

mercator (1.31.10f.)⁵. *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,⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ At 1.12.57 *laetum* has a well-attested variant *latum*.⁹

University of Illinois, Urbana

HOWARD JACOBSON

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

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

⁷ 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.

⁸ *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.

⁹ 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.¹ It is now established that this was on the South-West of the Palatine.²

¹ 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.

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

Suetonius' description of Augustus' modest house (*Augustus* 72) is often cited as 'evidence' that the same ground was once occupied by the home of poor Evander. However, Augustus' frugality was only in comparison with the extravagance of the later Neronian and Flavian palaces which flanked it in Suetonius' time³. If we adopt Servius Auctus' identification of Evander's *regia*, and with it a different location, the recent inclination to see in the building an association between Augustus and Rome's humble beginnings is seen to be unnatural and unattested.

He has a lengthy (and corrupt) note on line 363:

hic ius pontificale quibusdam videtur subtiliter tangere: domus enim, in qua pontifex habitat, regia dicitur, quod hic ostendit ex persona Evandri, quem facit orantem ut Aeneas suam ingrederetur domum, non utique profanam, sed sacratam, scilicet quae fuerit hospitium Herculis, illis versibus 'haec, inquit, limina victor Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit'. quem etiam honore divinae dignationis sociat adiciens 'aude hospes contemnere opes et te quoque dignum finge deo': haec enim dicendo quid aliud agit, quam ut sacratae religionis usum tribuat antisti *** divina communia, utpote quem etiam pontificali honore nuncupaverat, dicens 'maxime Teucrorum ductor': neque enim quia ductor eo maximus, sed quia maximus eo *** omnia. regiae autem verius meminit dicendo 'tectis subibant pauperis Evandri' (et) 'Romanoque foro': quis enim ignorat regiam, ubi Numa habitaverit, in radicibus Palatii finibusque Romano fori esse?

Despite the lacunae which render parts of the note very difficult, the fundamental points can be understood: Vergil here is referring to the Regia, the building in the Roman Forum, at the bottom of the Palatine, where Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome lived until he bequeathed it to the Pontifex Maximus.⁴ Because of its royal associations the building was called the Regia. Servius Auctus seeks to confirm this identification by asserting the sacred nature of the building, (appropriate to a priest's college but not a private house) and by citing the epithet *maximus*, used by Evander of Aeneas at 8.470.

This interpretation is not addressed in the editions of Williams, Eden, Fordyce or Gransden, but is surely worthy of serious attention.⁵ The Regia stood beside the Via Sacra, approximately halfway between the Arches of Septimius Severus and Titus.⁶

accepted by e.g. E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* vol. 1 (London, 1961), 310 and J. Patterson, 'The City of Rome: from Republic to Empire', *JRS* 82 (1992), 186–215; E. Henry, 'Virgil and the Monuments', *PVS* 18 (1986), 19–45; cf. Fowler 75 and J. H. Bishop, 'Palatine Apollo', *CQ* NS 6 (1956), 187–92.

³ G. Carettoni, *Das Haus des Augustus auf dem Palatin* (Mainz, 1983); id. on the wallpaintings in the building in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Berlin, 1988), pp. 287–90; P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, 1988), 51f. and 67f.

⁴ F. E. Brown, 'New Soundings in the Regia; the evidence for the early Republic', *Entretiens Hardt* 13 (1967), 47–64 concludes that the Regia was built not for a *rex* but a *rex sacrificulus*, and not as a dwelling place but as a site for sacred rites. See also S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 279–80 and cf. F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano* (Rome, 1983), 61. For consideration of Servius' general reliability see R. D. Williams, 'Servius—Commentator and Guide', *PVS* 6 (1966–7), 50–6. Plutarch, *Numa* 14.1, mentions the construction of the Regia; at 9.1 Plutarch says that Numa instituted the office of Pontifex and was himself the first of them.

⁵ R. D. Williams, *Aeneid 7–12* (London, 1973); Eden, Gransden and Fordyce, op. cit. (n. 1). T. P. Wiseman, 'Cybele, Virgil and Augustus', in A. J. Woodman and D. A. West (eds.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge, 1984), 117–28 sees an allusion to the piety and frugality of Numa in the word *regia*.

⁶ Nash, op. cit. (n. 2), vol. 2 (London, 1962), 264f. The location of the Regia actually permits of an extraordinary compromise between the interpretations of Servius Auctus and Richmond: T. P. Wiseman, 'The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses', in *L'Urbs—espace urbain et histoire, Collection de l'école Française de Rome* 98 (1987), 393–413, reprinted in *Historiography and Imagination* (Exeter, 1994), 98–115 describes how, from the 30's B.C., Octavian bought up land and houses between his house on the Palatine and the Temple of Vesta,

In tracing the route of Evander and Aeneas through the settlement, Gransden (35–6) has them pass by this very spot.

Vergil's text accommodates Servius Auctus' identification and location very comfortably. First, 'ad tecta subibant' (359) need not be understood to suggest ascent.⁷ The collocation of *subeo* and *ad* does not appear elsewhere in Vergil. It is used of a spear in Statius' *Thebaid* (10.746), where a steep climb is suggested. In Pliny's *N.H.* (6.45) a topographical usage again suggests ascent, but spread over 700 miles, 'ab eodem amne si subeatur ad Portas DCC [milia]'. Livy uses the collocation 11 times, with the regular sense of 'advance towards' or 'approach'.⁸ Thus Vergil's use of the collocation can refer to the progress of Evander and Aeneas along the Via Sacra towards the Regia, without any implication of a climb (up the Palatine).

Furthermore, conclusions from recent topographical research show that part of the Carinae could be seen from the Regia, refuting Fowler's confident rejection of the identification of Evander's house with the Regia, which he based on the visibility of cattle on the Carinae from the Roman Forum (74–5).⁹ The synaesthesia of lines 360–1 is the net result of the sight of some cattle, such as those in the Forum and the nearer slope of the Carinae, and the sound of others, such as those beyond the brow of the Carinae—a natural experience for Evander and Aeneas as they approached the Regia.

Traditionally there has been some difficulty in establishing the precise location of the Porta Mugonia, a gate of the Palatine. It was clearly somewhere to the North-East of the Palatine, perhaps a little above the site of the Arch of Titus.¹⁰ *mugire* (361) suggests an etymology for the Porta Mugonia, an interpretation entirely consistent with the topography.¹¹ Wiseman's revelation (1987, 399–403) that the *domus Augusta* was approached from the Lupercal, not from the Forum or Velia, until the reconstruction and reorientation following the fire of A.D. 3, adds further weight to this argument. For recent commentators to be correct, Vergil would have to have ascribed to Evander and Aeneas an unconventional, even bizarre route.¹²

fastigia (366) better suits identification of the building as the Regia. Weinstock (280–81) argues that Augustus' palace had no pediment at the time, but that one was added, probably by Caligula.¹³ However, the Regia almost certainly had a pediment. Julius Caesar had been granted a pediment by the Senate, which was probably erected on his *domus publica*, to make it resemble the Regia. There could also be more recent resonances in the word *fastigia*, as in 36 B.C., after Caesar's assassination and before the publication of the *Aeneid*, Cn. Domitius Calvinus rebuilt the Regia in marble.¹⁴

intent on creating a palace complex spanning the entire area. According to this grand plan, he might have intended to incorporate the Regia in his scheme. Wiseman cites the dedication *in honorem domus Augustae*, discovered on the wall of the Regia and suggests the *terminus ante quem* of 12 B.C. for Augustus' rejection of this plan.

⁷ Cf. Fordyce 246 and Richmond, 'Palatine Apollo Again', *CQ* NS 8 (1958), 180–4, pp. 181–2.

⁸ E.g. 2.31.4 *subeundum erat ad hostes*; 4.22.5 *subeundo ad moenia*; 9.37.3 *ad vallum subeunt*; 31.45.4 *ad urbem subeunt*; 34.46.7 *subiere ad vallum*.

⁹ N. Terrenato, 'Velia and Carinae: some observations on an area of Archaic Rome', in E. Herring, R. Whitehouse, J. Wilkins (eds.), *Papers of the Fourth Conference of Italian Archaeology* 4 (London, 1992), 31–47, at 33–4.

¹⁰ Coarelli 26–33; Terrenato 33; Wiseman (1987), 403–4.

¹¹ Wiseman (1984), 123; Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 5.164.

¹² Richmond's assertion that the distance between the Forum and the *domus Augusta* is covered in the phrase *ut ventum ad sedes* (362) because 'Virgil has nothing to remark' (1958, 181), in which he is tacitly followed by Gransden, is an unconvincing challenge to the claims of likelihood.

¹³ Cf. Richmond (1958), 182.

¹⁴ Nash (1962), 264; Zanker 66.

Finally, Servius Auctus' note adds further significance to the religious context of the much discussed 'te quoque dignum/ finge deo' (364–5). The austerity and self-denial advocated in these lines could be suitably demanded of a prototype Pontifex Maximus; and there could be no more suitable location for this than the prototype pontifical Regia.¹⁵ The pontifical character of Aeneas' religious decorum is granted its fitting apogee in his reception in the Regia.¹⁶

The attraction of the ideological implications of the identification of Evander's regia as Augustus' Palatium has been too tempting for recent scholars to resist, yet their arguments have been ill-founded. Servius Auctus' natural and attested identification of Evander's regia as the Regia, with its predominantly regal and republican associations, should be reinstated.¹⁷

University of St. Andrews

ROGER REES

¹⁵ F. E. Brown, 'Of Huts and Houses' in L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze (eds.), *In Memoriam: O. J. Brendel* (Mainz, 1976), 5–12 says that buildings like the Regia recalled the primitive virtues such as piety, probity and austerity.

¹⁶ Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.2.17 *pontificem Aenean... ostendit*; H. J. Rose, *Aeneas Pontifex*, (London, 1948). Servius Auctus' identification of the Regia does not claim to suggest a foreshadowing of the adoption of the position of Pontifex Maximus by the emperor, as Augustus did not assume the office until 12 B.C. (*Res Gestae* 10), although Rose (3) doubts that his intentions were kept secret even before Vergil's death.

¹⁷ My thanks to Roy Gibson, Roger Green, James Morwood, Christopher Smith, Peter Wiseman, and the referee.

TWO PROBLEMS IN MARTIAL*

I. Martial 1.102

qui pinxit Venerem tuam, Lycori,
blanditus, puto, pictor est Minervae.

'Some of Martial's shortest epigrams are also the obscurest', observes P. T. Eden, apropos of 1.102.¹ This two-line poem has certainly generated a remarkable diversity of interpretations. All the critics are agreed that the portrait of Venus owned by the courtesan² Lycoris ('Venerem tuam, Lycori') is in some way botched or unattractive, but, beyond this, their explanations differ widely. Izaac³ suggested that the painter deliberately made Venus' portrait ugly, so as to please Minerva, her rival in the

* Commentaries and editions of Martial referred to in the notes:

Schrevel, K., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata cum notis Farnabii et variorum* (Leiden, 1656).

Paley, F. A. & Stone, W. H., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata Selecta* (London, 1881).

Stephenson, H. M., *Selected Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1887).

Bridge, R. and Lake, E., *Select Epigrams of Martial* (Oxford, 1908).

Izaac, H. J., *Martial, Epigrammes* Tome 1 (Budé ed., Paris, 1930).

Citroni, M., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber 1* (Firenze, 1975).

Howell, P., *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1980).

Bailey, D. R. Shackleton, *Martial Epigrams* (Loeb Classical Library, 1993).

¹ 'Problems in Martial (III)', *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990), 160–5 at 163.

² Lycoris' status is established by (i) her ownership of a painting of Venus, the patroness of meretrices (K. Schneider, *RE* 8.1356, H. Herter *JbAC* 3 (1960), 86 n. 298), who decorated their houses with portraits of the goddess (W. Gilbert, 'Zum ersten Buch Martials', *Philologus* 41 (1882), 364) and (ii) her name, which she shares with a famous predecessor, the courtesan Cytheris-Lycoris, on whom see *RE* 12.218f. and R. G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 69 (1979), 148 and 152ff. Mart. 6.40 also suggests that Lycoris is a courtesan.

³ Izaac (1930), p. 47.