

Conjectural Emendations in the *Aeneid*, 4.436 & 12.423

Egil Kraggerud
*University of Oslo*¹

Abstract: **I:** *A.* 4.436 has caused commentators and interpreters serious worries and have done so for two millennia: (1) Which reading is correct, *dederit* or *dederis*? (2) Which *varia lectio* is preferable, *cumulatam* or *cumulatā*? (3) What does *morte* refer to? (4) What is meant by (*veniam*) *remittere*? These issues are constantly seeking some form of unified solution. The 19th century made several attempts at conjectures none of which gained ground. After discussing the best among these at length (Philip Wagner’s 1832 proposal) the time has come to move outside the well-trodden paths and make a new try at a solution. **II:** Taking his point of departure from an error in Hirtzel’s Vergil edition (*OCT* 1900) the author advocates a new text at *A.* 12.423, *nullā* for *nullo*, finding the resulting text more suited to bring the miraculous event of Aeneas’ recovery to the fore, metrically as well as stylistically.

Keywords: Vergil; Textual criticism.

I: *A.* 4.436

The sudden decision of Aeneas to leave Carthage (4.279–282) leads immediately to a complicated confrontation with Dido. This stage of the epic’s Fourth Book ends with the queen’s appeal to Aeneas to give her a little respite with his departure. The humble request is to be conveyed by her sister Anna (416–436): a short delay is the only thing she is asking for, only until the winds have become favourable for the Trojans to set sails; she will not detain him for long (430–432). This time-limited prolongation of his stay shall be his farewell gift to the woman who loves him, she maintains (429). What is the purpose of this request? She must be allowed time, she claims, to calm down and learn to live with her grief (433–434). This could have been the end of her final address to Aeneas, but there is yet another couplet (435–436), lines that highly respected interpreters justly have called “a mystery” (Roland Austin) or even “the most difficult in the *Aeneid*” (John Conington).² Indeed, in the couplet’s closing sentence four elements are at play, two nouns and two verbs, the most crucial of which is the word *mors*. The two lines are usually presented like this:

Extremam hanc oro veniam (miserere sororis), 435
 quam mihi cum dederit cumulatam morte remittam. 436

* I have to thank Monika Asztalos Murdoch for thought-provoking comments on an earlier draft of 12.423.

¹ Correspondence address: egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no.

² Austin’s so-called ‘Red’ on the 4th book from 1955 was re-published in 1983; Conington – Nettleship’s commentary on Vergil’s *opera* was published anew by P. Hardie in 2007.

THE TRANSMISSION

The critical apparatus is as follows in Gian Biagio Conte's Teubneriana (¹2009, ²2019), an edition that has the most up-to-date apparatus on the history of the text in antiquity and the early Middle Ages:

436 dederit MPPqwy (derit Π_s): dederis ωγ¹, *Seru.* cumulatam Ppwy *Seru.*: cumulata MΠ_sb?qw; dederis cumulatam *probasse Tuccam et Varium testatur Seru.*; dederit cumulata "male quidam" *ap. Seru.*

Two words, *dederit* and *cumulatam*, each has its variant, *dederis* and *cumulatā* respectively. The variants are antique, that is to say, they were in circulation before the age of Servius (late fourth century). They cannot therefore be discounted in any serious discussion of the text. Based on the critical apparatus above we can conclude that the two words *dederit/-ris cumulatam/-tā* allow two times two variants of the last line:

- (1) quam mihi cum dederit, cumulatam morte remittam
- (2) quam mihi cum dederis, cumulatam morte remittam
- (3) quam mihi cum dederit, cumulatā morte remittam
- (4) quam mihi cum dederis, cumulatā morte remittam

As is evident from Mynors' apparatus in the Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (and in fact more so than from Conte's), this line is present in (only) two of the ancient manuscripts (the so-called "Codices antiquiores" in the terminology of Conte), namely *M(ediceus)* and *P(alatinus)* and in the pre-Carolingian 8th c. ms. *p(arisinus Lat. 7906)*. Only *P* and *p* have (1), whereas *M* has (3), a combination which Servius knew and disapproved of (*male quidam*). Servius' reference to the original editors of the Aeneid, *probasse Tuccam et Varium testatur*, seems to imply that some of the earliest commentators / editors were in favour of (2). Moreover, we can see from the substantial ω-group of manuscripts that *dederis* was widespread in the 9th and 10th centuries. Whether any manuscript ever had *dederis... cumulatā* is unknown, however. We do not, therefore, reckon (4) as an existing possibility in the following.

To judge from today's critical editions (in particular those of Mynors, Geymonat and Conte), (1) is the dominant form at present.³ No edition signalizes any form of doubt in the apparatus, let alone uses the *crux desperationis* in the text. Recently, however, Gian Biagio Conte is uncertain enough about the right choice to end his discussion with a *non liquet* as to alternatives (1) and (2).⁴ I herewith present each of these as closely as I can to the discussion Conte has given them:

³ Two other eminent Italian latinists have contributed perspicacious and thorough studies, without achieving a breakthrough in my view: Sergio Casali takes *morte* as containing a promise to annul the imprecation in lines 381–387 and Alessandro Schiesaro sees in *morte* an implicit threat.

⁴ See the chapter "An Aporetic Discussion. On *A.* 4.436" in Conte 2021, 82–85. Most recently, Fratantuono – Smith (2022) seem to be close to Conte's aporetic position: in the text they have *ded-*

(1) “This last grace I crave – pity your sister – which, when *he* has granted it, I will repay with full interest in my death” [semi-bold and underlining are mine]. This rendering Conte chooses to paraphrase in the following way: “for this extreme favour [cf. 435] I will repay him with my death, which will happen inevitably because I will not survive the abandonment; he will receive some sort of benefit from my death now that he sees me as an enemy.”⁵

(2) “A grace, which, when *you* have granted it, I will repay with full interest with my death” [Semi-bold and underlining are mine here as well].

As can be seen from this, it is only the pronoun (‘he’ versus ‘you’) in the *cum*-clause that in reality differentiates between (1) and (2).

A personal confession: forty years ago, I myself chose (2) *dederis cumulatam* in my Norwegian presentation of the *Aeneid*: “This is the last favour I am asking of you – have pity on your sister! – If you will grant it, I will repay it with interest in my death.” In my comment I wrote: “the rendering is problematic; *cumulatam morte remittam* in particular is an obscure expression. There is perhaps an intentional ambiguity: Anna shall not suspect suicide, but take it in the sense ‘when I die at some point in the future’, Dido means ‘with my imminent death.’”⁶ It is a kind of relief in admitting one’s own inadequate understanding of a passage when that same passage turns out to be so much richer in meaning decades later.

ATTEMPT AT AN ADEQUATE APPROACH.

Irrespective of one’s choice among the possibilities above, it is obvious that the last three words in line 436 is the core of the issue. For my own part, I am today mainly concerned with the lurking blind spots of editors and commentators. For the habit of delving deeper into textual difficulties – and with less respect for the paradosis at that – may have some benefits for text and/or interpretation from time to time. In our case, the problem is not necessarily the word *morte* alone, but the statement as a whole within its broader context. This must be our starting point. Judged in a wider perspective, lexical and grammatical nuances of an unforeseen, but decisive kind may lie hidden.

A general weakness in Mynors’ and Conte’s admirable Oxford and Teubner editions is the selectivity of their conjectural information: they have in large measure cut out the editorial tradition from the earliest times to the present day. One cannot, then, rely exclusively on the critical information in their editions. I therefore advise textual critics to have two additional editions of the 21st century close

erit, cumulatam (p. 78) whereas in the commentary they are arguing that *cumulata* “may be” the correct reading (p. 635 f.).

⁵ Cf. now a very different variant of this in Fratantuono – Smith’s comm. (2022) “by the mechanism of her self-imposed death she will forever render Aeneas *ingratus*. [...] Death is an effective interjection in the calculus of benefits.” (p. 638).

⁶ I have translated my own Norwegian translation and comment into English.

at hand: the Spanish edition from 2009–2011⁷ that may be called the Alma Mater edition (Rivero García et al.) and the enriched reprint of Geymonat’s 1973 edition from 2008.⁸ Moreover, Goold’s revision of Rushton Fairclough’s Loeb-edition has much to offer in the form of second thoughts on the latter’s text. Since neither Mynors nor Conte has kept any trace of earlier qualms about the text, let alone any conjectures trying to solve ‘the mystery’ / ‘difficulty’ / ‘aporia’ facing the reader, it is useful to consult the above mentioned more informative editions. I begin with Geymonat’s critical comment on *morte*: “Locum coniecturis complures temptaverunt (monte *Ribbeck*, sorte *Schrader*, rite *Baehrens*, cumulatam munere mittam *Klouček*.)” The lack of chronological order and documentation is indicative of Geymonat’s scepticism towards the value of conjectural improvements. Immediately before this information he dismissed all conjectural attempts in the following way: “*morte*] *mori enim decreverat*, vv. 308, 415”. The Alma Mater edition has the additional information that Heinsius (1676) and H. Snijder (1972) preferred *cumulatā* (the latter with *dederis*).

As my own standpoint owes much to one of the above mentioned conjectures, I will maintain that a future critical edition of the *Aeneid* cannot allow itself to disregard the conjectural legacy. Such attempts should have their place in the edition in a form divided according to merits, i.e. either in the *Apparatus criticus* or in an *Appendix critica* respectively. I have exemplified this view of mine in my book *Critica* (2021) 13–30.

The following amounts to a preliminary analysis and interpretation of the notions used in the couplet:

veniam: Translations like ‘grace’ and ‘favour’ are common; the latter word is least up to the actual nature of *venia* in Dido’s situation. In the last resort (435–436), Dido may seem to take her humble attitude a further step. *Venia* may imply indulgence shown towards the appealing person, ‘generous understanding and sympathy’, ‘graceful concession’, often implying some degree of thankfulness felt by the person or party approaching a stronger part as a supplicant. After all, *venia* is a favour to which one has no claim; it can only be bestowed out of benevolence.⁹ Finally, Dido leaves any personal merit out of account. So it cannot be Anna (2nd p. *dederis*) whom Dido is asking for *venia* (alternative 2). The strong notion of *venia* is in my view only applicable to Aeneas. He is the centre of the last two lines as he definitely is for the whole request.

⁷ Rivero García et al. (2009–11). The critical apparatus is perspicuous. The philological tradition is clearly presented. The drawback is only that the Latin text is divided into four volumes.

⁸ Reviewed by me in *Klassisk Forum* 2008 : 2, 59–67. In that connection I criticised the overloaded critical apparatus. The second edition is on the whole even more unmanageable as a vademecum text.

⁹ This is pointed out in the useful article on *venia* in *EVV**, p. 485 f. (Giuliano Cripò).

miserere sororis, “have pity on your sister”, implies something like: pity my despair and please convey this message as I have worded it. Dido expects nothing more from Anna: Dido only appeals to Anna’s loyal service concerning what is anyway a very demanding task from her own point of view. This *miserere sororis* is a fully appropriate expression in the last couplet as referring in equal measure to the whole mission (420–436) Dido has entrusted her sister with. Viewed in this perspective the brackets around *miserere sororis* should be replaced by so-called em dashes (see the end of I). This wider reference of the words is in fact signalled also by demonstrative *hanc* as the second word in the couplet: the demonstrative points back to the message as a whole.

Before arriving at line 436, we have a comma in the best editions after the parenthesis (*miserere sororis*). As all readers of Latin prose are familiar with, the relative pronoun often introduces a main clause in the fashion of a so-called *coordinating relative*.¹⁰ It is worth emphasizing this syntactical fact. The previous line (435) ends with a somewhat stronger stop than an attached *ordinary relative clause* would require. I therefore recommend a semicolon before *quam* = (*et*) *eam/eam (autem)* to mark the beginning a new syntactic unit consisting of two clauses.

veniam remittere: Back at the notion of *venia*, it is straightforward Latin to take it as an object of transitive verbs like *orare* (435) and *dare* (436). In the same way as one would ask a person of *venia*, this person can choose to grant it as a gift, but not one necessarily merited by the other person (cf. also *munus* 429). The *communis opinio* takes it for granted, whether we choose (1) or (2), that we can say meaningfully both *cumulare veniam* and *remittere veniam* (and likewise the combination *alicui cumulatam aliqua re veniam remittere*). It is to be doubted, however, that such phrases – taken in isolation – may count as plain and unambiguous syntagms.

Remittam: Let us start with the last of the two verbs. Just now professional scholars have got a very solid fundament for evaluating *remittere* in context. In 2021 the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* published its fasc. ‘relinquo – renuo’ with an article 19 columns long on *remitto* composed by its experienced collaborators Johann Ramming and Josine Schrickx (XI,2, fasc. VII, 1036, 69 – 1055, 61). It became immediately clear that the usage is exceptionally rich and diversified, not to say complicated. A. 4.436 (cited in the above form 1 as “quam *veniam* mihi cum dederit *Aeneas*, cumulatam morte –am”) is located in category II A 2 a, col. 1050,16–17 under the heading “*In compensatione (quid mittatur, indicatur fere per acc. [...])*.”¹¹ Two ex-

¹⁰ For examples see e.g. Woodcock 1958, 188f.

¹¹ The dictionaries (and many translations) have the translation ‘repay’, a reference being *alicui beneficium remittere*; the German dictionary of Georges s.v. *remitto* I, 2 and *OLD* s.v. 2 d points to Caesar *Civ.* 2.32.14: *vestrum vobis beneficium remitto* (“I return to you your present” [which present is that the soldiers have called Gaius Curio ‘imperator’ when he had just wanted to be called ‘*Caesaris miles*’]). This is very far from the abstract use postulated in Vergil; in reality it implies ‘return’ in the

amples from Plautus precede the example from Vergil, *As.* 336 and *Ps.* 44–46 (the latter example contains a double entendre making it less useful than the first one). *As.* 336 concerns an X who has sold donkeys [*a*] to Y; Y has paid for them in silver [*b*]: *is* [Y] *argentum* [*b*] *huc remisit ... pro asinis* [*a*] (“he has sent money back here ... (to pay) for the donkeys”). This is a *quid pro quo* transaction of the easiest kind involving physical entities [*a* and *b*], but far from a key to the Vergil quotation, I dare say. There as well it is about a kind of transaction, but otherwise the example is different. The situation is not a straightforward compensation in kind, of [*b*] compensating [*a*]. The *venia* [*a*] stemming from X (Aeneas) is an abstract that belongs to him alone and can never result in a *venia* [*b*] returned by Y. In other words: Plautus is not a valid parallel. The best parallel in *TLL*’s article occurs a little later (col. 1050,39–40) at Ovid 3.460 where Narcissus talks to his *alter ego* in the water: *nutu quoque signa remittis* (“you [Y] return (my) signs [*a* from X] with a nod as well [*b* reflecting *a*]”). The rather incongruent *A.* 4.436 makes one suspect that *morte* does not belong to *cumulare*, *cumulatam* but must instead represent Dido’s compensation [*b*] of Aeneas’ *venia* [*a*]. The incomplete nature of *veniam remittere* when taken by itself makes the attribute *cumulatam* equally suspect. So far, then, I am only willing to subscribe to the translation ‘repay’, ‘return’, ‘recompense’ provided that it is supplemented by an ablative giving complete meaning to *veniam remittere*. In Norwegian ‘gjengjelde’ would probably be the most applicable term to use as a starting point to render *remittere*, in German ‘vergeltten’; *remittere veniam* rendered correspondingly could be ‘pay back (his) *veniam*’, ‘return’, ‘recompensate’ (*by means of* something equivalent in worth, that is something that can be reckoned by the receiver as compensation for the *venia* he or she has experienced).

morte: We have reached the crux of the matter so to speak. Whose death? What kind of ablative? If I have so far accepted that the combined *veniam remittere* presupposes something (abl.) in return for the *venia* being asked for the natural question follows: what had Dido to offer in return so that it could become a real exchange. An adjunct is needed *to balance the gift of venia in the scales*. We are back where we were before this episode (cf. 308, 323): If something like *mors* was what Dido wanted to communicate as *her* exchange gift it would add nothing new for his ears (cf. *me moribundam deseris* 323) but would rather be taken as an affront. He would be in the position to answer like this: “She still threatens to kill herself *even if I granted her some postponement of my departure* or, worse, *does she even threaten to kill me?*” The word *mors* would all of a sudden affect her entire appeal and turn it into something like a provocation. Against the backdrop of the previous couplet

sense of ‘annulling’, ‘forgetting’ the *beneficium*. this usage is excellently categorized as ‘refusing’, ‘not accepting’ by the *TLL* s.v. *B b res ab altero oblatas, sc. quae recusantur* (col. 1042,21).

(433–434) alone there would be a glaring contradiction.”¹² So far, then, we are truly faced with an *aporia* in our analysis.

cumulatam/ cumulata: It remains to say explicitly that *cumulare veniam*, to enhance one’s *venia*, would only heighten the absurdity of Dido’s *antidoron*. Nonetheless, *cumulare* seems at first sight to belong to the same sphere of business transactions as *remittere*. Livy has for instance *cumulare aes alienum* in this sense in contemporary prose (2.23.6: *id* [sc. *aes alienum*] *cumulatum usuris* ...). Is there, then, still hope for an ablative *cumulata*?

CONJECTURAL EMENDATIONS AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

A situation characterized by multiple perplexities should sometimes be solved by conjectural means. Here is what has gradually dawned on me as the solution:

cumulata: This ablative is too strongly attested in the ancient paradoxis to be brushed aside as an instance of haplography (*CUMULATAMORTE* > *CUMULATAMORTE*). Equally often it is the other way round; a nominative or ablative ending in *-a* gives rise to an accusative in script owing to the weakened pronunciation of *-m*. The ablative *cumulata*¹³ allows us to attach *cumulare* to the following noun. Taking account of the discredited status of *morte* we must consider whether there is a reasonable substitute for it, in other words a feminine noun beginning with a consonant. There is no other possible candidate than *sorte*.

sorte: The credit for having proposed *sorte* goes to the Dutch scholar Johannes Schrader who in 1783 left behind a number of conjectures to Vergil’s poems. These were bequeathed to Christian Gottlob Heyne who was in the position to make use of them, but as to *sorte* it was his posthumous editor Philip Wagner who made *sorte* known in 1832. Wagner writes: “**Si ingenio utendum esset, saltem metaphorae immanendum erat, et cumulata sorte remittam erat coniectandum: ut beneficium cum foenore reddituram se spondeat.**”¹⁴ [my semibold] (“If one should spend ingenuity on this, one should anyhow abide by the metaphor and conjecture *cumulata sorte remittam*; in order to promise that she will return the benefit with

¹² “*cumulatam (veniam) morte remittam, ich will die Gunst dir noch im Tode reichlich vergelten, d.i. meine Dankbarkeit soll erst mit (bei) meinem Tode ihr Ende finden, so dass ich dir dann diesen Dienst reich vergolten haben werde (nach A.: ‘ich werde dich nach meinem Tode stets als guter Geist umschweben’, als Gegentheile von v. 385 flg.)” Koch 1870, 97.*

¹³ On absolute ablatives in Vergil see s.v. *ablativo assoluto* in *EVI* (1984) p. 6.

¹⁴ Wagner continues (*loc. cit.*): *Proxime accessit in schediis Io. Schraderus, qui cum alia tentat, tum hoc: Quam mihi si dederit, cumulata sorte, relinquat; quod non satis intelligo.* (“Closest came in his sheets J. Schrader who among other suggestions here has this: *quam ... relinquat* what I do not quite comprehend.”).

interest”).¹⁵ *Sors* would in itself deserve a detailed article on a large scale. *OLD* is a good substitute at hand. Here its meaning is defined by *cumulare* according to my analysis. *Sors* is in the society of the Roman republic a financial term meaning ‘capital’, ‘principal’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. 7), cf. Pl. *Mos.* 561 *qui mihi neque fenus neque sortem argenti danunt* (“who are giving me neither interest nor principal”) and *ibid.* 592 [Tr.] *Sortem accipe* [Da.] *Immo fenus, id primum volo.* (“Have your principal!” – “No, rather the interest. That’s what I want first.”) It is in the nature of *sors* that it can grow in the course of time by means of *fenus*. One should adopt a metaphorical understanding in accordance with Wagner’s comment. Dido is a forsaken woman begging for time to adjust herself to the new situation, not a merchant in process of concluding a bargain.

Dido’s language implies that she would have something to offer in return which would increase the assets of Aeneas. As *his venia* would be a *beneficium* or *munus* to her (see 429), she will in return augment his resources before the departure. This is perfectly in harmony with the principle of mutual benefit as if she had said **cum Aeneas mihi veniam dederit, ego cumulabo eius sortem*. In other words: she will increase his assets in kind (by means of equipment, food grains, supplies rather than rich gifts, gold and silver). *Sors*, then, is meant to point to what Aeneas is in the position to benefit from there and then as he is about to continue his voyage towards Italy. Dido reminds him of the boon she is able to provide for him in case he delays his departure. The translation of the line would be: “when he grants me that (favour), I will pay him back through increase of his assets.” Although I have found this conjecture quite attractive, two objections have been lingering in my mind: 1) the basic meaning of *sors* would be ‘lot’, ‘share’, ‘allotment’. Is the mercantile meaning clear enough? 2) paleographically the loss of M in MORTE is not easy to account for unless as the result of some deliberate alteration.



Having decided to try all avenues, I will propose in earnest an alternative emendation that satisfies me even more, namely

cumulato marte remittam.

Thus, Dido’s last words would represent a tempting and generous offer particularly in line with the safety of the last leg of his expedition. My line of argument is this:

When Ilioneus was first being received by Dido in Carthage, he complained bitterly about the hostile reception the Trojans had experienced (1.539ff.): He would just ask for an opportunity to repair their ships so that they might find refuge and

¹⁵ Wagner continues (loc. cit.): *Proxime accessit in schediis Io. Schraderus, qui cum alia tentat, tum hoc: Quam mihi si dederit, cumulata sorte, relinquat; quod non satis intelligo.* (“Closest came in his sheets J. Schrader who among other suggestions here has this: *quam ... relinquat* what I do not quite comprehend.”)

protection in the Sicily of Acestes where they would find the towns and weapons (*urbes et arma*) the exiled people was longing for. On the coast of Libya, on the other hand, they had met with contempt for their sheer existence as human beings and their ability to defend themselves properly (*Si genus humanum et mortalia temnitis arma* 542). They are in sore need of their missing leader: *Rex erat Aeneas, quo iustior alter/ nec pietate fuit nec bello maior et armis*. Towards this articulate and highly respectable supplicant (cf. *parce pio generi* 526) Dido's answer is utmost generous through her unconditional promise to help: *seu uos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva/ sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten,/ auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo* (571–572).

At 4.425–436 Dido seems yet again to have adopted the same attitude towards the 'guests'. In this final couplet she is playing the same role of generosity so that Aeneas can be prepared in the best way possible to settle in their future home. It may seem that she remembers Ilioneus and his appeal and the way she answered him in those circumstances.

The word *mars* (with lower-case initial, that is!)¹⁶ is a word Vergil makes much use of and not only in the Aeneid. *OLD* s.v. assists us in explaining how Vergil uses this metonymy by dividing it into several categories in accordance with classical usage in general. The most illustrative example is perhaps *A.* 8.675–678 describing the 'prophetic' shield of Aeneas:

In medio classis aeratas, Actia bella,
cernere erat totumque **instructo Marte** videres
fervere Leucaten auroque effulgere fluctus.

In the middle there were bronze ships to observe, the Actian battle, and you could see the whole of Leucate seething, **with martial power arrayed**, and the waves flashing of gold.

Fratantuono & Smith's comment (2018) is worth quoting: "this metonymical epiphany is mere prelude to the dramatic depiction of Mavors raging in the midst of the strife (700–701)." The verb *instruere*, they add, is one of drawing up troops in order of battle (*OLD* s.v. 2).

It is useful also to append some elementary comments on 4.436. Relevant for my conjectural emendation is to specify that the abl. abs. is temporal and is equivalent to the post-classical equivalent **cumulatione* + obj. gen. (or **post cumulationem*)

¹⁶ I need not remind readers of this article that the god Mars has a metonymic side, as in particular the prominent deities Liber (Bacchus), Ceres, Neptunus etc. To draw the borderline between the god and his metonymic manifestations is of course not always possible. Nevertheless, the difference is being blurred when editors almost regularly use the capital initial, especially so when it comes to dictionaries and concordances (like e.g. H. Holm Warwick's indispensable *A Vergil Concordance*, Minneapolis 1975, a concordance dependent on Mynor's text). In the article on Mars *EV* acknowledges the purely metonymic usage in expressions like *aequo, secundo* or *adverso Marte* (*A.* 7.540; 10.21: 11.899; 12.1 and 497) but uses all the same the upper-case M. In the 'Index nominum' I hope that future editions will write "Mars/ mars" as heading in order to notify users about the distinction.

which serves as a reminder of the leading role of the p.p. in the construction. Moreover, in an abl. abs. like **finito bello consul Romam rediet'* we can usually infer this much: a) the consul is the agent, b) either that he has already finished the campaign or not yet finished it (= **cum bellum consul finierit* (fut. ex.), c) the focus is on the *action*, d) that the end of the war is probably *a condition* for the consul's return and e) that the consul was probably not responsible for the outbreak of the war. Each of these inferences have to be taken into consideration with our conjecture *cumulato Marte*: Dido is the one to enhance the military prowess of Aeneas; she has not yet taken any steps in that direction. That action is dependent on Aeneas' *venia*. She is thus making a highly conditional proposal.

As to the military nature of *Marte* it remains to underline that it is a confirmation of her promise *auxilio tutos dimittam* at 1.572: the Trojans were threatened entering the realm of Dido, she will send them away (and then according to my paraphrase): "so that you all will be safe by means of my help". Her former generosity knew no limits: she was even ready to incorporate the Trojans giving them with equal rights (cf. 1.572–574). If they should choose to continue their voyage toward Italia and Latium (cf. 569) or stop in the island they have just left (557–558, cf. Dido's 570), in either case she will send them off providing them with additional safety. In what way she would have done this is never to be stated, however. At 4.436, on the other hand, she returns to this open question by the assurance that she will enhance Aeneas' martial strength.

Finally, I will take a scrutinizing look at Servius. My aim is not primarily to hypothesize on what might have happened in the earliest stage of the transmission, but to bring in some reflections to bear on the issue. The combined Servius/ Servius auctus should be consulted carefully on line 436, preferably in Servius (1965, p. 392–394 [with my semibold below]). The long note begins by declaring unequivocally: "sensus est: quod beneficium cum mihi cumulatam dederis, sola **morte** derelinquam" which makes one ask: what is behind this confidence? The longer left column version ascertains at once: "et hic intellectus est melior, quia sorori loquitur, quam mihi cum dederis **cumulatam**" whereupon both versions have "quam lectionem Tucca et Varius probant." Only at this point the alternative comes to the fore (also in both columns): "nam male quidam legunt quam mihi cum dedit **it** (id est Aeneas) **cumulata** morte **remittam**, et volunt intellegi 'acceptum ab illo beneficium mea morte cumulabo et sic relinquam [sic!]'¹⁷ The Servian tradition shows in my view a persistent perplexity. Making Tucca and Varius his allies Servius evidently aims at putting an end to the discussion. He reveals, however, that the disagreements are as old as the paradosis itself. Moreover, he is making one assume that the reading *dederis*, together with Anna's prominent role in the exchange, was due to the problems caused by understanding *morte*. The attempt to attach *cumu-*

¹⁷ I assume that *relinquam* has crept into the ancient commentary because the verb had been so highlighted in the first interpretation (Ed. Harv. 392,9–10), *remittam* is namely the verb to be expected in p. 393, col. 1 & 2, line 13 after col. 1, line 11 (S. auctus).

latam - followed by a bucolic diaeresis with pause – going closely with the previous sentence and not with the sentence *morte remittam* – expresses an ingrained, almost intransigent position (*male quidam* just after *intellectus melior*). Admittedly one can understand the sweepingly disparaging tone towards *dederit, cumulatam morte remittam* in view of the widely different and incompatible interpretations the adherents gave it: a) ‘faciam quod illi scio placiturum: occidam me’, b) “alii” 393,26) ‘reddam illi gratiam: occidam illum’). The extraordinary split in the ancient discussion of line 436 can only strengthen one’s scepticism against *morte* as a genuine reading from Vergil’s pen.

On the other hand, if Vergil and his amanuensis had written CUMULATO • MARTE I guess that some early and influential authority (Tucca and Varius?) would have refused to accept it and changed MARTE to MORTE. The same authority could have argued that the Fourth Book is a drama about the hero’s salvation and the heroine’s death not least. Just before our line the death theme presents itself strongly with *moribunda* (323) and *moritura* (415). Moreover, MORTE is almost three times more frequent than MARTE. Ergo: MARTE would anyway have been in a weak position unless protected by its context – and that it was hardly so is seen from the words we have analysed already.

What the transmission has left us is a real *quaestio insolubilis*. I hope, however, that my analysis and conjectural emendation can be part of future discussions of the line.

A NEW TEXT AND A SOMEWHAT AUGMENTED CRITICAL APPARATUS

Extremam hanc oro veniam – miserere sororis! –; 435
 quam mihi cum dederit, **cumulato marte** remittam. 436

This is the last favour I am asking for – have pity on your sister! –;
 when he has granted me that, I will repay him by enhancing his martial strength.

436 dederit **MPpqwy** (derit Π₅): dederis ωγ¹, *Seru.* • cumulata **MP, b?qw** dederit, cumulata m. r. “*male quidam*” *ap. Seru.* : cumulatam **Ppqwy** *Seru.*; dederis cumulatam, [sc. m. r.] *probasse Tuccam et Varium testatur Seru.* • cumulato marte *scripsi*: cumulata sorte remittam *Wagner*: cumulata sorte relinquat *Schrader ap. Wagner* : morte *codd.*

As to the hapless Hirtzel, one reviewer of an earlier version of this study²³ informed me that the Teubner editor of Vergil (1886), Otto Güthling, was the probable origin of the mistake. It may be suspected that Güthling's edition was the base text for Hirtzel and that the latter simply failed to correct the line. A most reasonable warning that is for scholars in our digital age culling their texts from the internet.

DIAGNOSIS

And that was the *finis* of the misprint story, right? I confess that this was my initial reaction. It was when I looked closer on the paradosis that I gradually came to change my mind:

manum *M^cRω, DSeru.* : manus *P^c* : manu *M^cP, Tib.*

Thus according to Richard Tarrant's excellent and user-friendly *apparatus criticus*: originally *R(omanus)* had *manum*, *P(alatinus)* had *manus* whereas *M(ediceus)* had *manu*. To judge from corrections, *manus* had understandably feeble support (be it a nominative or more probably an acc. pl.); *manum* and *manu* are definitely the more respectable members of the triad of readings and each of them needs to be considered in more detail in the following.

Per se the consensus wording (shared by all modern editors except Hirtzel) gives an easy, but in my opinion not particularly successful description of the unexpected event on which the very outcome of the epic hinges. For, on reflection, the absolute ablative *nullo cogente* raises a seemingly irrelevant question insofar as substantival *nullus* implies some outsider being potentially able to use muscular force to remove the arrow. However, there is no place for even a thought of any other participant than the very same physician Iapyx; he is the only one intent on removing the arrow and has been standing by for some time already (400 ff.). *Nullo cogente* is, strictly speaking, a clumsy parenthesis severing Iapyx and *his* hand from the agent/ subject of *cogente* be it ever so imperceptibly expressed for the majority of readers. More important is the grammatical issue involved: an *ablativus absolutus* is generally an economical construction in the sense that a good author will prefer to attach the participle to the true agent of the main sentence (in our case the **manūs Iapygis*).

It happens that it is useful to look at some highly esteemed prose translations in the course of a diagnostic process: Goold (Loeb 2000) renders *nullo cogente* by "with no force applied", E. & G. Binder (Reclam 2008) similarly: "ohne Zutun" and J. Perret (Budé 1987) "sans effort".²⁴ All of them, as if by common consent, leave out the *personal* part of the abl. abs., namely *nullo*. But it is not otiose; to my knowledge *nullo cogente* had never become so much a formula that such a ren-

²³ See asterisk above.

²⁴ But not necessarily so, cf. e.g. Luca Canali in Paratore's edition: "E già, seguendo la mano, la freccia cadde, **senza che nessuno intervenisse**" (Vol. VI, p. 99); Miryam Librán Moreno in Rivero García et al. (2011): "y ya la fleche, siguiendo la mano **sin que nadie forzara** salió."

dering by translators is quite correct. There is one well-known example of *nullo cogente* at Ov. *Met.* 1.103–4: *contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis/ arbuteos fetus montanaque fraga legebant* (“and, content with foods produced by no one’s labour they gathered arbutus fruits and mountain strawberries.” [i.e. opposing men free from labour in the golden age and the toiling later generations]). Thus used, *nullo cogente* is straightforward and logic: “nobody was using force”. Depicting the spontaneity of natural growth Vergil says (*G.* 2.10 f.): *Namque aliae [i.e. arbores] nullis hominum cogentibus ipsae/ sponte sua veniunt ...* The Vergil example serves to corroborate our understanding of Ovid’s easy construction.²⁵

In other words *nullo cogente* is not a weakened formula, but should be taken like the examples just quoted above, the one Ovidian going closely with *creatis* (from *creare*), the other Vergilian with *veniunt* (from *venire*).²⁶ So far I can make a double deduction: to put a comma after “with no force applied” seems wrong because: 1) it is in fact rather superfluous; we will anyway understand *sagitta excidit* as **sua sponte excidit*, 2) if we put commas on both sides of it as Goold does it becomes a parenthesis bringing in some other’s potential use of force. 3) But the crux of the matter is that Iapyx’s hand is not involved in any force at all at this point. He has been refraining from all *cheirourgia* (*LSJ* s.v. 2). Venus’ *dictamnium* is being administered by Iapyx’ warm water and proves to be the only efficacious remedy needed. Too much, then, seems to substantiate my claim that the transmitted line is a bit clumsy.

TOWARDS A NEW CONJECTURAL EMENDATION

Although *nullo* has long been taken as a reading above suspicion the divided manuscript evidence for the previous word ‘hand’ gives food for thought indeed.

Tarrant’s information about the variant reading *manu* (*M*^{sc} *P*^c, *Tib.*) needs a probable addition based on the fact that the *F*-manuscript of *DServius* (i.e. *Servius auctus*) had *manu* as well.²⁷ Thus, the Spanish Alma Mater editors are perfectly entitled to put *DSeru.* next to *Tib.* as support for *manu*, not *manum*.²⁸ As I understand the transmission, then, *M* was based on a text having the ablative *manu*, whereas only *R* had perhaps a forerunner with the acc. *manum*. After the copying process, *M* had its reading *manu* ‘corrected’ to *manum*, whereas *P* changed its plural acc. *manūs* (or possibly nom. *manus*) to what *M* had from the start, namely

²⁵ Cp. further the forensic definition given by *Dig.* 50.17.83: *Donari videtur, quod nullo iure cogente conceditur* (which opposes men’s generosity to the compulsion of law).

²⁶ I cannot but call to mind an early teacher pointing to the useful ‘rule of the right hand’: in case one is uncertain about an absolute construction’s affiliation, look to the right hand side.

²⁷ According to Thilo – Hagen’s edition, vol. II (1884), p. 614 n.; see now Servius (2018) p. 463 in the *app. crit.* on line 12.423.

²⁸ Taking account of Murgia’s and Kaster’s *app. crit.* I assume that the Servian lemma *IAMQVE SECUTA MANUM* is secondary and that the ‘original’ lemma was likely *IAMQVE SECUTA MANU* followed by *leniter temptantis* (genitive) *secuta est*, in other words that Tiberius Donatus tried to improve on the transmitted attempt by explaining *leniter temptare* as *fovere*.

manu. With this strong evidence for *manu* it is tempting to say, that the *lectio* clearly *difficilior* is also *potior* in the ancient transmission.

It is likewise clear that *secuta* can be easily explained as an absolute use of *sequi* when the word that follows is the ablative *manū*, an ablative that would almost inevitably become an accusative singular (*manum*) or plural (*manūs P*) if *secuta* is taken by scribes as a transitive verb. The above-mentioned reviewer of the previous version calls my attention to an absolute use of *sequi* in medical usage, cf. Cels. VII 7.1 *Tum digitis eam [sc. vesicam] adprehendere oportet et evellere; facile autem sequitur* (“Then it is advisable to seize it with the fingers and remove it; and it follows easily.”).

The main Vergil commentators of the past did not take the ablative *manu* seriously enough to discuss the matter properly. I believe that this was mainly due to their insufficient knowledge of the transmission. For that reason they did not ask: if *manum* was the original reading, how could *manu* arise to its prominent position? Moreover, how could it be that ancient commentators like Servius (probably) and Tib. Donatus (definitely) took *manu* on trust? The latter commentator had, understandably enough, a problem in explaining *secuta manu*:

si ‘nullo cogente’, quomodo ‘secuta manu’? Hoc ne claudicet, sic intellegendum est, ut sagitta non manu tenentis secuta videatur, sed foventis. (Tib. Claudius Donatus ed. H. Georgii 1906 = 1969, p. 603, 19–22).

There is every reason to ask how Donatus understood **sagitta videtur manu foventis secuta esse (nullo cogente)?* In all likelihood²⁹ Tiberius took *manu* as ‘with/by means of the hand’, not of him who held, but of him who warmed the *vulnus* of Aeneas’, i.e. instrumental abl. All the same, his explanation will not add up; it is logically deficient; for the line is still halting, ‘claudicat’, to use his own term. This is because *fovere* is a medical term used by Vergil in the correct way at line 420 with *vulnus* as its object, that is the part of the body affected by an injury or a disease, the sense of which is (to quote *OLD* s.v. 3) “treat with soothing (warm) application”. In Latin one could equally well have said **fovit femur vulneratum*.

After Tiberius’ forced interpretation of *manu* my conclusion could easily have been: an ablative *manu* is improbable whereby I would have conceded that the accusative *manum* is better after all. At the same time, however, my dissatisfied queries sketched out above would have remained in my mind and above all the enigma why *manu* have had such a strong position in the earliest evidence.

There is, however, an easy conjectural emendation to solve all lingering questions, namely by changing one letter and reciting the line in the following way:

²⁹ Hardly to be taken as a local abl. or as a dative = *manui*, as at Verg. *A.* 3.541; 6.698 or 9.605 (+ Gellius 4.16.6–7): the accompanying verbs should be prefixed by *sub-* or *in-* to clarify if a dative were involved. An *abl. modi* is more likely, however, if taken as ‘with his strength’ (like the abl. at *A.* 9.636 *clamore sequuntur*).

iamque secutā, mǎnū nullā cogente, sagittā
excidit

The resulting absolute ablative *manu nulla cogente* separates *secuta* from *sagitta*, intentionally I believe. In its new shape the line seems to illustrate how the arrow slowly responds to the treatment of Iapyx using his miraculous warm liquid, without any outward compulsion from *his* human hand, until the arrow falls from the thigh of Aeneas, *sua sponte* in prosaic words. The marked enjambment between 423 and 424 gives a final emphasis to the wonderful separation that is taking place before the eyes of all. The ‘parenthesis’ *manu nulla cogente*, with its implied delaying effect on the syntax, will be best be encapsulated in the process by means of commas in a modern edition. The best rendering is in my opinion ‘without any hand compelling (it)’/ i.e. exerting any pressure on the arrow’. The change of *nullo* (= *nemine*) to adjectival *nulla* is indeed more than a change in word category.³⁰

Instead of the marked *penthemimeres* after *manum* in ms. *R* there is in my reading an artificial pause and suspense after *secuta* in so far as the expected caesura is counteracted by the syntax; the reciter has to join *manu* with the following two words. After *nulla* there will be a *hepthemimeres* with normal emphasis. Altogether, this is a case of elegant versification, no doubt intended to illustrate the miraculous event as it unfolds jerkily before the spectator. The outcome is hanging in the air until the beginning of the next line with its enjambment (*excidit*) marks the happy ending.

In conclusion, I put down the whole sentence (period) as I have experienced the incident:

Fovit ea vulnus lympha longaevus Iapyx	420
ignorans subitoque omnis de corpore fugit	
quippe dolor – omnis stetit imo vulnere sanguis –	
iamque secuta, manu nulla cogente, sagitta	423
excidit atque novae rediere in pristina vires. ³¹	

At the end of his comment on the episode, Richard Heinze (1993, 24) said: “We see how Virgil has taken trouble to make the miracle closer to a natural event, though without falling into trivial rationalizing.” I hope that my analysis of line 423 has made the ‘miracle’ sound as natural and elegant as it was originally conceived by the “wielder of the stateliest measure / ever moulded by the lips of man” (Tennyson).

³⁰ As to *manu ... cogente* my excellent reviewer points to a natural phrase in the same book of Celsus (VII 14.6) *digitis tumorem cum premere, ut, si quid delapsum non est, manu cogatur* (“to press with the fingers that tumour so that whatever has not slipped down, can be forced with the hand”).

³¹ I have introduced dashes to separate *omnis stetit imo vulnere sanguis* in line 422 instead of the full stop found after *sanguis* in most editions. This means that there can little doubt that *excidit* is perfect in line with *fugit* (421), not a present as it easily would be taken if the reciter had marked a full pause after *sanguis*. As to *stetit*, it describes the situation, whereas the perfects *fugit* and *excidit* describe sudden occurrences.

Bibliography

- Casali, S. 2000. "Staring at the Pun: *Aeneid* 4.435–36 Reconsidered", *CJ* 95, 1999–2000, 103–118.
- Conte, G.B. ¹2011, ²2019. *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin/New York.
- 2021. *Virgilian Parerga. Textual Criticism and Stylistic Analysis*. Berlin/Boston.
- EV* (1984–1991): *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. Rome.
- Fratantuono, L.M. & R.A. Smith. 2018. *Virgil, Aeneid 8. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden/Boston.
- 2022. *Virgil, Aeneid 4. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden/Boston.
- Geymonat, M. ¹1973, ²2008. *Vergili Maronis Opera* [Corpus Paravianum]. 2nd ed. in the series *Temi e testi*, Reprint 4. Rome.
- Heinze, R. 1993. *Virgil's Epic Technique*. Trans. H. & D. Harvey & F. Robertson. 1993/1999, p. 245.
- Hirtzel, F.A. 1900. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Koch, G.A. 1870. *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zu den Gedichten des P. Vergilius Maro*⁴. Hannover.
- 1880. *Schulwörterbuch zur Aeneide des P. Vergilius Maro*. Hannover. (1st ed. 1855).
- Kraggerud, E. 1985. *Vergil. Aeneiden. Fjerde og femte bok oversatt med kommentarer og etterord av E.K. Tangen*.
- 2012. Review of Rivera García et alii (Vol. II-IV), *Exemplaria Classica* 16, 283–289.
- 2021. *Critica. Textual Issues in Horace, Ennius, Vergil and other Authors*. London and New York.
- Mackail, J.W. 1930. *The Aeneid edited with introduction and commentary*. Oxford.
- Murgia, C.E. & R.A. Kaster, see Servius (2018).
- Mynors, R.A.B. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Rivero García, L., J.A. Estévez Sola, M. Librán Moreno & A. Ramirez de Verger. 2009–2011. *Virgilio, Eneida I–IV. Introd., texto latino, traducción y notas* [Alma Mater, Colección de autores griegos y latinos]. Madrid.
- Schiesaro, A. 2008. "Furthest Voices in Virgil's Dido", *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 100, 60–109 & 194–245.
- Servius 1965. *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae Vol. III confecerunt* A. F. Stocker & A. H. Travis. Oxford.
- 2018. *Serviani in Vergili Aeneidos libros IX–XII commentarii. Ed. by C. E. Murgia. Completed and prepared for publication by R. A. Kaster*. Oxford.
- Smith, R.A. see Fratantuono.
- Snijder, H. 1972. "Virgil, *Aeneid* IV 436: *quam mihi cum dederit(s) cumulata(m) morte remittam*", *Athenaeum* 50, 417–420 (not accessed by me).
- Tarrant, R. 2012. *Virgil. Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge.

- Wagner, Ph. 1832. *Publius Virgilius Maro ... illustratus a C. G. Heyne. Editio quarta curavit G. P. E. Wagner. Vol secundum.* Leipzig/London.
- Woodcock, E.C. 1958. *A New Latin Syntax.* London.