



This is the text as printed by Mynors, Geymonat and Harrison,<sup>1</sup> but line 366 presents a well-known crux. While most admit that *quando* postponed to an unparalleled sixth place in its clause is problematic, a further objection has been made by J.M. Trappes-Lomax, whose treatment of the passage is one of the most recent.<sup>2</sup> He describes as ‘not exact’ the parallels quoted by Harrison in support of *asper aquis*, namely *Aen.* 4.526–7 *aspera dumis | rura*,<sup>3</sup> Sall. *Cat.* 59.2 *planities ... rupe asperā* and Hor. *Carm.* 1.5.6–7 *aspera | nigris aequora uentis*. In the first two cases, he says, *dumis* and *rupe* ‘refer to items on top of an otherwise flat surface’; in the third case *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. Trappes-Lomax is right in saying that *Aen.* 4.526–7 is no parallel for *aspera aquis*, since surface debris, not water-logged ground, is the hazard in Book 10; but what of the two other alleged parallels?

The objection of Trappes-Lomax to the relevance of Horace seems perverse.<sup>4</sup> He says that *uentis* refers to that which has caused an ordinarily flat surface to be itself rough’, but his statement is exactly applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to Virgil’s phrase as emended by Madvig: *aquis* refers to the *torrens* (10.363) which has caused the ordinarily flat ground to be rough with obstacles posed by the rocks and uprooted trees. As for the passage of Sallust, the quotation implies that *aspera* qualifies *planities*, but that is not the case, as will become clear from the clause as a whole: *uti planities erat inter sinistros montis et ab dextra rupe aspera*. If this, the reading of the principal manuscripts, is correct,<sup>5</sup> it is obvious that *aspera* must be neuter accusative plural and that the passage is more tricky than we were given to believe. What is its meaning? The neuter plural *aspera* is frequently used of ‘rough/difficult things’ in a wide variety of contexts (for example Sall. *Iug.* 89.3 *maiora et magis aspera adgredi*; *TLL* 2.812.61–813.9), including places (for example Mela 3.40 *in asperiora deuenit*, Plin. *HN* 21.53 *asperis et siluestribus*; *TLL* 2.808.81–809.10); *rupe*, which means ‘a steep rocky cliff, crag’ (*OLD*), will be an ablative of cause (‘places difficult because of a/the cliff’). On the other hand, it is possible that *ab dextra*, usually understood as a set phrase = ‘on the right’ (as in Sall. *Iug.* 50.4; *OLD* s.v. *dextera*<sup>1</sup> 3), is to be taken with *rupe* and that *ab* is causal (as in Vitr. *De arch.* 2.5.2 *saxa ... lenta sunt ab umore* ‘pliant because of the moisture’; *OLD* 15). It is difficult to know which of these alternatives is preferable, but, if the meaning is ‘because there was level ground between the leftward mountains and the hazards from a cliff on the right’, then the passage seems to offer a reasonable defence of Madvig’s *aquis*.

<sup>1</sup> R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis opera* (Oxford, 1972); M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis opera* (Turin, 1973); S.J. Harrison, *Vergil Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991).

<sup>2</sup> J.M. Trappes-Lomax, ‘Virgil, *Aeneid* 10.366–7’, *CQ* 55 (2005), 315–17. G.B. Conte in his edition of the *Aeneid* (*Publius Vergilius Maro Aeneis* [Berlin and Boston, 2019], 276) prints *aspera quis*, which he defends in id., ‘Quattro note critico-testuali all’*Eneide*’, *MD* 79 (2017), 201–11, at 206–8 and id., *Critical Notes on Virgil* (Berlin and Boston, 2016), 51–2 against E. Kraggerud, ‘Marginalia to a new *Aeneis Recensa*’, *SO* 85 (2011), 210–25, at 221–2; but none of his alleged parallels for a relative pronoun + conjunction seems to me to be parallel at all.

<sup>3</sup> Mistakenly reported as 4.426–7.

<sup>4</sup> It is striking that, in his dismissal of the passage of Horace, Trappes-Lomax mentions *saxa* and *arbusta* but omits any reference to Madvig’s *aquis*. Likewise R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 7–12* (London, 1973), 345–6, while accepting and printing Madvig’s *aquis*, translates ‘since the nature of the ground rugged with rocks had persuaded them to abandon their horses’.

<sup>5</sup> Later manuscripts read *rupem asperam*, which is adopted by J.T. Ramsey both in his commentary (*Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae* [Oxford, 2007<sup>2</sup>], 223) and in his Loeb edition (*Sallust*, 2 vols. [Cambridge, MA and London, 2013–2015], 1.140).

Trappes-Lomax, who finds problems also with line 367, proposes a radical solution: he regards ‘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*’. No doubt Virgil’s readers did not need to be told the kind of ground over which cavalry can and cannot operate, but, if Trappes-Lomax’s proposed deletion were to be accepted, it would not be clear from Virgil’s text that ‘the Arcadians were fighting on foot’. All we are told in lines 364–5 is that the Arcadians were unused to making attacks on foot (*insuetos acies inferre pedestris*) and were retreating: since *terga* can refer to a cavalry retreat (Livy 22.47.3 *equites terga uertunt*), the natural inference is that the Arcadians, realizing that any advance would have to be made on foot, instead had wheeled their horses and were riding away. Thus, when Pallas a few lines later issues the order *fidite ne pedibus* (10.372), readers would get a surprise: with lines 366–7 deleted, there had been nothing to tell them that the Arcadians had dismissed their horses. This strongly suggests that lines 366–7 are required by the logic of the narrative.

Now, since the passage of Sallust which is used to defend *asper aquis* is immediately preceded by a sentence in which reference is made to the dismissal of horses (*Cat.* 59.1 *remotis omnium equis*), it is worth asking whether it is simply coincidence that the same two phenomena are juxtaposed in the very two lines of Virgil which Trappes-Lomax wished to delete (10.366–7).

Sallust’s two sentences are taken from the final chapters of the *Bellum Catilinae* describing Catiline’s last stand. Realizing that he was trapped outside Pistorium and could neither flee nor expect reinforcements, Catiline decided to engage with the consul Antonius in battle (*Cat.* 57.5). He therefore assembled his men and addressed them in a pre-battle *hortatio* of some considerable length (58). When he had finished speaking, he led his troops to a level area and had everyone dismiss their horses *quo militibus exaequato periculo animus amplior esset* (59.1); his men were deployed as dictated by the nature of the battlefield, with mountains on the left and a cliff on the right (59.2–3). Meanwhile, in another section of the field, Antonius was incapacitated by an ailment to his feet and had handed over command to his deputy, M. Petreius, who followed his deployment of the loyalist troops with a speech of his own (59.4–6). Then both sides came to grips in the battle which would seal Catiline’s fate (60).

If we compare Sallust’s narrative, which extends to three pages of the Oxford Classical Text, with Virgil’s account of both Latin and Trojan activity (10.354–79), the results look like this:

Virgil	Sallust
expellere <b>tendunt</b>	60.5 <b>tendere</b>
nunc hi, nunc illi: <b>certatur</b> limine in ipso      355	60.3 <b>certatur</b>
Ausoniae. magno discordes aethere uenti proelia ceu tollunt animis et uiribus aquis; non ipsi inter se, non nubila, non mare cedit; anceps pugna diu, stant obnixa omnia contra:	

<p>haud aliter Troianae acies aciesque Latinae 360  <b>concurrunt</b>, haeret pede pes densusque uiro uir.  <b>At parte ex alia</b>, qua saxa rotantia late  intulerat torrens arbustaque diruta ripis,  Arcadas insuetos acies inferre pedestris  ut uidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci, 365  <b>aspera aquis</b> natura loci <b>dimittere</b> quando  suasit <b>equos</b>, unum quod rebus restat egenis,  nunc prece, nunc <b>dictis uirtutem accendit</b> amaris:  ‘Quo fugitis, socii? per <b>uos et fortia facta</b>,</p> <p>per ducis Euandri nomen deuictaque bella 370  <b>spemque meam, patriae</b> quae nunc subit aemula laudi,  fidite ne pedibus. <b>ferro rumpenda</b> per hostis  <b>est uia</b>. qua globus ille uirum densissimus urget,  hac uos et Pallanta ducem <b>patria</b> alta reposcit.  numina nulla premunt, mortali urgemur ab hoste 375  mortales; totidem nobis animaeque manusque.  ecce maris magna claudit nos obice pontus,  deest iam terra fugae: pelagus Troiamne petamus?’  haec ait, et <b>medius densos prorumpit in hostis</b>.</p>	<p>60.2 <b>concurrunt</b>  59.4 <b>At ex altera parte</b>  59.2 <b>rupe aspera</b>, 59.1  <b>remotis ... equis</b>  58.1 <b>uerba uirtutem</b>, 59.6  <b>adcendebat</b>  59.6 <b>ipsos factaque ...</b>  <b>fortia</b>, 58.18 <b>uos ... et</b>  <b>... facta</b>  58.18 <b>me spes</b>, 58.11  <b>patria</b>  58.7 <b>ferro iter</b>  <b>aperiendum est</b>  59.5 <b>patria</b>  60.5 <b>in medios hostis</b>,  60.7 <b>in confertissimos</b>  <b>hostis incurrit</b></p>
---	--

*certare* in the impersonal passive and *concurrunt* are commonplaces of battle narrative, and the verb *tendere* can be expected to be used in any context where mental or physical endeavour is described. Likewise, references to *spes* and *patria* are conventional in pre-battle speeches.<sup>6</sup> Plunging into the enemy ranks is a generic feature of heroes (one thinks

<sup>6</sup> For the conventions of these speeches, see J. Albertus, *Die παρακλητικοί in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Strassburg, 1908), 46–93, M.L. Harto Trujillo, *Las arengas militares en la historiografía latina* (Madrid, 2008), 99–134. For discussion of such speeches in general, together with a vast bibliography, see J.E. Lendon, ‘Battle description in the ancient historians. Part II: Speeches, results, and sea battles’, *G&R* 64 (2017), 145–67, at 145–54.

of the practice of *deuotio*),<sup>7</sup> and *accendere* is the *mot juste* for raising morale.<sup>8</sup> Taken individually, these similarities between the two passages seem insignificant; but the clustering within single episodes is suggestive: one could argue, for example, that in line 379 Virgil condensed two Sallustian references into one, substituted *densos* for *confertissimos* and *prorumpit* for *incurrit*, and subtly changed *medios* to the less obvious *medius*.

Rather different is the coincidence of *At ex altera parte* in Sallust and *At parte ex alia* in Virgil. Although *ex altera parte* is itself a very common expression in various forms, when preceded by *at* it is found only in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (40.2 *at ... ex altera parte*) and Livy (3.11.1, 10.29.3 *at ex parte altera*), all three examples being earlier than Virgil.<sup>9</sup> Likewise, *parte ex alia* in various forms is common, but preceded by *at* is found before Virgil only in Catullus (64.251 *at parte ex alia*) and Cicero (*Arat.* 367 *at parte ex alia*): although Virgil's debt to Poem 64 of Catullus is well known, the coincidence of the same phrase in Cicero's *Aratea* strongly suggests that all three poets were adopting a phrase from Ennius' *Annales* which is no longer extant.<sup>10</sup> If that is so, has Sallust adopted the same phrase but changed *alia* to *altera* to suit his own context? We should remember that *certare* is an Ennian verb (six times in the extant *Annales*) and that the first appearance of *concurrunt* is also in Ennius (*Ann.* 144 Sk.). Livy has numerous references to making one's way with the sword (for example 4.28.5 *ferro uia facienda est*),<sup>11</sup> but he also has *ui uiam faciunt* (4.38.4), which may be compared with Virgil's *fit uia ui* (*Aen.* 2.494). Although Horsfall on this last passage says that use of Ennius is 'far from proved',<sup>12</sup> the frequency of the motif strongly suggests a common source: if so, it could be argued that this source, presumably Ennius, also lies behind Sallust's *ferro iter aperitundum est*.

The expression *fortia facta*, which occurs three times elsewhere in Sallust's works and once elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (1.641), seems a strong candidate for an Ennian reminiscence;<sup>13</sup> but we should note that, when Sallust uses the expression in our passage, he couples it with persons (59.6 *ipsos factaque eorum fortia*), as does Virgil (10.369 *uos et fortia facta*), and that Virgil's words *uos et ... facta* are an exact reproduction of Sallust's *uos ... et ... facta* (58.18). These are just the kinds of detailed interconnection that one would expect when one author has another in mind. We have already seen that, although both Sallust (59.1) and Virgil (10.366–7) refer to the dismissal of horses, the reason in Sallust is the raising of morale but in Virgil it is necessitated by the state of the ground: this too is the kind of adjustment that an author makes when he is alluding to another. Catiline begins his *hortatio* with the conventional statement that words cannot induce courage (58.1 *uerba uirtutem non addere*),<sup>14</sup> but Virgil introduces Pallas' *hortatio* with a statement of the opposite (10.368 *dictis uirtutem accendit*), a classic case of what has been called *oppositio in imitando*.

The polyptoton *pede pes* in Virgil's line 361 originates in Latin with Ennius' *Annales*, where it is coupled with another (*Ann.* 584 Sk. *premitur pede pes atque armis arma teruntur*): this makes it very probable that Virgil's double polyptoton in

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Harrison (n. 1) on line 379.

<sup>8</sup> For this verb, cf. E. Skard, *Ennius und Sallustius* (Oslo, 1933), 22–3.

<sup>9</sup> I am assuming that Livy began writing in the 30s: see A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London / Sydney / Portland, OR, 1988), 128–40.

<sup>10</sup> So too Skard (n. 8), 13–14.

<sup>11</sup> Other examples are collected by S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X. Volume II: Books VII and VIII* (Oxford, 1998) on 7.33.10.

<sup>12</sup> N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A Commentary* (Leiden and Boston, 2008), 379.

<sup>13</sup> See further Skard (n. 8), 35–6.

<sup>14</sup> For other examples, see Harto Trujillo (n. 6), 107–11.

the same line (*uiro uir*) is also Ennian, although in extant verse the only exact parallel for this particular doubling is Furius Bibaculus (fr. 10C/75H *pressatur pede pes, mucro mucrone, uiro uir*).<sup>15</sup> Such features support the notion that Ennius lies behind Virgil's battle description, whose numerous similarities to the narrative in Sallust could thus be explained by the reliance of both authors upon a common source; yet, as we have seen, a case can certainly be made that Sallust himself is 'a possible model' for Virgil here.<sup>16</sup>

Sallust tells us that the sedition of Catiline and his followers was felt in Cisalpine Gaul (*Cat.* 42.1), and Eden comments that this was 'perhaps the first political event to impress itself on the boyhood of Virgil (about seven at the time)'.<sup>17</sup> The *Eclogues* were written under the patronage of Asinius Pollio,<sup>18</sup> who shared with Sallust both a literary consultant and a Thucydidean style,<sup>19</sup> and in the *Aeneid* Virgil depicted Catiline, *pendentem scopulo*, and the younger Cato, *dantem iura*, alongside each other on Aeneas' shield (8.668–70).<sup>20</sup> Several recent scholars have suggested various ways in which Virgil may have been indebted to Sallust,<sup>21</sup> and it would not be at all surprising if, as he wrote about the conflict between Etruscans and Latins in Book 10, the events of a more recent civil war came into his mind.

Durham

A.J. WOODMAN

[ajw6n@virginia.edu](mailto:ajw6n@virginia.edu)

doi:10.1017/S0009838822000519

### CVIVS MENSÆ SACRA? A TEXTUAL PROBLEM IN VALERIUS MAXIMUS (VAL. MAX. 4.2.3)\*

#### ABSTRACT

*This note proposes to emend the problematic preserved reading ad cuius mensae sacra (Val. Max. 4.2.3) to ad Iouis mensae sacra.*

**Keywords:** Valerius Maximus; textual criticism; *epulum Iouis*; *mensae sacra*

<sup>15</sup> See J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1996), 194–8.

<sup>16</sup> So Harrison (n. 1) on 10.366–7; he mentions our passage of Sallust again in his notes on 369 and 372–3.

<sup>17</sup> P.T. Eden, *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII* (Leiden, 1975), 177.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. F. Cairns, 'Pollio and the *Eclogues*', *CCJ* 54 (2008), 49–79.

<sup>19</sup> For Ateius Philologus as literary consultant, see Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10.6 and R.A. Kaster, *C. Suetonius Tranquillus De grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Oxford, 1995), ad loc. For Pollio and Sallust, see Woodman (n. 9), 127–8 and id., *From Poetry to History* (Oxford, 2012), 138–9.

<sup>20</sup> For Virgil's interest in the figure of Catiline, see D.H. Berry, *Cicero's Catilinarians* (Oxford, 2020), 194–6.

<sup>21</sup> See R. Ash, 'Epic encounters? Ancient historical battle narratives and the epic tradition', in D.S. Levene and D.P. Nelis (edd.), *Clio and the Poets* (Leiden / Boston / Cologne, 2002), 253–73, at 256–67, N. Horsfall, 'Sallustian politicians and Virgilian villains', *SCI* 21 (2002), 79–81, V.E. Pagán, 'Forestalling violence in Sallust and Virgil', *Mouseion* 10 (2010), 23–44, J. Marincola, 'Eros and empire: Virgil and the historians on Civil War', in C.S. Kraus, J. Marincola and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts. Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman* (Oxford, 2010), 193–204.

\* I would like to thank David Wardle and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments.