

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

**Band:** 75 (2018)

**Heft:** 1

  

**Artikel:** A possible corruption in Verg. Aen. 12.510

**Autor:** Shumilin, Mikhail

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-780961>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 20.08.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## A Possible Corruption in Verg. *Aen.* 12.510

Mikhail Shumilin, Moscow

*Abstract:* A conjecture of *longe* is proposed at Verg. *Aen.* 12.510 based on Vergil's Homeric model and on a probable imitation by Statius.

In his recent edition of *Aeneid* 12, Richard Tarrant justifiably notes that, although Vergil's text looks almost entirely reliable and scarcely in need of any conjectures, it is nonetheless doubtful that "in a poem of nearly 10'000 verses the original reading has been faithfully preserved somewhere in the tradition in all but 40 places [where R.A.B. Mynors and G.B. Conte print conjectural readings]"<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, although Vergil's text was accorded careful and uninterrupted attention by ancient scholars practically from the moment of its completion<sup>2</sup>, which would seem to have minimized potential distortions, the apparent "cleanness" of the text does not necessarily reflect a faithfulness to the original: for the very same scholarly attention could have led to alterations with the aim of achieving this smooth and easy readability, or to a preference for textual variants based on "cleanness" rather than authenticity. And while we can hardly expect to glimpse behind the curtain of ancient editors and reconstruct Vergil's original, especially where the text appears impeccable, we should investigate points in the vulgate text, though not striking or of central importance, that leave room for doubt. Even a passage that is generally considered unproblematic, but could easily be a corruption of a more authentic reading, is worth scrutinizing. A good example is the brilliant conjecture of *en felix* instead of *infelix* in *Aen.* 12.641 proposed by T. Gehring in *MH* in 2003<sup>3</sup>. And yet Tarrant, despite his stated reservations as to the received text, only prints this insightful suggestion in his *apparatus criticus*<sup>4</sup>. In the present note, I propose a conjecture justified along similar lines.

In *Aen.* 12.509–512 Turnus kills two brothers, one with a spear and the other with a sword:

Turnus equo deiectum Amycum fratremque Dioren,  
510 congressus pedes, hunc uenientem cuspide longa,  
hunc mucrone ferit, curruque abscisa duorum  
suspendit capita et rorantia sanguine portat.

\* The author thanks Kevin McNeer and the anonymous reader of *MH* for their help.

1 R. Tarrant (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid Book XII* (Cambridge 2012) 47.

2 See e.g. J.E.G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York 1981) 28–54.

3 T. Gehring, "Infelix – en felix (eine Konjektur zu *Aen.* 12,641)", *MH* 60 (2003) 165–166.

4 He explains his doubts in his note *ad loc.* G.B. Conte does not mention this conjecture in his edition (G.B. Conte (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis*, Berlin/New York 2009).

It has been known to Vergilian commentators since the 16<sup>th</sup> cent. that Vergil's main source here is probably Hom. *Il.* 20.460–462<sup>5</sup>. Though there are some other passages in Homer (not mentioned in R.G. Knauer's index or in commentaries) where a hero kills one adversary with a spear and another with a sword<sup>6</sup>, this passage seems particularly relevant for a number of reasons: it also describes a joint death of two brothers<sup>7</sup> in a few compact phrases<sup>8</sup>, without mentioning where the weapons strike their bodies<sup>9</sup>:

αὐτὰρ ὃ Λαόγονον καὶ Δάρδανον νῖε Βίαντος  
ἄμφω ἐφορμηθεῖς ἐξ ἵππων ὥσε χαμᾶζε,  
τὸν μὲν δουρὶ βαλὼν, τὸν δὲ σχεδὸν ἄορι τύψας.

Moreover, the *aristeia* of Achilles in *Iliad* 20 (to which these lines belong) is in general the main Homeric model used by Vergil in this episode<sup>10</sup>. Cf. also ἐξ ἵππων ὥσε χαμᾶζε with *equo deiectum*, ἐφορμηθεῖς with *congressus*.

The only detail in Homer's text that has no explicit correspondence in Vergil is the opposition of distances from which two blows are made (σχεδὸν vs the implied "further off")<sup>11</sup>. Tarrant sees a twisted version of this opposition in *congressus*, which is used instead of σχεδὸν/*comminus* in this opposition in *Aen.* 12.342<sup>12</sup>, but this sounds doubtful: it must mean that Aeneas kills both adversaries from close quarters, which contradicts all the parallels (and probably common sense too): spears are always used to kill from distance. At the same time, in *Aen.* 12.510 *congressus* seems to suit the sense of Homeric ἐφορμηθεῖς well enough.

I suggest, therefore, replacing *longa* in line 510 with *longe*<sup>13</sup>. Vergil uses this word instead of *eminus* in the same opposition in *Aen.* 10.715–716 (*non ulli est*

5 F. Orsini, *Virgilius collatione scriptorum Graecorum illustratus* (Antwerp 1567) 464, cf. G.N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerizitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen 1979) 429, 484, Tarrant, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) *ad loc.*

6 See, in particular, Hom. *Il.* 5.144–147; 11.101–109.

7 Unlike Hom. *Il.* 5.144–147.

8 Unlike Hom. *Il.* 11.101–109.

9 Unlike both other passages mentioned.

10 See Tarrant, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 219.

11 Cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.378 μή πῶς σ' ἡὲ βάλη ἡὲ σχεδὸν ἄορι τύψη, Verg. *Aen.* 12.341–342 *iamque neci Sthenelumque dedit Thamyrumque Pholumque*, | *hunc congressus et hunc, illum eminus*, Ov. *Met.* 3.119 *comminus ense ferit; iaculo cadit eminus ipse*, 12.378–379 *ante tamen leto dederat Phlegraeon et Hylen* | *eminus, Iphinoum conlato Marte Clanisque*.

12 Tarrant, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 175.

13 S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Vergil, Aeneid 10* (Oxford 1991) 257, defending the reading *longe* against *longo* of the majority of ancient manuscripts in Verg. *Aen.* 10.769 along the lines of J.N. Madvig's argumentation (perhaps correctly, *pace* Mynors and Conte), notes that the corruption is made easier by the influence of the adjacent noun (*agmine*); our case is similar (cf. *cuspidē*). Less controversial examples of similar corruptions are Verg. *Aen.* 7.288 (*ex aethere longe > ex aethere longo* M), Luc. 4.757 (*longe ... pulsus > longi ... pulsus* M<sub>1</sub>Z, *longo ... pulsu* P<sub>2</sub>), Stat. *Theb.* 11.493 (*longe | ora > longa | ora* P).

*animus stricto concurrere ferro, | missilibus longe et uasto clamore lacesunt*); cf. also *Aen.* 9.572 (*hic iaculo bonus, hic longe fallente sagitta*), 10.754 (*iaculo et longe fallente sagitta*). The position at line-end is quite normal for *longe* in Vergil<sup>14</sup>. The combination *longa + cuspidē* is certainly possible<sup>15</sup>, as well as speaking of two people killed with a spear and with a sword without juxtaposing the distances<sup>16</sup>, but the epithet does not seem to have any particular motivation here<sup>17</sup>, and the main Homeric model here is otherwise followed by Vergil without omissions. If we suppose that the original Vergilian text was *cuspidē longe*, Statius will appear to allude to it in *Theb.* 9.108:

*conuulsae cuspidē longe  
diffugere iubae patuitque ingloria cassis.*

Interestingly, the content of this passage in Statius is clearly indebted to a passage in the *Aeneid* that occurs close to the verses under discussion above: the hitting of Aeneas' helmet plumes by Messapus' spear in *Aen.* 12.491–493<sup>18</sup>. It is also worth noting that for the vulgate text *cuspidē longa*, it seems we have neither quotations in ancient scholarly literature<sup>19</sup> nor imitations in poetry before Corippus (6<sup>th</sup> cent.)<sup>20</sup> who actually postdates our earliest Vergilian manuscripts<sup>21</sup>.

Correspondence:

Mikhail Shumilin

Laboratory of Classical Studies

School of the Advanced Studies in the Humanities

The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

Prospekt Vernadskogo, 82, str. 9

RU-119571 Moscow

mvlshumilin@gmail.com

14 Cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.358, Verg. *Aen.* 1.13, 3.703, 5.23, 7.288, 7.701, 8.92, 9.322, 12.44, 12.452, 12.480. Interestingly, the form *longa* never elsewhere appears at line-ends in Vergil, although other forms of *longus* do (*longo*: Verg. *Georg.* 3.506, Verg. *Aen.* 1.395, 5.90, 8.411, 11.143; *longos*: Verg. *Ecl.* 9.51; *longis*: Verg. *Aen.* 8.662; *longae*: Verg. *Aen.* 1.341; *longam*: Verg. *Aen.* 1.703).

15 Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.386 (*alternos longa nitentem cuspidē gressus*). A combination noun + adjective at line-end is frequent in Vergil, and very often noun occupies the fifth foot and adjective the sixth: cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 1.62, 1.84, 1.118, 1.223, 1.293, 1.296, 1.300, 1.395 etc.

16 Cf. Homeric passages mentioned in n. 6.

17 A comparison with χαλκήρεϊ δουρί in Hom. *Il.* 5.145, in one of the possible parallel passages, also in the end of the second line of the scene, does not seem particularly convincing since it lacks semantic correspondence.

18 See M. Dewar (ed.), *Statius, Thebaid IX* (Oxford 1991) 79.

19 See O. Ribbeck (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera, Vol. III: Aeneidos libri VII–XII* (Leipzig 1872) 330.

20 *Iohannis* 8.394–395 (*quem cuspidē longa | auersum post terga ferit*).

21 Cf. Ribbeck, *loc. cit.* (n. 19) 415. There are some instances of *longa + cuspidē* in other *sedes* in post-Vergilian poetry (Ov. *Met.* 6.673, Stat. *Theb.* 5.399, 7.73–74, Mart. 14.221.2), but they can as well be explained as dependent on Verg. *Aen.* 12.386 (quoted in n. 15). Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 1048 (*egreditur longa sustentans cuspidē gressus*) is definitely dependent on it.