Textual and interpretive notes on the epic poems of Maffeo Vegio

KYLE GERVAIS

Seven textual problems are discussed in the epic poems of Maffeo Vegio: Supplementum Aeneidos (1428), Vellus aureum (1431), Astyanax (1430), Antoniad (1437). In each case, arguments are made for accepting new emendations or previously rejected variants. Due consideration is given to Vegio's careful use of various Classical models (Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, and Statius).

The epic poetry of Maffeo Vegio was brought to a wider audience with a 2004 entry in the *I Tatti Renaissance Library* series by Michael Putnam, with the assistance of James Hankins.¹ Putnam and Hankins based their edition of Vegio's 630-line *Supplement* to the *Aeneid* (published in 1428, henceforth *Suppl.*) on the 1985 edition with German translation by Bernd Schneider; the text for the four books of the less-well known *Vellus aureum* (1431, henceforth *VA*) was based on the 1998 edition (also with German translation) by Reinhold Gleis and Markus Köhler.² For the 318-line *Astyanax* (1430, henceforth *Ast.*) and the four short books of the *Antoniad* (1437), on the life of Saint Anthony Abbott, Hankins collated a selection of manuscripts in order to prepare a "provisional edition" with brief apparatus criticus for each.³ This editorial work has inspired some renewed focus on the text of the poems, including a recent article in this journal, in which Shumilin argues against two of Hankins's corrections to the transmitted text of the *Antoniad*.⁴

I wish to take a somewhat more adventurous textual critical approach to several difficult passages in Vegio's epics, arguing in most cases for

¹ M.C.J. Putnam, J. Hankins (ed., tr.), Maffeo Vegio, *Short Epics* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

² B. Schneider (ed., tr.), *Das Aeneissupplement des Maffeo Vegio* (Weinheim, 1985); R. Gleis, M. Köhler (ed., tr.), Maffeo Vegio, *Vellus Aureum — Das Goldene Vlies (1431). Einleitung, kritische Edition, Übersetzung* (Trier, 1998).

³ Gleis, M. Köhler 1998 (as in n. 2), 169-173.

⁴ M. Shumilin, "Two Textual Notes on Maffeo Vegio's *Antonias*", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 67.2 (2018), 469-472.

emendation. I hope that my suggestions will be persuasive on their own merits, but for those who may hesitate to reject readings in manuscript traditions that begin very soon after the poems' composition,⁵ I would point out that the apparatus critici for our editions of the *Supplement* and *Vellus aureum* offer abundant evidence of corruption, both trivial and significant, early on in the traditions; even in the witnesses closest to Vegio's original, significant textual variants may be found.⁶ Furthermore, as evidenced by the several conjectures printed in the text of the *Vellus aureum* by both Gleï and Köhler, and Putnam and Hankins, there are places where Vegio's original text survives nowhere in the tradition and emendation is called for.⁷ Finally, I hope that my arguments will be of interest also to literary critics of Vegio, since they rely on consideration of the great Renaissance poet's many careful appropriations of material from the Classical models that he found in Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, and Statius.

1. *Supplementum Aeneidos*

424-33

Venisti tandem, cupidum nec fixa fefellit	
spes animum, lux Troianae clarissima gentis,	425
magnorum quem iussa deum tot casibus actum	
Italia et nostris voluerunt sistere tectis,	
quamquam humana furens nimis ausa licentia sanctas	
turbarit leges et divum exciverit iras,	
quin etiam invitum totiens meque arma negantem	430

⁵ All four editions use manuscripts from the fifteenth century, in several cases from the first half of the century.

⁶ Most notable are variant versions of entire phrases at *Ast.* 31 and 127 (Putnam and Hankins, 171) and several places in the *Suppl.* (Schneider, 29, 33-34) in several manuscripts, including Vatican City, BAV, ms. Vat. lat. 1668, which seems to preserve a text most faithful to Vegio's original (Glei and Köhler, 36; Schneider, 29). Putnam and Hankins (171) and Schneider (33-34) take these variants as evidence of multiple redactions of the poems; Schneider leaves open the question of whether a second redaction was undertaken by the author himself or a later editor. The corruptions I identify at *Ast.* 118-119, 128-134, and VA 4.209-213 could all be the product of intervention by an editor (although the errors could have arisen inadvertently as well).

⁷ Conjectures by Franciscus Modius (who produced the poem's *editio princeps*) are printed at VA 1.66, 76; 2.172, 175; 3.60, 119; 4.55. Gleï and Köhler print their own conjecture at 2.132 and suggest one at 2.255.

crediderit duri perferre pericula Martis.
Factum etenim, sed nec parvo: sat numina iustas
indignata animis misere ultricia poenas.

427 crediderit] tradiderit F0eVe

Print *impulerit*.

Thus begins an exchange between Latinus and Aeneas in which the former endorses the latter's divine mission to Italy, lays the blame for the war in Latium entirely at the very human feet of Turnus, and offers himself as both father-in-law and (surrogate) father to Aeneas (438 *te generum et natum tempus complector in omne*). All three of these arguments are supported by careful allusion to the *Aeneid*.⁸ But the meaning of 430 *crediderit* is suspect. Putnam translates "consigned", so that the *humana* [...] *licentia* of Turnus has entrusted Latinus to the Fates or to Mars, with disastrous results. We might then compare passages like *Aen.* 5.850 "Aenean credam [...] fallacibus auris?" or 6.14-15 "Daedalus [...] ausus se credere caelo." But the lack of a dative (explicitly naming the entity to which Latinus has been entrusted) is difficult, as is the presence of the epexegetic infinitive *perferre*, for which I can find no parallel.⁹ Moreover, *crediderit* here deserves extra scrutiny because of the line-opening *crediderim* eleven lines later (439-442):

Rex maxime, nullam
te causam armorum et tanti movisse tumultus
crediderim sacrae cupientem foedera pacis [...]

This verb could have led to the displacement of some other perfect subjunctive at the start of line 430.¹⁰ Moreover, as these lines

⁸ For instance, the first words of Latinus' speech, "venisti tandem", are also the first words of the Virgilian Anchises' address to Aeneas in the underworld (*Aen.* 6.687): Latinus presents himself as Aeneas' father intertextually before doing so explicitly. Aeneas accepts Latinus' self-presentation with an intertextual gesture of his own: his speech ends "magni mihi surget imago / Anchisae et rursum ardebo genitoris amore" (444-445), echoing *imago* and *genitor* of Anchises at *Aen.* 2.560 and 6.695.

⁹ If anything, we might expect a gerundive, as at Tib. *Eleg.* 1.6.37, "at mihi servandam credas".

¹⁰ Cf. a similar corruption at *Suppl.* 26: "Daunia proles" corrupted to "Lavinia proles" by anticipation of "Lavinia parvo".

demonstrate, *credo* followed by an accusative and infinitive, but no dative, is idiomatic in the sense of “believe (something to be true)”, not “entrust”. The received text would thus have Latinus say, nonsensically, that the *licentia* of Turnus “believed that I was suffering the perils of war.”

The variant *tradiderit* is found in one branch of the tradition,¹¹ and looks to be an attempted correction of the strange *crediderit*. It is a good attempt. Paleographically, corruption from *tra-* to *crediderit* is plausible, and *tradere* can better accommodate the negative connotation of Putnam’s “consigned”,¹² and perhaps even the epexegetic infinitive *perferre*.¹³ But the lack of a dative remains difficult, and the verb itself is very rare in both Vegio and his primary linguistic model, Virgil.¹⁴ In any case, Schneider’s translation of the passage reveals what verbal idea we should expect: Latinus has not been “consigned”, “entrusted”, or “handed over” to anyone or anything, but rather “forced” to endure the perils of war: “ja sogar mich oft [...] gezwungen hat, schlimme Kriegsgefahren zu erdulden.” This suits not only the strong rhetoric of the rest of the passage (*turbarit*, *exciverit*, etc.), but also the notions of compulsion found in the intertexts for this passage. Aeneas has been “driven on” by many mischances, “tot casibus actum”, just as Venus describes the Trojans in her complaint to Jupiter at *Aen.* 1.240 “viros tot casibus actos”. The *iussa deum* that settled Aeneas in Italy echo the *iussa deum* (6.461) that “drove” Aeneas “under orders” (*imperiis egere suis*, 463) away from Dido and then “force” (*cogunt*, 462) him to meet her again in the underworld. But the most important intertext is the famous indignation and rage of Juno, which “compelled” Aeneas to undergo all his suffering (1.11-13):

¹¹ The δ branch in Schneider’s stemma (at 39), which includes several sub-branches (Schneider’s ϵ and θ) and the 1471 *editio princeps* (Schneider’s e).

¹² Cf. *OLD* s.v. *trado* 3, “to hand over (to an enemy or opponent), surrender”, and 9 “to consign (things to conditions, processes, etc.)”.

¹³ Cf. *tradere* with an infinitive at Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.1-3 and 2.4.10-12 (but both times with a dative, and in the second passage the infinitive may be taken instead with the adjective *leviora*). But in Ovid, for instance, *tradere* is constructed with a gerundive (*Her.* 7.17, 163; *Met.* 1.624).

¹⁴ Never in Vegio’s non-epic poetry (available on the *Musisque Deoque* database, <http://mizar.unive.it/poetiditalia/public/>); in his epics, only *Ant.* 1.69-70 (constructed with a dative and no infinitive). In Virgil, *Buc.* 3.2, *Aen.* 4.619, 5.713, 11.710. The author of *tradiderit* perhaps had in mind the passage from *Aen.* 4 (but here *tradere* is constructed with *sub* + accusative: “cum se sub leges pacis iniquae / tradiderit”).

Quidve dolens regina deum tot volvere casus
 insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores
impulerit. Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?

(cf. *Suppl.* 426 “iussa deum tot casibus actos”;

429 “divum exciverit iras”)

This passage provides the necessary correction for *crediderit*: Vegio wrote *impulerit*, which was then corrupted by anticipation of 441 *crediderim*, and further corrupted in one branch of the tradition to *tradiderit*.¹⁵ With *impulerit*, the intertextual logic of the passage falls into place. The *iussa deum* which drove Aeneas to Italy remain in Vegio’s poem, although the phrase is now associated with a happy settling in Italy rather than a painful separation and reunion with Dido. And in place of the problematic divine *irae* of Juno which compelled Aeneas through all his trials, we have the emphatically human *licentia* of Turnus which compelled Latinus to suffer the *pericula* of war, while incurring the divine *irae* of Jupiter. Instead of the divided providence of Virgil’s epic, with the king and queen of the gods tussling for control and causing needless suffering on earth, Vegio offers a more ordered universe for his Christian audience: humans are to blame for their suffering and heaven visits its wrath only on sinners like Turnus and not on the famously pious Aeneas.¹⁶

¹⁵ We might also consider *compulerit*, which is slightly closer in form to *crediderit*. For this verb, Vegio would have had as a model Ov. *Fast.* 3.859-860 (the reluctant King Athamas compelled to sacrifice his children): “utque recusantem cives et tempus et Ino / compulerunt regem iussa nefanda pati.” But the verb *impello* is more in the manner of Virgil (20 occurrences in the *Aeneid*), who uses *compello* in the *Aeneid* only at 1.575 “Noto compulsus”, to avoid elision with the preceding vowel.

¹⁶ A similar intertextual reordering of the heavens may be found, for instance, in the speech that Aeneas delivers to the dead Turnus at *Suppl.* 28-30: “disce Iovem revereri et iussa facessere divum. / Magnum etiam capit ira Iovem, memoresque malorum / sollicitat vindicta deos.” With *iussa facessere divum*, Vegio combines the Trojans carrying out the orders of Jupiter as they continue on their divine mission (4.295, “iussa facessunt”) with Aeolus carrying out the orders of Juno and she tries to hinder that same mission (1.77, “iussa capessere”); the theological tension is resolved in favour of unified divine support for Aeneas. And in the next line, the famous “mindful anger” of Juno (1.4, “saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram”) that harried Aeneas throughout Virgil’s poem becomes the anger of Jupiter, who leads the gods in remembering and punishing the sins of Turnus.

623-630

Tum Venus aerias descendit lapsa per auras
 Laurentumque petit. Vicina Numicius undis
 flumineis ibi currit in aequora harundine tectus. 625
 Hunc corpus nati abluere et deferre sub undas,
 quicquid erat mortale, iubet. Dehinc laeta recentem
 felicemque animam secum super aera duxit,
 immisitque Aeneam astris, quem Iulia proles
 Indigetem appellat templisque imponit honores. 630

504 ibi] ubi DEF0HLMc | 625 Aeneam] Aenean Putnam et Hankins (errore typographico, ut vid.)

Print *ubi* and *Aeneam*.

Putnam has well analysed the complex intertextuality of the *Supplement*'s finale, which features allusions to multiple scenes in the *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.¹⁷ The most prominent of these models, Ovid's description of Aeneas' apotheosis, similarly begins with Venus travelling to the river Numicius (*Met.* 14.597-9):

Perque leves auras iunctis invecta columbis
 litus adit Laurens, ubi tectus harundine serpit
 in freta flumineis vicina Numicius undis.

Vegio extensively reuses the diction of this passage, and so I am inclined to reject Schneider's choice of *ibi* in favour of the widespread variant *ubi* (with a comma after 624 *petit*), which in any case yields a longer period more in Vegio's style. The postponement of *ubi* several words into the clause most likely led to the understanding of a full stop after *petit*, along with corruption of the relative to a demonstrative. Here, then, I would agree with Kallendorf's criticism of Schneider for occasionally relying too heavily on manuscripts A and B (which read *ibi*).¹⁸

¹⁷ Putnam, Hankins 2004 (as in n. 1), 15-17.

¹⁸ C. Kallendorf, review of "B. Schneider (ed., tr.), *Das Aeneissupplement des Maffeo Vegio* (Weinheim, 1985)", *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987), 95-96. These manuscripts (Vatican City, BAV, ms. Vat. lat. 1668 and the closely related ms. Vat. lat. 1669) have a text that seems in general to be closest to Vegio's original.

Putnam and Hankins follow Schneider's editorial choice at 625, as they do throughout their edition. But at 629 they print the unmetrical *Aenean* (and reproduce this form on p. xiv of the introduction) – presumably no more than a typographical error. Vegio uses both the Greek accusative *Aenean* (417, 450, 602, 620) and the Latin *Aeneam* (21, 507, and in elision at 607), so there is nothing difficult about the form here. But Putnam and Hankins's typo fortuitously points to a more subtle difficulty in the text. The Latin accusative *-am* is necessary because the final syllable of *Aeneam* elides, which is something that never happens to the word *Aeneas* (in any form) in Virgil or any other Classical Latin poet. Moreover, the elision is necessary to fit the word into a highly unusual *sedes*, beginning in the middle of the second foot. Recently, I have observed that Virgil never puts forms of the word *Aeneas* in the middle of a foot, but rather always at the start of the first, second, or third foot; Virgil is followed in this practice by his Classical successors. I furthermore have argued that the one apparent Virgilian exception to this rule, with *Aeneas* in the middle of the third foot (7.5 *at pius exequiis Aeneas rite solutis*), is in fact a corruption of an original line with *Aeneas* in a usual position (*at pius Aeneas sacris iam rite solutis*).¹⁹

Vegio follows Virgilian precedent in placing *Aeneas* at the start of the first, second, or third foot everywhere else in the *Supplement* except here. We might then be tempted to “correct” this metrical oddity, but in this case, emendation would be a mistake. Vegio's text of the *Aeneid*, of course, would have included the one apparent exception to the usual rule of placing *Aeneas* at the start of a foot. Ever the careful reader of Virgil, Vegio produced one exception of his own, and even managed to improve on Virgil. As I have argued, there is no persuasive literary explanation to justify the unusual position of *Aeneas* at 7.5. But the unusual position of *Aeneam* here, coupled with the elision at the start and end of the word, has an attractive metapoetic resonance. Aeneas, after all of his earthly trials and tribulations, has earned his final reward as his mother “sends him into the stars”. As if to illustrate this metaphysical shift, Vegio slides Aeneas sideways in the verse and blends his name with the heavens where he now keeps his home.

685 neu] ne ed. pr., Urb. lat. 353, Vat. lat. 7192

¹⁹ K. Gervais, “Positioning *Aeneas*. A Proposed Emendation to *Aeneid* 7.5”, *Classical Journal* 115.2 (2019), 146-173.

2. *Astyanax*

34-8

Superest Priami de gente superba
Astyanax, qui si fortes maturior annos
attigerit, quantum excidium clademque Mycenis
portendat, quae fata mihi, neu credite! Calchas
ista canit

Print [...] *quae fata—mihi ne credite—Calchas / ista canit.*

Agamemnon tells the Greeks of the disaster that Calchas has predicted if Astyanax is allowed to live. Vegio adapts Sen. *Troad.* 524-533, where Ulysses tells Andromache that Astyanax's death is not *his* wish but is instead demanded by the Fates and by Calchas' prophecy that the Greeks would never be safe while Astyanax lives; note especially 533 *augur haec Calchas canit*, adapted by Vegio as *Calchas / ista canit*.²⁰ At 37, Putnam and Hankins print *neu*, which is found in most witnesses, translating "You cannot believe what ruin and disaster he would forebode for Mycenae, what doom for me! It is Calchas who chants these prophecies." But *credere* governing an indirect question is unusual (cf. *TLL* 4.1144.81-1145.3) and *neu credite* on its own to mean "you cannot believe" is very doubtful Latin. Indeed, Virgilian instances of *neu + credere* are all part of a coordinating *ne(u)...neu* construction (*Georg.* 4.48, *Aen.* 7.97, 9.42). Putnam and Hankins report *ne* in the 1475 *editio princeps* of the *Astyanax*; I also find the reading in two Vatican Library manuscripts not used by Putnam and Hankins.²¹ With this reading, "mihi ne credite" is a parenthesis in opposition to what follows: "what great ruin and disaster he would forebode for Mycenae, what doom – don't take *my* word for it – Calchas foretells these things." Agamemnon thus uses the same rhetoric as Seneca's Ulysses: "Calchas, not I, wants this."

²⁰ For Seneca's *Troades* as a primary model in the *Astyanax*, see Putnam's introduction in Putnam and Hankins (2004), xxiv.

²¹ For the manuscripts and early editions of the *Astyanax*, see S.I.O. Fojas, J. Hankins, "A Checklist of Manuscripts and Early Editions Containing Maffeo Vegio's *Astyanax* (1430) and *Antonias* (1436/7) (With a Note on the Date of the *Antonias*)", *Scriptorium* 58.2 (2004), 265-273. They report that Vatican City, BAV, ms. Vat. lat. 7192 is likely copied from one of the later incunables. Vatican City, BAV, ms. Urb. lat. 353 was copied at Urbino in the 15th-century, and might perhaps be related to the *editio princeps* printed at the nearby Cagli in 1475 (though I have not seen this edition).

Corruption may have been influenced by memory of “neu crede” in the same *sedes* at the three Virgilian passages cited above, or perhaps by anticipation of 40, “seu fidae”. Most likely the confusion began when “quae fata mihi” was read together to produce a phrase in parallel with “quantum excidium clademque Mycenis”. A construction similar to the corrected text appears in Statius’ *Thebaid*, where Adrastus reminds Polynices and Tydeus that they witnessed his daughters’ beauty and character firsthand, and thus do not have to take his word for it: 2.160-161, “quantus honos, quantusque pudor (ne credite patri) / et super hesternas licuit cognoscere mensas”.

118-119

Illum ego post multos pelagi terraeque labores
sublimem ad caelum mittam et divum numero addam

119 et...addam *codd.*

Print *numeroque deorum*.

Jupiter has refused Venus’ request to save Astyanax, but prophesies the future deification of Aeneas. Vegio had an abundance of models in Ovid for describing the process of apotheosis: *Met.* 9.272, “radiantibus intulit astris”; 14.811, “imponere caelo”; 814, “tolles in caerula caeli”; 15.818, “ut deus accedat caelo”; 839, “aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget”; 846, “caelestibus intulit astris”; 870, “accedat caelo”. But it is his own account of Aeneas’ apotheosis in the *Supplement* that is his primary model in these lines (601-603, 606-609, 611-615):

Verum ad siderei missurum culmina caeli
pollicitus magnum Aenean meritumque ferebas
illaturum astris [...]

Quantum, Cytherea, potentem
Aeneam Aeneadasque omnes infessus amavi
et terra et pelago et per tanta pericula vectos, nosti [...]

Nunc stat sententia menti,
 qua ductorem alto Phrygium succedere caelo
 institui, et firma est; numeroque inferre deorum
 constat, et id concedo libens. Tu, si quid in ipso
 mortale est, adime, atque astris ingentibus adde.²²

But line 119 is a particularly clumsy remixing of this material from a metrical standpoint. The rhythm of the clausula “divum numero addam” is odd: an anapaestic word with elision of the final long syllable and a lack of the expected coincidence between ictus and accent. I find no parallel for this rhythm elsewhere in Vegio’s epic or non-epic poems and only a handful of Classical parallels, all in satire.²³ As a rule, Vegio’s clausulae, like most aspects of his style, are carefully Classical, and usually Virgilian.²⁴

Line 613 of the *Supplement* suggests a less metrically odd text: “sublimem ad caelum mittam numeroque deorum” (for the clausula “numeroque deorum”, cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.391). With this, we should understand the sky as the place to which Jupiter will send Aeneas (*mittam* + *ad*) and “the number of the gods” as the people to whom he will send him (*mittam* + *dat.*). But this change of construction could have created an apparent gap in the text, and a corrector would have had to look no further than the *Supplement* for a verb to supply: 615, “astris ingentibus adde”. “Correction” of the text could have happened in one step, but we could also imagine *addam* as a gloss that intruded, leading to further corruption to repair the meter. For *mittere* + *dat.* in an apotheosis, Vegio had as a model Tib. *Eleg.* 2.5.43-44, addressed to Aeneas:

Illic sanctus eris cum te veneranda Numici
 unda deum caelo miserit indigetem.

²² The model for 612-613 is Verg. *Georg.* 4.227-8, “sed viva volare / sideris in numerum atque alto succedere caelo.”

²³ Lucil. *Sat.* 329 Marx; Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.76, *Ep.* 1.2.40; Pers. *Sat.* 6.38; Iuv. *Sat.* 14.202. But even in these, the elided syllable is often short.

²⁴ Rarer rhythms in clausulae like *Ast.* 57, “mentis egens sum”; 178, “in medium affer”; VA 3.20, “interea sol”, and *Ant.* 3.111, “dilecte Deo vir” all have precedent in Virgil. Virgilian precedent argues against emendation of the clausula at *Ast.* 206, “iacet Ilium opus divorum”, otherwise one might be tempted to suggest “iacet Ilium opusque deorum” and imagine some scribe particularly hostile to the genitive plural of *deus*.

128-134

Tempus erat quo noctem oriens aurora fugabat.
 Tunc Venus effigiem, fuerat quae tempore vitae,
 Hectoris induitur, non ut ferus arma movere,
 aut, quando in medios horrendum insurgeret hostes,
 magnanimus turmas Danaum terrere solebat.
 Fit maestus fletuque madens, fit pallidus Hector,
 et fossam ostendens pectus squalentiaque ora [...]

129 fuerat... vitae *codd.*

Print *non qualis tempore vitae*.

Not fully satisfied by Jupiter's prophecy, Venus descends to earth in disguise as Hector and visits Andromache to urge her, in vain, to hide Astyanax. Jupiter's prophecy is modelled on the prophecy he gives to Venus in *Aeneid* 1,²⁵ after which she appears to her son in disguise. Venus's disguised appearance to Andromache here thus corresponds, structurally, to that Virgilian episode, and so we should likely hear an echo of *Aen.* 1.335 "tum Venus: 'haud equidem [...]" in Vegio's "tunc Venus effigiem [...]". The apparition of Hector's ghost to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2 is of course another important model, and is signalled by an exact quotation of *Aen.* 2.268, "tempus erat quo [...]" at the start of the Vegio's passage.

A third intertextual model will help us address the problem in line 129. As the text stands, the phrase "fuerat quae tempore vitae" creates a nonsensical idea. Putnam expresses what must be the intended meaning of 129-132, namely that Hector appears as a corpse: "at that moment Venus clothes herself in the likeness of great-souled Hector, but not as he had been at that time in his life when he was wont fiercely ready to his weapons [...]" This is, however, more or less the opposite of what the transmitted text says: "at that moment Venus clothes herself in the likeness of Hector that he had possessed in life, not as he was wont fiercely to ready his weapons [...]" What is needed, clearly, is a

²⁵ Vegio signals this intertext at the outset of Jupiter's prophecy: 104-5, "Olli hominum divumque parens haec pectore ab alto / verba dedit: 'Quid me totiens, Cytherea, fatigas [...]'. See *Aen.* 1.254-7, "Olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum / [...] / parce metu, Cytherea [...]" (Vegio's *totiens* nods to his repetition of Virgil's famous scene).

negative to show that this image of Hector is *not* the one he had possessed in life, a statement which Vegio then elaborates on with “non ut ferus [...] solebat”.

Virgil also has Hector appear as he was in death, rather than life: note especially 2.274-275, “ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo / Hectore [...]”. Seneca adapts this passage for his apparition of Hector to Andromache in the *Troades* (443-450):²⁶

Cum subito nostros Hector ante oculos stetit,
non qualis ultro bella in Argivos ferens
 Graias petebat facibus Idaeis rates,
 nec caede multa qualis in Danaos furens
 vera ex Achille spolia simulato tulit;
 non ille vultus flammeum intendens iubar,
 sed fessus ac deiectus et fletu gravis
 similisque nostro, squalida obtectus coma.

Vegio uses language from Seneca’s Hector in the speech that he gives to his “Hector”,²⁷ and I suggest that he also signals Seneca as a model at the outset, writing:

Tum Venus effigiem, non qualis tempore vitae,
 Hectoris induitur, non ut ferus arma movere [...].

At that moment Venus clothes herself in a likeness—but not as he was in life—of Hector, not as [he was wont] fiercely to ready his weapons [...].

Vegio thus opens his scene by pointing to his three models with close echoes of phrases, one after another, from *Aeneid* 2, *Aeneid* 1, and Seneca’s *Troades*.

Corruption was perhaps caused by a sense that a verb was missing from *non qualis tempore vitae* (recall the same source of corruption at 119 in the previous passage). A misguided corrector could have produced the corrupted text in one move, but it is also possible that *erat*

²⁶ Putnam notes the combination of Virgil’s and Seneca’s Hector as models: Putnam, Hankins 2004 (as in n. 1), xxv.

²⁷ *Ast.* 135-141 “Surge, o carissima coniunx / [...] tecum arripe natum / [...] / [...] hic patriae nostrae una salus est”. See *Tro.* 452-453 “‘Dispelle somnos’ inquit ‘et natum eripe, / o fida coniunx: lateat, haec una est salus.’”

intruded first to yield the common phrase *qualis erat* (which is found in the model passage from *Aeneid* 2); subsequent “correction” could have been made with reference to 137 *dum vita fuit*, or recalling *quae quondam fuerat* at *Aen.* 5.397 and 10.613.

3. *Vellus aureum*

4.209-213

Extemplo casu turbatus amaro
purpureum, quo indutus erat, discindit amictum 210
et pectus pugnīs ferit et rabido ungue capillos
vellit et, ut capiti diadema illustre gerebat,
et sceptrum dextra labi sinit

211 rabido...capillos] rabido **abc** (rapido **O**) : rapida **FPTUV** : *om.* **d** | 212 ut] in **V**¹
capiti] capitis (*ut vid.*) **T**

Print *rabido ungue capillis* / *vellit quod*.

Hearing the news of Medea’s departure, her father Aeetes performs stereotypical gestures of mourning, tearing his clothing, attacking his breast and (as the text stands) hair, and dropping his diadem and sceptre. The transmitted text for line 212 is ungrammatical, and Glei and Köhler suspect a lacuna. But emendation may also be tried. We could take our beginning from *rabido/rapido/rapida* in line 211.²⁸ Glei and Köhler print *rabido*, which is probably a more appropriate epithet than *rapidus*. But the final *-a* in the variant *rapida* is difficult to account for by corruption,²⁹ whereas *rabido* could easily have arisen to match the masculine ablative *ungue*. If *rapida* preserves traces of an original *rabida*, then we might imagine that it once modified the noun *ora* (cf. “*rabida ora*” at *Aen.* 6.102), so that Aeetes attacks his breast with his fists and his face with his nails: “et pectus pugnīs ferit et *rabida* unguibus ora.” These paired

²⁸ The **α** branch of the tradition (a 1569 edition and two later editions copied from it) has *rabido*. The **β** branch (a group of 14th or early 15th-century manuscripts) has *rapida*. Manuscript **O** belongs to the **β** branch, contaminated with **α** readings. The 1724 edition **d**, in the **δ** branch, omits this passage.

²⁹ Unless a scribe was influenced by memory of Verg. *Aen.* 12.339, “spargit rapida ungula rores.”

gestures are Virgilian: *Aen.* 11.86, “pectora nunc foedans pugnīs, nunc unguibus ora”; 4.673 = 12.871, “unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnīs.” Vegio would thus continue to adapt Virgilian descriptions of mourning, following the echo of Amata tearing her clothing in grief (*Aen.* 12.602, “purpureos [...] discindit amictus”). The *capilli* that we have banished from the end of 211 could then be moved to the end of the following line, so that Aeetes tears his diadem from his hair: “vellit et incomptis diadema illustre capillis”.³⁰

This is of course a radical intervention, although no more so than positing a lacuna. But a more economical (if perhaps less elegant) repair is possible. Like the emendation above, it has Aeetes tear his diadem from his hair, rather than tearing the hair itself: “rabido ungue capillis / vellit quod capiti diadema illustre gerebat”. And indeed the hair is what diadems are torn from in Statius’ *Thebaid*, which accounts for most instances of the word *diadema* in Classical Latin poetry:³¹ 9.163, “exutum canos lacero diademate crines”; 10.76, “turbavit diadema coma”; 11.227, “raptumque comis diadema” (cf. “diademate crinis/es/em” at Lucan. *Phars.* 5.60 and Claud. *Hon.* III 84, *Hon.* VI 560, and Ov. *Am.* 1.6.67 “non laetis detracta corona capillis”). Statius also provides a model for “ungue [...] quod [...] diadema”: *Theb.* 1.82-83, “indue quod madidum tabo diadema cruentis / unguibus abripui”. Corruption would have begun when a scribe failed to recognize *diadema*, within the relative clause, as the object of *vellit* and thereby produced the simplified idea *capillos vellit*.

4. *Antoniad*

This fascinating poem deserves further critical attention, now that Putnam and Hankins have produced a modern edition. Here, I content myself with one trivial correction. At 3.64, Putnam and Hankins print an unmetrical line: “[...] imperantne minis alii?” sic fatus est. olli [...]”. In their apparatus they report *et* for *est* in two of the three manuscripts that they

³⁰ The phrase “incomptis [...] capillis” would evoke descriptions of female mourning in Propertius (*Eleg.* 1.15.11, 3.6.9) and Ovid (*Met.* 4.261), matching the female models for Aeetes tearing his clothing and attacking his breast and face.

³¹ 7 occurrences in the in the *Thebaid* (and 3 in the *Silvae*. Elsewhere: Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.21, Sen. *Thyest.* 599, Lucan. *Phars.* 5.60, Mart. (2 occurrences), Iuv. (3 occurrences), and more frequently in late antiquity.

have used (El Escorial, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, ms. f II 2 and Lodi, Biblioteca Comunale Laudense, ms. XXVIII A 11), and I can see no reason not to adopt this reading.³² And in fact, their third manuscript (Vatican City, BAV, ms. Vat. lat. 3600)³³ also has *et* (f. 11v), making the origin of *est* a pleasant mystery with which to end this article.

The University of Western Ontario
kgervai2@uwo.ca

³² “Sic fatus et” is a favourite phrase of Statius in this *sedes* (*Theb.* 1.510, 3.496, 5.689, 7.390, 10.271, 12.773); note also *sic fatus et* later in the *Antoniad* at 4.69.

³³ A high-quality scan is available on the Digital Vatican Library.