

- G.Steffen, De canone qui dicitur Aristophanis et Aristarchi (diss. Leipzig, 1876); O.Kroehnert, Canonesne poetarum scriptorum artificum per antiquitatem fuerint (diss. Königsberg, 1897); Christ-Schmid, Gr. Literaturgeschichte, II, pp. 22-23.; Luck, Comp.Lit. 1958.
94. Quintilian, Inst.Or.10.2.28 fin.
95. Cf., e.g., A.Guillemin, 'L'imitation dans les littératures antiques', REL 2 (1924), 35-57 and L'Originalité de Virgile (Paris, 1931), pp. 125 ff.; M.Hügi, Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung (Berne, 1951), pp. 19 ff., excellently exhibits the principle in relation to Virgil.
96. Quintilian, Inst.Or.10: on epic, 85 ff.; on elegy, 93; on satire 93 f.; on tragedy, 97; on comedy, 99 ff.; on historiography, 101 ff.; on oratory, 105 ff.; on philosophy, 123 ff.: cf. Cousin, op.cit., p.587.
[Some portions of this paper have been based on my article "The Reputation of Antimachus of Colophon", to appear in Hermes.]
- V.S. Lectures, No. 97.

VIRGIL UNPUNCTUATED

Text of a lecture read to the Virgil Society,
21st March, 1970.

by Professor G.B.Townend, M.A.

For some months now we have had Professor Mynors's new Oxford text of Virgil. With an author whose manuscript tradition has been so strong from the start, whose ancient codices can for the most part be read with considerable ease and satisfaction, a new edition can hardly hope to mark a new epoch. Mynors's main contribution in his apparatus criticus has been to take account of a number of important MSS from the ninth century - not so much in the hope of discovering fresh readings or of obtaining authority for old ones, as for clarifying the history of the text after the great period of Mediceus and the rest. His main divergencies from Hirtzel, his predecessor in the OCT series, appear to occur where a superior understanding of Virgil's method, or a greater mastery of textual criticism, has enabled him to reject readings which can fairly be described as ill-advised.

My own interest, when I opened the new volume, was perhaps peculiar. I looked, in fact, not so much at the words as at the punctuation. This is sometimes a field in which an editor's idiosyncrasy shows itself to the full, and in which a fresh survey of the MSS, rather than of previous printed editions, may lead to significant changes. The changes and retentions I found in Mynors's text were interesting, if not striking.

In my own paper, which appeared in Classical Quarterly in February I was concerned to raise the whole question of the legitimacy of editorial punctuation in Lucretius as well as in Virgil; but I confined myself almost exclusively to those places where a sense-break occurs at the end of the fifth foot of the hexameter. In the present paper, while fittingly restricting myself to Virgil, I intend to take a rather wider view of the problem, employing Mynors's text as my starting-point. A certain amount of recapitulation will be necessary.

Our knowledge of Latin literary texts before the fourth century is surprisingly small, and the palaeographical evidence for punctuation is scanty. We have relevant fragments, apparently from the first century A.D., of two prose works. First there is a very small fragment from an anonymous account of the Macedonian wars, in which one can at least distinguish a sort of elevated comma marking what appears to be a period. Next, a small piece of Cicero's second Verrine, badly broken at the beginning of each line and not at all easy for an amateur to decipher. Most easily distinguishable is the letter K in the third line, following the mutilated word conlocaret, which we know formed the clausula of a period. In addition, the scribe has used two signs, / and / quite indiscriminately, to represent commas.

Next comes our one good example of a text in verse - the eight fragments of the anonymous poem on Actium, decisively dated between the year of that battle and the destruction of Herculaneum just over a hundred years later - certainly during the period when Virgil's poems were being widely reproduced for the market. Here we have a curious period-mark at the end of one line; and further on in the same fragment, while there is nothing to mark the end of the period in the penultimate line, the beginning of the next sentence in the last line is indicated by an entirely different symbol. Minor pauses (commas or colons) appear at the end of several lines, in the form of an oblique dash, resembling one type of comma just noticed in the Verrine fragment. It should be noticed that at the one place where the reader might expect help from punctuation, there is nothing at all: 'pars inlita parva veneni ocus interemit laqueis pars cogitur artis'. It is not difficult to see that laqueis must go with what follows; but in a text so fully marked the lack of a mark here is curious.

From these examples (and apparently no others) R.P.Oliver in T.A.P.A., lxxxii (1951) pp. 241-2, argued that down to about the end of the first century A.D. Latin literary texts, unlike Greek, were regularly punctuated; but that after that period punctuation fell out of use, to be restored only during the fourth century. The date of this 'astonishing regression', as Oliver properly calls it, would not of course be hard and fast. Certainly we have two fragments from Herculaneum (that is, before 79) of an oratorical work in which the experts are satisfied that there was no punctuation. Apparently not much later is the Servius Tullius fragment from Oxyrhynchus, with words clearly divided but no other marks. But even without examples of this sort we should suspect Oliver's conclusion, if only because of the striking lack of uniformity in his three texts. Of the three texts, each has a distinct way of indicating a period; the apostrophe of the de Belis; the K of the Verrines; and the curious marks, two of them, in the Carmen Actiacum - this is what Oliver

describes as 'uniformity'. The inference may more convincingly be drawn that there was no accepted method of indicating phrasing, and no common practice of punctuation at all, in the first century as in the fourth.

This is precisely the conclusion we are forced to adopt when we consider the evidence for Virgil's text in the earliest extant codices and in the commentaries of Servius, from about the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth. For example in the Schedae Vaticanae-Berolinenses or Codex Augusteus, which Mynors now dates to the fifth century, though others have placed it in the fourth or even earlier, there is no punctuation at all, and the words are not even divided. In those of the great codices which possess some sort of punctuation, it plainly does not belong to the same date as the actual text. In the Schedae Sangallenses one can see the comma inserted above the line (there is no space between words) at various places where our texts now print a comma. Likewise in the Mediceus, which Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius, consul in 494, informs us that he himself punctuated, evidently many years after it was written, one can observe the erratic series of points he has just managed to squeeze in at various places. It is clear that the subsequent punctuators of these finely-written texts felt that they had an entirely free hand to insert these marks; and so does Servius in his numerous notes on the interpreting of Virgilian phrasing. He often quotes previous discussions of these problems, usually from not long before his own time; though there are rare examples from Asper, dated by Mynors to the third century, and even to Probus, in the first. If punctuated texts of Virgil had been available, as Oliver holds, down to about 100 A.D., I do not believe that all knowledge of the original phrasing - Virgil's original phrasing - should have been lost without trace. Certainly Quintilian (i.8.1), writing at precisely the crucial period, indicates that correct phrasing - 'ubi claudatur sensus, ubi incipiat' - is a thing the young scholar learns by study and example, and not by simple reference to a marked text. Texts might be appropriately marked by a teacher precisely for the purpose of assisting young men to read; and presumably Oliver's three texts, with their private systems of punctuation, belong to this class of schoolbook, leaving no trace in the common MS tradition. It is a sad thought that our own texts are all schoolbooks, not texts for adult reading. I remarked in my article that Aulus Gellius, in the middle of the second century, was never concerned to discuss punctuation. In fact, a colleague has pointed out to me that in xiii.31 he does recall the interesting case of a pretentious scholar who both mispronounced words and 'sententias intercidebat', so as to make nonsense of a text; though the text in question was Varro's Menippea, hardly so familiar as Virgil. But Gellius, while discussing so many details of philology, certainly never considers it his business to discuss actual questions of punctuation. There are two possible explanations. Either there was a valid tradition of reading the poems, in direct descent from the poet himself (although neither Quintilian nor Suetonius nor Gellius suggests as much, and Servius has no knowledge of the existence of such a tradition at any time); or, as I think more likely, the poet arranged his words in such a way that a contemporary, or a later reader in the same cultural tradition, would know almost at sight how a passage ought to be read. Education such as Quintilian describes would play a part in training this power of reading; but it seems unlikely that in order to read the Aeneid the young scholar would need to listen to an enarratio, or

reading with comment, of the entire poem. That this educational tradition must have been interrupted to some extent by the cultural hiatus of the third century is to be inferred by the gross lack of sensibility exhibited in many of Servius' suggestions. Yet Cassiodorus, (Inst. i.9 and 12) in the sixth century, can still refer to 'distinctiones saecularium literarum' as a technique which some might learn at school; while those who did not have this advantage would require the 'cola et commata' with which S. Jerome, a contemporary of Servius, and writing for relatively uneducated people, had so thoughtfully adorned his Vulgate from the first.

In short, when Servius or Asterius was faced with a text of Virgil, he evidently felt he had at least as free a hand as Mynors has - or more so, because Mynors at least is used to the printed texts of Hirtzel and others, and can hardly forget it. Servius' decisions are often absurd, and he supports them with even more absurd arguments - and his arguments never, I believe, include reference to the natural run of the words. This is a pity, for even so late as the late fourth century we might expect Servius' ear to be a better guide than our own. Evidently not. At all events, he is so much of a grammarian that he does not even contemplate appealing to anything so remote from quasi-logical argument. Where we can make a real advance beyond Servius, in addition to scholarly study of Virgilian usage, is to recognise the relevance of trying to read his lines as naturally and responsively as readers would in the century after his death: not depending on intrusive markings in the text, but allowing the words to lead us by themselves. This may be a remote possibility, but I submit that it is not a meaningless one.

Now let us see how Mynors appears to be operating. He is certainly not bound by the dubious traditions of the late Empire. At Aen. v.389-91 where we read 'Entelle, heroum quondam fortissime frustra tantane tam patiens nullo certamine tolli dona sines?', Servius and Donatus, with the punctuators of Mediceus and Palatinus, take frustra with the following line. They are almost certainly wrong, as Ribbeck and R.D. Williams have argued. Moreover, this would be one of those breaks before the sixth foot, which always require some special explanation. Mynors, like Hirtzel, puts a comma at the end of the line. Neither Oxford editor acknowledges the old view in his apparatus.

It is certainly noticeable how little Mynors is concerned to register his own policy in these matters. I find only five explicit references to punctuation in his whole apparatus, all referring to the ancient commentators. Three of these belong to the first three Eclogues, as if the editor began on a policy of which he soon wearied; one occurs at Aen. ii.433, one at vii.533, both of which I shall discuss in due course. Mynors never refers to the punctuation of the ancient codices; nor does he draw attention to his departures from Hirtzel's text. 'At Aen. vi.857-8, 'hic (Marcellus) rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu sistet eques sternet Poenum Gallumque rebellem', Hirtzel puts a comma after sistet, Mynors after eques. Servius has nothing there; most editors agree with Hirtzel. Norden showed how in fact Virgil avoids breaks at the trochaic caesura, and his evidence seems decisive here; Mynors assumes that we have read our Norden. In addition, I think Virgil's practice of opening a new phrase in asyndeton with a verb confirms the rightness of Mynors' decision. Likewise at viii. 90-1, Hirtzel followed Heyne and a hint in

Palatinus with 'ergo iter inceptum celerant. rumore secundo labitur uncta carina'. Servius, again with no note at all, presumably equated line and sentence, as Macrobius does some years later when he cites line 90 as a unit. Conington does the same, and now Mynors, without comment. This phrasing is natural and right. Other things being equal, pauses are more likely at the end of lines than elsewhere; and there is nothing in line 90 or in what follows to justify breaking the run of words after celerant.

The ancient editors followed the same commonsense principle at vii.37, 'nunc age qui reges Erato quae tempora rerum quis Latio antiquo fuerit status', giving a steadily increasing tricolon, of one word, two words, three words, not counting the verb, which adds further weight to the third and strongest member. Peerlkamp inserted one of the most arbitrary breaks in the whole of the text when he attached rerum to status to produce a familiar prose cliché - too familiar and too prosaic, surely, for Virgilian verse. Quite apart from that, Peerlkamp, and Henry after him, never considered how a Roman reader could have known that he was supposed to separate such a natural, if unusual, phrase as quae tempora rerum, especially in the cadence of the line. Yet Hirtzel followed Peerlkamp, with acknowledgement. Mynors does so without admitting the possibility of an alternative and without, I suggest, listening to what he has written.

With better justification, Mynors quietly inserts a comma in v.80-81, 'salve sancte parens iterum, salvete recepti nequicquam cineres'. He is in fact following a fairly sensible note by Servius, as Heyne and Wagner also did; Hirtzel, with Ribbeck and with the support now of R.D. Williams, punctuated after parens. The decision depends only marginally on the sense, especially since the adverb must to some extent be understood with both imperatives. Henry believed that the run of the line was better with 'salve sancte parens, iterum salvete', and Williams concurs. I wonder if this is simply a predilection for a sense-break at the third-foot caesura; I wonder whether a reader of the first century would naturally make a pause at the same point; I wonder what lies behind Mynors's decision.

If he is ever influenced by Servius, we may have an explanation of his apparatus at ii.432-4, 'testor in occasu vestro nec tela nec ullas vitavisse vices Danaum et si fata fuissent ut caderem meruisse manu'. Here both Oxford editors have a comma after vices, so that Danaum goes with manu. Hirtzel notes that vices Danaum is found vulgo; Mynors that it is found in Servius (as it is in Mediceus). His reason for citing Servius here when, as so often, his view is rejected, is presumably because Austin rejects Hirtzel for the vulgate, rightly pointing out the difficulty of taking Danaum away from vices and attaching it to manu. Austin might have emphasized more strongly the sheer improbability of removing Danaum also from tela (the weapons being unquestionably Danaan, whatever may be said of the hazards), unless directed by unusually forceful punctuation.

Sometimes Mynors's reticence is puzzling. At viii. 532-3, there has long been uncertainty about the meaning of 'ne quaere profecto quem casum portenta ferant'. The old tradition, with Servius, took 'ne quaere profecto' together. Hirtzel, striking out the comma which many editors placed at the

end of the line, remarks: 'correxit Ladewig, ut profecto sit participium' - a comma after quaere would have made his interpretation clearer still. Mynors has no comma and no note. In fact Ladewig's rejection of 'ne quaere profecto' may be justified not merely by the fact that it is a curious use of the adverb, for which scholars can find no real parallel, but by Virgil's failure to employ profecto as an adverb anywhere else at all. The break at this point in the line is still odd, and can be justified only if it is felt that a first-century reader would at once recognise that 'ne quaere profecto' could not be an epic phrase, and that profecto must be taken as dative with ferant. Mynors may have been influenced in his decision (whatever his decision was) by the fact that he prefers to take 'ego poscor Olympo' together in the next line, where Hirtzel had attached Olympo to the following phrase as an ablative. Certainly the break at this point in two successive verses, as Hirtzel has it, would be extraordinary, to an extent which Virgil never appears to admit.

By contrast, it is curious to find Mynors for once using punctuation to clarify what could hardly be ambiguous, at i.737, 'primaque, libato, summo tenus attigit ore'. He could hardly be saying more clearly 'libato is to be taken as ablative absolute and not, as you might have thought if you were very foolish, with ore'. This is so unlike his usual practice that we must conclude that he has inadvertently reproduced a feature of Hirtzel's text, where punctuation is consistently more prescriptive.

Now it is of course impossible for the editor of a plain text such as the Oxford Virgil to explain his reasons for printing a particular reading, whether of letters or of punctuation. Normally he will not change the accepted wording, unless he is a philological autocrat like W.M.Lindsay, without explanation in his apparatus criticus. Mynors patently does not consider that traditional punctuation, whether of the fourth or of the nineteenth century, has any authenticity - of course it has none - and it is only remarkable that he does notice the ancient commentators as often as five times, whether to follow them or not. His unmatched mastery of Latin usage in general, and of Virgil's in particular, qualifies him uniquely to determine how the lines ought to run; and repeatedly he gives better guidance to the reader than was to be found in his predecessors, even if he sometimes seems to ignore genuine disputes which have engaged scholars from Servius to Hirtzel at least, preferring to let the reader make up his own mind. Libato, mentioned just now, is a rare instance of paternalism. Often, though, when he does indicate a preference, it is difficult to work out his reasoning. Having completed my study of breaks before the sixth foot for CQ, I waited curiously to see how often Mynors would turn out to have reached opposite conclusions. His acceptance of 'quae tempora, rerum quis Latio antiquo fuerit status' at vii.37-8 still puzzles me; and so does the similar phrasing of 'quid Thesea, magnum quid memorem Alciden' at vi.122-3. But it is not for an editor to justify his ways in this sort of matter.

Those who have read my discussion of these and similar passages in the Quarterly will recall my general conclusion concerning the punctuation of Virgil at least: that in so far as his text was for several hundred years intended to be read without pointing, as Virgil left it, the words somehow spoke themselves, falling into their proper phrases as a result of their

actual arrangement one to another; and that only a gradual decline in the reading of epic during the third and early fourth centuries led to a real need for scholars like Servius and Asterius to produce texts of the sort we are familiar with, intended for those to whom Virgilian language is fundamentally alien - as it was, I conjecture, even to such a writer as Claudian. I still believe that it should not be difficult to read all but a very small number of Virgil's lines without needing to employ a punctuated text.

There is a dilemma here, no doubt: to read with understanding we need to know Virgil's language and style intimately, by reading his works; by reading his works we inevitably learn to accept the phrasing prescribed by Hirtzel or Mymors or whatever text we have been using. I have tried the experiment of reading Mynors right through as if no stops were there - as if I were a young Roman of the second century first looking into Virgil's Aeneid, allowing the sentences to sort themselves out as they must. Naturally it was difficult to ignore the periods and commas in the print; no less significant, I had read it all before and could not forget how I had been taught to construe over the last forty years. However, it struck me how very seldom one could really get it wrong. If you try the test for yourselves, you will find this to be true. Even in Virgil, as in Lucretius and Catullus, the line is a natural unit, and there is a certain predisposition for the sense of a line to be self-contained to a considerable extent. When it is not, as continually happens in 'Virgil, the lead-on is pretty clear, and a firm break within a line is almost always heralded by a word which could not possibly be a continuation of the previous phrase.

For example, in the opening lines of Aeneid iv I note the following: 'multa viri virtus animo multusque recursat gentis honos. haerent infixi pectore vultus verbaque' - the new verb leaves no option. Or 'degeneres animos timor arguit. heu quibus ille iactatus fatis quae bella exhausta canebat'. First the interjection, then the emphatic quibus quae in anaphora. And in 22-3 'solus hic inflexit sensus animumque labantem impulit. Agnosco veteris vestigia flammae' - again and again it is a verb, emphasized by its initial position, which determines the phrasing, without need for hesitation; though one notes that it is necessary for the eye to have noticed impulit, so as not to end the sentence at labantem. So far as actual breaks between sentences are concerned, there is hardly any real ambiguity in the whole of Virgil. In my paper on the fifth-foot break, I was hesitant only about Georgic iii, 500-02, of the horse: 'demissae aures, incertus ibidem sudor et ille quidem moriturus frigidus aret pellis et ad tactum tractanti dura resistit'. Given that pellis is feminine, and cannot go with the masculine adjective frigidus so as to allow et ad tactum to be the start of an entirely new member: yet et continually stands second in the sentence, and it is as easy to make a break after aret as before, especially since there is always the tendency for a sentence to end with the line. Nevertheless, the sense is ultimately superior with the break before aret. I should still prefer not to think that the reader needs to indulge in considerations of 'Which gives the more satisfactory sense?' before he can read the passage. In the end, I think R.G.Austin is right in insisting that it is a matter of rhetorical arrangement. He has suggested to me that we have here a recognisable tricolon, with predicate opening each member in turn: 'demissae (sunt) aures; incertus

(est) ibidem sudor (and then the parenthetic addition about the cold sweat characteristic of the dying); aret pellis et ... resistit'. If we were more familiar with the use of these common rhetorical features, we might be more confident that we should all read these lines correctly at sight.

Most of the other problems concern minor pauses, usually commas. I reckon that there are about seventy places in all Virgil's work where a comma can be or has been significantly inserted or removed, including some extraordinarily silly examples thought up by Servius or his predecessors. Far the commonest of the problems occur where a word stands between two phrases in such a way that it can be taken equally with either. Some of these we have noted already, particularly the two parallel examples in Aeneid vii.37 'quae tempora rerum quis status' and vi. 123 'quid Thesea magnum quid memorem Alciden'. Here, as I have argued, only firm conventions of punctuation can separate the last word of either line from what precedes; yet, as Henry and others have argued, status has a considerable claim on rerum, and Alcides (Hercules) deserves the epithet magnum somewhat better than Theseus does. In fact, the debated word in each example is to be taken apo koinou, both with tempora or Thesea, to which both rhythm and rhetorical balance attach them, and with status or Alciden, as sense may suggest, however secondary a consideration sense ought to be in this respect. Likewise, there is a whole series of lines, especially in the Georgics, where the central word is patently apo koinou, as i.453, 'caeruleus pluuiam denuntiat igneus Euros' ii.446 'viminibus salices fecundae frondibus ulmi', or iii.165 'dum faciles animi iuuenum dum mobilis aetas'. We tend in cases like this to assume that the common word belongs with the preceding phrase and is understood with the following. Hirtzel, with delightful inconsequentiality, punctuated the first and third examples in this way, the second the other way round. We might do better to dispense with commas altogether in such places.

In a slightly different way, Aen.vi.358, 'paulatim adnabam terrae iam tuta tenebam' allows, as Servius noted, a break either after terrae, making it dative with adnabam (such as the verb surely needs) or before, making it partitive genitive with tuta, as the alliteration suggests. Here the run of the line gives little help, unless there is really anything in the preference for third-foot caesura for a sense-break; but if the phrasing is intentionally ambiguous, and terrae is somehow apo koinou dative and genitive, it is still difficult to see (or hear) how Virgil himself can have read the line so as to leave the problem open. Or would he read it differently on different days?

Again v.262, 'donat habere viro decus et tutamen in armis' was punctuated in Palatinus and Mediceus after viro, attaching the dative to donat, where it must to some extent belong, even if huic has occurred as indirect object three lines before. Both Oxford editors print a comma after habere, attaching viro to decus et tutamen. I should rather regard the distinction as meaningless either way, and leave the ambiguity open. Equally idle is the quibble over ii.294-5, 'his moenia quaere magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto'. Magna here qualifies moenia in any event, whether as part of the main clause moenia quaere or of the relative clause quae statues. It does not appear to affect sense or delivery. Hirtzel's comma after magna, anticipated by Mediceus, is as unnecessary as the point inserted after quaere by a later hand in Augusteus. Mynors, I am happy to see, has neither. Only line-structure

seems to justify Mynors's comma at the end of iii.433, 'si qua est Heleno prudentia vati, si qua fides'. Rhetorical balance may suggest that vati belongs rather with si qua fides, and Servius reasonably remarks 'in homine prudentia est, in vatibus fides'. But that is a scholar's argument, not a consideration for the reader of an unpunctuated text, who cannot be expected to pause before the end of the line, unless rhetorical economy is more important than one would have supposed.

A little more tricky, as again requiring a common word to masquerade as two different cases, is ii.48, 'aut aliquis latet error equo ne credite Teucris'. Most editors have felt that credite requires equo as dative more than latet does, presumably as ablative. Servius and the Medicean prefer equo ne credite; Servius Auctus, with Tiberius Donatus and apparently the Palatine, prefers latet equo. It may be natural and acceptable to read the line without indicating a break at all.

Two lines in the eleventh book seem genuinely puzzling. In 18 Aeneas is exhorting his men: 'arma parate animis et spe praesumite bellum'. At first sight, the verse is a complex chiasmus: noun-verb-ablative, ablative-verb-noun, with et as a simple link. Yet the Oxford texts both have a comma after arma parate, and leave the et to join simply two ablatives, forming in effect a hendiadys, 'with hopeful hearts'. This is excellent sense, certainly. Indeed could Virgil have intended 'arma parate animis' as a complex phrase, as Donatus paraphrases it, 'arma sint in animis vestris', and as Ribbeck and Conington believe? In fact, that is what the poet has written, and I do not see how anything but editorial directives could prevent us from reading the line accordingly. Again, in 359, Drances is urging Turnus to give up the war: 'cedat ius proprium regi patriaeque remittat'. The Oxford texts separate cedat as 'let him yield' from ius, leaving the noun as object exclusively to the second verb, from which it is removed, with both datives regi and patriae linked by -que. The rhythm is not un-Virgilian (compare 'unam, quae Lycios' at i.113), but the comma seems arbitrary, when cedat ius regi makes so natural a phrase. Perhaps the double of alliteration of 'proprium regi patriaeque remittat' is to be taken as an element in favour of welding the last four words together. I cannot help thinking that the question ought not to have been asked in the first place, far less answered so magisterially as by the insertion of a comma.

Finally, a familiar crux from the fourth book, repeated twice within forty lines, as Juno arranges the liaison of Dido and Aeneas: 'speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem devenient' (124). Forty lines further on the meeting takes place, with deveniunt. It is normally assumed that dux Troianus is Aeneas, although he happens to be so described nowhere else, and there are of course plenty of parallels for the postponed et, as Pease shows in his note on the passage. Quinn (*Virgil's Aeneid*, p.40) is not the only critic to recognise that et may be taken as a normal link, leaving dux with Dido, so that she has priority in effecting the union. Dido is certainly dux in i.364, 'dux femina facti', and again alliteration may be significant. Aeneas will then be simply Troianus, as he is twice elsewhere, although only in the vocative. The balance of probability is almost complete - the ambiguity presumably intentional, unless the unusual break at the end of the third foot (speluncam Dido dux), in actual conflict with third-foot caesura, can be taken

as a pointer to connecting 'dux et Troianus'. No ancient scholars, and very few modern, appear even to have recognised the problem; which incidentally is not to be solved by any normal sort of punctuation.

Provided we are prepared to accept ambiguities of this sort, particularly the type depending on a word shared between preceding and following phrases, the number of real problems is extraordinarily small. So far as I can make out, there are no genuine pitfalls in the Eclogues, unless you count 'ab Iove principium Musae' at iii.60 as a possible vocative, rather than as genitive singular (a suggestion of Servius which Mynors exceptionally thinks worthy of a mention in his apparatus); and line 102 of the same poem: 'his certe neque amor causa est vix ossibus haerent'. Here Aelius Donatus apparently took 'neque amor causa est' as a parenthesis, as word-order suggests, leaving his as an archaic or rustic nominative plural, like hisce in Plautus and Livy. Hirtzel accepted this, except that he followed Stephanus in emending to hi, judging that only failure to recognise the parenthesis had given rise to his. Mynors prefers the vulgate, with the awkward postponement of neque to third place. I think I should rather accept the correction of his to hi than juggle with punctuation.

The Georgics contain the puzzle of aret pellis, which probably ought not to puzzle us at all; and perhaps another at iv. 78-9, of the bees: 'erumpunt portis; concurritur aethere in alto fit sonitus magnum mixtae glomerantur in orbem'. Mynors surprisingly takes aethere in alto with fit sonitus; although the paradox of battle being joined in mid-air might be thought to give priority to 'concurritur aethere in alto', which after all comes together as the second half of a single line. And of course the noise of battle is heard in the same place as the battle has been joined. I should prefer to label this one apo koinou.

In the Aeneid, I have been struck by the different incidence of problems in different books. This may be rather a subjective impression; but in book iii, for example, I am puzzled only by line 546, 'praeceptisque Heleni dederat quae maxima rite Iunoni Argivae iussos adolemus honores'. How can the reader tell that rite is to be taken with the following line, as sense probably requires? In the Quarterly I could suggest only that the ritual feeling of the following line might somehow attract the adverb; but I remain uncertain.

Equally, in book ix I hesitate over nothing except lines 60-1, where Turnus is on the prowl like a wolf: 'cum fremit ad caulas ventos perpressus et imbris nocte super media tuti sub matribus agni balatum exercent'. Traditionally there is a break at the main caesura in 61, attaching the indication of midnight to wolf rather than lambs, though the hour is in fact the same for both. Certainly there is nothing to check the reader as he passes on from wind and rain to the darkness of midnight; and then tuti effectively marks the new sentence with its emphatic change to plural from the solitary singular of the marauder. Probably not a real problem.

Again, book x has nothing more difficult than 228-9, 'vigilansne nequgens Aenea vigila et velis admitte rudentis'. Both Oxford editors have decided to end the question after Aenea, rather than at the end of the line.