αὐξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἕρνεσιν
οἰναρέοις θαλέθοισιν, ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος
οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν.

From ἦρι μὲν κτλ. we would not have expected what we in fact get: ἐμοὶ δέ, with οὐδεμίαν ὥραν casually tucked in later. Likewise, in Anacreon 13, we should not insist that because the μέν has κόμην, the δέ must, too. The contrast that is ultimately revealed may not fulfill our precise expectations—the joke is made παρὰ προσδοκίαν, after all—but the revelation does not utterly violate acceptable usage, either: the contrast simply rests with the fact that the μέν-clause gives the rejection of one person, the δέ-clause the pursuit of another; it cannot be pressed further. For an instance where the antithetical force of μέν . . . δέ is superseded by an enclosing structure (resembling that of Anacreon 13. 5–8 as analyzed above), compare Tyrtaeus 10. 27–29 West:

νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν,
ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχῃ,
ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξί.[16]

Here the antithesis lies between ἀνδράσι and γυναιξί, while μέν . . . δέ look as if they are trying to oppose the incommensurable pair, ἀνδράσι and ἐρατός;[17] contrast, for example, Mimnermus 1. 9 ἀλλ' ἐχθρὸς μὲν παισίν, ἀτίμαστος δὲ γυναιξίν.

HAYDEN PELLICCIA
Cornell University

16. Reading (with Bergk, West, and Gentili-Prato) Reiske's θηητός for the MSS' θνητοῖσιν in line 29. Whatever it was, there can be no doubt but that some masc. nom. sing. adjective stood here. The line thus emended has a precise, pyramidal symmetry (ἰδεῖν at the exact center, with 7 syllables on each side), and it may be complained that the emendation is suspicious for that reason alone; but as Calvert Watkins points out to me, the preceding (ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχῃ) and succeeding (ζωὸς ἐών, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών) pentameters are also symmetrical, which suggests that symmetry was being deliberately sought throughout. See next note.

17. Cf. the pentameter quoted in Aristotle *EN* 2.5 1106b28 (= *Adespota Elegiaca* 3 West = *Frag. Adesp.* 11 Bergk[4]) ἐσθλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς, παντοδαπῶς δὲ κακοί, where some of the MSS (see Bergk) read κακοὶ δὲ παντοδαπῶς (this passage was drawn to my attention by A. B. Westervelt).

OVID AND DIVUS AUGUSTUS

The evidence of the poets is of particular interest to the social historian in that poetry seems often to provide the clearest reflection of popular attitudes and practices.[1] Ovid, for example, makes frequent allusions to the emperor's divinity in terms that add up to a clear case of special pleading, the hope that by extravagant metaphor he can touch the emperor's heart and secure his own return from exile.[2] But are all passages of this sort to be dismissed as "verbal intoxication," verbiage pure and simple? In a poem written at a time when the emperor was already dead the poet says that Augustus, now one with the gods, can hear his

1. F. Bömer, "Vergil und Augustus," *Gymnasium* 58 (1951): 33.
2. See in general K. Scott, "Emperor Worship in Ovid," *TAPA* 61 (1930): 43–69, esp. 44–45, 68–69.

prayers and yield to his entreaties (*Pont.* 4. 9. 129–30): "tu nostras audis inter convexa locatus / sidera, sollicito quas damus ore preces." Similarly, he says that in writing a poem in the tongue of the uncivilized Getae, he was aided by the divine power of the god, that is, Divus Augustus (ibid. 13. 24): "adiuta est novitas numine nostra dei." Both texts are consistent with an earlier declaration that Augustus, when he leaves earth and goes to heaven, will listen to those who pray to him (*Met.* 4. 868–70):

> tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo
> qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
> accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens.

Are Ovid's words to be dismissed simply as literary affectation, or did he really believe that the deified Augustus could hear and answer his prayer? If not, what is one to make of these passages and of the concept that lies behind them?

The overwhelming testimony of the ancient authors strongly suggests that Ovid's sentiments will have been in direct line with contemporary beliefs on the efficacy of the dear departed. It seems to have been a commonly held notion in antiquity that mortals were ordinarily open to prayers after death. The point has been covered in some detail by A. D. Nock, who adduces literary testimony that the dead Agamemnon or Alcestis were called on for help, or that the dead Alexander was imagined as still powerful to aid the comrades he had left behind on earth.[3] Even a boy who died at the age of four is described by his parents in a prose epitaph as their "own god who listens to prayers,"[4] and at the moment of Caesar's assassination Cassius looked across to Pompey's statue and implored his assistance, forgetting in the moment his rationalism (Plut. *Caes.* 66. 2). How exactly the deceased could help is unclear, but requests to the dead, particularly the righteous dead, to pray on behalf of the living suggest that their souls may have been thought to intercede with the gods, a notion in line with the familiar Platonic concept of δαίμονες as helpful intermediaries.[5] One might compare the role of the false prophet Alexander of Abonuteichos, who played the part of an intercessor with the divine serpent Glycon.[6]

For prayer to the deified dead,[7] we can turn in the first place to what Livy says of the apotheosis of Romulus (1. 16. 3): "pacem precibus exposcunt uti volens propitius suam semper sospitet progeniem." A similar attitude on the part of the

3. "Deification and Julian," *JRS* 47 (1957): 116, 121 (= id., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World,* ed. Z. Stewart [Oxford, 1972], pp. 835, 843), with further evidence.

4. H. W. Pleket, *Epigraphica II* (Leiden, 1969), no. 55; cited most recently by H. S. Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," in *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World,* ed. H. S. Versnel (Leiden, 1981), p. 37. Cf. Nock, "Deification," p. 121 (= *Essays,* p. 843), citing *Carm. epigr.* 576 Bücheler = *CIL* 8. 2803a: "D. M. S. | Donata, pia, iusta, vale, serva tuos omnes."

5. Nock, "Deification," p. 121 (= *Essays,* pp. 842–43).

6. A. D. Nock, "Alexander of Abonuteichos," *CQ* 22 (1928): 160–62. In support of the idea of intercession, Nock cites Catull. 68. 65 "iam prece Pollucis, iam Castoris implorata"; but for the meaning "by prayer *to* Pollux, *to* Castor," see C. J. Fordyce, ed., *Catullus* (Oxford, 1961), p. 351, and cf. G. P. Goold, ed., *Catullus* (London, 1983), p. 181: "in answer to prayers now made to Castor and to Pollux." See now M. Le Glay, "D'Abônouteichos à Sabratha, les déviations de la religion romaine au temps de Marc Aurèle," in *L'Africa Romana: Atti del VI convegno di studio (Sassari, 16–18 dicembre 1988),* ed. A. Mastino (Sassari, 1989), pp. 35–41, esp. 36–38.

7. On prayer to the emperor, see S. R. F. Price, "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Imperial Cult," *JHS* 104 (1984): 92–93; D. Fishwick, "Prayer and the Living Emperor," in *Mélanges in Honor of Alexander G. MacKay,* forthcoming.

plebs has been seen behind the rituals Suetonius describes at the column dedicated to Caesar in the Roman Forum (*Iul.* 85): "apud eam longo tempore sacrificare, vota suscipere, controversias quasdam interposito per Caesarem iure iurando distrahere perseveravit." In the same vein Vergil speaks of the beneficial effect of Caesar's star in *Eclogue* 9. 46–49:

> Daphni, quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?
> ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum,
> astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo
> duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem.

Again, Valerius Maximus says of Caesar (1. 6. 13): "tuas aras tuaque sanctissima templa, dive Iule, veneratus oro, ut propitio ac faventi numine tantorum casus virorum sub tui exempli praesidio ac tutela delitescere patiaris." One may compare Vergil's anticipation in Octavian's lifetime of the divine powers he will possess on deification and his invitation to him even now to be addressed by vows (*G.* 1. 42): "et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari." The poet similarly alludes to the deification of a Julius (whether Caesar or Augustus is uncertain) who will likewise be called on in prayer (*Aen.* 1. 290): " . . . vocabitur hic quoque votis." Prima facie such passages seem to reflect a genuine belief that the deified dead could render supernatural assistance.

For the notion that Divus Augustus in particular was open to prayer we have in the first place the verses of Ovid mentioned above.[8] A similar conviction may lie behind the mysteries of Divus Augustus attested under Hadrian at Pergamum,[9] where he was perhaps expected to hear the prayers of the μύσται and to give aid, in much the same way as Antinous, who was also worshiped in a mystery cult and is said to have heard prayers and to have helped the sick by sending dreams.[10] There is, however, no actual mention of prayers at Pergamum, and the precise nature of these mysteries is disputed; more particularly, they have been thought to consist simply of hymns, eulogies, and the showing of sacred representations (imperial images) in a closed club, with no guarantee of blessings in this world or the next.[11] The most unequivocal testimony to the divine efficacy of Divus Augustus is Prudentius' outburst against pagan practice as he understood it under the later Roman Empire (*c. Symm.* 1. 245–48):

> Hunc morem veterum docili iam aetate secuta
> posteritas mense adque adytis et flamine et aris
> Augustum coluit, vitulo placavit et agno,
> strata ad pulvina iacuit, responsa poposcit.

8. For a clear case of poetic license, see in contrast Ovid's description of Germanicus as a god to be propitiated by prayer—lines that Ovid hopes will touch Germanicus' heart (*Pont.* 4. 8. 23–26).

9. H. W. Pleket, "An Aspect of the Emperor Cult: Imperial Mysteries," *HThR* 58 (1965): 346–47, with n. 65 and refs.

10. Nock, "Deification," p. 120 (= *Essays,* p. 842); J. Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire,* vol. 1 (Paris, 1955), pp. 242–58, with full discussion of the sources. Consistently with this evidence, Prudentius represents Antinous listening to prayers in temples: *c. Symm.* 1. 277: " . . . cumque suo in templis vota exaudire marito?" But see D. Fishwick, "Votive Offerings to the Emperor?" *ZPE* 80 (1990): 121–30, noting that there are no votives to deified emperors, except in company with "real" gods.

11. Pleket, "Aspects," p. 335, n. 15, noting the view of Pouilloux; cf. S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 191.

The supposed sacrifice of a calf and a lamb to Augustus must be a confusion on Prudentius' part,[12] but the term *placavit* certainly seems to put Divus Augustus on equal terms with a "real" god who needed to be appeased, as does the prostration of the worshiper in an attitude of supplication at the god's sacred *pulvinar*.[13] Above all, Prudentius uses the term *poposcit,* with its connotation of insistent, repetitive prayer that demanded replies.[14] Prudentius does not state that Divus Augustus actually heard and answered—that he was a "hearing" god, in other words[15]—but the popularity of his cult and the fervor of supplicants certainly point to a popular belief in his divine efficacy. How precisely he was supposed to respond is a matter for conjecture. We have no mention of oracles by a statue of Divus Augustus (or of any other *divus,* for that matter),[16] but the notion of a *divus* prophesying in dreams is attested by a passage in the life of Marcus Aurelius (*H. A. M. Ant.* 18. 3; cf. below), which itself gains credibility from the widespread belief in divine intervention through dreams and visions.[17] Whatever the medium may have been, there can be no question that Prudentius portrays the devotee praying to Augustus on exactly the same terms as to one of the Olympians. Despite the polemical tone, it would be unreasonable to dismiss this evidence as pure fabrication when what Prudentius reports of Antinous and his cult, a few lines later, is amply confirmed by other sources.

Other *divi* came in time to take their place beside Divus Augustus, as "good" emperors possessed of particularly effective deity. According to the *Historia Augusta,* Marcus Aurelius was, before his funeral, spontaneously acclaimed a propitious god by the senate and the people acting in concert, an unprecedented action that was never repeated (*M. Ant.* 18. 3; cf. 5–6): " . . . senatus populusque non divisis locis sed in una sede propitium deum dixit." The term *propitius* can be used of ordinary mortals generally and of the emperor in particular, but the fact that the same word is used of gods, particularly at the recognition of a new god, seems to imply a hope that the new *divus* will be merciful, that he will show divine favor.[18] Evidently the wish was granted, for we are told that there were men "qui somniis eum multa praedixisse augurantes futura et vera concinuerunt" (18. 7). Whatever the status of this particular *vita,*[19] here surely is unequivocal evidence for a popular belief that a *divus* who had been a good and beloved monarch was able to give divine help after death.[20] From two years or so after the death of

12. See D. Fishwick, "Prudentius and the Cult of Divus Augustus," *Historia* 39 (1990), suggesting that Prudentius repeats a common misconception, conceivably based itself on a Divus Augustus Pater issue, the reverse of which shows the Temple of Vesta flanked by a bull and a ram; cf. id., "A Temple of Vesta on the Palatine?" *Festschrift Tadeusz Kotula,* forthcoming.

13. Full discussion in Fishwick, "Prudentius."

14. *OLD,* s.v. 1 and 2; cf. Versnel, "Religious Mentality," p. 64, on wearing the gods out with prayer.

15. On ἐπήκοος, see Versnel, "Religious Mentality," pp. 34–37, with bibliography at n. 134.

16. For the association of imperial statues with signs and wonders, see Price, *Rituals and Power,* pp. 195–98.

17. On the formula *ex visu* or *visu monitus* in inscriptions, see A. D. Nock, "Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire," *JHS* 45 (1925): 95–96 (= *Essays,* pp. 45–46).

18. See S. Weinstock, "*Propitius,*" *RE* 23. 1 (1957): 822–26; *OLD,* s.v. *propitius* (a); cf. Livy 1. 16. 3, Val. Max. 1. 6. 13 (quoted above).

19. On the authorship of the *Historia Augusta,* see most recently T. Honoré, "Scriptor Historiae Augustae," *JRS* 77 (1987): 156–76.

20. J. Bayet, *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine* (Paris, 1957), pp. 190–91. For the suggestion that the conferral of extraordinary honors on the Elder Faustina may show that Antoninus

Julian—who in the eyes of his admirers already stood close to the gods during his lifetime—we have a passage from the *Epitaphios* of Libanius stating that blessings had been asked of him and prayers answered:[21] "To such an extent has he literally ascended to the gods and received a share of their power from them themselves" (*Or.* 18. 304). Similarly, in an oration addressed by the Antiochenes to Julian in 363 there is a promise that the time will come when "men will offer sacrifice and prayer to you as they do to Heracles" (*Or.* 15. 36);[22] and the peroration of a speech of 379 states that the deceased Julian "will support all this and will render its accomplishment easy, unseen by the eyes of the soldiers but recognized by his deeds" (*Or.* 24. 40). Nock saw this devotion to Julian as a pagan reply to the Christian concept of a saint who can give efficacious aid by interceding with God. The above outline suggests instead that the divine efficacy of a *divus* was an idea already rooted in pagan mentality long before Christianity had become a force to reckon with.[23] Hence, perhaps, the speed with which Constantine was paid cult as a saint so soon after his death.[24]

The overall picture that can be pieced together from the passages marshaled above emerges with reasonable clarity. While there is no reason to think that prayers were ever addressed to the living emperor as one who might answer in a supernatural way,[25] the deceased and deified emperor—particularly a good ruler such as Augustus, Marcus Aurelius, or Julian—was clearly in a different category. Divus Augustus in particular stands out as a consecrated emperor possessed of particularly effective deity, a belief attested in one source after another. The lines of Ovid with which we began have their place at the origins of this belief, with which they dovetail nicely. Strictly speaking, what Ovid says of Divus Augustus is unsupported by further evidence of the period; but it is surely significant that other contemporary writers, notably Livy, Vergil, and Valerius Maximus, make broadly similar statements in regard to Romulus, Caesar, and Octavian. More particularly, Suetonius reports an omen shortly before the death of Augustus (*Aug.* 97) that is particularly relevant in the context of his imminent deification, since it seems to reflect the conviction that he will shortly become a god in a very real sense of the term. In the light of all this, Ovid's references to the efficacious aid of the deceased Augustus must surely be put down to something more than poetic license or deliberately inflated language inspired by Hellenistic models. Did he then believe, in common with other Romans of his age, that Divus Augustus could hear his prayer? Possibly so, though we cannot be sure of his personal convictions—and it is worth noting that his attitude to the traditional gods seems

---

Pius thought his wife continued to exist after death, see H. Mattingly, "The Consecration of Faustina the Elder and Her Daughter," *HThR* 41 (1948): 147–51; the same point may apply to the attitude of Marcus Aurelius toward the younger Faustina. Whether these revered *divae* were also thought powerful to aid is not in evidence.

21. Nock, "Deification," pp. 115, 121–23 (= *Essays,* pp. 833, 844–46). For background to Libanius' statement that many cities had set Julian's image beside the images of the gods, see D. Fishwick, "Pliny and the Christians: The Rites *ad imaginem principis,*" *AJAH* 9 (1984): 125–26, with n. 28.

22. Cf. Vergil's remark regarding Octavian, *G.* 1. 42, quoted above.

23. Contra, G. W. Bowersock, "The Imperial Cult: Perceptions and Persistence," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, III,* ed. B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia, 1983), pp. 181–82. He explained the Libanius passage in terms of Christian management of the imperial cult.

24. Bowersock, ibid.; Price, "Gods and Emperors," p. 92, with n. 108.

25. Fishwick, "Prayer and the Living Emperor."

to have verged on the agnostic at times.[26] The alternative interpretation—whatever Ovid himself believed—would be to view these passages as essentially a rhetorical exercise aimed at a public, elements of which were themselves convinced of the efficacy of Divus Augustus. If that is the case, then the poet's reference to the deceased emperor can be seen as a strategy by which Ovid played upon a popular belief, current in Rome,[27] in the hope that it would help to save him from miserable exile.

DUNCAN FISHWICK
University of Alberta

26. Cf. *Ars am.* 1. 637–38 "expedit esse deos et, ut expedit, esse putemus; / dentur in antiquos tura merumque focos."

27. The outlook that seems to lie behind the passages cited above differs radically from the rationalist view of deification as simply a posthumous reward for meritorious services rendered during life; cf. Nock, "Deification," p. 121, with n. 47 (= *Essays,* p. 844, with n. 47), citing Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21. 9 "qui consecrantur non ad fidem numinis sed ad honorem emeritae potestatis." But clearly in the vast Roman Empire one should expect differing perceptions of the emperor's deification and what it implied. Not everyone was a rationalist theologian.

A BIBULOUS COUCH ([VERG.] *COPA* 5–6)?

quid iuvat aestivo defessum pulvere abesse
quam potius bibulo decubuisse toro?

5 abesse] abisse *Ilgen:* 6 bibulo] vivo *Schenkl*

So the poet—or the poet in the guise of the innkeeper (*caupo*), or the *copa* herself, or possibly even the animated *taberna*—begins an enumeration of the tavern's attractions.[1] It is not just the punctuation of this couplet that "requires more consideration than it has commonly received."[2] The greater problem lies in the words *bibulo . . . toro;* as Goodyear asked: "What is this *bibulus torus* on which the wayfarer is invited to recline?" He reviews the current options. The couch might be splashed with wine;[3] or we might understand a grass couch al fresco,

I wish to thank my colleague, R. J. Tarrant, whose forthcoming article ("Nights at the *Copa:* Observations on Language and Date," *HSCP* 94 [1991]) led me to examine the problems of this couplet.

1. For the arguments for and against these various possibilities, see F. R. D. Goodyear, "The *Copa:* A Text and Commentary," *BICS* 24 (1977): 118–19. I incline to Wilamowitz' view, although the issue is not as straightforward or easy as he implies: "Nicht die leiseste Andeutung führt davon ab, dass der Dichter redet" (*Hellenistische Dichtung,* vol. 2 [Berlin, 1924], p. 311). The claim of Goodyear and others that the poet cannot, *propria persona,* address a passing traveler (none is actually named, and so the issue is kept rather vague) is perhaps excessively rationalistic. This issue, like that of the punctuation of the couplet (see below, n. 2), does not affect the central contribution of the present note.

2. Goodyear, "The *Copa,*" p. 122. I have opted to follow Kenney's punctuation (in the OCT), taking *quam potius* as *potius quam,* with full regard for the scarcity of parallels. The alternative, in which *quam* = *quanto* and line 6 becomes an exclamation in response to the question posed in line 5, seems to me to mar the parallelism of the couplet.

3. Supported by Ov. *Ars am.* 1. 233 "vinaque cum bibulas sparsere Cupidinis alas"—a "remote analogy" (Goodyear, ibid.).