

Citation style

Kiss, Dániel: Rezension über: Egil Kraggerud, *Vergiliana. Critical Studies on the Texts of Publius Vergilius Maro*, London/New York: Routledge, 2016, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 21 (2017), S. 305-314, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v21i0.3226, heruntergeladen über Website

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

copyright

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

EGIL KRAGGERUD, *Vergiliana. Critical Studies on the Texts of Publius Vergilius Maro*, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016, 363 pp., ISBN 978-1-138-20134-7.¹

Scholars who edit the writings of Vergil start out from a privileged position. While we owe our knowledge of most of classical Latin literature to relatively corrupt manuscripts from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, for the greatest Roman poet of all we have eight incomplete late antique manuscripts and two dozen others from the eighth and the ninth centuries, which are backed up by an indirect transmission consisting of several commentaries and a rich harvest of quotations from antiquity. Far from being spectacularly corrupt, Vergil's manuscripts transmit most passages in at least one plausible version, and often in several. Recent critical editions have documented this exceptionally rich source material with increasing fullness and accuracy.

Editors have not failed to respond to the unique antiquity of these manuscripts: Vergil's oldest codices have received an accolade from as level-headed a scholar as R. A. B. Mynors, while Gian Biagio Conte has stated confidently that they enable us to restore the original text of the *Aeneid*.² This editorial optimism has been mirrored in the reconstructions of the text: as Kraggerud puts it, "textual conservatism has become more rooted in the course of the last century" (p. 1), thanks to the editions not only of Mynors (*Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid*: 1969) and Conte (*Aen.*: 2009, *Geo.*: 2013), but also of Geymonat (*Ecl., Geo., Aen.*: 2008), Rivero, Estévez Sola, Librán Moreno and Ramírez de Verger (*Aen.*: 2009-11) and Ottaviano (*Ecl.*: 2013).

At the start of this book Kraggerud makes an appeal "for a slight change of paradigm" in Vergilian textual criticism (p. 1). He states that its "ambition ... is to influence future editors and encourage them to become a little braver than they have been for the last hundred years or so", arguing that "the ancient paradosis is too lacunose and arbitrary to serve as the sole basis for the text" (p. xv), which he illustrates by documenting the extent of

¹ This review has been written with the help of a Beatriu de Pinós Fellowship (reference: 2014 BP-B 00071), held within the research group LITTERA (2014SGR63) at the Universitat de Barcelona, and an OTKA Postdoctoral Fellowship (OTKA 2015/1 PD 116524), held at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest.

² R.A.B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford 1969, p. v; G.B. Conte (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin-New York 2009, p. vii "Testes enim potissimi, quibus freti *Aeneidos* textum restituere in integrum possumus, libri sunt aliquot sub aevi antiqui occasum scripti".

the differences between the earliest manuscripts and by listing some passages where the genuine reading does not appear in any of them (pp. 5-7). He also notes with slight disapproval “how often editors move in a flock, adhere to national preferences or simply take over some forerunner’s text and punctuation” (p. xv). As remedies, he recommends the careful study of every textual problem and a more open-minded attitude towards conjectures (pp. 1-5).

The body of his book consists of 109 short chapters, each of them devoted to a passage in Vergil that is in some way problematic. Almost all of the problems discussed have to do with textual criticism in a broad sense, including clarifying the meaning of the transmitted text and verifying its authenticity (the crucial task that Paul Maas called *examinatio*). Most chapters are based on past articles by Kraggerud, which have been reproduced with or without additions; some have been rewritten or replaced by a new piece that modifies or recants an earlier opinion. The volume sums up a significant part of the life work of the author, who is currently Professor Emeritus at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Oslo. It adds a personal touch that the book does not offer a systematic re-examination of every problematic passage in Vergil, but merely discusses a selection. Some parts of the text receive more attention than others: out of 109 chapters, 22 are devoted to the *Eclogues* but only 7 to the *Georgics*, which are more than twice as long and no less challenging; in the *Aeneid* Books 6 and 9 receive the most space with 18 and 20 chapters, respectively.

While Kraggerud treats the transmitted text with greater scepticism than recent editors, he proposes a broad range of solutions to the problems that it presents. He puts forward conjectures of his own, advocates those of other scholars, recommends a manuscript reading or defends the transmitted text, while sometimes altering its punctuation. He combines this methodological flexibility with the sensitivity to style and linguistic usage that is required from every competent critic, and with an impressive knowledge of earlier scholarship on the text of Vergil. He advocates conjectures made by familiar figures such as Bentley, Ribbeck and Baehrens as well as the little-known but excellent Frisian scholar Johannes Schrader (1721-1783) and the somewhat infamous but highly productive Dutch philologist Petrus Hofman Peerlkamp (1786-1865). On the other hand, he makes fairly little use of recent scholarship on the literary aspects of Vergil’s writings. His studies of individual problems tend to be perceptive and thoroughly presented, sometimes excessively so; there are some lengthy lists of parallels where a brief reference to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* would have sufficed. But if there are any capital sins in textual criticism, being too thorough is surely not one of them.

I will consider the core of this book in two ways: first by discussing all of Kraggerud’s proposals that concern a well-known part of the writings of

Vergil, namely Book 4 of the *Aeneid*, and next by commenting on the main kinds of proposals that he makes.³

In a chapter originally published in *SO* 65, 1990, 67-70, Kraggerud argues convincingly for Peerlkamp's deletion of *Aen.* 4.126 *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo*, a verse that is identical to 1.73, where it makes good sense. Here it is out of place: *conubio iungam stabili* can only be supplied with an object awkwardly from line 124, *propriam* does not agree with anything nearby, and the line oddly characterizes the tryst of Dido and Aeneas in the cave as a properly enacted marriage. Remove the line and all these problems disappear. It has now been bracketed by Conte (2009).—At *Aen.* 4.176 *parua metu primo* Kraggerud advocates Baehrens' brilliant conjecture *initu*, which yields the right sense, picks up Lucretius 1.383 *initum primum*, and is palaeographically plausible. He concludes that this remedy "has yet to be adopted wholeheartedly by a courageous editor" (p. 180).—Kraggerud provides an authoritative discussion of the textual problems in the famous comparison of the restless Dido with Pentheus and Orestes (*Aen.* 4.469-73). Here most recent editors have kept the transmitted text, but G.P. Goold has accepted two conjectures in his revised Loeb edition (1999): Samuel Allen's *Euiadum* "of the Bacchantes" at 4.469 *Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus* and Jeremiah Markland's *Poenis* at 4.471 *scaenis agitatus Orestes*. Kraggerud advocates Allen's conjecture, or rather the form *Euhiadum*, as Roman authors tend to write *Euhias*, conserving the internal aspiration of *euhoē* (incidentally, this form is also closer to the reading of the manuscripts). He bases his arguments on a study of the intertextual connections between this passage and Euripides' *Bacchae*. One might add that *agmina* "throng, bands" makes better sense if it refers to the Bacchantes, who tended to operate in groups. Kraggerud argues further that in view of the close parallels with Euripides' play, "Markland's argument against the word *scaenis* in the next example loses its weight" (p. 188). In fact the phrase *scaenis agitatus Orestes* is not just acceptable, but a number of recent interpretations of this part of the *Aeneid* have shown it to be heavily charged with meaning.⁴ Eliminating this artful oddity would impoverish the text. Kraggerud proceeds to clarify that *scaenis* means not "the stage"

³ In each case I start out from the text printed by Mynors (1969). I normally give no page references to Kraggerud's book, whose chapters follow the sequence of Vergil's text.

⁴ See e.g. E.L. Harrison, "The Tragedy of Dido", *EMC* 8, 1989, 1-21, at 4-5; A. Barchiesi, "Future Reflexive: Two Models of Allusion and Ovid's Heroides", *HSCP* 95, 1993, 333-65, at 353; S.J. Harrison, "Response to Akbar Khan", in A. Sommerstein (ed.), *Religion and Superstition in Classical Literature*, Bari 1996, 29-37, at 35, quoting M. Fernandelli, "Tragico e tragedia nell'episodio cartaginese dell'Eneide", Diss. Turin 1994; S.M. Goldberg, *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge 2005, 116-8; F. Mac Góráin, "Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic", in J. Farrell, D.P. Nelis (eds.), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2013, 124-45, at 127.

but “a kind of revolving background”, “a building forming the background of the scene” (p. 189), from which he infers that the dramatic scene Vergil has in mind here does not come from Pacuvius, as was stated already by Servius, but from Euripides’ *Orestes*.—At **Aen. 4.112** most manuscripts (and most recent editions) read *foedera iungi*, but the variant *foedere* is acknowledged by Servius and it appears in an eighth-century codex. Kraggerud offers cautious support for the latter, but makes the important observation that “Vergil’s syntax may have been more flexible than shown by today’s editions” (p. 175).—The transmitted text of **Aen. 4.224–5** has Jupiter describe Aeneas as *Dardaniumque ducem Tyria Karthagine qui nunc / expectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes*. It has been controversial for long whether *expectat* could be used intransitively here (thus e.g. *OLD* s.v. *expecto*, 4) or the text has to be emended. Earlier conjectures include *Hesperiam* (Housman) and *optatas* (Kraggerud, *PVS* 25, 2004, 161–3) as well as *Tyrias ... / res captat* (Courtney). Here Kraggerud proposes the reconstruction *Tyrias ... / res spectat*, but this would result in an awkward jingle in *res spectat fatisque datas non respicit*; moreover, the meaning of *spectat* “he watches over, inspects” seems rather too bland for this context. Out of the conjectures that have been put forward, Housman’s *Hesperiam* may be the best, but it would create a long, disjointed, awkwardly trailing clause. Could those defending the transmitted reading be right after all?

In general, Kraggerud’s conjectures tend to require limited alterations to the transmitted text: as he remarks in connection with his excellent proposal *nunc* at **Geo. 1.500–1** *hunc saltem euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo / ne prohibete*, “[m]inimal change can work wonders” (p. 110). The end result too must be satisfactory, and here *nunc* removes the incomprehensible *hunc saltem ... iuuenem* “this young man at any rate”.—Meanwhile, at **Ecl. 3.62** *Et me Phoebus amat* Kraggerud’s *At* tidies up the meaning of the text and introduces a common formula of transition.—Another intervention that only involves changing one letter comes at **Aen. 2.139** *quos illi fors et poenas ... reposcent*, where a superfluous *et* strongly suggests that the text may be corrupt. However, Kraggerud’s proposal *forsit* is a risky bet, as this abbreviated form of *forsitan* only appears in classical Latin at Horace, *Satires* 1.6.49 and it could be a one-off coinage by Horace.⁵ We should look for another remedy.—At **Aen. 7.598** the transmitted text puts the words *nam mihi parta quies* into the mouth of King Latinus, rather oddly, as he is exasperated, and not content or at peace. Kraggerud’s brilliant conjecture

⁵ *forsit* has also been conjectured at *Ter. Andr.* 957 and *Eun.* 197 by L. Havet (*RPh* 30, 1906, 191). In both passages the manuscripts write *forsitan*. But as far as I can tell, Havet’s proposals have not been adopted in any edition; the critical edition of S. Prete (Heidelberg 1954) has *fors* in the former passage and *forsan* in the latter. It is always risky to conjecture such an extremely rare word.

rapta obtains the right tone and meaning at minimal cost; it deserves to find its way into every critical apparatus, and arguably also into the text.—Less convincing is his solution for **Aen. 2.738–40** *heu misero coniunx fatone erepta Creusa / substitit, errauitne uia seu lapsa resedit, / incertum*, where he proposes to write *fato mea rapta*; but *meo* would be superfluous after *misero coniunx*, and the loose syntax of *fatone* may perhaps be admissible in such an emotional passage. (Mynors prints *lapsa* in 2.739, which stands in Mnq, but Kraggerud tacitly accepts *lassa* from the majority of manuscripts, for good reason.)

Kraggerud advocates a number of conjectures by earlier scholars. One of them affects a puzzling passage at **Ecl. 10.44–8** *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis / tela inter media atque aduersos detinet hostis. / tu procul a patria ... / Alpinas, a! dura niues et frigora Rheni / me sine sola uides*, where Gallus ostensibly complains that he is at war (44–5) and his beloved Lycoris is in the Alps (46–8). Many other passages in the poem show him to be in peaceful isolation in the Arcadian countryside (9–15, 26, 31–6, 42–3, 55–7), where there is not the slightest hint of warfare. The contradiction is removed by Heumann’s conjecture *te* for *me* in line 44, which is advocated convincingly by Kraggerud. It results in a text in which it is no longer Gallus who is in a war zone but his beloved Lycoris, who is evidently accompanying a lover on a campaign through the Alps near the upper reaches of the Rhine.—**Aen. 7.128–9** *haec erat illa fames, haec nos suprema manebat / exitiis positura modum* reinterprets a previous prophecy by Helenus that Aeneas and his companions would bite into their tables (3.394). All authoritative sources write *exitiis*, but *exiliis* appears in some late manuscripts, most likely due to a conjecture or a creative error. However, Kraggerud is right to contend that “as to content it is by far the better alternative”, and the change from one form to the other is minimal.—At **Ecl. 6.23–4** Silenus pleads with the shepherds who have tied him up: “*quo uincola nectitis?*” *inquit. / “soluite me, pueri; satis est potuisse uideri. ...”* The last words are somewhat puzzling, so Peerlkamp conjectured *uieri*, while Kraggerud would write *satis est potuisse uiere* “it is enough to have been able to tie (me) up”. This is ingenious but unconvincing, as *uieo*, *uiere* means “to weave, plait”, for example willow twigs into wickerwork (*uimen*), and not “to bind, to tie up”. Either the transmitted text is correct after all, or we should look for another conjecture.

In some other chapters Kraggerud argues for a textual variant conserved in the manuscripts or the other ancient sources of the text that has not found favour with recent editors. At **Aen. 9.128–30** *Troianos haec monstra petunt, his Iuppiter ipse / auxilium solitum eripuit: non tela neque ignis / expectant Rutulos* Turnus sneers that the transformation of the boats of the Trojans into sea-nymphs is a sign that Jupiter has turned against

them. But it is a weak taunt that the boats “do not wait (any longer) for the weapons and the fire of the Rutulians”. Kraggerud offers a convincing solution: we should put a comma after 9.129 *eripuit* and accept M’s reading *expectans* in the following line. Jupiter has not had the patience to wait for the Rutulians; he has decided to destroy the Trojan fleet himself.—At **Aen. 5.850-1** Palinurus asks *Aenean credam (quid enim?) fallacibus auris / et caeli totiens deceptus fraude sereni?* Most manuscripts write *caeli*, pseudo-Acro quotes the passage with this reading, and it is acknowledged by Servius *auctus*. On the other hand, one ancient manuscript (P) and two Carolingian ones (cy) write *caelo*, which is also supported by Servius and Tiberius Donatus. In cy *caelo* is followed by *sereno*. Mynors and Conte print *caeli ... sereni*, but Kraggerud rightly points out that this results in a clumsy text. He proposes to write *fallacibus auris / et caelo, totiens deceptus fraude sereni?* In fact substantival *serenum* “A clear sky, bright weather” (*OLD* s.v.) is well attested, and it is helpful to have *fraude* clarified by a genitive.—At **Ecl. 7.63-4** *Phyllis amat corylos: illas dum Phyllis amabit, / nec myrtus uincet corylos, nec laurea Phoebi* all manuscripts write *uincet corylos*, but Servius *auctus* states that the ancient commentator Hebrus or Hebruius quoted the verse with the reading *uincet Veneris*. Kraggerud argues convincingly that this reading is superior to the transmitted text. It may be an early conjecture or a creative error or (more likely perhaps) a relic of the genuine reading. It deserves serious consideration in any case.—While **Aen. 1.646** is transmitted in all early codices in the form *omnis in Ascanio cari stat cura parentis*, a papyrus in the John Rylands Library reads *caro*. Kraggerud defends this reading, adducing many parallels to show that Vergil tends to use *carus* in a passive sense to mean “beloved”, which is just what one would expect. That meaning would be appropriate in this passage, which highlights Aeneas’ loving care for Ascanius. But Vergil’s use of *enallage*, a figure of speech in which an adjective is deliberately “mis-aligned” with the wrong noun, has been well documented;⁶ and here it would put an interesting emphasis on the mutual bond of affection between father and son. Moreover, *cari* may be slightly less cacophonous than *caro ... cura*, and it is hard to see how *cari* could have arisen from *caro*, rather than vice versa. Here it seems best to apply the maxim that *lectio difficilior potior est*.

One matter to which Kraggerud pays particular attention is punctuation. Of course the Romans did not have anything comparable to our rich system of commas, full stops, colons, semi-colons, and all the rest. All the same the modern punctuation of classical Latin texts is highly significant, as it reflects our understanding of the syntax. This should put into perspective

⁶ See esp. G.B. Conte, *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Vergilian Epic*, transl. S.J. Harrison, Oxford 2007, 58-122, esp. 70-6.

Kraggerud's ironical statement that "I have fought more than half of my professional life for a semicolon instead of a comma after line 4 in the prologue to the *Aeneid*" (p. 131). His case for this punctuation of *Aen.* 1.4 strikes me as convincing.—Commentators have struggled with the syntax of the description of L. Iunius Brutus, the founder of the Roman Republic, at *Aen.* 6.820-3 *natosque pater noua bella mouentis / ad poenam pulchra pro libertate uocabit, / infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores: / uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*. Kraggerud argues cogently that *infelix* must stand in enjambment at the start of verse 822 and after it, *utcumque* must start a new sentence; so we need a full stop between the two and nothing more than a comma at the end of the line.

On occasion, Kraggerud argues that the transmitted text should be conserved, as at *Ecl.* 4.28-9 *molli paulatim flauescet campus arista / incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uua*, where A.J. Woodman has argued (at *CQ* n.s. 60, 2010, 257-8) that the initial words should be reshuffled so as to read *incultus molli flauescet campus arista / paulatimque rubens pendebit sentibus uua*. Kraggerud offers a convincing defence of the transmitted text: the grape has to hang *incultus ... sentibus* if it is to be the fruit of a miracle.—*Ecl.* 1.67-9 *en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis / pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen, / post aliquot, mea regna, uidens mirabor aristas?* has puzzled interpreters for long. Kraggerud gives his support to those who take *post aliquot ... aristas* to mean "behind some sheaves of grain" (W. Berg). But why only a few (*aliquot*)? However we answer this question, the difficulty of this passage is at odds with Vergil's usual clarity. E.J. Courtney may have been right in suspecting textual corruption (at *WJA* n.s. 33, 2009, 81), but his proposed remedy *a! aliquot* does not seem much better than the ailment.—The Magna Mater describes a sacred grove in the Troad at *Aen.* 9.85-7 *pineae silua mihi multos dilecta per annos, / lucus in arce fuit summa, quo sacra ferebant, / nigranti picea trabibusque obscurus acernis*. "Lines 85 and 86 look like alternative versions" (p. 289) and the former has been bracketed by Ribbeck. In a piece that first appeared in *SO* 73, 1998, 95-6, Kraggerud argues against this deletion, as the transmitted text makes sense and *pineae silua mihi* provides the personal focus that could be expected here. The line has now been kept by Conte (2009), who argues against Ribbeck's deletion *in apparatu*. Both Kraggerud and Conte assume that the *lucus* is part of the *silua*, but I cannot see how this meaning could be extracted from the text, where *lucus* stands in apposition to *silua*. That renders disturbing the contrast between the "forest of pinewood" (*pineae silua*) in verse 85 and the spruces (*piceae*) and maples (*acres*) that appear two lines later. Could lines 85 and 86-7 be authorial variants that somehow made their way into the transmitted text? Or could line 85 have been cobbled together by an

interpolator on the basis of examples such as *Geo. 2.208 et nemora euertit multos ignaua per annos?*

A handful of chapters study passages from a purely literary point of view, without a hint of textual controversy. Kraggerud's discussion of Vergil's imitation of Ennius at *Aen. 6.846* is excellent. He studies the imitation of Catullus at *Aen. 6.460* in a chapter that is longer but less illuminating. His pages on the amoebean stanzas at *Ecl. 7.29-44* lack the analytical focus of his contributions to textual criticism, but they prepare the ground for a section in which he advocates Perret's attractive proposal to let two strophes exchange places and speakers at *Ecl. 7.53-60*.

While the contents of this book are very good indeed, its presentation is less satisfactory. One reason for this has to do with the way in which earlier articles by Kraggerud have been revised for publication in this volume. The revisions have focused on the problem at stake, adding further arguments or indicating changes of mind by the author. They have not taken into account systematically the most important recent publications in the field, such as the aforementioned editions by Conte, Ottaviano, and Rivero *et al.*, and the important commentary on the *Eclogues* by Andrea Cucchiarelli (2012). Many of the quotations from Vergil in this book are accompanied by an *apparatus criticus*. One would expect the latter to follow the best available source, that is, the Teubner editions of Conte (2009/2013) and Ottaviano (2013), but often it is based on the Oxford Classical Text of Mynors (1969), which is less complete and less reliable. As a result, the reader constantly has to check the editions of Conte and Ottaviano and modify Kraggerud's arguments in line with their apparatus.

The care with which this book has been produced also leaves something to be desired. It was not an inspired decision to locate the notes not where most readers would have expected them—at the foot of the pages, after every chapter, or at the end of the book—but tucked away after groups of chapters on the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and Books 1-4, 5-8, and 9-12 of the *Aeneid*. The final group of notes is followed by a short bibliography, but this does not include every work that has been quoted in a short form in the volume (see e.g. p. 86). The layout is inconsistent, with new additions set apart from previously published passages in several different ways, and with examples of careless formatting (e.g. on p. 100). The author writes in a lively, witty and clear English, but (like this reviewer) he is not a native speaker, and a number of mistakes in his text have not been corrected.⁷ More disturbing are the typographical errors, some of which distort the meaning of the text. For ex-

⁷ P. 1 "I have my primary attention directed", p. 36 "to beware his words", p. 58 "There is no need nor natural to see him", p. 146 "If accepting" (for "Whether to accept"), etc.—There are slips in the title on p. 181 ("A. 4. 223-4", for "224-5") and in the subtitle on p. 231 ("if one letter is taken away", for "is added").

ample, the critical apparatus to *Georgics* 3.519 reads “reliquit **MxPabirxnδe** [...] : reliquit **Mrωy**” (p. 120). Rather puzzlingly, this attributes two contradictory readings to manuscripts M and r, and it quotes manuscript x twice. A look at the edition of Conte reveals that it is the source of this apparatus, but his siglum “M^x” (standing for a textual variant of unspecified origin in M) has become “**Mx**” and *reliquit* should have been followed by a capital R, not a lower-case one.⁸ The kind and frequency of linguistic and typographical errors in this volume make one wonder whether it has passed through the hands of a professional copy-editor or a proof-reader.

None of these things should distract from the fact that this is a very good book. It makes a valuable contribution to the reconstruction of several dozen passages in Vergil, as a result of which it will be obligatory reading for all future editors and commentators, and it can safely be recommended to anyone interested in these parts of the text. But Kraggerud’s arguments for a paradigm shift in Vergilian textual criticism have deeper implications. He shows convincingly that Vergil’s earliest surviving manuscripts are, for all their value, not free from fault. This renders unsustainable the position of Pasquali, who asked “Was there always an archetype?” and concluded that a transmission *recta via* (i.e. without an archetype, with the different lines of transmission going back directly to the author’s manuscript) was “likely [...] if not for all of Vergil, at least for entire books of the *Aeneid*.”⁹ In fact even the 27 conjectures of modern scholars that were admitted to the text by as conservative an editor as Mynors make it likely that there did exist an archetype (or something of the kind) for each work of Vergil’s. The conjectures proposed or advocated by Kraggerud provide further support for this position. It is not the least of the merits of his book that it forces us to think again about the transmission of these important texts.

Despite the antiquity of the earliest surviving codices and the relative abundance of other sources on the text of Vergil, including later manuscripts and ancient quotations, we know fairly little about the earliest stage of transmission, when the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* were copied on papyrus.¹⁰ We can only speculate as to what a *stemma codicum* would have

⁸ Further typos include p. 16 “grammtical”, p. 33 “*cuspidēs* [for –e] *gressus*”, p. 63 “Corydonos” in *Ecl.* 7.40, p. 139 “seavum”, p. 145 “Achillevs”, p. 152 “his apparatus [of] 1895”, p. 167 the unmetrical “subsistit” for *Aen.* 2.739 *substitit*, p. 243 “*Gaius* [for *Gr-*] *homo*” at *Aen.* 10.720, etc.

⁹ G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence 1952, chapter II “Ci fu sempre un archetipo?”; *ibid.* p. 21 “Altri testi che siano tramandati *recta via*, non ne conosco; ritengo probabile che lo stesso sia avvenuto, se non per tutto Virgilio, almeno per interi libri dell’*Eneide*”.

¹⁰ For two excellent attempts to make inferences from the sources see E.J. Courtney, “The Formation of the Text of Vergil”, *BICS* 28, 1981, 13–29 and J. Velaza, *Itur in antiquam silvam: un estudio sobre la tradición antigua de Virgilio*, Frankfurt am Main 2001.

looked like or what would have happened to the archetype. Corrupt readings could have entered the tradition in at least two ways: during the very first stage of the transmission of the text, as it was composed, edited and copied before reaching a broader public; or later on through the rise of a vulgate that came to outnumber or displace all other versions of the text.¹¹

DÁNIEL KISS
Universitat de Barcelona &
Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (Budapest)
kiss@ub.edu

¹¹ The rise of a vulgate text has been documented within the manuscript tradition of Dante's *Commedia*, a text comparable in some ways to the *Aeneid*: see P. Trovato, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Lachmann's Method: A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text*, Padua 2017, 299-333, esp. 328-30.