

hexameter works on the Packard Humanities Institute's Latin CD-Rom 5.3, I find only five instances, all in Lucretius, of words ending in *a* elided before forms of *aqua*.¹ Even when the preceding vowel is not an *a*, elision before *aqua* is extremely rare: the only example in Vergil is *A.* 4.489, *sistere aquam*. The combination in one line of an unparalleled elision and an unparalleled postponement of *quando* seems to me to rule out Madvig's *aquis*. Though palaeographically ingenious, it is unlikely in the extreme.

Some of the same considerations apply to O. Nikitinski's recent proposal to emend *quis* to *equis* and understand *aspera equis natura loci* as equivalent to Greek *δύσιππος χώρα*.² It is true that there are horses in the context and that dative *equis* is less awkward than ablative *aquis*. However, elision before *equus* (as in 6.655, *pascere equos*) is nearly as rare in Vergil as before *aqua*. Further, despite Nikitinski's recommendation of the ep-analepsis, I find *equis* and *equos* in the same *sedes* in adjacent lines unappealing.³ A less subjective objection is that *equis* does nothing for the unparalleled postponement of *quando*.

However, if *aquis* is wrong, and *equis* no better, we are not therefore forced to put up our daggers, as Harrison's last sentence implies. In fact, his note provides all the evidence needed to locate the fault precisely, though not quite enough to correct it. As he says, either *quis* or *quando* must go, and *quando* is far too late in the line: therefore we should keep *quis* (or perhaps *quos*) and alter *quando* to some word that is not a conjunction.⁴ One of the more obvious principles of textual criticism is that there are always at least two ways to remove a redundancy. If one of them also removes another problem, it is very likely the right way.

¹ The disc professes to contain all of Latin literature through 200 C.E., and I have not noticed any omissions. The exceptions in Lucretius are 2.344 *loca aquarum*, 6.497 *semina aquai* and 6.507, 520, 672 *semina aquarum*. If we were dealing with one of the more Lucretian passages of the *Georgics*, rather than a battle-narrative from the *Aeneid*, an echo or 'metrical allusion' would be worth considering, but I see nothing particularly Lucretian or didactic here.

² "Zu Vergil Aen. 10, 366", *RhM* 139 (1996) 191-2.

³ He might have defended it by pointing to my second passage, but I will argue that that is also corrupt. In any case it seems *unmethodisch* to introduce by conjecture an anomaly that would be barely tolerable in a manuscript reading.

⁴ Given its rather weak manuscript support, *quos* is likely to have come from *quis* rather than the other way around. The corruption would have been all the easier with *equos* directly below.

The only remaining problem is to find a contextually appropriate and palaeographically plausible conjecture for *quando*. What Harrison and other recent editors do not mention is that there is a perfectly acceptable alternative: Parrhasius' *quondam*.⁵ The difference between *quondam* and *quando* (or *quōdā* and *quādo*) is little more than an interchange of vowels. At Propertius 2.21.11, to look no further, *quondam* has been corrupted to *quando* in the first hand of the oldest manuscript (N₁), though that is of course nearly a millennium younger than Vergil's oldest manuscripts. While I would not call *quondam* certain, it seems preferable to the alternatives, and will certainly do until something better is proposed. It may not add much, but *quando* adds nothing. One should not have to think of it oneself, or go all the way back to Ribbeck to find it in the apparatus.⁶

2

Turnus seeks out Pallas for single combat (439-48):

Interea soror alma monet succedere Lauso
 Turnum, qui uolucris curru medium secat agmen. 440
 ut uidit socios: 'tempus desistere pugnae;
 solus ego in Pallanta feror, soli mihi Pallas
 debetur; cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset.'
 haec ait, et socii cesserunt aequare iussi.
 at Rutulum abscessu iuuenis tum iussa superba 445
 miratus stupet in Turno corpusque per ingens
 lumina uoluit obitque truci procul omnia uisu,
 talibus et dictis it contra dicta tyranni:

444 iussi ed. Aldina : iusso codd. 445 iussa] dicta aeu

Again I take Harrison's note (on 444) as my starting-point:

«**socii cesserunt aequare iussi**: all MSS have *iusso*, but *iussi*, found in the first Aldine edition (1501), seems stylistically preferable: Turnus has not ordered an *aequor* or level fighting-ground (cf. 451), but has told his *socii* to fall back, and they do as ordered (*cesserunt . . . iussi*); for the phrase cf. 7. 156 'festinant iussi'. Heyne-Wagner praise *iusso* as an

⁵ The use of *quondam* in the sense 'previously', with no great length of time implied, is fairly common. A good parallel in Vergil is the description of the dying Camilla: *labuntur frigida leto / lumina, purpureus quondam color ora reliquit* (A. 11.818-9).

⁶ O. RIBBECK (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera I-IV*, Leipzig 1894-95.

elegant hypallage, recognizing (with Servius) that *iussi* would be natural Latin, but the language of the line was doubted as early as the commentator Probus (1st c. ad), who according to D. Servius placed here the sign *alogos*, indicating puzzlement, . . . *iusso*, to agree with *aequore*, would be an easy assimilating error.»

However, *iussi* does nothing for the other problem in 444, which is that the occurrence of either *iusso* or *iussi* just one line before *iussa* seems highly suspect, all the more so when we note that the two words are directly above one another.⁷ Of the two, the first is the more likely to be corrupt, since *aequore iusso* is so odd a phrase, while *iussa superba* is unexceptionable. That would be reason enough to reject *aeuv*'s *dicta* (in 445), even if the same word did not occur twice in 448. The variant does suggest that some ancient or mediaeval readers objected to the repetition.

The most economical suggestion is *aequore iusto*. Corruption to *iusso* would have been very easy with *iussa* just below: like the Aldine's *iussi*, this is an 'easy assimilating error', but vertical rather than horizontal. The adjective is suitably polyvalent for Vergil. The primary meaning is that the area vacated by Turnus' allies is of the proper size for a formal duel, large enough to provide elbow-room for the combatants and small enough to afford a good view for the spectators: a 'regulation' arena or duelling-ground, as it were. It also refers to the terrain, which must be flat and open enough to give no unfair advantage to either side. Although Tacitus refers to fighting *iustis locis* (*A.* 2.5.3), Vergil generally uses *aequus* to express the same idea: a fair fight is fought *aequo* . . . *solo* (11.706-7).⁸ There may be some implication that this is to be the 'field of vengeance', as *debetur* (443) hints. One further advantage of reading *iusto* is that it would provide a bit of lexicographical word-play — always a plus in Vergil —, since *iustus* is a near-syn-

⁷ The last word in 444 would have been almost directly above *iussa* in 445: there are 30 letters before *iusso*, 27 before *iussa*. However, the former are, on the average, narrower letters in most scripts, with one more I and two fewer Ms, so the lengths would have been fairly close — as they are in Mynors' Oxford text, a fact which first gave me the idea for this paper.

⁸ F. R. D. Goodyear (*The Annals of Tacitus, Vol. II* [Cambridge, 1981], *ad loc.*) has another explanation: «**acie et iustis locis** The expression *iustus locus* seems unprecedented, which is not surprising for, while *iustus* = 'formal, regular' is intelligibly applied e.g. to *acies, bellum, proelium, pugna* . . ., topography resists such rules. If anything, *iustis* here = *aequis*, 'fair, equally favourable': . . . But why did T. not write *aequis*? *Brevis esse laboravit*: he had in mind *iusta acie et aequis locis*, but saves one word by a very forced contraction, akin to ἀπὸ κοινῶν.» Of course, if I am right in emending Vergil, the locution is not entirely unprecedented.

onym of *aequus*, and *aequus* a cognate of *aequor*. Although there may be other possibilities, *iusto* seems to me much better than either *iusso* or *iussi*, and it is hard to imagine that anything as good or better would be as close to the paradox.