

and Oceanid nymphs (cf. Catullus' *genitor Nympharum*), but more interesting is *Theogony* 131–6, where the children of Ouranos and Gaia are listed: the eldest of these is Oceanus (133), the youngest Tethys (136). Oceanus and Tethys, then, are an incestuous sibling couple, a feature common enough in the genealogy of the gods, as Ovid's Byblis, herself seeking arguments for sibling incest, recalls (*Met.* 9.499): *di nempe suas habuere sorores: / sic Saturnus Opem iunctam sibi sanguine duxit / Oceanus Tethyn, Iunonem rector Olympi*. Once this idea is introduced, Catullus' attack on Gellius' alleged incest gains greater wit and point, and a motive is provided for a mythological allusion unusual in this type of Catullan poem. Not even the mythologically incestuous couple Oceanus and Tethys can wash out Gellius' incest, though they are guilty of the offence themselves and might be thought likely to connive at it.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

## TWO CONJECTURES IN HORACE, *ODES*

I offer here two emendations of the text of the *Odes*, in two passages that make perfectly good sense, offer Latin that is unexceptionable, and have apparently never been questioned.

*Otium divos rogat in patenti / pressus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes / condidit lumen etc.* (2.16.1–3). None of this text is problematic. But it does contain three peculiarities. First, as far as I can tell, nowhere else in his oeuvre does Horace use *rogo* with the double accusative. Second, the use of the nominative perfect participle as a substantive is rare in classical Latin and may occur only twice elsewhere in Horace (*Carm.* 3.20.16; *Serm.* 1.2.137).<sup>1</sup> Third, and most important, we are struck by the complete absence of definition or characterization of the person who is trapped at sea. This absence is made the more remarkable by the contrast with the Thracians and Medes who are *bello furiosa* and *pharetra decori*, descriptions that set off their current yearning for leisure and peace. Commentators so feel this lack that they routinely add a defining subject in their paraphrases or translations of these verses. Thus, E. C. Wickham offers, 'The trader prays for [bodily] rest, but it is only in the moment of storm',<sup>2</sup> while Nisbet-Hubbard write (p. 256), 'The *negotiator* ... is driven in a crisis to seek for *otium*'.

These are small objections, but the fact is that one trivial emendation removes them all. For *divos* read *dives*<sup>3</sup>: even the most acquisitive materialist prays for *otium* when caught in a storm<sup>4</sup>. *Dives* is a word Horace likes, both as adjective and substantive (e.g. *Carm.* 2.18.10, 3.11.6, 3.16.23, 3.29.13). It is a word naturally associated with the

<sup>1</sup> These two examples are cited by Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes: Book II* (Oxford, 1978), ad loc. I know no others. See too Kühner-Stegmann 1.224 ('sehr selten').

<sup>2</sup> *Horace Volume I: The Odes, Carmen Saeculare and Epodes with a Commentary* (Oxford, 1904), p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> The confusion of *e* and *o* is common. For examples in Horace, see e.g. *C.* 3.4.16, 4.14.4, *Serm.* 1.5.78. There are many examples in Lucretius, e.g. at 4.879, 5.1068, 6.589. To be sure, the strictly palaeographic argument will turn on whether Porphyrio (who had *divos*) read Horace in uncials, which we cannot know.

<sup>4</sup> 'Gods', to be sure, is still implicit. Verbs like *rogo*, *oro*, *quaero* often leave out the external accusative when it is obvious from the context. See e.g. *Stat. Silv.* 3.2.130, *alias ... rogabimus auras* (sc. *deos* or *Aeolum*); also *Verg. Aen.* 4.56–7, 4.451, 8.376–7, 11.101, *Georg.* 1.100–1, *Lucr.* 5.1229–30, *Ovid, Fasti* 4.407–8, *Ars* 1.442, *Stat. Silv.* 1.4.95, *Theb.* 10.66, *Caes. B.G.* 1.11.

*mercator* (1.31.10f.)<sup>5</sup>. *Otium dives* gives us the juxtaposition of subject and object that Horace is so fond of (e.g. *Carm.* 1.6.9, 2.16.10, 2.18.10, 2.20.17, 3.4.9, 3.7.13, 3.11.31, 4.4.31f.). We may recall the wealthy *mercator* of *Carm.* 1.1, who for a moment praises *otium*, but is soon back on the seas, *indocilis pauperiem pati* (16–18). Finally, the substantival adjective provides a nice Horatian balance to the descriptions of the Thracians and Medes that follow.

In the opening poem of *Odes* 4, Horace dismisses Venus and suggests that she will find in Maximus a more suitable soldier in her service: *centum puer artium / late signa feret militiae tuae* (15f.). I do not think this text has ever been doubted. Nonetheless, I raise one question. While *late signa feret* is entirely appropriate for a genuine Roman soldier,<sup>6</sup> is it for a soldier in Venus' army? Is it a Don-Juanish call to numerous love affairs? Is that the service of Venus? This seems highly unlikely for a member of the Augustan court, especially if this poem is a virtual epithalamium for Maximus on the occasion of his forthcoming marriage to Marcia.<sup>7</sup> I suggest an alternative. In a poem that is essentially a *recusatio* of sorts, as Horace expresses his reluctance to serve in Venus' army, it will be appropriate for him to say of Maximus, *laete signa feret militiae tuae*: Maximus will joyfully serve in this army.<sup>8</sup> At 1.12.57 *laetum* has a well-attested variant *latum*.<sup>9</sup>

University of Illinois, Urbana

HOWARD JACOBSON

<sup>5</sup> Note too the contrast of the (presumed) *mercator* to the *pauper colonus* at 1.35.5–6.

<sup>6</sup> Cf Florus, Praef. 1.2, *ita late per orbem terrarum arma circumtulit ut ...* (of the Roman people).

<sup>7</sup> So argued cogently by A. T. von S. Bradshaw, *CQ* 20 (1970), 147–51. Accepted by R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), 145 with note 3; *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 403.

<sup>8</sup> *Laetus* seems almost a *vox propria* in Venus-contexts. See e.g. Lucr. 1.23, Hor. C. 3.21.21, Mart. 6.21.2, Juv. 6.570, Stat. *Theb.* 2.191, *Sil.* 1.2.143.

<sup>9</sup> I am indebted to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet, who read an earlier version of these notes and offered several valuable suggestions.

#### REVISITING EVANDER AT *AENEID* 8.363

The purpose of this note is to revive Servius Auctus' interpretation of *Aeneid* 8.363, which has been overlooked or dismissed without argument by recent scholars. It concerns the identification and location of Evander's *regia*. The relevant lines are worth quoting in full (359–67):

talibus inter se dictis ad tecta subibant	
pauperis Evandri passimque armenta videbant	360
Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis.	
ut ventum ad sedes 'haec' inquit 'limina victor	
Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.	
aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum	
finde deo rebusque veni non asper egenis.'	365
dixit, et angusti subter fastigia tecti	
ingentem Aeneas duxit.	

There has been general agreement amongst scholars this century that the building is to be understood to be occupying the same place—or thereabouts—as that later to be taken by Augustus' house.<sup>1</sup> It is now established that this was on the South-West of the Palatine.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. W. W. Fowler, *Aeneas at the site of Rome* (Oxford, 1917), 72; P. T. Eden, *Aeneid* 8 (Leiden, 1975), 104; K. W. Gransden, *Aeneid* 8 (Cambridge, 1976), 30; C. J. Fordyce, *Aeneid* 7 and 8 (Oxford, 1977), 246.

<sup>2</sup> O. L. Richmond, 'The Augustan Palatium', *JRS* 4 (1914), 193–226 makes the identification,