

The Enigmatic *Vergili* at Hor. *Carm.* 4.12.13 and a Roman Monument

An article to thank the Society for the election as Honorary Vice-President

Ode 4.12

(1) *Iam veris comites, quae mare temperant,
impellunt animae lintea Thraciae,
iam nec prata rigent nec fluvii strepunt
hiberna nive turgidi.*

(2) *Nidum ponit, Ityn flebiliter gemens, 5
infelix avis et Cecropiae domus
aeternum opprobrium, quod male barbaras
regum est ultra libidines.*

(3) *Dicunt in tenero gramine pinguium
custodes ovium carmina fistula 10
delectantque deum, cui pecus et nigri
colles Arcadiae placent.*

(4) *Adduxere sitim tempora, Vergili,
sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum
si gestis, iuvenum nobilium cliens, 15
nardo vina merebere;*

* I thank Federico Aurora for a useful epigraphic parallel to *apparet* (CIL 1² 1203 and 1204) and, respectively, Rachel McCombie and Jonathan Rome for allowing me to make use of their rare photographs of the less accessible western side of the monument of Eurysaces. Above all I thank the conscientious editor for all suggestions, improvements and corrections.

(5) *nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum,
qui nunc Sulpiciis accubat horreis,
spes donare novas largus amaraque
curarum eluere efficax.* 20

(6) *Ad quae si properas gaudia, cum tua
velox merce veni; non ego te meis
immunem meditor tingere poculis,
plena dives ut in domo.*

(7) *Verum¹ pone moras et studium lucri, 25
nigrorumque memor, dum licet, ignium
miscere stultitiam consiliis brevem:
dulce est desipere in loco.*

(“**(1)** Already the companions of spring, the Thracian breezes that calm the sea, drive the sails on, the meadows are stiff no longer, nor do the rivers roar swollen from winter snow. **(2)** With weeping laments for Itys, the bird builds her nest, the ill-starred and an everlasting disgrace on Cecrops’ house, by having avenged so cruelly the barbarous lust of kings. **(3)** Shepherds, while tending fat sheep on soft grass, recite songs to the pipe, delighting the god who finds pleasure in the flocks and dark hills of Arcadia. **(4)** The season has brought thirst, **Vergilius**, but if you wish to drink the juice of Liber, squeezed at Cales, o client of young nobles, you will only earn your wine by means of nard. **(5)** A small flacon of nard will lure out a jar just now reposing in the Sulpician storage rooms, a jar generous in giving fresh hopes and effective at washing away a bitter layer of cares. **(6)** If you are eager for these delights, come hastily with your commodity. For I have no intention to moisten you from my own goblets free of charge, as if I were a rich man in a well-stocked house. **(7)** However, put aside delay and the pursuit of profit and, mindful of the black flames, blend while you may a brief folly with your counsels: it’s a sweet thing to be silly on occasion”).²

The Problem

Strange, if not inscrutable assertions about the friend of Horace, addressed as *Vergili* at line 13, seem to be in vogue.³ One recent and fairly representative example may suffice:

¹ Shackleton Bailey (2001) and Fedeli in Fedeli & Ciccarelli (2008) have adopted Campbell’s conjecture *rerum*, perhaps justly (on this issue see more below).

² The author’s translation.

³ References to pro and con positions are found in Thomas (2001) 55-58 and Thomas (2011) 226-227.

“In *Carm.* 4.12, Vergil is to be guest of honor at the symposium, and his attendance is of the utmost importance. Without Vergil and the gift he will bring (*tua merx*, 4.12.21-2) there will be no party. That he has passed away will provide no barrier; if Vergil himself cannot be present, at least his poetry can. It is the *merx*⁴ that will pay for the cups of wine Horace will provide. By addressing the poem to Vergil, Horace has resurrected him, and by making his poetry the necessary contribution for the symposium to take place, he recalls 4.10 and invites his readers to reflect again on Vergil”.⁵

Making the poet Virgil (dead or alive) the pivotal figure of a private symposium is a fairly risky and challenging business. If the poem is read in this way, a kind of meta-meaning easily becomes its quintessence. Still, while I myself,⁶ and perhaps the majority of modern scholars in the field, have been opposed to the idea that the poet Virgil is the addressee, this is not to say that the arguments for the other position have generally been altogether lacking in substance and credibility. A principal argument is, of course, that, since the poet Virgil is mentioned indisputably 9 times in Horace’s oeuvre,⁷ the burden of proof lies rather heavily with those who are disallowing the tenth instance. But what of the main objection,⁸ the putative date of the poem’s composition and publication, after Virgil’s death?⁹ To reconcile the genesis of the collection with the invitation of the famous poet colleague to a wine party is so difficult to accept that Richard Thomas and others have certainly chosen a safer ground by assuming that Horace has included a poem written *before* Virgil’s death in his collection.¹⁰ But even this position does not escape the objection: How could the younger poet escape a verdict from most contemporary readers that he had shown bad taste and irreverence by addressing the master of the recently published *Aeneid* in such a way? In view of the standing both Virgil and Horace must have had with Augustus and his regime, the attitude shown by Horace may seem on this assumption to

⁴ I am at a loss as to how *merx* should be taken as “Virgil’s poetry”, when it is, according to the poet’s own words, “a small bottle of spikenard”. The reference to 4.10 is of no relevance.

⁵ Zarecki (2010) 250. See further e.g. Putnam (1996) 145-56.

⁶ Cf. Kraggerud (2012) 599.

⁷ See Shackleton Bailey (2001), *index nominum*, 371.

⁸ Phrased with sharpness and authority in a footnote by Fraenkel (1957, 418 n.1, quoted also by Thomas, 2001, 56 and Thomas 2011, 226).

⁹ The common opinion is that the fourth book of Odes was written in the years following the *Carmen Saeculare* and published in 13 BC. Cf. the collection’s opening sort of “sphragis”, *circa lustra decem* (C. 4.1.6). It is in the nature of things that some poems in the collection are without any indication of date. For a recent discussion see Fedeli in Fedeli & Ciccarelli (2008) 13-16.

¹⁰ For Thomas, see n.3 above. Niall Rudd (2004, 252 n. 33) is a recent spokesman for a similar view: “The ode seems to be an imaginary invitation, set nostalgically in the period when Horace first knew him”. The problem is that there is no indication in the poem (or for that matter in the collection as a whole), why its chronological setting should differ so radically from the rest of the book.

verge on the frivolous. The poem's setting would also be hard to reconcile with what we know about the respective abodes of both poets: Virgil presented himself as a citizen of Naples at the end of the *Georgics* in 30/29 BC (4.563-64) and so he remained apart from short visits to Rome and abroad, Horace was seldom more than two days' journey away from Rome (the Digentia valley, Tibur). So it is hard to believe that the poem could have been written between the publication of *Odes* 1-3 (probably 23 BC) and Virgil's death. The situation depicted in the poem seems rather to be one involving old friends living in the same city on a permanent basis and within walking distance from each other. Yet so far the alternative to this, namely to posit another Vergilius,¹¹ has had little appeal to readers.

The Other Vergilius

Let us then set out on another course, and start from what the poem is actually offering us in the way of identifying clues. For Horace seems deliberately to have put such clues into his poem to prevent future ages from being bewildered by the name Vergilius and from drawing false conclusions. If his friend had been an otherwise anonymous *mercator* or *ungentarius*, there would in all likelihood have been no solution to our enigma and no end to the discussions it has given rise to. But Horace is certainly a circumspect poet. For a start, he knew that contemporary readers of the fourth book of *Carmina*, be it in 13 BC or somewhat later, would (1) certainly be attentive and think of Vergilius Maro when meeting the vocative *Vergili* at line 13 – and, what is more important, ask themselves (2) whether there was another man with the same *nomen gentile* who was well enough known to merit the attention caused by such a conspicuous name. To use the name Vergilius instead of for example an unknown Ligurinus (as in *C.* 4.1 and 4.10) was obviously as deliberate a choice as putting any nobleman's name into the collection. Horace must therefore have reckoned it probable that his compatriots would be in a position to identify the other Vergilius, not least those who were his primary audience: the circle around Augustus, men of letters, those who had listened to his *Carmen Saeculare*, in short all he believed would know the identity of *Vergili* as well as that of *Censorine* (*C.* 4.8.2). My theory, then, is that Horace included the man calling himself *Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces* as one of his identifiable individuals in the fourth book of *Odes*. But as this person has so far not been considered as a candidate by commentators, he will need some introduction.

¹¹ Shackleton Bailey (2001) 371 rejecting the comments of the scholiasts says: "alius amicus Horati, ut vid".

The Monument of Eurysaces

All we know about Vergilius Eurysaces is connected with his tomb just outside the Porta Maggiore in Rome, the *Sepulchrum Eurysacis*, as it is called by modern handbooks.¹² I prefer to use the term monument (*monimentum*) in accordance with the owner's own designation: it is clearly both a memorial and a tomb. This is an extraordinary construction, and no less so is its history. It was brought to light in 1838, after having been encapsulated for more than fourteen centuries in the fortifications outside the most easterly entrance to the city through the Aurelian Walls.

Built during the early years of Augustus' reign,¹³ the monument was spared by the emperor Claudius around 50 AD, when he led two aqueducts across the fork of the Via Labicana and the Via Praenestina. These aqueducts were supported by arches constituting the Porta Maggiore, which had an impressive attica celebrating the emperor and his care for the water supply of Rome. In the 270s the arches were integrated into Aurelian's walls. Early in the fifth century, under Stilicho, the baker's tomb was incorporated into a fortification tower at this entrance and its inscription was hidden from view.

The form of the monument is called trapezoid, its shape being perhaps best characterized as a deliberately non-rectangular quadrilateral: there are neither right angles nor sides of equal length.¹⁴ Eurysaces' builder or architect had been constrained in his enterprise by the roads on either side and the restricted space available for the construction. The longer northern side of the monument is parallel to the ancient Via Praenestina, the southern side to the Via Labicana. The now totally demolished eastern side was in all probability decorated above the entrance with a marble portrait relief of Eurysaces and his wife Atistia after their deaths.¹⁵ The main part of the monument, built in travertine, consists of a lower tier with solid supportive elements, conspicuous among them being the cylindrical column forms standing between more or less broad partition props. Above is a fascia reminiscent of an architrave. The next tier is even more extraordinary than the first, because of its three rows of horizontal drums adorning the wall, each side of the monument having a different number of drums in accordance with the varying length of the sides. The corners of this tier had nice regular pilasters ending in capitals. An illustrative frieze

¹² Platner & Ashby (1929); Richardson, Jr (1992); Steinby (1993-2000).

¹³ See below, 'The Dating of the Monument'.

¹⁴ Coarelli (2007) 204.

¹⁵ The relief of Eurysaces and Atistia was found in the ruins in 1838. A photograph of it in its pre-1934 state of preservation can be seen in the documentation of the monument by Nash (1968) II, 329-32. An inscription belonging to Atistia's so-called *panarium*, i.e. her cinerary urn in the form of a bread bin, was also found (*CIL* I² 1206).

encircling the upper part on the three preserved sides is obviously meant to be the main attraction for the passer-by. A geison gives a further impression of a construction inspired by grand temples.

Much attention has, as a matter of course, been given to the monument's most striking and distinctive feature, the drums – framed orifices, thirty of which are extant. This decorative element is explained well enough, it seems, for both the ancient and the modern viewer, by a closer look at the frieze, which exhibits their full context and function: the drums are representations of a key element in the baking process, circular tanks for preparing dough. Their sheer number alludes to a big bakery producing bread on an industrial scale.¹⁶ The cylinders below in the first tier are more disputed. I find the interpretation offered recently by Diana Kleiner appealing: they are meant to point at or represent silos for grain.¹⁷ But it is the inscription, as taken together with a reading of the frieze, that has been the most relevant part of the monument in my quest for the correct identification of the *Vergili* in Horace's ode.

The Inscription(s)

Accordingly we start, as the ancient viewer would have done, with the inscribed message on the architrave-like fascia. The inscription – I prefer to refer to it in the singular – presents itself in the middle of the monument between the lower tier and the drums, and is the key element of the whole. It is identical on two sides (the western and northern), and has an abbreviated form on the third (southern) side, which perhaps ended on the destroyed eastern side.¹⁸ The western side, however, has a layout which in my view should be seen as the “original” and the first one which was put in place. On this side the inscription is divided into two lines, as follows:¹⁹

EST·HOC·MONIMENTUM·MARGEI·VERGILEI·EVRY·SACIS
PISTORIS·REDEMP·TORIS·APPARET

¹⁶ This interpretation is borne out by the westernmost part of the northern frieze showing the same cylindrical trough in its normal upright position in the bakery. The preparing of the dough was the start of baking proper after the flour had been inspected. It is clear for the modern viewer that the upper tier is built in the “lego” fashion from prefabricated identical travertine blocks with drums in the middle.

¹⁷ This view is most recently advocated in her online course on Roman funerary art from Yale University (openyalecourses, HSAR 252, Lecture 10).

¹⁸ For all the versions see *CIL* I² 1203-05, the two line version being 1204.

¹⁹ An excellent printed reproduction can be seen in Ciancio Rossetto (1973) 35. On the northern side, the inscription is on a single line.

The inscription here is marred by a spelling mistake, corrected on the northern side (see Fig. 2): The stonecutter wrote a G for a C in the forename.²⁰ Otherwise the inscription is diligently and beautifully carved.²¹ Only, at the end of the first line, IS was written in somewhat smaller letters due to lack of space.

The first line informs us about the monument's ownership. The second is more essential for our purposes. *Pistor*, the usual word for a baker, should be taken in its etymological sense: this baker is also grinding (*pinsere*) his grain at the start of the baking process. The word *redemptor*, contractor, adds essential information: Eurysaces is no ordinary baker, he is a baker who holds a contract²² with the authorities of Rome. Before I expatiate on this designation, or rather title, the last word *apparet* is in sore need of comment. Theodor Mommsen, writing in his early years an otherwise magisterial article about the mixed group of *apparitores* in Roman public life,²³ was notably hesitant here. On the one hand he would not directly reject (*non improbo*) taking *apparet* as an abbreviation of *apparitoris*,²⁴ but on the other hand he was evidently in favour of seeing it as a verb in the present indicative, with Eurysaces as its subject. He added, quite rightly, that the present tense would reflect the fact that Eurysaces had made the monument during his own life-time, to serve both his wife Atistia and himself. Mommsen then spoke of Eurysaces' *tria officia*, namely as 1. *pistor*, 2. <operum publicorum> *redemptor* and 3. *praeco* (defining his role as a magistrate's

²⁰ Was he a Greek more familiar with the word ΜΑΓΙΣΤΟΣ than the Roman *praenomen*?

²¹ I do not follow O. Brandt (1993, 13-17, esp. 14-15) in his belief that the version written on the western side is copied after the "original" on the "southern side", "as that inscription is more beautiful than the rest". Leaving aside the article's obvious mistake in mixing up the southern and northern sides in the text under Fig. 1, I cannot see any significant difference in quality in the versions. I believe that the same *incisor* wrote the inscription on all extant sides with the same diligence. Taking the most difficult task first, the short western side, he probably followed the owner's instruction in dividing the inscription there as he did. Afterwards he became aware of (or was told about) his spelling mistake and made it all correct on the northern side. The southern inscription, which reads EST·HOC·MONIMENTUM·MARCI·VERGILI·EVRYSSAC(IS) (*CIL* I² 1205) was, according to Brandt's attractive idea, continued on the eastern side because of the easy angle for the viewer. This would strengthen my point that the three last words of the inscription were meant to have an emphasis of their own.

²² *redemptor*, added to *pistor*, should be taken as an adjective and not be printed after a dividing comma. Cf. the standard example *exercitus victor* = "a victorious army" (Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, § 92).

²³ Mommsen (1848). For our inscription, 22.

²⁴ It raised Mommsen's suspicion that an 'E' was written instead of an 'I'. The *apparitor* theory has been repeated also in recent times: A. Claridge translated the inscription in her archaeological guide (1998, 360) as: "This is the tomb of Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces, baker, contractor, he serves ... [possibly some minor public official]". In the 2010 edition, however, she has changed "he serves" to "it's obvious". Cf. also Coarelli (2007) 205: "attendant".

attendant or servant, *apparitor*), all of which gave him considerable wealth. But on the basis of monument's own evidence it is not easy to accept such combined activity or to see or say how Eurysaces would have functioned as an *apparitor*. For which magistrate? Or simply in the capacity of being a baker? But Eurysaces' "function" vis-à-vis the authorities is already defined well enough by taking *redemptoris* closely with *pistoris*. I cannot see the point of mentioning any functions in the inscription beyond that connected with his special occupation as a contract baker, which is clearly pointed out and illustrated by the monument as a whole. Therefore I share, with some modification, the view represented by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*,²⁵ that *apparet*²⁶ is impersonal.

At first glance, however, an abrupt and one word statement like *apparet*, "it is obvious", must seem strange. For one thing, the common expression is *ut apparet*.²⁷ But *apparet* alone in an absolute usage might arguably be taken as a more definitive form of expression. The one parallel mentioned by the *ThLL* is Plaut. *Cist.* 696: [Phanostrata:] *locum signat, ubi ea (sc. cistella) excidit: apparet*. The colloquial nature of this example is plain to see. The brevity is in tune with the speaker's observations on the spot and her immediate conclusions. But the same kind of brevity and syntax seems out of place on the monument. Consequently an interpretation of the syntax seems best guided by the western *in situ* version: we should make a pause at the end of the first line after EURYSACIS, preferably in print marking the line's pause with a semi colon or colon, and then read the whole lower line as a sentence in its own right. This creates a more even balance between the two verbs (*est* and *apparet*). The syntactic construction of the lower line is thus: *apparet + acc. c. inf.* (cf. *ThLL* 1.266, 77 - 267, 11) with an easy ellipsis, *pistoris redemptoris <esse hoc monimentum> apparet*,²⁸ which points to the man's profession, emphasizing the fact that he is a contract baker. For *apparet* is the monument's way of calling on passers-bys' attention.²⁹ Every Roman on the point of leaving the city or entering it, either by the Via Praenestina or the Via Labicana, would have seen the monument, and some of them at least would have looked at the frieze which the inscription is specifically referring to.

²⁵ The author of the lemma *appareo* is A. von Mess (1875-1916).

²⁶ *ThLL* 2.267, 48-61.

²⁷ E.g. Cic. *Flac.* 38; *Brut.* 95; *Fin.* 5. 21; later *sicut apparet* is also common.

²⁸ An analogous case can be found in *CIL* XI 494; the epitaph in question has *quod suis dedit appare(t)*, "what he gave to his own people is obvious".

²⁹ It is well known how often Greek and Latin inscriptions, especially epitaphs, address the passer-by with an appeal to make a stop before the monument and take an empathic interest in the deceased. A fair number of examples was collected by Richmond Lattimore in his valuable 1935 University of Illinois dissertation, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, later published in part as Lattimore (1962), where cf. esp. 230-34.

The Frieze

The sequence of illustrations depicting the baking process can, at least from Eurysaces' point of view, be seen as the most important part of the monument. But, however interesting in itself, it does not need to detain us for long here. I single out the top panel on Fig. 3, showing the sequence on the western side which represents the last phase in the production of bread: after the loaves of bread have come out of the ovens, they are carried to the weighing scales, emphasized by their central position, then they are put in baskets, and finally they are carried away by slaves into the city. Persons dressed in togas are supervising each stage. The artists who planned and carved this frieze were almost certainly following the ideas and instructions of Eurysaces himself. That is why the official supervision of the production is so prominent in his frieze. Eurysaces was keen to show the public that he was scrupulously and honestly fulfilling his obligations towards the authorities. A business like his was based on trust from those who paid for the bread, as to both the quality of the production and the accountability of the owner.

The Dating of the Monument

Experts are far from agreed on when Eurysaces had his monument built. The dating ranges from the late 50s BC³⁰ to the end of the century and beyond. A date of the monument after the Mausoleum Augusti was begun (in the early 20s BC) seems altogether the likeliest. I hope that my contribution will lead to a new interest in this issue among archaeologists and art historians. I have come to believe that the monument was built when the baker's enterprise had been flourishing for years and Caesar Octavianus had for some time been Augustus, in short that Ciancio Rossetto's dating of the monument between 30 and 20 BC is tenable.³¹ The portrait relief of the baker and his wife stems most probably from a somewhat later date than the monument itself, so that Diana Kleiner may well be right in dating the drapery and coiffure as belonging to the period influenced by the craftsmanship of the Ara Pacis between 13 BC and AD 5.³²

Without, I hope, being too much a prey to circular reasoning, I believe in conclusion that Horace wrote his poem when the monument was a fairly recent sight at the eastern crossroads leading out of the city, and that its owner was still concerned at the time with the bakery firm on a daily basis and the contract he was responsible for.

³⁰ Kockel (1993) 88-90 (with many references).

³¹ Ciancio Rossetto (1973) 67.

³² Kleiner (1977) 202.

The Poem in View of its Addressee

As can be easily seen, the poem is a sort of combination of two well-known subtypes of Horatian poetry: a spring poem (1-12) and an invitation poem (13-28). As to its dates, the most reasonable estimate is this: 4.12 was probably written at any time between 17 BC (autumn) and 13 BC (summer), the latter year being a fair guess for the publication of the collection. This would mean that when his compatriots were for the first time confronted with the collection, more than five years had passed since the poet Virgil's death. Coming to the twelfth poem, they would probably have ascertained by then that the other identifiable addressees in the collection were alive, contemporary friends and acquaintances of Horace. Then, why should poem 12 be an exception? Virgil the poet was out of the question, but they would not have to look far for another addressee: there was another Vergilius around and a Roman one at that, Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces.³³ His name indicates a *libertus* who had once had an unfree status, but had become a Roman citizen of distinction, and his monument spoke eloquently of his success, both to his contemporaries and to posterity.

As to his name, there is no reason to dwell on the fact that our modern age has mostly preferred to call him by his Greek name, to which was added the acquired Roman name to which he had a legitimate right like other *liberti*. But if a successful *libertus* could be identified only by his *nomen gentile*, so much the better. The case of Andronikos from Tarentum, who in the second half of the 3rd century BC became the first Roman poet, is relevant here. As a free man his *tria nomina* were Lucius Livius Andronicus. About two centuries later Livy, belonging to the same widely ramified *gens*, mentions him on more than one occasion just as Livius, without adding his Greek name.³⁴ So *Vergili* was in the eyes of Romans the most honourable way of addressing a Eurysaces living as a respected and wealthy citizen of Rome. Perhaps the fuller form *Vergilius Eurysaces* would have been officially preferable in many situations during the poet Virgil's lifetime, in order to distinguish between the two men, if required. But after the poet's death confusion was less likely, and *Vergilius* alone would have been sufficiently clear to identify the contract

³³ He had a name by birth ("Broad-shield") "inherited" from the son of Ajax Telamonius. The mythical Eurysaces became king of Salamis, made over his island to Athens (Plut. *Sol.* 10. 2), where there was a heroic shrine, the Eurysakeion at Melite (Paus. 1.35.1-3). To claim descent from Eurysaces was honorable among Salaminians (Ferguson, 1938, esp. 15-17). Eurysaces is prominent in Sophocles' *Ajax* (particularly 545-95). Sophocles dealt with him also in the lost tragedies *Teucer* (presumably) and *Eurysaces* (cf. *RE s.v.* and Lloyd-Jones, 1996, 96-97).

³⁴ Liv. 7.2.8; 27.37.7. For "Livius" alone cf. also Cic. *Brut.* 72; *Tusc.* 1.3. Likewise Horace: mentioning Andronicus twice in *Epist.* 2. 1 (62, 69), he calls him by his *nomen gentile* (admittedly, *Andronicus* could not be handled in a hexameter).

baker in both official and every day speech. As for Horace himself, he would hardly have left out the acquired Roman *nomen gentile* which must have contributed much to his addressee's social standing.

As to much discussed details in the poem,³⁵ *iuvenum nobilium cliens* (16) could in theory designate poets from Ennius onwards, but it suits our contract baker infinitely better than the poet Virgil. For Eurysaces, being a *libertus*, it adds to his prestige that one could meet him at times among the high and mighty. Horace implies: "You are a well-known man and have connections pointing to the highest places in society and politics". In fact, as he set out rather explicitly himself in his frieze, Eurysaces' kind of business would clearly involve close co-operation and contact with the authorities, not least with a view to obtaining a steady and undisputed income from his contract. Horace himself could well have become acquainted with Eurysaces in such a social setting. Indeed Vergilius Eurysaces must have been a pivotal figure for the satisfactory supply of bread in Rome, most probably to the poor and needy populace. Social unrest would be the result if such supplies failed.

But with the opening line of the seventh stanza we are nearer to proving our case. Applied to the poet Virgil, *verum pone moras et studium lucri* (25) would come dangerously close to an insult (*i.e. vivo poeta*) or thoughtlessness. To go after profit would be no compliment addressed to men serving the Muses like Virgil and Horace, *lucrum* being often a negative notion. Yet its mention here would necessarily imply that to make profit was rated as a reputable aim for poetic talent.³⁶ The sentiment would be even worse in a sort of obituary. Misplaced teasing would be the only explanation and excuse which I can come up with in that case. But if the address is to Vergilius Eurysaces, the potentially provocative *lucrum* will say something quite different: on an occasion like the one depicted, the friend must not let himself be kept back by his business³⁷ and his perfectly legitimate interest in its profit (*studium lucri*). Applied to a Eurysaces, *studium lucri* is in tune with his monument and will be taken as the best of compliments. It would signal that Eurysaces is

³⁵ Another perhaps significant detail: Horace mentions that his exquisite wine is waiting to be fetched from the Sulpician magazines (*Sulpicia horrea*) close to the Tiber. With the baker at the center of the poem, it is a unifying trait that his provisions of grain would come from the same complex of magazines.

³⁶ That poets were sponsored by aristocrats and by the Augustan regime more or less directly was a matter of course, but to say that a fellow poet was devoting his spiritual energy to acquiring a good income would be tasteless or offensive or both.

³⁷ Especially if we adopt, as I think we should, the reading *rerum* for *verum*: subjective genitive; understand *morae* caused by his *res* ("business", "affairs", *OLD s.v.* 14).

always intent on fulfilling his duties towards the authorities and the people of Rome and not putting his income at stake by forfeiting their goodwill.

There are also positive factors in the poem's whole structure and wording that speak in favour of our identification. Horace allows himself in the playful second half of the poem to allude to Eurysaces' profession as *pistor redemptor*, demonstrated so precisely on the frieze, as he makes the whole symposium dependent on a form of contract between them, a contract to be scrupulously observed. Otherwise the invitation will evidently be annulled. Horace is not in the mood for treating Vergilius with good wine for nothing, this being in accordance with the Roman principle *do ut des*. Horace insists on his condition by repeating it in consecutive stanzas (4, 5 and 6): *nardo vina merebere* (16); *nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum* (17); *cum tua ... merce veni* to compensate for *meis ... tingere poculis* (21-24). Words like *mereri*, *merx*, *immunis* emphasize that the businesslike side of their contract must be agreed upon and accepted.³⁸

But there are even more indications that we are on the right track in identifying *Vergili* with Eurysaces. The spring section of the poem dominating the three first stanzas takes us away from Rome and Italy to the eastern part of the Greek world. Here, the expression *animae ... Thraciae* (2) for *zephyri* (or *favonii*) is unusual. In his comment on the line, Richard Thomas seems to be right in spotting an influence from the Greek word for *venti*, ἄνεμοι. The epithet *Thraciae* reveals Greek influence even more. Horace is alluding to Homer's personified Ζέφυρος whose grand moment in the *Iliad* is his role in the 23rd song, when the pyre of Patroclus will not catch fire (192). The helpless Achilles calls on the brothers Boreas and Zephyros, promising them rich offerings (193-98). The goddess Iris takes his prayer to the abode of Zephyros in Thrace, finds the other winds assembled there and asks Boreas and Zephyros to make haste, whereupon they rush forth with formidable strength and noise on their way across the sea (that is the Mare Thracium).³⁹ Having completed their mission at Troy they return to their home in Thrace (198-230). The reference to this *locus classicus* about Zephyros and Boreas makes us see that the rough winds of spring emanating from the north have undergone a metamorphosis in Horace, in accordance with the mild season evoked. The same winds are now moderating the sea and allowing the ships a safe travel across calmer waves.

³⁸ If the contract Eurysaces had with the authorities was not duly kept it would be the end of both his "commodity" produced by his bakery (~ spikenard) and *lucrum* from the authorities (~ wine from Cales).

³⁹ τοὶ δ' ὀρέοντο / ἠχῆ θεσπεσίῃ νέφεα κλονέοντε πάροιθεν. / αἶψα δὲ πόντον ἴκανον ἀήμεναι, ὥρτο δὲ κῦμα / πνοιῆ ὑπο λιγυρῆ (*Il.* 23. 212-15).

Greek associations are also very much to the fore in the second stanza. While seen building its nest, the bird of spring, the swallow or *hirundo* in daily speech, is associated with terrible memories of the mythical age before the bird's final metamorphosis, when she as an Athenian princess, Pandion's daughter, had killed her off-spring Itys to avenge the gruesome passion of her husband, the Thracian king Tereus. The infamy attached forever to the Athenian royal house (*Cecropia domus*) comes from her horrible deeds. This atrocity is more prominent than Tereus' barbarous passion in Horace's condensed account. We cannot say for sure whether Horace had specifically in mind the tragedy *Tereus* by Sophocles, the earliest famous treatment of the myth. All the same, the emphasis on the tragedy of Athens and the grave guilt of its princess are motives that stand out in the stanza.

Then, with the third stanza, a bright Greek spring is seen without all sinister associations. The bucolic world of Arcadia is filled with singing shepherds and thriving sheep. Pan himself enjoys it all to the full. The elements of bucolic poetry set in the landscape of Arcadia are pointing directly to the poet Virgil,⁴⁰ a reference that clashes almost paradoxically with the immediate address to (another) Vergilius at the beginning of the next stanza. From (possible) references to Homer and Sophocles we are turning in the third stanza unmistakably to the Roman poet Virgil, whose first poetic achievement was to have transplanted bucolic Greek scenery to Italy.⁴¹

This account of a spring in the Greek world, with its allusion to Greek myth and literature, and finally to Virgil's adoption of the pleasant scenery of Arcadia, seems well attuned to an address made to a man who had emerged socially from the state of a Greek slave to become a successful Roman citizen. It is as if Horace wants to communicate indirectly: "You, my Vergilius Eurysaces, by birth a Greek, have become a Roman, nay even a Vergilius, and are able to enjoy your new status in the high levels of Roman society". There is even a metapoetic dimension involved in the spring stanzas, if I am right in my identification of literary associations with the Greek name Eurysaces. After the initial reference to a famous Homeric scene in the first stanza, the second reference seems to point to Sophocles, who had also dealt notably with Eurysaces by name in his *Ajax*, *Eurysaces* and *Teucer*. Then the poet Virgil is directly alluded to in the third stanza, just before the introduction of the guest.

⁴⁰ Pan and Arcadia are mentioned together both in *Ecl.* 4 (58-59) and *Ecl.* 10 (26).

⁴¹ For a somewhat more detailed comment on this literary and linguistic Romanization in Virgil's *Eclagues*, see the comments on *Prima ... Thalea* in Kraggerud (2010).

Incontrovertible arguments are of course lacking, but the sum of possible and probable indications is much in favour of *Vergili* being Vergilius Eurysaces. The outlook on contemporary Rome which Horace shows in his fourth book of Odes seems indeed to strengthen this interpretation. Seldom, if ever, is a clearer ideology worded by the poet. In brief, Horace is praising the happy present in undisguised terms: prosperity, peace and security have become manifest realities, the country is thriving. The regime of Augustus is behind it all. These odes seem almost intended to prop up the impression communicated by the Ara Pacis. Already from the *Carmen Saeculare* (29-30, cf. also 59-60) the goddess Ceres is at the centre of people's wellbeing. And one man, Vergilius Eurysaces, can be adduced as a prominent example in that regard, instrumental on behalf of the regime in passing on the blessing of this affluence to the people of Rome. He is, as shown by his own monument, both a worthy and a necessary mainstay for Rome in these years, a man in whom Augustus must have put his trust no less than in aristocratic addressees like Censorinus and Lollius. I also think that Horace felt some personal motive in giving prominence to a man who was a *libertus*, albeit in a category of his own, just as Horace's father had been a *libertus*. And to end on a word of compromise and reconciliation, to bring together those for and against the presence of the poet Virgil in the poem: In an elegant way Horace has in my view deliberately combined the two Vergilii, the dead poet and the living contract baker, both friends, evoking the presence of each of them in very different ways, making us aware of both with striking effect by means of the juxtaposed lines 12 (*Arcadiae*) and 13 (*Vergili*).

EGIL KRAGGERUD

Bygdøy allé 13, 0257 Oslo
(egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no)

Bibliography

- O. Brandt (1993) 'Recent research on the tomb of Eurysaces', *ORom* 19, 13-17.
- P. Ciancio Rossetto (1973) *Il sepolcro del fornaio Marco Virgilio Eurisace a Porta Maggiore*, Rome.
- A. Claridge (1998) *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford.
- F. Coarelli (2007) *Rome and Environs: An Archaeological Guide*.
- P. Fedeli & I. Ciccarelli (eds) (2008) *Q. Horatii Flacci carmina liber IV*, Florence.
- W. S. Ferguson (1938) 'The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sunion', *Hesperia* 7, 1938.
- E. Fraenkel (1957) *Horace*, Oxford.
- L. Hackworth Petersen (2003) 'The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket. The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome', *ABull* 85, 230-257.
- D. E. E. Kleiner (1977) *Roman Group Portraiture. The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire*, New York.
- V. Kockel (1993) *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, Mainz.
- E. Kraggerud (2010), Vergil's Introduction to his Sixth Eclogue', *SO* 84, 111-24.
- E. Kraggerud (2012) 'Zwei neue Horaz-Kommentare', *Gymnasium* 119, 597-602.
- R. A. Lattimore (1942) *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana IL.
- H. Lloyd-Jones (ed.) (1996) *Sophocles. Fragments*, 1996, Cambridge MA.
- T. Mommsen (1848) 'De apparatoribus magistratuum Romanorum', *RbM* 6, 1-57.
- E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*², 1989.
- S. B. Platner & T. Ashby (1929) *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London.
- M. Putnam (1986) *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*, Ithaca NY.
- L. Richardson, Jr (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore.
- N. Rudd (ed.) (2004) *Horace, Odes and Epodes*, Cambridge MA.
- D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.) (2001), *Horatius. Opera*⁴, Munich.
- E. M. Steinby (ed.) (1993-2000) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, Rome.
- R. F. Thomas (2001) *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, Cambridge.
- R. F. Thomas (ed.) (2011) *Horace. Odes. Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge.
- J. P. Zarecki (2010) 'A Duet of Praise: Horace, Vergil, and the Subject of *canemus* in *Carm.* 4.15.32', *CJ* 105, 245-63.



Figure 1. The monument's western (and shorter) and northern side seen through the Porta Maggiore. © Rachel McCombie



Figure 2. The inscription in its full form in two rows on the western side.

© Jonathan Rome



Figure. 3.

1st row: Western side (from left to right).

2nd row: Southern side (from right to left).

3rd row: Northern side (from right to left). *Image from Foto Flickr Commons*

