in historical prose mean “to sound the retreat” (*OLD* s.v. 2c). Here it is evident that Turnus is not talking of a place to retire in case of defeat,⁴⁰ but of the place where his troops have to hide in anticipation of the ambush, as the next two lines make clear. What about Servius’s note then? Servius says: *TVTIQVE RECEPTVS male quidam “recessus” legunt: nam “receptus” dicitur, quo se tuto exercitus recipit: unde et signa “receptui canere” dicuntur*. But this “defence” of *receptus* seems to say exactly the opposite of what one would expect: the words *nam “receptus” — dicuntur* seem to presuppose Wagner’s reasoning in defense of *recessus*, and are not an adequate defence of *receptus*. In fact, Wagner, on the basis of the text of the *Dresdensis* D.136 (15th century, Thilo’s **D**), argued that the correct reading in Servius’ note was: *TVTIQVE RECESSVS male quidam “receptus” legunt: nam etc.* This is also the text of *Par. Lat.* 7965, another ms. of the same family as **D**, and therefore also prepared in the context of the school of Guarino Veronese, as well as the *editio princeps* of Servius of 1471. The text of Servius approved by Wagner, therefore, should ultimately go back to a conjectural intervention of Guarino himself, on the basis of the same reasoning that will later be made by Wagner, even if the sources used by Guarino remain somewhat obscure.⁴¹ That Servius’s note should be printed as *TVTIQVE RECESSVS male quidam “receptus” legunt: nam etc.* seems certain. Servius, therefore, on the basis of the same reasoning that will later be Wagner’s, approved *recessus* and condemned *receptus*.

However, if it is certain that in Servius’s lemma we must read *recessus*, and not *receptus*, it is not so certain what Virgil actually wrote. In fact, it is not impossible that Virgil wanted to use *receptus* in a different meaning from the standard one in historical prose, to make it express the concept that “Turnus’ troops withdraw to a safe spot, where they can await the Trojans without fear of attack” (McGill); cf. Horsfall:

³⁹ Pace Horsfall and Fratantuono, who inherits Horsfall’s mistake, also Geymonat prints *receptus* and not *recessus*. Horsfall’s mistake perhaps arises from a misunderstanding of the observation by A. Bartalucci, *EV* s.v. *capio* 1, 1984, 653-5, at 654: “per la var. *recessus*, condannata da Servio, cf. Geymonat *ad l.*”.

⁴⁰ Pace Henry, whose long defence of *receptus* is based on the erroneous belief that “the *planities* on the top of the hill [is] not [...] the position which Turnus occupies with his ambush, but a reserved position, to which he has safe retreat (*tuti receptus*), in case his ambush should prove unsuccessful, and the defiles be forced”. Henry’s argument in favor of *receptus* serves, then, paradoxically, to corroborate the choice of *recessus*.

⁴¹ No other MS of Servius presents those variants. I thank Fabio Stok for his advice on this point.

“*Receptus* an elegant extension of the milit. t.t. for ‘retreat’ (*receptui canere*, etc.) to a place for safe withdrawal”.⁴² *receptus* is corroborated by the imitation at Stat. *Theb.* 7.443 *placuit sedes fidiq̄ue receptus*, in a passage that clearly re-elaborates the present Virgilian context; cf. 441 *tutisque accomoda castris* (~ *Aen.* 11.522 *est curuo anfractu ualles, accomoda fraudi*).⁴³ Statius clearly uses *receptus* in the same sense that one should assume in Virgil (“A place for shelter, refuge”, *OLD* s.v. 3, which in addition to the passages from Virgil and Statius, cites only Tac. *ann.* 13.55 *seruare sane receptus gregibus*), and this demonstrates two things: (i) that Statius read *receptus* in his text of the *Aeneid*, and (ii) that he thought it possible that *receptus* meant what it should mean in the Virgilian passage. Even if this Statian imitation is the strongest argument that can be found in defense of *receptus*, one must nevertheless remain uncertain, because it is theoretically possible that Statius also was “wrong”: that is, that he felt justified in this forcing of the usual meaning of *receptus* (“retreat”, and therefore “a place for retreat”) by the authority of Virgil, when in reality Virgil had written *recessus* and not *receptus*.

receptus and *recessus* are also exchanged elsewhere in the MSS.⁴⁴ The *utrum in alterum* criterion, however, is not much help. While it is true that the “inappropriate” *receptus* could easily have been replaced by the more appropriate *recessus*, on the other hand the frequency of the expression *tutus/tuti receptus* in historiographic prose could have led to the opposite substitution.⁴⁵ And it is not just the historiographical prose: the junctura occurs once in Statius and once in Silius, both times with specific reference to the concept of “retreat”: Stat. *Theb.* 11.51-2 *sed tunc miseris dabat utile signum / suadebatque fugam et tutos in castra receptus*, Sil. 7.331-2 *ad fraudem occultamque fugam tutosque receptus / nunc nocte utendum est* (“for a secret flight and safe retreat”, Duff). In the case of Silius, one should imagine that he has re-diverted the Virgilian nexus to its more usual meaning; but it is also possible to suppose that those who changed *recessus* into *receptus* in the text of the *Aeneid* had Silius’s line end in their minds.⁴⁶

20. 736-40:

at non in Venerem segnes nocturnaue bella,
aut ubi curua choros indixit tibia Bacchi.
exspectate dapes et plenae pocula mensae

⁴² Conington’s assessment is different: “Virg. is hardly likely to have used a technical military term in an improper sense when an unobjectionable word was ready to his hands”. *Contra*, see Papillon *ad loc.*

⁴³ See J.J.L. Smolenaars, *Statius: Thebaid VII. A Commentary*, Leiden 1994, *ad loc.*

⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. Ov. *met.* 1.340 (where it must mean “retreat”, and in fact Tarrant prints *receptus*), *trist.* 4.9.31 (where *receptus* is certainly right: *cane, Musa, r.*), *Aetna* 336 *prospectans... opus uastosque recessus / recessus* (where it must mean “a recess”, and in fact Goodyear prints *recessus*).

⁴⁵ Cf. Caes. *ciu.* 1.46.3 (*equitatus*) *commodiorem ac tutiorem nostris receptum dat* (“a safer retreat”; cf. 3.30.3 *ut ... magna multitudine nauium et tutius et facilius in Siciliam receptus daretur*; “so that the retreat was safer and easier”), Liv. 2.65.2 *quamquam cessere magis quam pulsi hostes sunt, quia ab tergo erant cliui, in quos post principia integris ordinibus tutus receptus fuit* (“a safe refuge for retreat”), etc. (nine more times in Livy).

⁴⁶ There is another occurrence of the phrase in the *additamentum Aldinum*: Sil. 8.181 *huc rapies, germana, uiam tutosque receptus*, which the interpolator obviously composed by putting together *Aen.* 4.478 *inueni, germana, uiam* with *Aen.* 11.527 (and/or Sil. 7.332).

(hic amor, hoc studium) dum sacra secundus haruspex
 nuntiet ac lucos uocet hostia pinguis in altos! 740
 Conte: 737 *post Bacchi dist. M^s, Tib., fortiter dist. Klouček*
 738 *expectare recc.; “expectate pro ‘expectatis’” Seru.; imperatiu*
modo inest mordacitas

McGill: 738 *expectare recc.*

In his commentary on 737 McGill notes: “I follow Williams, Mynors, and Horsfall *ad loc.* in placing a period at the end of the line (Gransden has a comma, while Conte has a colon)”, and a 738: “*expectate* ‘await in expectation’ (*OLD* s.v. 4). The imperative is derisive”. This is currently the most widespread way of understanding the passage (that Conte puts a colon instead of the period does not change anything as regards the overall interpretation). On the basis of the note in the apparatus of Ribbeck², Conte attributes to Klouček the initiative to place a period at the end of 737.⁴⁷ In fact, this is already found in the edition of Hortensius, who prints a period at the end of 737 in his text, and comments: “Ironica exhortatio ad luxum et ignauiam, ut multo etiam magis ad pugnandum inardescant”. But these are details. However, it should be made explicit, especially for the inexperienced reader, that, with this punctuation, in 736-7 we must imply *estis*, and Gransden is not all wrong when he says that “this would make *expectate* too abrupt”. Ribbeck (no punctuation in Ribbeck¹, comma in Ribbeck²), Sabbadini, and Geymonat (both without punctuation) also print *expectate* without period at the end of 737, and McGill should have said something about this possibility.

A sense of unease for the sudden imperative in 738 is already evident from the note by Servius, but above all from the behavior of modern editors. Indeed, it should have been said that the reading *expectare* of the *recc.*, which McGill points out in the apparatus, but about which says nothing in the commentary, was the vulgate reading up to Ribbeck: thus, among others, print La Cerda, Heinsius, Heyne, Wagner, Conington, Forbiger, and Page. *expectare* would then depend upon *segnes* (cf. Hor. *carm.* 3.21.22 *segnes ... nodum soluere Gratiae*). The only argument against this probable humanistic conjecture is the one presented by Ribbeck: from the point of view of meaning, *non segnes expectare* is not entirely satisfactory, “quoniam expectandi studium nullum est”.

21. Camilla’s death: 828-31:

tum frigida toto
 paulatim exsoluit se corpore, lentaque colla
 et captum leto posuit caput, arma relinquens, 830
 uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

Conte: 830 *relinquunt Probus et “alii” ap. DSeru. (“Probus hypallagen uult esse uel contrarium, ut ipsa relinquat; alii arma relinquunt cum laude dictum accipiunt, id est illa decidebant e manibus Camillae exani-*

⁴⁷ Conte refers to the 1886 edition of Klouček; see W. Klouček, “Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Vergilius”, in *Programm des k. k. deutschen Obergymnasiums der Kleinseite in Prag am Schlusse des Schuljahres 1879*, Prague 1879, 3-31, at 31.

mis”), *Tib.* : relinquat **M** : reliquit **P** (*ut uid.*) **Ra** : relinquens **M²P²** (reli-
quens **P¹**, **n** in ras.) ωγ, *DSeru.*; *haud aliter* ‘relinquunt’ *uim absolutam*
habere mihi uidetur in Aen. 6, 444 ‘*curae non ipsa in morte relinquunt*’

McGill: 830 relinquens *M^cP^cω*, *DSeru.* : relinquunt “*alii*” *ap. DSeru.*
: relinquat *M^{ac}* : reliquit *P^{ac}* (*ut uid.*) *R*

This is one of the places where McGill’s text differs from that of Conte.⁴⁸ The omission of Tiberius Claudius Donatus among the witnesses for *relinquunt* will be a simple oversight, but neglecting to mention Probus among those same witnesses is unjustifiable, since not even in his note *ad loc.* does McGill make any mention of the fact that we are here dealing with one of those famous cases in which we know what reading was known and approved by Probus, although most likely, in this case, not introduced by him in Virgil’s text. For discussion of the textual problem McGill does indeed refer to Courtney and Timpanaro, but without saying that the first supports *relinquens* and the second *relinquunt*, but above all without making any mention of Timpanaro’s arguments (nor Horsfall’s, for that matter).⁴⁹ In his note *ad loc.*, McGill’s argument against *relinquunt* (which he admits to be the *lectio difficilior*) and in favor of *relinquens* is substantially based on the idea, already advanced by Courtney, that *relinquens* would echo *linquebat* in 827. Against the comparison made by Conte with 6.444, McGill says that “*arma relinquunt* does not make the sense that *curae non ... relinquunt* does”. No further explanation is given. At the very least, one ought to have tried to explain what then could be the origin of the difficult variant *relinquunt* (the will to eliminate the participle at the end of the line, as Courtney says, following the well-known hypothesis of Unterharnscheidt?).⁵⁰ In support of *arma relinquens*, McGill cites Grat. 125 *ne tela relinquite diuae*, with reference to B. Kayachev, “*Hunt as War and War as Hunt*”, in S.J. Green, ed., *Grattius: Hunting an Augustan Poet*, Oxford 2018, 97-114, at 100 (not 125, as in McGill’s note). I don’t find this parallel particularly illuminating. McGill could also have cited, and much more appropriately, the passages from post-Virgilian epic adduced by Delvigo, in which the image of the weapons that slip from the body of the dying warrior is present, and in which perhaps one can trace echoes of the variant *relinquunt*: see Stat. *Theb.* 7.682 *arma fluunt*, Val. Fl. 6.259 *arma cadunt*, Sil. 7.633, 9.52.⁵¹

SERGIO CASALI
Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”
casali@uniroma2.it

⁴⁸ The others (listed at p. 33) are 202 *ardentibus* McGill vs. *fulgentibus* Conte, and 854 *fulgentem armis* McGill vs. *laetantem animis* Conte ((at p. 33 McGill mistakenly writes only *fulgentem* vs. *laetantem*). At 256 McGill prints *mitto quae* following E. Kraggerud, “On Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.256: A Conjecture”, *Eranos* 107, 2012-13, 21-3, and this text is now accepted also by Conte in his second edition.

⁴⁹ E. Courtney, “The Formation of the Text of Vergil”, *BICS* 28, 1981, 13-29, at 25-6; S. Timpanaro, *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta*, Firenze 2001, 73-7.

⁵⁰ M. Unterharnscheidt, *De veterum in Aeneide coniecturis*, Diss. Münster 1911, 9.

⁵¹ M.L. Delvigo, *Testo virgiliano e tradizione indiretta. Le varianti probiane*, Pisa 1987, 77-8.

APPENDIX OF EDITIONS OF *AEN.* 11, OR INCLUDING *AEN.* 11,
CITED BY THE AUTHOR'S SURNAME ONLY

- Brunck = R.F.P. Brunck, *Publi Virgilio Maronis Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneis*, Strasbourg 1785.
- Bryce = A.H. Bryce, *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro, from the Text of Heyne and Wagner*, London-Glasgow 1857.
- Burman = P. Burman Jr., *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera, cum integris & emendatioribus commentariis Servii, Phylargyrii, Pierii. Accedunt ... Nicolai Heinsii notae nunc primum editae ...*, vol. 3, Amsterdam 1746.
- Conington = J. Conington-H. Nettleship, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. The Works of Virgil, with a Commentary*, vol. 3, London 1871.
- Conte = G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin-New York 2009 (= 2019²).
- Fairclough = *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII, The Minor Poems*, with an English translation by H.R. Fairclough, London-New York 1918.
- Forbiger = A. Forbiger, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 3. Leipzig 1875⁴.
- Fratantuono = L. Fratantuono, *A Commentary on Virgil, Aeneid XI*, Brussels 2009.
- Geymonat = M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Torino 1973 (= Roma 2008²).
- Gildenhart-Henderson = I. Gildenhart-J. Henderson, *Virgil, Aeneid 11 (Pallas & Camilla) 1-224, 498-521, 532-96, 648-89, 725-835*, Cambridge 2018.
- Goold = *Virgil: Aeneid VII–XII, Appendix Vergiliana*, with an English translation by H.R. Fairclough, revised by G.P. Goold, Cambridge, MA, 2000.
- Gossrau¹ = G.W. Gossrau, *Publii Virgilio Maronis Aeneis, in usum scholarum annotatione perpetua illustravit G.G. Gossrau*, Quedlinburg 1846.
- Gossrau² = G.W. Gossrau, *P. Virgilio Maronis Aeneis illustravit G.G. Gossrau*, Quedlinburg 1876.
- Gransden = K.W. Gransden, *Virgil: Aeneid, Book XI*, Cambridge 1991.
- Güthling = O. Güthling, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneis*, Leipzig 1886.
- Henry = J. Henry, *Aeneidea, or Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneis*, vol. 4, Dublin 1889.
- Heyne³ = *Publius Virgilius Maro varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus a C.G. Heyne*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1775¹, 1787², 1803³.
- Heyne-Wagner = *Publius Virgilius Maro varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus a C.G. Heyne*. Editio quarta curavit G.P.E. Wagner, vol. 3, Leipzig-London 1833.
- Horsfall = N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*, Leiden 2003.
- Jahn¹ = J.C. Jahn, *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera omnia ad librorum fidem recensuit et in usum scholarum edidit I.C. Iahnus*, Leipzig 1825.
- Jahn² = J.C. Jahn, *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera omnia ad librorum fidem recensuit et in usum scholarum iterum edidit I.C. Iahnus*, Leipzig 1838.
- Klouček = *P. Vergili Maronis Opera scholarum in usum edidit W. Klouček*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1886.
- La Cerda = J.L. de la Cerda, *P. Virgilio Maronis posteriores sex libri Aeneidos Argumentis notis explicationibus illustrati*, Lyon 1617.

- Mackail = J.W. Mackail, *The Aeneid Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1930.
- Mynors = R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford 1969.
- Page = T.E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books VII–XII*, London 1900.
- Papillon = T.L. Papillon, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. Virgil with an Introduction and Notes*, vol. 2, Oxford 1882.
- Paratore = E. Paratore, *Virgilio: Eneide*, vol. 6, *Libri XI–XII*, Milano 1983.
- Peerlkamp = P.H. Peerlkamp, *P. Virgilio Maronis Aeneidos libri VII–XII*, Leiden 1843.
- Perret = J. Perret, *Virgile: Énéide*, vol. 3, Paris 1980.
- Ribbeck¹ = *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1862.
- Ribbeck² = *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1895.
- Rivero *et al.* = L. Rivero García, J.A. Estévez Sola, M. Librán Moreno, A. Ramírez de Verger, *Publio Virgilio Marón: Eneida*, vol. 4, Madrid 2011.
- Sabbadini = R. Sabbadini, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 2, Roma 1930.
- Sidgwick = A. Sidgwick, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber XI. Edited with Notes*, Cambridge 1876.
- Thiel = C. Thiel, *Publii Virgilio Maronis Aeneis mit Erläuterungen*, vol. 2, Berlin 1838.
- Wagner³ = P. Wagner, *P. Virgilio Maronis Carmina breviter enarravit P. Wagner. Editio tertia superioribus multo praestabilior*, Leipzig 1861.
- Wakefield = G. Wakefield, *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera: emendabat et notulis illustrabat G. W.*, vol. 2, London 1796.
- Williams = R.D. Williams, *Virgil: Aeneid, Books VII–XII*, London 1973.