Gratus is not paleographically obvious but is not impossible either. Lachmann and Munro demonstrated that O., Q. and the Italian manuscripts are derived ultimately from an early manuscript in capitals, but immediately from a minuscule version. One of the errors produced from the minuscule copy is the reading of n for r and vice-versa). Once the corruption gnatus had been admitted, it is not unlikely that a scribe, seeing a form he failed to recognise, would try further emendation.

Seneca provides an extremely close parallel for the proposed emendation. Fortuna is imagined demanding back her gifts, including possibly life itself. Seneca’s sage replies ‘cedo gratus libensque’ (Tranq. An. 11. 3).

We are unlikely to reach certainty in this much discussed passage, but both grandis and gratus merit serious consideration.
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VIRGIL, AENEID 8. 588

Iamque adeo exierat portis equitatus apertos,
Aeneas inter primos et fidus Achates,
inde alii Troiae proceres; ipse agmine Pallas
it medio chlamyde et piktis conspectus in armis,
qualis ubi Oceani perfusus Lucifer unda,
quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignis,
extulit os sacrum caelo tenebrasque resolvit.

Aeneid 8. 585-591

In 588 in must be understood with chlamyde as well as armis1), otherwise chlamyde has no proper construction. For a preposition ἀπὸ xoio6 cf. A. 6. 416 informi limo glaucaque exponit in ulva with R. G. Austin’s note2).

It may also be suggested that piktis goes with chlamyde as well as with armis. A χλαμύς is defined by P. Chantraine as follows: ‘manteau

d’homme, sorte de pêlerine faisant partie de la tenue de voyage, portée spécialement par les militaires: vêtement caractéristique des Thessaliens et des éphèbes athéniens\(^3\). It was in Greece a garment intended for use, and not, or at least not primarily, for ornament. Pallas was an appropriate person to wear such a cloak, being as he was a Greek, of the same kind of age as an ephebe, engaged on military service, and also travelling. So his chlamys may in part be suggested by Greek life.

But we may doubt whether Virgil would have troubled to record such an ordinary fact as that Pallas happened to be wearing a cloak of a kind appropriate for him. If, however, his chlamys was picta, embroidered and coloured, that would be of greater interest, and would also fit the context, in which he is compared to the Morning Star. Only if Pallas is a brilliant sight himself can he be fittingly compared to the glorious Morning Star. It might be argued that the fact that his arma are picta is all that is needed to justify the simile, to which the chlamys is not relevant, but it is surely more likely that Virgil would not have introduced the chlamys at all if it did not contribute to the brilliance of the scene.

Virgil mentions a chlamys on six other occasions: A.3.482ff. nec minus Andromache ... / fert picturatæ aurī subtemine vestis / et Phrygiam Ascanio chlamydam, A.4.136ff. tandem progreditur ... / Sidoniam picto chlamydem circum-data limbo; / cui pharetra ex auro, crines nodantur in aurum, / aurea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem, A. 5.250ff. victori chlamydem auratam, quam plurima circum / purpurea maeandro duplicit Meliboea cucurrit, A.8.167 chlamydemque auro dedit intertextam, A.9.581ff. stabat in egregiis Arcentis filius armis / pictus acu chlamydem et ferrugine clarus Hibera, A.11.774ff. aureus ex umeris erat arcus et aurea vati / cassida; tum croceam chlamydemque sinuque crepantis / carbaseos fulvo in nodum collegerat auro, / pictus acu tunicas et barbaræ tegmina crurum. In all of these passages the chlamys is a magnificent garment, and in some, especially A.4.136ff. and 11.774ff., it is one element in a scene of brilliant colour. More particularly, the epithet pictus is twice used of it, in A.4.137 picto chlamydem ... limbo and 9.582 pictus acu chlamydem. In 11. 777 pictus acu tunicas occurs in the immediate context of the chlamys, as also picturatæ vestis in 3.483. These passages, then, as well as the context, strongly suggest that in A.8.588 pictus goes ἀρμοιονοῦ with chlamyde as well as with armis. For an adjective ἀρμοιονοῦ cf. A.8.166 insignem pharetram Lyciasque sagittas, where Lycias goes with pharetram as well as sagittas\(^4\). In Georgic 4.141 illi tiliae atque uberrima pinus, uberrima goes with tiliae as well as pinus\(^5\).

We may now consider the text of A.8.588. The first word of the line, in all manuscripts, is in. Markland, however, conjectured it\(^6\), and he has been followed by Sir Roger Mynors\(^7\) and C. J. Fordyce\(^8\). K. W. Gransden\(^9\) and R. D. Williams\(^10\), however, reject the change, the latter remarking that it "is attractive, but not essential." Certainly it is not essential, but may yet be desirable. in contributes nothing to the sense, whereas it helps the listener to visualize Pallas riding out on his journey. And the repetition of in twice within the same line is perhaps inelegant.