

poser, avec grande vraisemblance, que beaucoup d'enfants qui ne portent pas un surnom formé sur celui d'un des parents ont hérité leur surnom d'un de leurs grands-parents."⁵

The cognomen Novatus, then, is very likely to have belonged to the parents of either L. Annaeus Seneca *rhetor* or of Helvia. The Spanish and Italian inscriptions show no Annaei Novati and only the above M. Helvius Novatus. So, although we cannot directly link the inscription with the mother of the philosopher, we can argue that the association is probable. The Senecae are from Hispania Baetica. Either the father or the mother probably had a Novatus or Novata as parent. Our only match is this inscription, showing that

Novatus was a cognomen used by a Baetican family of Helvii. Therefore it is a good educated guess that our Helvia was herself from Hispania Baetica.

It would be satisfying to be able to discover also the source of the third son's cognomen, Mela. But the inscriptions show no Annaeus Mela or Helvius Mela, and it is pointless to conjecture that, for instance, the boy's name may somehow be connected with the geographer Pomponius Mela, a contemporary and a Spaniard.

JOHN M. GLEASON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

5. *Ibid.*, p. 121. For a general discussion of the use of cognomina under the empire, see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 487 ff.

OVID *ARS AMATORIA* 1. 114: AN EMENDATION

In *Ars. am.* 1. 89 ff., Ovid recommends the theaters of Rome as places where young men will have little difficulty in finding girls. Consistent with his usual practice in his love poetry, he then proceeds to support his recommendation by citing an example from myth: the games rigged by Romulus in his plot to kidnap the Sabine ladies (*Ars. am.* 1. 100–30). At 1. 114, the major MSS have “rex populo praedae signa petenda dedit [sc. Romulus].” The word *petenda* is obelized in Kenney's recent Oxford text edition,¹ and rightly so, since it makes no sense in the context. Kenney's apparatus shows that Bentley and Madvig had proposed *petita* as a substitute. This conjecture was in turn adopted by Ehwald in his Teubner text² and by Mozley in the Loeb,³ where the verse is rendered: “the king gave to the people the *expected* sign of rape.” It is doubtful that *petita* could be stretched to have this meaning, for, as is clear from Lewis and Short, *peto* has no meaning so pale and passive as “to expect” or “wait for,” but rather signifies “to go after” and the like with a definite degree of purpose and determination. At *Am.* 1. 8. 92, Ovid has

“fit cito per multas praeda petita manus,” where the juxtaposition of *praeda* and *petita* may conceivably have “helped” Bentley, Madvig, and Mozley toward their conjecture or acceptance of *petita* in *Ars. am.* 1. 114, but we certainly hope not, for this passage forcefully illustrates precisely what has been said above with regard to the incompatibility of *peto* in our original passage. The old *lena*, Dipsas, tells her mistress to have her sister, her mother, her nurse, practically everyone in the household, “ask for” gifts from the suitor (“multos si pauca rogabunt, / postmodo de stipula grandis acervus erit,” *Am.* 1. 8. 89–90). It is likely, I think, that a more reasonable solution than the conjectured *petita* is at hand to help us with the trouble in *Ars am.* 1. 114, our point of departure.

Ovid in *Rem. am.* 432 has “vidit in immundo signa pudenda toro.” Further, in *Ars am.* 2. 406 we read of Agamemnon and Cassandra, “victor erat praedae praeda pudenda suae,” and in *Ars am.* 3. 84, of Cephalus and Aurora, “nec Cephalus roseae praeda pudenda deae [sc. est rubori].” If we consider these verses in

1. P. Ovidi Nasonis *Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* (Oxford, 1961).

2. P. Ovidius Naso, I (Leipzig, 1916), xxxii.

3. Ovid, II (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), 20.

comparison with our original line (*Ars am.* 1. 114) as the major MSS have it, i.e., "rex populo praedae signa petenda dedit," it will seem reasonable, I think, that *pudenda* might well be read there in place of the impossible *petenda*.

S. G. Owen rightly states⁴ that the *Remedia amoris* "followed soon after the *Ars*," and bases this dating on *Rem. am.* 155–56: "ecce fugax Parthus, magni nova causa triumphi, / iam videt in campis Caesaris arma suis." It is my suggestion that *Rem. am.* 432 ("vidit in inmundo signa pudenda toro") may contain elements (*signa pudenda*) of *Ars am.* 1. 114, as Ovid wrote it, and that *petenda* was later substituted in the latter for *pudenda* through scribal error stemming, perhaps, from the similarity in sound of the two words. To the ear, the two differ but slightly. Mass production of MSS by means of dictation must often have led to such blunders and it is surely true that

the single copyist, working by himself, must often have "thought" the sound of the word he was transcribing and have done a poor job of "dictating" to himself.

Looking again at *Ars am.* 2. 406 and 3. 84, the presence of *praeda pudenda* in both passages (ostensibly written after *Ars am.* 1. 114) is further cogent inducement to assume *pudenda* for *petenda* in *Ars am.* 1. 114.

It might also be pointed out that *pudenda* appears in precisely the same line position as that which it would occupy if read, as is suggested, in *Ars am.* 1. 114, twelve times in the total of Ovid's production.⁵

It is therefore earnestly proposed that *Ars am.* 1. 114 be read as follows: "rex populo praedae signa pudenda dedit."

WILLIAM T. AVERY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

4. *OCD*, s.v. "Ovid," p. 631.

5. *A Concordance of Ovid*, ed. by Deferrari, Barry, and McGuire (Washington, 1939), s.vv. "pudendus" and "pudeo."

THE POLITICS OF M'. GLABRIO, *COS.* 67

Modern discussions of the tribunate of Cornelius in 67 have rightly stressed its background of Pompey and the political conflict involving tribunician rights and powers.¹ Cornelius, as a *popularis* and former quaestor of Pompey, was naturally opposed by the Optimate senators, including the consul, C. Piso, whose anti-Pompeian actions are well known.² What, however, of the other consul, M'. Acilius Glabrio? It seems to be tacitly assumed that he shared his colleague's political beliefs, but on investigation he is more likely to have been on the other side.³

Two men undoubtedly influenced Glabrio as a youth. One was, of course, his father, the tribunician author of the *lex Acilia*, which gave equestrians the right of forming juries in the extortion court. The circumstances and even the date of this law have been disputed, and it has recently been argued that the elder Glabrio, like Livius Drusus, was a conservative acting in the interests of the Senate.⁴ Hands's argument that the *lex Acilia* is actually more pro-senatorial than Gracchus' original intention of mixed senatorial and equestrian juries is unconvincing, and the fact that the tribune

1. See in particular A. Ward, "Politics in the Trials of Manilius and Cornelius," *TAPA*, CI (1970), 545–56; and R. Seager, "The Tribunate of Cornelius: Some Ramifications," *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (Paris, 1969), II, 680–86.

2. In addition to his opposition to Cornelius in 67, Piso spoke against the *lex Gabinia*, then prevented Pompey from recruiting for the pirate war in his province of Gallia Narbonensis (Dio 36. 24 and 36. 37; Plut. *Pomp.* 27). He also tried to prosecute Manilius, and refused to accept Lollius Palicanus as a consular candidate (Val. Max. 3. 8. 3; cf. Cic. *Att.* 1. 1. 1); Palicanus as tribune in 71 had worked closely with Pompey.

For a discussion of Piso and the anti-Pompeian attitude of other Pisones, see E. Gruen, "Pompey and the Pisones," *Calif. Stud. in Class. Ant.*, I (1968), 155–70.

3. Glabrio's politics are explicitly stated by W. McDonald, "The Tribunate of Cornelius," *CQ*, XXIII (1929), 196–208: "The optimatist candidates, C. Calpurnius Piso and M'. Acilius Glabrio, were successful (in 67) . . ." This statement has not been challenged.

4. A. R. Hands, "The Political Background of the 'Lex Acilia de repetundis,'" *Latomus*, XXIV (1965), 225–37.