Classical Quarterly 60.2 486–496 (2010) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838810000212

REREADING *AENEID* 10.702–6

nec non Euanthen Phrygium Paridisque Mimanta
aequalem comitemque, una quem nocte Theano
in lucem genitori Amyco dedit et face praegnas
Cisseis regina Parim; *Paris* urbe paterna
occubat, ignarum Laurens habet ora Mimanta.

This passage is part of the *aristeia* of Mezentius, and commentators often point out that one must understand a verb to govern the two accusative objects, *Euanthen* and *Mimanta* in line 702. I will return to this point later, but first I want to consider the reading of line 705. Most modern editors present Virgil's text with *Paris* as shown above.[1] *Paris* is, in fact, a conjecture to replace *creat*, which all manuscripts and testimonia here show.[2] If one keeps *creat* and punctuates just after it, then one must understand Paris to be the unstated subject of *urbe … | occubat* (705–6). This, in fact, is what Servius explicitly suggests (*ad Aen*. 10.705), and he attributes the

[1] All the following emend *creat* to *Paris* after *Parim* (or *Parin*) in line 705: R.F.P. Brunck, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneis* (Strassburg, 1785); C. Thiel, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Aeneis* vol. *2* (Berlin, 1838); F. Bowen, *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneis* (Boston, 1842); J.C. Jahn, *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneis* (Leipzig, 1852); O. Ribbeck, *P. Virgili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–XII* (Leipzig, 1862); A. Forbiger, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* pt. 3 (Leipzig, 1875); R. Sabbadini, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* (Rome, 1930); R. Durand (ed.) and A. Bellessort (tr.), *Virgile. Énéide. Livres VII–XII* (Paris, 1948); R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1969, repr. 1990); R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil* (London, 1973); R. Sabbadini, A. Castiglioni and M. Geymonat, *P. Virgili Maronis opera* (Turin, 1973); J. Perret, *Virgile. Énéide. Livres IX–XII* (Paris, 1980); E. Paratore (ed.) and Luca Canali (tr.), *Virgilio. Eneide* vol. 5 (Milan, 1982); S.J. Harrison, *Virgil Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991); G.P. Goold (ed.) and H.R. Fairclough (tr.), *Virgil. Aeneid VII–XII, Appendix Virgiliana* (Cambridge, MA, 2000). J. Sparrow advocates this emendation in a review of Janell (below), *JRS* 21 (1931), 165–8. The recent edition of M. Geymonat, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* (Rome, 2008) prints a conjecture attributed to Ellis, *creat: Paris* which reverses the word order from the manuscripts and changes the case of *Parim* to make it into the subject of the following clause. However, Geymonat reverts to *Parin: Paris* in his corrigenda at 772. The key problem with Ellis's conjecture is that *creat* needs an object, as long ago noted by H.L. Jones, 'Proposed emendation of Verg. *Aen*. X. 705', *CR* 22.6 (1908), 180. Jones suggests reading *parit; Paris* because *parit* is better able to stand without an object. However, even if lexicographically more appealing, this emendation leaves Paris awkwardly unexpressed inside the relative clause where the initial *quem* refers only to Mimas. Furthermore, Jones unconvincingly pleads to accept the harsh and apparently pointless assonance of *parit; Paris* without producing a convincing Virgilian parallel. Finally, Jones's proposal assumes a complicated and improbable series of changes. Those who accept the textual tradition and read *Parim creat* include: G.W. Gossrau, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Aeneis (*Leipzig, 1846); G. Long, J. Conington and H. Nettleship, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* vol. 3 (London, 1871); K. Kappes, *Virgils Aeneide* (Leipzig, 1882); T.L. Papillon and A.E. Haigh, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1892); T.E. Page, *P. Virgili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis* (London, 1895); W. Janell, *P. Virgili Maronis Virgili Maronis Aeneis* (Leipzig, 1930).

[2] The single exception is the *Mediceus*, which reads 'CREPAT', but this is clearly a random error and the P has in fact been marked out.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lack of subject to metrical necessity.[3] Bentley first suggested changing *creat* here to *Paris* to solve this problem, and modern editions have usually incorporated his suggestion.[4] However, as will be seen, there is a simpler solution that will fix the difficulty in 705–6 as well as provide a verb for the accusatives in 702. First, Bentley's conjecture needs closer scrutiny.

While admitting the missing subject for *occubat*, Bentley rightly complained that no metrical necessity could excuse Virgil from such a careless and jarring omission. In his opinion, not only normal Latin procedure but also rhetorical propriety calls for an explicit subject, since Bentley, along with many others including the ancient commentator Tiberius Claudius Donatus,[5] believed that Virgil is rhetorically playing on the different deaths of Paris and Mimas, the one being in his homeland and the other on a foreign shore.[6] Finally, Bentley vigorously condemns *creat* here on two grounds. First, he notes that it is unnecessary ('redundans et supervacuum'), since Virgil's *in lucem … dedit* can easily be taken with both subjects, *Theano* and *Cisseis*. Second, he argues that the inconcinnity of tenses between *dedit* and *creat* is problematic. Despite Bentley's rhetorical tirade against redundancy,[7] the repetition of thoughts and the parallel use of synonyms are common in Latin poetry and particularly in Virgil.[8] Nor is Bentley's second point convincing, since not only are *creat* and similar verbs such as *generat* used as historical presents in poetic Latin genealogies,[9] but one can even find pairs of similarly mismatched tenses that prove that this is not a problem.

[3] The source of Servius Auctus also read the text without *Paris*, for he elaborated: 'nam deest "qui" ut sit "qui urbe paterna"'. Although Virgil can elide *qui* (*G*. 1.201 *qui adverso*, *Aen*. 1.388 *qui adveneris*, *Aen*. 2.663 *qui obtruncat*), adding *qui* here provides no solution without changing *creat* too, since *Parim creat, qui* violates the dactylic rhythm.

[4] R. Bentley, *Q. Horatius Flaccus* vol. 1 (Berlin, 1711, repr. 1869[3]), 285.

[5] His key comment on 10.705 is: '[Virgilius] ludit inter duorum nomina et nativitates ac parentes et mortes.'

[6] Bentley (n. 4), 285: 'At quam dispari fato? *Paris* in urbe patria sepultus est; *Mimas* in terra longinqua ignotus iacet.'

[7] Bentley (n. 4), 285: 'Quin et illud quam redundans et supervacuum, Theano *in lucem dedit*, et Cisseis *creat*? ut ne dicam, inconcinne tempora mutari, *dedit*, et *creat*. Quid multa?'

[8] To note only some nearby Virgilian examples, there are *continuit* with *repressit* (10.686), *sternere* with *dare … vulnus* (733), and *occurrit* with *se … contulit* (734–5). The parallel verbal expressions in 10.704–5 (*in lucem … dedit* and *creat*) closely resemble what is usually called theme and variation. In such cases, the poet presents phrases or clauses that 'look at the matter from differing perspectives' as described by J. O'Hara, 'Virgil's style' in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge, 1997), 241–58, at 248. However, instances of theme and variation typically involve multiple ways of describing the same thing. Here the two expressions describe births that are simultaneous, or at least on the same night, but not actually the same.

[9] Ennius (fr. 16–17 Warmington) has *generat* for the unaugmented aorist τέκε in an adaptation of *Iliad* 20.239. The frequent use of such unaugmented forms as τέκε and τίκτε (e.g. Hes. *Theog*. 212–13, 223–6, and Hom. *Il*. 237–40) in Greek epic may have inspired imitation through analogous use of Latin historical presents. In any case, Virgilian examples include: *creat* (*G*. 1.279), *generat* (*Aen*. 8.141), and *educat* (10.518). See H. Pinkster, 'The present tense in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 705–17, at 715 and 716 n. 22, on the possible Greek origin of such presents. See also H. Pinkster, 'Is the Latin present tense the unmarked neutral tense in the system?' in R. Risselada (ed.), *Latin in Use* (Amsterdam, 1998), 63–83, for a systematic analysis of such presents. Similar presents at *Aen*. 2.663 and 7.363 are discussed by N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden, 1999), 253, and *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary* (Leiden, 2003), 472.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For example, in Virgil, *generat* (*Aen*. 8.141) is parallel with *fudit* (139). Ovid at *Fast*. 4.33–4 has *est generatus* parallel to *creat*. If the language of Greek epic provides a possible model, augmented and unaugmented verb forms are often mixed indiscriminately in the same scene (Hes. *Theog*. 212, 308–10 and 383–5). While *dedit* and *creat* may seem more problematic because they apparently represent simultaneous actions, this is not decisive. First, other apparently simultaneous events are likewise represented with a mixture of present and perfect tenses showing no substantial differentiation in meaning (e.g. *resultant* and *deflexit*, *Aen*. 10.330–1; *servat* and *pependit*, 340–1; *subsistit* and *infremuit*, 711; *gaudet*, *arrexit* and *haeret*, 726) – note that in each of the above examples Harrison translates the associated perfects and presents with the same English tense. Second, Virgil need not be claiming that Mimas and Paris were born exactly at the same time, only on the same night; thus the perfect *dedit* could suggest a slightly earlier time than *creat* – for such anterior perfects with historical presents see Pinkster (n. 9), 707–9. Third, we could understand *in lucem … dedit* as picturing the birth as an event and *creat* as equivalent to an imperfect depicting the process of the birth – see Pinkster (n. 9), 78, for present as imperfect. Fourth, we may take *creat* as what is often called a registering present which shows a continuing present state that started in the past – see Harrison (n. 1), 203, on 10.517–9. Finally, the mismatched tenses of *dedit* and *creat* did not trouble any ancient readers such as Servius. In the context of the clear allusive features of the entire passage, it is also tempting to read the tense variation as a metaliterary device. Theano *has just brought forth* Mimas – *dedit* being a present perfect or what Pinkster (n. 9), 78 n. 26, following narratological terminology calls an authorial present – because Virgil has just created him from the literary tradition about Theano; and Theano (or Virgil) has done this on the same night as Hecuba bore and continues to bear Paris ever since his original literary birth. For all these reasons, Bentley's condemnation of *creat* is erroneous.

To explain how the alleged corruption might have occurred, Bentley says: 'Scribes who were yawning [i.e. inattentive] – that being a traditional fault of theirs – wrote a word that appeared twice [i.e. 'Parim; Paris'] only once. Then others added that inept *creat* to prop up the verse.'[10] Thus Bentley blames a common type of scribal error, haplography, and claims that the *creat* was then added to emend the faulty hexameter.[11]

Two main considerations weaken, if not completely dismiss, the force of his argument. First, all the oldest manuscripts and testimonia give *creat*, which means that not only must the scribes have 'nodded off' very early in the textual tradition, but also that the error must have completely overwhelmed the correct reading despite the *Aeneid* being one of the most copied and most studied of all ancient Latin texts. If any ancient reader had ever had to choose between reading ***Paris*** *urbe paterna* | *occubat* and ***creat*** *urbe paterna* | *occubat* where *occubat* must understand Paris as an unexpressed subject, there is no doubt that, like Servius, they would have been bothered by the omission of the subject and would have

[10] Bentley (n. 4), 285: 'Oscitantes librarii (quod sollemne eorum peccatum est) verbum bis positum, semel tantum scripserunt: inde alii ad versum fulciendum ineptum illud creat supposuerunt.'

[11] If true, then the alleged false emendation would fall under the first category of the typology of interpolation in Latin poetry as proposed by R. Tarrant, 'Toward a typology of interpolation in Latin poetry', *TAPhA* 117 (1987), 281–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chosen to read *Paris*. Therefore, unless we assume an almost immediate corruption, it is virtually impossible to see how such a problematic reading could gain universal acceptance.

Second, if we do assume that *Paris* was omitted very early in the tradition, then it is perverse to imagine that *creat* would have been inserted. The *Aeneid* is known for its incomplete lines which Varius left unfinished in his original edition of the *Aeneid*.[12] Furthermore, Virgil was so universally revered by the Romans that these lines typically remained incomplete in the ancient manuscript tradition.[13] Regular scribes would hardly dare deface the text of the *Aeneid*, though one could imagine that an ancient poet-scholar might have completed the line, since Donatus records that some tried to finish the incomplete verses (*Vit. Verg.* 41), though they had trouble because almost all the half-lines were complete in sense. This problem would apply for our line as well, since *creat* is unnecessary after *in lucem … dedit*, as Bentley was right to indicate, so that there would have been no need to add it. Indeed, if the text ever suffered such an omission, as Bentley proposes, and if anyone with even the slightest understanding of Latin were trying to complete the hypothetical verse *Cisseis regina Parim urbe paterna* when the next line began with *occubat*, he would by no means insert an unnecessary *creat* between *Parim* and *urbe* because this supplement would not fix the disturbing problem of an unstated subject for *occubat*. Furthermore, it would have been strange to insert a supplement into the middle of the line rather than adding it on to the end, if Virgil were thought to have left it unfinished.[14]

I have outlined significant difficulties in accepting Bentley's conjecture, but admittedly he did solve the serious problem of the omission of the subject for *occubat*. Even those editors who have not followed Bentley admit that the lack of a subject for *occubat* is a major fault, though they blame the *Aeneid*'s unfinished state.[15] Furthermore, Bentley's suggested repetition *Parim,* ***Paris*** is in itself com-

[12] There are fifty-eight or fifty-nine incomplete lines – see J. Sparrow, *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil* (Oxford, 1931), 28–9, and J. O'Hara, *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid and Lucan* (Cambridge, 2007), 77. For Varius' editorial practice, see Donat. *Vit. Verg*. 41: *Edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam inperfectos sicut erant reliquerit; quos multi mox supplere conati non perinde valuerunt ob difficultatem, quod omnia fere apud eum hemistichia absoluto perfectoque sunt sensu, praeter illud: 'quem tibi iam Troia'.*

[13] I refer to the earliest manuscript tradition, not the later medieval tradition which saw a proliferation in such supplements. However, even the early manuscripts, which are none the less centuries later than Virgil himself, are not entirely void of supplements as Sparrow (n. 12), 49, notes. The idea that Virgil intended to leave some lines incomplete has been occasionally entertained – see Sparrow (n. 12), 24–5, and B. Baldwin, 'Half-lines in Virgil: old and new ideas', *SO* 68 (1993), 144–51. However, this view was apparently not held by any of Virgil's ancient readers unless perhaps Baldwin, 149–51, is right about Nero intentionally producing a hemistich.

[14] Note that this alleged incomplete line, which *pace Bentleii* never existed, is five feet with a fifth foot spondee, a rare but none the less Virgilian feature, e.g. *Aen*. 3.12 and 8.679. I know of no example of Virgil's incomplete lines being supplemented by insertion rather than by addition.

[15] Gossrau (n. 1) and Long, Conington and Nettleship (n. 1) reject Bentley's emendation. Gossrau at 513 while praising Virgil's excellent conception, finds fault with the unpolished execution of the passage: 'quod optime excogitavit poeta, nondum expolivit.' My arguments are partially anticipated by Conington and Nettleship, 287: 'Whatever may be the case with other authors, it is not likely that in the text of Virg. "Paris" should have dropped out and have been replaced by "creat". "Creat" itself is critically probable, the pres. being used in the case of that and similar verbs when we should expect the past: see on v. 518 above, E. 8.45 note, G. 1.279.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

patible with Virgilian style.[16] His emendation does provide a text consonant with Virgilian style; but, owing to the problems discussed above, it has little, if any, chance of being Virgil's original wording. If we leave the text as it is, Virgil seems at fault here, but we can at least excuse him, as earlier scholars have done, on the grounds that he was never able to polish the rough line. Dismissing Bentley's unlikely conjecture, one must look for another answer to this problem, if Virgil is to be saved from reproach.

There is a way to solve this problem and to provide a smooth text that harmonizes with Virgil's usual brilliance. Moreover, unlike Bentley's suggested emendation, the proposed reading has manuscript support.[17] Before outlining this solution, I need to draw attention to a misunderstanding of Virgil's purpose in this passage. At least since Tiberius Claudius Donatus scholars have here detected a complicated rhetorical play on the differences between the two peers, Paris and Mimas. Because of this supposed rhetorical comparison, the lack of an expressed subject, *Paris*, to correspond to the stated *Mimanta* (706) strikes readers as even more problematic. Moreover, Gossrau claims that: 'Even if we accept Bentley's conjecture, all the points of comparison are not joined very suitably, for we need a connection like *quem eadem nocte qua.* Then to complete the comparison it would be suitable to add both *Priamo* [parallel to *genitori Amyco*] and a word to correspond to *ignarum* [to contrast the manner of their deaths].'[18] Forbiger (n. 1) notes that Peerlkamp even suggested the bold emendation *Cisseis Priamo Paridem* in order to complete the parallelism of the comparison. Papillon (n. 15) states: 'The antithesis between [Paris'] fate and that of Mimas so obviously requires the repetition of his name, that most editors accept Bentley's conjecture "Paris" for "creat"'. Harrison (n. 1), 239, among recent editors enthusiastically supports Bentley's conjecture because it creates what he calls '"enclosing" names'.[19] Others, as early as de la Rue, draw attention to the contrast between *paterna urbe* and *ignarum … Mimanta*, where they take *ignarum* either as an active verbal adjective 'not recognizing [the Laurentine shore]' or as a passive, transferred epithet, 'unknown' – correctly describing the land.[20]

According to T.L. Papillon, *P. Virgili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1882) at 324, Bentley's emendation has a serious fault: '… most editors accept Bentley's conjecture "Paris" for "creat" (see his note on Hor. Epod. v. 28), despite the difficulty of seeing how "creat" could have gotten into the text.' Page (n. 1) prints *Parin creat*, while recording Bentley's emendation in a note, so he must have doubted the conjecture.

[16] For example, compare *Aen.* 10.442 and 753. For discussion of similar kinds of poetic repetition, see J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1996), on noun polyptoton (191–221), noun shifts (272–89) and climax (329–36).

[17] Bentley's conjecture was once thought to have manuscript support. A certain Pottier reported that six Paris manuscripts contained Bentley's conjectured reading of *Parim, Paris*. See Gossrau (n. 1), 513; Conington and Nettleship (n. 1), 287; Forbiger (n. 1), 404; and J. Henry, *Aeneidea or Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneis* vol. 4 (Dublin, 1889), 100. This may have been an unfortunate academic joke from the beginning – manuscripts from Paris that read *Paris* instead of *creat*!

[18] Gossrau (n. 1), 513: 'Sed etiamsi Bentleii accipimus coniecturam; nondum omnia aptissime iunguntur. Nam opus erat iungi: *quem eadem nocte qua*. Deinde ad complendam comparationem addi aptum erat et *Priamo*, et quod voci *ignarum* opponeretur.'

[19] Such artful arrangement of names is indeed Virgilian. However, this hardly proves Bentley's emendation to be correct. The reading proposed below is both artful and supported by the manuscripts.

[20] C. de la Rue, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (Paris, 1675; repr. Philadelphia, 1823).
Williams (n. 1), 367: '**ignarum … Mimanta**: the phrase is in strong antithesis to the previous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While there is certainly an *implicit* contrast between Paris and Mimas, I argue that the main point of this passage is to provide a pathetic digression akin to that seen in some of the Homeric battle scenes where the poet turns aside for a moment to describe a victim's peaceful background in the midst of his violent slaughter.[21] The complex and explicit rhetoric suggested by others mistakenly diverts attention from a scene meant to express deep pathos; that is, the digression is meant to stimulate the reader's heart, not his mind. Commentators have commonly drawn attention to Virgil's adaptation of *Iliad* 18.251–2:

> Ἕκτορι δ' ἦεν ἑταῖρος, ἰῇ δ' ἐν νυκτὶ γένοντο,
> ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν ἄρ μύθοισιν, ὃ δ' ἔγχεϊ πολλὸν ἐνίκα·
>
> And [Polydamas] was the comrade of Hector, and they were born on the same night, but the former was far superior with words, and the latter with a spear.

Obviously Virgil adapted the idea of a companion born on the same night from this passage. But perhaps scholars have been too heavily influenced by this parallel. Here we do see an explicit comparison of Polydamas and Hector (252), but this passage, unlike Virgil's, is not part of a battle scene nor is it meant to evoke a strong emotional response. Virgil's borrowing here only illustrates the close comradeship of Paris and Mimas – that is, their similarity not their differences. Other poetic models are more thematically important for the Mimas digression.

Virgil's references to Cisseis, Theano, Mimas and Amycus, for example, lead us to models found in combat scenes, some of them quite similar in tone to the digression on Mimas. First, in the case of Cisseis (daughter of Cisseus) and Theano, we have Homeric models. At *Iliad* 5.69–71 Pedaeus, a bastard son of Antenor tenderly reared by Theano as her own, is mercilessly slain by Meges; and at 11.221–31 Iphidamas, son of Antenor, raised in Thrace from infancy by his grandfather Cisseus, Theano's father, and newly wed to a wife who will never see him return, falls at the hands of Agamemnon. Iphidamas in particular is a fitting model for Virgil's Mimas, since Homer explicitly evokes pathos for his death far away from his wife at home (11.242–3), presumably back in Thrace – much like Mimas' death far from home.[22] Furthermore, we can tell that Virgil was particularly familiar with the Iphidamas scene, since he elsewhere refers to Cisseus, king of Thrace (*Aen*. 5.536–8). The other Homeric reference to Theano is not in battle but

one – "Paris lies in the city of his fathers, but …" *Ignarum* here has a passive sense …' But contrast Harrison (n. 1), 240: 'note the elegant antithesis and *asyndeton adversativum* (cf. 80) … the (pathetic) point is that unlike Paris, buried in Troy, Mimas is a stranger to the land of his burial in Italy, and *ignarus* is therefore active in sense (cf. 25).' Henry (n. 17), 102, is unusual in his vigorous rejection of this idea: 'It is the poet's own fault that his words have been misunderstood, for the reader naturally expects in the word IGNARUM, a contrast of the condition of Mimas to that of Paris; but in this expectation the reader is disappointed, Paris being as ignorant that his body lies in its native, as Mimas is that his body lies in a foreign, country.'

[21] J. Griffin discusses Homer's pathetic digressions in detail in 'Homeric pathos and objectivity', *CQ* 26 (1976), 161–87, and *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980), 103–43. For Virgil's interest in pathetic description, see J. Griffin, *Virgil* (Oxford, 1986), 75–7, 91 and 97. In G.B. Conte and S.J. Harrison, *The Poetry of Pathos* (Oxford, 2007), Conte describes Virgil as writing epic intentionally permeated with pathos, 56: 'The sympathetic "sentimentality" of the poet is certainly an act of solidarity with the many defeated figures in his poem.'

[22] Compare Griffin (n. 21), 133–4, who notes that this digression is explicitly marked as pathetic by the epithet applied to Iphidamas, *οἰκτρός* (*Il*. 11.242), and cites the scholia as commenting that the poet 'says this sympathetically', 134 n. 52 (*scholia vetera in Iliadem* 11.243).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the temple of Athena (*Il*. 6.298–311) where the Trojan women all offer sacrifices, and Theano prays that Athena take pity on the Trojan women and children (309–10). While the dissimilar context may suggest no connection with Virgil, like the other references to Theano the scene is full of pathos. Finally, when Virgil uses *Cisseis* to name Hecuba rather than Theano, he diverges from Homer who apparently makes Hecuba the daughter of Dymas (*Il*. 16.718)[23] and instead follows Euripides' *Hecuba*, a tragedy which contains even more than the usual number of pathetic deaths (both of Hecuba's own children, Polydorus and Polyxena, die horribly, as do Polymestor's children).[24] In short, all the Homeric references to Theano and Cisses/Cisseus involve the pathos of children either dead or threatened with death, and the probable Euripidean allusion comes from a play full of dead children. This allusive background highlights the pathetic character of Virgil's digression which anachronistically transports the reader back in time to view both ill-fated peers, Paris and Mimas, as innocent babes to be slaughtered.

As for models for Mimas and Amycus, Harrison (n. 1), 239–40, suggests Mimas the giant slain by Aeetes (Ap. Rhod. 3.1227) and Amycus the Bebrycian king (Ap. Rhod. 2.4). Other possible models include Mimas the Centaur (Hes. *Sc*. 186) and Mimas the Bebrycian (Ap. Rhod. 2.105).[25] Most likely both Amycus and Mimas are drawn from Apollonius' battle of the Argonauts against the Bebrycians (2.21–140), where the names appear in close context, and Mimas occurs in the same case and line position as in Virgil (2.90 *Ἄμυκος*; 2.105 *Μίμαντα*; 2.110 *Ἀμύκοιο*). Apollonius here provides no pathetic background for either Amycus or Mimas, since the Bebrycians are portrayed as rather despicable, monstrous characters. Therefore, as with the adaptation of *Iliad* 18.251, Virgil's appropriation of Apollonius is apparently for poetic convenience because it does not display any significant thematic similarities. Therefore, the death of Iphidamas is the most thematically pertinent model for Virgil's description since the Mimas digression is clearly meant to provide a similar pathetic commentary on the unfortunate victim of Mezentius. While Iphidamas supplies a specific example to which Virgil may allude through mentioning Theano and Cisseis, he would also have been familiar with Pedaeus and other pathetic victims (such as the sons of Merops, *Il*. 11.328–34), and so one may also take the passage generally as a Virgilian reworking of this kind of Homeric scene.

In order to avoid an overly rigid rhetorical comparison and to preserve the pathos appropriate to this scene, I propose the following. Keep the manuscripts'

[23] Alternately it may be possible that Euripides, Virgil and others read the *Iliad* differently here. The line in question describes Asius, Hector's uncle: *αὐτοκασίγνητος Ἑκάβης, υἱὸς δὲ Δύμαντος*. The word *αὐτοκασίγνητος* ought properly to mean full-brother, but the *δὲ* is ambiguous, since it might be understood adversatively, as translated by A.T. Murray, *Homer, the Iliad* vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1924), 217: 'own brother to Hecabe, but son of Dymas'. With this reading, Hecuba becomes a half-sister of Asius, and is no longer the daughter of Dymas. Note that the *scholia vetera* (on *Il*. 16.718) mention Euripides' alternate version (cf. *Hecuba* 3, daughter of Cisseus) and record the claims of Pherecydes of Athens (*FGrH* 3 F 136b, daughter of Dymas and the nymph Euthoe) and Athenaion (*FGrH* 546 F 2, daughter of Cisses/Cisseus and Telekeia). Virgil's juxtaposition of Theano and Hecuba *Cisseis* here (*Aen*. 10.703 and 705) strongly suggests that he is alluding to the ancient scholarly debate on this issue.

[24] On Euripides' innovation of Hecuba's genealogy (*Hec*. 3), see J. Gregory, 'Genealogy and intertextuality in *Hecuba*', *AJPh* 116.3 (1995), 389–97, who at 389–90 connects Euripides' innovation with Homer's Iphidamas scene (*Il*. 11.221–43) and compares Virgil's *Cisseis* (*Aen*. 10.705).

[25] In Homer and the *Homeric Hymns* (*Od*. 3.172, *Hymn. Hom. Ap*. 39), Mimas is a geographic feature.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading for 10.705: *Cisseis regina Parim creat urbe paterna*. To avoid the awkward, unstated change of subject, read *occupat* at the beginning of line 706. This is, in fact, the reading of two of the primary manuscripts, the *Romanus* (*Vaticanus Vat. lat.* 3867) and the *Mediceus* (*Florentinus Laurentianus* xxxix I), though, in the case of the second, a later corrector (Durand's M^2) has changed it to *occubat*.[26] With a change in punctuation, the text now reads:

> nec non Euanthen Phrygium Paridisque Mimanta
> aequalem comitemque – una quem nocte Theano
> in lucem genitori Amyco dedit et face praegnas
> Cisseis regina Parim *creat* urbe paterna – 705
> *occupat*; ignarum Laurens habet ora Mimanta.

The subject of *occupat* is, of course, Mezentius who is in the midst of his *aristeia* and has been the subject of *succedit* and *invadit* (690), *sternit* (697), *occupat* (699),[27] *sinit* (700) and *donat* (701).[28] The Latin text can then be translated:

[26] Though Mynors (n. 1) and many other editors fail to mention this reading – no doubt thinking it unimportant, Ribbeck (n. 1) reports *occupat* in the *Romanus*, and both Durand (n. 1) and Perret (n. 1) report *occupat* in the *Romanus* and the *Mediceus* despite the fact that all these editors print *occubat* here and accept Bentley's *Paris* in 705. The important and earliest Spanish codex, *Ausonensis* ('Vic, Archivo Capitular' 197), likewise reads *occupat* according to corrigenda of the recent edition of Geymonat (n. 1), 772 – see also M.L. Moreno, 'Colación Del MS. 197 (*P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, Georgicon, Aeneidos*) del Archivo Capitular de Vic', *ExClass* 9 (2005), 33–73, at 51. The change of one letter from *occupat* to *occubat* and vice versa is an easy error; this is obviously why the variant *occupat* has been dismissed so quickly. Readers and editors thought the verb illogically referred to Paris. Moreover, Servius and Tiberius Claudius Donatus apparently read *occubat*, so modern editors were discouraged from suspecting that *occupat* might be correct.

[27] One reason that some scholars might reject *occupat* in 706 is that with 699 it creates two instances of the same verb within eight lines. However, *occupat* is repeated in close proximity elsewhere in Latin poetry: Tib. 1.10.40 and 50, Ov. *Met*. 3.40 and 48, Val. Flacc. 3.154 and 168, German. *Arat*. 251 and 256, *Ilias* 669 and 675. Furthermore, the *Aeneid* provides similar pairs of verbs in close proximity. Considering only repetitions found at the beginning of a line, the position of *occupat* here, one finds: *miratur*, 1.421–2**;** *accipe* and *accipere*, 2.65 and 70; *apparet* and *apparent*, 483–4; *da* and *dat*, 691 and 698; *da*, 3.85 and 89; *hortantur*, *hortor* and *hortatur*, 129, 134, 144; *accipiunt* and *accipite*, 243 and 250; *excipit*, 318 and 332; *agnoscit* and *agnosco*, 347 and 351; *dixit* and *dixerat*, 4.659 and 663; *hortatur*, 5.177 and 189; *accipite* and *accipient*, 304 and 309; *impediunt*, 585 and 593; *educet*, 6.765 and 779; *accipe*, *accipio* and *accipit*, 8.150, 155, 178; *fecerat*, 628 and 630; *stabant* and *stabat*, 641 and 653. Further parallels can easily be found, especially if one considers other positions (e.g. final: *esset*, 6.653–4; *dedissent* and *dedisset*, 11.112 and 118; *remittat*, 346 and 359; *relinquit* and *reliquit*, 628 and 637) and other parts of speech (e.g. nouns: *dicta*, 10.584–5; *auro*, 11.776 and 779; *auras* 795 and 799). Though many of the above repetitions are arguably intended, whereas the repetition of *occupat* in 10.699 and 706 apparently has no purpose, this by no means disproves the recurrence of *occupat*. Wills (n. 16), 473–7, discusses what he calls 'unfigured repetitions' (repetitions for which the reader sees no intended purpose). In fact, he specifically cites Virgil (*Aen*. 6.417–23) at 473 as a key evidence illustrating that, as he explains at 475, the 'fact is that proximate repetitions are not uncommon in ancient poets'. At 476–7 he concludes that apparent lack of intention is not sufficient reason for condemning repetition and further suggests that some seemingly unintentional repetitions have a purpose that remains unrecognized. Therefore, repetition of *occupat* (10.699 and 706) may easily be understood as unfigured repetition, an accepted verbal feature of Latin and specifically of Virgilian Latin. On the other hand, the second instance of *occupat* may be specifically intended to direct the reader quickly back to the main sequence of the battle narrative by using the repetition as a sort of verbal signpost.

[28] While Harrison (n. 1), 239, points to 9.334 as a parallel to defend the lack of a verb describing Mezentius' killing blow, that passage is not strictly parallel because, whereas at 9.334 the preceding clauses 332–4 describe only Nisus' slaughter and the resultant bloody corpses, at

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> …and likewise Phrygian Euanthes and Mimas Paris'
> peer and comrade – whom Theano on one and the same night[29]
> brought into the light for his father Amycus, and[30] pregnant with a torch
> the queen, daughter of Cisseus, bears Paris in their paternal city –
> him[31] Mezentius strikes; the Laurentine shore holds unfamiliar Mimas.

Now, instead of a problematic contrast between the deaths of Paris and Mimas, the passage concentrates on the pathetic details of Mimas' birth on the same day and in the same paternal city as Paris. Though *urbe paterna* (705) is usually assumed to refer only to Paris' birth, I suggest that just as with the temporal qualifier *nocte* (703) so the locational qualifier *urbe paterna* describes both births so that the former picks up on *aequalem* (peer in age) and the latter on *comitem* (comrade, companion) from 703.[32] It is to be expected that Mimas was born in Troy, since the *Iliad* makes Troy Theano's residence, as she is Antenor's wife (5.69–70) and priestess of Athena in the city (6.298–300).[33] Virgil therefore would not diverge from this tradition by imagining Mimas to have been born elsewhere. It is important to note that Mimas' birthplace is Troy, since it contrasts with his place of death in a far off, foreign land (as with Iphidamas).[34] Also it is significant that he is an exact peer of Paris in both time and place of birth, as the wording of *aequalem comitemque, una* indicates, because Mimas can be seen as sharing somewhat in Paris' ill-starred fate to which Virgil alludes with *face praegnas* (704). In 706, the resumption of Mezentius' slaughter with the strong hyperbaton of *occupat* powerfully disrupts the reader after the calm digression about Mimas' birth – an effective poetic stroke that increases the pathos by objectifying Mimas.[35] This abrupt

10.700–1 there is an intervening description of Mezentius giving Lausus the helmet of Palmus to have and to wear on his head. The pause makes it more awkward to omit a verb here.

[29] For *una* as 'one and the same', compare *OLD* 'unus' 5. It is also possible to take *una* and *nocte* separately so that *una* is an adverb meaning 'at the same time' (*OLD* 'una' 2a) and *nocte* means 'at night' or 'on a night' (*OLD* 'nox' 1d). Compare *Aen*. 12.846–7 for a similar construction.

[30] The basic meaning is clear enough, though one may debate the exact syntax here. The *et* (704) may be translated 'as' or 'just as' (*OLD* 'et' 8c and 19) if one takes it as equivalent to *ac/atque* after *una* (703) which here equals *eadem* or *simul*, as explained in the previous note. Another possibility is to understand *et* as meaning 'likewise' (*OLD* 'et' 5a) in which case it would not be strictly correlative.

[31] Or one might translate '**them** Mezentius strikes' as *occupat* would syntactically pick up both objects from line 702, although my above translation reflects how the intervening digression about Mimas focuses the force of the verb on him.

[32] For an example where two linked clauses share temporal and locational qualifiers as I suggest here, see 2.419–21: *illi etiam, si quos* ***obscura nocte*** *per umbram* | *fudimus insidiis* ***tota****que agitauimus* ***urbe****,* | *apparent*.

[33] For this reasoning, see also the *schol. in Il.* 11.221, where it is explained that Iphidamas must have been born in Troy because Theano would not have gone to Thrace. Thus, as a scholarly poet, Virgil may well be reflecting an ancient commentator on Iphidamas in his description of Mimas.

[34] Harrison (n. 1), 240, comments: 'The motif of "death in an unknown land" is common in the *Aeneid* as in the *Iliad*: cf. 782, 5.871, 11.866, Griffin, *Life and Death*, 106ff.' Williams (n. 1) notes, 367: 'For the pathos of death far away from home cf. 12.546–7.' However, neither points out the specific parallel with Iphidamas.

[35] For relative clauses producing similar parenthetical digressions and thus instances of hyperbaton with the resumption of the main clause, see the following examples from Books 9 and 10: 9.334–41 (digression 335–8, resumption with simile describing main clause subject at 339), 9.386–9, 9.549–55 (digression within a simile 551–3, resumption with main clause coordinated with simile at 554), 9.672–6 (digression 673–4, resumption with main clause direct object at

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resumption of violence recalls the end of Homer's second pathetic digression on Iphidamas (*Il*. 11.241–5) which is interrupted by Agamemnon's violent treatment of the corpse (246).[36]

There is another reason to prefer *occupat* over *occubat* here. The position of the word at the beginning of the line is metrically emphatic,[37] which fits the semantic value of *occupat*, whereas the less vigorous *occubat* is elsewhere only found in the less emphatic fifth foot position.[38] On the other hand, *occupat* often occurs in an emphatic first-foot position, and many of these instances are in a battle scene or similar context, where they can be translated as 'smite' or 'strike', as I translate above.[39] Additionally the alleged clause *Paris urbe paterna* | *occubat* awkwardly ends the relative parenthesis in mid-hexameter and introduces an uneven pair of additional parentheses spanning one and a half lines in an awkward way which does not suit their supposed contrast. With *occupat*, the relative parenthesis is

675), 9.771–4 (digression 772–3, resumption with additional direct object of main clause at 774), 10.100–4 (digression 100–3, resumption with direct speech of main clause subject at 105), 10.220–3 (digression 220–2, resumption with main clause verb after first word of 222), 10.252–5 (digression 252–3, resumption with repeated main clause subject at 254), 10.707–16 (digression within a simile 708–18 – with Scaliger's transposition of 717 and 718 before 714, resumption of main clause coordinated with simile at 714). Perhaps the closest parallels are: 9.334–41, which is a similarly pathetic digression that ends abruptly with the following violent simile; 9.672–6, which similarly digresses about births and ends abruptly with the introduction of the main clause direct object and verb in hyperbaton; 10.220–3, which resumes with the main verb in hyperbaton, as I suggest at 10.706. Many of these digressions occur within or in close proximity to a simile, as the Mimas digression which is followed by a simile at 10.707. The juxtaposition of digressions and similes makes sense as both are poetic devices which similarly lend variety to the relentless action of the battle narratives in Books 9 and 10. Notably all but one (10.220–3) of these parentheses stop at line end; this suggests that Virgil favoured completing such lengthy relative parentheses at the end of a line, just as I propose at 10.705–6. 9.774–7 (digression 775–7) provides an important parallel because, although the main clause does not resume with hyperbaton, the digression is about the same length as 10.702–6, and the passage has structural and verbal similarities to 10.702–6. Both start with the pair of accusative objects (*Clytium* and *Crethea*, *Euanthen* and *Mimanta*). In both cases, the second object is described with reference to a personal relationship (*amicum … Musis*, *Paridis … aequalem*), and then that relationship is redescribed with poetic variation by means of the same word (*comitem*) before the introduction of the relative clause halfway through the second line (9.775, 10.703). Finally, both digressions are completed at the end of the third hexameter (9.777, 10.705 with my reading). In addition to the many Virgilian parentheses listed above, which likewise complete hexameters, the Homeric digression on Iphidamas, which I here propose as a key model for Virgil's Mimas digression, completes the hexameter at *Il*. 11.245 before the resumption of Agamemnon's action at 246.

[36] *Il*. 11.246: δὴ τότε γ' Ἀτρεΐδης Ἀγαμέμνων ἐξενάριξε. The verb here as commonly in the *Iliad* means 'stripped' or 'despoiled', but the violence of the action is clear from the fact that the same verb sometimes means 'kill' or 'slay' (*Od*. 11.273, *Il*. 6.30; Hes. *Theog*. 289). In recalling the scene, Virgil may well be alluding to the verb's dual meaning.

[37] That is, the minor pause between lines gives more force to the first word of the line.

[38] The hexameter examples include: Verg. *Aen*. 1.547 (*aetheria neque adhuc crudelibus* ***occubat*** *umbris*), 5.371 (*idemque ad tumulum quo maximus* ***occubat*** *Hector*); Val. Flacc. *Arg*. (*Incurrit strictis manus ensibus.* ***occubat*** *Iron*); Stat. *Theb*. 2.574 (*frena secundus Halys, sed tunc pedes* ***occubat*** *aruis*). One other poetic instance is found at line end in Sen. *Phaed*. 997: (*Hippolytus, heu me, flebili leto* ***occubat***).

[39] Verg. *G*. 4.440 (Aristaeus overcomes Proteus.), *Aen*. 9.770 (Turnus smites Lynceus.), 10.699 (Mezentius hits Latagus in the face.), 12.300 (Corynaeus hits Ebysus in the face with a torch.); Ov. *Met*. 3.48 (serpent attacks men.), 4.716 (eagle attacks a snake.), 8.399 (Caledonian boar attacks Ancaeus.), 11.239 (Peleus seizes and wrestles Thetis.) 12.343 (Theseus kills Aphareus.); Val. Flacc. *Arg*. 3.154 (Hercules kills Glaucus.), 3.168 (Hercules seizes Admon.); *Ilias* 363 (Ajax kills the son of Anthemio.), 406 (Phegeus strikes Diomedes.), 669 (Diomedes kills Agelaus.), 675 (Hector strikes Teucer with a stone.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

neatly completed at the end of 705; the main clause is forcefully resumed in 706; and another small artful parenthesis completes 706.

In summary, Bentley's long-popular conjecture of *Paris* for *creat* in *Aen*. 10.705 is far more dubious than has long been assumed. But if we keep *creat*, as all manuscripts and testimonia read, then the usual *occubat* in 706 has no explicit subject. Finally, if instead we follow the *Romanus* and *Mediceus* and read *occupat*, then the subject becomes clear, Mezentius. The passage, as a whole, now presents a powerfully pathetic digression that emphasizes Mimas' unfortunate fate and particularly his death far from home, while closely comparing him with Paris and not engaging in an unnecessarily complex rhetorical contrast between the two peers and comrades. The implicit contrast between the pair (for no one needs to be reminded that Paris died at Troy) then becomes secondary to the primary pathetic image of the young hero dying far from home, an image specifically recalling Virgil's chief model here, the Homeric description of the death of Iphidamas at *Il*. 11.221–31 and 242–3.[40]

Franklin and Marshall College ABRAM RING
abram.ring@fandm.edu

[40] I would like to thank Shawn O'Bryhim, A. J. Woodman and the anonymous reviewer for their comments on earlier versions of this article. The original inspiration came from James O'Hara's stimulating *Aeneid* seminar at the University of North Carolina in the fall of 2001.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press