

is made to illustrate a poet's attempt by means of his *carmina* to protest at the brutal way in which his overlords are manipulating common folk like himself: the proverb is applied to a poet's protest. Secondly, by specifying that the doves are Chaonian and thereby referring to the dove-priestesses of Dione at Dodona, the *πέλειαι*, Virgil is turning the doves of the proverb into *uates*, prophet-poets, who have their own *carmina* to sing.⁷ This adaptation of the proverb is unparalleled in Latin literature and was suggested to Virgil, I submit, by Hesiod's use of poetry to modify the unjust behaviour of his *βασιλῆες* towards their common subjects and by Hesiod's *ἀηδών*, who is so emphatically called an *αἰοιδός*.⁸ Virgil is indebted to Hesiod in *E.* 4, where the myth of the five ages is a major influence,⁹ and at *E.* 6.64–73, where explicit reference is made to Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Theog.* 22–35); so a creative reminiscence of the farmer-poet's sermon to the *βασιλῆες* in a poem, like *E.* 9, protesting on behalf of country folk is quite in line with Virgilian practice.

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

G. ZANKER

⁷ So e.g. M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues* (Princeton, 1970), 303–6, 312 and 318, and R. G. G. Coleman, *Virgil: Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977) on 13.

⁸ Fables and proverbs were of course comparable in that they were both used as vehicles of folk-wisdom; Virgil may have preferred a proverb because the brevity of the genus was more appropriate in the dramatic dialogue of *E.* 9.

⁹ See Coleman on *E.* 4.6, 15 f., 18, 30, 32, 36, 53.

ROMULUS TROPAEOPHORUS (*AENEID* 6.779–80)

...viden, ut geminae stant vertice cristae
et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?

A general consensus has emerged among twentieth-century commentators on the *Aeneid* that *pater ipse...superum* must be taken together and understood as referring to the father of the gods and not to Mars, sire of Romulus. What remains a subject of debate is the meaning of *honor* here and its particular association with Jupiter. Does it betoken the abstraction itself or a concrete manifestation of it? Austin, following Donatus, opts for the former alternative ('probably no more than "majesty"'),¹ Norden and R. D. Williams for the latter. Of these the first finds a reference to the Zeus-given sceptre of kings,² the second to Jove's thunderbolt.³

The language of the passage argues in favour of metonymy for two reasons. First, we expect Anchises, when showing off Romulus, to adhere to the pattern he has already set in the two portions of his parade which have preceded. In the case of the initial hero, Silvius, we attend largely to genealogical background (760–6). The second segment, a group made up of Procas, Capys, Numitor and Aeneas Silvius, elicits from Aeneas' father a series of exclamations on the valour of their *res gestae* (767–77). Yet

¹ *P. Vergili Maronis: Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, ed. R. G. Austin (Oxford, 1977), on line 780. His comments are in the tradition of La Cerda and Heyne-Wagner, who see the line as proof of Romulus' apotheosis.

² E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart, 1957), on lines 779 f., citing Homer *Il.* 9.98, Pindar *P.* 1.6 and the imitation at *Ciris* 269 (*quem* [Nisus] *pater ipse deum sceptri donavit honore...*). He offers Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 3.61 and Lydus *de Mag.* 1.7 as evidence for Romulus as sceptre-bearer, but Dionysius associates the Roman adoption of regalia (including the sceptre) from the Etruscans with Tarquinius Priscus and only connects Rome's use of the twelve axes explicitly with Romulus.

³ *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1–6*, ed. R. D. Williams (London, 1972), on 779–80.

each also has a tangible symbol of martial *virtus* that distinguishes him. In the case of Silvius, whom Anchises introduces with the verb *vides*, it is the *hasta pura*. The members of the subsequent cluster of four are characterised as wearing 'civil oak' on their brows; the *corona civica* that Augustus could also boast was nailed above his house-door (*R.G.* 34.2). We anticipate nothing less for Romulus, with lines devoted to his birth (777–9) and then to some distinctive, palpable emblem of bravery.

Secondly, though *signat* can denote the bestowal of either an abstract or a concrete 'sign', the initial *viden* strongly implies that Aeneas must rely on the evidence of sight to divine the accoutrements that distinguish Romulus in the crowd of heroes his father parades before him. We expect also that *honor*, in the second phrase, will complement the earlier *cristae* and offer further documentation for honour given to Romulus for his courage and for its close association with (*suo*), and dispensation by, the ruler of the gods.

But there are problems with the proposals of Norden and Williams. The iconography of Romulus divides into three essential types, categorising him as toga-clad statesman, warrior, and young shepherd.⁴ The sceptre would be an appropriate adjunct to the first class, but there is no evidence, artistic or literary, until Lydus, writing in the sixth century, that connects Romulus with this emblem of regality. Moreover, he could take to himself the lightning-bolt as a symbol of power presumably under the heading of either king or hero, but once again explicit evidence is lacking for any such association.

Cristae, however, proves that Anchises is describing, and his son viewing, Romulus as warrior. What, then, of *suo honore* in this connection? The one deed of valour for which Romulus gained fame was the killing of Acron, king of the Caeninenses, as a result of which he was the first to be awarded the *spolia opima*. This is the only exploit singled out on the *elogium* which was inscribed on a plaque attached to the base of Romulus' statue, placed in the central niche of the exedra built against the southern wall of the forum of Augustus. It reads as follows:⁵

Romulus Martis | filius urbem Romam | condidit et regnavit annos | duodequadraginta
isque | primus dux duce hostium | Acrone rege Caeninensium | interfecto spolia opima | Iovi
Feretrio consecravit | receptusque in deorum | numerum Quirinus | appellatus est.

Visual representation of the focal deed of heroism is to be found in a painting excavated in 1913 in the via dell'Abbondanza, Pompeii, which in turn serves as a plausible guide to the Augustan statue of which it is a direct or indirect imitation. It shows Romulus in armour, carrying the *spolia* over his left shoulder with a spear in his right hand.⁶ This pictorial evidence is confirmed by Ovid, who imagines Mars first surveying his temple, which was the forum's chief ornament, then gazing at the statue of Aeneas as embodiment of *pietas*, in the central niche of the northern exedra, and at the counterbalancing figure of Romulus with its accompanying *elogium*:⁷

hinc videt Iliaden umeris ducis arma ferentem,
claraque dispositis acta subesse viris.

⁴ A. Rosenberg summarises the evidence (*RE* 2.1.1103–4, s.v. Romulus).

⁵ *CIL* 1.12 (p. 189); A. Degraffi, ed., *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII* (Rome, 1937); *Fasti et Elogia*, fasc. 3 (*Elogia*), no. 86 (p. 70).

⁶ The picture is illustrated and discussed in *CAH*, volume of plates iv (Cambridge, 1934), 176 f. (fig. a); V. Spinazzola, *Pompei alla luce degli scavi nuovi di via dell'Abbondanza (anni 1910–1923)* (Rome, 1953), 151 ff. and 922 ff. (notes 132 and 137), on images of Romulus; R. Steiger, 'Gemmen und Kameen in Römermuseum Augst', *Antike Kunst* 9 (1966), 29 ff., especially 35 and notes 58–61; P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum* (Tübingen, n.d. [1968?]), 17 and 32 (notes 81–2), and fig. 41. K. Scheffold, *Die Wände Pompejis* (Berlin, 1957), 194, 196, 280 and 289, lists other possible appearances of Romulus *tropaeophorus* in Pompeii.

⁷ *F.* 5.565 f. Ovid echoes *Aen.* 6.780 at line 551, where the phrase *ad suos honores* refers to the honours due to Mars, just as the *spolia opima* are due to Jupiter.

A century later Plutarch speaks as if statues of Romulus *tropaeophorus* were abundant in Rome (τοῦ δὲ Ῥωμύλου τὰς εἰκόνας ὄραν ἔστιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὰς τροπαιοφόρους περὶ αὐτοῦ),⁸ and we have frequent depictions of the figure on the coinage of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Commodus.⁹

It is of this exploit and of its resulting icon that, I suggest, Virgil was thinking, in anticipation of the programme of the Forum Augustum. The description of Romulus now shares the emphasis Anchises places throughout his speech on feats of arms and their resultant honours, the most appropriate of which for Romulus would be the *spolia opima*. But what makes the visualisation of Romulus as trophy-bearer particularly apt for the context of *Aeneid* 6 is the relationship, which the *elogium* also details, of the *spolia opima* with Jupiter Feretrius, to whom they were dedicated and in whose temple on the Capitolium they were traditionally deposited.¹⁰

Suo honore, therefore, works in several ways at once. It refers to a reward due to Jupiter, when the head of the gods receives as offering the spoils of a slain enemy chieftain. But, through the god's benison, the 'honour', in turn, reverts to Romulus, the first of only three Romans to achieve such a distinction, and becomes the principal *signum* of his *virtus*. Finally, by having Romulus recognised by the head of the gods, through an award that seems specifically Jupiter's to bestow, Virgil implies the still closer association between the two that results from Romulus' divinisation. This connection in turn serves to compliment Augustus.

Because of Romulus' auspicious start, Rome, in Anchises' words, 'will make her spirit equal to Olympus' (*animos aequabit Olympo*, 782), which is to say high as heaven but immortal as well. It is the happy fate of Augustus, description of whose achievements follows forthwith in Anchises' speech, to complete what Romulus had so brilliantly begun and to renew Rome's golden age. Though he chose to refuse the name itself, Augustus is in fact the new Romulus. The resulting implicit divinisation Virgil had already announced years before, at *Georgic* 3.27, when he labels Octavian *victor Quirinus*, a new Romulus deified for his victorious acts of war.

In the remainder of *Aeneid* 6 the two other recipients of the *spolia opima* are not

⁸ *Rom.* 16.8 (and 16.6, for Romulus himself and the trophy).

⁹ See, e.g., H. Cohen, *Médailles impériales* ii² (Paris, 1882), for Hadrian (nos. 1315–20) and Antoninus Pius (nos. 704–6), and iii² (Paris, 1883), for Commodus (no. 662); H. Mattingly and E. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage* ii (London, 1926), for Hadrian (nos. 266, 370, 376, 653, 776), and iii (London, 1930), for Antoninus Pius (nos. 624, 665) and Commodus (no. 204). In all cases the figure of Romulus, with the legend *Romulo Conditori* or *Romulo Augusto*, is on the reverse of coins with the emperors' portraits on the obverse. At least in the second century A.D. Romulus, as founder of Rome and august taker of her initiating auspices, is depicted as *tropaeophorus*. This symbolism lends further point to Virgil's careful juxtaposition of Romulus and Augustus as *Aeneid* 6 continues.

The relationship of Romulus to Augustan propaganda has been treated in detail by J. Gagé, 'Romulus–Augustus', *Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist.* 47 (1930), 138 ff. (140–5 on Romulus *tropaeophorus*) and A. Alföldi, 'Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik: Kleine Beiträge zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte: 2. Der neue Romulus', *MH* 8 (1951), 190 ff., especially 193 f. and n. 9. For the Republican background see C. Classen, 'Romulus in der römischen Republik', *Philologus* 106 (1962), 174 ff., especially 181 and 195.

¹⁰ R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965), 70 ff. (on Livy 1.10), discusses in detail, with full bibliography, the meaning of Feretrius, the cult of Jupiter Feretrius, and its connection with the *spolia opima*. For citations on the original dedication of the temple by Romulus and its restoration by Augustus see S. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London, 1929), 293 (s.v. Iuppiter Feretrius). Propertius 4.10 is witness that the subject of Romulus and the *spolia opima* was in the air in the decade after Virgil's death. At line 17 the elegist styles Romulus *urbis virtutisque parens*. That Augustus is to be seen as the renewer of both the city and her *virtus* Virgil makes clear in the lines that follow in *Aeneid* 6.

forgotten. Cossus is apostrophised at line 841,¹¹ and at 859 we learn of the future Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who, in Anchises' vaticination,

tertia... arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.

In the third and last disposition of the *spolia opima* the deified Romulus will be their recipient. This is now his due, and the spoils his emblem, because of the initial gesture of the father of the gods, in whose temple they would in any case have been placed.¹²

Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

¹¹ On Cossus, the *spolia opima* and Livy's famous digression on Augustus' interest in their award, see Ogilvie, op. cit. 563 f. (on 4.20.5–11).

¹² It is possible that there is a connection between the programme of statuary in the Forum Augustum and the procession of heroes in *Aeneid* 6. Though the forum was only dedicated in 2 B.C., T. Frank argues ('Augustus, Vergil and the Augustan elogia', *AJP* 59 [1938], 91 ff.) that the intellectual 'plan' of the forum was conceived by Augustus as early as 27, and his reasoning is strongly supported by H. Rowell ('Vergil and the forum of Augustus', *AJP* 62 [1941], 261 ff.). Degraffi ('Virgilio e il foro di Augusto', *Epigraphica* 7 [1945], 88 ff.) counters this view by observing that construction of the forum could not in all likelihood have begun before 12 B.C. at the earliest. But, other practical considerations aside (the emperor's impatience, for instance, at the delay in building, *Macr. Sat.* 2.4.9), there is still no reason why Augustus and his artists, poets included, should not have had the contents of the forum under consideration for many years before the actual work on it began.

ASINIUS POLLIO AND HEROD'S SONS¹

In a recent note, D. Braund² has challenged my identification³ of the Pollio (Josephus, *Antiquities* 15.343) at whose home in Rome Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus stayed in 22 B.C. as Gaius Asinius Pollio, the famous consul of 40 B.C., who was a close friend of Julius Caesar and to whom Virgil dedicated his Fourth Eclogue. Braund's argument rests upon five grounds. (1) If this Pollio were a man of the stature of Asinius Pollio, we would expect Josephus to make his identity clear and not to describe him solely as one of Herod's most devoted friends (*ἀνδρὸς τῶν μάλιστα σπουδασάντων περὶ τὴν Ἡρώδου φιλίαν*). (2) Josephus' reference to Pollio here is different from the definite references to Asinius Pollio elsewhere in Josephus, where he is referred to as Asinius (*Ant.* 14.138) or Gaius Asinius Pollio (*Ant.* 14.389). (3) In the latter passage his name is spelled *Πωλίωνος*, whereas the name of the host of Herod's sons is spelled *Πολλίωνος*. (4) When Herod sent two other sons to Rome, they stayed 'with a certain Jew' (*Ant.* 17.20), and hence it seems likely that the two other sons likewise stayed with a Jew. (5) Asinius' role in the elevation by the Roman Senate of Herod to the kingship of Judaea was no greater than that of any other magistrate.

In reply we may note the following.

(1) If Josephus were introducing a new character we would normally expect him to identify that person (e.g. *Ant.* 13.375 [Obedas], 15.405 [Vitellius], 17.149 [Judas the son of Sariphaeus], 19.235 [Veranius], 20.132 [Celer], etc.) or to refer to him as *τις* (thus, for example, in the section which follows immediately after the one in question

¹ I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr Daniel R. Schwartz of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, for several helpful suggestions in connection with this note.

² 'Four Notes on the Herods', *CQ* 33 (1983), 239–42.

³ 'Asinius Pollio and His Jewish Interests', *TAPA* 84 (1953), 73–80.