

capable of doing the work, he was also morally bound to undertake it. This was one of the duties expected of the traditional *paterfamilias*, and when Augustus took himself seriously in this role, he could hardly decline a practice carried out by worthies like Cato the Censor and L. Aemilius Paullus.<sup>12</sup> So there is nothing in the least improbable about his training his grandsons personally. And if Suetonius chose to link swimming with reading, two considerations clearly led him to this seeming incongruity. First, his liking for arranging his material "non per tempora sed per species"<sup>13</sup> presumably led him to select an intellectual skill and a physical skill, to show that the princes received an all-round education even at the elementary level. Second and more important, there was a Greek proverb according to which an uneducated person was one who could neither read nor swim;<sup>14</sup> since his

comment on Caligula—"tam docilis ad cetera natare nesciit"—proves that the biographer knew the proverb, we have the reason for his linking reading and swimming in the passage under consideration here. The biographer's going on to talk about Augustus' wish that Gaius and Lucius Caesar be able to imitate his own handwriting is no more incongruous. On several occasions in the *Divus Augustus* Suetonius mentions two topics in sequence and then backtracks to provide further details on the first of the two to be mentioned.<sup>15</sup>

In short, we must accept the manuscript reading in the passage we have been discussing. However surprising we may find it, in or out of context, Augustus did indeed teach Gaius and Lucius Caesar *natate*, swimming.

M. GWYN MORGAN

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

12. Plut. *Cato cens.* 20. 2–8, *Aem. Paull.* 6. 4–5; cf. Plin. *Epist.* 8. 14. 6. The whole of *Div. Aug.* 63–65 is designed to portray Augustus as very much the traditional *paterfamilias*; 64. 2 is especially noteworthy.

13. See W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie*<sup>2</sup> (Munich, 1963), pp. 108 ff., 113 ff.

14. Plato *Leg.* 3. 689D; cf. Marrou, *op. cit.*, p. 118, and Harris, *op. cit.*, pp. 112, 117.

15. Thus at *Div. Aug.* 82. 1 Suetonius refers in sequence to Augustus' discomfort in winter, his tolerance of summer, and his inability to endure the winter sun. Not very different is *Div. Aug.* 49. 1, where he talks of the troops, the fleets, and then—in much greater detail—the troops again.

#### A NOTE ON THE FAMILY OF THE SENECAE

Discussing Helvia, the mother of Seneca *philosophus*, Karlhans Abel recently wrote, "Als H.s Heimatland vermutet man—ohne ausreichenden Anhalt—Spanien."<sup>1</sup> There are, certainly, a great many Helvii to choose from.<sup>2</sup> But perhaps the required *Anhalt* can be found in *CIL* II. 999, from Hispania Baetica. This reads:<sup>3</sup>

M·HELVIO·RVFINO·VRO  
ANN·LX·ET·M·HELVIO  
NOVATO·FR·ANN·XXXXI  
ET·AM·HELVIO·RVFO·FR  
ANN·XXXX·HELVIA·L·F  
SEVERA·ET·M·HELVIVS  
RVFINUS·F/////F·C  
H·S·S·S·V·T·L

1. K. Abel, *s.v.* "Helvia (22)," *RE*, Supp. XII (1970), 426.

2. Ours is the twenty-second in *RE*. There are twenty Helvii in *PIR*<sup>2</sup>. The indexes to *CIL* II list twenty-six individuals with the name. The sepulchral inscriptions from Rome, *CIL* VI<sup>3</sup>, include twenty-six of Helvii.

3. In the substantially different corrected form given in *Eph. Epigr.* IX. 147, p. 60. The original publication in *CIL* gives two versions so different as to seem separate inscriptions

The three sons of Helvia and Lucius Annaeus Seneca were, in order of birth, M. Annaeus Novatus, L. Annaeus Seneca, and M. Annaeus Mela. Now, under the empire, it is not at all unusual for the father's cognomen to be given not to the first son, but to the second.<sup>4</sup> But the first son's cognomen is hardly chosen at random. According to Thylander, on the subject of naming practices under the empire, "Dans tous les cas où les grands-parents ainsi que les deux parents sont connus, les enfants ont pris un surnom formé de celui d'un des parents ou de celui d'un des grands-parents. Il est vrai que les exemples sont peu nombreux mais assez pourtant pour qu'on puisse sup-

naming two different Helvii Novati. Since the mere occurrence of the name Helvius Novatus is what concerns us here, I have simply relied on the version of *Eph. Epigr.* None of the editors gives any indication of the inscription's date.

4. H. Thylander, *Etude sur l'épigraphie latine* (Lund, 1952), p. 119: "Le surnom du père n'a pas été hérité seulement par l'aîné des enfants, mais à peu près aussi souvent par le second."

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."<sup>5</sup>

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,<sup>1</sup> 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 text<sup>2</sup> and by Mozley in the Loeb,<sup>3</sup> 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.