

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.<sup>15</sup> The pontifical character of Aeneas' religious decorum is granted its fitting apogee in his reception in the Regia.<sup>16</sup>

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.<sup>17</sup>

University of St. Andrews

ROGER REES

<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 courtesan<sup>2</sup> Lycoris ('Venerem tuam, Lycori') is in some way botched or unattractive, but, beyond this, their explanations differ widely. Izaac<sup>3</sup> 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).

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Izaac (1930), p. 47.

Judgement of Paris. This ignores the palpably ironic force of 'puto'.<sup>4</sup> According to Gessler<sup>5</sup> and Stégen,<sup>6</sup> the painter has portrayed Venus so ineptly that Martial supposes he has, without so intending, represented a Minerva, on the principle that, in the hands of an artistic incompetent, 'amphora coepit / institui; currente rota ... urceus exit' (Hor. *Ars Poetica* 21-2). It is difficult to see how a representation of Venus that comes out as Minerva could in any meaningful sense be construed as 'flattering' ('blanditus est') to the latter. Eden<sup>7</sup> combines in a single discussion 1.102 and 5.40 'pinxisti Venerem, colis, Artemidore, Minervam; / et miraris opus displicuisse tuum?': 'the point of these epigrams,' it is suggested, 'is the hidden assumption that if an artist only paints good pictures of a divinity he worships *qua* artist, he is doomed to failure with any but those of Minerva.' The author of the most recent English commentary on book 1, Peter Howell,<sup>8</sup> sees 1.102 as an elegant variation on several epigrams in the Greek Anthology in which the rightness or wrongness of the Judgement of Paris is disputed with reference to different artistic representations of the contending goddesses. Interpretationally, however, he does not venture beyond this. Finally, in a refinement of Izaak's view, Durand<sup>9</sup> and Citroni<sup>10</sup> argue that the portrait of Venus was worthless because the painter in question was incapable of doing any good work—but Martial ironically affects to believe that he has rendered her ugly on purpose so as to gratify Minerva who is flattered to find herself more beautiful than her rival.

This last explanation is more clearly on the right lines, but all the interpretations<sup>11</sup> just listed are based on the premise that the poem is a satire against a hack painter. In support of this assumption, critics regularly cite 5.40, which *is* certainly directed against an artistic incompetent. But there is a crucial difference between this epigram and 1.102, to wit, the addressee Lycoris, who is elsewhere described by Martial as *nigra, fusca* and *lusca*.<sup>12</sup> In view of this, and Martial's consistently misogynistic stance, it seems better to read the present epigram as an attack on Lycoris. Here credit must go to Paley and Stone,<sup>13</sup> who alone among the critics have seen what we take to be the key detail: Lycoris herself has served as the model for the unbecoming Venus. These scholars have, however, failed to adduce the clinching piece of evidence for this reading: another courtesan, Phryne, notoriously served as a model for a painting of Venus, sc. the Aphrodite Anadyomene of Apelles.<sup>14</sup> But unlike her famously beautiful<sup>15</sup> predecessor—and also the homonymous Lycoris/Cytheris,<sup>16</sup> the

<sup>4</sup> See OLD s.v. 8. For other objections to this explanation, see J. Gessler, 'In Martialem', *Latomus* 5 (1946), 57-8.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. (previous note).

<sup>6</sup> G. Stégen, 'Vénus et Minerve', *LEC* 27 (1959), 28-30.

<sup>7</sup> Above, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Howell (1980), p. 317.

<sup>9</sup> R. Durand, 'In Martialem', *Latomus* 5 (1946), 257-8.

<sup>10</sup> Citroni (1975), p. 312.

<sup>11</sup> We omit from consideration the highly improbable interpretations of the poem offered by Farnaby/Schrevel (1656) and the Delphin editions of 1720 and 1823.

<sup>12</sup> 4.62.1; 7.13. 2; 3.39.

<sup>13</sup> Paley and Stone (1881), on line 1 ('perhaps a portrait of Lycoris ... dressed as Venus').

<sup>14</sup> See Athenaeus 590F-591A and RE 20.898f. s.v. 'Phryne'. This famous work, acknowledged to be Apelles' masterpiece, was installed by Augustus 'in delubro patris Caesaris', but was subsequently replaced by Nero, when it deteriorated through age and rot (Plin. *N.H.* 35.91). For what is known, or can be inferred, about the Aphrodite Anadyomene, see E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* Bd. 2 (München, 1923), pp. 740-1.

<sup>15</sup> See for example Athenaeus 590F, Val. Max. 4.3. ext.3, and Quintil. 2.15.9 'et Phrynem non Hyperidis actione, quanquam admirabili, sed conspectu corporis, quod illa speciosissimum aliqui ducta nudaverat tunica, putant periculo liberatam'.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Mart. 8.73.6 'ingenium Galli pulchra Lycoris erat', Prop. 2.34.91-2 'et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus / mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua!' See further n. 2 above.

mistress of Cornelius Gallus and other Roman notables—Martial's Lycoris is distinctly unattractive. Thus any representation of Venus based on her must seem, Martial sarcastically suggests, like a deliberate attempt to flatter Minerva by overturning the Judgement of Paris.

## II. Martial 5.24.10

In Martial's well-known epigram on Hermes the gladiator (5.24), the subject is described as the 'cura laborque ludiarum' (line 10). Both 'cura laborque' and 'ludia' have been translated in various ways. The sense of the latter term in particular is subject to debate, and our discussion will focus upon this.

Of several renderings which have been offered for *ludia* in this passage, one may be readily dismissed: 'female stage-dancer'.<sup>17</sup> Although the masculine form *ludius* often occurs in the sense of 'dancer', the contexts in which the term *ludia* is used here and elsewhere all point to some connection with the gladiatorial schools. The other two common translations are 'gladiators' wives/mistresses'<sup>18</sup> and 'women who love the *ludus* and gladiators'. The second of these, favoured by a number of scholars, has been argued in greatest detail by Piernavieja,<sup>19</sup> whose discussion merits examination. Piernavieja used as his main evidence for the meaning of *ludia* the passage from Juvenal 6 (103ff.) on the notorious Eppia, the senator's wife who deserted her family and undertook a dangerous sea voyage to Egypt to accompany her lover, the unprepossessing gladiator Sergius. What attraction, asks the satirist, did she see in him that she could endure to be called a *ludia*? (104–5 'quid vidit propterea quod ludia dici / sustinuit?'). In Piernavieja's view, *ludia* cannot be translated here as 'a gladiator's wife or mistress'. His reasoning appears<sup>20</sup> to be as follows: although Eppia has eloped with a gladiator and so could be regarded as a gladiator's 'wife', her real function in the passage is as a concrete example of the obsession with gladiators shared by the female sex as a whole (cf. line 112 'ferrum est quod amant'). Thus *ludia* in line 104 must refer not to Eppia's particular case, but to the well-attested<sup>21</sup> propensity of women in general to fall in love with gladiators. The conclusion is that *ludia* as employed in Juv. 6.104 is opprobrious in sense and must be translated as 'a woman who loves the *ludus* and gladiators'. The same meaning, Piernavieja assumes, is borne by *ludia* in Martial 5.24.

Piernavieja's argument is clearly fallacious. Eppia has earned the title *ludia* not because she sits and sighs, like many others, over a gladiator during a show in the

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Izaac *ad loc.*, *CGL* V.635.49 'ludia, saltatrix' and Forcellini's Lexicon s.v. The dictionaries of De Freund-Theil (Paris, 1853), Lewis and Short (Oxford, 1879), Gaffiot (Paris, 1934), Lebaigue (Paris, 1960) all give the meaning 'an actress, a female stage-dancer' for this passage, though in the two Juvenal passages to be discussed below, they interpret it as 'a female gladiator' and/or 'a gladiator's wife or mistress'.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. n. 17 above, *D-S* III 1379 s.v. *ludius*, Paley and Stone (1881) *ad loc.*

<sup>19</sup> P. Piernavieja, '*Ludia*: un terme sportif latin chez Juvénal et Martial', *Latomus* 31 (1972), 1037–40, accepted by H. S. Versnel, 'A Parody on Hymns in Martial V 24 and some Trinitarian Problems', *Mnemosyne* 27 (1974), 365–405, at 385, n. 88; cf. *TLL* s.v. *ludia* 'cum contemptu de femina, quae ludos vel ludios amat'. Farnaby/Schrevel (1656) and Stephenson (1887) *ad loc.* vacillate between the first and second explanations.

<sup>20</sup> The following is an attempt to clarify Piernavieja's arguments, which are far from coherent.

<sup>21</sup> Piernavieja (above, n. 19), p. 1037, observed the special attraction which gladiators held for women, especially members of the upper classes, comparing Petronius, *Sat.* 126 'harena aliquas accendit' and Pompeian graffiti which attest the popularity of certain gladiators with the girls: *CIL* 4.4342 ('susprium puellarum/Tr./Celadus'), 4345 ('puellarum decus/Celadus Tr. '), 4356 (Tr./Celadus, reti./Crescens/puparru domnus').

amphitheatre, but because she has left her husband and is living with a gladiator in a sexual relationship (cf. *moechum* in line 102 of the gladiator). When Juvenal employs the word *ludia* in this passage, he is ironically using a term which is not normally contemptuous in itself: that is to say, it is the usual word in popular speech for a gladiator's sexual partner. In the Juvenal passage it acquires special derogatory resonances<sup>22</sup> because it is applied, not to a person of servile or humble status, such as gladiators' women would normally have been,<sup>23</sup> but to a member of the aristocracy who has degraded herself by becoming sexually involved with a gladiator<sup>24</sup>—a class which, despite the popular esteem and substantial earnings which they often enjoyed,<sup>25</sup> nevertheless remained on the lowest rung in the social hierarchy.

In rebutting Piernavieja's argument, we have implied that the other commonly given translation for *ludia* in Martial, 'a gladiator's wife or mistress', is more appropriate. Caution needs to be exercised here, however. Although there is evidence<sup>26</sup> that some women lived in reasonably permanent relationships with gladiators as their wives, or more often—given that most gladiators were of servile status—their *contubernales*, a large number of sexual relationships within the gladiatorial *ludus* were likely to have been on a more casual basis.<sup>27</sup> Hence *ludiae* are more accurately defined as women attached to the gladiatorial schools who catered for the gladiators' sexual needs:<sup>28</sup> this explanation could encompass the 'wives' of gladiators as well as those women who simply serviced the members of the school.

That *ludia* is in essence a straightforward technical term for women attached to the gladiatorial *ludus* can be demonstrated from two other occurrences of the word. At Juvenal 6. 265–7 the poet criticizes *matronae* who perform as gladiators—something a *ludia* would never do ('dicite vos neptes Lepidi caecive Metelli/Gurgitis aut Fabii, quae ludia sumpserit umquam/hos habitus, quando ad palum gemat uxor Asyli').<sup>29</sup> Far from being a pejorative term here, *ludia* is applied to someone whose behaviour, though she is of low status, is favourably compared to that of the *matronae* who defy convention by appearing in the arena.

The second piece of evidence has been overlooked both by compilers of dictionaries and by commentators on Martial,<sup>30</sup> yet it offers the clearest testimony of the meaning

<sup>22</sup> Courtney *ad loc.* refers to Eppia as a 'gladiator's moll', borrowing the phrase from J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (London, 1969), p. 297. The translation is appropriate in the Juvenal passage, with its pejorative tone, but not elsewhere (Courtney compares Mart. 5.24). The same consideration rules out the rendering by A. Scobie, 'Spectator Security and Comfort at Gladiatorial Games', *Nikephoros* 1 (1988), 201 of *ludiae* as 'gladiators' "groupies"'.  
<sup>23</sup> Cf. G. Ville, *La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien* (Rome, 1981), p. 330 and n. 225.

<sup>24</sup> And indeed by attaching herself to his troupe: see lines 82–3 'nupta senatori comitata est Eppia ludum / ad Pharon...'.  
<sup>25</sup> Cf. L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris, 1940, repr. Amsterdam, 1971), p. 287, Balsdon (above, n. 22), p. 301, M. Grant, *Gladiators* (London, 1967), pp. 92ff., Ville (above, n. 23), pp. 330, 334–9.

<sup>26</sup> The discovery in the gladiatorial barracks at Pompeii of a room with both a woman's skeleton and a jar containing the bones of an infant suggests that at least some *ludiae* lived with their partners as a family group. On this point, see further Robert (above, n. 25), p. 303, Scobie (above, n. 22), 191–244 at 201, T. Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London/New York, 1992), pp. 114–16.  
<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ville (above, n. 23), p. 329.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Ville (above, n. 23), p. 330 n. 226, *OLD* s.v. *ludia*.

<sup>29</sup> *Ludia* is explained, correctly, by the scholiast as 'uxor gladiatoris' and *Asyli* as 'nomen gladiatoris'.

<sup>30</sup> It is not mentioned in *TLL* s.v., for instance, or in discussions of the term *ludia* in standard works on gladiators: we came upon it in J. Pearson's *Arena: The Story of the Colosseum* (London, 1973), p. 112 where, however, the first two words are mistranslated 'modest Ludia.'

of *ludia* for which the present note argues. This is an inscription found on a fragment of a red Samian ware patera which was discovered at Leicester during the excavations for the town drainage system, and was first published in 1855.<sup>31</sup> The text reads:

VERECUNDA  
LUDIA LUC  
IUS GLA DIA  
TOR.

Here too the meaning of the noun can hardly be derogatory: it simply describes Verecunda's rôle, just as *gladiator* describes that of her lover<sup>32</sup> Lucius.<sup>33</sup>

To return to *Martial* 5.24.10. In his discussion, Piernavieja arbitrarily assumes that *ludia* here and elsewhere bears the sense 'a woman who loves the *ludus* and gladiators'. No one would dispute that when popular gladiators performed in the amphitheatre they inspired the same type of reaction as that seen today among teenage girls at a pop concert or older women at a Domingo performance: such might well have been the effect of the famous Hermes on his female audience.<sup>34</sup> But, on the basis of the texts here considered, these considerations have little bearing on the sense of the word *ludia*.

It remains to consider the meaning of *cura laborque*, which is variously interpreted. The majority of commentators take the words as synonymous: Hermes is either a source of worry and trouble to the gladiators' women because his prowess in gladiatorial combat threatens the lives of their partners,<sup>35</sup> or else all these women are in love with him (taking both *cura* and *labor* in an erotic sense).<sup>36</sup> The first interpretation may be ruled out: *cura*, followed by the genitive case, invariably refers to someone who is the object of another's care or concern,<sup>37</sup> not to a person who causes another concern on behalf of a third party. The second interpretation is more appealing: *cura* is often used in an amatory context to mean 'an object of love'.<sup>38</sup> Similarly *laboro* is used of being in love (*N-H* on *Hor. Od.* 1.17.19–20, *Ov. Am.* 1.11.6, *Ep.* 20.173), and *labores* can describe the woes experienced by lovers (e.g. *Prop.* 1.6.23 with *Enk ad loc.*, *Pl. Pseud.* 695). For *cura* and *labor* used together in an amatory context, cf. [Tib.] 3.6.7 'ite procul durum curae genus, ite labores'.

A third possibility is raised by Shackleton Bailey,<sup>39</sup> who does not regard *labor* and *cura* as synonymous, but treats *que* as adversative, and takes the nouns in two

<sup>31</sup> See J. F. Hollings, 'Roman Leicester', *Leicester Literary and Philosophical Society Report* (1855), 319–67, at 363 (= *CIL* 7.1335).

<sup>32</sup> See Hollings (above, n. 31) for the suggestion that the fragment (which is perforated, as if to allow it to be worn as a pendant) served as a love token.

<sup>33</sup> The meaning 'dancer, actress' which some have assumed for the *Martial* passage (see above, n. 17) is not impossible here, though it would be unparalleled. Given that *ludius* can have a range of meanings, perhaps *ludia* could also (thus *D-S*, above, n. 18). In that case the inscription would be irrelevant to the *Martial* passage, since the context in *Martial* requires that *ludiae* have a close association with the gladiatorial schools. It would, however, still offer proof that the word is a technical term describing a profession and not, as Piernavieja argues, a derogatory one.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the passages cited above, note 21; also Ville (above, n. 23), pp. 330–31, Balsdon (above, n. 22), p. 297, Wiedemann (above, n. 26), p. 26.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Izaac (1930); Bridge and Lake (1908), *ad loc.*

<sup>36</sup> E.g. Piernavieja, Versnel (above, n. 19), Paley and Stone (1881); Stephenson (1887) takes *labor* as erotic.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. 'cura deorum' = 'the object of concern [on the part] of the gods': *Ov. Met.* 8.724, *Stat. Silv.* 4.2.15, *Virg. Aen.* 3.476.

<sup>38</sup> E.g. *Virg. Ecl.* 10.22, *Hor. Od.* 2.8.8, *Ov. Am.* 1.3.16.

<sup>39</sup> In his recent Loeb edition (1993).

different senses to produce the translation 'darling and distress'. For *labor* in the sense of 'a cause of pain or distress' (though not in erotic contexts), cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 792, Sil. 3.75 (of Hannibal). This explanation is in principle feasible: the *ludiae* might well feel the glamour exerted by Hermes, yet simultaneously experience worry should he be matched with their own *vir*.<sup>40</sup>

On balance, however, it seems best to opt for the second explanation, for three reasons. First, the idea that Hermes is a source of anxiety to the inhabitants of the *ludus* might seem to have been adequately covered already by line 4 'Hermes turba sui tremorque ludi.' Second, with the possible exception of the contentious<sup>41</sup> 'Hermes omnia solus et ter unus' (15), all the other verses of the epigram focus on a single aspect of Hermes' craft.<sup>42</sup> Third, to interpret *cura* in an erotic sense and *labor* in a non-erotic sense involves taking *que* as emphatically antithetical, yet when the particle is so used the force is, as a rule, only mildly adversative.<sup>43</sup> In sum, to deny synonymity to *cura* and *labor*, as Shackleton Bailey does, runs counter to the architecture of the epigram.

The conclusion must be that 'cura laborque ludiarum' means 'the darling and hearthrob of the gladiators' women'. The erotic allure of Hermes is conveyed by *cura laborque*, and *ludiae* is an objective term for the particular category of females whom this affects.\*

University of Sydney

P. WATSON

L. WATSON

<sup>40</sup> Farnaby's explanation, reproduced in the Delphin edition (London, 1822), that they are all in love with Hermes and consequently also fear for his safety, ill fits the emphasis elsewhere in the poem on Hermes' invincibility in combat.

<sup>41</sup> See Versnel (above, n. 19), *passim*.

<sup>42</sup> In addition, lines 9–10 go together, 'divitiae locariorum' (9) balancing 'cura laborque ludiarum': this structure works better if 'cura laborque', like 'divitiae', represents a single idea.

<sup>43</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 219, n. 4.

\* Addendum: P. Howell's edition of Book 5 (Warminster, 1995) translates *ludiae* as 'female fans'.

#### PLUTARCH, *DE STOICORUM REPUGNANTIIS* 1048DE

In chapters 30–1 of the *de Stoicorum repugnantiis*, Plutarch sets out to show that the Stoics involve themselves in self-contradiction if they claim that their philosophy allows them an intelligible notion of providence. In the first place, he says, this is so because the traditional boons which men expect to receive from the gods (health, wealth etc.) do not benefit them at all if they do not have wisdom. Indeed, the fool uses all things badly, so that to give him anything at all without giving him virtue should be positively harmful to him. Yet the gods never give virtue to anyone so, on this score, they benefit no one either.

This argument is followed by another at 1048DE which aims to prove that the Stoic god does not benefit men any more than men benefit him, so that the very concept of providence is an impossibility in Stoicism. The text, as we find it in the MSS, is as follows:

(1) τὸ δὲ τοὺς ἄλλως γενομένους ἀγαθοὺς κρίνειν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἢ ἰσχὺν οὐδὲν ἐστι· (2) καὶ γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς οἱ ἀγαθοὶ κρίνουσι κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ ἰσχύν<sup>1</sup>. (3) ὥστε μηδὲν μᾶλλον ὠφελεῖν ἢ ὠφελίσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς<sup>2</sup> ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

<sup>1</sup> ἰσχύουσιν X<sup>1</sup>F<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>θεοὺς om. αA<sup>1</sup>; αὐτοὺς A<sup>2</sup>En

The conclusion of this argument—that the gods do not benefit men any more than