the bulk of the evidence.[15] Here, I have simply tried to show that there are no slave-gangs in Varro's *De re rustica* 1.2.21.

University of Edinburgh ULRIKE ROTH
u.roth@ed.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi027

VIRGIL, *AENEID* 10.366–7

At parte ex alia, qua saxa rotantia late
impulerat torrens arbustaque diruta ripis,
Arcadas insuetos acies inferre pedestris
ut uidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci,
aspera aquis natura loci dimittere quando
suasit equos, unum quod rebus restat egenis,
nunc prece, nunc dictis uirtutem accendit amaris;

Such is the text of (among others) Mynors[1] and Harrison.[2] In v366 P gives *quos*; the other manuscripts give *quis*; *aquis* is the suggestion of Madvig.

We may begin with Harrison's comment:

> In these lines the MSS give a relative pronoun in the same clause as another element expressing the same subordination, the conjunction *quando.* This is intolerable... Recent editors have favoured Madvig's conjecture *aspera aquis* ... this is highly plausible palaeographically, and would mean 'made rough by the waters': cf. 4.426–7 *aspera dumis/rura*, Horace *C.* 1.5.6–7 *aspera nigris aequora uentis*, Sall. *Cat.* 59.2 *planities* ... *rupe aspera*... However this has seemed unsatisfactory to some, not only because it produces something of an odd phrase but also because it leaves an even odder word order, the subordinating *quando* being postponed almost to the end of its clause: *quando* occurs in fourth place at 6.50, in third at 11.509, but never this far back at sixth place. For those unpersuaded by Madvig the passage remains a genuine crux.

Madvig's *aspera aquis* is of course 'something of an odd phrase' because the parallels are not exact. In the examples from Virgil and Sallust *dumis* and *rupe* refer to items on top of an otherwise flat surface, and a true parallel here would be *asper saxis et arbustis locus.* In the example from Horace *uentis* refers to that which has caused an ordinarily flat surface to be itself rough, whereas in our passage the Arcadians' difficulties are caused by the *saxa* and *arbusta* rather than by any irregularity in the ground itself.

We should note that there are two other oddities here. The first is *unum.* Peerlkamp[3] writes: 'et quid *unum* restabat? Restabant plura: poterat fugientes hasta intentata sistere et in hostes impellere, ut Romani duces saepe fecerunt: poterat se ipsum in hostes moriturum inferre, et suos pudore ad uirtutem incendere. Itaque fecit us. 397...'. The second is *rebus egenis.* (i) As a minor point, what case is it? Harrison's note is: 'ablative absolute, possibly derived from older epic (cf. Norden. *Aen.* 6, Anh. 1.1, Austin on 6.91)'. This may well be right, but in the absence of *in*

[15] U. Roth, 'Food rations in Cato's *De agricultura* and female slave labour', *Ostraka* 11.1 (2002), 195–213.

[1] R. A. B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1969).

[2] S. J. Harrison, *Vergil Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991).

[3] P. H. Peerlkamp, *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneis*, 2 vols (Leidae, 1843). Peerlkamp has a reputation, based presumably on his treatment of Horace's *Odes*, for a wanton indulgence in athetesis. He is comparatively restrained in his treatment of the *Aeneid*, and those excisions that he does make are supported by arguments that deserve careful consideration.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi028 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it would at any rate be possible to suppose that it is a dative depending on *restat* and applied to the circumstances as it would regularly be to the person subject to those circumstances; cf. *Aen.* 2.70, *aut quid iam misero mihi denique restat*; 2.142, *per si qua est quae restet adhuc mortalibus usquam/intemerata fides.* (ii) More importantly, what does *egenus* mean here? Its normal meaning is 'poor', 'destitute', 'in need of something which somebody else can supply'. Thus *Aen.* 6.91, *cum tu supplex in rebus egenis/quas gentis Italum aut quas non oraueris urbes?*; 8.365, *rebusque ueni non asper egenis*; 1.599 *omnium egenos*; cf. also Silius 8.55, *quis rebus egenis/ferret opem?*; Stat. *Theb.* 11.550, *exilio rebusque exercita egenis/membra uides.* Yet here the reference is to desperate and immediate danger, and it is at least possible that *rebus egenis* has been borrowed from contexts in which it is more at home.

Meanwhile 'those unpersuaded by Madvig' continue to make alternative suggestions. Thus Nikitinski[4] suggested *aspera equis*, but (i) this leaves the admitted problem of the unparalleled postponement of *quando*; (ii) it does not deal with the problems of *unum* and *rebus egenis*; (iii) it is true that such ground would be rough for horses, but to say so would be a footling statement of the obvious, nor is it easy to see any point in the apparent implication that the ground would not be rough for those who happen not to be horses. Hendry,[5] dissatisfied with both *aquis* and *equis*, revived Parrhasius' *quondam* for *quando*, which, as he points out, involves 'little more than an exchange of vowels'. But (i) this still leaves the unsatisfactory *unum* and *rebus egenis*; (ii) even granting that *quondam* can be used 'with no great length of time implied', in this context it could only be a metrical filler; (iii) the lines are superfluous.

Going back in time we find that Peerlkamp removed many of the problems by reducing the two lines to one; however, the parenthesis that he retained seems to have no useful purpose. He restored the passage as follows:

> Arcadas, insuetos acies inferre pedestres,
> (aspera equos natura loci dimittere suasit)
> ut uidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci,
> nunc prece, nunc dictis uirtutem accendit amaris;

Mackail,[6] on the other hand, regarded both lines as Vergilian but saw that the passage would be better without them: 'It is also possible that ll. 366–7 belong to an alternative draft, and were mistakenly retained by his original editors.'

We may think it best to build on the suggestions of Peerlkamp and Mackail by treating both lines as interpolated by one who wished to explain why the Arcadians were fighting on foot, although Vergil's intended readers surely did not need telling that cavalry cannot operate over *saxa rotantia* and *arbusta diruta.* This would account for the various problematic and unsatisfactory expressions that we have already discussed; the passage also runs much more smoothly if Pallas is brought nearer to the verb of which he is subject. Read:[7]

> At parte ex alia, qua saxa rotantia late
> impulerat torrens arbustaque diruta ripis,
> Arcadas insuetos acies inferre pedestris

[4] O. Nikitinski, 'Zu Vergil, Aen. 10, 366', *RhM* 139 (1996), 191–2.
[5] M. Hendry, 'Verg. *Aen.* X 362–8, 439–48', *MCr* 32–5 (1997–2000), 145–9.
[6] J. W. Mackail, *The Aeneid* (Oxford, 1930).
[7] Perhaps surprisingly 10.366–7 are not among the substantial portions of the *Aeneid* athetized by O. Zwierlein, *Die Ovid—und Vergil—Revision in tiberischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1999).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi028 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ut uidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci, (365)
nunc prece, nunc dictis uirtutem accendit amaris; (368)

Bury St Edmunds J. M. TRAPPES-LOMAX
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi028

WAR AND THE SWEET LIFE: THE GALLUS FRAGMENT AND THE TEXT OF TIBULLUS 1.10.11*

Tunc mihi uita foret uulgi nec tristia nossem
Arma nec audissem corde micante tubam (Tib. 1.10.11–12)

uulgi AGV: dulcis *Leidensis Voss. lat. 0.13, Leidensis Voss. lat. 0.81*: Valgi *Heyne*: uulgo *Haupt*: uigili *Postgate*: facilis *Reid*

At Tibullus 1.10.11–12, the manuscript reading *uulgi* and the most popular suggested emendations have met with criticism. If *uulgi* is connected with *uita* it would have to refer to something desirable, but this would both suggest a fondness for the common man unusual for Tibullus (who uses the word *uulgus* nowhere else), and also produce difficult logic: why would a common man be any less likely to know *tristia arma*? If we put a comma after *foret* and read *tunc mihi uita foret* as a wish or as a protasis of a condition, then *uulgi* can govern *tristia arma*, but it adds little to what becomes a fairly inelegant sentence, except the vague notion that war belongs to the common man, while the rest of the poem (like most of elegy) stresses that war is fought for wealth. Two humanist manuscripts from the fifteenth century preserve the conjecture *dulcis*,[1] which has won some modern adherents, but has also been criticized: Murgatroyd calls *dulcis* 'weak and superfluous here'.[2] Maltby's new commentary, like Goold's revision of the Loeb text and Luck's Teubner, prints Heyne's conjecture *Valgi*, as an address to the poet C. Valgius Rufus, suffect consul in 12 B.C. and author of elegiac and perhaps other types of verse.[3] But it seems unfortunate to introduce into the text of Tibullus, by emendation, a reference to a fellow poet, when otherwise Tibullus is notorious (and thus different from Catullus, Gallus, the Virgil of the *Eclogues*, Propertius, and Horace) for not making references to contemporary poets.[4]

* I thank my colleagues Jerzy Linderski and Sharon James for comments on a draft of this paper, and Robert Maltby for discussion by e-mail.

[1] Leidensis Voss. lat. 0.13 and Leidensis Voss. lat. 0.81 date from 1459 and 1460, respectively. G. Luck, *Tibullus* (Stuttgart, 1998), calls them Voss 3 and 5, after Heyne, and F. Lenz and G. K. Galinsky, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* (Leiden, 1971), call the second of them V_5.

[2] P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus 1: A Commentary* (Pietermaritzburg, 1980), 324, arguing that when read with *arma* the manuscripts' '*uulgi* gives excellent sense'. So too Lenz and Galinsky, reading the first clause as a protasis, and providing further references in the apparatus. F. Giordano, 'In margine a Tibullo I,10,11', *AFLN* 12 (1969–70), 39–48, rejects *dulcis* largely because elsewhere in Tibullus the word precedes rather than follows its noun (though see below for Gallus); Giordano defends *uulgi*, and also gives a detailed survey of the scholarship.

[3] Robert Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Leeds, 2002), 47–8 and 244, who cites the support for *Valgi* in G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies* (Leeds, 1990), 143, but also notes that 'it is possible … that *uulgi* is the correct reading'; E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 287–90. Goold's revised Loeb: *Catullus, Tibullus, Peruigilium Veneris* (Cambridge, MA, 1988).

[4] J. P. Elder, 'Tibullus tersus atque elegans', in J. P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric* (London, 1962), 65–105, at 70–1, notes that Tibullus is 'the only

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi028 Published online by Cambridge University Press