



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *A Commentary on the Prose Preface and Epigrams 1-20 of Martial Book 12*

CARSON, KEIRAN,DESMOND

#### How to cite:

---

CARSON, KEIRAN,DESMOND (2018) *A Commentary on the Prose Preface and Epigrams 1-20 of Martial Book 12*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/12530/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

# **A Commentary on the Prose Preface and Epigrams 1-20 of Martial Book 12**

A dissertation submitted in October 2017 to the Department of Classics of Durham University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

by Keiran Desmond Carson

“The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author’s prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.”

*Abstract:*

This PhD thesis provides a commentary for the prefatory epistle and the opening twenty epigrams of Martial Book 12. The texts will be analysed through an interpretative method and focus will be placed upon intra- and intertextual references in order to orientate the work within the broader framework of Ancient literature. Beyond the concentration upon literary allusions, attention will be paid to metrical and philological concerns in order to distinguish Martial's particular techniques and innovations from conventional or generic usages. Each text will be accompanied with a translation and an introductory essay, which will focus upon the structure, style and content of the text, in order to provide a clear and unambiguous interpretation for each work. A supplementary thematic essay will also be supplied, when it is necessary to pursue particular points that cannot be catered for in the lemmatised entries or the initial essay on the content and structure of each text.

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>12 Preface</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>12.1</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>12.2(3)</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>12.3(4)</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>12.4(5)</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>12.5(2)</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>12.6</b> .....	<b>79</b>
<b>12.7</b> .....	<b>89</b>
<b>12.8</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>12.9</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>12.10</b> .....	<b>121</b>
<b>12.11</b> .....	<b>129</b>
<b>12.12</b> .....	<b>142</b>
<b>12.13</b> .....	<b>153</b>
<b>12.14</b> .....	<b>159</b>
<b>12.15</b> .....	<b>172</b>
<b>12.16</b> .....	<b>182</b>
<b>12.17</b> .....	<b>190</b>
<b>12.18</b> .....	<b>201</b>
<b>12.19</b> .....	<b>220</b>
<b>12.20</b> .....	<b>225</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>232</b>

## Introduction

This PhD thesis, an interpretative commentary on the prefatory epistle and the initial twenty epigrams in Martial's twelfth Book, is intended to serve as the impetus for a much more ambitious project; *viz.* a complete commentary to Martial's final book. The work's origin lies in a select commentary, comprising epigrams 42-46(7), from Book 12, which formed my M.A. thesis (Durham 2014). The need for a commentary upon Martial's final book is immediately apparent: it is the only work of Martial that lacks a published commentary for the Book in its entirety.<sup>1</sup> Aside from analyses of certain individual epigrams offered in selective commentaries, the only full scale treatment of Book 12 currently available is Bowie's unpublished, and now somewhat dated, thesis (1988). There is, however, a more recent work, which offers commentaries for the preface and the opening thirty-three epigrams, written in Italian by Craca (2011), but there is no extended treatment of Book 12 in English subsequent to Bowie.

The aim of this thesis is to offer an interpretative commentary for the pieces selected. Close attention will be paid to intra- and intertextual usages within this commentary. Another objective will be the cataloguing and interpretation of technical details (especially metrical issues), as such matters are fundamental to the appreciation of Martial's style and purpose. Since in Martial's scopic poems, the humour is frequently hitched to and corroborated by a dissonant or jarring rhythm at the conclusion, the commentary will be employed to elucidate the achieved effects. Another concomitant feature of the interpretative approach selected, will be the provision of introductory essays prior to the lemma entries. These essays, effectively practical criticisms, will be used to furnish an overall evaluation of the content, structure, and style of each poem; bibliographical references will also be supplied and, where required, a supplementary thematic overview.

The methodology adopted necessarily entails certain attendant problems. Although it serves admirably for the shorter epigrams, the interpretative process, in the case of a long epigram, necessitates either the production of an incredibly lengthy commentary or a somewhat selective one. Therefore the latter approach has been selected. For certain commentaries

---

<sup>1</sup> Limiting the scope to the most important editions, the list of published commentaries for other individual books would include the following: Book 1: Citroni (1975) and Howell (1980); Book 2: Williams (2004); Book 3: Fusi (2006); Book 4: Moreno Soldevila (2006); Book 5: Howell (1995) and Canobbio (2011); Book 6: Grewing (1997); Book 7: Galán Vioque (2002); Book 8: Schöffel (2002); Book 9: Henriksen (2012); Book 10: Damschen and Heil (2004); Book 11: Kay (1985); *Xenia*: Leary (2001); *Apophoreta*: Leary (1996); *Liber Spectaculorum*: Coleman (2006). There are also several selective commentaries, which offer treatments for certain individual epigrams across the corpus, among which are included: Paley and Stone (1898); Stephenson (1914); Watson and Watson (2003); and Williams (2011). Finally, to compensate for certain deficiencies in Damschen and Heil's treatment of Book 10, see the extended analyses of the long epigrams from Book 10, offered by Buongiovanni (2012) and also the unpublished Cambridge thesis on a series of poems from the same book, completed by Jenkins (1981).

(12. *pr.*, 12.2(3), 12.18) the lemmatised element has had to omit certain entries that may be viewed as desirable in order to keep the commentaries within an acceptable scale. This approach is requisite if an interpretative framework, with its consequent extended length, is to be maintained across all the poems within this ambit.

Given the scope of the PhD thesis, it was instantly evident that a satisfactory commentary for the book in its entirety would not be practicable.<sup>2</sup> As this was the case, there were two options available: the work could include either a selection of epigrams from Book 12 (chosen either on a thematic, metrical, or random basis) or concentrate upon a consecutive series of poems from the book. Although both options have their attractions, the second was deemed most appropriate, since Martial is the only epigrammatist from antiquity whose work is transmitted in the order the poet himself selected.<sup>3</sup> Thus investigations in the interplay between neighbouring epigrams - even the overarching architectural arrangement of a book, or a series of books - can be undertaken in Martial's work with a certain degree of confidence; indeed it seems, at times, positively encouraged by the poet. Although this overriding concern to retain some semblance of the artistic structure Martial imposed on Book 12 has dictated the choice, it must still be acknowledged that the very act of an abridged treatment necessitates certain unfortunate omissions.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> It is true that Bowie (1988) did provide a complete commentary for Book 12 for his Oxford PhD thesis. This was no mean achievement. Nevertheless, such facility comes at the price of a thorough interpretation and the appreciation of the niceties each epigram contains. It is also to be pointed out that since Bowie's period, scholarly works upon Martial - in the form of commentaries, monographs, and articles, - have been voluminous.

<sup>3</sup> Most epigrams are, of course, transmitted in anthologies and florilegia, names which attest to their selected condition and incorporated status. Although attempts can be made to try and piece together and arrange the disparate epigrams of the Greek and Latin anthologies into authorial cycles, and in some cases book forms (e.g. Kay's (2006) allocation of *Anthologia Latina* 78-188 to a single [anonymous] poet, or Seneca's, Luxorius', and Symphosius' poems from the same anthology), the very nature of such anthologies suggests that poems may well be omitted to satisfy the broader requirements of the florilegium itself. Indeed, in the *Anthologia Graeca*, the problem is increased twofold, since earlier anthologies (e.g. Meleager's "Garland"; Phillip's collection; Strato's "Musa Puerilis") are obviously buried within later collections (Cephalas' and Planudes'); thus anthologies of anthologies are provided. Elsewhere in the Latin epigrammatic genre, the problems of the transmission of Catullus' work are well known, as is the contention that, given its size, it may well represent three books. Even if one considers that Catullus' work is transmitted in the order the poet imposed, it would then seem that the arrangement was dictated primarily by metrical rather than thematic accord, contrary to Martial's practice of *variatio*. In later Latin literature, Ausonius' epigrams likewise furnish fundamental problems in respect to the basic arrangement of the poems; see Kay (2001: 29-32). In sum, despite the occasional problem with the order of one or two individual epigrams, Martial is the only ancient epigrammatist whose work comes to us transmitted in the artistically arranged manner that the poet intended; the structure and integrity of the books of the Neo-Latin epigrammatists (e.g. Beccadelli, Marullus, Owen) lies outside the requirements of this introduction.

<sup>4</sup> Such omissions include (but are by no means limited to) important characters in Martial's work like his patroness at Bilbilis, Marcella (12.21 & 31), his friend of longstanding, Julius Martialis (12.34), the future governor of Tarraconensis, Istantius Rufus (12.95 & 98), and the final poem to his *bête noire*, Zoilus (12.54). Also some final poems addressed to the book's dedicatee, Priscus (12.62 & 12.92), are absent, as well as the absence of a final poem set in Martial's Italian farm at Nomentum (12.57). Interesting characters, such as the drunken bawd Phyllis (12.65), the gourmand Tucca (12.41), and

Despite these reservations the present selection seems the most appropriate. It has the benefit of including the programmatic poems that introduce the work and the preface, which lends a certain sombre tone, which is somewhat absent from the rest of the book (see the introduction to the preface for its distinct character). Within its scope it can attest to a number of features that mark out Book 12, notably the increased importance of the hendecasyllabic metre (12.7, 12.8, 12.15, 12.16, 12.18, 12.20), the employment of scoptic *monodisticha* (12.7, 12.10, 12.12, 12.13, 12.19, 12.20), and the importance of Priscus to the collection (12. *pr.*, 12.1, 12.3(4), 12.14). Furthermore it affords an opportunity to examine Martial's use of imperial panegyrics (12.4(5), 12.6, 12.8, 12.9), which are absent from the rest of the book, and allows investigation of distinguished friends of Martial (i.e. Priscus and Stella), as well as the resumption of characters from earlier works (e.g. Ligeia in 12.7). In sum, given the limitations imposed, the present selection is defensible.

### Structure and Content

The care with which Martial assembled the epigrams in his books is a well-known topic and has received frequent attention. Among the many scholars who have addressed this issue, Scherf (2001), Holzberg (2004/2005 & 2012), and, Holzberg's pupil, Lorenz (2002 & 2004) stand out as prominent representatives. It is important to appreciate that, although this topic did not receive the minute critical attention and speculation that more recent scholarship has dedicated to it, the importance of Martial's techniques of arrangement has been understood throughout the lengthy history of critical attention which Martial has received.<sup>5</sup> This tendency becomes all the more apparent in the poems treated in this commentary. If the epigrams were rearranged into the order that predominated from the time of de Blavis (1482) up until Schneidewin (1842) - and extending, albeit with greater hesitation on their part, to Gilbert (1885) and Friedländer (1886) -, it would be clear that the Renaissance editors (known in *apparatus critici* as *Ital.*) and their immediate successors paid great attention to the coincidences, developments, and overriding logic of the book's arrangement.<sup>6</sup> When rearranged to the order current from the 15th to the late 19th century the programmatic section, comprising the opening fifteen poems, can be assigned to three broad divisions

---

the hypocritical *Aper* (12.70), are omitted. Certain epigrams that are reminiscent of other genres of poetry, such as the Archilochean temper contained in the lengthy choliambic attack on Vacerra (12.32), the deliciously iterative poem (12.39) to (*bellus*) Sabellus, which recalls through its audible coincidences Plautus and Catullus, the complicated (here with a surrogate fourth character) *menage à trois* (12.93), which is laced with the genre of mime, and the cavilling taxonomy, reminiscent of such distinctions as writers like Aulus Gellius are later to record, which distinguishes the scent of *fellatores* from *cunnilinctores* (12.85), all have had to be excluded, as has the diptych poem, which treats the same theme of marital infidelity in alternate ways (12.96-7).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. the interesting section Pertsch (1911: 59-68) dedicated to the arrangement of Martial's epigrams.

<sup>6</sup> It is to be noted that Ker (1920) transmits the same order of epigrams in poems 1-20 as the earlier representatives. This is due to the fact that Ker employed the text from the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (1905) edition; see Wright Duff (1920: 176).



followed by two coda poems. The first cycle would include the elegiac epigrams 1 to 4 - now ordered 12.1, 12.2(3), 12.3(4), 12.5(2). Here the poems on the extreme boundaries (1 and 4) both have the same addressee (Priscus), whilst the internal poems are thematically related (the “travelling book” motif).<sup>7</sup> Within this sequence Martial acknowledges his respect to his personal friends Priscus (12.1 and 12.4) and Stella (12.3). The next series, which can be considered as an “imperial” cycle of poems and consequently less warm and familiar than the earlier group, comprises epigrams 5 to 9 (now ordered 12.4(5), 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9). Here the central hendecasyllabic poem (12.7) is placed so as to separate the epigrams that treat Nerva (12.5 & 12.6) from those to his successor, Trajan (12.8 & 12.9). The addresses to the respective emperors are further distinguished by the chiasmic arrangement of the respective manners of address adopted; the poems at the extreme edge of the cycle employ the title *Caesar* (12.5.4 & 12.9.1), whereas the inner poems use their respective *cognomina* (12.6.2: *Nerva*; 12.8.3: *Traiani*). The central poem (12.7) also has programmatic functions. These include its metre (hendecasyllable, which consequently bleeds into the neighbouring poem, 12.8), its theme (humour), and its length (a single couplet), all of which are prominent in Book 12; see the introduction to 12.7 for further on this matter. The final cycle, which includes epigrams 10 to 13 is somewhat looser in its arrangement, yet it can be considered in some senses the mirror image of the “imperial” cycle delineated above. In this section the scopic theme (hinted at in 12.7), which characterises the vast majority of poems in Book 12, is predominant, as is the use of *mondisticha* poems (again *cf.* 12.7); 12.10, 12.12, and 12.13 are all humorous poems fashioned from single couplets. A sense of the imperial concerns outlined in the previous cycle is retained by a poem addressed to Parthenius (12.11), the assassin of Domitian. This sequence also includes greater metrical variety as it includes the third metre employed in Book 12 (the choliamb) and retains a sense of order by having choliambic poems on the extreme borders (12.10 & 12.13) and elegiac poems in the centre (12.11 & 12.12). The next two poems form an effective coda to the introductory unit. Epigram 12.14 signals the closure by repeating the theme (hunting) and addressee (Priscus) of the initial poem (12.1), whereas 12.15, through a contrast of the wretched existence the citizens eked out under Domitian’s rule against the present cheery conditions under the new regime (Nervan / Trajanic), echoes and underlines sentiments found in the “imperial” cycle (12.5, 6, 8, and 9 respectively) and 12.11. It may also be worth noting that 12.14 and 12.15, by their alternate use of the elegiac and hendecasyllabic metres, anticipate the metrical variety of alternating hendecasyllables and elegiacs (broken occasionally with the odd inclusion of a choliamb or an occasional series of poems that retain the same metre) that marks out the predominant rhythm of the following epigrams. It is noted that the five poems after 12.15 all alternate the metre in this way (though it is evident that the cycle properly begins with 12.16 as it repeats the hendecasyllabic metre of 12.15). In sum the order as transmitted by the

---

<sup>7</sup> It is interesting to observe that, although Martial seems to dedicate less attention to structural harmony at the conclusion of his books than he does at the beginning, in Book 12 the pattern traced for the opening four epigrams (above) is found mirrored at the end of the book. Both 12.95 and 12.98 feature a reference to Istantius Rufus (the future governor of Tarraconensis), whilst the poems between (12.96 and 12.97) treat the same theme of marital infidelity.

earlier tradition demonstrates their comprehension and acknowledgement of the purposeful assembly that courses through Martial's work.

Unfortunately, although the arrangement as outlined above represents the most thematically harmonious distribution of the poems being considered, it does not accord with the knowledge gleaned from the manuscripts at our disposal.<sup>8</sup> Although Gilbert (1885) expressed doubts in his edition (also in a later article, see the introduction to 12.5) about the integrity and position of the fragment now numbered 12.5(2), the replacement of this poem to the fifth epigram of the book is first undertaken by Lindsay (1903). Subsequent to Lindsay, whose emendation was based solely on the evidence available from the manuscripts, Immisch (1911) offered a more radical solution to problems posed by the manuscript tradition for the opening poems of Book 12. Before outlining Immisch's emendations, it is necessary to briefly trace out the problem contained in the transmission of the text. Martial's work comes to us through three manuscript families ( $\alpha$   $\beta$   $\gamma$ ); for the present selection those from family  $\alpha$ , a florilegium edition, are inconsequential. In the poems under discussion, certain epigrams (12.4(5), 12.5(2), 12.6.1-6, 12.11, and 12.15) are not transmitted in the  $\gamma$  family. Thus the only representative for these poems rests with the  $\beta$  family, whilst in the  $\gamma$  manuscripts 12.3(4) is immediately followed by 12.6.7-12. Given the fact that the omitted poems include obviously unchronological references to Nerva, Parthenius, and the immediate aftermath of the Domitianic period, and the fact that 12.4(5) mentions a collection of poems that will be sent to Nerva (fashioned largely from Books 10-11), there has been speculation that these poems represent a separate *libellus* addressed to Nerva; see Lorenz (2002: 233-8). Such a collection would be political in its content and perhaps include the explicit attack on Domitian, which is now, without any reference to chronology, transmitted at the end of the *Liber Spectaculorum* (0.37 S.B.). This understanding is naturally in accordance with the use of White's (1974) *libellus* theory; see 12.1.3 entry (*breui ... libello*). Given these problems Immisch's solution was twofold; he hitched the final six lines of 12.6 to the end of 12.3 to form a new poem of twelve lines, he also attached the (probable) fragment 12.5(2) as the initial couplet to 12.6.1-6 to form a new poem of eight lines. Immisch's solution has received wide, almost universal, support in subsequent works; only Bowie (1988) rejects the emendations. The reasons that underlie Bowie's rejections are thoroughly sound and it is a great shame that they have been so widely ignored. Although there is a degree of support from the manuscripts to support Immisch, he overplays his hand and offers some weak, indeed positively feeble, defences that motivate his changes; the result is that he provides two rather crass and unsatisfactory epigrams. If the newly formed poem 12.5 (i.e. 12.5(2) + 12.6.1-6) is considered, it will be seen that there are two addressees (*carmina*: line 1; *Nerva*: line 4). The *carmina* addressed in the opening verses thereafter utterly disappear, Nerva is not requested to read them, protect them, or to engage with them in any way. This is completely at odds with M.'s techniques for such poems (cf. e.g. 12.2(3) where Martial's

---

<sup>8</sup> The following, of course, ignores the possibility that the earlier tradition had access to manuscripts that accorded with their arrangement, which have subsequently been lost or destroyed.

book travels to Stella). Beyond this fundamental objection a few trivial inconsistencies concerning Roman topography can also be made to further undermine the coupling of these two poems; see 12.5(2) introduction. It is quite probable that 12.5(2) does represent a fragment, but it ought not to be attached to 12.6. The next newly fashioned poem 12.3 (i.e. 12.3(4) + 12.6.7-12) is similarly destructive to Martial's techniques and the logic of his poetry. Here 12.3, rather than ending with the dissonant polysyllabic close supplied by *pigritia*, which is the final long-hoped for reward of secure patronage, instead goes off onto a six line eulogy concerning munificence under the Domitianic terror. It will be seen that given the theme of patronage the emendation retains some logical consistencies, but one may well question whether or not the comparisons to Numa and Cato (line 8) accord to Priscus who has just been compared to the (foppish) Maecenas (line 2). This becomes all the more evident when we note that the poem from which these six lines have been extracted is addressed to Nerva. Not only are Numa and Cato, and the associated ability to be generally munificent, more appropriate analogues to the emperor himself, but there is even a parallel instance supplied in Martial's work of Nerva being described with reference to both Numa and Cato (11.5.2 *quanta Numae fuerat: sed Numa pauper erat* & 11.5.14 *si Cato reddatur, Caesarianus erit*); for further criticisms see Bowie (1988: 51-2). A final notion that the split in the manuscripts has generated is the suggestion that Book 12 received two editions; the first represented by the  $\gamma$  tradition would have been published in around A.D. 101, with a second edition, including unchronological poems, occurring later, possibly as a posthumous collection, which included previously unpublished poems around A.D. 104; see Sullivan (1991: 320-1). Aside from Bowie, those scholars who concentrate upon the thematic development of the book (and indeed books) and the integrity of its poems, tend to be somewhat less receptive to such techniques as noted by White and Immisch; Lorenz (*op. cit.*) dismisses the notion that the unchronological poems in Book 12 should be seen as a separate work addressed to Nerva, whilst Holzberg (2004/2005) completely rejects chronological concerns by arguing that Book 10 does not represent a second edition published subsequent to Book 11. Instead he suggests that Book 11, which celebrates Nerva, was actually published subsequent to Nerva's death and that the unchronological mixture of poems addressed to both Nerva and Trajan in Book 12 is a deliberate engagement with Books 10 and 11 respectively. Although Holzberg may be viewed as going too far, he is actually on somewhat safe ground, when he suggests that chronological concerns need not dictate the choice of poems selected for each book.<sup>9</sup> Pliny's programmatic epistle can provide evidence that chronological coherence need not be a primary concern when assembling a collection; *Ep. 1.1 Collegi non servato temporis ordine (neque enim historiam componebam), sed ut quaeque in manus venerat*.<sup>10</sup> If, however, one advocates that the poems omitted from the  $\gamma$  manuscripts are rightly excluded due to

---

<sup>9</sup> Although Martial's publication habits tended to be annual, often according with the Saturnalia, there is no need to see his epigrams as a humorous version of the annalistic tradition favoured by certain historians. At no stage in his work does he suggest that his books had chronological consistency.

<sup>10</sup> Although Pliny definitely took great care (contrary to his understated declaration) in arranging his work, his explicit disavowal of a temporal rationale to the collection is evident in the first book; see Sherwin White (1967: 73).

chronological incoherence, there still remains a problem. Epigram 12.8, which is transmitted in both manuscript families, appears to be similarly unchronological. It is a poem that seems more appropriate to the outset of Trajan's reign; see the introduction to 12.8. In sum, the order of the poems presented here will revert to that provided by Lindsay (1903), and ignore the later emendations that flow from Immisch (1911).

## **Text**

The text used for the purposes of research and citation has been Shackleton Bailey's Teubner (1989); it is selected primarily for the current numbering of the *Liber Spectaculorum*. Readers who employ Siedschlag's useful concordance (1979) are advised that the numeration of the *Liber Spectaculorum* will be radically at variance with Shackleton Bailey's. For the sake of convenience, when citing the *Liber Spectaculorum*, I have adopted Siedschlag's method of numbering the book "0"; thus the initial line of the first poem in the *Liber Spectaculorum* would appear as 0.1.1. Similarly I have retained the standard, but unchronological, numbering of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* as "13" and "14" respectively; thus the opening line for the first poem of the *Xenia* would be 13.1.1, for the *Apophoreta* it would be 14.1.1. The recording of manuscript families will follow Heraeus' method ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ), retained by Shackleton Bailey, in preference to Lindsay's more cumbersome approach ( $A^a$ ,  $B^b$ ,  $C^c$ ). Finally Martial will be referred to by the initial "M." within the commentary.

The numbering of the epigrams in the commentary is somewhat at variance with Shackleton Bailey and Heraeus, it follows Lindsay's *OCT* instead; see above (structure and content).

## 12 Preface

*Text:* VALERIUS MARTIALIS PRISCO SUO SALUTEM

scio me patrociniū debere contumacissimae trienni desidiaē; quo absolvenda non esset illas quoque urbicas occupationes, quibus facilius consequimur ut molesti potius quam ut officiosi esse videamur; nedum in hac provinciali solitudine, ubi nisi etiam intemperanter studemus, et sine solacio et sine excusatione secessimus. accipe ergo rationem. in qua hoc maximum et primum est, quod civitatis aures quibus assueveram quaero, et videor mihi in alieno foro litigare; si quid est enim quod in libellis meis placeat, dictavit auditor: illam iudiciorum subtilitatem, illud materiarum ingenium, bibliothecas, theatra, convictus, in quibus studere se voluptates non sentiunt, ad summam omnium illa quae delicati reliquimus desideramus quasi destituti. accedit his municipalium robigo dentium et iudici loco livor, et unus aut alter mali, in pusillo loco multi; adversus quod difficile est habere cotidie bonum stomachum: ne mireris igitur abiecta ab indignante quae a gestiente fieri solebant. ne quid tamen et adveniēti tibi ab urbe et exigenti negarem - cui non refero gratiam, si tantum ea praesto quae possum -, imperavi mihi quod indulgere consueveram, et studui paucissimis diebus, ut familiarissimas mihi aures tuas exciperem adventoria sua. tu velim ista, quae tantum apud te non periclitantur, diligenter aestimare et excutere non graveris; et, quod tibi difficillimum est, de nugis nostris iudices nitore seposito, ne Romam, si ita decreveris, non Hispaniensem librum mittamus, sed Hispanum.

*Translation:* Valerius Martial (sends) greetings to his friend Priscus.

I know that I owe a defence for my most obstinate three year's idleness; with which (defence) it ought not to be acquitted even among those urban occupations, whereby we more easily obtain (the state) that we seem to be troublesome rather than obliging; (but it is excusable) much less in this provincial solitude, where if I do not study rather excessively, I (would) have retired both without solace and without an excuse. Therefore hear my account. Amid which (causes) this is greatest and foremost: that I seek the citizenry's ears, with which I had grown accustomed, and I seem to myself to be pleading in an alien courtroom; for if there is anything which may cause pleasure in my books the listener dictated (it): that acuity of judgement, that inspiration for themes, libraries, theatres, communal life, in which pleasures do not feel themselves as studied, in conclusion of all these things: those elements which due to fastidiousness I abandoned, I (now) long for as if I were forsaken. The blight of municipal teeth is added to these (losses) and envy in the place of judgement and one or two malign individuals - many in a minuscule place; against which it is difficult to have a good humour every day. Therefore do not be surprised that what was accustomed to be done exultantly has now been tossed away disdainfully. However, to prevent my denying what you demand upon arriving from the city - you to whom I do not return thanks if I only discharge those things which I can - I have ordered myself (to do) what I had been

accustomed to indulge in, and I have studied for a (very) few days, so that I would welcome your ears, most familiar to me, with their own homecoming feast. I hope that you will not object to carefully estimate and examine these things (of yours), which are not imperilled only in your hands. Furthermore, what is most difficult for you, judge from my trifles with your (own) brilliance put aside, to prevent my sending to Rome, if you so determine, not a book from Spain, but a Spanish (book).

## Content and Themes

M. deploys a juridical metaphor to fashion the overriding conceit of this letter so that he may present his apologies for a hiatus in his literary output and in order to comically represent himself as a defendant on a criminal charge. The motif receives explicit reference towards the beginning (*patrocinium*) and the conclusion of the letter (*decreveris*) and is reinforced at various points throughout the epistle: e.g. *absolvenda, in foro litigare*. It should be added that the semantic capabilities of the following phrases such as *solacium* (= atonement, compensation), *excusatio, ratio* (= ground, motive) further promote the theme. It may be hypothesised that beyond providing an amusing conceit, the legal emphasis could be a courteous nod towards Priscus' own occupation. Next it should be observed that M. uses this general scheme as a springboard for various related, but distinct ideas. The topic of criminal judgement is naturally made to feed into literary judgement as the use of *decernere* at the conclusion attests. It can be seen that there are three uses of *iudicium* or *iudicare* in this letter; the uses applied to Priscus (*de nugis ... iudices*) and the Roman populace (*illam iudiciorum subtilitatem*) relate to shrewd literary appreciation. The final example (*iudici loco livor*), which refers to the inhabitants of Bilbilis, demonstrates the restriction of this quality to *Romanitas* and also initiates a distinction between Rome and Spain. It will be noted that, beyond the concentration on legal terminology, the letter also exhibits a quite marked accumulation of diction concerned with anatomy: *ures* x2 (and *auditor*), *robigo dentium, stomachum*, (*cf. livor* = a bluish, black mark or spot). This focus on the body is employed principally to distinguish the gulf between Rome and Bilbilis; for the distasteful representation of corporeal features as an element in M.'s work see Rimell (2008: 19-50). Whereas Rome is presented as cultivated with its emphasis on the civilised (abstract) qualities of law and literature, Bilbilis is depicted as rather earthy and concerned with the corporeal. Even within the list provided above we can see this division articulated; the words relating to the ear concern the appreciation of literature and are confined to Priscus or the Romans, indeed the feast M. promises Priscus is not an actual meal but a recital of his works; the remaining words are either distasteful (*dentium, livor*) and betray an ugly, unsophisticated element to Bilbilitan life, or they are limited to the ill effects (*stomachum*) that such a life bestows on M. The tropes here expressed, and particularly the adopted stances, are something of a moveable feast in M.'s works. One does not have to look hard to find examples of M. pronouncing activities such as literary recitals as a burdensome chore (e.g. 4.41, 8.76); legal concerns likewise are elsewhere not depicted as a civilising force, rather they are noticeably

absent from M.'s depictions of the "good life" (e.g. 10.47.5). The burdens of urban life (acknowledged in *urbicas occupationes*) are frequently bemoaned as the enemy of *otium* and rural obscurity is in consequence often desired (e.g. 12.18). In sum M. can depict urban (civilising/ burdensome) or rural (peaceful/ boorish) situations in a positive or negative light according to the respective attitudes the epigram will adopt.

Taking a closer look at the construction of the letter it can be advanced that M. varies the arrangement, length, and position of his clauses to retain the reader's interest. The first sentence concerns M.'s reasons for his lack of literary productivity; he states that such tardiness would be inexcusable even among the habitual interferences of urban life, and less so in rural retirement. It functions as a direct appeal to Priscus for absolution and also, of course, serves to communicate to the general reader a brief outline of the poet's activities since the republication of Book 10. The sentence is complex but its components tend to follow on sequentially; it is formed of a single main clause (*scio*) which initiates an indirect statement (*me ... debere ... desidiae*); this is followed by a relative clause (*quo* [antecedent = *patrocinium*] *absolvenda non esset ... occupationes*) which in turn triggers its own relative construction (*quibus* [antecedent = *occupationes*] *consequimur*); the final relative clause promotes two purpose clauses in a correlative formation sharing the same verb (*ut ... ut ... esse videamur*); after the phrase *nedum in hac provinciali solitudine* is used (with the suppression of *absolvenda esset*), the sentence terminates with two subordinate sections: the clause (*ubi ... secessimus*) here surrounds a conditional protasis (*nisi ... studemus*). The second sentence states plainly in three words that M. will provide a defence for his tardiness; it is simple in construction and a welcome variation from the complex formations that surround it. A summary of the content of the third sentence is straightforward: M. states that the absence of Rome and its accompanying inspirational *stimuli* have resulted in his writer's block. It is the most complex sentence in its formation; it has ten constructions with finite verbs and tends to parcel up various subordinate elements within clauses rather than to advance each clause sequentially. The sentence begins with a main clause based on a connecting relative and verb (*in qua* [antecedent = *rationem*] ... *est*), this then prompts a causal component (*quod ... quaero*) which contains an internal relative clause (*quibus* [antecedent = *ures*] *assueveram*) the causal element is then continued, via coordination, in the next unit (*et videor ... litigare*). After a strong pause the sentence continues with a conditional protasis (*si quid est enim*), a generic relative construction (*quod* [antecedent = *quid*] ... *placeat*), and the apodosis main clause (*dictavit auditor*). The final components of this sentence are ultimately in apposition to *dictavit auditor*; the main clause (*illam ... illud ... illa ... desideramus quasi destituti*) frames two subordinate relative sections (*in quibus* [antecedents = *bibliothecas, theatra, convictus*] ... *non sentiunt* and *quae* [antecedent = *illa*] ... *reliquimus*); the first relative clause also initiates an indirect statement: *studere se*. The fourth sentence then addresses M.'s literary problems from a different perspective. He here turns to his unenviable location in Spain and paints it as ill-cultured and barbaric; ultimately it is far from conducive to any literary pursuits. This sentence, though complex, is much more

straightforward than the previous, fashioned as it is from two main clauses (*accedit ... mali; ne mireris ... indignante*) followed by their respective relative constructions (*adversus quod* [antecedent = general unstated *id*] ... *stomachum; quae* [antecedent = *abiecta*] ... *solebant*). The phrase *in pusillo loco multi* is properly in apposition to the final element of the first principal clause's predicate and has suppressed its verb (*sunt*). The fifth sentence relates that M. has stirred himself to action and that he has composed this volume in order to welcome his patron Priscus to Spain with due deference. This is the only sentence where M. begins with a subordinate unit. The sentence starts with a negative purpose clause (*ne quid ... negarem*), this is followed by three parenthetical elements: a relative clause, which is also the apodosis to the later conditional element, (*cui* [antecedent = *tibi*] ... *refero gratiam*) and a conditional protasis (*si ... praesto*) with its own relative construction (*quae* [antecedent = *ea*] *possum*). The next element is the main clause (*imperavi mihi*) which, after eliding an expected *ut facerem*, triggers a relative construction (*quod* [antecedent = general suppressed *id*] ... *consueram*), the following unit is a second coordinated main clause (*et studui ... diebus*) which is qualified by a purpose clause (*ut ... exciperem adventoria sua*). The final sentence suggests that M. is eagerly anticipating Priscus' consideration and patronage of the twelfth book. Fears are also expressed that M.'s retirement in Spain may have promoted adverse elements creeping into his work; he anticipates that Priscus will be able to rectify such infelicities. This final sentence is complex in construction and habitually encloses its subordinate units. It begins with a main clause (*tu velim ... graveris*) which contains a relative element (*quae* [antecedent = *ista*] ... *periclitantur*); then another coordinated principal clause follows (*et ... iudices*) which likewise encloses a relative (*quod* [antecedent = general suppressed *id*] ... *est*). If we exclude the ablative absolute (*nitore seposito*) the sentence terminates with a negative purpose clause (*ne ... mittamus, sed Hispanum*) with an internal conditional protasis (*si ita decreveris*).

Beyond the variations that the individual clauses betray, engagement is sustained by several rhetorical devices. In the third sentence for instance tricola, *congeries verborum*, an asyndetic style and polyptoton all feature in an arresting *cri de coeur* concerning M.'s removal from the ennobling constituents of civilised life. The first tricolon is formed with a repeated polyptoton use of a deictic (often amplified with a qualifying substantive and a further genitive element) *illam iudiciorum subtilitatem, illud materiarum ingenium, ... (ad summam omnium) illa ...*; this tricolon forms the basis for further rhetorical flourishes. The second item in the list initiates its own tricolon phrase, here succinctly listed in an asyndetic cluster, *bibliothecas, theatra, convictus*. The style is further complicated by the addition of relative clauses that some of the items promote: the phrases *bibliothecas, theatra, convictus* and the final element in the principal tricolon *illa* both prompt further such amplification. The effectiveness of this rhetorical device is also allowed to develop into the next sentence. In the fourth sentence M., now turning to the topic of the boredom and malice that Bilbilis provides, utilises another tricolon for the predicates. To underline the difference in subject a polysyndetic separation of each element is preferred. Though penned in prose, charming



sound effects are not excluded, e.g. the marked use of alliteration, assonance and homoeoteleuton (all framed via a chiasmus) in *delicati reliquimus desideramus quasi destituti*. The conclusion of the letter is itself highly epigrammatic (see the lemma entry *sed... non*), whilst Ciceronian *clausulae* (see esp. *esse videamur*) achieve not only a sonorous close, but also aid the promotion of the courtroom theme. This judicial theme should be noted as a humorous employment of hyperbole; other hyperbolic elements include the use of superlatives: *contumacissimae ... desidiae; paucissimus ... diebus* as well as the exaggerated avowal that the book could only fare well under Priscus' sole guidance (*quae tantum apud te non periclitantur*). There are a host of rather striking phrases (*municipalium robigo dentium, in alieno foro litigare*), oxymoronic sentiments (*et unus aut alter mali, in pusillo multi*), noticeable uses of balance of both clauses (e.g. *quo absolvenda ... occupationes - nedum ... solitudine*) and individual phrases (e.g. *sine solacio sine excusatione*). In sum the epistle provides a thoughtful and engaging introduction to the book.

## Prose Prefaces

The employment of epistolary prefaces by M. and Statius (*Silvae*) has generated a considerable amount of critical attention; for the most recent extended treatment of the topic and for bibliographical references see Johannsen (2006: esp. 107-21) and Pagán (2010: 194-201). For the present purposes it can be noted that M. (Books 1, 2, 8, 9, and 12) and Statius (*Silvae* 1-5) are somewhat distinct in supplying such prefaces for some of their poetical works. It should be noted, however, that the convention seems ultimately Hellenistic, as several prose works from the 4th century supply prose prefaces; see Coleman (1998: 53). For the more restricted employment of epistolary prologues the first extant use is supplied by Archimedes in Greek and there are examples in Latin prose works: Hirtius *De Bello Gallico* (Book 8) and Seneca *Contr.* Technical treaties particularly attract the use of prefaces (see Vitruvius, Columella, Pliny the Elder); on the use of prose prefaces see Janson (1964) generally and for their employment in technical texts see Fögen (2009). The uniqueness of the convention (when confined to a preface's employment in poetical works) should be further tempered by acknowledging the separate introductory poems supplied by other Latin poets, e.g. Ovid (*Amores* 1) or Persius's introductory choliamb. Qualification is additionally suggested due to the fact that M., in the preface to Book 2, explicitly states that an epistolary introduction is justified for a tragedy or a comedy, but incongruous for a book of epigrams. Given M.'s own statement, it may be an accident in the transmission of our texts that such prefatory epistles, when used in poetical works, appear restricted to M. and Statius and do not, for instance, feature in Seneca's tragedies; see Quintilian *Inst.* 8.3.31 for more support in this regard. The possibility of an introductory epistle being lost in the transmission of a text is, of course, not only restricted to other poets. It is to be noted that the surviving prose epistles in M.'s work have a somewhat haphazard transmission: the  $\gamma$  family of manuscripts omits the epistles to Books 2 and 9, and the  $\beta$  family omits the preface to Book 8. It is only the prefaces to Books 1 and 12 respectively that both manuscript families furnish. The ease

with which they could be omitted receives comment from Lindsay (1903: 15-7), and Fontán Pérez (1987: 353) speculates that all of M.'s epigram books would originally have contained an epistolary preface (like Statius' *Silvae*).

When comparing M.'s and Statius' prefaces, the following differences emerge. Statius tends to use his prefaces to serve as a summary of the arrangement and contents of the respective poems (except in the incomplete *pr.* 5). Concentration is also frequently paid to their low status in the generic hierarchy, but this is at times mitigated by the acknowledgement of the production of greater works by the poet (e.g. the *Thebaid* in *pr.* 1). The speed with which the poems were penned is detailed, albeit as an understatement, as further evidence for their triviality (*pr.* 1) and the opening epistle need not be directed to the addressee of the book's initial poem: see *pr.* 1 and *pr.* 4 where the books are addressed to private patrons and the opening poems to Domitian.<sup>11</sup> By contrast, M. offers no comparable summaries for his books' contents like Statius; this is probably a necessary corollary to the sheer amount of epigrams each book contained. Nevertheless, it should be recalled that Meleager did provide a poetic introduction to his *Stephanos* (*A.G.* 4.1) in which he lists the forty-seven different epigrammatists included in his anthology. Although M. provides *apologiae* for his books this frequently involves the actual language that epigram employs (such concerns feature in *praefationes* 1, 2, and 8), rather than an explicit defence of his chosen genre *per se* (though *pr.* 2 and the attached poem of *pr.* 9 to some extent offer apologetic comparisons of epigram to other genres). M. associates the opening poem of his book explicitly with the themes or the individuals referred to in the preface. In Book 1, the preface marks its point with a poem attached as a conclusion and epigram 1.1 is as universal in its address as the preface; in Book 2, although the addressee Decianus does not appear in the opening poem, 2.1 is similarly concerned with *brevitas* like the humorous preface; in Book 8, the opening poem is explicitly signalled and recapitulates the addressee (Domitian) and the concomitant theme of a suitably chaste diction that the book will employ; in Book 9, the preface contains an attached poem like *pr.* 1, this preface is, however, unusually distinct from the rest of the book; in Book 12, the addressee (Priscus) likewise features as the referent of the opening poem. In sum M.'s prefaces tend to betray a much closer connection to the rest of the work and more often are made to feed into the opening poems in some fashion.<sup>12</sup>

There are a few features that distinguish M.'s prefaces from each other that should also be noted. The prefaces to Books 8 (Domitian) and 12 (Priscus) are the only ones that are unambiguous dedications to their respective addressee: Book 1 contains no address - unless one includes the general address to a *lector* transmitted in some of the  $\gamma$

---

<sup>11</sup> Coleman (1998: 54) suggests that Statius may have purposefully employed prose prefaces in order not to overshadow opening poems addressed to Domitian.

<sup>12</sup> This can also be noted by the absence of *vale* at the conclusion to any of M.'s prefaces; Statius, by contrast, terminates prefaces 3 and 4 with *vale*.

manuscripts, see Howell (1980: 97); the preface to Book 2 is presented as a dialogue between the poet and Decianus concerning the redundancy of such an introduction; Book 9 presents an explanation to Toranius about the identity of Avitus in the attached poem. The epistle to Book 12 is also unique in presenting the background activities, lifestyle, manner of composition and concerns of M.; in this respect the preface has more in common with those offered by Statius. Similarly to the brief preface to Book 9, the prologue to Book 12 does not discuss the coarse language that will or will not be employed in his book, the apologetic element is instead confined to the meiosis concerning the epigrams' hasty composition and a potential Hispanic intrusion in its themes and diction.

### The Singularity of the Preface

The prose epistle for Book 12 carries an inordinate amount of weight in our appreciation of Book 12 *in toto* and is actually quite exceptional in its mood and expression. To detail its singularity, it can be observed that the epistle contains at least 40 words that feature only three times or less in all M.'s works (many, of course, are used once and confined to this epistle): *patrocinium* (1); *triennium* (1); *desidia* (2); *urbicus* (3); *occupatio* (1); *consequor* (2); *nedum* (1); *provincialis* (1); *solitudo* (3); *intemperans* (1); *solacium* (2); *excusatio* (1); *secedo* (1); *civitas* (1); *adsuesco* (2); *dicto* (3); *auditor* (3); *iudico* (2); *subtilitas* (1); *convictus* (2); *voluptas* (3); *desidero* (2); *destituo* (3); *municipalis* (2); *robigo* (1); *livor* (3); *adversus* (1); *cotidie* (1); *abicio* (1); *indignor* (3); *gestio* (1); *advenio* (1); *consuesco* (3); *familiaris* (1); *adventorius* (1); *periclitor* (2); *gravo* (2); *nitor* (2) - for the variants of *nitor*: *nidor* (2), *candor* (1) -; *decerno* (3); *Hispaniensis* (1). These 40 examples could be extended by the inclusion of *studeo*: although it is found on four occasions, three are restricted to this letter. Even though it could be advanced that the prose epistle will naturally employ a lexicon that differs from poetical usage, whether it be through metrical requirements or stylistic inclinations, a similar comparison of the prose epistles from M.'s other books counters this facile assumption. The words that feature on only three occasions or less in the other prefaces present the following evidence: Book 1: 7 in the prose letter (8 if one treats *infirmus* as distinct from *inferus*) and 3 in the attached poem; i.e. 10 or 11 instances; Book 2: 7 instances; Book 8: 14 instances; Book 9: 4 instances in the prose section, 1 in the attached poem; i.e. 5 instances. As can be seen the totals from all the other prefaces, on both an individual or a cumulative basis, are comfortably less than that provided for the preface to Book 12 alone.

Beyond the narrow focus on the coincidence of words, the themes and tones that concern the preface are similarly quite distinct from the poems in the book. The sour notes found in the preface, which bewail the tedium of Bilbilis and the consequent stultifying effect on his poetry, have naturally been seized upon in interpretations of Book 12. Sullivan (1991: 53-4) dubs the book a "melancholy production" and adds that "Bilbilis was not furnishing fresh material". The depiction, of course, finds plenty of literary precedent in Ovid's depiction of his exile at Tomis; for the general theme of Ovid's "living death" among barbarians see Grebe

(2010: 491-509) and for a good comparison to M.'s preface, with its catalogue of absent prior pleasures contrasted against present incivility, to result in pathos, see *Tr.* 4.6.45-8 (*Urbis abest facies, absunt, mea cura, sodales, / et, qua nulla mihi carior, uxor abest. / Vulgus adest Scythicum bracataque turba Getarum: / sic me quae video non videoque movent.*). Similar comparisons can also be made with reference to a loss of artistic *ingenium* amid barbarous surroundings; *cf.* esp. Ovid *Tr.* 1.1.35-49.<sup>13</sup> Although the introductory letter certainly supports such sentiments, the contents of the poems provide little, if any, further corroboration. One could, by focusing on the preponderance of scoptic epigrams and the pronounced increase in the hendecasyllabic metre, contend that humour is the defining characteristic of the book. Furthermore, if attention is directed at M.'s portrayal of Spain in the epigrams of Book 12, we again find the prefatory complaints largely unsupported. In the epigrams addressed to Priscus it can be noted that Spain (presumably the location) is portrayed as a fertile hunting ground (1 and 14) and that Priscus is praised as a splendid patron to M. (4) and Bilbilis generally (62). Further articulation of the handsome patronage M. received at Spain is provided in epigrams 21 and 31 (Marcella) and 24 (Aelianus), whilst the character of the province is shown to reflect that of its good governance (epigrams 9 and 98). Contrary to the preface, its rustic charms are eulogised, not condemned, in epigrams 18 and 31, whilst Corduba (epigram 63) is addressed with regard. Although scope for complaint is offered in the travelling book motif in epigrams 2 and 5, it does not emerge: rather Bilbilis, when described, is depicted with pride (12.2.3-4). Only epigram 68 chimes with the negative depiction of the preface, since M. presents himself as being pestered by morning clients who disturb his rest in a manner that corresponds to his life at Rome. This criticism should itself be tempered by the fact that Rome is equally portrayed as uncomfortable and disturbing: a theme that is also advanced in epigrams 18 and 57 of Book 12. Epigram 12.68 should also be viewed as a companion and sequel to 10.103. In sum, were the preface removed, the contents of the rest of the book would provide little to support the impression of a dissatisfied poet producing an uninspired work.

**Prisco suo:** There are 18 usages of the name Priscus found in M.'s corpus (0.31(27, *prius* 29).1, 1.112.2, 2.41.10, 6.18.3, 7.46.4, 8.12.3, 8.45.1, 9.10.1 & 2, 9.77.2, 10.3.6, 12.0.0, 12.1.3, 12.3(4).3, 12.14.2 & 12, 12.62.5, 12.92.1). It has been argued that not all these instances refer to the same individual; there is dispute concerning the amount that relate to M.'s friend and patron (mentioned here), and whether he is the same person as Terentius Priscus (12.3(4).3). The divisions for the usages offered in Shackleton Bailey's "index of names" (1993: 378 & 85) provide a good starting point for the issue. Shackleton Bailey suggests that the name may be used with reference to four separate individuals, though he

---

<sup>13</sup> It should also be noted that a rustic environment could also be presented as tedious to even its most ardent enthusiasts; see Columella *R. R.* 8.11.1 (... *quibus solitudinem ruris eblandiatur*) with Steiner (1954: 87). For a thematic comparison of the temperamentally incompatible pair (M. and Columella) see Steiner (1954: 85-90).

notes that two of these divisions could be conflated and involve the same person.<sup>14</sup> The fourfold classification amounts to the following: 1) a gladiator (0.31), 2) a friend of M., who is *perhaps* Terentius Priscus (6.18, 9.77, 10.3, 12.14, 12.92), 3) Terentius Priscus, a Spanish friend and patron (8.45, 12. *pr.*, 12.1, 12.3, 12.62), 4) Priscus (1.112, 2.41, 7.46, 8.12, 9.10). A similar, though less explicit, taxonomy is offered by Cabañero (1986: 131), as he assigns the following poems to Terentius Priscus: 8.45, 12. *pr.*, 12.3, and maybe 12.1, 12.14, 12.62, 12.92. Aside from the usage at 0.31, which is separate since it refers to a gladiator, the arbitrary nature of such distinctions (and the incompatibility of those provided by the two scholars) immediately arouses suspicions. A closer look at the instances found in Books 1-12 will demonstrate that there is actually no need to separate the usages, they could all happily describe the same individual: Terentius Priscus. The portrait includes 1.112, in which Priscus is a patron of M.'s work; 2.41, where Priscus is incidentally included as a foppish character; 6.18, where Priscus mourns a friend who died in Iberia; 7.46, in which Priscus presents a poem to M. when M. anticipated a financial reward; 8.12, Priscus is here the addressee of a humorous poem which treats M.'s reluctance to marry; 8.45, where Priscus has returned from Sicily, and M. hopes Flaccus will likewise return safe; 9.10, in which Paula is praised for her desire to marry Priscus, and Priscus likewise praised for his reluctance to wed her; 10.3, has Priscus as the addressee in a poem where M. complains that forgeries are circulating under his own name; 12.1, Priscus is presented with M.'s book, which can be read during his hunting outing; 12.3, in which Priscus is praised as M.'s modern day Maecenas; 12.14, where Priscus is cautioned to be careful during his hunting exploits; 12.62, notes that Priscus' patronage extends to an annual dinner for the people at Bilbilis; 12.92, where Priscus features as the addressee in a scoptic poem concerning how one's nature is dictated by one's resources. Thus the usages can be made to yield a compatible portrait, which shows an individual who has supported M.'s work from the beginning (1.112) to the end (12. *pr.*), a man who shares Maecenas' dandyish characteristics (2.41) as well as his munificence (12.3), and an individual who delights in hunting (12.1, 12.14). Further it is noted that both M. and Priscus are linked by a love for poetry (7.46), a misogynistic sense of humour (8.12, 9.10), and an Iberian background (6.18, 12.62). Further to this picture see Balland (2010: 14-21), who provides a convincing account for the portrait of Priscus presented above. He also employs a work by Plutarch (*De defectu oraculorum*), which is addressed to Terentius Priscus, to inform the links he creates between M.'s usages. Elsewhere see Vallat (2008: 63-4, 116, 483), who would separate the usage at 9.10, as he suggests that the reason Paula wishes to marry Priscus, is because he is old (and presumably rich). Finally, see the entries at 12.3 and 12.14 for further details.

---

<sup>14</sup> Shackleton Bailey's suggestion that the usage at 7.79.3 (*prisco consule*) could relate to Q. Peducaeus Priscus (consul in 93), is ignored in this list as it is purposefully ambiguous within its context. It would provide a further division, but it should be noted that it is a proposed emendation by Housman for *ipso*; see Galán Vioque (2002: 140-1).

**contumacissimae trienni desidia:** Cf. 10.70.1-2 *quod mihi vix unus toto liber exeat anno/ desidia tibi sum, docte Potite, reus*. As can be seen here, the only other usage of the noun *desidia*, the term features in a context of M.'s literary production and M. is likewise portrayed as arraigned for the crime of idleness: in this case for only publishing once per year. The occurrence of the cognate adjective *desidiosus* (1.107.2, 8.3.12, 12.29.2) also appears in circumstances concerned with M.'s poetical composition (1.107.2, 8.3.12). Nisbet (2015: 207 & 280) chooses to translate *desidia* colloquially as "sitting on my arse"; he notes that the cognate verb *desidere* can mean "to sit on the toilet". He is certainly right that the verb, in medical writings (e.g. Cels. 2.7 *cum voluntas desidendi est, venter nihil reddit* and Forcellini *desidere* 2) can distinguish such a meaning. It does, however, appear rather limited in its use and no such meanings are attributed to the noun by Forcellini; this does not, of course, disqualify Nisbet's suggestion, but definitely modifies it.

**trienni:** Sullivan (1991: 320-1) advances the following dates for the publication of Book 12: he believes that (presumably on the basis of this statement) it was first published in A.D. 101, he also argues (due to the inclusion of anachronistic epigrams in the current book) that a second edition must have been posthumously published in A.D. 104.<sup>15</sup> This suggests, as Sullivan (1991: 48) notes, that Book 10 (originally published in 95) would have been republished towards the end of 98. Although such dating is necessarily somewhat speculative, it is largely agreed (due to chronological clues within the epigram books and statements like the one above concerning the frequency of M.'s publication) that M. tended to publish on an annual basis: thus M. here feels it necessary to offer his excuses for the break from his custom.

**consequimur ut molesti potius quam ut officiosi esse videamur:** The sentiment and lexis is picked up and reworked in the fourth century; see Fletcher (1983: 411) citing Jerome *Ep.* 49.1 (*verebar ... ne ... si ... scriberem molestum me magis quam officiosum putares*).

**esse videamur:** The Ciceronian feel to this *clausula* is very obvious and suits the context admirably. For the cliché of the employment of *esse videatur* in orators' speeches around M.'s period, see Quintilian *Inst Or.* 10.2.18.3. M.'s prose style generally exhibits many Ciceronian traits, particularly his *clausulae*: for an analysis of his style see Havet (1903: 123-4) and for more recent discussion see Henriksén (2012: 3).

**quod civitatis ... quaero:** The use of *civitas* is here a metonym for the city of Rome; see Fenger (1906: 15). Its use is purposeful; it equates civilisation with Rome and, by implication, barbarity with Bilbilis. The tone and range of the verb *quaero* here is capably explained, with

---

<sup>15</sup> For further information on the dating of M.'s works see: Coleman (2005: 23-6).

a host of *exempla*, by Friedrich (1908: 630-1). Friedrich notes the pathetic, yearning sentiment the verb contains by contextualising it around 10.71.7 (which is found in the context of a son mourning the loss of both parents). Friedrich builds upon Frieländer's (1886: *ad loc.*) coupling of 10.71.7 and the usage in this preface, to include (among others) citations from Ovid's exile poetry (*Pont.* 1.8.29) and Roman epitaphs. In sum the verb, in the present context, is pathetically emotive and should be situated among such usages that exhibit a link with mourning and death.

**in alieno foro litigare:** The metaphor is striking for two reasons. First, it uses an institution (*forum*, here synonymous with law courts) associated with the height of civilisation to depict M.'s misery amid his barbarous environs. Secondly, it places M. as an effective stranger (*alienus*) in his hometown. It is not surprising that M. omits references to the law courts in his itemisation of the good life Rome provided. Elsewhere he presents the *fora*, and more specifically the *lites* conducted there, as an inherent nuisance that typifies the incommodities of life at Rome; on this point see Spaeth Jr. (1930: 20) who equates those epigrams of M. which concern the theme of hatred for Rome in preference to a rustic environment (e.g. 10.58, 10.70), with Virgil's (*Georg.* 2.502) depiction of the *insanum forum*. Despite M.'s portrayal here, Bilbilis was not a cultural backwater, like many such towns it possessed several civic amenities including a theatre, baths, a temple; for further on Bilbilis see Dolç (1953: 133-52) and Sullivan (1991: 179-84).

**dictavit auditor:** M. elsewhere often presents recitation as a vapid nuisance (e.g. 3.44, 4.41); other works with a comical bent likewise bemoan the tedium that such recitations provoke: *cf.* *Juv. Sat.* 1.1.1-6 and Horace's neat iunctura *auditor et ultor* (*Ep.* 1.19.39). Although *dictavit auditor* possesses a somewhat oxymoronic quality - especially if understood too literally - such recitals doubtless could be a source of much benefit to an artist. Pliny's letters provide ample evidence for a wide-spread and vibrant literary culture based upon mutual attendance at recitals and shared criticism of each aspiring or established writer's literary works. As evidence for the benefit of recitation see e.g. *Ep.* 5.12, where Pliny requests an intimate gathering of his friends to form a critical audience for a speech he is planning to publish, or *Ep.* 4.27 where he reports that for three consecutive days he has attended Augurinus' poetical recitals. Concerning the related matter of literary criticism see e.g. *Ep.* 3.15 in which Pliny's opinion of Proculus' poetry is solicited, or *Ep.* 4.14 where Pliny sends his own hendecasyllables to Paternus. In sum, although a recital lasting three days could be turned (and was indeed turned) to derisive disparagement, Pliny's letters, nevertheless, attest to a wide-spread enthusiasm for literary appreciation at Rome, whose absence M. may well have truly felt to be detrimental. It is to be noted that the only other uses of *auditor* in M. are found at 7.52.6 and 9.81.1 (*auditor et lector*); the use at 7.52 is comparable to the wider trope of this letter as Celer, the audience for M.'s epigrams, is presented as a judge, not a listener. Given the limited use of *auditor* and the marked use of

the Ovidian *lector* (26 usages), one may hypothesise that M.'s works were more often read than heard; this view should be somewhat qualified, however, since the 40 usages of *auris* afford many examples of the recitation of M.'s (and other poet's) works not limited to Rome. Even if M.'s epigrams supply ample evidence for a considerable reading culture, it is also clear that recitation was still widely practised.

**illam iudiciorum subtilitatem:** The noun *iudicium* is here a specialist term concerned with literary judgement and criticism; see Dickey (2016: 86) citing Dositheus (*iudicium est quo poemata ceteraque scripta perpendimus et discernimus*).

**bibliothecas, theatra, convictus:** The archaeological record is somewhat silent concerning the presence of libraries in the western half of the Roman empire; see Casson (2002: 118-23) There are only two definite examples from the environs of England, Spain, France, and North Africa; these are both found in North Africa (at Carthage in Tunisia and Timgad in Algeria respectively). Given the relative inconsequentiality of the town of Timgad, Casson (2002: 120) speculates that more surely existed, and even suggests Bilbilis, given its size and Martial's education prior to his arrival at Rome, as a likely location for a library. Of these three words *bibliothecae* receives infrequent treatment, whereas the other two are more prominent within M.'s work. There are 5 usages of the word *bibliotheca* (7.17.1 & 12, 9.0.3 12.0.11, 14.190.2). Excluding the present usage, the libraries referenced include Julius Martialis' private library at his villa (7.17), Stertinus' private library (9.0), and M.'s own library (14.190). Despite the limited references, the libraries at Rome (especially the Palatine library built by Augustus) would, of course, be a great loss to a poet. The use of *theatra* in M.'s work is often found as a setting for humorous societal commentary. A series of such poems is found in Book 5 on the theme of Domitian's reinvigoration of a law regulating seating arrangements (*Lex Roscia theatralis*), see e.g. 5.8. Finally, the importance of *convictus* as a theme in M.'s epigrams needs little explanation, given the predominance of the use of *amicitia* and the sympotic setting cultivated in the corpus; for the theme of social life in M.'s epigrams see Howell (2009: 73-91), Wolff (2008: 51-2), and, for the disparate society of readers for M.'s work, see Fitzgerald (2007: 139-66).

**ad summam omnium illa:** Although *omnia* may be deemed more natural - see Friedlaender (1886: *ad loc.*) for the suggestion and Shackleton Bailey (1989: *ad loc.*) for the emendation - both manuscript families supply *omnium*. Due to the weight of the evidence from the manuscripts and the fact that the phrase can be made to yield sense, no such correction need be applied. Beyond the comparable Ovidian equation of absence from Rome resulting in literary incompetence (see introduction), Woodman (1983: 82) notes that Juvenal S. 1.22 ff. (*contra* Horace) similarly stresses that urban life provides the themes and motives for the satirist's literary work.



**et unus aut alter mali, in pusillo loco multi:** For the power of even a single enemy to disturb a poet cf. Ovid *Ibis* 7-8 (*unus - et hoc ipsum est iniuria magna -*). In both Ovid and M. the enemy(s) remain unnamed.

**bonum stomachum:** For the use of the phrase in Latin literature, and its opposite (*malum stomachum*) see Salemme (1976: 20).

**studui paucissimis diebus:** Despite the fact that the use of *studere* with a phrase emphasising brevity could be felt to denote a neoteric attachment, the only clear parallel concerns soldiers building a bridge over the Rhine: Caesar *B.G.* 6.9 ... *magno militum studio paucis diebus*. Nevertheless, Pliny (*Ep.* 7.13) provides a usage of *studere*, likewise contrasted with idleness (*desidia*), which bears close comparison to the present context; for further on Pliny's letter see Fögen (2017: 29-30), who classifies the meiosis concerning the compositional technique and studied artlessness as "kunstvolle Kunstlosigkeit". Although it may well be a hyperbolic claim (cf. 7.85 which notes the difficulty involved in composing a book of epigrams) that serves M.'s deferential attitude towards Priscus and the lowliness of his genre, rapid composition is noted for other authors. Statius (*Silv. pr.* 1) states that much of his occasional poetry was written *in singulis diebus* and that no poem from Book 1 took more than two days (*nullum ... biduo longius*). Horace, in a well known criticism of Lucilius' slapdash composition, presents himself as unimpressed by such facilities (*Sat* 1.4.9-10 *nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos, / ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno*; see too *Sat.* 1.4.14-16). Finally Quintus Cicero is reputed to have written four tragedies in sixteen days whilst on leave at Gaul; see Duff (1958: xvi). At the opposite extreme a consummate poet like Virgil was reportedly a very slow and careful writer according to Donatus *Comm. Verg. (vita Vergiliana): Bucolica triennio, Georgica VII, Aeneida XI perfecit annis*. Further examples of lengthy and arduous composition would include Catullus' praise for Cinna's publication of his *Zyrrna*, which took nine years to complete (*Cat. C.* 95.1-2); elsewhere Statius is recorded to have devoted twelve years to his *Thebaid* and its revisions (cf. *Stat. Theb.* 12.811 and *Stat. Silv.* 4.7.26). Given the trivial associations that quick and easy composition could suggest M. here, even though adopting a lowly stance, tempers his meiosis with the inclusion of *studere*.

**adventoria sua:** The adjective *adventoria* has its substantive (*cena*) elided; the phrase refers to a banquet given for the arrival of a guest. The word is restricted to M.; Flavius Caper (2nd century) cautioned that it was a solecism and should be understood as *adventicia: de Verb. Dub.* 107 *adventicia caena, non adventoria*.<sup>16</sup> The phrase *adventicia*

---

<sup>16</sup> Note the archaic form *caena* (not *cena*) is printed here.

*cena* features elsewhere in Suetonius referring to a feast given to Vitellius (*Vit.* 13.2: *famosissima super ceteras fuit cena data ei adventicia a fratre*). This metaphorical dinner that M. offers Priscus serves as a signalled advertisement to Priscus' generous bestowal of an annual feast at the Saturnalia: see 12.62. This offer by M. of a metaphorical dinner to Priscus, who actually will provide a feast, could also be considered as a further use by M. of Catullus' *cenabis bene* theme (c. 13). M. engages with this Catullan poem on a number of other occasions: see 5.78, 10.48, 11.52 and Swann (1994: 68-9). For unusual words with the suffix *-orius* and their plebeian character in M.'s work see Salemme (1976: 18).

**de nugis nostris:** Cf. Cat. 1.3-4 ... *namque tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare nugas*. Among the Catullan commentators Fordyce (1961: 85) and Ellis (1889: 6) restrict the use to only encompass Catullus' short epigrams, whilst Quinn (1970: 89) argues that the word should be understood as "rubbish, junk", i.e. without the sense of denoting a literary genre. Fortunately Swann (1994: 47-55) provides an insightful examination of the use of *nugae* in Catullus and M. that tends to support the stance that Catullus used the term with reference to his minor works. Summarising his findings it can be noted that in M.'s twenty usages of the word *nugae* is sometimes placed in an overtly Catullan context and it frequently refers to M.'s minor genre of poetry (only 3.55,3 and 7.14.7 differ). Note too that the word picks up on the earlier neoteric meiosis that can be found in *libellus*. For the employment of *nugae* elsewhere in Latin literature see Fögen (2009: 33 & 36 n.26).

**nitore seposito:** *nidore*: β; *nitore*: γ; *candore*: Housman. Of the two options offered by the manuscripts *nitore* is by far the best option and there is no reason to adjust it as Shackleton Bailey (1989: *ad loc.*) has. The substantive *nitore* was understood by Housman as being inappropriate in its semantic range to logically promote the conclusion of the letter. Gilbert (1886: *ad loc.*) had already wrestled with this issue and chose to understand *nitore* as "Heiterkeit" (cheerfulness), an interpretation denied by Housman, but supported, as Bowie (1988: 29) details, by Quintilian *Inst.* 7.1.27. Thus, according to Gilbert's understanding, the phrase would be rendered: "put aside your good cheer (towards me) and judge my work ...". As Housman ruled out Gilbert's reasoning he was led, via the alternative reading *nidor*, to advance *candor* instead as a similar solution for a quality that an impartial critic ought to dispense with. Although Gilbert's solution is worthwhile and certainly could answer a perceived problem, it could be advanced that both Housman and Gilbert are not suitably appreciating the context. There is ultimately no reason to adjust the primary meaning of *nitore* ("brilliance") in this context. M. describes his own work in lowly terms (*nugae*) and is not requesting here that a masterpiece be sent back to Rome, rather a slightly less boorish, but still a provincial, production (*Hispaniensis liber*). Interpreted in these terms M. is saying that Priscus has no need of his literary excellence; instead he is politely asked to comment on M.'s trifles to prevent anything egregiously awful going to Rome. Of course this should be understood as an example of exaggerated meiosis on M.'s part. A further interesting idea

promoted by the use of *nitor* is the word's associations with the legal realm. Forcellini (*nitor* 6) notes that it often refers to the fine rhetoric of a lawyer, with the exception of Ovid *Ex Pont.* 2.2.49-50 (which is set in a legal context anyway - *nunc tibi et eloquii nitor ille domesticus adsit, / quo poteras trepidis utilis esse reis*). All the other examples cited are from works concerned with oratory: Cicero *Orat.* 32.115 (*sed quia sua sponte squalidiora sunt, adhibendus erit in his explicandis quidam orationis nitor*), Tacitus *Dial.* 20 (*nitor et cultus descriptionum*) and *Dial.* 23 (*summus nitor et cultus verborum*), Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.33 (*in digressionibus historico nonnumquam nitore uti*) and *Inst.* 12.10.36 (*orationem translationum nitore illuminare*). This interpretation is useful in a variety of ways: a) it supports the juridical theme that runs through the letter; b) it adds a subtle ambiguity to the phrase, which could be rendered “put aside that advocacy brilliance of yours and judge my work impartially”; c) it could also, if Priscus was a renowned advocate, serve as a complimentary acknowledgement of his skills. The use of *nitor* is largely indefensible and ultimately erroneous. Although its meaning (“smell”) betrays some logical connections with *nasus*, a term used for literary appreciation (e.g. 1.3, 12.88), no evidence is recorded for its use as a literary term.

**seposito:** For the use of *seponere* associated elsewhere in the corpus with M.'s work see 4.14.6 and 7.29.5.

**si ita decreveris:** The original purpose of such introductory letters was to request helpful criticism from a friend or patron; see Henriksén (2012: 4). As such we find Statius making similar appeals and ostensibly devolving the ultimate decision of publication to the addressee: see *Silv. pr.* 2.27-8 (Melior): ... *Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint, a te publicum accipiant; si minus, ad me revertantur; cf. pr.*4.34-5 (Marcellus): *hunc tamen librum tu, Marcelle, defendes, si videtur, hactenus sin minus, reprehendemur.*

**non ... sed:** The construction is reminiscent of the conclusion to many of M.'s pointed epigrams. Restricting the search to include only those epigrams that employ this rhetoric in the final line yields the following results: 1.41.20 (*non est Tettius ille, sed caballus*); 1.63.2 (*non audire, Celer, sed recitare cupis*); 1.66.14 (*non emere librum, sed silentium debet*); 2.46.10 (*quid metuis? non te, Naevole, sed tineas*); 3.21.2 (*non fuit haec domini vita, sed invidia*); 3.67.10 (*non nautas puto vos, sed Argonautas*); 3.71.2 (*non sum divinus, sed scio quid facias*); 6.22.4 (*non nubis, Proculina, sed fateris*); 6.70.15 (*non est vivere, sed valere vita est*); 6.75.4 (*has ego non mittam, Pontia, sed nec edam*); 9.56.12 (*non Libye faciat, sed tua Roma virum*); 10.55.7 (*non ergo est manus ista, sed statera*); 11.33.4 (*vicit nimirum non Nero, sed prasinus*); 11.92.2 (*non vitiosus homo es, Zoile, sed vitium*); 12.49.13 (*grandes - non pueros, sed uniones*); 12.89.2 (*non aures tibi sed dolent capilli*); 13.121.2 (*non tu, libertus sed bibat illa tuus*). From the above 17 examples 3.67.10 and 11.92.2 provide the most obvious parallels through their play on cognate words to support the point and the

placement of *sed* at the penultimate position followed by the cognate. It should be noted that the technique is more frequent in M. than the above restrictions suggest. If our search included the construction wherever it featured in a poem, the results would necessarily increase: e.g. 11.1.5 (*libros non legit ille, sed libellos*). Likewise if alternative negative constructions were admitted, this would also expand the findings: e.g. 11.27.14 (*nolo, sed his ut sit digna puella volo*); 12.40.6 (*“accipiam bene te.” nil volo: sed morere.*); or if an alternative adversative were supplied, the data would similarly accumulate: e.g. 2.7.7 (*nil bene cum facias, facias tamen omnia belle*). The important thing that all of the above betrays is that the rhetoric is of a piece with M.’s customary epigrammatic habits. Given the fact that elsewhere (Book 1 and Book 9) M. concludes his prose prefaces with a poem, this final statement, with some slight adjustments to accord with the metre, could easily (had M. so wished) have been fashioned into a neat choliambic line beginning with *Hispaniensem*, plus a delayed negative elsewhere in the opening clause, and concluding *sed Hispanum*. As it is, the letter ends with a rhythmical ending formed of a cretic and a trochee if the final syllable of *mittamus* is included.

**Hispaniensem ... Hispanum:** Cf. Vell. Pat. *Hist. Rom.* 2.51.3.6 (*non Hispaniensis natus, sed Hispanus*) and Flavius Sospiter Charisius (4th century) *Gramm. Lat.* 1.106 (*cum dicimus Hispanos, nomen nationis ostendimus; cum autem Hispaniensis, cognomen eorum qui provinciam Hispanam incolunt, etsi non sunt Hispani*). For details about the suffix *-ensis*, denoting a provincial attachment to Rome (albeit with some stray exceptions), see Arnold (1889: 201-2). It should be noted that although M. here worries that his *liber* may have gone native, no such fears accrue about his own origin. Elsewhere M. portrays himself as a thorough *Hispanus*, not a *Hispaniensis* (which features only here in M.’s work): cf. 10.65.7 (*Hispanis ego contumax capillis*). Beyond M.’s corpus, an Iberian origin is promoted and praised by other writers; cf. Isidore of Seville *de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum* 1.1 (*omnium terrarum, quaeque sunt ab occiduo usque ad Indos, pulcherrima es, o sacra, semperque felix principum, gentiumque mater Hispania*). The notion that a foreign book will necessarily be inferior to M.’s Roman books finds an earlier precedent in Book 3, written at Forum Cornelii (modern Imola): 3.1.5-6 (*plus sane placeat domina qui domina qui natus in urbe est; / debet enim Gallum vincere verna liber*). The personification of the book, here hinted at, will be later developed in the travelling book device which will be treated in the commentaries to epigrams 2 and 5. Although M.’s concern for a Spanish dominance to the book should not be taken as a serious concern on his part, it is known from the *Historia Augusta* that the *Hispaniensis* (*Hist. Aug.* 1.1) emperor Hadrian was mocked for his provincialisms in a speech delivered in the senate: *Hist. Aug.* 3.1. Cf. 1.65, in which M. is mocked for his pronunciation of *ficus*. Comparable concerns are to be found later in the third century with Septimius Severus’ consciousness of his own African accent (*Hist. Aug.* 19.9) and his embarrassment concerning his sister’s linguistic limitations (*Hist. Aug.* 15.7: *cum soror sua Leptitana ad eum venissent vix Latine loquens, ac de illa multum imperator erubesceret ... redire mulierem in patriam praecepit*). Contrariwise, fears were earlier voiced

about Roman troops stationed at Spain becoming Hispanised and consequently useless to Rome; see Curchin (1991: 97), who cites his evidence from Caesar *B.C.* 1.44 and 1.86 and *Bell. Alex.* 53. On the same theme, note too Cicero's censure of Spanish barbarisms (*Arch.* 26 *Cordubae natis poetis, pingue quiddam sonantibus atque peregrinum*). Apologies for foreign elements creeping into one's works are to be found elsewhere in Latin literature; e.g. Apul. *Met.* 1.1 (*modo si papyrum Aegyptiam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam non spreveris inspicere*), later in the same section (*Met.* 1.1) Apuleius notes his work is a melding of a Greek tale to the Latin tongue (*fabulam Graecinam*). The detection of alien diction (provincialisms, Italian dialects) is frequently explored in other Latin writers: e.g. Catullus' Transpadane language and character (see Fordyce, 1961: ix-xiv), or Livy's Patavine elements. Beyond literary or cultural concerns, it is to be noted that a lack of proficiency in the Latin language could place one outside the jurisdiction of Roman law and, in consequence, effectively nullify any civilian status; see Dickey (2017: 3) on the frequent occurrence of two versions of the same will, written in Greek and Latin respectively, in the Eastern part of the empire (the Latin version being required to render the will valid). Finally if one considers Books 1-12 as a deliberately conceived twelve-volume construction the concern for a thematic or linguistic alteration, here expressed, could be compared to M.'s statement in the preface to Book 1 which states that priggish readers may object to the use of (coarse) Latin: *in nulla pagina Latine loqui fas sit*.

## 12.1

*Text:*                Retia dum cessant latratoresque Molossi,  
                              et non invento silva quiescit apro,  
                              otia, Prisce, brevi poteris donare libello.  
                              Hora nec aestiva est nec tibi tota perit.

*Translation:* While the nets and the barking Molossians are idle and the forest is at peace without a discovered boar, you, Priscus, will be able to give your leisure to my short booklet. The hour is not summer's nor will you lose all of it.

### Structure and Content

The epigram is broadly bipartite in its construction. The opening couplet establishes a setting (*silva*), and a theme (hunting). The environment can be viewed in a programmatic manner as it provides some sense of a *locus amoenus* not only for Priscus but also for the general reader, who is about to begin this work. It is to be noted that the depiction of the forest is merely hinted at through the context of hunting and the peacefulness betrayed by the verbs (*cessant* and *quiescit*), nevertheless it serves to establish a more pleasant setting and distances the reader from the rather rude setting of Bilbilis traced out in the introduction. Thus this initial epigram allows an effective break in the bitter tone established in the preface, despite the fact that the same addressee (Priscus) is retained.<sup>17</sup> The next line (line 3) acts as a bridge between the opening couplet and the concluding line. It supplies the addressee (Priscus) and suggests that the theme ought to be adjusted from hunting to literature. M. offers a concession to his addressee's tastes by suggesting that both themes can be undertaken simultaneously. The description of his work as a *brevis libellus* implies that it is small enough to be included amid Priscus' hunting pursuits, it also suggests, again in programmatic fashion to the general reader, that the work will be in conformity to Alexandrian standards of poetry; see *brevi ... libello* entry. The final line (line 4) can be read in two ways, dependent upon how *hora* is interpreted. If *hora* is viewed as a division of the day ("an hour"), the conclusion is consequently characterised by *meiosis*; it suggests that M.'s book is so insubstantial that it can be read in less than an hour. Here the *hora*, which is defined as not set in the summertime, should be considered as a winter's hour, the season which supplied the shortest *horae*. Alternatively, if the *hora* is interpreted as a "season", the epigram would be making a grand claim about the book's worth and relevance. It would thus

---

<sup>17</sup> The view that the tone established in the initial poem somewhat severs its connections to the preface is to be stressed; contrast this with Bowie (1988: *ad loc.*) who tends to view the poem as a seamless continuation of the preface. He notes that the initial poem, sometimes an attached poem, after M.'s other prose prefaces betray close associations to the specific themes or concerns of the preface itself. This is, of course, true and the coincidence of addressee and perhaps a Spanish location marks a union in this case; but there are also important distinctions that require emphasis.

be understood as “it is not the summer season nor will you waste all of it (if you read my book)”. Here M. claims that his work is so dense in the quality of its content that almost nine months would be taken to appreciate its worth. This poem’s tone, with its Alexandrian pretensions and its use of *meiosis* coupled with boastfulness, finds a suitable precedent in the introductory poem to Catullus’ work (C. 1), the poet whom M. frequently imitates.

Taking a closer look at the content, it is apparent that rhythm establishes a distinction between the themes of hunting and literature in this epigram. The overall feel of the initial couplet, which treats the theme of hunting, is rather slow and stately. The final hemistich of the initial line is taken up with the rather grand and periphrastic phrase *latratoresque Molossi*. The initial hemiepes of the pentameter provides, through its spondaic tone, a heavy staccato feel. It could be felt that the use of *Molossi* anticipates the following spondees, not in the form of a trisyllabic *molossus* but through two monosyllables and a prepositional prefix. The slow pace established is reinforced by the meaning conveyed through the verbs *cessant* (line 1) and *quiescit* (line 2); there is also quite a marked assonance on the letter “o”, which could be felt to convey the bored irritation of the hunter frustrated in his sport. Thus the opening two lines distinguish the noble activity of hunting and also mark a lull in the proceedings. However, the next line, which concerns M.’s presentation of his book to Priscus, lightens the tone through its three initial dactyls. The rhythm here seems to impress upon Priscus’ mind that M.’s poetry will form a welcome relief to such periods of inactivity. It is to be noted that the initial word *otia* seems purposefully anticipated in the opening couplet; it audibly echoes the initial word of the poem (*retia*) and picks up on the assonance of the letter “o” already discussed, as well as continuing the theme of relaxation which can be detected in the verbs *cessant* and *quiescit*. The concluding line does not add much to a structural appreciation of the poem, beyond the fact that the coupling of *nec* in each hemiepes marks the bipartite nature of the themes treated in the poem as a whole.

For an analogue to this poem, again a programmatic work from a minor genre addressed to a (reportedly busy and important) patron, cf. Phaedrus *Fab. 3 pr. 1-5* (*Phaedri libellos legere si desideras, / vaces oportet, Eutyche, a negotiis, / ut liber animus sentiat vim carminis. / “verum” inquis “tanti non est ingenium tuum, / momentum ut horae pereat officiis meis.”*).

## Themes

The use of *cessant* (line 1) and *quiescit* (line 2) is somewhat ambiguous; they could signify a period of inactivity during the hunt or denote a timeframe which lies outside the hunting season. The earlier commentators tended to interpret 12.1 as being set outside the hunting season, and consequently placed the poem (and Book 12 by extension) within the period of spring or autumn; winter is ruled out due to its association with boar-hunting. Farnaby (1605: *ad loc.*) can be employed as a shorthand for this understanding: *dum cessat venandi*

*studium per anni tempus videtur fuisse ver vel autumnus horae enim neque aestivae et aprorum venationi inservit hyems.*<sup>18</sup> To support the contention of a spring or autumn setting the use of *pulverulenta* at 12.5(2).2 is noted by such commentators. The use of poems within Book 12 to advance a specified season is strewn with problems, since no consistent picture emerges (e.g. 12.60 is set in March, 12.62 in December). As this is the case the employment of other epigrams within the book offers little support for the issue raised by these commentators. Nevertheless, the internal evidence of the poem itself can logically promote this understanding. It is, however, possible to interpret the poem as being set during a hunt. This is the way in which both the *Loeb* editors - Ker (1919) and Shackleton Bailey (1993) - view the poem. They strengthen their case by coupling it with certain letters of Pliny (*Ep.* 1.6 & 5.18), which attest to the fact that literary men tended to take or compose literature with them while hunting. Given this possibility they would interpret the concluding line's instance of *hora* - like Friedländer (1886: *ad loc.*) had earlier insisted - as appropriate to winter, which was the season with the shortest hours.

A second issue that the epigram supplies concerns the relative respectability of the pastimes engaged in. It could be advanced that there is a minor subversion in the coupling of habits that a traditional Roman conservatism would frown upon: hunting and *otium*. Their association with Priscus ("Mr. Ancient") is in consequence subtly amusing. For Roman views on hunting for pleasure being deemed an Eastern practice in origin and for suggestions that the early Romans did not hunt for pleasure see Anderson (1985: 83-101) and Green (1996: 222-60); for the pejorative sense of *otium* in Roman literature, particularly Catullus 51, see Woodman (1966: 217-26), Laidlaw (1968: 42-52), and, for an extensive treatment of the positive and negative associations of *otium*, André (1962). Although evidence can be supplied to demonstrate that such hobbies were viewed in a negative fashion, both can also be defended as perfectly respectable. Howell's (1980: 328-9) note on 1.107.3 shows that by M.'s period, the associations of *otium* need not contain any stigma, but could instead identify the gentlemanly pursuits of a cultured man rather than the agricultural or business pursuits of the *bourgeoisie*. A similar and much more topical defence could be made of the rôle of hunting in the new Trajanic period. Mandaraki (2012) has argued that Pliny's *Panegyricus* offers a strong defence of Trajan's favourite pastime to counter any Roman feelings that criticise hunting as an Eastern self-indulgence. If one accepts Mandaraki's arguments that Pliny is praising the virtues of hunting for Trajan's benefit, the opening cycle's foregrounding of the fellow Spaniard and hunt-enthusiast Priscus serves as a neat way to foreshadow the later references to Trajan and lobbies favourably for a potential defect in Trajan's character. By extension it could also be argued that, in some sense, Priscus here represents an effective (and approachable) foil for the character of Trajan. As it stands the epigram

---

<sup>18</sup> It may be worth noting that Gallet (1701: *ad loc.*) differs in his interpretation. He opts for an autumn or early winter time period: *Hinc librum Prisco oblatum fuisse vel extremo autumnno, aut brumae tempore prae nimio calore facile defatigatur lector.*



contains the mere trace of characteristics that may affront a specific commitment to some old-fashioned values, nothing more.

**1. retia:** The list of hunting elements involving nets, dogs, and a boar is conventional; *cf.* Ovid *R. A.* 201-4. It is assumed here, as with Bowie (1988: *ad loc.*), that the nets are specific to the boar hunt and not employed for other animals or birds; for the hunting nets used to trap boars see Aymard (1951: 210-2).

**cessant:** The verb is here used as a zeugma with both an animate (*latratorisque Molossi*) and an inanimate (*retia*) subject. The verb offers a range of associations from rest and relaxation to ineffective failure. As such it could suggest that Priscus is frustrated in his exploits from poor equipment, beyond the obvious sense that the dogs and nets are at rest due to the boar's absence. For the verb's heavy association with *otium* (line 3) see Forcellini *cesso A.*

**latratorisque Molossi:** The phrase is suggestive of the epic genre; *latrator* is found elsewhere only at Virg. *Aen.* 8.698 (*latrator Anubis*), Ovid *Met.* 9.690 (*latrator Anubis*), Quint. *Inst. Or.* 12.9.12 (*in rabulam latratoremque*), and Sil. It. *Pun.* 2.444 (*latratorque Cydon*). Beyond M.'s use, it is only in Silius' reference to Cretan dogs that the noun is properly found employed with canines. The use of *Molossi* is found elsewhere in M. at 0.33(29 *prius* 30).1 (*veloces ... Molossos*); in both M.'s usages and the five of Statius (see *Theb.* 3.203; 3.475; 8.201; *Silv.* 2.6.19; *Ach.* 1.747) the word is found at the conclusion of the line. For the Molossian dog's origin in Epirus and its function as both a watchdog and a hunter see Aymard (1951: 251-4) and Coleman (2006: 245-6). As the dogs here will be used to hunt boar *cf.* 11.69 (an epitaph to a dog slain by a boar in the amphitheatre).

**2. apro:** The boar is frequently found in M.'s work, in total there are 41 instances (0.17(15).2, 0.32(28, *prius* 27).4, 1.43.2 & 9 & 12 & 13 & 14, 1.49.24, 1.104.7, 3.13.2, 3.50.8, 3.77.2, 3.82.20, 4.66.5, 5.65.2, 7.2.4, 7.20.4, 7.27.1 & 10, 7.59.1, 7.78.3, 8.22.1, 9.14.3, 9.48.5 & 8 & 12, 9.57.11, 9.88.11, 9.101.6, 10.45.4, 11.69.9, 12.1.2, 12.14.10, 12.17.4, 12.48.1, 13.93.0, 13.94.1, 14.30.1, 14.31.2, 14.71(70).2, 14.221.2). The most important reference for the present usage is at 12.14.10; there Priscus is requested to hunt boar instead of coursing hare on horseback for his own safety. Given the social context of M.'s work a vast majority of these instances (25 in total), concern the boar's supreme and sumptuous status as part of a fine menu; *cf.* e.g. 12.17.4. It is to be noted that often in M. (in accordance with his humour), the excellent quality of the boar as a meat is undermined in some fashion (e.g. 3.50.8), or it is used as a hook in a context of *captatio* (e.g. 9.48.5). When found in a hunting context the boar is either hunted in an amphitheatre (0.17(15).2, 0.32(28, *prius* 27).4, 11.69.9) or in Bilbilis (1.49.24, 12.1.2). For further on boar hunting see MacKinnon (2014: 206-11). As this

poem notes a transition from hunting to M.'s own literature, the usage at 10.45.4 should be highlighted. In 10.45.4 M. compares the quality of his own work to the supreme status of the Laurentine boar as a menu option.

**3. otia:** The noun *otium* is found 17 times in M.'s work and its cognate adjective *otiosus* 10 times. The broad analysis that Segal (1970) supplies for the use of *otium* in the works of Catullus and Ovid has relevance to M. also; Segal suggests that not only does *otium* set the aesthetic tone for minor (particularly erotic) poetry but it also signifies an exclusionary retreat from public life. In M.'s work consequently *otium* is usually something bestowed by, or anticipated from, a powerful patron; the use at 12.4(5).3 demonstrates this usage admirably: the busy emperor, who himself is too busy to enjoy *otium*, nevertheless furnishes it for the people at large to enjoy; see the entry to 12.4(5).3 for a fuller discussion. In the present usage it will be noted that it is not the client, but the patron who is at rest and M. needs to provide work to fill his patron's spare time.

**Prisce:** For details on Priscus see the lemma entries in 12 *pr.*, 12.3(4).3, and 12.14.2.

**brevi ... libello:** The use of *brevis* with *libellus* is a coinage of M.'s; *cf.* 1.45.1, 12.11.7 (see too 2.1.4 *brevior ... mihi charta perit*, and 12.4(5).2). The phrase is found later in *Hist. Aug. Treb. Poll.* 1.2 (*libellum ... brevem*) and, with slight adjustment, *Hist. Aug. Flav. Vop. Syr. Prob.* 24.7 (*in alio libro, et quidem brevī*). The usage, however, cannot lay claim to originality as it is merely a reworking of the more familiar *parvus libellus / parvus liber*; *cf.* (for *parvus libellus*) Cic. *In Verr.* 2.2.184, Ovid *A.A.* 3.206, M. 10.20(19).1-2 and (for *parvus liber*) Ovid *Tr.* 1.1.1, M. 1.3.2, 3.5.2. It is also further noted that both *libellus* and *brevis* allude to the conventional lexicon of Alexandrian poetry, which predominantly informed much of Roman poetry subsequent to the neoterics. For the use of *brevis*, with reference to scale, and *libellus*, with reference both to the scale and the content of poetry, in the works of Catullus and Horace see Crowther (1978: 40-2).<sup>19</sup> Thus the central concern cultivated here, in the programmatic initial epigram, is to establish the Alexandrian character of the book. It also, of course, utilises *meiosis* to falsely proclaim the work's trivial nature beyond its scope.

The terms *liber* (used 61 times) and *libellus* (used 117 times) in M.'s work have generated a certain amount of attention, concerning any possible distinction to be noted. Sage (1919) was among the first to analyse the potential differences. Initially he found that *libellus* betrayed little distinction; the word could be used to denote a book, like *liber* (*cf.* e.g. 5.2.5), a shortened volume, as distinct from a *liber* (*cf.* e.g. 10.1.2), or indeed a single epigram (10.20(19).2). Given the range which the word *libellus* denotes in M.'s work, Sage hit upon

---

<sup>19</sup> Crowther notes that Catullus did not employ *brevis*, but the synonym *parvus* is found in such Alexandrian contexts in both Horace and Catullus.

the notion that the use of *libellus* may well indicate that the poems were not originally composed in the form we now possess, but sent as individual (smaller) units to respective patrons. The nucleus of this idea forms the “*libellus* theory” which White (1974) later advocates, when he speculates upon the original dissemination of M.’s epigrams and Statius’ *Silvae*. White’s promotion of the “*libellus* theory” has been quite influential in several scholarly works on M., e.g. it heavily informs Nauta’s (2002) investigation of M.’s and Statius’ work, which is examined through the lens of patronage. If White’s interpretation were accepted, the present epigram could be seen as the initial poem of a short series of epigrams especially composed for Priscus (terminating, perhaps, with 12.14 to form a ring composition on the theme of hunting); it would, of course, also impact on the reader’s interpretation of the preface addressed to Priscus, particularly the statement that M. worked for a few days to complete the work (*studui paucissimis diebus*). There are, however, reasons to be sceptical with respect to White’s approach. If the “*libellus* theory” is applied, it does rather undermine the structural integrity and compositional technique of the *liber* as a whole. Given the care with which M. composed and arranged his books, such a haphazard method of assembling his poetry seems somewhat alien; this is the principal reason why critics such as Holzberg (2004 / 2005 & 2012) and his pupil Lorenz (2002 & 2004), who both place particular emphasis upon the composition and arrangement of M.’s books, reject White’s theory. Secondly, the theory ignores, by its overly literal interpretation of a *libellus*, the Alexandrian associations that are traced above. Finally, it is noted that M., like Pliny (*cf. Ep. 1.1* and Fögen’s notion of “*kunstvolle Kunstlosigkeit*”, 2017: 28), sometimes deliberately draws attention, in a deeply understated and ultimately false manner, to the careless assembly of his work and suggests that the reader may omit any poems he chooses, in order to form his own book (*cf. 10.1, 14.2, et al.*). Despite these reservations, White’s theory is not to be rejected out of hand since it can, as Nauta has shown, still be profitably, albeit not conclusively, employed to investigate M.’s work.

Finally, it may be worth noting that the use of *brevi* here anticipates the ambiguous use of *hora* at the conclusion. The word could either be interpreted as an adjective qualifying *libello* (= to a small little book), or, alternatively, it could be used as a substantive in the ablative case to denote a time-frame; see *OLD brevis* 6. This use of *brevi* would suggest either that Priscus could read the book quickly (“Priscus give leisure to the book *for a short time*”) or that he could read it after his hunting trip (“Priscus give leisure to the book *soon*”).

**4. hora:** There are 29 occurrences of the noun in M. (1.86.4, 1.108.9, 1.113.3, 2.1.5, 2.67.3, 3.36.5, 3.67.6, 3.100.1, 4.8.1 & 7, 4.73.1, 5.80.1, 8.7.2, 8.67.1, 8.81.9, 9.59.21, 10.5.10, 10.20.19, 10.38.4, 10.44.6, 10.48.3, 10.74.5, 11.29.4, 11.49.1, 11.73.2, 11.77.2, 11.79.1, 12.1.4, 12.18.14). Of these usages, four stand out as of relevance to this poem. At 1.113.3, M. provides directions for his bookseller, if the reader wishes to spend good hours poorly (*male ... bonas ... horas*) perusing his work. In 2.1.5, M. notes that Book 2 is so short that

the copyist completes the work within an hour (*una hora*). At 5.80.1, Severus is requested to provide less than an hour (*non totam horam*), in order to read M.'s book. Finally in 10.20(19).19, the epigram addressed to Pliny is forewarned not to disturb him until evening and the drinking hour, the appropriate time for light verse (*haec hora est tua, cum furit Lyaeus*). Elsewhere in 4.8.7 M. recommends that the tenth hour is appropriate for reading. The notion that a reader will not want to dedicate too long to M.'s poetry is a frequent trope and not just limited to these references; cf. e.g. 4.89 with Moreno Soldevila (2006: 543). Finally, the use of *hora* here may be contrasted with the declaration that M. hasn't produced any work for three years (12. *pr.*), after such a long delay the reader may expect a *magnum opus*, instead it is a work that will take less than an hour to read.

**tota:** The use is confirmed by the analogous use of 5.80.1 (cited above). Although most *apparatus critici* omit the fact, two stray manuscripts - cited in Schneidewin (1842: *ad loc.*) - record *charta* instead. This reading is perhaps suggested due to 2.1.4 (*brevior quod mihi charta perit*) and could also be influenced by 6.64.23 (*scribere versiculos miseras et perdere chartas*). Although it should not obscure the reading of *tota*, the use of *charta* is not insensible. It would, as well as chiming with *libello* (line 3), note an association with the next poem addressed to Priscus 12.3(4).4 (*charta anus*). If employed it could suggest that the work is so small that there will be little paper used or, if the poetry written on it does not please, there will be paper to spare for Priscus to use for notes or his own poetry while hunting; cf. the welcome gift of blank pages by a poet in 14.10 and the use of *aversa charta* at 8.62.1, where Picens uses the back sheets of paper to compose his own poetry.

**perit:** The verb is used 33 times in M.'s work (1.18.7, 1.21.2, 1.45.1, 1.99.18, 1.113.6, 2.1.4, 2.34.2, 2.64.5, 2.92.4, 3.19.8, 4.63.3, 5.20.13, 5.25.12, 5.49.13, 5.52.8, 5.60.7, 5.64.6, 5.76.4, 7.33.4, 7.51.8, 8.69.4, 9.82.1 & 6, 10.58.8, 10.77.2, 11.24.9, 11.97.2, 12.1.4, 12.18.26, 12.50.6, 14.17.2, 14.49.1, 14.172.2). From these usages the following stand out as significant here. The verb is used five times in a reference to M.'s literature. At 1.45.1 M. suggests that he will bulk out his book with repetitious content rather than have his work perish through being insignificant, in 1.113.6 M. records that even his juvenalia will not perish since the bookseller Valerianus still sells copies; at 2.1.4 M. records that a small book is good as it wastes less paper; in 7.51.8 M. boasts that no page in his book perishes as Urbicus recites the whole corpus from memory; in 11.24.9 M. complains that his constant attendance upon his patron Labullus has caused hosts of poems, which could have been written in the time spent, to perish. A further association with poets and the verb *perire* is noted in 8.69.4. Here M. criticises the antiquarian tastes of his time that saw fit to limit praise to dead poets alone; he suggests that at this price the praise is not worth cultivating. There are also three instances where the verb *perire* is found in a temporal context (2.64.5, 5.20.13, 10.58.8); elsewhere *perire* is linked with *hora* at Prop. 4.8.4, Quint. *Declam. Maior.* 8.13.12; 9.20.16; 13.15.8, there is also a similar use with *perdere* at Pliny *Ep.* 3.5.16. Finally

it can be briefly noted that it is somewhat amusing that in the context of a hunting poem the only thing that perishes will be Priscus' time, when reading M.'s book; it is also notable (especially if any credence is given to *charta*, see above) that the verb (formed from *ire*) anticipates the movement that characterises the next poem's "travelling book" motif.

### 12.2(3)

*Text:* Ad populos mitti qui nuper ab urbe solebas  
ibis io Romam, nunc peregrine liber,  
auriferi de gente Tagi tetricique Salonis,  
dat patrios amnes quos mihi terra potens.  
non tamen hospes eris nec iam potes advena dici,           5.  
cuius habet fratres tot domus alta Remi.  
iure tuo veneranda novi pete limina templi,  
reddita Pierio sunt ubi tecta choro.  
vel si malueris, prima gradiere Subura;  
atria sunt illic consulis alta mei:                           10.  
laurigeros habitat facundus Stella penatis,  
clarus lantheae Stella sititor aquae;  
fons ibi Castalius vitreo torrente superbit,  
unde novem dominas saepe bibisse ferunt:  
ille dabit populo patribusque equitique legendum,       15.  
nec nimium siccis perleget ipse genis.  
quid titulum poscis? versus duo tresve legantur,  
clamabunt omnes te, liber, esse meum.

*Translation:* You, who were recently accustomed to be sent from the city to the nations, look! you shall go to Rome, now a foreign book, from the country of gold-bearing Tagus and stern Salo, my native rivers which a powerful land grants to me. You shall not, however, be a guest and you are no longer able to be called a stranger, you whose brothers so many lofty homes of Remus possesses. As it is your right, seek the venerable thresholds of the new temple, where their building has been restored to the Pierian chorus. Or if you prefer, step on the Subura first; there are the lofty halls of my consul: eloquent Stella dwells in his laurelled home, illustrious Stella, the drinker of lanthis' water; there the Castalian spring will be splendid with its glassy torrent, from where the nine mistresses are said to have often drunk. He will provide you to the public, the senators and the equestrian class to be read, nor will he himself read you through with excessively dry cheeks. Why do you require a title? Let two or three verses be read and all will shout that you, book, are mine.

#### Content and Structure

The epigram can be divided into four sections. The first section (ll. 1-4) is set in Spain and shows, via its apostrophe to the *liber*, that the poem will treat the travelling-book motif. In the first couplet M. notes that, contrary to his former habits, he now sends his work from a provincial setting to Rome; cf. 12.5(2). The second couplet emphasises M.'s homeland at

Bilbilis. M. describes Bilbilis chiefly through its rivers, the Tagus and Salo. Through the epithets used to describe the rivers, a certain ambiguity with reference to his homeland can be detected; pride is shown at its strength and resources (*auriferi*: l. 3, *terra potens*: l. 4), but there is also stress on the rustic seriousness of his environs (*tetrici*: l. 3, *terra potens*: l. 4). As such the adjectives may hint at feelings made explicit elsewhere (12 *pr.*). The next section (ll. 5-8) is set in Rome and here M. reassures the book that it will receive a pleasant reception. The book is informed that the rest of its siblings will welcome it at Rome (l. 6), consequently the *peregrine liber* (l. 2) is transformed into a rightful inhabitant of the city (*non ... hospes ... nec ... advena*: l. 5). Beyond familial recognition the book is also promised admittance to a public library (ll. 7-8); thus the book can anticipate both a career and kinship at Rome. The third section (ll. 9-16) offers the book an alternative reception in Rome at the Subura, under the protection of Stella. In this section the rôle of the book recedes somewhat in order to allow congratulations to be bestowed upon Stella, the true (veiled) addressee of the poem. Stella is initially congratulated on his assumption of the consulship (ll.10-11); this serves not only to magnify Stella, but also to praise Trajan for Stella's appointment. After celebrating Stella's political success, attention then turns to his poetical abilities (ll. 12-14). The final couplet in this section returns the focus to M.'s work. A request for Stella to support and read M.'s book is not made directly, the friendship between the pair is so strong that it can be assumed that Stella will do both of his own volition. The final section (ll. 17-8) repeats the direct address to the book at the start of the poem (*liber*: l. 18) and serves to assure the general reader that, despite M.'s retirement in Bilbilis, his book will retain the character of his works at Rome, and not pursue an alternative artistic direction.

A number of points can be made to distinguish the singularity of this epigram; these points concern the poem's length, rhythm, and diction. The singular nature of 12.2(3) is to be contrasted to the sentiment of the concluding couplet and the noticeable sphragis (*meum*: l. 18). It could be suggested that the rather epigrammatic conclusion represents the only verses in the poem that are generic to and typical of M.'s poetry. Thus the use of *versus duo* at the conclusion may be felt as a humorous nod to this distinction. The length of M.'s epigrams receives fuller treatment in the commentary to 12.18 (see the introduction); it is enough to remark here that a poem of 18 lines in M.'s epigrams represents a lengthy poem; although M.'s epigrams tend to be longer than earlier Greek epigrams the average length of a poem in books 1-12 is still only 7.4 lines. This point can be further corroborated by observing that M. tends to favour different metres (hendecasyllable or choliamb) for more lengthy poems. There are only 20 elegiac epigrams (including the present poem) of 18 lines or more in M.'s corpus. There are also certain noticeable metrical peculiarities, the most prominent being the pronounced dactylic rhythm of the hexametric lines. By noting Giarratano's (1908: 8) statistics for the use of spondees and dactyls in M.'s hexameters the following trend emerges, equal number of spondees and dactyls: 43.74%, spondaic lines: 33.77%, dactylic lines: 22.49%. By using Platnauer's (1951: 36-7) statistics on the Roman elegists, M.'s typical hexametric rhythm is closest to Tibullus'. In 12.2(3), however, the

hexametric lines are heavily distinguished by their dactylic nature (six dactylic, no spondaic, three equal lines). A total of 66.6% of dactylic lines is striking enough, but if the final, strikingly epigrammatic, couplet is removed, there are six dactylic lines and only two equal lines among the hexameters, making a total of 75% dactylic hexametric lines. Given the prevalence of Ovidian intertextuality (see below) and the function of the elegist Stella in the poem, it might be entertained that M. is purposefully aping the elegiac style of Stella and Ovid. The dactylic feel to Ovidian verse is well-known; see e.g. Platnauer (*op. cit.*) for statistics. Beyond the basic dactylic feel to the poem, further metrical peculiarities include the enjambement from the pentameter to the hexameter in line 3, the trochaic *caesurae* in the 4th and 5th foot of line 1 (for the unusual nature of this device in M. see Giarratano 1908: 24), the hepthemimeral *caesurae* in lines 3 and 7, and the linked dactylic couplets evident in lines 7-8 and 13-4. Finally, certain phrases can be isolated which betray associations to the phraseology of higher genres of poetry; chief among which are *domus alta Remi* (l. 6), *Pierio ... choro* (l. 8), *lantheae ... sititor aquae* (l. 12), and *fons Castalius* (l. 13). When all of the above is considered and attention is paid to the frequency with which M.'s longer poems note a generic alteration (see 12.18 introduction), it may be suspected that M. is here mimicking the elegiac style of his friend Stella.

Further details of the poem that should be briefly noted are the pronounced intertextuality with Ovid *Tr.* 1.1, pointedly at the start and conclusion of the poem (see *liber peregrine* entry), and intratextual reference points to 12.18 (see 12.18 introduction) and 12.11 (through the association of the Boeotian springs and the poetical abilities of the respective addressees, Stella and Parthenius). Although traced out more fully in the entries below it may also be noted that the use of water in this poem is pronounced and betrays a diminishing scale. Although the poem begins with the Bacchic cry *io* (l. 2) it is water rather than wine that is predominant; for the distinction between wine and water in a context of poetic inspiration see 12.11. In this poem water is first attested by the mighty rivers in Spain (ll. 3-4), water next emerges in Stella's urban spring from which he drinks in order to gain poetic inspiration (ll. 12-4), finally water is referenced by the tears Stella will shed upon reading M.'s work (l. 16). This theme is to be contrasted to M.'s usual employment of water to note a substance which can usefully be employed to delete his shoddy epigrams; cf. e.g. 3.100 and 9.58. The theme of water is also complemented by a similar emphasis upon light in the epigram, which is purposefully used to acknowledge Stella; cf. *clarus* (l. 12), *vitreo* and *superbit* (l. 13). There is also a pronounced focus upon buildings or structures which may offer shelter and accommodation to M.'s book; see *domus alta Remi* (l. 6), *veneranda novi ... limina templi* (l. 7), *tecta* (l. 8), *atria ... alta* (l. 10), *laurigeros ... penatis* (l. 11).

**1-2. nuper... nunc:** For the similar usage of two temporal adverbs noting the contrast between the former dissemination of M.'s works (from Rome out to the empire at large) and



the present publication (from the empire to Rome) see 12.5(2).1-2 (*modo... iam* entry). For *nuper... nunc* used in conjunction elsewhere by M. see 1.47.1, 7.61.10, 12.15.8-9.

**2. *ibis ... nunc*:** Although not the case here, the verb *ire* is often found in the imperative with the adverb *nunc* in Latin literature; see Lease (1898: 59-69, esp. 65-6 for M.'s instances).

***io*:** The interjection features six times in M.'s work (5.25.3 & 4, 7.6.7, 8.4.1, 11.2.5, 11.36.2, 12.2(3).2). There is also a disputed reading at 0.34(30, *prius* 28).10 (*dives, Caesar, io, praestitit unda tibi*, which is found in Shackleton Bailey's text as *id dives, Caesar, praestitit unda tibi*). The exclamation features elsewhere in a context involving the wider empire focusing upon Italy generally, or Rome particularly; such usages, however, occur with reference to the emperor. At 7.6.7 Rome uses the ritual cry in anticipation of Domitian's successful return from his campaigns abroad; in 8.4.1 the interjection features in a context of the empire offering vows to the emperor on Latin altars. Elsewhere the jubilant Bacchic tones of the cry are noted when it is used in reference to the Saturnalia (11.2.5) or with respect to a celebration for the recovery of a friend from illness (11.36.2). Although the use of the exclamation with reference to a book is striking, the present example (given the book's animation) can be compared to those instances of *io* addressed to a person, rather than a divinity; see *OLD io* c. For the disputed quantity of *io* see Postgate (1923: 38-9 & 46). It should also be noted that this use of euphoria in M.'s work tends to feature in poems towards the outset of the book. This can be contrasted with the use of *ohe* in Book 4 (4.89.1 & 9), where M. reins his book in and overtly signals its close.

***peregrine liber*:** The phrase emphasises an intertextual re-interpretation of Ovid *Tristia* 1.1. At *Tr.* 1.1.58-60 Ovid addresses his book thus: *di facerent, possem nunc meus esse liber! / nec te, quod venias magnus peregrinus in urbem, / ignotum populo posse venire puta*. Beyond this instance, further Ovidian echoes are found in the use of *fratres* (l. 6), *nec siccis perlegat... genis* (l. 16) and the concluding couplet (ll. 17-8); see Hinds (2007: 133). It is interesting to observe that this final usage of the apostrophe-to-the-book motif takes Ovid's *Tristia* as the principal intertextual reference, whereas M.'s first usage of the trope (1.3) was clearly a re-interpretation of Horace's apostrophe to the book at the epilogue of his first book of epistles (*Ep.* 1.20). Furthermore it is to be noted that M. changes the order of his intertexts: whereas Horace's address occurs at the end of his book, M. begins his very first book with the Horatian apostrophe. In Ovid, by contrast, the address occurs at the start of his book of *Tristia* to emphasise the new artistic direction his work in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* will take, whereas M. concludes his final book with the Ovidian address and deliberately stresses that his artistic focus has not changed at all, since, if a few verses are read, the reader will instantly know they are M.'s (ll. 17-8). Although Ovid's *Tristia* 1.1 lies at the heart of this poem, it is important to stress that M. does not seem to be using his intertext to provoke a similar feeling of pity at being relegated. In contrast to Ovid he lives a

leisured life at Spain, as noted by the subsequent poem (12.3(4): *pigritiae*) and 12.18. Unlike Ovid, he finds political favour as his books are directed to the state library (ll. 7-8) and to his consular patron Stella (ll. 9-16). The coincidence between 1.3 and 12.2(3) receives attention from Holzberg (2004/2005: 212 and, more generally, 2012: 135-52). Holzberg argues for a preconceived twelve volume construction to M.'s work; he considers the repeated motif here as an effective framing device which signals the superstructure he advocates. For the literary precedents to M.'s address to the book see Citroni (1975: 23), and for the later use by Ausonius (*Ep.* 10: *perge, o libelle, Sirmium*) see Szelest (1996: 334-43). It may also be recorded that Neo-Latin imitators of M. used the device of an address to a travelling book; cf. Beccadelli *Herm.* 2.37 where the book is given directions to a Florentine brothel.<sup>20</sup>

**3. auriferi... Tagi:** The Tagus is the longest river in the Iberian peninsula and is referenced 10 times by M. (1.49.15, 4.55.2, 6.86.5, 7.88.7, 8.78.6, 10.17(16).4, 10.65.4, 10.78.12, 10.96.3, 12.2(3).3). A predominant number of its usages associate the river with wealth, either by a reference to gold (1.49.15: *aureo ... Tago*, 7.88.7: *Tagus impleat auro*, 10.17(16).4 *aurea quidquid habet divitis unda Tagi*, 10.96.3: **auriferum** *Tagum*, 12.2(3).3: *auriferi de gente Tagi*) or by cataloguing it among other rivers noted for their wealth (6.86.5, 7.88.7, 8.78.6, 10.17(16).4). Elsewhere the river is utilised as a marker of Hispanic pride. In 4.55.2, it features with reference to Licinianus' skill at oratory which magnifies Spain's and the river's importance; at 10.65.4, in respect to M.'s Hispanic manly origin, which is contrasted to an effeminate Greek; in 10.78.12, M. notes that his pen, with which he writes immortal poems, is from the Tagus rich with fish (*piscosi calamo Tagi*). When twinned with the *Salo*, the adjective *auriferus* is used to describe the *Tagus* (10.96.3 and 12.2(3).3); elsewhere the river is so described by Catullus *C.* 29.19, Ovid *Am.* 1.15.34, Pliny *H. N.* 4.115, and Silius Italicus 1.115, 16.450 & 16.560. The wealth of Spain is further attested by M.'s employment of the adjective *auriferus*. In the five usages of the adjective (10.13(20).1, 10.78.5, 10.96.3, 12.2(3).3, 14.199.2) it is used with respect to Spain in all, save one instance (10.78.5, where it denotes Dalmatia's agricultural wealth). For the predominant position Spain held in supplying mineral resources to the Graeco-Roman world see Reece (1969: 43), Fear (2000: 34), and Curchin (1991: index: *mines*).

**tetricique Salonis:** The *Salo* (*Jalon*) is a river that flows round Bilbilis. As the hydronym is only mentioned by Martial, Leary (1996: 87) suggests that it might well be a local word. In M. the *Salo* is typically noted for its icy waters (14.33.2) which are used to temper steel (1.49.12, 4.55.15); Howell (1980: 217) and Leary (1996: 87) record the references of Pliny *H. N.* 34.144 and Justin 44.3.8 to emphasise Bilbilis' links to metallurgy. Elsewhere, outside of Book 12, M. uses the *Salo* as an indicator of his homeland: 10.13.1, 10.96.3, 10.103.2, 10.104.6. The two usages of the *Salo* in Book 12 (12.2(3).3 and 12.21.1) are, however, quite unique in the way M. characterises the river and may well reflect his *persona's*

<sup>20</sup> For Beccadelli's use of M. see Marsh (2006/2007: 199-209).

disillusionment with life back at Bilbilis, as outlined in the opening epistle. At 12.21.1 M. dubs the river *rigidi... Salonis*, this can be explained how Leary (1996: 88) interprets it as denoting the river's iciness. Nevertheless when we consider how M. frequently uses *rigidus* to describe and debunk old-fashioned morality (cf. 12.42.1, 6.64.1) and to detail the type of reader who doesn't appreciate his epigrams (cf. 10.20.21), and then couple it with the use of *tetricus* here, which is equally used to denote grim morality (cf. 1.62.2) and the type of reader M. wishes to exclude from his Saturnalian verse (cf. 4.82.4, 11.2.7), it should be considered that M. is here betraying his disillusionment. This viewpoint was advanced in many of the earlier commentaries in so far as they applied the term to the inhabitants, e.g. de Blavis (1483) *tetrici: quoniam eius aquis ferrum temperat: vel tetricos accolat*, whereas lanssonius (1654) suggests that it could either be applicable to the mountains (see *OLD*.1c for geographical usages) or the natives. For further on the Salo and for related bibliography see Howell (1980: 217-20), Leary (1996: 87-8), and Moreno Soldevila (2006: 395).

**tetrici:** M. uses the adjective on fifteen other occasions. At 4.73.6 and 7.96.4 it refers to the Fates; at 1.62.2 and 7.88.4 it refers to a husband of stern morals; at 4.82.4, 6.10.5, 10.20.14, 10.64.2, 11.2.7 it notes the type of reader M. does not want; at 7.80.2 it describes a war-trumpet; at 11.43.1 it suggests the grim words M.'s girlfriend will utter when he betrays her for a slave boy; at 5.20.6 it is connected to lawsuits; at 6.70.8 it describes a fever; at 12.70.4 it depicts a previously grim teetotaler, and finally at 14.81.2 it is applied to a Cynic. As can be seen, the adjective always has a somewhat negative force and M. tries to distance himself and his poetry from it. It should be noted that M. always uses the form *tetricus* rather than *taetricus*, though a singular instance of *taeter* at 3.24.6 is provided. Ultimately the etymology is uncertain. Ernout and Meillet (1939: 1037) tentatively advance a link to *taeter* and *tristis*, without real conviction; de Vaan (2008: 618) dismisses a hypothesised origin from the verb *terere*, but provides no etymology himself, whilst the *OLD* states that the etymology is uncertain and probably unconnected with *taeter*.<sup>21</sup>

**4. patrios amnes quos:** The emendation is supplied by Housman (1889: 200), for the manuscript reading of *manes quod* (β) or *manes quae* (γ). From the later editions Lindsay (1903) transmits the manuscript reading of *manes*, whilst Heraeus (1982) and Shackleton Bailey (1989) print *amnes*. As Housman himself acknowledges the sense derived from *manes* here would suggest that M. is referencing the land of Spain which contained his parents' ashes; it could, if given credence, be seen as contrasted later by the use of *penatis* (line 11) to denote Stella's house.<sup>22</sup> The problem, however, is that the sense seems forced

<sup>21</sup> Readers who use Siedschlag's concordance should note that there is no entry for *tetricus*; the instances are supplied under the heading *taetricus* (1979: 864-5).

<sup>22</sup> M.'s parents are often viewed as being the dead pair Fronto and Flacilla (5.34.1: *Fronto pater, genetrix Flacilla*) to whose care the dead slave girl Erotion is commended; for speculation upon the identity of Fronto and Flacilla (including the possibility that they were Erotion's parents) see Bell Jr. (1984: 23) with references.

and its connection to the previous line somewhat weak. As such Housman's simple transposition of two letters is far more satisfactory, since it caps the sense of the first line of the couplet remarkably well and notes an association with water that is pronounced in the poem as a whole. For the use of the adjective *patrius* applied to a Spanish river elsewhere in M.'s work see 10.96.3 (*patriumque Salonem*); cf. also the use of *patriae* at 12.62.7 noting Priscus' return to Bilbilis. Finally, the use of *terra potens* (rather than an hypothesised *terra parens*) in the same line is also defended by Housman through examples from Lucan and Virgil; it also serves to amplify the use of *tetricique Salonis* (above).

**6. fratres:** The Ovidian intertextual reference with *Tristia* 1.1 is attested once again with this reference to the *peregrinus liber* having *fratres libri* at Rome; cf. *Tr.* 1.1.107. In the other twenty-eight usages of *frater* in M. the noun is used in a straightforward manner to denote a person described as a real brother (1.36.4 & 6, 2.2.5, 2.11.6, 2.41.20, 3.88.1, 5.3.5, 5.28.3, 5.38.2 & 5 & 9, 8.32.8, 8.53.16, 9.51.1 & 6, 9.54.6, 9.86.5, 10.89.5 & 6, 11.7.9, 11.10.2, 12.44.3 & 8), or to detail an affectionate reference to a contemporary (9.0.1 and 10.65.3), or a pet name for a lover (2.4.3 and 10.65.14). The only other usage with an inanimate object, though M.'s *liber* is portrayed as highly animate, is to Gellia's pearls at 8.81.6, but Schoffel (2002: 682) aligns this idiomatic usage to correspond to a pet name for a lover as at 2.4.3 and 10.65.14. Thus M.'s usage here is unique to his corpus and betrays the intertextual link to Ovid all the more. In Ovid's case, however, his *Tristia* are destined to go to the bookshelf in his own household; it is further noted that Ovid's other works (the *fratres*) are characterised, especially the three *Ars Amatoria*, which are depicted as dangerous works that have unwittingly harmed their author / father and consequently Ovid's book of *Tristia* is cautioned to avoid them (*Trist.* 1.1.110-16). Martial's books, by contrast, are not characterised at all nor, as with Ovid's *Tristia*, is the apostrophe to the book used in the place of overt patronage in order to avoid the patron garnering imperial disfavour through an association to a relegated poet; see Geysen (2007: 374). As M. is in voluntary retirement such concerns are unnecessary. In contrast to Ovid's book, which seeks refuge in his private library, or Horace's in *Epist.* 1.20, which is mauled and prostituted to the *vulgus*, M.'s book travels into the approved public sphere of the main Roman library. This difference in status between M.'s work and that of his two intertextual models is brought out even more starkly at the start of the next line; the phrase *iure tuo* betrays the fact that M., and by extension his *liber*, was a Roman citizen, who enjoyed full legal protection. Horace's servile book and the poems of the relegated Ovid could not hope for such legal protection.

**domus ... Remi:** The phrase is found elsewhere only at Propertius 4.1.9 (*qua gradibus domus ista, Remi se sustulit olim*); for the Propertian phrase, and its troubling designation (it could either refer to the temple of Quirinus, the *casa Romuli*, or the Palatine under Augustus' development) see Lucot (1957), Watt (1975), and Heyworth (2007: 415-7) and for a later Propertian echo see the *siccis ... genis* entry. Although the possible identity of the *domus*

*Remi* is disputed in Propertius' treatment, in M.'s case here the phrase could well be considered as a homely periphrasis for Rome itself, rather than betokening a specific building. In M.'s only other usage of Remus (10.76.4), Remus is again used as a metonym for Rome (*de plebe Remi*). Indeed Remus' general metonymical employment in Latin literature for Rome itself has led to the contention that Remus, not Romulus, was the original founder of Rome; see Puhvel (1975).<sup>23</sup>

**7. novi... templi:** A somewhat troubling location. It is often identified as the *templum divi Augusti* built by Tiberius in honour of Augustus in the forum below the Palatine; see Platner and Ashby (1926: 62-5), Richardson (1992: 59) and Casson (2002: 84). The library attached to this temple is only dubbed the *novum templum* by M. (4.53.2) and Suetonius (*Tib.* 74). Given the fact that Domitian is often credited with the restoration of the library (see e.g. Platner and Ashby and Richardson *op. cit.*), doubts have emerged concerning the reference here. Nauta (1995: 135) suggests that the *novum templum* is the *templum divi Augusti*, but suggests that Nerva, rather than Domitian, should be credited with the repairs. Stephenson (1914: *ad loc.*), by contrast, hazards that the *novum templum* may refer to a new library complex built by Trajan; for Trajan's library see Casson (2002: 84-92). Whatever the ultimate location may be, it is clear that M. here presents his work as suited to a reception in a state library, which can be sharply contrasted to his position in Bilbilis (12. *pr.*).

**8. reddita Pierio... choro:** Cf. 7.69.8 (*Pierio ... choro*) and 12.11.4 (*quam ... Pierio de grege*). Fenger (1906: 21) notes that the use of *chorus* here conveys two meanings; it can be used to denote the Muses as a group, or it can refer to their function as leaders of a dancing chorus.

**9. Subura:** The Subura is an area of Rome in a valley at the southern side of the Viminal hill. The location occurs 12 times in M.'s work (2.17.1, 5.22.5, 6.66.2, 7.31.12, 9.37.1, 10.20(19).5, 10.94.5, 11.61.3, 11.78.11, 12.2(3).9, 12.18.2, 12.21.5). Despite its seedy reputation as a well-known red-light district in Rome, M.'s references do not betray this association as much as one might initially expect. Citations that note the brothels or prostitutes of the Subura in M. occur at 6.66.2, 11.61.3, 11.78.11; it is possible that the female barber at 2.17.1, who fleeces her clients, may also be a prostitute. In fact the Subura features just as frequently as a general marketplace, which sells everything Rome has to offer (foodstuffs, wigs, false teeth); see 7.31.12, 9.37.1, 10.94.5. Another usage of the Subura in M. concerns its occurrence in a catalogue of places to be travelled through on a

---

<sup>23</sup> Although Puhvel notes that *Remi* is much easier to accommodate in verse than the cretic *Romuli*, he stresses the initial placement of Remus in formulae where both siblings are mentioned to support his contention and even goes on to suggest that Romulus may be considered a later addition to the foundation myth.

journey (often by a client); see 5.22.5, 10.20(19).5, 12.18.2.<sup>24</sup> The final instance (12.21.5) employs the Subura as a place that typifies Rome; the Spaniard Marcella is here compared as more Roman than any woman from the Subura. It should be noted that although the Subura had a somewhat tarnished reputation, Stella was not the only well-to-do Roman who owned property in the area; *cf.* the reference to Marcella (cited above [12.21.5], which is not to be viewed as an insult comparing her to whores) and Suetonius' (*Caes.* 46.1) reference to Julius Caesar's dwelling in the Subura. For further on the Subura see Platner and Ashby (1926: 500-1) and for its importance in later poems see 12.5(2).2 (*Sacra ... via* entry) and 12.18.2.

**10. *consulis... mei*:** Despite the fact that M. petitioned Domitian in 9.42 to promote Stella to the consulship, it seems that Lucius Arruntius Stella only became a suffect consul in A. D. 101 / 102, during Trajan's reign; see Syme (1983: 103 & 113-4) for the respective dates and the rise of the Arruntian line from Padua. If this was the case, the foregrounding of *consulis* here may serve as another criticism of Domitian's period and by implication a judicious compliment on Trajan's decision to promote Stella. Lines 10-15 neatly progress through the dual nature of Stella as politician and poet. Initially his political success is noted by *consulis* (10), then the adjective *facundus* (11), which is used by M. to characterise both statesmen and poets, creates a neat bridge to Stella's later portrayal as a poet (ll.12-15).

**11. *laurigeros ... penatis*:** A phrase peculiar to M. recorded elsewhere at 8.1.1 (likewise addressed to the *liber* and placed in the same neoteric arrangement, spanning the whole line), is here thoroughly consonant with the elevated diction as noted at *domus alta Remi* (l. 6), *veneranda ... limina templi* (l. 7), and *Pierio ... choro* (l. 8). It is instructive to compare the transference of the phrase from 8.1.1, referring to Domitian's home, to the present poem. At 8.1.1 *laurigeros* refers to the emperor's victories on the Danube, and the poem is used to characterise the particularly chaste nature of Book 8 in its entirety, as it requests Venus to withdraw (8.1.3) and Domitian's Pallas to enter (8.1.4). In the present poem, by contrast, the phrase seems to celebrate Stella's promotion under Trajan and the poem's tone, in its references to Stella's erotic elegies (as observed in the notes to follow on *lantheae* and *novem sororem*), promotes Stella's Venus over Domitian's Pallas. For the metonymical employment of *penates* for *domus* in M. see Fenger (1906: 6).

***facundus Stella*:** Stella is the third most frequently mentioned addressee in M.'s corpus and, with the exception of the *Xenia*, *Apophoreta*, and *Liber Spectaculorum*, features in every book, save Books 2 and 3; only Stella's fellow poet from Padua, Flaccus, and

---

<sup>24</sup> In this context *cf.* especially 10.20(19).5, which provides directions for M.'s poetry to Pliny's house. It should also be noted that 12.2(3) is the only instance where the Subura represents the termination of the journey in such catalogues.

Domitian are more frequently addressed. References to Stella elsewhere occur at 1.7.1&4, 1.44.3, 1.61.4, 4.6.5, 5.11.2, 5.12.7, 5.59.2, 6.21.1, 6.47.1, 7.14.5, 7.36.6, 8.78.3, 9.42.7, 9.55.2&8, 9.89.2, 10.48.5, 11.52.15; and to his wife at 6.21.1, 7.14.5, 7.15.1, 7.50.1. Lucius Arruntius Stella was a praetor (8.78) and a *quindecimvir sacris faciundis* (Stattius, *Silvae* 1.2.176-7) during Domitian's period, but did not rise to the heights of consul until A.D. 101 / 102, (see above). Besides the references of Stattius and M., Stella's attainment of the consulship (on October 19th) is known from an inscription recorded at *CIL* 6.1492. Beyond his political career, it is understood from M. 6.21 and Stattius *Silvae* 1.2 that he married a rich Neapolitan widow named Violentilla, whom Stella called Asteris in his elegiac poetry, and whom M. in turn dubs Ianthis. Stella was also particularly praised by M. and Stattius for his poetical achievements. Although it is tempting to dismiss such compliments as merely polite statements by poetical clients, Stella may well have been a noted elegist since he is found in distinguished poetical company, when Sidonius Apollinaris in the fourth-century mentions him; Sid. Apoll. C. 9.265-8: *non Lucilius hic Lucretiusque est,/ non Turnus, Memor, Ennius, Catullus,/ Stella et Septimius Petroniusque,/ aut mordax sine fine Martialis*. Beyond these references it is apparent (*cf.* 1.7) that Stella composed a Catullan *passer*-like poem on Asteris' *columba*. For a comparative investigation into how M. and Stattius address Stella, emphasising his poetic abilities, see White (1975: 267), for Stella's consular career and a comparison with seven other consuls from Padua see Syme (1983: 102-24), for hypothetical methods in the ways in which M. refers intertextually to Stella see Watson (1999: 348-56) and Howell (1980: 121-3), finally, for a comparison to M.'s manner of address to Flaccus and Stella see Pitcher (1984: 414-23).

**facundus:** As noted above the use of *facundus* is particularly apposite in relation to Stella. Of the twenty-one instances where M. employs this adjective and the single occasion he uses its cognate noun (*facundia*) in twelve instances it is associated with real poets and statesmen, a striking fact given M.'s habit of employing fictional names: see 7.91.1 (Juvenal), 5.30.3 (Catullus), 7.45.1 (Seneca), 10.87.2 (Restitutus), 11.48.2 (Cicero), 14.185.1 (Virgil), 14.189.1 (Propertius), 6.64.11 (Regulus), 9.26.1 (Nerva), 10.20(19).3 (Pliny), and 8.70.1 (Nerva).

**12. clarus:** The adjective used to describe Stella is even more apt than *facundus*, since it recalls the brightness noted in both Stella's praenomen (*Lucius*) and cognomen (*Stella*) and repays Stella for his similar semantic wordplay by transforming Violentilla to Asteris in his own poetry. By placing the phrase *clarus ... Stella* around *Iantheae* M. seems to be fusing and emphasising not only Stella's poetic name for Violentilla but M.'s own alternative poetic name for her. The employment of *clarus ... Stella* also anticipates the way M. contrasts light in the next line with *vitreo* (glassy, transparent, glittering) and *superbit* (to be proud, splendid, superb) with Violentilla's spring, depicted as a source of poetic inspiration for Stella and M. For the use of poetical emphasis on light with reference to a person called Stella elsewhere see *Ep. Bob.* 31. For the comparison of poets to celestial bodies, rather than the more

frequent use of flowers (cf. Meleager A.G. 4.1 and M.'s use of *Violentilla*), in later Latin epigram see Waudré (*Ep.* 42) where M. is compared to the sun, Owen to the moon, and Waudré himself to a star; see Jansen (2009: 288-9).

**lantheae:** A deliberately ambiguous usage. Since Lindsay's correction of *lantheae* to *Hyanteae*, in the light of Housman's (1914: 70) arguments, all the subsequent editions have favoured reading *Hyanteae*. It is important to state that, as Housman (*op. cit.*) acknowledges, only the  $\gamma$  family of manuscripts offer *Hyanteae*, the  $\beta$  family print a confused selection ranging from *iamthee* to *yantheae*, which is no surprise given the problems Greek words prompted in the transmission of Latin texts. The argument about the correct reading actually can be traced back to the seventeenth century, with Scriverius favouring *lantheae* whilst Gronovius supported *Hyanteae*.<sup>25</sup> Bowie (1988: *ad loc.*) considers that the problem essentially revolves around whether Stella would be likely to thirst for water from his own spring or the Muses', and suggests that it must be the Muses'. He does not stop to consider that the spring itself is elsewhere portrayed as a source of poetic inspiration. A solution can be provided through an examination of the way M. portrays Violentilla's spring elsewhere and the etymological games both he and Stella used to refer to Violentilla. Etymological puns around Violentilla's name unite the poetry of Stella and M. As is known from Statius' epithalamium (*Silv.* 1.2.197-8) Stella referred to Violentilla in his poetry as Asteris, using a pun on his own name to link the two as a pair of twin stars. M., by contrast, uses the violet associations in Violentilla's name and employs the Greek name for a violet ( $\iota\omicron\nu$ ) to refer to her exclusively as *lanthis* (6.21.1, 7.14.5, 7.15.1, and 7.50.1). For the actual etymological root of Violentilla's name see Syme (1983: 114), who states that her name has no real floral associations, but derives from the cognomen Violens. Further investigation of these passages shows that Violentilla is particularly associated with her spring and the myth of Hylas, which probably echoes a theme in Stella's own elegies. In Statius (*Silv.* 1.2.197-9) the following may be cited: *Asteris et vatis totam cantata per urbem, / Asteris ante dapas, nocte Asteris, Asteris ortu, / quantum non clamatus Hylas*. This theme, which links Violentilla with the Hylas myth in the region of her spring, is given prominence in M. (7.15 and 7.50); indeed at 7.15.1 the spring's waters are called her own *lanthidos undis*. From the etymological games that Stella and M. engaged in when referring to Violentilla it is clear that she had a strong association with the spring, thus the grounds for calling the spring *lantheae* in M.'s depiction is particularly pronounced. Further substantiation for this point may be gained through Grewing's (1996: 323-4) introduction to 6.47. Grewing notes that 6.47 plays a neat intertextual trick through a reference to Horace's famous Bandusia Ode (3.13); whereas

---

<sup>25</sup> Their arguments are summarised by Ianssonius (1654: *ad loc.*): *Toties totiesque monui, ut scribatur lantheae,  $\iota\alpha\nu\theta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , inquit Scriverius. At ille fallitur. Nihil huc facit Violentilla, nihil fons lanthidos. Hyanteae scripsit Martialis. Et Hyantea aqua est unde Castalius. Ausonius: et Hyantea Aganippe. Ovidio Actaeon iuvenis Hyantius. Statio Hyantiae sorores Musae. Rursus Ovidius lib. 8 et Hyanteo lolao*. Gronovius is obviously correct in noting the poetical links that bind *Hyanteae* and its Helicon associations with the Castalian spring at Delphi, however, his assertion that the spring has nothing to do with Violentilla/ Asteris/ lanthis is not particularly convincing.



Horace's Ode latinises the famous poetical Grecian springs of the past and makes Bandusia their rival, M. by contrast urbanises the spring motif and celebrates Stella's artificial spring in an urban garden, as an articulation of his own poetical thematic landscape. He also suggests that the spring was a source of poetical inspiration not only for M. but for Stella as well, hence M.'s apology to Stella for drinking from his spring at 6.47. With Grewing's suggestions and the earlier cited strong connection with Ianthis / Asteris and springs it seems quite natural to argue in favour of *Iantheae* being read here. No doubt M. intends a double pun in the present context: first, his usual pun on Violentilla's own name, and secondly the Boeotian reference to Helicon and its poetical tradition that is contained in the homophone *Hyanteae*. The point is that Stella's spring is a poetic spring like the Castalian (as stated in l. 13) but is here not generalised, rather it is personalised to reflect his own poetry and muse (*Asteris*) as used by M. (*Ianthis*).

For a comparable etymological game involving ἴον in Greek literature see Cameron's (1995: 481-2) account of Tzetzes' summary of a pair of anagrams used by Lycophron. Lycophron (*Schol. Lyc.* 5.7 Scheer) honoured Ptolemy with the phrase ἀπὸ μέλιτος λέγει, and his wife, Arsinoe, is described anagrammatically as Ἑραξ ἴον. Thus besides the well-known use of flowers in Greek epigram, there is also Grecian precedent for M.'s pun on ἴον. For the prevalence of the violet in the Greek countryside see Lindsay (1937: 90).

**sititor:** *Sititor*. γ; *petitor*. β. With the exception of lanssonius (1654) and Gallet (1701), *sititor* has found universal favour in editions of M.'s text. If accepted, this will be its first usage of *sititor* in Latin literature and its only other occurrence in the PHI database and the *OLD* is provided by Apuleius *Met.* 1.2. In the older commentaries *sititor* is interpreted with reference to Violentilla's spring and could also be supported by the employment of *bibisse* (l. 14) and the association with water, which is prevalent in this poem. Nevertheless the reading *petitor* has a few things that should be said in its favour. It would likewise be balanced through an echo to the earlier usage of *pete* (l. 7) and has political as well as romantic connotations that could initially prove relevant, when applied to an elegist and politician like Stella. These connotations, however, on further investigation are not particularly convincing. When used in a political sense *petitor* denotes a political candidate, whereas M. has stated (l. 10) that Stella is already a consul. Although *petitor* can imply a romantic suitor (see *OLD*. 2c) its usage comes outside of the genre of elegy; see *Sen. fr.* (Haase: 426), Apuleius *Met.* 4.32 & 8.9.<sup>26</sup> Given these issues *sititor* seems, despite its rarity, the best and most thematically harmonious reading. For the high register poetic usage of *sititor*, rather than the more frequent plebeian nature of nouns terminating with the suffix *-tor*, see Watson (2002: 248).

---

<sup>26</sup> It was, nevertheless, for this reason that lanssonius, who was aware of the alternate reading, employed *petitor* as he states: *Stella diu ambivit Violentillam*.

**13. fons Castalius:** For the use of the Boeotian springs elsewhere in M. cf. the references at 12.11.

**vitreo torrente:** For the use of *vitrum* in reference to a spring cf. Horace C. 3.13.1 (*O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro*). As Nonius Marcellus (*De comp. doct.* 6.24) attests the adjective (*vitreus*) can be used with reference to anything translucent (*vitreum pertenne et perlucidum, quidquid est, auctoritate veterum dici potest*). For the use of glass in M.'s epigrams (the example at 12.2(3).13 being the only metaphorical usage) see Whitehouse (1999).

**14. novem dominas... ferunt:** An ambiguous usage, which prompts at least three possible interpretations. 1.) The first interpretation would view the nine *dominae* as synonymous with the Muses. This reading would be paralleled by *novem sorores* (2.22.1) and *novem sororum* (5.6.18), which refer to the Muses, and would of course be fully harmonious with the poetical landscape initiated with *fons Castalius* (line 13) and the echo of *Hyanteae* felt in the usage of *lantheae* (line 12). Epigram 6.47.4 should also be consulted, where Stella's spring is associated with the nine Latin Muses, the *Camenae*. The reading of the Muses here would, of course, also be in full accordance with Stella's status as a poet and may well find further corroboration in the *decem puellae* (5.12.7), whom Stella wears on his jewelled ring, if one accepts that the ten girls there represented refer to the Muses and Minerva (see Howell 1995: *ad loc.*), or Elegy and the nine Muses (as Statius's epithalamium to Stella states that Elegy becomes the tenth Muse: *Silv.* 1.2.7-10), or indeed the nine Muses and Violentilla / Asteris. Although the use of *domina* applied to a goddess is sufficiently paralleled (e.g. 10.92.8), there is, as Bowie (1988: *ad loc.*) observes, no employment of the word when applied to the Muses; the nearest parallel is at *TLL* 5.1940.9 in reference to the Naiads. The usage therefore is meant to be striking and prompts associations beyond the obvious interpretation that *dominas* refers exclusively to the Muses.

2.) The second interpretation would read the *novem dominae* as a reference to Stella's girlfriends or mistresses. Such an interpretation owes its origin to the way Durand (1946: 260) interprets the usage of *decem puellae* in 5.12.7. Durand argues that the girls mentioned are images of Stella's girlfriends depicted as jewels on his ring, described in the previous poem (5.11). In support of the *Don Juanesque* character, who lies behind Durand's reading, one can point to a number of references in both M. and Statius. In Statius' epithalamium there is suspicion cast on some kind of scandalous past involving Stella (*Silv.* 1.2.27-30). The rumours that circulate in lines 27-30 of Statius' epithalamium find an analogue in the usage of *ferunt* here, which, as Greenwood (1998: 293;308-9) shows, is a usage fully consonant with the suggestive rumours that pervade M.'s epigrammatic technique,

particularly those of a sexually transgressive nature.<sup>27</sup> In M.'s own intertextual reworking (6.21) of Statius' epithalamium, a clearer idea is provided of what the scandal may have been, since Venus, as Violentilla's bridesmaid, rebukes Stella and asks him to end his numerous other sexual liaisons and settle down monogamously (6.21.4-8). Grewing's introductory comments on this epigram (1996: 176-7), however, should be recorded; although observing the lascivious function Venus plays by her suggestions to Stella in 6.21, he cogently argues that Stella's marriage serves a rôle of moral integrity in contradiction to all the other countless adulteries and frauds in Book 6, which is a book especially concerned with the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*. The marriage between Stella and Violentilla, commemorated in 6.21, would chronologically explain the numerical change in Stella's girlfriends. Prior to the marriage, in Book 5, Stella had ten girlfriends, after the marriage he now has nine plus his wife, Violentilla. Furthermore, Violentilla's spring elsewhere has been interpreted as a site for her potential sexual rivals for Stella's affection. Although the *Ganymedeo... choro* in 7.50.4 probably only depicts a series of sculptures around the statue, it has been argued that Argynus, who stands by the fountain at 7.15, may well be a *puer delicatus* of Stella's household rather than a statue; for a summary of the various interpretations of Argynus in 7.15 see Galán Vioque (2002: 129-30). Such readings are of course in line with the ease and familiarity with which M. treats Stella; for further sexually suggestive readings inherent in M.'s poems to Stella see Howell (1980:121-3). Beyond the evidence that emerges of Stella's character in M. and Statius, the usage of *domina* to imply "mistress" or "girlfriend" is sufficiently well recorded in M. to support using Durand's thesis in the present context; see e.g. 6.71.6 and consider the usages of *domina* when applied to Violentilla herself at 6.21.3, 7.50.1, and (possibly) 6.86.1 (if *dominae* rather than *domitae* is read; see Friedlaender (1886: *ad loc.*).

3.) Finally one can interpret the use of *novem dominas* as fictional girlfriends of Stella's elegiac *persona*. This view stems from an interpretation on 6.21 by Watson (1999: 348-56), which is maintained in the later commentary she co-authored (2003: 118-9); it is essentially a refining of Durand's thesis. Watson considers that it would be inappropriate for M. in 6.21 to not only hint at the sexual transgressions of Stella but also his wife in a poem celebrating their marriage. Therefore she suggests that the poem is rich in intertextual allusiveness not only with Statius' epithalamium on the same marriage but Stella's own elegiac poetry, which would consequently detail his fictional sexual history with Violentilla / Asteris. Certainly, as White (1975) has shown, both Statius and M. emphasise the poetic abilities of their patron. Therefore one could thus interpret such potentially defamatory comments to Stella in M.'s poems not only as the gentle teasing of two like-minded friends, who enjoy the bawdiness of epigram, but as a polite and subtle reference, which serves to commemorate episodes in Stella's own poetry. This interpretation would better explain the usage of *dominas* as a word thoroughly suited to the elegiac genre; see e.g. Pichon (1902: 134) and Grewing (1996: 468-

<sup>27</sup> It should be noted that Greenwood interprets this use of *ferunt* as applying to the Muses and does not examine the potentially adulterous undertones when applied to Stella.

9) for the elegiac parallels. Such a usage would also harmonise and lend credence to the reading of *Iantheae* earlier in the poem. It was earlier argued that such a usage was a pun meant to recall *Hyanteae* and its poetical associations; here again we find the general standard poetical associations of the Muses, which is how most readers will initially interpret *novem dominas*, focused more particularly and personally onto Stella's chosen genre, elegy (with the associations of *domina*), and the characters of his poetry, the *decem puellae* of 5.12 now reduced to *novem dominae* after Stella's marriage.

**16. nec nimium siccis perlegat ... genis:** The phrase *siccis ... genis* finds its ultimate origin in Propertius (4.11.80 ... *siccis oscula falle genis*); for the use of the phrase in later Latin literature see Fletcher (1961: 92). Despite this fact, the actual intertextual reference point is clearly Ovid *Tristia* 1.1; cf. *Tr.* 1.1.28 *carmina nec siccis perlegat ista genis*. Both references concern the emotional impact of the poets' verses, both use litotes on the phrase *siccis ... genis*, both employ the same verb (*perlegere*). Again M.'s use of his intertext is adjusted. Whereas Ovid (at *Tr.* 1.1.28) states that his book will be in peril at Augustus' Rome and should seek a sympathiser, who will weep tears of pathos upon reading of Ovid's plight, M.'s book enters Rome fearlessly and makes for consular hospitality. M.'s use of the tears his work inspires is also ambiguous (unlike Ovid): are Stella's tears prompted by his laughter at M.'s epigrams or his sadness at M.'s absence or a mixture of both? The use of Stella's tears also betrays the theme of the transformation of water, which is an inherent motif in this poem. The poem begins with the book journeying by sea from Spain to Rome, thereafter the book travels to Stella's poetical spring and then, once read, results in the tears it prompts in Stella. Essentially the poem functions in a comparable way to Horace's Bandusia Ode, which may well be nodded to by the usage of *vitreo torrente* (l. 13). In Horace's Ode the spring gradually becomes animate; it takes its life from the *haedus* sacrificed in its stream and then becomes *loquax* itself. In M.'s case, by contrast, the animate book transfers its animation across the Mediterranean and, after encountering Stella's poetical spring, transforms into the silent tears of friendship and poetical appreciation. For the use of the phrase *siccis... genis* elsewhere in M. see 1.78.3 where it refers to Festus' Stoical and tearless attitude when determining upon suicide, his heroic attitude is contrasted with his friend's and family's tears.

**17-18:** Cf. Ovid *Tr.* 1.1.61-2 *ut titulo careas, ipso noscere colore; / dissimulare velis, te liquet esse meum*.

**17. quid titulum poscis?:** *quid* is an internal accusative (otherwise known as an inner object). Here the interrogative *quid* has the force of *cur*; for this type of accusative see Gildersleeve and Lodge (1895: 210-11). The use of *titulus* is provocative; the verb *titulare* means to engrave an inscription on. Of the six usages of *titulus* in M.'s corpus two betray this literal meaning (1.93.4 and 10.71.2), as the noun refers to a funerary epitaph. In such

inscriptional contexts M. generally prefers to use *inscriptio* or its cognate verb, since it is the literal transcription of the Greek ἐπίγραμμα and affords M. the opportunity to employ a number of metapoetical references to his chosen genre's tradition and his place in its canon. The four other usages of *titulus* (1.0.14, 2.93.4, 12.3.17, 13.3.7) convey the meaning of a title. The question this prompts is whether the title in question is to be applied only to the book itself or whether each epigram had its own title. The earlier commentators were united in the belief that its reference here at 12.3.17 referred to M.'s own name as the title: de Blavis (1482: *ad loc.*) *titulum: nomen auctoris*; Ianussonius (1654: *ad loc.*) *titulum: auctoris nomine insignitum*; Gallet (1701: *ad loc.*) *titulum: nomen auctoris*. This interpretation is a reasonable assumption given the fact that M. states that his book does not need a title since its contents will immediately betray his authorship. Nevertheless the usage of *titulo* at 2.93.4 emphasises that the book had its own title, since M. suggests to a questioner, who doubts the existence of his first book, to delete an iota on the title of his second book to make it the first. If one considers the four usages of *titulus* it can be assumed, with some hesitation, that in Books 1-12 the word refers to the title of the book as a whole, since it is always a singular noun (1.0.14, 2.93.4, 12.3.17). The only plural usage occurs at 13.3.7 where *titulos* refers to the individual headings for the series of *monodisticha* in M.'s *Xenia*; Leary (2001: 47) observes its unprecedented usage here and provides a reference to Quintilian *Inst.* 2.14.4 to evidence *titulus* denoting the title for a book. Although, from the scanty evidence transmitted, it seems clear that in Books 1-12 *titulus* signifies the title of the book itself, whether or not each epigram had its own title is less certain. By examining M.'s four usages (10.59.1, 11.42.2, 14.2.3 & 4) of the word *lemma*, which can likewise denote a title, we can observe that the *lemmata* mentioned in the *Apophoreta* refer, like *titulos* in the *Xenia*, to the titles of individual epigrams. Although Kay (1985: 161) correctly interprets the usage of 11.42.2 to denote the themes of the epigrams rather than title headings, the employment of *lemmata* at 10.59.1 refers to title headings and suggests, as Lindsay (1903: 38) observes, that each of the poems in Books 1-12 possessed their own titles. Although the epigrams of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* are all published with their own titles as transmitted via the manuscripts, Books 1-12 in recent editions do not transmit the headings preserved in the three manuscript families, due to the frequent discrepancies and occasional grammatical solecisms that cast considerable doubt on their reliability. Finally, it should be noted with reference to the intertextual importance of Ovid *Tristia* 1.1 that Ovid's book travels bearing a *titulus* (*Trist.* 1.1.7), though a plain unadorned one as befits its and the author's woeful status. By contrast it is not the travelling book that lacks a *titulus* but the harmful *Ars Amatoria* (*Trist.* 1.1.108-12) which skulked obscured in the shadows of Ovid's bookshelf. Thus Ovid could be viewed here as in some way disowning the *Ars Amatoria*, his earlier work, and trying to claim a new character, whereas M.'s book, by contrast, is viewed as so intrinsically and unmistakably a work of his own that the book needs no *titulus*. For further information on the subject of title headings in the epigrams and citations and explanations of some of the more egregious solecisms see Lindsay (1903: 34-55); also the commentaries of Kay (1985: 161) and Leary (1996: 57-8 & 2001: 47) are useful. For the absence of titles in Neo Latin epigram see Enenkel (2009: 13-4).

**18. clamabunt ... te... meum:** Although the use of *omnes* suggests that all of Rome will shout out the book's authorship, the use of *clamare* is particularly suited to the Subura, which is dubbed *clamosa* at 12.18.2. For a parallel usage cf. 10.4.8 (*hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita "meum est"*) where *vita* states that M.'s themes concern reality, and, for the popularity of M.'s work, see e.g. 12.11.8.

### 12.3(4)

*Text:* Quod Flacco Varioque fuit summoque Maroni  
Maecenas, atavis regibus ortus eques,  
gentibus et populis hoc te mihi, Prisce Terenti,  
fama fuisse loquax chartaque dicet anus.  
tu facis ingenium, tu, si quid posse videmur;  
tu das ingenuae ius mihi pigritiae.

*Translation:* What Maecenas, the knight sprung from ancient kings, was to Flaccus and Varius and greatest Maro, garrulous fame and an ancient page will say to the races and peoples that you, Priscus Terentius, were this to me. You make my genius, you, if I appear to have any ability, you give me the right of gentlemanly idleness.

#### Content and Structure

The poem is bipartite in construction. The opening four lines provide the *Erwartung*, which is separated into two clauses. The first part consists of a relative clause which concerns the great patronage several Augustan poets received under Maecenas. The second part, concerned with a present timeframe, provides the antecedent which records that M. has himself finally found a patron comparable to the great Augustan patron. The final couplet (lines 5-6) supplies the *Aufschluß*, which employs a hymnic repetition of the second person pronoun to honour Priscus and to attest that his gift has resulted in, not literary *otium*, but *pigritia*. For the placement of the concluding six lines of 12.6, which are frequently appended to 12.3(4), see the introduction to the commentary.

Essentially this epigram may be viewed as a programmatic avowal of M.'s continued involvement with the genre of epigram. As such it offers a *recusatio* with respect to more ambitious poetry. This reading is achieved in three ways. Initially, there is the promotion of leading poets from the higher genres: Virgil (epic), Varius (tragedy), Horace (lyric, as noted by the revamping of the opening to Horace's first book of Odes in line 2). These poets are all, as is noted, clients of Maecenas. M. has elsewhere often stated that given a Maecenas figure he would rival the work of the poets the Augustan patron sponsored (see *Maecenas* entry). It now emerges that M. has finally secured the Maecenas he has craved throughout his career in the form of Terentius Priscus. Any reader familiar with M.'s methods will naturally anticipate some engagement with M.'s earlier promises, now that the situation has altered. M. chooses to explicitly ignore the obvious question that his reader will mentally pose. Despite the explicit omission, an implied answer to the question is provided not just once, but twice. At the fourth line M. reworks two Catullan phrases (in order to reinforce the

Catullan quality sought here) to demonstrate that Terentius Priscus will be praised by M. for this patronage. The use of the Catullan allusions is telling, since M. aligns his epigrammatic genre with Catullus' poetry, indeed he goes so far as to represent Catullus as the father of the genre, and frequently contrasts Catullus' poetry with other forms of poetry, notably Virgil's (see *Maroni* entry). Thus the Catullan allusions provide the first avowal to maintain the genre of epigram in defiance to more elevated forms. The second answer is provided by the final word *pigritiae*. Here M. purposefully uses a tetrasyllable to create a dissonance of ictus and accent at the conclusion of the poem. This sound-effect naturally draws even more attention to the concluding word, which states that it is idleness that Priscus' patronage has bestowed, not a willingness or the wherewithal to scale the poetic heights. In sum *pigritia* is here to be interpreted almost as the Muse of M.'s occasional epigrammatic poetry, which is still, however, gentlemanly (*ingenuae*).

The above interpretation can be supplemented by acknowledging the nature of the allusions that course through the poem. It will be seen that we begin with intertextual references from the high register of lyric poetry to terminate in unpoetical fashion with prosaic legalese. The first section (lines 1-4) is rich in lofty poetical allusions, most obviously in the second line's usage of *atavis regibus* echoing Horace's opening line to his first Ode: *Maecenas atavis edite regibus*. Next, we descend from the Horatian heights to a conflation of two lines of Catullus in the fourth line: 78b.3 *fama loquetur anus* and 68.46 *carta anus*. These allusions function alongside the mock hyperbole of M.'s statement, which effectively places Priscus on a par with Maecenas and M. himself equal to the works of Horace, Varius, and Virgil, the foremost lyricist, tragedian, and epicist of Rome. So far, so obvious. But the *Aufschluß* plays a decidedly different tune. Although one could find a precedent in Propertius 2.1.4 (likewise addressed to Maecenas): *ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit* for the first clause in line 5: *tu facis ingenium*, the intertextual references thereafter are to be found in prose, not poetry, and accord with the change in tone from mock hyperbole to mock meiosis. Although Roman (2014: 319) believes that *si quid posse videmur* echoes Catullus 1.3-4 and 1.8-9, it does so in sentiment only. The phrase *si quid videri* is especially favoured by prose writers, and is a particularly common expression in Cicero's legal speeches and letters. It is particularly the legalistic aspect of this phrase that gives the first clue to the concluding pun of this poem. M.'s arresting juxtaposition of *ius pigritiae* at the conclusion, could be viewed as an echo of a legalistic formula (*ius pignoris*), which is attested countless times in the *Digesta Iustiniani*. Such a reference is rich in meaning and adds an especially cynical, albeit light-hearted, joke on the nature of patronage. So interpreted, the intertextual reference points betray two different views of patronage: the first, lofty and poetical section reminds the patron of how the poet bestows fame upon him with his poetical powers, whereas the second, much more pedestrian and prosaic argument, prompts the patron that the poet's talent is dependant upon his wallet. Indeed the intertextual legalese almost suggests a legal financial requirement.



In fact it is possible, though a little more tendentious, to stretch the interpretation a little further. We could read *ingenium* as M.'s character (rather than his poetical ability), and turn the *Aufschluß* into a light-hearted dig at the meanness of Priscus' patronage; this is expressed by the poet not in lofty poeticisms but legalistic jargon. As M. has a penchant for using *facere*, *posse*, and *dare* as colloquialisms with sexual overtones, such usages in close proximity are bound to arrest a reader familiar with M.'s writings; see Kay (2010: 318-31). Thus the conclusion is capable of being understood as follows: "you are fucking my talent, you, if I seem to have any potency, you give me the law of gentlemanly idleness (i.e. you give me nothing so I produce nothing)". This reading neatly reworks the hymnic tricolon iteration of *tu* into something more akin to a barrister attacking a defendant, and would consequently be miles away from Bowie's (1988: 55) statement that "the expansive expression of this line shows how nearly panegyric sails to the hymnal style". As stated, this additional interpretation perhaps reads too much into the conclusion, and should accordingly be received with some scepticism.

1. For the collocation cf. 1.107.4 (*Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo*) and 8.18.5-7 (*sic Maro nec Calabri temptavit carmina Flacci, / Pindaricos nosset cum superare modos, / et Vario cessit Romani laude cothurni.*).

**Flacco:** There are 31 references to Flaccus in M.'s work, the vast majority of these instances relate to M.'s friend and fellow poet Flaccus; for M.'s friend Flaccus see Pitcher (1984: 414-23). Excluding the references to M.'s *amicus*, there are three references to the Augustan poet, Quintus Horatius Flaccus (1.107.4, 8.18.5, 12.3(4).1). The nomen, Horatius, is not employed with reference to the Augustan poet, but reserved for usages involving the famous Republican siblings (3.47.3, 4.2.2 & 6, 9.41.5). The only other references that should be added are 5.30.2 (*Calabra ... Iyra*) and 12.94.5 (*Calabris ... Camenis*), where M. intends to suggest Horace's lyrical poetry despite his erroneous geography; cf. the use of Calabria in 8.18.5 (above). Despite the limited number of direct citations, allusions to Horace are to be found in the epigrams; see Sullivan (1991: 103-4) and the travelling book motif discussed in 12.2(3). The main links between the two poets, however, concern temperamental affinities; viz. Epicureanism, satire, friendship, rusticity, jovial good humour. For further on M.'s use of Horace see Mindt (2013: 175-90).

**Varioque:** Lucius Varius Rufus was celebrated as the leading Augustan dramatist; cf. Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 10.1.98 (on his *Thyestes*) and see Housman & Garrod (1917). There are, unfortunately, only fragments of his work still extant. These are supplied by Macrobius and ancient commentators on Virgil and Horace; see Morel (1927: 100-1). Varius receives little

attention by M.; beyond the present poem he is only found at 8.18.7 (again in the company of Virgil and Horace).

**summoque Maroni:** Virgil receives quite frequent reference in M.'s works. There are 28 usages of the cognomen, Maro; 20 instances (in 17 poems) relate to the poet and the remaining eight (in 5 epigrams) treat a fictional character.<sup>28</sup> Elsewhere M. uses the nomen, Vergilius, to indicate the poet; there are ten such examples and all are restricted to the Augustan poet (1.107.4, 3.38.10, 8.55.6 & 23 & 24, 11.52.18, 14.57.1, 14.185.0, 14.186.0, 14.195.2). Despite the praenomen, Publius, being found in M.'s work six times (1.109.5 & 18, 2.57.3, 7.72.7, 7.87.3, 10.98.11), it is never used with reference to Publius Vergilius Maro. There are various contexts for the usage of Virgil in M.'s work. Virgil can be employed, as in the present poem, with Maecenas (1.107.4, 7.29.7, 8.55.3 & 5, 12.3(4).1); often such usages contrast the patronage which Virgil received with M.'s poverty. The financial discrepancy is portrayed as detrimental to the quality of M.'s work; he suggests that he would be able to rival Virgil if the fiscal barrier were removed. Despite this financial distinction, Virgil is elsewhere portrayed by M. as poor in order to suggest the hard-lot common to (even the finest) poets; cf. 3.38.8, 5.56.5. A further distinction is made between M. and Virgil on the basis of genre. In this context M. often praises a contemporary writer as the equivalent of Virgil, while aligning himself with Catullus; cf. 4.14.4, 5.5.8. A distinction between M. and Virgil seems to be maintained later in the second century, among other peculiar literary tastes (e.g. the selection of Apicius' work as bedtime reading) the emperor Aelius Verus is said (ironically?) to have deemed M. his Virgil; see *Hist. Aug. Ael.* 5.9 (*Atque idem Ovidii libros Amorum ad verbum memoriter scisse fertur, idem Apicii, ut ab aliis relatum, in lecto semper habuisse, idem Martialem epigrammaticum poetam, Vergilium suum dixisse*). In other places Virgil is found within catalogues of famous poets (or writers), among whom he is depicted as chief or (in the case of Silius Italicus) as a source of inspiration: 1.61.2 (Livy, Stella, Flaccus [not Horace!], Apollodorus, Ovid, et al.); 4.14.4, 7.63.5, 11.48.1 & 4, 11.50(49).1 and (probably) 12.67.3 & 5 (Silius Italicus); 1.107.4, 8.18.5, 8.55.3 & 5, and (as a humorous reference via fictitious characters) 9.33.2 (Horace); 10.21.4 (Cinna, who is unfavourably contrasted with Virgil); 3.38.10 (Ovid); 14.195.2 (Catullus); 14.57.1 (Homer). Final references include 5.10.7, which records the fact that like all poets Virgil was unappreciated by his contemporaries; three epigrams use the poet in reference to three of his literary works: 7.29.7 (*Eclogues*), 11.52.18 (*Georgics*), 14.185.1 (*Culex*).

This is the only example of the adjective *summus* being applied to Virgil in M.'s work. Nevertheless, when an adjective is applied, the most frequent description concerns an association of scale; cf. *magno ... Maroni* (4.14.14), *magni ... Maronis* (11.48.1), *magni ...*

---

<sup>28</sup> The twenty instances referring to the poet are 1.61.2, 3.38.8, 4.14.14, 5.5.8, 5.10.7, 5.56.5, 7.29.7, 7.63.5, 8.18.5, 8.55.3 & 5, 10.21.4, 11.48.1 & 4, 11.50(49).1, 12.3(4).1, 12.67.3 & 5, 14.185.1, 14.186.1. The eight fictitious references are 4.80.1 & 2 & 6, 9.33.2, 11.34.3, 11.67.2, 12.90.1 & 6.

*Maronis* (12.67.5). These examples could be amplified by the inclusion of the phrase *immensum ... Maronem* (14.186.1), which refers to both the actual size and the intrinsic quality of Virgil's work. As should be obvious the insistence upon the magnitude of Virgil complements the comparison between M. and Virgil and their respective genres noted above. Elsewhere Virgil is referred to as *cothurnatus* (5.5.8, 7.63.5), *sacer* (8.55.3), and *facundus* (14.185.1).<sup>29</sup> Adjectives are not commonly employed with the nomen, the only instance is at 11.52.18 (*aeterno ... Vergilio*). A final reference to the greatness of Virgil is found in the contrast to the poet's smalltown origins; cf. 14.195.2 (*quantum parva suo Mantua Vergilio*). Beyond M.'s own treatment, the greatness of Virgil, usually restricted to his epic, is attested among other Augustan poets; cf. e.g. Prop. 2.34.65-6 and Ovid's preface to his epitome of the *Aeneid* (A.L. 1: *Vergilius magno quantum concessit Homero, / tantum ego Vergilio, Naso poeta, meo*). For further on M.'s use of Virgil see Spaeth Jr. (1930: 19-28), Sullivan (1991: 102-3), and Mindt (2013: 70-130).

**2. Maecenas:** In M.'s poetry Gaius Cilnius Maecenas is portrayed as the epitome of literary patronage. There are seven instances of Maecenas (1.107.4, 7.29.7, 8.55.5 & 23, 10.73.4, 11.3.10, 12.3(4).2). None of the other literary patrons of the Augustan period receive such recognition by M.; see the Pollio entry at 12.12. Aside from the reference in 10.73 (which refers to a toga sumptuous enough to please even Maecenas), all the remaining references concern Maecenas' function as a literary patron; for the fragments of Maecenas' own poetry see Morel (1927: 101-3). Each instance sheds light upon 12.3(4) and should be briefly recorded. At 1.107.4 M. requests the *otium* that Maecenas provided other poets in order to write great poetry; note the contrast here between a positive *otium* and a negative *pigritia* (12.3(4).6). In 7.29.7 Maecenas is shown to be ecumenical in his literary appreciation: he attended to both the mighty Virgil and the more insignificant Domitius Marsus. Here M. naturally suggests that Maecenas would have appreciated his epigrams, just as he did Marsus'; for Maecenas and Marsus see Byrne (2004). At 8.55.5 M. again states that the presence of poets like Virgil in society is dependent upon the existence of figures like Maecenas. In line 23 of the same poem, M. humorously subverts the trajectory of the poem by the affirmation that even were he to possess such patronage he would become Marsus (an epigrammatist) rather than Maro (an epicist); cf. the programmatic interpretation supplied in the introduction. Finally at 11.3.10 M. states that as Augustus has returned in the form of Nerva, a Maecenas should be reborn as well; here M. promises that he will compose great poetry if he secures such patronage. For further on Maecenas' function in the poem see the entry on *Prisce Terenti* (below) and for patronage in M. generally see Nauta (2002: 37-9).

---

<sup>29</sup> Note that the usage at 5.5.8 reinforces the predominant theme of Virgil's greatness; here the work, rather than the poet, is described as great (*grande cothurnati pone Maronis opus*). The association of scale with reference to Maro, even informs usages with the fictitious character; cf. 9.33.2, where Flaccus (Mr Floppy) is told that the applause in the baths is occasioned by the arrival of Maro's penis.

**3. gentibus et populis:** For the phrase indicating the “entire world” and similar employment elsewhere in Book 12 (12.6.5, 12.8.1) see Bowie (1988: 53).

**Prisce Terenti:** For general details relating to Priscus see the lemma entries at 12 *pr.* and 12.1. In the present case the addition of the nomen (*Terentius*) is of interest. Williams (2011: 125) concentrates on the register of using nomen and praenomen together and states that it is somewhere between the informality of using the praenomen alone and the most formal usage of praenomen and nomen together. In this instance, however, it is probably not etiquette that dictates the use of the nomen, rather its associations to Maecenas’ wife, Terentia. Maecenas’ reputation was often marred in antiquity by allegations of uxoriousness; Seneca (*Ep.* 114) reports that he married his wife a thousand times. Elsewhere she was considered unworthy of Maecenas’ affection due to her affair with Augustus; *cf.* Cassius Dio 55.7. Terentia was also deemed to be the cause of Maecenas’ fall from political favour due to the fact that he betrayed Augustus’ confidence by informing her brother, Murena, about the emperor’s awareness of his part in a conspiracy; see Suetonius *Vita Aug.* 66.3 and Cassius Dio 54.19. It is primarily through the hostile reports of Seneca that we get the image of Maecenas as an effeminate in thrall to his wife, and the usage here of *Prisce Terenti* could be read as “old Mr. Terentia”, a humorous pun that finds an actual precedent in Seneca’s work. Seneca (*De Provid.* 3.9-12) contrasts the noble Stoical sacrifices of the Republican senator Regulus unfavourably against Maecenas’ effeminate Epicurean tendencies. Having decided that no sane individual would prefer to be Maecenas rather than Regulus, Seneca states that anyone who would do so would actually prefer to be a Terentia: *aut si quis fuerit, qui audeat dicere Maecenatem se quam Regulum nasci maluisse, idem iste, taceat licet, nasci se Terentiam maluit!* For further attacks by Seneca on Maecenas’ innate effeminacy see *Ep.* 19.9; 92.35; 101.13; and 114.4-5. Further associations between Terentius Priscus and Maecenas are noted by Balland (2010: 14-7). Balland believes that there are three logical reasons to suggest the comparison: 1) Balland proposes that, although Terentius Priscus was born in Iberia (Tarraconensis), his ultimate origins should be viewed as Etruscan, like Maecenas; 2) he suggests that both men shared the same equestrian status; 3) on the basis of 1.112.2, Balland notes that Priscus had sponsored M. at the outset of his career, just as Maecenas had been an early champion of several Augustan poets. Although these points could all be questioned (particularly the assumed Etruscan link), Balland’s investigation into deeper connections that may link Maecenas and Priscus seems to be sound in its motivation, even if one may quibble over the details. Elsewhere Nauta (2002: 15) considers that Priscus’ patronage of M. resulted in the gift of a country estate to the poet.

**4. fama ... loquax:** This is the first of two Catullan allusions in this line; *cf.* C. 78b.4 (*fama loquetur anus*) with Quinn (1973: 413). The triple cluster of words denoting speech is very noticeable here: *fama* (from *fari*), *loquax* (from *loqui*), *dicet* (from *dicere*). The use here feeds into the conceit that poetry is the only guarantor of immortality, given the fact that even

monuments (such as tombstones) perish; cf. e.g. Hor. C. 3.30. For the use of *fama* in Latin literature see Hardie (2012: esp. 273-330); for M.'s use of *fama* see Greenwood (1996: 291-3); for the eternity M.'s poetry bestows see the entry on *charta* (below) and Best Jr. (1969: 211). It may be worth noting that contrary to M.'s declaration that his poetry will bestow eternal fame, the only explicit testimony we have by a contemporaneous writer announces the opposite. Pliny (*Ep.* 3.21), after mourning the death of M. and citing an extract from epigram 10.20 (dedicated by M. to Pliny), in which Pliny's work is said to be eternal like Cicero's (10.20.16-7: *hoc quod saecula posterique possint / Arpinis quoque comparare chartis*), concludes his letter by doubting that M.'s work will survive (*At non erunt aeternae quae scripsit*). Pliny is similarly hesitant about the enduring quality of Silius Italicus, in the same book; cf. *Ep.* 3.7.5 (*scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio*).

**chartaque ... anus:** The second Catullan reference of the line; cf. C. 68.46 (*haec carta loquatur anus*). Beyond the Catullan allusion, the use of the adjective is interesting. Elsewhere another term denoting femininity is applied to *charta*; cf. 1.66.7 (*virginis pater chartae*) referring to unused, and hence still clean, paper (cf. 10.93.6). It is Watson's (2002: 240-1) contention that the use of *anus* and *vetulus*, as feminine adjectives, are clearly demarcated in M.'s work. She suggests that the use of the feminine form of *vetula* is reserved for the use of promiscuous old women, whilst the feminine form of *anus* is usually meant to serve other contexts denoting old-age generally. Watson's proposal is somewhat tendentious as there are far too many instances of *anus* found in M. which are applied to exactly the type of women Watson wishes to classify as *vetulae*; cf. 2.32.6, 4.20.2, 9.80.1, 11.87.3, 12.70.2, 13.34.1, 14.147.2. Although Watson's contention in its particulars is flawed, the broad point being made could well have merit, if recast. It might be less misleading to state that the feminine form *vetula* is solely reserved for old hags; whereas the 20 instances of *anus* can record usages denoting old and sexually undesirable women, as well as other usages betokening maturity generally. The point at issue is merely one concerning the weighting of the evidence; 8 out of 20 (40%) instances is not a trifling occurrence that can be easily overlooked. A few other points on the adjective can be briefly made. It is found, as with the Catullan precedent (at C. 78b.4) applied to *fama* in 1.39.2; its semantic associations with the addressee *Priscus* (old) are worth noting in passing; generally in M. its adjectival employment is predominant, but it can be found as a substantive (11.87.3).

There are 41 usages of *charta* in M.'s work. It is found twinned with, or close to, *fama* on two other occasions: 5.25.5 (*quem chartis famaerque damus populisque loquendum*) and 7.6.4-5 (*credo tibi, verum dicere, Fama, soles. / publica victrices testantur gaudia chartae*). The association of M.'s *charta* bestowing immortality is also often encountered, frequently coupled with the future participle *victurus*: cf. 1.25.7, 3.20.2, 7.44.7, 11.3.7, note also the use of *victurus ... liber* at 6.61.9. Further links with *charta* and renown are found at 9.76.10 (where M.'s poem bestows immortality on a dead child). The mortality of *chartae* is the

subject of an epigram (14.84.2); M. argues that good storage, in the form of a bookcase, will prolong the existence of *chartae*. The etymology of *charta* has received some attention. First, Varro (*de L. L. Frag.* 14a & b) notes that the feminine noun *charta* is among a few words that derive from masculine Greek first declension nouns (χάρτης). Despite the fact that Egypt chiefly supplied the papyrus plant, the etymology of “papyrus” is uncertain; see McGready (1968: 251). Similarly, the etymology of *charta* is hard to determine, but a semitic origin is often proposed; see Muss-Arnott (1892: 126) and Rendsburg (2017), for a proposed Greek etymology = “torn off (sheets)” see Postgate (1882: 336). It is also to be noted that the personification of the *charta* here and its function as a subject continues the animation M. has bestowed on his work at the start of Book 12. Elsewhere *charta* can also be found as a subject; cf. e.g. 1.25.7, 1.44.2. For the metonymical employment of *charta* for *carmina* see Fenger (1906: 30).

**5. ingenium:** The noun is used 23 times; of these usages 10 concern or are heavily associated with literary ability (1.0.6, 5.63.4, 8.0.6, 8.18.10, 8.55.3, 8.70.2, 8.73.6, 9.50.1, 12.0.11, 12.3(4).5). The interesting thing about these usages is that only the instance of 12.3(4) argues that M.’s work has *ingenium*. At 9.50.1 M.’s talent is described as *pusillum ingenium*, whereas at 1.0.6 and 8.0.6 M. denies that his work possesses *ingenium* altogether; the other six usages refer to other writers’ *ingenium*. If the search is extended to include the 8 instances of the cognate adjective (*ingeniosus*), no further instances can be added to describe M.’s poetry. There are two usages of *ingeniosus* found in relation to other poet’s literary talent (1.0.8, 6.61 (60).5). Although M. does not employ *ingenium* often in respect to his work, Pliny (*Ep.* 3.21) summarises M.’s literary abilities in the following manner: *erat homo ingeniosus acutus acer*.

**6. ingenuae ius ... pigritiae:** The substantive *pigritia* is only found on 3 occasions in M.’s work (7.32.14, 11.79.2, 12.3(4).6); in every instance it is placed at the conclusion of the pentameter (in 7.32.14 in the prodelided form *pigritia est*). Its cognate adjective (*piger*) is more commonly employed, there are 25 usages. Idleness is a key theme in the opening poems of Book 12, as it refers in a general sense to M.’s retirement at Bilbilis; this freedom can be presented as a blessing (12.18.10 *pigri*) or a curse (12 *pr. desidiae*). The enjoyment of leisure is seen as the gift of a patron to his client elsewhere in Book 12; cf. 12.4(5).3 (*vacui*). In contrast to the gift of *otium* bestowed, the patron is frequently marked by his *negotium* and lack of time; cf. e.g. 12.1.4, 12.4(5).3, 12.11.5. In the present case, it will be seen that the adjective (*ingenuae*) adds an oxymoronic quality to the phrase, since it alters the negative associations of idleness inherent in *pigritiae* and adds a “gentlemanly” quality to this inactivity. It also suggests, via its status, an absence of the need for such patronage to secure this leisure; for the metonymical use of *ingenuae* here see Fenger (1906: 24) and for the frequent use of oxymoronic phrases linked by homoioteleuton at these points in the pentameter in ancient epigram see Pertsch (1911: 52-6). Bowie (1988: 55) draws attention

to the fact that this novel phrase is constructed like the qualification of *ius trium liberorum*; cf. 2.92.1. This observation promotes a further clue to the interpretation of the epigram. Just as M. portrays his attainment of the qualification of “the right of three children”, which has been achieved without the need for, or the intention of, fathering children (2.92), so, in the present case, M.’s attainment of a contemporary Maecenas has been gained without the requirement to pen more ambitious poetry or to adjust his genre. The heterodyne conclusion to the line provided by the tetrasyllable, with its consequent discordance, may well be viewed as a programmatic insistence upon M.’s continuation in the genre of epigram (see the introduction); for the use of homodyne and heterodyne elements see Coleman (1999: 30-1), for the frequency of polysyllabic endings in Augustan elegiac verse see Platnauer (1951: 17); for further information about M.’s usages of polysyllabic closures to the pentameter contrasted with the Augustan elegists see Wilkinson (1948: 68-75). It may be worth noting that the dissonant close could be further signalled, if M. intends *pigritiae* to be understood with the etymology proposed by Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* 10.212): *Piger, quasi pedibus aeger. Est enim tardus ad incedendum: quod nomen per usum transiit ad animum.* Finally, a further link that may promote the use of both Maecenas and Horace in this context may be added. As Epicurus was dubbed by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 19.51.2) *Epicurus otii magister*, the usage of *pigritiae* at the end seems to unite M.’s philosophical outlook with both Maecenas’, who is frequently abused by the Stoic Seneca for his Epicureanism, and Horace the *Epicuri de grege porcum* (*Ep.* 1.6.16).

It should be recorded that there is an alternative reading offered by the  $\beta$  family of manuscripts. Unfortunately Shackleton Bailey (1989) did not include the reading. Lindsay’s *apparatus criticus* shows that *peritiae* is also found. Such a reading is logical, but it does rather nullify any point the conclusion would supply. Nevertheless it should not be omitted. Further alternative readings for the poem are supplied in Schneidewin’s (1842: *ad loc.*) full *apparatus*, although many readings can be excluded through metrical deficiencies, such readings can be profitably explored. It should also be pointed out that in earlier editions, notably de Blavis (1482), Ianssonius (1654), and Gallet (1701) the final line supplied was as follows: “*tu das ingenuae munera pigritiae*”.

## 12.4(5)

*Text:* Longior undecimi nobis decimique libelli  
artatus labor est et breve rasit opus.  
plura legant vacui, quibus otia tuta dedisti:  
haec lege tu, Caesar; forsan et illa leges.

*Translation:* The longer labour of my eleventh and twelfth books has been compressed and has shaved a short work. Let the disengaged, to whom you have given safe leisure, read more: you, Caesar, read these; perhaps you will also read the others.

### Content and Structure

The epigram is bipartite in its core structure and betrays a pronounced binary element in each of its constituent parts. The first couplet details that M. has prepared an epitome of Books 10 and 11. The diction employed is both complementary and antithetical. In the opening line it is noted that scale is distinguished by the placement of *longior* at one extreme and *libelli* on the other. The pentameter reverses this technique by a comparable juxtaposition of *artatus* and *opus*; thus creating a chiasmic arrangement across the couplet as a whole. The first line uses a pronounced assonance of “i” and evident balance in the placement of *undecimi* and *decimi* either side of *nobis*, whilst the pentameter relies upon antithesis in the use of its oxymora *artatus labor* and *breve ... opus*. The second section concerns M.’s readership. The epitome, it emerges is prepared for the emperor himself. The emperor’s reading habits are carefully distinguished from the rest of Rome. In the hexametric line two clauses split perfectly by the central *caesura* note that the urban crowd can read M. in his entirety due to the leisure the emperor has provided for them. The fourth line, which treats the emperor, is likewise perfectly divided into two clauses, which is further distinguished by the repetition of the same verb and the use of demonstratives.

Essentially 12.4(5) is a recapitulation of 12.1; here, however, the address is made to the emperor, rather than a personal patron. The effect of the repetition demonstrates a clear hierarchy in the bestowal of *otium*. In M.’s poems to Priscus leisure is the reward that Priscus’ munificence bestows on M. (12.3(4).6: *pigrityae*); M. in turn provides poetry to amuse Priscus in his moments of leisure (12.1.3: *otia*). The emperor, by contrast, bestows universal unlimited leisure and protection (12.4(5).3: *otia tuta*). A further comparison between 12.1 and 12.4(5) concerns the programmatic adherence to Callimachean aesthetics which M. advertises as representative of Book 12. This concern is to be noted by terms denoting small scale (l. 1: *libelli*; l. 2: *breve*) studiousness (l. 2: *labor* and *opus*) and a painfully precise editorial technique (l. 2: *artatus est* and *rasit*). Judged in this manner, the



Romans' enjoyment of *otia* (l. 3) may be re-evaluated. The emperor, by only reading the most perfect small scale productions of M., is portrayed as an eminently Callimachean reader. He excludes all but the finest works; he is to be contrasted to the indiscriminating mob (l. 3: *plura legant vacui*). For the programmatic literary terms in 12.4(5) and their Callimachean tone see Batstone (1998).

The themes of the present poem are quite conventional to M.'s corpus as the lemmatised entries will show. They include the advertising of past poems; the recognition of the fact that a superior dedicatee is far too busy to be concerned with M.'s work; the proposition of a selected edition that the present reader does not have recourse to but is aware of; the employment of *meiosis* by the poet in relation to his work and the expectation of a readership; *otium* contrasted with *labor / opus*. Given the structural arrangement of poems in Book 12, it makes sense to see Nerva as the referent described by *Caesar* here, rather than Trajan. This would suggest a chiasmic arrangement of poems addressed to Nerva and Trajan, in epigrams 12.4(5) (*Caesar / Nerva*), 12.6 (*Nerva*), 12.8 (*Trajan*), and 12.9 (*Caesar / Trajan*). Beyond these basic thematic observances an Ovidian intertext should be observed; cf. the epigram at the start of the *Amores*.

*Qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli,  
tres sumus; hoc illi praetulit auctor opus.  
Ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse voluptas,  
at levior demptis poena duobus erit.*

Strong links to 12.4(5) are provided by the following coincidences. Both poems concern the preparation of an abridged edition, the naming and numbering of Books, the respective position and repetition of *libelli* and *opus*, and the rhetorical use of the demonstratives in the second line. Furthermore the *meiosis* that characterises each poem is to be noted. Ovid pretends that the reader will be glad not to have the former two books and it is implied that the reader will never look for them. M., by contrast, defers to the emperor's occupational commitments and prepares a curtailed edition; but he then insinuates that the work will pique the emperor's interest into reading the poems that have been omitted.

**1. Longior... libelli:** As Sullivan (1991: 79) demonstrates, the fashion for composing longer epigrams increased among the epigrammatists of the Hellenistic period and M. continues this trend (for issues of length see 12.2(3) and 12.18). The conceit of beginning a four-line epigram with a word that would suggest a long composition is amusing, but M.'s emphasis on the length of his works is an oft employed *topos*. A few examples to be noted that emphasise the length of individual poems are 1.110, 2.77, 6.65, whilst 2.1, 2.6, 3.68, 4.82, 10.1, 11.108 furnish examples of M. stressing the length of individual books. M.'s view

concerning the virtues of long vs. short poems is inconsistent and designed to suit his immediate purpose. At times M. will defend his long poems (6.65) and even claim them to be superior to his shorter poems (10.59.2), at others the long length of the book is deplored, even when the book is not long (2.1 and 2.6). Sometimes readers are advised to make their own selections from the work to prevent boredom (4.82.8 and 10.1), whereas M. can at other times alter *meiosis* to hyperbole through a commendation of his chosen genre beyond all others (10.4). The concluding poems of Book 11 (11.106-9) offer a neat example of this disparate stance, and reward comparison with the present poem, which may be viewed as picking up the concluding theme of his previous book.

Despite the fact that Books 10 and 11, as we have them, are clearly complete and, if anything, rather long epigram books (Book 10: 104 epigrams; Book 11: 109 epigrams), the earlier commentators took this poem rather too literally and felt the need to cite Raderus to support the fact that these books have come to us complete, not in the excerpted selection here mentioned; see e.g. Gallet (1701: *ad loc*).

**undecimi ... decimique** The convention of naming Books 2 - 12 by the numbers we now use has its origin in M. and is not a later practice. Elsewhere M. numerically characterises other books in the following poems: 2.93 (Books 1-2); 5.2, 5.15 (Book 5); 6.1, 6.85 (Book 6); 7.17 (Books 1-7); 8.0, 8.3 (Books 5-8); 10.2 (Book 10). Although there is agreement that Books 2 - 12 originally possessed these numerical titles, the context of 2.93 appears to argue against the fact that the first book was called *LIBER PRIMUS*. Williams (2004: 281-2) explores this problem and notes *inter alia* that before M. Roman poets very rarely made explicit reference to the number of their poetry books, citing only Ovid *Am.* 1.epigr., Ovid *Fasti* 1.723-4, and (hesitatingly) Propertius 2.13.25. After detailing the range of current propositions concerning the original title for the first book, Williams aligns himself with Citroni's interpretation (1975: xiv-xviii) that it originally bore the modest title of *M. VALERII MARTIALIS EPIGRAMMATON LIBER*.

The revised edition of Book 10 (10.2) and Book 11 are, of course, M.'s only post-Domitianic works; diplomacy would dictate that a selection made for the emperor (Nerva or Trajan) would necessarily be made from these books. Whether or not this involves a neat erasing (*rasit* line 2) of earlier works written in the Domitianic period and a nod to the consequent *damnatio memoriae* of Domitian will ultimately be a matter of personal conjecture. Fitzgerald (2007: 158-60) can be consulted for the present poem's unease at the presence of the first edition of Book 10 still in circulation and the (hypothesised) panegyrics to Domitian contained therein. There are, however, a number of other alternatives to advance for M. making a presentation from these books to the emperor. One could for instance see the present selection of Books 10 and 11 in Book 12 as lending credence to Holzberg's contention (2012: 135-53) that M. designed Books 1-12 deliberately as a narrative work over

twelve books. Holzberg maintains that this twelve-book arrangement is structured around four sets of three consecutive books (i.e. Books 1-3; 4-6; 7-9; 10-12), thus the naming of Books 10 and 11 here would be telling. Alternatively the naming of recently completed books could be viewed as an advertising approach conventionally employed by M.; he frequently uses such tactics not only to name but also to typify and contrast previous books to his present work. One could note 1.113, where a reader, who wishes to waste his time, is advised to read M's earlier work; 5.2 contrasts the nature of Book 5 (dedicated to Domitian and consequently less obscene) with the preceding works; the epistle to Book 8 and 8.1, which is likewise excised of obscenity and takes its panegyric themes from its imperial dedicatee, notes the distinctive character of the book; finally, 7.17 should be recalled, which is variously interpreted as a reference to a revised edition for the entire opening seven books or a salacious selection from these works for Julius Martialis' benefit (see Galán Vioque 2002: 139-40). The practice of characterising one's own preceding poetic works and advertising revised editions is thoroughly consonant with M.'s Ovidian borrowings; see *Am. epig.*; *Trist.* 1.1.115-22. M., however, builds on this precedent and offers a range of neat variations such as offering a collection of works (Books 4-8) to Norbanus to make up for the works he has missed when serving outside Rome (9.84), or providing individual poems or collections (e.g. 7.17, 11.106), or offering an unnamed readership the chance to make his works as short as suited (10.1, and see *longior* entry above).

**2. labor:** A rather alien term (like *opus*) for M. with reference to his own poetry. Nevertheless, as noted in the introduction, M. is clearly here, via a reference to the neoteric *labor limae*, programmatically introducing the nature of his work and using appropriate critical terminology to detail his adherence to Callimachean conventions. From the 32 uses of this word and the 16 of its cognates (*laborare*: 12; *laboriosus*: 4) only five are employed with respect to poetical composition. At 1.107.8 M. states he will undertake a true poetic *labor* and pen an epic, if provided with a Maecenas; 2.86.10 describes the composition of palindromes and effeminate poetry inimicable to M. and dismissed as a *stultus labor*; 4.33.1 refers to the *laboratis... libris* (presumably not containing M.'s own work) that line the bookshelf of the unpublished author Sosibianus; 8 *pr.* states that there was less need for work in composing the book (*minus... ingenio laborandum fuit*) since its theme results from Domitian's excellence; 10.3.11 describes a poetic exertion that M. is not going to take, i.e. the public defaming of persons through his poetry. As can be seen above, the term is rejected by M.'s *persona* to such an extent that *labor* can be transferred from the chore of composition to the boredom of listening to poetry (3.44.9). Two further uses spell out M.'s antipathy to anything laborious. At 10.104 M. requests Flavius to find him a retreat at Bilbilis that requires no work (104.13-14 *iucundos mihi nec laboriosis/ secessus*), and at 11.106 M. describes his Saturnalian poetry as *versu non laborioso*.

**breve ... opus:** Brevity is the characteristic feature of M.'s genre. The adjective is applied to *opus* also at 4.82.8 (again in the context of a [proposed] epitome of M.'s work); the phrase likewise occurs in Manilius 1.825, Ovid *Ep.* 15.4 and Ovid *Fast.* 5.654. Elsewhere in M.'s

work *brevis* is applied to his *libellus* (e.g. 12.11.7), his *chartae* (e.g. 5.6.7), and contrasted with the concerns of his *liber* (8.29.2). For the metonymical use of *opus* by M. to describe his poetry see Fenger (1906: 39).

**rasit:** A number of editions concentrate on the syntactical and interpretative problems inherent in the last hemiepes of the second line. The problem concerns the use of the active third person singular verb *rasit* with *opus breve*. Many previous commentators and editors would like to take *opus breve* as the subject of a passive or alternative verb, not as the object of *rasit*. Several emendations have been suggested to solve the perceived problem. One obvious solution, favoured by Friedländer (1886: *ad loc.*) and Paley and Stone (1898: *ad loc.*), has been to take *labor* as the subject of the two opening clauses and *opus breve* as the object. Friedländer (1886: *ad loc.*) uses Munro's explanation of *rasit* as a synonym for *perfecit* and 10.2.3 (*lima rasa recenti*) in order to qualify the usage of *radere*. Friedländer cannot have been altogether convinced, however, as he also includes Haupt's suggested emendation of *mansit* for *rasit*. The edition of Heraeus (1982) offers two alternatives. The first is to take *rasit* as a proleptic use paraphrased thus: *breve radendo fecit opus*. The second is to contradict Friedländer's use of 10.2.3, which uses *radere* as a synonym of *polire*, and to interpret the use of *radere* as indicative of shortening or abridgement; *cf.* at 8.71.8 (*rasa selibra*). The same concerns that motivated Heraeus are fully in evidence in Ker's (1920) Izaak's (1930) and Fernández Valdeverde's (1997) translations. Ker (1920: 322-3) confronts the issue by putting the adjective *breve* into a prepositional phrase, thus: "The too lengthy labour of my eleventh and twelfth books has been shortened, and has **filed down my work to a brief compass**". Izaak (1930: 159-60), by contrast, favours Heraeus' proleptic explanation as he translates the verb *radere* as a present participle using *facere* as the main verb: "Mon onzième et mon douzième livre étaient trop longs: j'ai travaillé à en resserrer le texte **et en ai fait, en l'écourtant, un mince volume.**" Fernández Valdeverde's Spanish translation (1997: 276) takes a similar approach but employs a passive infinitive governed by a preposition rather than present participle: "El trabajo excesivamente prolijo de mi undécimo y décimo/ libritos se ha condensado **y, al reducirse, ha producido una obra breve.**" Bowie (1988: 58-9), who provides a good summary of the matter at issue including much of the information provided above, believes that the present reading is highly suspect and suggests that *rasit* should be obelized, and favours a verb that would take *opus* as the subject. Following his supervisor Nisbet, Bowie suggests reading *prodit* or more persuasively *surgit*, whose use with *artare* can be paralleled in Propertius 4.1.67; Ovid *Amores* 1.1.17; *Fasti* 5.1.11; *Laus Pis.* 1.

A preferable alternative, however, was already at hand recorded in the older commentaries of Ianssonius (1654), Hackius (1661) and Gallet (1701), since they record an alternative in Aldus' edition which is truly worth recording. Whilst it is not immediately obvious how palaeography can be twisted to render *rasit* as *surgit* or *prodit*, it is easier to imagine how

Aldus' suggestion of *vasit* could have been misread as *rasit*. Although the use of majuscule script rules out the similarity of "r" and "v", any minor damage to the initial letter could potentially have led to such a substitution. Ianssonius, Hackius, and Gallet suggest that this use of *vasit* should be interpreted in the sense of *evasit*. This reading would also bind this poem much closer with the travelling book motif found in other early poems; see 12.2(3) and 12.5(2). Consequently the rearticulation of *otium* and its dependency upon patronage, found in 12.1 and 12.4, would demonstrate that 12.4(5) links to all its surrounding poems. This substitution would turn this poem, which begins the new cycle of poems (5-9) on the emperor, into a neat precis of the opening poems as well. If any substitution is admitted Aldus' suggestion is to be recommended.

Despite Aldus' suggestion, the unanimous publication of *rasit* and M.'s previous use of the verb *radere* both in a context of polishing his works (1.117.16, 4.10.1, 10.2.3) and, as Heraeus states, of contracting items (8.71.8) makes its use with *artatus est* thoroughly suitable. It should be added that, although a passive verb after *artatus est* with *opus breve* as the subject might be expected, the syntax as it stands is not impossible. Heraeus' suggestions for *rasit* are quite welcome; another way would be to interpret the adjective as in some sense resultative to *opus*, i.e.: "the labour has shaved my work (as being now) small". Alternatively, one could follow Friedländer's emphasis on *radere* being a synonym of *polire* and translate: "the rather long labour of my tenth and eleventh books has been shortened, (after this is done) and has polished the short work."

**3. plura:** M. professes to agree with the sentiments expressed in Ovid's opening epigram in the *Amores*, where it is stated that even if the poems themselves do not please, at least in this revised abridged edition the work is reduced from five to three books. The theme of the variegated quality of M.'s poetry and the tedium which his poetry may induce over a sustained period receives frequent acknowledgement in the corpus. Perhaps M.'s best expression of this theme is 1.16.1, where he states that his book's contents necessarily include good, bad, and indifferent poems (*sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura*). It is to be noted that the majority (*plura*) are inferior. Other examples can be cited. At 3.1.5, M.'s earlier urban books are represented as more entertaining than the present, Gallic one. In 4.29.10 he cautions readers against perusing more than one of his books, as boredom will result. At 5.80.8, like 12.1.4, he notes that his book is short enough to be read in an hour; nevertheless, it will owe more to Severus and Secundus after their prudent editing than it does to its own author. In 8.3.3 M. asks how fame can confer more on him, since he has already written seven books and has no need to continue writing. At 11.52.16 M. invites Cerialis to dinner, the temptations offered are not only limited to a fine menu, but also by the promise that none of M.'s poetry will be recited. Finally, 14.115.1 argues that an artist has ruined his work by providing too many additions.

**vacui:** A comparison of the lazy and busy audiences, who consume M.'s work, is provided at 11.3.1-4, where M. states that he appeals not only to the *vacuis auribus* of the leisured populace at Rome, but is even read by soldiers on campaign. It is further to be noted, on the theme of *brevitas*, that M. elsewhere (14.10.2) states that a poet gives a fine gift when he provides *vacuas chartas*. For the use of *vacuus* to denote idlers see *OLD vacuus* 10. The use of *vacui* here distinguishes two separate compliments to the emperor. First, it notes that he immerses himself in the business of the empire and forfeits his own leisure time to the public good; cf. the description of Parthenius at 11.1.6 *nec Musis vacat, aut suis vacaret*. Second, it notes that as a good patron of the Roman people, he provides welcome leisure for them (further reinforced by *tuta otia*); cf. M.'s constant pleas for *otium* throughout books 1-12 and the use of *pigrity* (12.3(4).6).

**otia tuta:** The noun *otium* is found 17 times in M.'s work (1.55.4, 1.107.3, 1.113.4, 3.58.24, 3.67.9, 4.14.10, 4.25.8, 4.82.2, 6.43.3, 7.28.7, 9.101.21, 10.44.4, 11.3.2, 12.1.3, 12.4(5).3, 12.68.5, 14.82.2); its cognate adjective occurs 10 times (1.41.5, 1.96.13, 2.37.9, 3.20.8, 3.58.2 & 49, 5.20.3, 11.1.1 & 10, 12.57.7). When M. employs *otium* with respect to himself it concerns his wish for sufficient leisure to write a substantial work (e.g. 1.107.3) or to enjoy a holiday location (e.g. 4.25.8). Another usage concerns the leisure hours that will be devoted by M.'s readers to his book (1.113.4, 4.14.10, 4.82.2, 7.28.7, 11.3.2, 12.1.3). Such is the connection between M.'s work and the cultivation of *otium* that his book can be dubbed *otiose liber* (11.1.1) Rome is elsewhere noted by its *otium* at 10.44.4, 11.1.10 and 11.3.2. Leisure is elsewhere presented as an imperial gift (here by Domitian) in 9.101.21.

Beyond M.'s own usages, the phrase *otia tuta* is found in Horace *Sat.* 1.1.31 (where it concerns the desired retirement aimed at by people pursuing risky professions) and Ovid *Tr.* 4.10.39-40 (where it signifies poetry in preference to public duties). The gift of *otium* is elsewhere seen as the preserve of the emperor. In Silius Italicus' eulogy (*Pun.* 14.686-8) to the emperor, leisure and peace are shown to result from good governance.<sup>30</sup> The same gift, however, is viewed by Tacitus as the means by which imperial rule enslaved the Roman populace; cf. *Ann.* 1.2 *ubi militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit*. In a similar vein Tacitus goes on to criticise the Romans of Augustus' period for exchanging their freedom for safety; cf. *Ann.* 1.2 *tuta et praesentia quam vetera et periculosa mallent*. It should be borne in mind, however, that safety cuts both ways; for the hazardous position of despotic regimes see Nepos *Dion* 5.4 (*ex quo intellegi potest nullum esse imperium tutum nisi benevolentia munitum*). For the emphasis on the safety and benevolence Nerva and Trajan brought note the use of *tutus* in 12.6.2 and the employment of *mitissimus* with respect to Nerva (12.6.1) and Trajan (12.9.1).

---

<sup>30</sup> Although there are contentions that the reference concerns Nerva, the emperor in question is probably Domitian; see McDermott and Orentzel (1977: 30).

**4. haec ... forsan ... leges:** The use of the deictic pronoun here has attracted the attention of Fitzgerald (2007: 158-60). Rejecting White's (1974: 47) "libellus theory" (which would, in the present context, note that the poem represents a separate cycle of poems sent to the emperor), Fitzgerald implies that the use of the deictic pronoun serves both to exclude and to include the general reader (associated with the *vacui*: l. 3) into the circle of the emperor. The reader notes that the book, which he is reading, is not the same as the emperor's; nevertheless, a trace of such an exclusive edition is provided here.

The concluding sentiment, which notes that the emperor may read M.'s other works, is quite ambiguous. It could be interpreted as implying that the emperor will eventually read the first edition of Book 10, which was written in Domitian's reign and likely contained panegyrics to Domitian, which in the new political climate may prove embarrassing to M.; cf. 10.2.<sup>31</sup> As a supplement to this point it could be added that M. here is concerned that the emperor may read the books set in Domitian's reign prior to Books 10 and 11, which are purposefully selected for the emperor's attention. It is, of course, possible to interpret the line in a different fashion. M. could instead, in a typically understated manner, suggest that once the emperor has read the epitome, his taste for M.'s works will become so pronounced that he will actively seek and read the whole corpus.

---

<sup>31</sup> For the contention that there was only a single edition of Book 10, written in the form now transmitted, see Holzberg (2004 / 2005).

## 12.5 (2)

*Text:* Quae modo litoreos ibatis, carmina, Pyrgos,  
ite Sacra, non iam pulverulenta, via.

*Translation:* Poems, you that recently used to go to coastal Pyrgi, go, no longer dusty, on the Sacred way.

### Content and Structure

The poem can be separated into two parts. The first line describes M.'s previous habit of sending his works from Rome to the provinces. The second line notes the altered geographical placement of the author and his works: he now sends his poetry from the provinces to Rome itself. The poem communicates this distinction via its selection of adverbs and the use of the imperfect tense.

It should be noted that editions of M.'s text from the fifteenth century up until and including Schneidewin (1842) printed *est* at the conclusion, which consequently adjusts the meaning of this poem:

Quae modo litoreos ibatis carmina Pyrgos,  
ite Sacra, non iam pulverulenta via est.

This reading is rightly rejected as it would leave *Sacra* unqualified; it also creates a far cruder epigram. Part of the pleasure in the poem as it is constituted is that the adjectives at first sight do display logical connections to nearby nouns that the metre then denies; e.g. *Sacra* could happily describe *carmina*, and *pulverulenta* would logically apply to a *via*. It is this flexible use of the adjectives that helps to elevate a rather mundane poem.

The question has to be posed whether 12.5(2) is really a fragment or just a trivial epigram. An answer to this question is to some extent dependent upon the way one chooses to interpret the first line. If the reader accepts Shackleton Bailey's (1993: 96-7) reading that the poems start off from Spain and near Rome in the first line and then enter it in the second, then certainly the epigram does seem fragmentary and pointless. If this were the case then it can be confirmed that none of the other 241 *monodisticha* from the twelve books of M.'s epigrams yield anything remotely suggesting a parallel. If, however, the reader views the first



line as an articulation of M.'s previous habit of sending his poetry from Rome to the rest of the world, as noted above, then 12.5(2) is making a neat epigrammatic point about the changing nature of the author, his poetry, and the Roman world. The main problem with such an interpretation, which the earlier commentators had no difficulty appreciating, is the reiteration of the same point in 12.2(3).1-2, but it would not be the first time that M. has repeated himself. Although the structure of M.'s poems addressed to his poetry is usually far more complex than this *monodistichum*, suggesting that it may well be the opening to a longer poem which has subsequently been lost in transmission, the structure of the shifting time periods and consequent change finds precedent in several of M.'s other *monodisticha* (though all of these examples are humorous). 1.69 is perhaps the best example with its use of a relative pronoun and imperfect verb in the first line and a temporal adverb in the second, plus its slightly elliptical feel; but see also 1.30; 1.47; 1.74; 3.48; 8.74; 9.95a. Despite the inherent problems of interpretation that this epigram presents, it is interesting to note that in its structure, verbal repetition, and delineation of two timeframes it is not dissimilar to a Platonic epigram (A.G. 7.670), dubbed by Mackail (1906: 415) as the "most perfect epigram ever written in any language":

Ἄσπῆρ πρὶν μὲν ἔλαμπες ἐνὶ ζωοῖσιν Ἐῶος,  
 νῦν δὲ θανῶν λάμπεις Ἕσπερος ἐν φθιμένοισι.

It is, of course, entirely possible that 12.5(2) is an incomplete fragment. Although the manuscript transmission of M.'s work is particularly strong, encompassing three separate families of manuscripts, there are, nevertheless, occasional flaws to be found. These can be classified according to various types. The most noteworthy omission concerns the transmission of the *Liber Spectaculorum*. As this book is only transmitted by the α family of manuscripts, itself a *florilegium*, roughly two thirds of this book are lost to us; for the *Liber Spectaculorum* see Coleman (2006: xxi-xxv) and for the α family see Lindsay (1903: 8-12). Book 10, which likely represents a second edition, presents similar problems, owing to the fact that hypothesised panegyrics to Domitian from the first edition are now lost too; contrary to this view see Holzberg (2004/2005: 213-9) and Holzberg (2012: 142-51), who contends that the present Book 10 is the first and only edition, which is set in the Trajanic period. Several chronologically incongruous poems in Book 12 (12.4, 12.5(2), 12.6.1-6, 12.11, 12.15), which are omitted from the γ family, have also been interpreted as later posthumous additions to the book; contrary to this view see Lorenz (2002: 234-8) and the introduction to this commentary. A final chronological oddity, which logically belongs somewhere within the ambit of Books 10-12, is the explicit denunciation of Domitian that is often appended as the final poem of the *Liber Spectaculorum* (poem 37 by Shackleton Bailey's numbering). Beyond these more substantive problems, other fragmentary omissions can be catalogued. There are three *monosticha* (2.73, 7.98, 8.19), which may well represent incomplete couplets. There is the odd transmission of a poem that is now edited as two separate poems (9.95,

9.95b); contrary to this, 12.5(2) and 0.26(22).7-8 are both potentially fragments, which are often added to separate poems. Missing lines are to be found in five poems (0.17(15), 0.33(29), 5.27, 11.65, 12.38); a proper name of dactylic formation is untransmitted at 12.28(29).1. There are also occasional interpolations (6.12.2, 12.52.7-8).<sup>32</sup> Finally, there are poems that have been identified as spurious; only one (3.3) is transmitted with M.'s text, but the *Anthologia Latina* (13 and 270 SB) provides two examples, and Schneidewin (1842: 631-40) provides a lengthy and interesting *suppositicia* at the end of his edition.

The fragmentary nature of 12.5(2) first received explicit identification by Gilbert (1885: 220). Gilbert, likewise, suggested that it may well be appended as the introductory verses to 12.6: "Indessen ist das Distichon wohl nur ein Fragment; als erstes Distichon von XII,3 oder von XII,6 (vor welchem es in P steht) lässt es sich leider nicht ansehen". Although Gilbert did not make such an emendation in his Teubner text (1885), his suggestion was promoted forcibly by Immisch (1911: 497 & 505-6). Immisch's article has had great influence; in the twentieth century only Lindsay, whose edition preceded Immisch, Ker, who employed the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (1905) text - see Wright Duff (1920: 176) -, and Bowie (1988) provide texts contrary to Immisch's proposed emendation. Although it is indeed possible that this epigram is fragmentary and also possible that it is addressed to the emperor (see *carmina* entry), its inclusion as the opening to 12.6 is objectionable. Structurally, if appended to 12.6, it would create two addressees, with the *carmina* essentially disappearing from the poem after this couplet; there would also be logical inconsistencies, such as the *Sacra via* not leading towards the *Ausonia aula* (12.6.1); see the introduction to the commentary for further problems with Immisch's proposals. In conclusion, although 12.5(2) may well be a fragmentary remnant of a much larger poem, perhaps set in an imperial context, it is not happily coupled with 12.6 and should be printed separately.

**1. modo ... iam:** M.'s four other usages of these adverbs in conjunction to emphasise a temporal shift (though not a geographical one) are 4.7.2-3, 4.52.2, 8.67.2-3, and 11.88.1-3. By far the most revealing of these are the two examples in Book 4. 4.52.2: *qui modo ficus eras, iam caprificus eris* makes a humorous and sexual reference to the growth of Hedylus' piles. 4.7.2-3: *durus tam subito, qui modo mitis eras?/ sed iam caesaris barbamque annosque pilosque* should be read with Moreno Soldevila's (2006: 133-4) note on the structural employment of the temporal adverbs in the opening two lines. A more obvious structural parallel employing *nunc* rather than *iam* is provided by 12.2(3).1-2. It mirrors the usage of a relative pronoun, denoting M.'s poetry, in the first line (12.5(2).1: *quae*; 12.2(3).1: *qui*) and a verb in the imperfect tense to reinforce M.'s previous custom of sending his books from Rome (12.5(2).1: *ibat*; 12.2(3).1: *solebas*), and then contrasts the temporal and geographic change by the use of an adverb (12.5(2).2: *modo*; 12.2(3).2: *nunc*).

<sup>32</sup> It is to be noted that Shackleton Bailey adjusted his opinion on 12.52.7-8: in his Teubner edition (1989) no interpolation is instanced, but in his Loeb edition (1993) the interpolation is identified.

**ibatis ... ite:** In the twelve books of epigrams M employs *ire* 79 times; a high proportion of such usages (51 out of the 79) display a connection with the obligations of a client to his patron or vice versa. Frequently the usage will illustrate that travel is a necessary function of an inferior to a superior or a necessary obligation encompassing the debts to civil society, such as the celebration of a triumph or going to the law court. These fifty-one of the usages can be roughly classified within seven groups; often, however, they display coincidences between their respective boundaries. The first group affords 19 examples and concerns the inferior or servile rôle the traveller/ client plays (2.5.4,7,8; 2.18.3; 2.24.4; 2.32.4; 3.46.2; 7.2.7; 7.8.8; 7.44.6; 8.30.8; 9.100.4; 10.6.8; 10.10.8; 10.56.2; 10.72.5; 10.96.13; 12.25.6; 12.60.10). The usages at 2.5 best illustrate the inferiority of the client (here M.'s persona) and his requirement to travel to an ungrateful and absent patron.<sup>33</sup> Another example from this group worthy of attention is 3.46.2; here M. refrains from attending his patron but assigns the function to his freedman (*libertum*) instead. This usage anticipates the next group of 14 examples, which concern the transference of M.'s own obligations onto his books; it is an interplay of the book (*liber*) as slave theme, which can be traced back to Horace *Ep.* 1.20. This usage of *ire* is found at: 1.3.8,12; 1.70.1; 4.10.3; 4.89.3; 7.84.3; 9.99.6; 10.20.4,18; 10.104.1,1; 12.2(3).2; 12.5(2).1,2. From this group 9.99.6 is of particular interest since M. states that his book can endure long stretches of travel unlike M. himself (*tu qui longa potes dispendia ferre viarum*). The third group focuses instead upon the patron's need to travel (either to celebrate a triumph, govern a province); there are five such usages (4.1.6; 6.10.8; 7.6.2; 10.78.1,2). Closely connected to the previous list is the fourth group of two usages, which concerns the need to travel to escape civilian and urban occupations; cf. 10.12.7; 12.57.28. The next two groups both relate to civilian duties or those of a client: group five, with three usages, employs *ire* in a dining context (2.69.3; 3.44.14; 12.87.6); group six, with two usages, connects *ire* with the need to attend the imperial court (1.103.11; 12.97.10). The final group, with six instances, is associated with a journey to the underworld (1.36.5; 1.101.10; 1.114.5; 4.73.2; 7.96.8; 9.51.4). Of particular note to the second group from these instances is 1.101.10, where the book/slave (*liber*) theme is subtly continued as M. liberates a loyal ex-slave on his deathbed so that he can travel to Hades as a *liber*. For further observations on the nature of travel in M.'s corpus see the note below on *via*.

**carmina:** This is the only occasion when M. directly addresses his work as *carmen/ carmina*. When apostrophising his work M. prefers to characterise it as a book or booklet rather than by other means: *liber* has eleven instances of apostrophe in ten poems: 1.3.2; 1.70.1; 2.1.2; 3.4.1; 3.5.2; 7.84.3; 8.1.1; 9.99.6; 11.1.1; 12.3.2 & 18; *libellus* has nine instances in seven poems: 3.2.1; 4.86.2; 4.89.1 & 9; 5.10.11; 7.97.1; 8.72.3; 10.104.1 & 18. Other terms M. uses to characterise his work do not contain an apostrophe, e.g. none for *versus*, *versiculi*,

<sup>33</sup> This can be sharply contrasted with the leisured amusement of M.'s reflections on the same fruitless journeys Juvenal makes at 12.18.

*epigrammata, nugae, pagina, charta, opus, disticha, tetrasticha, ioci, poemata*; the only exception is *scazon*, which M. employs on three occasions, each time it is with a direct apostrophe: 1.96.1; 7.26.1 & 10. For the use of an apostrophe in the “travelling book” genre see the introduction to 12.2(3), the only thing to add here is that the use of *non iam pulverulenta* could be contrasted with the squalid condition of Horace’s travelling book: *Ep.* 1.20.11 (*sordescere*).

The singular apostrophe to M.’s work as *carmina* is all the more striking since he employs the noun 74 times; it features in every book except the *Liber Spectaculorum*. It is difficult to be overly systematic about M.’s usage of *carmen*. A number of observations, however, can be made to demonstrate how this more elevated term for poetry sits somewhat uncomfortably as a description of M.’s work in contrast to more deprecating terms: *libellus, versus/ versiculi*. In 37 instances (50%) *carmen/ carmina* refers unambiguously to the works of other poets. On nine occasions *carmen/ carmina* refers to the works of famous poets, who wrote in more lofty genres (5.11.3, 7.63.2, 8.18.5, 10.35.10, 11.10.2, 14.57.1, 14.183.1, 14.189.1, 14.192.2). In eleven instances it involves more obscure poets, frequently depicted in a negative fashion or in contrast to the genre of poetry M. himself writes (2.7.2., 2.86.11, 2.89.3, 3.9.2, 3.69.2, 4.33.3, 7.42.5, 7.69.9, 12.40.1, 12.44.3, 12.47.1). On two occasions *carmen* refers to the literary works of emperors (5.5.7, 8.70.8 = to the future emperor Nerva). The remaining fifteen examples are concerned with poetry more generally. In three instances *carmen* refers to poems stolen or purchased by a plagiarist (1.53.3; 1.66.5; 2.20.1). Thrice the lack of financial reward for *carmina* is articulated (3.38.7, 6.61.8, 14.219.2). Three times it is used in the context of critics, whom M. challenges (1.91.1, 11.90.1 & 3). Four times *carmen* is employed to describe poetry unlike M.’s (4.55.5, 7.17.3, 10.33.8, 12.61.10). Finally, stray examples are 10.10.9 (concerned with the tedious poetry recitals a client must endure) and 13.77.1 (a swansong). As the above demonstrates, in these 37 usages applied to other poets’ works, M. tends to distance himself principally in terms of genre (frequently epic and elegy), theme (either by being less elevated, e.g. 7.17.3, or more so, e.g. 12.61.10), and poetical ability (favourably comparing his own ability, e.g. 3.69.2, or, more rarely, unfavourably contrasting his own works, e.g. 7.42.5).

Of the 36 usages that remain (excluding the present poem), 21 qualify the meaning of *carmen* to reduce any potential loftiness the high register noun contains, either by stating that it is part of a *libellus*, or by contextualising its tone - rude, jocular, Saturnalian - or by stressing its small scale: 1.29.3 (*libellos* 1.29.1); 1.35.10 (*iocosis* 1.35.10); 4.72.3 (*libellos* 4.72.1; *nugis* 4.72.3); 5.16.3 (5.16.1-2 contextualises M. as a popular, not a serious poet); 5.30.6 (5.30.5-6 Saturnalian context); 6.60.4 (*libellos* 6.60.1; and 6.60.3 for how M. likes to shock his readers with his *carmina*); 6.85.11 (*lusus* 6.85.9; *iocos* 6.85.10; *breve* 6.85.11); 7.26.4 (*scazon* 7.26.1); 7.29.6 (*parva* 7.29.6); 7.51.2 (*lasciva* 7.51.2); 8.3.8 (*libelli* 8.3.1; *dulcis... nugas* 8.3.11); 8.73.4 (*Thaliae* 8.73.3); 9.0.103 (*breve* 9.0.102); 9.50.2 (*brevitate*

9.50.2); 9.58.7 (*libellos* 9.58.5); 10.1.3 (*libellus* 10.1.2; *parva/ pagina* 10.1.3-4); 10.18.3 (*iocos* 10.18.3; *nec tristia* 10.18.3); 10.21.5 (context similar to 5.16: M. writes to please readers, not critics); 11.57.1 (*carmina* here sent to a fellow poet and thus stated as being of little value); 11.94.3 (*libellis* 11.94.1); 12.61.1 (*breve vividumque* 12.61.1). When addressing the emperor, M. often employs *carmen* to suit the nature of his audience. There are six instances (1.4.6, 2.91.4, 5.15.2, 7.8.9, 8.82.2, 12.11.6); these examples are also often coupled with *meiosis*. The remaining nine poems that use *carmen* to describe M.'s own work can be briefly categorised. Three concern M.'s willingness to harm characters in his poetry (3.97.2; 3.99.2; 5.33.1); 7.72.13 advances the opposite, i.e. that M.'s poetry is not an aggressive weapon. Elsewhere, 3.100.2 notes that M.'s poems are valueless and worthy of deletion; 9.26.1 treats the futility of sending poetry to Nerva, who is a much better poet; 10.26.7 notes that M.'s *carmen* is *aeternum* because it is an epitaph to Varus; 10.93.4 has M. request Clemens to take his unpublished *carmina* to Helicaon to spread M.'s *fama*; finally, 12.94.2, uses *carmina* in the context of M. attempting all the literary genres from epic to epigram. In sum it will be seen that the present usage of *carmina* is striking. It is the only instance of a direct address and betrays no indication of *meiosis* or comparison to another poet. Given its placement around poems addressed to Nerva and Trajan, and the previous associations that link *carmina* with emperors in M.'s work, it may be the case that the emperor should be understood as the intended audience here.<sup>34</sup>

**Pyrgos:** Pyrgi was an Etruscan settlement and port. It is now renowned for its inscriptional evidence, which betray ties between the Etruscans and the Phoenicians. Pyrgi is not particularly well attested in Latin literature and a large amount of the citations concentrate on its Etruscan origins: cf. Livy 25.3.8.1; 25.4.4.2; 27.32.7.3; 36.3.6.1; Verg. *Aen.* 5.645; 10.184; Pliny *H.N.* 3.51.4; 4.22.2; 7.125.10; 37.8.7; Cicero *De Orat.* 2.287.6; Pomponius Mela *De Chorographia* 2.72.1; Suetonius *Nero* 5.2.8; and finally a stray and unusual reference to the *scorta Pyrgensia* is recorded as a statement by Lucilius in Servius *ad Aen.* 10.184. As is demonstrated by Rutilius (*Itin.* 1.223), the town had sunk to little more than a hamlet by the fifth century.<sup>35</sup> There are also geographical entries on *Pyrgi* in Greek literature; see e.g. Strabo *Geog.* 5.2.8. For further details on Pyrgi see Marconi (1998: 206-7) and Bruno (1973: 203-6). There have been some attempts, as Howell (1998: 180-1) records when summarising Caerols' thesis, to use the passage in Suetonius, which records that Nero's father died in a villa at Pyrgi, to suggest that M. is directing his book towards an imperial villa for protection. There is really little basis for such an interpretation and no evidence that either Nerva or Trajan even visited Pyrgi. Another similarly rather baseless statement is made by Immisch (1911: 506) and Bowie (1988: ad loc.) that Pyrgi may well have been the harbour used when travelling to and from Spain and Rome. This may well be the case but they offer

<sup>34</sup> As noted in the introduction, however, the structure of the poem would exclude the simple solution of appending it to the start of 12.6.

<sup>35</sup> Rutilius *Itin.* 1.223-4: *Alsia praelegitur tellus, Pyrgique recedunt; / nunc villae grandes, oppida parva prius.*

no evidence to support this claim. All that can be said is that Pyrgi was a port on the *Via Aurelia* about 26 miles North West of Rome; see Ker (1919: 320), Izaac (1930: 288). It may be simply that the port of Pyrgi was used by M. here, as a port near to Rome, because the main Roman port of Ostia would create metrical problems for the line as presently constructed. This suggestion, as with much else on the posited reasons underlying M.'s choice of Pyrgi here, is still rather feeble. Given M.'s habit of employing both fictional and proper names to signify further meaning for his epigrams, an insightful understanding of the choice of Pyrgi would doubtless assist an interpretation of this rather cryptic epigram. Presently, however, it has defied such an understanding.

**2. *Sacra ... via*:** The most famous road in Ancient Rome, it stretched from the Velia to the Regia. It was the only street, except for the *Nova via*, to be dignified with the title *via*. It is to be noted that, outside of poetry, the adjective always preceded the noun (*Sacra via* rather than *via Sacra*); see Platner and Ashby (1929: 456). The *Sacra via* was the site for the dwellings of the early kings and famed citizens in the Republican period, subsequently luxury shops were to be sited on the street and it was, of course, most noted as the triumphal route; for these details and the street's adjusted dimensions throughout its long history see Platner and Ashby (1929: 2.456-8) and Richardson (1992: 340). The *Sacra via* also provides a subtle connection to the usage of the *Subura* in 12.2(3), thus binding the two thematically related epigrams even closer together. It would seem from entries in Festus 190L, and 246L, and Plutarch *Quaest. Rom.* 97, and the collation of this antiquarian evidence provided by Richardson (*op. cit.*) that there is some justification to note that a degree of rivalry existed between Romans living in the *Sacra via* (the *Sacravienses*) and those in the *Subura* (the *Suburanenses*); see Richardson (1992: 340). This rivalry was articulated in an annual contest on the Ides of October when a horse was sacrificed at the Altar of Mars in the Campus Martius. After the sacrifice the horse was decapitated and its head decorated with bread so that the *Sacravienses* and the *Suburanenses* could vie for it. If the *Sacravienses* won they would nail the head to the wall of the Regia (at the terminus of the *Sacra via*). Thus in epigrams 12.2(3) and 12.5(2), which both treat the theme of M. sending his works from Spain to Rome, M. could well be appealing to different factions within the city to gain universal appreciation at Rome for Book 12. It could be that the loftier usage of *carmina* and the reference to the *Sacra via* in 12.5(2) alludes to M. sending his work to the more prestigious end of Roman society, whilst the *Subura* reference 12.2(3), despite containing the dwelling of the upper-class Stella, may refer to a plebeian appeal for M.'s works. In M.'s only other usage of the *Sacra via*, 2.63.2, a character fritters his money away on a slave or a prostitute; see Williams (2004: *ad loc.*).

**pulverulenta:** The adjective is found only three times in M.(3.5.8, 4.19.6, and 7.32.10); there are, however, thirteen usages of its cognate noun *pulvis*. Potential chronological or programmatic reasonings could be supplied to explain its employment. The chronological

utility of *pulverulenta* is provided by the support it gives to the timeframe established in 12.1.4, which excludes a summertime publication date. The occurrence of *pulverulentus* at 3.5.8 clarifies the fact that Book 3, the only other work by M. not composed at Rome, was sent during the warm months of summer; for further on the relationship between *pulverulentus* and summer see Fusi (2006: 142), Verg. *Georg.* 1.66, Cic. *Att.* 5.14.1.<sup>36</sup> Having excluded summer as the timeframe, earlier commentators suggested either spring or autumn as the appropriate seasons for Book 12 on the basis of *pulverulenta*.<sup>37</sup> A spring date could be defended by 12.60, which commemorates M.'s birthday in March, nevertheless a winter date, to coincide with the Saturnalia, is supported by 12.62 and M.'s earlier publication habits; for a publication date of December see Ker (1919: 2.320), Shackleton Bailey (1993: 3.96-7), and Sullivan (1991: 52 & 320).<sup>38</sup> A contrast to the dustless entry of the *carmina* to the city is provided by Trajan's triumphal entry into Rome, which is heralded by *longus pulvis* (10.6.5). For the dirty nature of travel on Roman roads see the use of *pulvis* in 14.68.1, which describes a clothes swatter, with Leary (1996: 127). One may also consider the Roman habit of throwing water outside the front door to dampen the dust when guests are expected; see Dickey (2016: 42 & 45). There could also be the possibility that *pulverulenta* relates to the spray from the sea during the sea voyage from Spain to Rome; see the usage of in *aequoreo... pulvere* (0.34.5, with Coleman and *T.L.L.* 10.2.2621.15).

It also remains possible that *pulverulenta* is used here in a programmatic manner in order to suggest the quality and nature of the book's contents. Such a reading would suggest that the book is "no longer dusty" as the papyrus scroll has been sanded down and perfected by the pumice stone. Its contents will thus be similarly refined and in accordance with poetry that can be broadly classified as Callimachean; for such a reading cf. 12.4(5).2 and Batstone's (1998: 125-35) programmatic interpretation of *arida* in Catullus (which could be seen as synonymous with *non iam pulverulenta*). This seems to be the only programmatic interpretation that could work. There is no precedent to suggest that *pulverulentus* could ever mean "dirty" in a sexual sense; therefore it debar an understanding that calls attention to the risqué nature of the epigrams.<sup>39</sup> Finally it may be worth recording that dust is used elsewhere as a means of reading secret messages written in milk, a manner of writing that is

---

<sup>36</sup> As Fusi's (2006: 142) entry on *pulverulentus* (3.5.8) demonstrates, Book 3 will be happily received by M.'s intimate friend Julius Martialis and his wife despite its dirty condition, since "l'amicizia non richiede formalità". The fact that the present book is described as *iam non pulverulenta* may suggest that it would be offered to someone on a less familiar basis, like the emperor; see *carmina* entry above.

<sup>37</sup> Gallet's entry *ad loc.* neatly summarises this stance: *hinc colligere est hunc librum missum esse vel vere, vel autumno, quia tunc humidum est caelum. vide epigramma praecedens.*

<sup>38</sup> In contending a December dating Shackleton Bailey views the *carmina* as beginning the journey from Bilbilis in early autumn and encountering dusty roads to the coast, sailing across to Pyrgi, and then travelling on the dustless December roads to Rome.

<sup>39</sup> The *T.L.L.*, however, provides no usages of *pulverulentus* or any of its cognates as a literary term. The nearest example is late, at 10.2.2628.40 *pulvis* is used in reference to old books; if considering a sexual reference, some Christian usages associate *pulvis* with sin: 10.2.2630.20.

undetectable until the dust is applied; see Ovid *A.A.* 3.627, Pliny *H.N.* 26.8 and Ausonius *Ep.* 23.21. It is, however, doubtful that such a cryptic meaning would be at play in 12.5(2).

**via:** The suitability of M.'s books for travel, particularly on long journeys, finds a number of parallels. In 1.2.2 M. states that his books make ideal companions (*comites*) for *longas vias*; the use of *comites* with travel here suggests that the books are depicted as part of a governor's or an emperor's retinue: cf. 7.8.8 *comes ibit*, or more aptly 7.2.7 *i comes* in reference to Domitian's triumphal cuirass, and 10.104.1 *i comes, i, libelle*. In 9.99.5 (see *ibatis* entry), M. similarly notes the appropriateness of his books to complete journeys in order to fulfil his obligations to friends and patrons. This stance is humorously undermined, however, at 2.6.14 where a reader, already bored with M.'s epigrams, is compared to a *viator* weary at the outset of a long trip; cf. 4.89. Other authors' books are likewise seen as fit company for long journeys (*longas vias*); cf. Cicero's works at 14.188.2. In related fashion, the very act of writing with a *stilus* on a papyrus roll is metaphorically described as a journey at 14.209.2. The *via* is also viewed as the site where M.'s friends at Bilbilis will encounter his book, which is ordered to greet them ahead of his return at 10.104.11. This usage may be contrasted with the portrayal of the Roman populace's attendance at the *Flaminia via* to hail the new emperor Trajan's entry into Rome at 10.6.6.<sup>40</sup> In sum it will be seen, with reference to the above and the earlier entry on *ibatis* (esp. group 2), that M.'s poetry is particularly mobile.<sup>41</sup> Given the epigraphic background to the genre and particularly the association of epigram and epitaph (customarily on tombs outside the city's limits), this very mobility, beyond its precedents in Horatian and Ovidian poetry (see 12.2(3) introduction), can be seen as a further evolution of the genre.

---

<sup>40</sup> It is noteworthy that the two Spaniards (M. and Trajan) in Book 10 are to take contrasting journeys: M. to Spain, Trajan to Rome.

<sup>41</sup> The associations with poetry and travel could be further lengthened by acknowledging depictions of travel by sea and poetry. At 12.44.7-8 Unicus is depicted as not going out far to sea but hugging the shoreline. It represents his contentment with poetry from lower genres (elegy) rather than the more expansive genres (e.g. epic). Such associations, with limited journeys and small craft representing poetic genre, are widely employed, see e.g. *A.L.* 429 (SB). Propertius' Callimacheanism similarly uses a road to depict generic boundaries and artistic novelty; cf. 3.3.26 with Camps (1985: 66). For the Callimachean narrow way for poetry see McLeod (2007: 38).



## 12.6

*Text:* contigit Ausoniae procerum mitissimus aulae  
Nerva; licet toto nunc Helicone frui.  
recta Fides, hilaris Clementia, cauta Potestas  
iam redeunt; longi terga dedere Metus.  
hoc populi gentesque tuae, pia Roma, precantur: 5.  
dux tibi sit semper talis, et iste diu.  
macte animi, quem rarus habes, morumque tuorum,  
quos Numa, quos hilaris possit habere Cato.  
largiri, praestare, breves extendere census  
et dare quae faciles vix tribuere dei, 10.  
nunc licet et fas est. sed tu sub principe duro  
temporibusque malis ausus es esse bonus.

*Translation:* Nerva, the gentlest of leading men, has succeeded to the Ausonian court; it is now permitted to enjoy the whole of Helicon. Upstanding Faith, good-humoured Clemency, cautious(ly exercised) Power now return; lengthy Fears have turned their tails. Your nations and peoples, pious Rome, pray for the following: that you always have such a leader, and that this (leader of yours) (goes on) for a long time. Fortunate in your spirit, which you uncommon(ly) possess, and your morals, of the type that Numa, that good-humoured Cato was able to possess. To be munificent, to stand out, to increase straitened wealth, and to give what the compliant gods have scarcely bestowed, is now permitted and is (morally) right. But you under a harsh emperor and in evil times dared to be good.

### Structure

The first couplet uses the following structural devices to support the announcement of Nerva's attainment of power: the foregrounding of the perfect verb (*contigit*) and the enjambement of its subject (*Nerva*) aids the sense that the action has been hopefully anticipated for some time. The pleasing assonance in the phrase **Ausoniae ... aulae**, an expression peculiar to M., is further strengthened by an internal rhyme at the end of each hemistich. The phrase also, by containing *procerum mitissimus* at its heart, shows that the beneficial political change has altered the character of the palace and, by extension, Rome itself. In the second line the sense of a permissive atmosphere (*licet nunc*; reiterated in chiasmic form at line 11) and the ability to enjoy complete poetic freedom, and *libertas* in speech more generally (*toto ... Helicone frui*), stresses the direct benefits Nerva's reign will bring. The second couplet's hexametric line is occupied by a catalogue of further qualities that Nerva's reign provides. Each phrase is similarly patterned (with an adjective preceding

its substantive in an asyndeton list) and the arrangement suggests that of a procession, either religious or triumphal. The pentameter uses enjambement to good effect by highlighting the absence of these qualities in the Domitianic period; again (as with line 2) a temporal adverb (*iam*) is employed to underline this political difference. The pentameter then presents a more overt criticism of Domitian as it relegates *metus* from Nerva's Rome.<sup>42</sup> The spread of the phrase *longi ... metus* attests to its duration in Domitian's reign (not just limited to the terror?), whilst the placement of *metus* at the conclusion demonstrates its appropriate distance from the new government. The third couplet is divided neatly into two sections: the hexameter treats the popular and pervasive (*populi gentesque*) reception of the new rule and introduces a religious component (*pia Roma precantur*). The pentameter reports the indirect statement and establishes a new timeframe. Up until now the poem has gravitated between the present and the past to contrast Nerva's Rome favourably against his predecessor's; now the focus shifts towards the future. In that future, again noted by temporal adverbs (*semper, diu*), hopes for sound governance are anticipated. The use of the pronouns *tibi* and *iste* clearly note that Nerva is favoured by Rome (see the lemma entry on *pia Roma* for evidence that the phrase was peculiar to M.'s post-Domitianic work). The sense is plain: Nerva is Rome's obvious and legitimate choice. The fourth couplet picks up on the religious diction in line 5 with the employment of *macte*, used in sacrificial contexts. Although the shift in address from *Roma* to *Nerva* is somewhat sudden (see below for textual problems in lines 6-12), there are a number of coincidences in the couplet that coheres with the opening six lines. The employment of *hilaris*, strikingly applied to Cato, echoes *hilaris Clementia* (line 3); the tricolon use of relative pronouns, to some extent, finds a precedent in the catalogue in line 3; the comparison of present with past time periods is consonant with the poem's primary antithesis. It should be noted, however, that the comparisons between the past and the present now provide positive exemplars in each instance. There may be a suggestion of effacing the Julio-Claudians and the Flavians from Roman history here (almost as an extension of the *damnatio memoriae* that concerned Domitian) in the choice of the exemplars: the examples advance from Numa (regal period) to Cato (republican era) to Nerva (a new type of imperial authority). The fifth couplet, like the second, provides another catalogue. The list of infinitives all cohere around the same theme (Nerva's liberality) and can be viewed as synonymous. The rhetoric shifts and progresses sufficiently in the couplet to suggest a growing munificence: the hexameter contains three infinitives in an asyndeton list. The final infinitive, however, is extended by the use of an accusative phrase as its predicate and occupies a complete hemistich. This growth is then amplified by the fourth infinitive, contained in the pentameter, which effectively has a relative clause as its accusative predicate and occupies a whole line. The final infinitive is further pronounced by the use of enjambement and the alteration in style: the asyndeton list is surrendered through the use of the conjunction *et*. The relative clause is a typical piece of hyperbole (which finds precedents in M.'s earlier comparisons of Domitian to Jupiter), but serves also to bring a

---

<sup>42</sup> Despite the obvious application to Domitian, it must be acknowledged that he is not directly named due to the *damnatio memoriae* following his death; cf. 12.15.

renewed religious focus to the poem (*dei*). The concluding couplet provides the main verbs that govern the list of infinitives in the preceding lines. The phrase *nunc licet* recalls its earlier employment (line 2) and again underscores the freedom that typifies the new age, whilst *fas est* retains the religious element that has coursed through the poem also. The final sentence utilises antithesis to make its point: not only antithesis concerning the past and the present (as is the case in the epigram generally) but also an antithesis that involves the character of Nerva set against Domitian. Domitian is portrayed as a ***durus princeps*** in order to contrast with Nerva's introduction as the ***mitissimus procerum***, whilst the use of the antonyms *malus* and *bonus* buttress this point still more.

**1. procerum mitissimus ... / Nerva:** There is an oxymoronic nature to this traditional representation of Nerva that should not be overlooked. The phrase implies *softest strength* (*cf.* "muscular liberalism"). Although used to typify Nerva's rule in contrast to Domitian's harshness (*cf. sub principe duro*: line 11), it should be noted that M. represented Nerva, before he entertained any ambitions for the principate, either through his poetical talents or his characteristic quiet qualities; see 5.28.4 (*quiete Nervas*); 8.70.1 (*quanta quies placidi tanta est facundia Nervae*) and Vallat (2008: 109-10). For the more overt political interpretation of the quality *mitis* with respect to Nerva and Trajan, see Lorenz's (2002: 238-41) treatment of 12.6, 8, and 9 plus Pliny's telling phrase applied to Trajan *mitis severitas* (Pliny, *Pan.* 80.1). What emerges from Lorenz's extended treatment and Pliny's oxymoronic phrase is that Trajan could effectively temper a gentle approach through his military strength, the unmilitary Nerva unfortunately could never harness (except through Trajan) the requisite military qualities to balance his gentleness. There seems to have been some contemporary attempts made to portray Nerva in a more virile fashion. Charles (2006: 87) interprets the story of Domitian's sodomy by Nerva in Suetonius *Dom.* 1.1 as a way not only to defame Domitian but also to lend such a sense of manliness to Nerva. Despite these attempts Nerva seems to have been blessed and cursed by this quality, he is described by Dio 68.1.3 positively as εὐγενέστατος καὶ ἐπιεικέστατος, but rather more tellingly as ἀσθενέστερος. Note the use of *procerum*: this is the only time in M.'s work it is applied to an emperor, it is purposefully used to suggest that Nerva is a leading citizen among other equal men in a quasi-restoral of the *res publica*.

**2. toto ... Helicone:** Friedlaender's (1886: *ad loc.*) suggestion of reading *tuto* instead of *toto* to recall the preceding poem's phrase *otia tuta* (12.4.3) is a careful and perceptive alternative reading. There is no need, however, to alter the text as Shackleton Bailey (1989; 1993) has. It is far better to leave it, as Friedlaender intended, as a footnote to be considered. The phrase *totus Helicon* is Ovidian and found at *Met.* 8.534 and *Trist.* 4.10.23. The phrase serves several related purposes here. As Nerva has previously been praised for his own poetry (8.70; esp. 8.70.3-4 *sacram... Permessida*) it is a nod to the emperor's own poetic abilities. The phrase should not be considered as only limited to poetic freedom, but

extended out to a *libertas* in speech more generally in line with the contemporary propaganda: see Tacitus *Hist.* 1.1.4: *rara temporum felicitate ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet* and, as Damon's (2003: 82) commentary notes, Pliny *Pan.* 66.4: *iubes, quae sentimus, promere in medium: proferemus*. Besides adhering to a current political signal, the line can be interpreted as a humorous appeal for patronage also. Poetry will thrive because the emperor will sustain it; cf. Juvenal *Sat* 7.1-3

*et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum;  
solus enim tristes hac tempestate Camenas  
respexit.*

Also the use of *totus* and the rhetorical sentiment that suggests the return of a possession in its entirety recalls the trope of a restoration of the city of Rome through the good governance of a new emperor: consider *Lib. Spect.* 2 (esp. lines 4, 11-12) where Flavian rule is seen to restore the city to its populace;<sup>43</sup> or similarly through the beneficial consequences of a new piece of legislation: see 7.61 on a ban against shopkeepers encroaching onto the public paths. In Jacobean England *licet toto nunc Helicone frui* is used as a tag by Ben Jonson for his panegyric to James I: see Nixon (1927: 108).

3. See Lorenz (2002: 238) on the catalogue of these qualities: he particularly notes their relation to Nerva's cheerful leniency and compares them with the personifications of *Veritas* (10.72.11) and *Blanditiae* (10.72.1) in a comparable panegyric to Trajan. The manner in which the attributes are described as a returning procession could be meant to echo Nerva's action of recalling exiles from Domitian's period back to Rome (the use of the phrase *recta Fides* from Ovid's exilic poetry indicates this also); see Dio 68.1.2 for Nerva's restoration of exiles. A similar catalogue is provided to describe an honourable governor (Macer) setting out to Dalmatia elsewhere in Book 10 (10.78.2-4). Macer will return home poorer due to his scrupulous morality and refusal to plunder the locals:

*ibit rara fides amorque recti  
et quae, cum comitem trahit pudorem,  
semper pauperior redit potestas.*

---

<sup>43</sup> Compare the anonymous verses against Nero in Morel (1927: 133): *Roma domus fiet: Veios migrate, Quirites, / si non et Veios occupat ista domus*. The same theme of restoring the city, or a part of the city, to the people is found in Nerva's period. At Pliny *Pan.* 47.4 it is reported that Nerva renamed the *domus Flavia* along populist lines, bestowing it to the people.

**recta Fides:** The phrase is Ovidian and from his exilic period: Ovid *Ex Pont.* 2.7.61 (*recta fides comitum poterat mala nostra levare*). For the reversal of Ovidian exile tropes in Book 12, see Rimell (2009: 190).

The phrase may be considered heavily ironic when applied to Nerva. Nerva has been implicated as a beneficiary for betraying conspiracies to two emperors. After the Pisonian conspiracy, Nerva was hailed as a triumphator and awarded an equestrian statue by Nero; after the Saturnine revolt, he was granted a consulship by Domitian: for references and interpretations see Jones (1992: 52-3; 194-5), Grainger (2004: 28), and for the theory that Nerva was Domitian's secret police chief see Erhardt (1987: 18-20). If Nerva intended to benefit through informing in Domitian's Rome, he was playing a dangerous game: Dio 67.1.3-4 is quite explicit in stating how such characters often suffered soon afterwards at Domitian's own hands. Elsewhere the phrase *sancta fides* is employed by M. at 7.84.2 to describe Norbanus' loyal service to Domitian during the Saturnine revolt.

**hilaris Clementia:** The use of *hilaris* is here synonymous with Nerva's mild qualities; see Lorenz (above). For its rare use in poetry, but frequent use in Statius, see Galán Vioque (2002: 86). Nerva's brief reign could be fairly typified as clement. He refused to employ capital punishment against those who plotted against him. For such a senatorial plot see Dio 68.3.2 and for his boast that he ruled so beneficially that he could surrender power without coming to any harm likewise see Dio 68.3.1. It should be noted that although these qualities are meant to be represented as absent from Domitian's period; Suetonius *Dom.* 10 records that Domitian started his rule in a clement vein but quickly retreated into violence. Suetonius also reports that among his victims was Nerva's relative, Salvius Cocceianus. The fact that Domitian's last recorded victim was called Flavius Clemens may also be alluded to with this usage; see Suetonius *Dom.* 15.1.

**cauta Potestas:** The noun is used on one other occasion as a quality of an emperor (either Titus or Domitian): at *Lib. Spect.* 33.7 the phrase *sacra potestas* describes a quality that even the animal kingdom recognises the emperor possesses. Given Nerva's lack of military experience and his frequent representation as a quiescent person (above), attributes suggestive of power would have been gladly cultivated; ultimately authority had to be assumed in the form of Trajan due to Nerva's weakness; see Dio 68.3.4. This weakness could be engaged with by direct allusion and refuted in this poem. There are a number of rhetorical similarities in the use of antitheses in 12.6 that recall an accusation the consul Fronto made concerning Nerva's Rome. During the commotion of counter accusations against perceived or supposed Domitianic informers at the start of Nerva's reign, Fronto is reported to have said: "It was bad to have an emperor under whom nobody was permitted to do anything, but worse to have one under whom everybody was permitted to do everything" (λέγεται Φρόντωννα τον ὑπάτον εἰπεῖν ὡς **κακὸν** μὲν ἐστὶν αὐτοκράτορα ἔχειν ἐφ' οὗ μηδενί

μηδὲν ἔξεστι ποιεῖν, χείρον δὲ ἐφ' οὗ πᾶσι πάντα); Dio 68.1.3. Given the fact that this statement was so well known as to be reported by Dio in the third century, M.'s principal antitheses of license vs. slavery and goodness vs. evil (*nunc licet, bonus / malus*) could be read as a direct comment upon (and reversal of) Fronto's sentiments.

**4. iam redeunt:** This picks up on the trope of a return to the golden age; Virgil's (so-called) messianic Eclogue can be cited as a shorthand for the use: *Ecl.* 4.6 **iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.**

**longi ... Metus:** One may consider the funereal feast offered by Domitian in Dio 67.9.1-5 as indicative of the nefarious atmosphere that loomed over Domitianic Rome. The fear inspired, however, was not just limited to the Roman populace but engulfed Domitian too. Consider Suetonius *Dom.* 14 for evidence of the emperor's increasing fear of assassination. It could also be considered that *metus* is used as a matter of prudent policy, as Domitian in Dio 67.2.3 is reported to have customarily said that those emperors who did not punish many men were not good, merely fortunate emperors (οὐκ ἀγαθοὺς ἀλλ' εὐτυχεῖς). A political strategy comparable to Caligula's *oderint, dum metuant*; Suetonius, *Cal.* 30.1.7. Finally the audible contrast between *metus* and the typical Nervan *mitis* should be observed. For the security provided after the Domitianic terror see Hoffer (1999: 52) and for the use of *metus* as symptomatic of Domitian's rule see Juvenal *Sat.* 4 (especially lines 34-154) with Fögen (2009: 171-81).

**5. pia Roma:** Cf. 10.87.2 *facundi pia Roma Restituti*. The wish involving Rome and the longevity of the emperor finds its echo in the nearby epigram addressed to Trajan, in which Rome is dubbed *dea ... Roma*. The coincidence in theme is yet another reason to view the arrangement and inclusion of the anachronistic poems as deliberate and thoughtfully conceived.

**6.** Cf. 11.4.8 (again with respect to Nerva) *moribus hic vivat principis, ille suis*.

**7. macte animi:** For the address see Dickey (2002: 338) and for the comparable *felix animo* (4.75.1) Soldevila (2006: 487). Although *macte* is used quite frequently in Latin poetry, the particular use with *animus* seems restricted to the Flavian poets. For *macte animo* see: Stat. *Theb.* 7.280; *Silv.* 2.2.95; *Silv.* 5.2.97; for *macte animi* see Stat. *Silv.* 1.3.106; *Silv.* 5.1.37; Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 15.275; for *macte animis* see Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.166. Essentially the construction with *animus* is a slight adjustment to the formula *macte virtute*, which is common across Latin literature but particularly prominent in early texts; see e.g. Turpilius *Palliatae* 7; Accius *Trag.* 473; Luc. *S.* 5.225; Livy *A.U.C.* 2.12.14; Virgil *Aen.* 9.641; Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 10.277.

The etymology of *macte* has received wide but inconclusive treatment. In the present context it may be considered somewhat divorced from its ritual origin and denote little more than “bravo!”; cf. Cic. *ad Att.* 12.6.3 as noted by Palmer (1938: 61). Three possible derivations have been proposed from hypothesised verb forms (*\*macio*, *\*mago*, *\*make/o*). Palmer (1938 & 1941) contended that as *macte* is used in sacrificial contexts with reference to both the divinity sacrificed to and the substance used in the sacrifice (*vinum*) a hypothesised *\*macio* form originally meant “to sprinkle, to bespatter”; the noun *macula* (spot) is adduced as a cognate form. He further notes that the phrase *macte virtute esto*, when used of soldiers, represents a formula to purify the combatant from the taint of bloodshed. If Palmer’s second view was adopted for 12.6, it would hint at Nerva’s involvement in Domitian’s assassination and the expression would contain an apotropaic function. Skutsch and Rose (1938 & 1942) argue against Palmer and root the etymology in a hypothesised verb *\*mago*, related to the adjective *magnus*. Thus *macte* here would suggest “increased, made greater”. This explanation would be similar to the ancient proposed etymology of *magis auctus*; see Ernout and Meillet (1939: 577). Finally, de Vaan (2008: 357) is somewhat tentative but favours a formation from *\*make/o* (“to raise, nourish”), which would have *macer* (“long”) as a cognate. He does not engage with Palmer’s suggestion, but does argue against the proposal by Skutsch and Rose. Although the actual etymology of the word is shrouded in some mystery, it can be said with certainty that it is part of the conservative ritual vocabulary. It is employed here to honour Nerva and it anticipates that the age his reign heralds will be preferential to the recent past.

**8. Numa:** There are 17 instances of the name Numa in M.’s work (3.62.2, 6.47.3, 9.27.6, 10.10.4, 10.35.14, 10.39.2, 10.44.3, 10.52.2, 10.76.4, 10.97.4, 11.5.2 & 2 & 4, 11.15.10, 11.104.2, 12.6.8, 12.62.8). When the name is used in respect to the second king of Rome, rather than a fictional character, Numa is used as follows. He is depicted, often in the company of other ancient heroes, as an old-fashioned exemplar (9.27.6, 11.104.2, 12.6.8) or as a paradigm of justice (11.5.2 & 2 & 4). He is also used, like Remus (cf. 12.2(3).6), as a synonym for Rome (10.44.3, 10.76.4, 12.62.8), or referenced in company of his wife, Egeria, (6.47.3, 103.5.14). Final usages concern either the straightforward coarse speech that typified Numa (and in consequence act as a defence for M.’s profanities) at 11.15.10 or Numa’s employment to denote great age (3.62.2, with reference to old wine, 10.39.2, with reference to an old woman). For further on M.’s use of Numa see Vallat (2008: index *Numa*). It is interestingly apparent that the greater majority of these usages (14 instances) occur in the books set in the Nervan and Trajanic period. Aside from the value gained in aligning the new regime with the virtues that Numa represents, the pronounced use of Numa in this period could have a different basis. A disgruntled senator, C. Calpurnius Piso Crassus Frugi, who through his membership of the Calpurnian *gens* traced his lineage back to Numa, attempted a *coup d’état* early in Nerva’s reign (November 96); see Grainger (2003: 68-70).

Ultimately the attempt was anticipated by Nerva and Crassus was subsequently exiled; he would later be killed in Hadrian's reign for subversive activity.

**hilaris ... Cato:** Vallat (2008: 147-8; 211), like many before him,<sup>44</sup> is troubled by the use of *hilaris* being applied to the grim figure of Cato the Younger. He argues that the Elder Cato, again not a good representative for *hilaritas*, should be understood. This is to misunderstand the sentiment: one may compare 11.5.14 where Cato the Younger, if he were to be alive in Nerva's period, is described as a willing imperialist *si Cato reddatur, Caesarianus erit*. Nerva's character and gentle rule is so persuasive and so dissimilar to imperialism that it would not only alter the political outlook but even the character of the grim Stoic. The ground was already prepared for this interpretation by *hilaris Clementia* in line 3; unfortunately the frequent separation of the final six lines in modern editions makes the interpretation more difficult than it should be. Essentially M. is using the character of Cato as an *adynaton* to reflect the power of Nerva's own personality.

**9. breves extendere census:** The noun *census* is uncommon in M.'s work; there are four instances (2.90.5, 4.75.3, 5.41.5, 12.6.9). This is the only instance where increasing one's *census* is viewed favourably. At 2.90.5 M. contrasts his own desire to live a contented life with those who strain to surpass their inherited wealth; in 4.75.3 Nigrina is praised for sharing her own *census* with her husband, thus betraying that she values her commitments to her spouse more than her wealth; finally, an effete catamite is mocked for his habit of talking about topics proper to the upper-class (e.g. edicts, civic functions and appointments, and inheritance). It is even the case that the only other use of the phrase *brevis census*, is likewise unassociated with the notion that increasing personal wealth is commendable. Horace (C. 2.15.13) uses the phrase *census ... brevis* to note the distinction between the poverty of the individual republican in contrast to the glory of the republic and publicly beneficial wealth. Despite these facts, the sentiment sought here concerns a criticism of Domitian's *cupiditas*; for the greed of Domitian and his representation as a legatee who benefits from every will, see Suetonius *Dom.* 12.2 and Pliny *Pan.* 43.1.

**10. faciles ... tribuere dei:** Cf. Seneca *Oed.* 198 *solum hoc faciles tribuere dei* and M. 1.103.4 *riserunt faciles et tribuere dei*.

**11. sed tu:** For this precise transitional formula in M. see Moreno Soldevila (2006: 266).

---

<sup>44</sup> Most of the older commentators note this issue, e.g. Janssonius (*ad loc.*) *quos mores posset habere Cato, nisi quod magis tetricus fuit quam Nerva*.



**12. temporibusque malis:** Nerva's period was characterised by its *felicitas*; see Tacitus *Hist.* 1.1.4 (*rara temporum felicitate*) with Damon (2003:81-2) who cites Tacitus *Agr.* 3.1 and the Nervan edict reported in Pliny *Ep.* 10.58.7 in support of this *felicitas*. M.'s palinode should be set against such statements of praise for Domitian's own period being described as especially blessed; consider 5.19.1-2:

*si qua fides veris, praeferri, maxime Caesar  
temporibus possunt saecula nulla tuis.*

In support of the statement we can deploy Dio 67.11.6. Dio reports that in the tumult that followed Saturninus' revolt the atmosphere at Rome degenerated into general and widespread homicidal lawlessness. Roman citizens supposedly poisoned each other in haphazard and unprovoked attacks.

**ausus es:** For the use of a single individual who dares to go beyond the limitations of his period Cf. Catullus' depiction of Cornelius Nepos' historical works *C.* 1.5 *iam tum, cum ausus es unus Italorum*. In the context of daring to go against the political climate of the period, it may be worthwhile to record McDermott and Orentzel's (1977: 24-34) interpretation of Silius Italicus' views towards Domitian. In the conclusion of their article (1977: 34), McDermott and Orentzel suggest that the reason for Pliny's cool tone when reporting Silius' death (*Ep.* 3.7) is due to the fact that Silius would not adjust his rhetoric and political stance in favour of the new regime. In their estimation the panegyrics to Domitian found in Silius Italicus' *Punica* (in Books 3 and 14) are more or less sincere. If this were the case, Silius Italicus would be somewhat unique among the writers of the period; as noted in this very epigram by M., which given his earlier praise of Domitian, leaves him open to the charge of hypocrisy (cf. 12.15).

**malis ... bonus:** Cf. Tac. *Agr.* 42.4 *sciunt, quibus moris est inlicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse*. A contrast to the present sentiment is found at 4.40: in this epigram M. depicts himself as sticking loyally to the patronage of Postumus throughout the bad times, yet when Postumus becomes wealthy he reneges on his obligations. See esp. 4.40.7-8: *iam donare potes, iam perdere, plenus honorum / largus opum* with 12.6.9-11, as noted by (though incorrectly numbered 12.2.9-11) Moreno Soldevila (2006: 304). The comparison between good and bad regimes is conventional particularly at the outset of a new dynasty. For this point compare Eutropius' depiction of the new Flavian emperors in contrast to Nero; at 7.14 Nero is described as *bonis omnibus hostis fuit*, whereas Vespasian, at 7.19, is described as comparable to the best emperors despite his humble origin (*princeps obscure quidem natus, sed optimis comparandus*), whose reign is typified by justice and freedom (7.19: *Nec facile ante eum cuiusquam principis vel maior est liberalitas comperta*,

*vel iustior*). His son Titus (7.21) is represented as continuing and maintaining Vespasian's spirit of *libertas*. In Eutropius' depiction of Nerva and Domitian, Nerva's reign heralds the return of good governance in contrast to Domitian's tyranny (8.1: *Anno octingentesimo et quinquagesimo ab urbe condita, Vetere et Valente consulibus res publica ad prosperrimum statum rediit bonis principibus ingenti felicitate commissa. Domitiano enim exitiabili tyranno, Nerva successit, vir in privata vita moderatus et strenuus, nobilitatis mediae.*). For the use of *bonus* and its antonym *improbus* as part of the Roman political lexicon (when detailing good or bad governance) see Lacey (1970: 3-16).

## 12.7

*Text:* Toto vertice quot gerit capillos,  
annos si tot habet Ligeia, trima est.

*Translation:* If Ligeia has as many years as the hairs she carries on her whole head she is three years old.

### Content and Structure

The epigram is divisible into two logical sections, composed of three clauses. The first two clauses, which span almost the entirety of the poem, set out the exposition and the ultimate two syllables supply the solution, which is in the form of an *aprosdoketon*. The exposition comprises a relative clause, which focuses upon the character's hair, and a conditional clause concerned with the character's age. It is to be noted that, although the epigram is bipartite in its logical development, this expository section is itself clearly divided by a chiasmic arrangement of its core constituent elements: *quot* (A), *capillos* (B), *annos* (B), *tot* (A). As *capillos* terminates the first line and *annos* initiates the second this pattern is particularly pronounced. This pattern could be further developed by noting the function that the caesurae in lines 1-2 play to mould the latter half of the first line and the initial section of the second together: *quot* (A), *gerit* (B), *capillos* (C)/ *annos* (C), *tot* (A), *habet* (B). Added to this point, the employment of *habet* and *gerit* in place of a zeugma in the correlated clauses is to be observed, especially since each verb could (and perhaps more appropriately) be applied to the alternative clauses: e.g. *habet capillos*, *gerit annos*. The epigram also demonstrates a somewhat noticeable alliteration of the letter "t". The purpose, if there is a purpose, of the alliteration is difficult to gauge; it could be used merely to audibly distinguish this poem, which marks a distinction between poems addressed to Nerva (12.4(5) and 12.6) from those referencing Trajan (12.8 and 12.9).

M. overcomes the rather hackneyed theme of this poem by a dexterous use of anastrophe both of individual words and clauses. This delaying tactic allows for a sense of confusion concerning the subject and theme of the poem, which is not resolved until the final words. By foregrounding the most subordinate elements and by retaining key information M. here forces the content to be geared and strain towards the point at the conclusion, thus emphasising his joke. The epigram begins with the ambiguous phrase *toto vertice*, which could equally well apply to the summit of a mountain. After the caesura the use of the correlative *quot* shows that the first line is a subordinate element that will need further explanation. In the second line M. postpones the conditional conjunction *si* slightly and then

provides the related *tot* to indicate that both subordinate clauses are to be taken together. Finally, after the caesura in the second line, the subject and the main clause are provided. It is slightly disputable whether or not *Ligeia* should be included with the conditional or the main clause; its placement after the caesura suggests reading it with the main clause, but Martial's well known practice of concluding his scoptic poems with a single word or adjective and an element of *esse* suggests the alternative. The *monodistichum* 4.52, which contains a conditional, relative and main clause, provides the nearest structural parallel from M.'s corpus.

This poem could be used effectively as an explanation of Lessing's well-known division of Martial's epigrams into *Erwartung* and *Aufschluß*. Nevertheless, L. Watson's (2005: 271-85) rebuttal of the value of this division may also be worth considering. After noting the fact that many of M.'s epigrams do not conform to Lessing's scheme, Watson maintains that even those epigrams which do seemingly adhere to this pattern should not be divided but interpreted as an inseparable unity. He argues this point by observing how the elements in what Lessing would regard as the *Erwartung* contain so many clues for any reader familiar with M. that the so-called *Aufschluß* would not be particularly unexpected. Certainly in the present poem the use of *capillos* and *annos* in the setup would lead most readers correctly interpreting the conclusion and point of the poem. Also the diminution that characterises the poem can only be considered by judging the poem as a unified whole: in a way the poem falls from great heights *toto vertice* to result in the ridiculously small three year old. Nevertheless there is a reason why Lessing's observations have stood the test of time: the division contains much that has been and still will be observed in M.'s poetic technique. Although in the present instance many readers would correctly deduce the context and direction of the poem in the first section, the concluding point is somewhat unexpected in describing a *vetula* as a toddler. In conclusion both Lessing's older view and Watson's more recent observations are of value in assessing the structure and logic of 12.7.

### **Programmatic Functions and Metre**

This epigram serves a number of introductory functions. It is the first *scoptic* poem in a book characterised by the prevalence of such poems; see Sullivan (1991: 54-5). It is also the first epigram in the book in hendecasyllables, the metre which is a defining feature of Book 12 (the mean average use of hendecasyllables in Books 1-11 is 17.7%, whereas in Book 12 the average use rises to 39%). Of course in many ways the two points above complement each other logically: as the hendecasyllable often conveys a humorous flavour it is no surprise that its increased usage will result in a similar increase in *scoptic* epigrams; for the mood conveyed by M.'s choice of metre see P. Watson (2006: 285-99) and for the hendecasyllable exclusively see Hack (1914: 107-115). Despite the fact that Book 12 has the lowest proportion of elegiacs (52.57%) in any of M.'s preceding eleven books and the consequent

increase in hendecasyllables and *scazontes*, it is also noteworthy that there is a comparatively long delay before introducing the metrical variety that typifies this book. The shift in metre tends to occur very early in M.'s previous books and the alteration can be summarised thus: Book 1: second epigram, Book 2: fourth epigram, Book 3: second epigram, Book 4: second epigram, Book 5: second epigram, Book 6: second epigram, Book 7: fourth epigram, Book 8: second epigram, Book 9: second epigram, Book 10: third epigram, Book 11: second epigram. As can be seen above, not only is M.'s high proportion of poems in a metre other than the elegiac significant, but his delay in introducing a metrical change is just as striking. Another point that should be mentioned is M.'s use of *monodisticha* and their respective metres.<sup>45</sup> The mean average use of *monodisticha* in Books 1-12 is 20.52%, the mean average for Book 12 shows a notable increase as it is 29.59% (only Book 3 has a higher proportion: 33%). The use of a hendecasyllabic *monodistichum* is interesting in a number of ways. The average line numbers for M.'s three principal metres in Books 1-12 are: elegiacs: 6.64 lines; hendecasyllables: 9 lines; *scazontes*: 10.19 lines. This bears close comparison to Catullus whose statistics for the same metres are as follows: elegiacs: 6.53 lines (if discounting poems 65-68; if including them: 12.18 lines); hendecasyllables: 13.14 lines; *scazontes*: 15.5 lines. As can be seen, both poets subtly contradict the expected trend by providing longer poems for metres that afford limited alterations and, as such, usually tend to produce short poems to prevent boredom. M.'s use of the hendecasyllable is even stricter in always beginning with three long syllables, though his use of *scazontes* shows more variability; for some differences between Catullus' use of the metre see Ferguson (1970: 173-5). The general rule that M.'s elegiacs tend to be shorter than his poems in other metres can be further corroborated by examining the metres used for his *monodisticha*. It comes as no surprise, given the prevalence of M.'s use of elegiacs and their comparative brevity, that 84.71% (205 out of 242 poems; or, removing Book 12, 190 out of 213 poems: 92.68%) of the *monodisticha* in Books 1-12 are written in this metre. The 29 *monodisticha* in Book 12, however, contradict the evidence provided above and produce the following statistics: elegiacs: 15 out of 29 epigrams = 51.72%; hendecasyllables: 11 out of 29 epigrams = 37.93%; *scazontes*: 3 out of 29 epigrams = 10.34%. This can be supported by the fact that the average length of elegiacs in this book is actually marginally greater than the average length of the hendecasyllables (elegiac: 7.41 lines; hendecasyllable: 7 lines), a feature that has only occurred elsewhere in Book 8 (elegiac: 8.26 lines; hendecasyllable: 7.47 lines). In sum in metre, length and tone this poem serves as a neat programmatic précis for Book 12.

A few points should also be made concerning the poem's placement in the series of epigrams 4-9. This poem functions as both bridge and hiatus between two respective epigrams to two different emperors: poems 4 and 6 to Nerva, poems 8-9 to Trajan. It will also be noted that the metre and tone of this poem to some extent intrudes on the

---

<sup>45</sup> As 12.5(2) is, in all likelihood, a fragmentary poem, 12.7 is the first *monodistichum* in Book 12.

panegyrics of the respective emperors and bleeds into the subsequent poem to Trajan, which is likewise written in hendecasyllables. In many ways it will be a matter of personal conjecture whether this is a case of a dissonant pairing - to use a theme Lorenz (2004: 268) concentrates upon - or whether the technique is to be understood as tempering the panegyric tone to Trajan; for recent views concerning the function of M.'s techniques of poetical arrangement see Fitzgerald (2007: 106-38) and for M.'s unease with Trajan see e.g. Fearnley (2002: 613-35).

## Themes

This epigram exhibits a number of themes that are important in M.'s corpus. Some are themes that are general to Greek and Latin literature, others slightly more peculiar to M.'s own usage. The themes to be explored will include: (a) the purpose and generic background of invective against *vetulae*; (b) attacks on physical deformity and baldness, both in M.'s own corpus and beyond; (c) the employment of mathematical games and riddles in the epigrammatic genre; (d) M.'s employment of incongruous mythological and historical names and his treatment of myth more generally. As the scope for all these points is so dense and wide-ranging their treatment here will be merely illustrative; the bibliographical references will furnish a more satisfactory picture.

Invective (or *aischrologia*) against *vetulae* is an oft-deployed technique that spans a range of genres in Greek and Latin literature. Before briefly outlining the literary background for the *topos*, Richlin's summary of the theme can be advanced to trace the traditional features that constitute such an attack. Richlin (1992: 109) suggests that invective of this type typically contains the following elements: (a) statements of the female's great age; (b) explicit descriptions of physical deterioration; (c) accusations of sexual incontinence; (d) a rejection of the female as a sexual partner.<sup>46</sup> This working definition provides a good starting point to explore the present poem. It will immediately be observed that the whole humour in 12.7 is achieved by ridiculously subverting the main attack against *vetulae*. Instead of emphasising old age M.'s conclusion pictures the woman as a toddler. The absence of an explicit attack on the old woman's sexual habits is actually mitigated if we consider the single other occurrence of the character named Ligeia at 10.90. Although there is some dispute in studies on Martial as to whether or not characters are developed and should be recalled from one book to another, the present instance can be strongly argued for (particularly as the revised Book 10 may well have been the last published book before the present volume).

---

<sup>46</sup> The reverse of the trope, i.e. the sexually appealing nature of older women is not found in M. but is attested, without emphasis on unattractiveness, in Philodemus, see *A.G.* 5.13 with Fain (2010: 191 & 200). Ovid likewise, despite his statement in *Am.* 1.9.4 (*turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor*), provides the occasional reference to the sexual appeal of older women; see e.g. *Am.* 2.4.45 (*me nova sollicitat, me tangit serior aetas*) with Booth (1991: 117).

In 10.90 Ligeia is attacked as an old woman who shaves her genitalia and is gruesomely depicted as a female too old for sexual relationships. The coincidence of hair loss in both poems is of course not accidental and the two poems together amount to the kind of explicit visual and traditional attack on *vetulae* as evidenced earlier in M.'s work at 3.93 and, perhaps more widely known, in Horace's eighth and twelfth epodes. The present poem then provides a kind of echo and answer to a recently provided epigram and amusingly reverses it. The shift in focus, as outlined in each poem's initial lines, from the character's genitalia (10.90.1: *cunnum*) to her head (12.7.1: *toto vertice*), can only be truly appreciated through a comparison of both epigrams. In short the present poem provides an interesting idea for studies on Martial: *viz.* Lessing's well-known theory on the division of M.'s single epigrams could be extended to multiple epigrams, i.e. 10.90 could be viewed as the *Erwartung* and 12.7 the concluding *Aufschluß*.

Further poems to explore that provide invective against *vetulae* include: Rufinus 5.21, 27, 28, 76 with Page (1978: *ad loc.*); the scoptic epigram series in the *Anthologia Graeca* Book 11 poems 64-74: for those of Lucilius and Nicarchus see Nisbet (2003: index entry *misogyny*); Horace *Epodes* 8 and 12 with Mankin (1995: 153-4; 205-6; 299-301); Horace C. 1.25 with West (1995: 116-19) and Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 289-92); Horace C. 3.15 with West (2002: 132-39) and Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 191-92); Horace C. 4.13 with Thomas (2011: 237-8); Juvenal 6.119ff with Watson and Watson (2014: *ad loc.*). For more general treatment on old age in Rome see Finley (1981: 156-71) and Cockayne (2003: 134-53), and for feminist readings in this type of poetry: Richlin (1984: 67-80) and Richlin (1992: 109-16; esp. 127-41). Without probing each of the texts above a significant division between them should be observed: i.e. those texts which ostensibly have a personal motive for the attack and those which are presented as impersonal abuse. Generally, the humorous texts should be separated as being impersonal: i.e. A.G. 11.64-74, Martial's epigrams, and Juvenal's Satires. Those that belong to the lyric, epodic or erotic epigrammatic tradition are ostensibly personal in motivation, at least the generic conceit is such.<sup>47</sup> For a recent approach, however, that tries to place M. into the Archilochean epodic tradition see Spisak (2007). The above list could, of course, be greatly extended, especially from Greek lyric and comedy.

The theme of *alopecia* belongs to a broader category of epigrams that mock physical deformities. Humorous epigrams in the *Anthologia Graeca* are attested in 11.68 (Lucilius), 11.310 (Lucilius), 5.76 (Rufinus), and 7.401 (Crinagoras). With comparison to Martial, however, they are not at all as frequent. All except the last of these instances is directed against females; M., by contrast, shows no particular gender-orientated preference for his attacks. M. treats the theme of baldness in sixteen epigrams. He often couples baldness with other descriptions of perceived ugliness. To this group belong 1.72 (a female, who is dark-

---

<sup>47</sup> It should be noted that on Horace *Odes* 1.25 West (1995: 119) views the attack as impersonal with Horace in his role of *praeceptor amoris*; for an alternative view see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970).

skinned and has false teeth), 3.93 (a female, who has three hairs, four teeth, a flat chest, and dark skin), 6.74 (a man with three hairs and no teeth), 12.23 (a female with a purchased wig, teeth, and a single eye). Associated with this group, but with the addition of pointed genital humour are 9.37 (a prostitute with false hair, teeth and eyelashes, but an unshaved vagina), 2.33 (a woman whose ruddy, bald, one-eyed features make her look like a *mentula*), 3.74 (a bald man, who resembles a *cunnus*). Of the remaining epigrams: 5.49 and 10.85 describe men with bald pates; 6.57 and 12.45 concern a bald character called Phoebus, who variously paints on hair or conceals it with a hat; 12.28 concerns shaved devotees of Isis; 12.89 shows a man who tries to conceal his baldness with a bandage; 12.82.9 details how a fawning parasite will state that a bald man has Achilles' locks to get invited to dinner. Also of interest to this theme are 14.26 and 14.27, which describe Germanic wigs for the Roman market, a theme explored earlier by Ovid in *Amores* 1.14.45-50.

Aside from Ovid's description of Corinna's hair-loss (*Am.* 1.14), humour originating from feminine *calvitia* is restricted to M. and the few examples from Greek epigram already noted. This is particularly noteworthy given the prevalence of humour connected with male *calvitia*. The theme receives wide expression. From the lesser genres baldness is treated in fables by Aesop *Fab.* 31 and Avianus *Fab.* 10; see Ellis (1887: 12-3). Papyrological finds attest to its amusing connotations; see Parsons (2002: 105). In the *Philogelos* the use of a bald character receives wide employment among other stock characters; see Beard (2014: 185-6). There are various humorous *exempla* on the theme of baldness with reference to emperors: see Suet. *Jul.* 51.1 (*moechum calvum*) on Julius Caesar, Suet. *Cal.* 50.1 (*capillo raro et circa verticem nullo*) on Gaius, Suet. *Dom.* 18.1-2 and Juv. *S.* 4.38 (*calvo ... Neroni*) on Domitian, and for Constantine's touchiness on the subject of his increasing baldness see van Dam (2008: 17-8). In later epigram the theme of *calvitia* is somewhat muted. It is entirely ignored by Luxorius; although he does provide epigrams against *vetulae* (see *A.L.* 296 and 304) and attacks an old man who tries to disguise his grey hair (*A.L.* 338). The theme is used occasionally by Owen (1.23(?), 1.73, 1.105, 1.106, 2.126), and ignored by Beccadelli's and Marullus' epigrams.<sup>48</sup> Consequently, despite the common currency of the theme of male *alopecia*, it can be shown that M. is among only a handful of writers who explore the theme of female *alopecia*. When this is added to the peculiar concentration on *lusci* (who likewise provide female *exempla*) in M.'s work - see Watson (1982: 71-6) -, it will be seen that M. is somewhat novel in the manner of his emphasis of female repulsiveness. Concerning M.'s usage of baldness and physical deformity more generally see Sullivan (1991: index *physical defects* and *physiognomy as showing character*), Watson and Watson (2015: index *women (old)* and *physical deficiencies*), Humez (1971: 2ff.) and Craig (1912: 10-11) for M.'s use of *alopecia*. For a general overview on deformity and disability in Greece and Rome see

---

<sup>48</sup> The only later use of female baldness I have found so far, happens merely to be coincidental and not the point of the joke; see Poggio *Facet.* 137.



Garland (1995), and for the use of physical defects and *calvitia* in ancient humour see Drew Griffiths & Marks (2007: 11) and Beard (2014: index *baldness*).

Although the themes of invective and depictions of physical deformity are a pronounced feature of this epigram, an equally important theme that should not be overlooked is the mathematical game that forms its conclusion. Number games and riddles are, of course, a significant feature of Greek epigram. A brief consultation of the *Anthologia Graeca* Book 14 and the isopsephy of Leonides' epigrams (see Nisbet: 2003: 202-7) will show that M.'s own efforts are somewhat crude by comparison. Nevertheless numerical games and riddles more generally are a characteristic, if rather less explored feature, of Martial's corpus. The following selected list of epigrams rely to some extent on a mathematical joke: 3.92; 4.65; 4.76. For riddles in M.'s genre more generally consideration should be given to the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, particularly if one removes the titles. From the monographs on M. Nixon seems to have gauged the importance of numerical play in M., though his examples tend to be based solely around epigrams having a financial concern; see Nixon (1927: 171-2). In later Latin literature Symphosius' *Aenigmata* attests to the continued interest in this genre; see Leary (2014). Ausonius' *Griphus Ternarii Numeri* provides a further example from the same period; see Green (1991: 444-6). For a quick overview of such puzzles in ancient poetry see Cameron (1995: 477-84).

Finally M.'s use of the name Ligeia is either meant to recall a Siren or less plausibly the nymph Ligea: see Virgil *Georg.* 4.336. For the present purposes either option amounts to the same conclusion: the humorous use of a mythological name, which is incongruous in its context. The technique is one particularly favoured by M. and can be evidenced elsewhere in a parallel context at 12.45, where a bald man is called Phoebus. For a general consideration of the device see Watson and Watson (2015: 63-5). The use of such techniques that are reliant on a mythological element, however, does provoke a question: *viz.* whether mythology is an important element in M.'s epigrams. The traditional answer would rebut the suggestion by placing reliance upon 4.49 and 10.4 as avowed statements that M.'s poems concern real life not fanciful mythology; see Howell (2009: 57-9). This disavowal of mythology as a hackneyed subject is something of a cliché itself from the time of Virgil's *Georgics* 3.3-8; see Kenney (1982: 125). Given M.'s close engagement with Ovid, who characteristically gave much prominence to mythological *exempla* in his poetry, one may wonder whether or not the use of incongruous mythological names in M. should not just be seen as puns of the type that Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 6.3.53) and Seneca (*Contr.* 10, preface 10) despise, but as completely pared down references in his much briefer genre.<sup>49</sup> For the use of mythological names in M. see Vallat (2008: 128-39).

---

<sup>49</sup> It should be recalled, however, that even the higher genres were not above the use of puns; e.g. *cf.* the use of *Οὐπίς* in Homer *Od.* 9.366, or Cicero's puns on Verres' name at *Verr.* 2.4.53.

**1. toto vertice:** The epigram begins ironically with a grand phrase; it has a Virgilian stamp and is found at *Aen.* 7.784 (*vertitur arma tenens et tota vertice supra est*) and 11.683 (*vertitur in mediis et toto vertice supra est*) to denote the great scale of Turnus and Ornytus respectively. Later epic usages include Statius *Theb.* 4.165 and Val. Flacc. *Arg.* 4.368. Elsewhere it is used with reference to an old woman (Myrrha's nurse) by Ovid *Met.* 10.424-5 (*albaque toto / vertice canities rigidis stetit hirta capillis*). Final instances are Germanicus *Arat.* 670 and Apul. *Met.* 7.5. In M. the closest parallel is 1.31.1 (*hos tibi, Phoebe, vovet totos a vertice crines*) with reference to Encolpos' vow to offer his locks to Phoebus, should Pudens receive a military promotion. For the use of *vertex* indicating the crown of the head, from which the hair radiates, see *OLD vertex* 2.

**quot ... tot:** The correlatives are found together four times in M. (8.26.1-3, 10.28.6, 11.6.15, 12.7.1-2). This is the only occasion where the relative *quot* precedes *tot*; for the structural arrangement see the introduction.

**capillos:** As a matter of compositional technique it should be observed that *capillus* in M.'s elegiacs and hendecasyllables is always placed at the end of the line. Although this is a quite natural position for such a word, it is to be noted that not every poet adheres so strictly to this practice; e.g. Ovid *Am.* 1.14.30 places *capillus* in the pentameter where it cannot be placed in the final position.

**2. Ligeia:** As noted in the introduction the name is found elsewhere in M. only at 10.90. Vallat (2008: 383-4) likewise draws attention to the information which is sketched in the introduction; *viz.* the literary background to the name denoting a siren or a nymph in Virgil *Georg.* 4.336, and the inherent humour involved in transferring a name redolent of beauty onto an ugly old woman. It should be added that the Greek adjective (λιγύς, λιγεία, λιγύ) denotes sound "clear, shrill". As such Ligeia, here, may be seen as disagreeable to at least two senses: her appearance offends the eyes, and her voice, as noted by her name (a shrill screech perhaps), the ears. Indeed the emphasis upon the visual and audible pull that the sirens produced is noted explicitly in Fulgentius *Mit.* 2.8: *Sirenae enim Grece tractoriae dicuntur; tribus enim modis amoris inlecebra trahitur, aut cantu aut visu aut consuetudine, amantur enim quaedam, <quaedam> speciei venustate, quaedam etiam lenante consuetudine.* In sum, Ligeia draws attention not by her appealing qualities, but her inherent hideousness.

As Ligeia is the first female character in the Book and the poem lends itself to a misogynist interpretation, the criticisms of Sullivan (1991: 197-207) and Coleman (2005: 30-1) could be

considered. Sullivan argues for a straightforward misogynist agenda as informing M.'s attitudes. Coleman, by contrast, focuses upon the fact that M. often boasts about having females among his audience. She then tabulates the various functions that women play in M.'s poems and argues for a more nuanced representation of women in M.'s work, which may be profitably contrasted with Sullivan's approach.

**trima:** The word is only found elsewhere in M. at 10.48.20. Interestingly, this other example similarly uses *trima* to denote maturity (*bis ... trima*), here of wine offered at a dinner party. The humorous employment of the number three is found in other epigrams, which exhibit a similar pseudo-logical rationale. In 2.52, the busty Spatale is made to pay thrice the standard admission to the baths (once for herself, and single admissions for each breast); in 5.49, Labienus is viewed as three people owing to his appearance (he has a bald pate and hair around his temples). This epigram seems somewhat distinctive in M.'s epigrams against *vetulae* by using extreme immaturity as a comparative point. Elsewhere, the tendency is to overemphasise the longevity of the *vetula* via hyperbole: cf. 3.93 (*Vetustilla*), 9..29 (*Philaenis*), 10.39 (*Lesbia*).<sup>50</sup> It should be noted that the humour in 12.7 is particularly surreal, perhaps more so in antiquity than the present day. Baldness naturally suggests old age, not youth; its use here to promote the logic of the joke is consequently very effective. As well as this internal logic, an obvious point ought to be made: *viz.* that the number of hairs on somebody's head would not be used as a method to calculate age.<sup>51</sup> There would not even be the recourse to similar methods of calculation that dendrochronology may suggest to later humorists. Although Theophrastus suggests some knowledge of tree growth and ring formations, an annual cycle for such tree-rings is not directly articulated until Da Vinci did so in the fifteenth century; see Pinto Andrade (2011: 2) and Speer (2010: 28). Given this fact there would be no logical comparative point of an annual growth that would have suggested itself as a parallel. Given the prominence of female *alopecia* in M.'s work (see introduction), it should be noted that, except for references to the shaving of pubic hair (already noted in the introduction), potential humour concerning unwanted or unsightly facial hair in respect to women is left unexplored by M.; for the theme cf. e.g. Mnesilochus' preparations, which include the shaving of his beard and the singeing of the hair around his anus, so that he might intrude himself within the female assembly in Arist. *Thes.* 221-248 and the description of ancient Roman women as being shaggier than their spouses in Juv. *S.* 6.10 (*et saepe horridior glandem ructante marito*). The elision, or more correctly prodelision, of the eleventh syllable before *esse* in hendecasyllables is found elsewhere in Catullus; see Ferguson (1970: 173) who contrasts Catullus' free use of elision against M.'s more rigid practice. For prodelision generally in M.'s hendecasyllables see Giarratano (1908: 55-6). Finally for a later comparison, which likewise uses childhood in an unchronological manner with reference to

---

<sup>50</sup> It may be worth noting the use of three to denote age in 9.29.3-4: *Euboicae nondum numerabas longa Sibyllae / tempora: maior erat mensibus illa tribus.*

<sup>51</sup> A poem whose humour is associated with hair and age is provided in Neo-Latin epigram, see Fox (1961: 77): *cur tibi barba, pater, nigra est canusque capillus? / viginti est annis, pupule, barba minor.*

Constantine's career, see Aurelius Victor *Epit. de Caes.* 41.16: *Unde proverbio vulgari Trachala, decem annis praestantissimus, duodecim sequentibus latro, decem novissimis pupillus ob profusiones immodicas nominatus.*

Given the fact that the preface to Book 12 states that there has been a three-year gap (*trienni desidia*) between the publication of this book and his last publication (probably a revised version of Book 10), the use of *trima* may provoke a metaliterary interpretation. For those who would wish to pursue a metaliterary interpretation, Zetzel (1996: 73-100, see esp. 78-9) provides a starting point as he links the representation of hair to the elegiac genre. If the association between hair and poetry was pronounced, the use of a bald character with a euphonic name (Ligeia) would furnish a subtle form of *meiosis* here. Another metaliterary interpretation, would understand the reference to the hideous Ligeia as a deflation of the literary worth of the mythological genre, not epigram. Consequently 12.7 could be read as a defence of the epigrammatic genre and a traditional *recusatio*. A further number game, which remains unfulfilled and possibly coincidental, is to be found by the use of *trima* here and *secundum* in the next epigram (12.8.2). It might be felt that the reader is being primed to expect some use of *unus* or *primus* to occur in 12.9. For similar number games in M.'s epigrams see the sequence 2.91-93 at the end of Book 2, where the cluster of the numbers three (2.91 and 2.92), two (2.93), one (2.93) could be felt to betoken a countdown towards the book's conclusion.

## 12.8

*Text:* Terrarum dea gentiumque Roma,  
cui par est nihil et nihil secundum,  
Traiani modo laeta cum futuros  
tot per saecula computaret annos,  
et fortem iuvenemque Martiumque  
in tanto duce militem videret,  
dixit praeside gloriosa tali:  
“Parthorum proceres ducesque Serum,  
Thraces, Sauromatae, Getae, Britanni,  
possum ostendere Caesarem. venite!”

*Translation:* Rome, goddess of lands and peoples, who has no equal and no second, when she was happily totting up Trajan’s future years through so many ages, and saw in such a great general a brave and youthful and martial soldier, full of glory for such a ruler she said: “Chiefs of the Parthians and leaders of the Seres, Thracians, Sarmatians, Getans, Britons, I can show you a Caesar. Come!”

### Content and structure

This epigram is marked by its artful use of rhetoric achieved through word placement, careful use of sound and employment of central caesurae. Although a variation of rhetorical devices is the chief characteristic, it will be observed that the figures noted below often counter rather than complement the actual sense of each line. The first line initially appears to be well weighted through two substantive phrases, formed with a genitive and nominative noun respectively, balanced either side of the caesura and with the enclitic conjunction *-que* employed to underline this distinction.<sup>52</sup> This seeming harmony is spoilt by the fact that *Roma* is logically in apposition to *dea* and that the genitive nouns *terrarum* and *gentium* do not each qualify a separate substantive but rather *dea* alone. The second line similarly uses a caesura and conjunction to separate two groups of phrases and mirrors the effect of the first line. The rhetorical iteration, however, of *nihil et nihil* (see the lemma entry for the construction) argues against a division. In the third line custom would argue for the

---

<sup>52</sup> For the purposes of this commentary the use of caesurae as appropriate to hendecasyllabic verse will be accepted without comment. It should be noted, however, that this is contentious ground and that it is quite legitimate to regard the caesura as alien to and unassociated with the hendecasyllable; see Batinski & Clarke (1996: 63-7; esp. pp 64-5). The primary reason for my insistence upon using the caesura to examine M.’s hendecasyllables is the observable fact that a central break in his hendecasyllabic lines is expected on the 5th or 6th syllable with a high degree of regularity (90.77%; see Giarratano, 1908: 51-2) and that departures from this practice are worthy of comment given his customary techniques.

placement of the caesura at the fifth syllable (after *modo*), but a seventh syllable caesura (after *laeta*) is permissible: the logic of the line, however, argues against any pronounced separation since its sense is carried on *via* enjambement to the following line. Contrary to the preceding line, the fourth line effectively uses the caesura to separate the prepositional phrase *tot per saecula*. It could be argued that this demarcation creates the illusion of a ledger (note *computaret*, a verb that amusingly portrays Roma as a dreary accountant), which divides respective time periods: the future generations' time-span (*tot per saecula*) and the extent of Trajan's life (*Traiani ... futuros ... annos*). The hyperbaton spread (over two lines) of the phrase denoting Trajan's life is to be noted (*Traiani ... futuros ... annos*): his influence will be all-encompassing. Line 5 is distinguished by the tricolon polysyndetic list of adjectives (see the lemma entry and that of line 9 for this construction in hendecasyllabic verse). The line has a rather late caesura (seventh syllable); this, along with the delayed substantive (*militem*: line 6), to which the adjectives refer, argues for a further promotion of Trajan's qualities *via* rhetorical emphasis. The compression of the adjectives describing Trajan here is also balanced by the spread of adjectives over lines 1-7 employed to describe *Roma*. Line 6 again, as with line 4, employs the caesura to separate a prepositional phrase (here with adjective and noun after the preposition) in a line which completes the sense of a preceding line. It will be observed that the opening six lines function as couplets much like M.'s customary elegiacs; it is to be noted, however, that the main verb has not yet been introduced and the following lines (7-10) do not maintain this impression. The seventh line finally completes the main clause, whose subject (*dea ... Roma*) is contained in the first line; this is emphasised by the use of *gloriosa* (referring to *Roma*) which is sandwiched between *praeside... tali* (referring to Trajan). The arrangement argues for one of mutual protection, concern, and interdependent success: Rome (lines 1-7) surrounds the timeframe and references to Trajan (3-6), while he in turn protects and endows glory upon Rome (*praeside... tali*). The caesura in line 7 has no effective impact. Lines 8 and 9, which begin the speech attributed to Roma deploy the caesurae to divide groups of people from each other: *Parthorum proceres* vs. *duces Serum; Thraces, Sauromatae* vs. *Getae, Britanni*. Again rhetorical arrangement and logic are somewhat at odds. The eighth line appears as though its logic and rhetoric are perfectly matched; the caesura separates the two groups, the enclitic conjunction *-que* notes the division, and the chiasmic arrangement of suffixes (*-um, -es, -es, -um*) and cases argues for such a division. It will, however, be observed that the enclitic (*-que*) somewhat intrudes on the coincidence of suffixes and that the complete suffix of *Parthorum* is *-orum* unlike the 3rd declension genitive plural contained in *Serum*: thus the chiasmus is restricted to case, not to an identical (case) ending. The next line reverses this effect. Although it is nothing but an asyndetic list of four vocative nouns, an audible chiasmic arrangement is achieved *via* the homoeoteleuton in the central pairing *Sauromatae Getae*. This effect also undermines the power of the central caesura as *Sauromatae* and *Getae* are linked audibly and geographically (for the number of times the two places are joined in M.'s epigrams see the respective lemma entry), thus suggesting union rather than separation. Also note the rhetorical alteration in address between lines 8 and 9: in line 8 the nationalities are addressed through their leaders with the people in the

genitive; in the following line the races are addressed directly in the vocative. The concluding line is noted by its rare use of elision (see Giarratano, 1908: 55-6). The caesura has no particular artistic quality, unless one views the delay of *Caesarem* as indicative of a leader who has been long awaited (after Domitian, and, possibly, Nerva?). The most striking effect, however, is saved for the single word conclusion; in the text and translation above a full-stop is employed after *Caesarem* unlike Shackleton Bailey's (1993 v.3: *ad loc.*) semicolon to stress this. The use of a single word or phrase to terminate an epigram is one of M.'s most well-known devices, but it should be noted that in the present instance the effect is not to reverse or question what has preceded but rather to further buttress it: "Trajan is a man of these qualities, come and surrender to him". For the employment of a direct speech at the conclusion of an epigram *cf.* 12.11.8.

### Interpretation, Background, and Problems

This epigram begins with two lines which eulogise Rome as a unique and world conquering power. The following four lines show Rome considering the longevity of Trajan, the actual subject of the eulogy, and his military prowess. In consequence of such traits Rome directly addresses the sweep of the known world from its eastern (*Serum*) to western (*Britanni*) extremities and urges the nations to come in submission to Rome and to Trajan. A number of conventional motifs can be extracted here: a) the eulogy to Rome; b) the longevity and military heroism of an emperor; c) the naming of distant nations and their submission to an emperor in a patriotic encomium.

a) Although the opening two lines are actually quite complicated and betray an interesting allusion to Frontinus *de Aq.* 88.1 (examined below), the conventional aspects of an address to Rome as omnipotent and incomparable should not be overlooked. The *locus classicus* of Roman power, supremacy, and uniqueness is provided by Virgil *Aen.* 1.278-9; for the sake of variation, however, the following two quotations from the (supposed) conversations between Hadrian and Epictetus will serve the purpose to explain what is signified by *dea Roma*: *Alterc. Had. et Epict.* 67.1 *H.: Quid est Roma? E.: Fons imperii orbis terrarum, mater gentium, rei possessor, Romanorum contubernium, pacis eterne consecratio.* 60.1 *H.: Quid est deus? E.: Qui omnia tenet.*

b) The wish for longevity and power as appropriate to the emperor are quite conventional and frequently found. The *genethliakon* to Domitian (4.1), with Moreno Soldevila (2006: 95-8), will serve as a shorthand for this trope: longevity is prayed for at 4.1.3 *longa, precor, Pylioque veni numerosior aevo*; while the sense of scale denoting the emperor's power is provided via phrases such as 4.1.6 *manus tantas*, 4.1.10 *pro tanto ... deo*, *cf.* 12.8.6 *in tanto duce*, 12.8.7 *praeside ... tali*.

c) One need only consider the depiction of subject nations offering tribute at Persepolis to recall that such conventions were by no means limited to the Romans or the medium of literature. The boastful display of power over the world in lines 8-9 is quite frequent; it is not, however, designed to be comprehensive or geographically precise. It broadly suggests, within the confines of the metre and the logic of the theme, universality: beginning with the east and going to the west. Although it might be observed that the compass could be stretched southward to the *Syrtes* in Africa, further west to *Hibernia* or *Thule* and that the power of Northern China (*Seres*) would hardly quake at Rome, such arguments would be to miss the point: the aim is not exactitude, geographical or otherwise, it is a simple statement of Rome's all-encompassing sway, whether potential or actual. The sentiment of conquest, whether of the whole world or in a more restricted sense, is part of the *laus Caesaris* trope. In M.'s work elsewhere it frequently coalesces around Domitian's campaigns in the north (*Getae* and *Sauromatae* in 12.8); a particularly egregious example, comparing Hercules' successes unfavourably with Domitian's, is provided by 9.101. A fruitful epigram to consider in the present context is 5.3, in which Degis, sent from Dacia to Rome to negotiate peace, brags that he is more fortunate than his brother, the ruler of Dacia, as he has personally seen the god (Domitian), whom he worships at a distance. Beyond M.'s own corpus examples are plentiful in Senecan epigrams from the *Anthologia Latina* where the limit of power frequently extends further than *Oceanus*; see epigrams 417-424 in Shackleton Bailey (1982: 322-5). For the analogous catalogue formula of different geographical realms in the elegiac genre (to denote the lengths a lover is prepared to travel) see Thomson (1951: 137-9). The trope of military success abroad *via* the emperor and the arduous drudge of imperial command was not necessarily represented as enviable. Consider for example the pair of epigrams attributed to Florus and Hadrian in Morel (1927: 136):

*Ego nolo Caesar esse,  
 ambulare per Brittanos,  
 latitare per ...  
 Scythicas pati pruinas*

*Ego nolo Florus esse,  
 ambulare per tabernas,  
 latitare per popinas,  
 culices pati rutundos.*

This sense of division between an active emperor guaranteeing the leisure of his people may be felt in 12.8 with the use of *laeta* (line 3) to describe *Roma*. It recalls the *laetitia* which characterises the (sedentary) Roman populace for the returning and triumphant emperor



after a campaign in earlier epigrams to Domitian; cf. 7.6; 8.11. It should also be noted that the rôle of the triumph here in lines 7-10 is somewhat reversed. A Roman triumph, by definition, is for the Roman people: they will see the subject nations and painted images of the lands conquered together with illustrative spoils for the display. Here it is the foreign nations who are invited to come and look at Caesar and Rome. The idea that Rome is all-encompassing and contains the known world is itself a *topos* though; cf. Ovid *A.A.* 1.52-6, *M. Lib. Sp.* 3, and, in a negative light, representing Rome as alien to its own people, Juv. *S.* 3.60-1.

At root then this epigram is quite conventional in its basic tropes; it could (with the omission of *Traiani* in line 3) be happily constructed as praise for Domitian or Nerva. What elevates it above a merely conventional panegyric is its context: (a) with reference to its interplay with surrounding epigrams; (b) with its consonance to other literary sentiments expressed at the start of the Trajanic period; (c) with the military conquests that Trajan was to fulfil or start during his reign.

a) There are a number of interactions with the poems placed immediately around 12.8 that add to its interest. The wishes for the long life and success of Trajan found at the heart of 12.8 interact somewhat unusually with the similar sentiments expressed to his predecessor Nerva in 12.6.5-6. The proximity of such a predecessor also establishes a contrast between Trajan and Rome: although Rome is described as having no equal nor any second, such cannot be claimed by Trajan in this context. This becomes particularly pronounced when we recall Pliny's statement in the *Panegyricus* 10.4 that Trajan dearly wanted to be subservient to Nerva, always his second in command and to grow old in such a capacity: *tu adhuc in secundo resistere atque etiam senescere optabas*. 12.7 also impacts on our reading of 12.8. It establishes the hendecasyllabic rhythm with which this poem continues; by the use of *trima* (12.7.2) coupled with *secundum* (12.8.2) it establishes the suggestion of a numerical game that should be looked for in the next poem (a tease that never emerges). Finally, the use of a bald character lends suggestions of Domitian - cf. Juvenal *S.* 4.38 (*calvo ... Neroni*) - intruding between Nerva (12.6) and Trajan (12.8) and could be argued to lend further emphasis to *Caesarem* (12.8.10): "come on foreign races see a real (hairy) Caesar". 12.9 also, with its more pacific tone, interacts with 12.8. Taken together the poems present Trajan as a warrior who knows the value of good governance and peace. For an alternative investigation into the relation between 12.8 and the poems neighbouring it, again arguing for the integrity and purposeful structure of the Book as it is now transmitted (rather than excluding the epigrams omitted from the  $\gamma$  manuscripts), see Lorenz (2002: 240)

b) The most intriguing aspect about 12.8 is the fact that the opening two lines rework a passage by Frontinus which praises Nerva's Rome: Front. *de Aq.* 88.1 *domina orbis in dies, quae terrarum dea consistit, cui par nihil et nihil secundum*. The coincidence has been long

observed; cf. Friedlaender (1886: *ad loc.*) and Mindt (2013: 100-1). The most recent treatment by König (2013: 14-5) examines the passage with reference to other allusions to Frontinus by M. elsewhere in the corpus. König argues against the notion that the coincidence is due to a scribal interpolation in Frontinus' text and powerfully advocates the literary milieu that would commend Frontinus to M. and *vice versa*. On the basis of dating she views the borrowing as from M. rather than Frontinus. The allusion, however, should be pressed further: does the phrase *cui par nihil et nihil secundum* have any particular political dimension one may wonder, or is it part of the new rhetoric that Pliny insists is needed in this new period of beneficial rule (Pliny *Pan.* 2.2)? Also, given M.'s frequent representation of Rome as unjust, might there not be a humorously subversive way to read this line in M. "Rome, to whom nothing is just, nothing favourable."? Beyond the direct allusion to Frontinus, the themes that 12.8 introduces can find several other parallels in Pliny's *Panegyricus*; cf. *Pan* 12, 14 and 16, all of which offer chapters dealing with Trajan's military appropriateness and the geographical extent of his conquests.

c) Given the dating of M.'s Book 12, it seems merely coincidental that several of the areas named in lines 8-9 were to be areas where Trajan would subsequently campaign: Dacia (Getae) and Parthia. Given the sentiments expressed in Tacitus' *Agricola* one may wonder whether there was a contemporary anticipation by some at the start of the new reign that the complete conquest of Britain (line 9) would also be undertaken. It is difficult, however, when reading the list of nations at 12.8.8-9 not to read Trajan's later campaigns as somewhat anticipated.

There is a problem with 12.8 that cannot be easily explained away, though some scholars valiantly try (see e.g. Rimell, 2008: 193), and that is the date of its composition. Although obvious examples of clearly anachronistic epigrams to dead recipients (e.g. 12.5, 12.6, 12.11) provide telling proof that argues for Book 12 containing old epigrams, whether posthumously collected or not, the present epigram is actually just as superannuated. It is also to be noted that 12.8 is transmitted in the  $\gamma$  manuscripts; therefore the arguments that are employed to discredit several other unchronological epigrams in Book 12 do not apply. This is a poem to commemorate the onset of an emperor's reign, not one that has already experienced four or five years in power. Also if composed later in Spain the conclusion would be quite absurd, recommending as it does that foreign leaders come to Rome to see the emperor, when the very author of such praise is advertising his own withdrawal to Iberia.

**1. dea ... Roma:** For the invocation to Rome cf. Rutilius Namatianus *de Reditu suo* 47-9 (*exaudi, regina tui pulcherrima mundi, / inter sidereos Roma recepta polos, / exaudi, genetrix hominum genetrix deorum*). For secondary literature on the cult of *dea Roma* see Fayer (1976) and, for the goddess' function in the Greek world, Mellor (1975). Finally, cf. Statius'

depiction of Domitian at the start of the *Thebaid* for a similar characterisation of Rome desiring an emperor's lengthy rule; Statius *Theb.* 1.24-5 (*quem nova maturi subeuntem exorsa parentis / aeternum sibi Roma cupit, ...*).

2. The employment of seven words in a hendecasyllabic line is worthy of comment, the highest limit in M. is 8 words. Out of 2070 lines there are 81 lines with seven words (3.91%), 8 lines with eight words (0.38%): i.e. 89 lines of seven or more words (4.29%).<sup>53</sup>

**nihil et nihil:** The use of the conjunction *et* in the position of the sixth syllable to divide a repeated word of two syllables whose last syllable is lengthened by position at the eighth syllable is peculiar to Martial's hendecasyllables with the following examples 2.13.1 (*petit et petit*); 3.44.10&11 (*legis et legis/ legis et legis*); 7.76.4 (*iuvat et iuvat*); 8.16.5 (*facis et facis*); 12.34.9 (*minus et minus*); a comparable effect is achieved with the interjection *ah* at 12.15.9 (*pudet ah pudet*); for the sake of completeness see the comparable, but less artful, example with a monosyllable: 10.83.1 (*hinc et hinc*). This device is quite alien to Catullus and Statius; Catullus provides only one comparable example 15.11 (*lubet ut lubet*), while Statius provides no real comparisons: the only near comparison being *Silv.* 4.3.47 (*hinc et hinc*). The device of lengthening a repeated word is commented upon directly by M. at 9.11.15.

3. **Traiani:** There are only three direct usages of Trajan's name in M.'s poetry (10.7.8, 10.34.1, 12.8.3). These instances can be supplemented with the various addresses to *Caesar* found in Books 10 and 12, which refer to Trajan (10.6.5, 10.34.1, 10.60.1, 12.8.10, 12.9.1) and the use of *imperator* (10.72.8).<sup>54</sup> Of these usages two relate to his return to Rome from his campaigns in Germany, and the consequent eager expectation of the Roman people (10.6 and 10.7). Two more treat differences between Trajan's governance and Domitian's; 10.34, concerns fair treatment for those exiled under Domitian, 10.72, articulates the need for a different mode of address as requisite under the climate of the new (benevolent) principate. The reference at 10.60 is wholly incidental and could refer equally to Nerva or Trajan; it is a scopic poem which has a teacher petition the emperor for the "right of three students", as he only teaches two currently. Finally, 12.9 concerns the sound appointment of Palma to govern *Tarraconensis*. The coincidence of M.'s relatively infrequent

---

<sup>53</sup> The following list could be further restricted by a stricter selection which refused to count prepositional phrases, enclitics or prodelided forms with *esse*. The 81 examples with seven words are: 1.1.1; 1.17.2&3; 1.54.4; 1.64.1&4; 1.72..7; 1.86.10; 1.99.3&8; 1.109.20; 1.117.6; 2.4.5; 2.6.9; 2.23.3; 2.33.1&2&3; 2.41.5; 2.44.9; 2.55.7; 2.70.2; 3.12.3; 3.44.2&4; 3.67.8; 4.28.6; 4.30.5&6; 4.43.9; 4.64.25; 4.84.1&3; 4.89.5; 5.6.1; 5.12.6; 5.44.9; 5.49.4&6; 5.60.8; 6.4.5; 6.19.1&2; 6.49.7; 6.70.2&15; 6.90.2; 7.55.6; 7.67.11; 7.86.4&5; 8.40.3&6; 8.64.17; 8.76.6; 9.57.12; 10.20.19; 10.49.4; 10.55.7; 10.72.10; 10.90.4; 10.98.12; 10.102.4; 11.6.15; 11.18.2&14; 11.24.9; 12.7.2; 12.8.2; 12.30.1; 12.34.5; 12.36.6; 12.41.1; 12.53.6; 12.61.11; 12.67.4; 12.75.4; 12.85.2; 12.91.3; 12.97.10; 14.56.1. The 8 examples with eight words are: 1.41.2; 1.54.2; 3.73.2; 4.43.10; 5.44.1; 7.86.3; 10.38.4; 10.72.4.

<sup>54</sup> Note that references to *Caesar* which appear to relate to Nerva have been excluded, as well as incidental usages like 12.65.6 (referencing money) or 10.101.2 (noting Augustus).

addresses to Trajan and his return to Bilbilis has prompted several scholars to see a degree of antagonism on M.'s part concerning Trajan; see Penwill (2015: 180-9) and Fearnley (2003: 603-37). The problem with such readings, aside from the lack of explicit evidence, concerns the assumption that M., who by the Trajanic period would have been in his sixties, was overly concerned with the politics at Rome; Howell (1998: 185) also offers a few brief arguments against this assumption.<sup>55</sup>

**laeta:** For the joy Rome gained in ruminating upon Trajan's reign cf. Tacitus *Agr.* 44.5, which contrasts Agricola's misfortune at being unable to witness the Trajanic principate against the fortune of his absence from the final years of Domitian's rule (*nam sicut ei [non licuit] durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem ac principem Traianum videre, quod augurio votisque apud nostras aures ominabatur, ita festinatae mortis grave solacium tulit evasisse postremum illud tempus, quo Domitianus non iam per intervalla ac spiramenta temporum, sed continuo et velut uno ictu rem publicam exhausti*). In the same vein it may be noted that Pliny's jubilation at Trajan's accession had a consequent effect on the style of his panegyric to the emperor; cf. *laetior stilus* (*Ep.* 3.18.10) with Radice (1968: 171).

5. For this repetitive use of enclitics in M.'s hendecasyllables see Siedschlag (1977: 41). For further examples of tricola in hendecasyllabic lines compare: 2.48.1-2 (*coponem laniumque balneumque/ tonsorem tabulamque calculosque*); 3.53.2-3 (*et collo manibusque cruribusque// et mammis natibusque clunibusque*); 4.28.2 (*Hispanas Tyriasque coccinasque*); 4.46.11 (*cum bulbis cocleisque caseoque*); 5.2.1 (*Matronae puerique virginesque*); 5.20.8 (*sed gestatio, fabulae, libelli*); 6.19.7 (*et Sullas Mariosque Muciosque*); 7.55.5 (*et Gallo Titioque Caesioque*); 7.76.2 (*per convivia, porticus, theatra*); 8.79.4 (*per convivia, porticus, theatra*); 9.9.2 (*clamas et maledicis et minaris*); 11.35.3 (*miraris quererisque litigasque*). Elsewhere Catullus' hendecasyllables offers a single example: 23.14 (*sole et frigore et esuritione*) and Statius' hendecasyllables two: *Silv.* 2.7.85 (*forma, simplicitate, comitate*); *Silv.* 4.9.26 (*chartae Thebaicaeve Caricaeve*).

**iuvenemque:** Depending upon when the epigram was originally written - whether at Trajan's accession in A.D. 98 or more narrowly confined to the composition of Book 12, circa A.D. 101-2 - Trajan would have been between the ages of 44 and 49.<sup>56</sup> Although this seems a little old for the use of *iuvenis*, it can be defended on two grounds. First, it is used as a favourable comparison to distinguish Trajan from the elderly Nerva; Pliny (*Pan.* 8.4.4) notes that Nerva's adoption of Trajan secured the tottering Roman state, as he drew strength from Trajan's youth and vigour (*tuis umeris se patriamque sustenans tua iuventa, tuo robore invaluit*). Comparison may also be made to a later eulogy to the 38 year old Constantine,

<sup>55</sup> M. is believed to have been born around the period A.D. 38-41; see Sullivan (1991: 314).

<sup>56</sup> Trajan was born 18th September A.D. 53.

who is compared to Apollo in a panegyric *circa* A.D. 310; see *Pan. Lat.* 6.21.5 (*ut ille, iuvenis et salutifer et pulcherrimus, imperator*) with Ronning (2007: 315). Second, it can be observed that *iuvenis* signifies a man who is younger than a *senex*; roughly men in the age range of 20-45 (though the usages for men in their forties are quite rare); see Dickey (2002: 196) for the uses of *puer*, *adulescens*, *iuvenis*, and *senex*.

**Martiumque:** Beyond the obvious military characteristic that is denoted, the usage may contain a pun, which indicates Trajan's *praenomen* (Marcus). Given his first name, it could be thought that Trajan was born in the month of March; for the use of the month of one's birth to inform the *praenomen* - especially the ordinal *praenomina* (*Quintus*, *Sextus*, *Decimus*) - see Petersen (1962: 347-54, esp. 351-2 for *Marcus*).<sup>57</sup> However, this is not the case, Trajan was born on 18th September (the date of Domitian's assassination and Nerva's accession); cf. Pliny *Pan.* 92.4 with Radice (1969: 540) and *Ep.* 10.17a.2. Instead, Trajan's association with the *praenomen* is informed by his father's (Marcus Ulpius Traianus), his mother's (Marcia), and even strengthened by his adoptive father's (Marcus Cocceius Nerva) *praenomina*. For the metonymical use of Mars in M. to suggest warfare see Fenger (1906: 10-1).

**8. Parthorum:** Unbeknownst to M. Trajan would go on to conquer the Parthians and its capital Ctesiphon in A.D. 115/16; for Trajan's campaigns in Parthia, for their novelty, and for the trend set by Trajan of Roman involvement in the region up to the fourth century see Lightfoot (1990) and Longden (1931).<sup>58</sup> Trajan was thus hailed as "Parthicus" and coins were minted with the legend "PARTHA CAPTA"; see Lightfoot (1980: 120). Indeed, it has been argued that Apicius' culinary book is contemporaneous with the Trajanic period and celebrated his victory over the Parthians with two dishes (*Pullum Parthicum* and *Haedum sive Agnum Parthicum*) to commemorate such an outstanding victory; see Edwards (2001: 259). It may be worth noting, given the use of *iuvenis* (above), that, after Trajan's success in Parthia in A.D. 116, he supposedly lamented the fact that he was no longer young enough to conquer India as well; cf. Dio 68.29.1 (εἶπεν ὅτι "πάντως ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς, εἰ νέος ἔτι ἦν, ἐπεραιώθην.").

**Serum:** Both the ultimate etymology and the geographical region for these peoples are shrouded in some mystery. The Latin is based on the Greek words: Σήρες (an Asiatic people, associated with silk) and σηρικός, ῆ, ὄν (silken). As a people they are frequently equated with the Chinese. There are four etymologies proposed that inform the Greek

---

<sup>57</sup> It is, of course, noted that Martial's own name references Mars in both his *praenomen* and his *cognomen*; both names could be selected due to the month of birth and M. was indeed born in March. It is doubtful, however, that *Martium* is here selected to show any connection or favour from Trajan towards M.

<sup>58</sup> Note that the exact date for the conquest of Ctesiphon is the subject of some debate; see Lightfoot (1990: 118).

words, but none are conclusive; the following is summarised from Norman, Tsu-Lin Mei & Coblin (2015: 315-6). The first etymology concerns *sy* 絲 *sje* (silk floss, silk thread); this derivation is often rejected due to the fact that silk was not traded as a raw material but as fabric. A second proposal, again concerning a reference to silk, would see the Greek as a derivative from the Mongolian “sirkeg” (fibre, thread) and Manchu “sirge” (silk thread, silk floss). As the Greek word is attested from the fourth century B.C., the Mongolic etymology is deemed doubtful unless it was itself a derivative based on a hypothesised form from the Shiongnu language. A third understanding would equate the Greek form to the first, short lived Chinese empire: *cf.* Chyn 秦 *dzjen*. Finally, it has been proposed that the *Seres* refers to a Chinese enclave in Turkestan and that the word for silk relates to Shuleh 疏勒 *sjwo lək* (the modern Kashgar). In sum the word *Seres* may derive from an association with silk, a Chinese dynasty, or a geographical region outside of China. The etymological confusion is mirrored in the geographical imprecision concerning these peoples. As the Parthian empire provided an effective buffer between the Roman and Chinese spheres this confusion must in some way be expected; for Roman ignorance with respect to China see Campbell (1989: 371-6, esp. 373), for the general imprecision with respect to geographical descriptions in Roman poetry see Syme (1987: 49-64, esp. 52 on the *Seres*), and for prose references to the *Seres* see Syme (1988: 227-8). Further details concerning trade links between Rome and China (whether by land or sea) and the report of a supposed visit to China by a Roman delegation in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (also mentioned in Campbell), can be found in Casson (1979: 123-5). For similar usages of the *Seres* in imperial panegyrics *cf.* e.g. Horace *C.* 1.12.55-6 (*sive subiectos Orientis orae / Seras et Indos*) and *C.* 4.15.21-4 (*non qui profundum Danuvium bibunt / edicta rumpent Iulia, non Getae, / non Seres infidique Persae, / non Tanain prope flumen orti*).

**9.** The *cumulatio* of four or more words in a hendecasyllabic line is a technique M. employs elsewhere at: 1.115.3 (*argento, nive, lilio, ligustro*); 5.20.9 (*campus, porticus, umbra, Virgo, thermae*);<sup>59</sup> 5.60.9 (*unus vel duo tresve quattuorve*); 7.97.12 (*aedes, compita, porticus, tabernae*); 10.98.9 (*tonsos, horridulos, rudes, pusillos*); 12.49.4 (*gemmas, aurea, vina, concubinos*); 12.49.12 (*formosos, niveos, pares, gemellos*); 12.97.3 (*dives, nobilis, erudita, casta*). Less satisfactory examples occur at 1.106.7 (*suspiras, retices, gemis; negavit*); 9.11.10 (*nomen nobile, molle, delicatum*) and 10.76.5 (*iucundus, probus, innocens amicus*). Although Catullus provides no such comparisons, Statius has two: *Silv.* 1.6..44 (*parvi, femina, plebs, eques, senatus*) and *Silv.* 2.7.86 (*censu, sanguine, gratia, decore*); in later Latin there is a stray example in a hymn by Prudentius, *Hymn* 4.83 (*oderunt, lacerant, trahunt, laccessunt*) and a less satisfactory offering by Luxorius *Ep.* 21.1 (*apros et capreas levesque cervos*).

---

<sup>59</sup> If one accepts the notion of feet division in the hendecasyllable, as does Giarratano (1908), this line is quite masterful, with each word terminating at the end of each foot; see Howell (1995: 9).

**Sauromatae, Getae:** Both areas receive nine references each; M. also has a habit of uniting both areas within the same poem (7.2.1-2, 7.80.7-8, 8.11.3, 9.101.17-8, 12.8.9).<sup>60</sup> Most of the references in M.'s work refer to Domitian's campaigns and military activity against the Dacians and the tribes of the Danube (6.58.2, 7.6.10, 7.80.7-8, 9.45.2, 9.101.17). Among such usages could be added 7.2.1-2, which pictures Domitian's cuirass as impervious to Sarmatian arrows and more trusty than a Getic shield, and 8.11.3, which describes the applause for Domitian in the circus as so great that it terrifies the Sarmatian and Getic tribes. Another usage that pertains with some regularity to the region concerns M.'s own literature. In order to demonstrate his universal appeal, he states that he is read as far away as these regions (albeit by soldiers on campaign in the region); cf. 7.80.7-8, 7.84.3, 11.3.3. The Sarmatians are also used elsewhere in extended catalogues of peoples by M.; such usages draw from the furthest geographical area to betoken universality. At 0.3.4, the Sarmatians are among the distant races who come in glory to see the Flavian amphitheatre; at 7.30.6, Caelia is shown to give her sexual favours to every race (no matter how alien, including Sarmatians), except the Roman. It should also be pointed out that this instance at 12.8.9 is the only occurrence of the form *Sauromata*; elsewhere the noun *Sarmata* (e.g. 0.3.4) or the adjectival form *Sarmaticus* (e.g. 7.2.1) is employed. For the linking of the races elsewhere see Ovid's exile poetry; such references are conveniently examined by Batty (1994: 88-111, see esp. 102-5 for the Sarmatians and 107-8 for the Getae). Beyond general ancient works on geography, there is also a sixth-century work, which focuses especially on the Getae by Iordanes (*de origine actibusque Getarum*); this work, however, is often criticised for its conflation of Getic and Gothic tribes.

**10. venite:** For the conclusion see M.'s first epigram addressed to Trajan, which, in theme and lexis, is deliberately echoed and contrasted in the present epigram to create a ring union between the poems; 10.6.8 (*ibitis et populi vox erit una "venit"?*). It is also to be noted that this poem continues the theme expressed in 12.2(3) and 12.5(2) of a movement towards Rome. Finally, Lorenz (2002: 13) offers a catalogue of the epigrams that conclude with a character delivering a speech. He notes that it does not add to the characterisation of the speaker, but strengthens the impression of the epigrammatic genre as communicative poetry founded on an epitaphic basis.

---

<sup>60</sup> The complete references for the *Getae* are 6.58.2, 7.2.2, 7.80.7, 7.84.3, 8.11.3, 9.45.2, 9.101.18, 11.3.3, 12.8.9; references for the Sarmatians include 0.3.4, 7.2.1, 7.6.10, 7.30.6, 7.80.8, 8.11.3, 9.35.4, 9.101.17, 12.8.9.

## 12.9

*Text:* Palma regit nostros, mitissime Caesar, Hiberos,  
et placido fruitur pax peregrina iugo.  
ergo agimus laeti tanto pro munere grates:  
misisti mores in loca nostra tuos.

*Translation:* Palma rules our Iberians, mildest Caesar, and alien peace enjoys a gentle yoke. On this account we happily give thanks for so great a gift: you have cast your morals into our regions.

### Structure

The epigram is divided into two sections. The first couplet, addressed to Caesar, notes that Palma governs the Iberian sphere and that peace is provided thereby. The second couplet focuses upon the Iberian citizens' gratitude for this boon and notes that the good governance mirrors the emperor's characteristics.

The problems of interpretation that this epigram promotes are actually emphasised by the careful simplicity and logic of its arrangement. In this epigram the surface simplicity is maintained by its rhetorical devices. Each line concludes its thought and is perfectly self-contained. Pleasing sound effects are provided by the internal rhyme in line 1 (*nostros ... Hiberos*) and the pronounced sibilance that characterises the opening; in line 2 alliteration of the letter "P" is employed to underscore the unusual phrase *pax peregrina*; the third line avoids any marked coincidence of sound allowing a greater force to be felt in the alliteration of "m" in the concluding line (*misisti mores*), the resumed sibilance, and the heavy assonance on the letter "o". Logical antitheses are provided (e.g. *nostra tuos* line 4), and each line employs an embracive word order (line 1 *nostros ... Hiberos* encloses *mitissime Caesar*; line 2 *placido ... iugo* surrounds *pax peregrina*; line 3 the common phrase *agimus ... grates* contains *tanto pro munere*; line 4 *mores tuos* fence around *in loca nostra*). As such, clearly controlled arrangement lends credence to the tidiness of the underlying thought. Similarly the poem's diction is constructed with unspectacular words, nevertheless they are capable of being more amorphous and suggestive; see the individual lemmatised entries. It is only when one pauses a little longer that the striking and dissonant details begin to emerge: while the pun on a personal name is quite common in M. (*Palma/palma*), the irony of *mitissime Caesar* begins to emerge when the peace is depicted in military terms (see below). It then emphasises the suggestions of triumph that *palma* elicits. The slightly unusual phrase *pax peregrina* is surrounded by the oxymoron *placido ... iugo*. Then there is the general dysphoria promoted by the use of personal adjectives (line 1 *nostros*; line 4



*nostra*) and the employment of *peregrina*. Whose perspective are we viewing this from: an Iberian or an Italian one? Where does M. (the Celt-Iberian estranged with Spain) and Trajan (the Baetican of Latin lineage) and Palma (the Etruscan of Roman lineage) fit in this scheme?<sup>61</sup> Is Trajan included in the uses of *nostros / nostra* above? If so, is it the case in both? In sum 12.9 is both logical, rhetorical, and provides the occasional striking phrase from the register of everyday diction, but ultimately elusive.

## Interpretations

Due to the inclusion of Palma (a close confederate of Trajan) and the proximity to 12.8 (which specifies Trajan directly), the *Caesar* (line 1) referenced will be interpreted here as Trajan. A case, however, could be made for Nerva; indeed Stephenson's commentary (1914: 413) offers such an interpretation. The logic for such a reading can be briefly catalogued. There are the following coincidences: *mitissime* (l. 1) is used frequently of Nerva almost to the point of being a personal epithet; cf. 12.6.1-2 (*mitissimus ... Nerva*) and Stephenson (*op. cit.*). The phrase *misisti mores* (l. 4) picks up on *morumque tuorum* (12.6.7) from the same poem; see Friedlaender (1886: 225). The phrase *tanto pro munere* (l. 3) is likewise found exclusively in a poem addressed to Nerva (10.28); see the lemma entry below. Beyond these coincidences of phraseology, the use of *noster* (ll. 1 and 4) need not include the emperor, and thus not exclude Nerva; see the lemma entry below. Such coincidences to Nerva's earlier representation by M. are, of course, essential to register. But if one considers that Trajan assumed Nerva's praiseworthy qualities, such coincidences would be equally applicable to Trajan.

Indeed Lorenz (2002: 240-2) offers such an interpretation that is worth outlining. In his argument Lorenz focuses principally on the use of *mitissime* and makes the following points: (1) the links this phrase has to the poems around it (2002: 240-2); (2) the use of *mitis* as a quality that binds Nerva and Trajan and sets them apart from the supposed *durus* quality which marked Domitian's reign (2002: 243-6). The way the phrase *mitissime Caesar* unites 12.9 with its neighbouring epigrams is as follows: (a) *Caesar* echoes the penultimate word of the preceding poem; (b) the superlative *mitissime* alludes to the same adjective which describes Nerva 12.6.1-2 (*mitissimus ... Nerva*); (c) the pacifying qualities exhibited in 12.9 are contrasted with the martial prowess with which Trajan is described in the preceding poem (12.8). The picture created suggests that Trajan is maintaining the qualities that distinguished Nerva's reign and further increasing them with his military abilities. The wider point that Lorenz makes aims to orientate M.'s depiction here around contemporary imperial propaganda and to characterise it as indicative of the trend. He supports his claim by focus

---

<sup>61</sup> Although it could be argued that Trajan, whose roots are ultimately Italian, need not be viewed as leading a Spanish takeover of Rome, Dio certainly portrays him as the first foreigner to hold Roman sovereignty (68.7.4-5).

upon Pliny's use of *mitis* applied to Trajan and Nerva vs. the negative portrayal of Domitian in his *Panegyricus*. In Pliny's depiction Nerva is depicted as too gentle and thus reliant upon Trajan's abilities to salvage a potentially revolutionary situation; cf. *Pan.* 6.1 (*mitissimo seni*). By contrast, Trajan's gentle side, as in 12.9, is tempered by his steely militarism; cf. *Pan.* 81.1 (*quam mitis severitas*). It should also be noted that M.'s inclusion of the good governance provided by Palma could be used to counter recent political criticism of the poor provincial governance supplied by Nerva in contrast to Domitian's good provincial administration; for the venality of provincial administrators due to Nerva's "laxity" over corruption see Ferguson's (1987: 147-8) entry on Marius Priscus, for Domitian's sound administration of the provinces see Jones (1992: 109-14, see 112-3 for Spain specifically). In sum 12.9, so interpreted, would suggest that the poem is carefully placed besides 12.8 to demonstrate both Trajan's military prowess and his humane side. Although his humane character (*mitissime*) is promoted, it is necessarily tempered - by both 12.8 and the striking phrases in 12.9 (e.g. *palma regit, pax peregrina, placido iugo*) - to demonstrate that Trajan will not let his mild character interfere with good governance or lead towards political instability.

The interpretation above is the most convincing reading of the poem, but the epigram does furnish enough evidence to promote those who view M. as hostile towards Trajan; both Fearnley (2003: 603-37) and Penwill (2015: 180-9) offer substantial arguments along such lines, Hennig's monograph (2003: 456) also includes the interpretation that M. returned to Spain through fear of Trajan. For those who would wish to interpret the poem in such a way the following points could be isolated. The military overtones of the peace offered to the province in 12.9 carries a latent threat and suggests a potentially fearful environment. Although the poem is not mentioned by Penwill (*op. cit.*), this would be in line with his broad thesis that Trajan's rule represented a return to Domitianic suppression after the brief interval of Nerva's *liberalitas*. Secondly, one could note that the only other specific use of the phrase *mitissime Caesar* is found in Ovid's exilic poetry; cf. *Tr.* 2.1.27.<sup>62</sup> Given the promotion of Ovidian exilic poetry elsewhere in Book 12 (especially 12 *pr.*), this is noteworthy. Of course, it could be argued that M. is purposefully contrasting his voluntary retirement against Ovid's enforced exile, but the allusion still remains and its interpretation is ambiguous. It could also be argued that if one considers M.'s earlier negative depiction of the Bilbilitans (12 *pr.*), the notion that the province resembles the character of the emperor (12.9.4) could be seen as far from complimentary.<sup>63</sup>

It should be borne in mind that such subtle interpretations are somewhat treacherous, especially when the slightest hint of imperial criticism could be fatal; see Toynbee (1944: 43-

<sup>62</sup> The poem in its entirety betrays other Ovidian characteristics: note the lemma entries on *in loca nostra* and *nostra tuos*.

<sup>63</sup> Hackius (1661: ad loc.), in estimating the importance of *misisti mores ... tuos*, earlier pointed to comparisons between Trajan and Domitian's function as a censor.

58) for a quick overview of the fatal punishments meted out to relatively trivial imperial criticism, for M.'s panegyrics and potential interpretations see Watson and Watson (2015: 32-6). To demonstrate the problems with such readings a sexual interpretation, which is definitely incorrect, could be advanced for 12.9. The following phrases may be isolated to justify the *hypothetical* reading: (1) *mitissime* (*Caesar*), (2) *iugo*, (3) *tanto munere* (4) *mores ... tuos*, (5) *in loca nostra*.

Although not referenced in Adams (1982) nor featuring in Williams (1999), there is a potentially sexual overtone the adjective *mitis* contains. In an erotic context it denotes compliance; its antonym is *durus*. This particular usage is commonly found among the elegists, e.g. Ovid *Am.* 2.17.5, Ovid *A.A.* 2.178; 2.462; Tib. 1.4.53 with Murgatroyd (1991: 149). Although not frequent in M. this usage is found, in a homosexual context, at 4.7.2, with Moreno Soldevila (2004: 135) and possibly 5.55.3.<sup>64</sup> The readings above demonstrate that in an erotic context *mitis* is essentially a feminine quality: not particularly one denoting softness (like *mollitia* / *mollis*) but rather the bestowal of one's sexual favours for the active partner and it is a term that is employed elsewhere by M. in a pathic context. For Trajan's sexual partiality to boys consult Dio 68.7.4-5.

To support the reading of *mitissime Caesar* suggested above Adams (1982) can be profitably employed. The noun *iugum* (more specifically *ferre iugum*) is one of many agricultural terms that Latin may metaphorically use as a sexual metaphor; it denotes the passive female rôle (Adams, 1982: 207-8). The substantive *munus* may denote the sexual duties of either partner (*op. cit.*: 164); *loca* can euphemistically designate the *cunnus* (*op. cit.*: 94-5) and by extension the *culus* (*op. cit.*: 114). Finally, although *mos* is used in a stock phrase *morem gero* (Adams, 1982: 164) to indicate one's sexual duties to a partner (like *munus* above), I would suggest a slight alteration and read *mares* (real men) here instead. When all of the above is assembled the suggested sense of the poem would run roughly thus: *Eager beaver Caesar, Palma rules over our Spaniards, and his odd peace enjoys a placated form of bondage. Therefore we happily give thanks for such a great shafting, you have sent your manners (men) into our rings.* Consequently this epigram could be read as the nucleus for Juvenal's second satire. Likewise set in Trajan's reign, Juvenal's satire is essentially concerned with Roman perversity (with a particular focus on homosexuality and effeminacy) and its spread from Rome to contaminate the outermost regions of the empire: see esp. the concluding line: *sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores.*

Such a reading is, of course, nonsensical and deeply insulting to Trajan. It is offered merely to demonstrate the implicit dangers that beset the critic of a poet like M., who *is* frequently

---

<sup>64</sup> It should be observed that although the usage is not frequent in M., the adjective itself is not particularly prevalent in his work. It is employed on only 16 occasions across his corpus.

allusive and purposefully ambiguous. In the present case, it seems safest to register the potential secondary readings that the military undertones and the Ovidian allusions provide, but to promote 12.9 as a more or less unambiguous panegyric, which celebrates Trajan's sound administration.

**1. Palma:** There is an untranslatable pun here since the noun could be used in an abstract sense to designate *victory* or be read as a cognomen. The likely candidate referred to is Aulus Cornelius Palma Frontoianus, who received particular favour in Trajan's reign; cf. Dio 68.14.5, 68.16.2, and 69.2.5 (for his assassination under Hadrian). What emerges from Dio's account is that Palma appears to be among a small group of men distinguished under Trajan's reign: in 68.14.5 he is shown to be governing Syria and subduing parts of Arabia (circa 106 AD). A few years later (circa 110 AD) he, along with Sosius and Celsus, was honoured with a statue erected in Trajan's forum. The final reference (69.2.5) concerns the assassination of Palma and Celsus by Hadrian at the start of his reign (117 AD), on the grounds that they were plotting against him. Thus Dio's account, though spare in its details, shows a man who was particularly distinguished by Trajan, and eventually along with Celsus and Sosius (and Sura, see below) came to be among the few men to typify Trajan's rule. We can supplement the picture by noting that Palma was made ordinary consul in the years 99 and 109 AD. It is assumed that he took up his governorship of Hispania citerior (Tarraconensis) some time after his first consulship, given M.'s own death at 104 AD, within the region of 100-104 AD. Finally it should be recorded that Palma was an Italian. He came from Volsinii in Etruria, but his ultimate origins are believed to be Roman; see Torelli (1995:53-4). These few facts help to show why such a person would be eminently suited for M. to utilise in Book 12: an Italian in Spain, possessing a name with useful associations, who is seen (and will in the future be seen) as truly representative of Trajan's new regime, is an ideal candidate for the concerns of Book 12, and a useful foil for the emperor in an imperial panegyric; for work that deals with Palma see Eck (1970: 154); Grainger (2004: 120); *PIR*(2) C 1412; Lebas-Waddington 2296.

Two more points on the significance of Palma ought to be noted. The name may, beyond the associations already observed, betray an allusion to the famous palm that miraculously sprouted on Augustus' altar at Tarraco. This occurrence is reported by Quintilian *Inst. Orat.* 6.3.77 to demonstrate Augustus' humour (*Et Augustus, nuntiantibus Tarraconensibus palmam in ara eius enatam, "apparet" inquit "quam saepe accendatis"*). Nevertheless, there is independent numismatic evidence displaying the palm, thus attesting to the wide promotion and advertisement of the miracle; for further see Fiske (1900: 134). It is to be noted that the temple at Tarraco was the first temple to be exclusively devoted to the worship of the emperor and set a precedent for such worship across the empire; cf. Tacitus *Ann.* 1.78 (*templum ut colonia Tarraconensi strueretur Augusto petantibus Hispanis permissum datumque in omnes provincias exemplum*). Given such a happy and well-known

association with the province and the palm, might Palma's selection in the province suggest a return to Augustanism with the new administration? For further details on the prominence of the imperial cult at Tarraco see Fiske (1900: 120). It should also be added that in Book 12 M. makes no mention of other individuals who are, and will go on to be, prominent in Trajan's reign: Sosius, Celsus and Sura. This is particularly surprising in the case of Sura, whom M. has addressed favourably as an admiring reader and protector elsewhere (1.49.40, 6.64.13, 7.47.1). Given the fact that Lucius Licinius Sura was a fellow Spaniard, who would conspicuously patronise Tarraconensis (the arch of Bara for instance was commissioned by him), and that he was a friend of Trajan whom M. had previously flattered, his omission is somewhat odd. It does, however, lend support to a date of Book 12 as being around A.D. 101 (the year of Stella's consulship), since Sura would achieve the consulship in A.D. 102, which M., had he known, might be expected to have celebrated. Thus we may want to narrow Palma's function as governor of Tarraconensis down to A.D. 101. For further details on Sura see Jones (1970: 98-100) and Bennett (1997: 149), for the epigraphical evidence in Spain noting Sura's prominence in the Trajanic period see Fiske (1900: 109), for the "Arch of Bara" see Travis (1952: 6).

**regit:** *regit* β; *gerit* γ (*non* E). The context would support either reading. Nevertheless, the omission of *gerit* from E, the best representative of the γ family of manuscripts, supports *regit* and Shackleton Bailey's (1989: *ad loc.*) decision to ignore any variant in his apparatus; for details on the γ manuscripts see Lindsay (1903: 7-8). Even without the stronger support of the manuscripts, *regit* can be preferred, *cf.* 7.52.3 *ille meas gentes, Celtas et rexit Hiberos*. A minor variant, found in a single manuscript and supplied in Schneidewin's (1842: *ad loc.*) apparatus, is *tegit*. Although *tegit* is not insensible, its protective overtones are somewhat at odds with the hostile peace portrayed here and with the ominous associations so carefully cultivated in the selected diction of this epigram.

**nostros ... Hiberos:** The temptation to read *nostros* as a deliberate usage that purposefully includes (the Spanish) Trajan (e.g. Shackleton Bailey, 1993: *ad loc.*) should not be too readily accepted here. It may be the case that M. is diplomatically and tactfully aligning himself on (perceived) racial grounds with Trajan. Alternatively it may be the frequent employment of the poetic plural for the singular, or it could refer, in a restricted sense, to M. and his fellow Bilbilitans.<sup>65</sup> There are both cultural and geographic reasons that can be advanced against such a reading and also rhetorical considerations in the epigram itself that argue against the assumption. At this period the peninsula was divided into three main administrative areas: Lusitania, Baetica and Hispania Citerior (Tarraconensis). It is somewhat uncertain whether a sense of patriotism would extend to the whole administrative area, let alone the whole peninsula; contrary to this point it should be noted that Sullivan

---

<sup>65</sup> It could also be advanced, as noted in the introduction, that Nerva is the referent and that *nostros* lacks any association with the emperor altogether.

(1991: 175) does associate M. strongly with national sympathies that encompass the entire peninsula. Although there is still much to discover about the Iberians and Celt-Iberians (see Curchin, 1991: 18-20), the usage of *Hiberos* may, if used with any particular point, prevent an association with the emperor Trajan. His origins in Italica were ultimately Italian in a part of the peninsula (Baetica) that had long absorbed and experienced frequent cultural and ethnic alteration: i.e. a world away from more northerly Iberian tribes. Despite these slightly pedantic points, there is a more compelling rhetorical reason for rejecting, or at least questioning, the association that *nostros* may suggest. It will be seen, particularly in the concluding line, that this epigram is neatly balanced between the use of *noster* to represent the recipients of a policy and *tuus* to denote the agent: i.e. Trajan shows the way, we (his subjects) follow. The epigram is actually rather clever in its use of personal adjectives. Since Trajan's actions are carried out through a (Italian) subordinate, the epigram manages to achieve an effect of having Trajan loom over the whole area without being there, which in turn generates a certain hesitancy for the reader when determining whether or not to include Trajan in the use of *noster* here and in line 4.

The display of pacified (H)iberians in this poem also engages with earlier literary portrayals of Iberians as implacably opposed to Romanisation and tantamount to brigands; cf. Virg. *Georg.* 3.408 (*aut inpacatos a tergo horrebis Hiberos*) in a context where the author advises retaining fierce dogs to keep such thieves away. Another near comparison, here with the Northern Spanish Cantabrians rather than the less specific *Hiberi*, is provided by Hor. *C.* 2.6.2 (*Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra...*) with Nisbet and Hubbard (2004: 97). Although such differences may be answered by the historical and political changes that had taken place since the Augustan period, and allowance made for M.'s own Spanish background, there is still a sense in which this image of a lawless and indomitable Hispanic trait is being harnessed in the present poem, thus making Trajan's taming of the region appear even more miraculous. Such *adynata* in M.'s imperial panegyrics are quite typical and found throughout the corpus from the *Liber Spectaculorum* down to his final work, Book 12.

When *Hiberi* is employed by M. its customary position tends to be at the end of the hexameter or hendecasyllable. It is used on eight other occasions: four times it is qualified with the additional adjective *Celti* separated by tmesis to form a single substantive to depict the Celt-Iberian peoples (4.55.8; 7.52.3; 10.65.3; 10.78.9) and on four occasions it is a geographical adjective qualifying a noun (5.65.11 *pastoris*; 6.18.1 *terris*; 8.28.5 *stabuli*; 10.13.5 *terris*). It will be seen that the present usage is quite singular in M.'s corpus since it functions as a noun qualified by the personal adjective *nostros*. Despite the slightly unusual nature here there have been no suggestions advanced offering to read *Celtos* instead of *nostros* to accord with M.'s other usages. As such this is the only usage in M. of (H)iberians rather than the more specific Celt-Iberians.

**mitissime Caesar:** For the importance of the phrase, its Ovidian origin, and its application to Nerva see the interpretation above. It is probably the merest coincidence, but it should be pointed out, that in the epitome of Dio's history a very similar phrase is used to describe Hadrian (φιλανθρωπότητα ἄρξας) in a passage that describes Hadrian's purges of Trajanic beneficiaries (Palma included) at the start of his reign: Dio 69.2.5.

**2. placido ... iugo:** The phrase is found elsewhere only in Valerius Flaccus *Arg.* 2.635 (*urbs placidis demissa iugis*). It is a striking oxymoron whose principal idea is encountered in other contexts, especially where a wild force is tamed by divine or imperial power. In M.'s work the best example is 1.104 (esp. ll. 1-2). In 1.104 Domitian's influential mastery is seen as the agent for a number of remarkable sights in the arena: the yoking of leopards, tigresses enduring the lash, *et al.* Such sentiments culminate in the repeated image of the lion sparing the hare; for the trope in M. see Howell (1980: 320-3). Other comparable examples include Bacchus' power resulting in the yoking of tigresses; *cf.* Hor. *C.* 3.3.13-4. The unrealistic and idealistic picture created here seems to have the same naïve insincerity as Alfius' portrayal of rural life, where hardships and work are unknown; see Mankin (1995: 62-87).

Florus, writing a little later than M., provides a rather different impression of the Spaniards' response to the Roman yoke: *plus est provinciam retinere quam facere. itaque per partes iam huc iam illuc missi duces, qui ferocissimas et in id tempus liberas gentes ideoque impatientes iugi multo labore nec incruentis certaminibus servire docuerunt.* (Florus 1.33.8). For further on this passage and discussion on a similar later occurrence in Florus see Lavan (2013: 103-4). Given the Spanish setting it may be contended that M. is here countering and updating a sentiment expressed in Horace *C.* 2.6.2 (cited above: *nostros ... Hiberos* entry) to the effect that the Cantabrians had not yet learned to endure the Roman yoke.

It is also possible, however, to interpret the phrase without promoting its oxymoronic side, or at least tempering it. Properly understood, a *iugum* would be a rudimentary arch fashioned by three spears. Defeated enemy combatants would be made to pass through a *iugum* in order to enact their conquered and humiliated status; *cf.* Livy *A.U.C.* 3.28 (*sed ut exprimatur tandem confessio subactum domitamque esse gentem, sub iugum abituros*). Naturally such a ceremony adds point to the humiliating nature outlined above and the oxymoronic use of *placido*. A *iugum*, however, need not imply such an aggressive and humiliating character, nor be limited to the military sphere. The entrance through such structures (*iuga*, triumphal arches, and doorways generally) metaphorically represented a liminal rite of passage or change of status. Thus we have recorded evidence of a priest who entered a *iugum* to signify his transition from a member of the laity to that of the priesthood; *cf.* *C.I.L.* VIII 24034 with Nock (1926: 107-9). In the present case the "placid yoke" could symbolise a cathartic

transition from the rule of Domitian to that of Trajan, without any of the harsh imperial overtones being emphasised. For further on the purificatory function of *iuga* and triumphal arches see Warde Fowler (1913: 48-51).<sup>66</sup>

**pax peregrina:** A conspicuous phrase underscored via alliteration; it is without an exact parallel. Once again, as with *noster* (see above), there is some confusion as to who exactly *peregrina* should refer: should the reader take a Spanish or an Italian perspective? Armed with the introductory epistle and its characteristic yearning for Rome and dissatisfaction with Spain and 12.2(3).2 (in which Book 12 is dubbed a *peregrine liber*) it is natural to assume that *peregrina* here refers, from an Italian viewpoint, to Spain. On the other hand, so striking is the usage and such a strong blend of Italian and Spanish elements course through Book 12 that the reader may legitimately view *peregrina* from an Iberian perspective and interpret it as an *Italian peace*. This is somewhat reinforced since in line 4 Trajan's morals (i.e. laws) are cast (*mittere*) into the region. In sum the ambiguity is to be viewed as quite intentional. For the attributive metonymical use here see Fenger (1906: 24).

**3. ergo agimus:** When using a conjunction to denote causality, M. prefers *ergo*: it is used 54 times compared to the 12 usages of *igitur* and the 2 of *itaque*. Given the fluctuating prosodic value placed on the ultimate syllable of *ergo* the elision should not be regarded as harsh; for the the prosody of *ergo* in M. see Giarratano (1908: 80) and for the harsh elision of a long syllable by a subsequent short see Postgate (1923: 35). There are eight other occasions in the corpus where an anceps syllable is elided by a short syllable - *ergo* is so elided twice (4.311.9 and 8.55.23) - and two occurrences of an anceps syllable being elided by a long one; for these references see Giarratano (1908: 35). M.'s usage here is completely consistent with comparable Latin poets: Horace, Ovid, Statius and Juvenal all favour *ergo* over any other causal conjunction (*itaque* is likewise found least often or not at all) and feel free to elide it with a short syllable. Catullus, however, differs slightly: he employs *igitur* and *itaque* more often than *ergo* (which is used once and without elision).

**tanto pro munere:** For the phrase cf. 10.28.7 (*tanto pro munere gratus*). The repeated reference is of especial interest as both epigrams concern peace and imperial munificence. The imperial referent is likewise ambiguous in 10.28. Stephenson (1914: 380) notes that the acknowledgement of the forum Transitorium could signify either Domitian or Nerva, but he logically assigns the praise to Nerva on the basis that a laudatory poem to Domitian in Book 10 would be incongruous. Nevertheless, Roman (2010: 112) does promote the idea that Domitian is the *Caesar* praised in 10.28. If Roman's identification were correct (and there should be considerable scepticism on this point), then the phrase would be another case in

---

<sup>66</sup> Given the purificatory function identified with arches, it is somewhat arresting that prostitutes used to employ such structures (*fornices*) as brothels. Doubtless the meaning of such ceremonial passages (to remove bloodguilt or to denote a change of status) gradually became dormant.



M.'s imperial panegyrics of the importation of praise delivered to Domitian and transferred, without emendation, onto a subsequent emperor (contrast the sentiment of 10.72). Alternatively, if Nerva is the referent of 10.28, the repetition would echo the Nervan echoes found in *mitissime* (line 1) cited elsewhere in 12.9. The phrase itself is a coinage of M.'s and is found subsequently in a sixth century panegyric to Justin II by Corippus; see *In laudem Iustini minoris* 2.28 (*quas tibi persolvam tanto pro munere grates*). The use of *munus* itself has the potential for different interpretations. Its employment here may, as a secondary reading, commemorate some splendid games (*munera*) that the imperial governor Palma would have bestowed on the province; for *munus* in the singular to betoken the games see 0.27.2 (*sacri muneris*). There is no direct evidence for these games, but it would not be unlikely. The noun here could be taken in two ways: in an abstract sense, the emperor would be thanked for good governance generally, or in a concrete sense, Palma personally would be seen as the object of thanks along with the emperor. For *munus* being used in reference to a person see *T.L.L.* 8.0.1663.20 (esp. note Seneca *Med.* 228-30 *munus est Orpheus meum ... geminumque munus Castor et Pollux meum est*). Various taxonomic distinctions are offered to separate *munus*, *praemium*, and *donum* (the words, so interpreted, would distinguish a hierarchy for various classes of recipients, e.g. men, heroes, gods), unfortunately such references are collectively contradictory and too contaminated to advance with confidence; for the instances see *T.L.L.* 8.0.1662.80.

**4. misisti mores ... tuos** The influential rôle that the emperor's own morals plays in shaping the behaviour of the citizenry and the general societal milieu is a trope frequently found in M. It is so common that similar sentiments can be found expressed by M. for Nerva and Domitian. To concentrate on the most obvious examples, consider Nerva's reinvigoration of public *libertas*, which is represented as pervading a post-Domitianic Rome, in Book 11; cf. 11.2 with Kay (1985: 57-60). In Book 6 Domitian's renewal of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* is used in a cycle of poems that acknowledges the positive social effects thus reaped; cf. 6.2 with Grewing (1997: 31-6 & 77-80). Despite the prevalence of the theme the actual phrasing is unparalleled: on no other occasion are *mores* the object of *mittere*. For secondary literature on the limitations and extent of Romanisation across Spain see the chapters devoted to the topic in Curchin (1991: 55-178).

Given the ambiguity of M.'s feelings towards Trajan which have found expression recently (see introduction) there could be a temptation to try and tamper with these words and render some expression which concerns a form of *mittere* and *timores*. Nevertheless the absence of support from the manuscripts and the metrical problems that such interference incurs prevents any support for reading *timores*.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>67</sup> My earlier hypothetical suggestion (see introduction) of reading *mares* does not have the same problems, but it must be acknowledged that there is no support in any of the *apparatus critici* for this. The only near parallel to be found linking *mares* with *mittere* is Virg. *Georg.* 3.64 (*solve mares; mitte in Venerem pecuaria primus*) in a passage concerning the season for breeding cattle.

**in loca nostra:** Although Servius *ad Aen.* 1.306.1 records that both *locus* and *iocus* furnish masculine or neuter forms in the plural, M.'s usages are consistent. In the plural *locus* is always in the neuter gender (four usages: 5.20.10, 7.84.4, 12.9.4, 12.52.11); *iocus* always in the masculine (16 usages: 1.4.3, 1.14.1, 3.20.5, 4.8.11, 4.10.8, 4.49.2, 6.82.5, 6.85.10, 7.8.9, 7.12.2, 7.28.8, 10.18.3, 10.35.13, 10.48.21, 10.64.2, 10.87.7). Given the strong Ovidian feel to the phrase *nostra tuos* (see below), it may be worth recording that the phrase *in loca nostra* is found elsewhere only at Ovid *Fast.* 4.78 (*in loca nostra deos*). The Ovidian usage is similarly placed in the second hemiepes of the pentameter.

**nostra tuos:** Leaving aside the twelve collocations of these pronominal adjectives found in prose texts (8 in Cicero, plus single instances found in Calpurnius Flaccus, Sallust, Quintilian, and *Historia Augusta*), this arrangement is redolent of Ovid's style, which M. uniquely seems to have adopted with any regularity. There are in total thirty-nine such collocations in poetry: Propertius, the Appendix Virgiliana (*Ciris*), Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus, and Laberius each provide single instances. Ovid furnishes twenty-eight examples (including three from the double letters); Martial has six instances (1.53.1, 2.91.4, 10.82.1, 11.23.12, 12.9.4, 12.94.2).<sup>68</sup> When investigating the placement of such instances it will be seen that M. has four out of six instances at the end of the pentameter and Ovid nineteen out of twenty-eight examples. This is of course a logical position for such an arrangement but it is unique to the elegiacs of Ovid and M.; the stray example from Propertius (1.7.25) is towards the start of a hexametric line.

---

<sup>68</sup> The double letters (*Heroides* 16-21) may be retained or removed from the Ovidian examples as one sees fit. Questions were raised in the 19th century about the Ovidian authorship due to metrical divergences from Ovid's style but more recent scholarship on these letters tends to assign them to an Ovidian authorship; see e.g. Tracy (1971: 328-30) and Kenney (1996: 20-6). It should be noted, however, that Courtney (1965: 63-6) reiterates doubts about the double letters and likewise assigns *Heroides* IX as spurious. Either way their exclusion or inclusion does not alter the fact that the collocation is favoured by Ovid.

## 12.10

*Text:* Habet Africanus miliens, tamen captat.  
Fortuna multis dat nimis, satis nulli.

*Translation:* Africanus has a hundred million, but still he hunts for legacies. Fortune gives too much to many, enough to none.

### Structure and Content

This epigram affords two possible divisions of its structure: it can be separated into two or four units respectively. A bipartite arrangement would concentrate on the division between the two lines. The first line, which can loosely be treated as the narrative, provides a concrete example of the contemporary practice of legacy hunting. In this section we are introduced to a central character, who attempts to capture bequests in wills. Due to the character's incredible wealth, his actions are somewhat puzzling and require an explanation. The second line furnishes the rationale for the situation advanced in the opening line via a proverb; for the use of a maxim to harmonise a paradox in M. see the introduction to 12.13. It is also possible to divide the poem up into four components, two to each line, as follows. The first section (*habet Africanus miliens*) details the wealth of the central character; the second (*tamen captat*) informs the reader that, despite his fortune, he practices *captatio*; the third unit (*Fortuna multis dat nimis*) states that the goddess Fortuna provides excessive wealth to many; the fourth (*satis nulli*) concludes by acknowledging that Fortuna, despite these gifts, satisfies nobody. It can readily be seen that such an arrangement counters the bipartite division advanced above. When dividing the poem into four sections, connections are made between the two lines and antitheses within them. The first and second parts are naturally opposed, as are the third and fourth; nevertheless the first section is at harmony with the third (via the association of excessive wealth), so too the second is in accord with the fourth (due to greedy dissatisfaction).

This is the first use of the choliambic metre in Book 12. Although the metre originates with the invective poems of Hipponax, M. (like Catullus) does not deploy the metre solely for such purposes; see Bowie (1988: 81) and contrariwise, for a somewhat tendentious attempt to link metre to theme universally across M.'s corpus, Watson (2006: 285-99). The metre seems to be adopted in the present poem not so much for the purposes of lending an abusive tone to the humour, rather for the rhetorical benefit that accrues from the choliambic metra divisions. It will be noted that each line is separated precisely before the final metron. This device serves to isolate and emphasise not only the concluding word in each line, which the limping

close naturally distinguishes, but also underlines the adversative quality of *tamen* and the frugality of *satis* to a noticeable degree. Given the rhetorical effectiveness achieved in the two lines of this scazon by separating the final metra, it is surprising how infrequently M. deploys this technique. Of the 790 choliambic lines there are only seven other examples of this device: 2.11.10, 5.51.8, 6.39.14, 8.10.2, 8.44.9, 8.44.16, 10.62.12. As is clear, 12.10 is the only poem that uses the technique in every line of a poem. When wishing to use the final metron of the scazon to reinforce his point, M. prefers to place the break at the final foot to allow the heavy limp to achieve its full force; though this device too is distributed sparingly: 1.10.4, 2.17.5, 3.20.21, 3.82.33, 4.65.2, 6.26.3, 8.44.2, 9.1.10, 10.5.19, 12.32.2, 12.57.2. Both techniques can be profitably compared with M.'s occasional avoidance of a disyllable at the conclusion of the pentameter to reduce the harmony of ictus and accent; see 12.2 introduction.

The broader placement of words within the poem deserves comment. In the first line the verbs from each clause appear at the beginning and the conclusion; such an arrangement here serves to stress the greed of Africanus. Elsewhere in Book 12 finite verb forms are found in such a position on twenty-one occasions.<sup>69</sup> If the search is restricted to include only those entries that begin and conclude each of the two clauses within the same line and refuses to admit entries that contain essential matter (subjects, vocatives, objects etc) in other lines, the results are reduced to eleven usages. In the second line a chiasmic structure marks the double antithesis of *multis vs. nulli* and *nimis vs. satis*. If one considers Ernout and Meillet's (1939: 382) etymology of *Fortuna* as a derivative of *ferre*, every word in the second line is logically opposed (e.g. *Fortuna vs. dat* also). Furthermore sound effects are to be observed in each line. The opening line is distinguished by its concentration of the "a" and "e" vowel sounds throughout and by a cluster of dental "t" consonants at the conclusion. The second line, by contrast, chooses to distinguish its tone with assonance on the lengthened vowels "u" and "i", plus a coincidence of short "a" sounds. The audible difference across the two lines is appreciable and buttresses the bipartite structural division traced above.

Finally the cribbed construction and economical use of words warrants mention. The first clause, logically concessive, suppresses the use of *cum*. Thus it appears not as a subordinate, but a main clause. Elsewhere in the first line ellipsis is to be found in the usage of *miliens*, *tamen* is without M.'s customary addition of *et*, and *captat* does not include a direct object (*testamenta*); for all these usages see the lemma entries. The second line also elides certain elements, though in a far more customary fashion. Both clauses share the same verb (*dat*); the reader is also expected to supply a partitive genitive (e.g. *pecuniae*, *divitiarum*) with the adverbs (*nimis* and *satis*).

---

<sup>69</sup> 12.8.10, 12.11.6, 12.17.3, 12.18.8, 12.28(29).4, 12.28(29).11, 12.32.2, 12.34.11, 12.40.1 & 2 & 3, 12.48.3, 12.51.2, 12.61.7, 12.79.1 & 2, 12.83.6, 12.92.4, 12.94.1, 12.98.6.

Further analyses on the structure of 12.10 are provided in the following works. Siedschlag (1977: 31-2) concentrates on the use of antithesis in the initial line and the length of such antithetical epigrams. He demonstrates that the structure is without precedent in Greek epigram and innovative, as all the Latin comparisons are subsequent to M.'s work. Pertsch (1911: 41-2), somewhat complementary to Siedschlag's findings, details examples of the standard use of *sententiae* at the conclusion of both Greek epigrams and M.'s own. García-Hernández (1986: 251-2) confines his narrower analysis to an investigation of the use and opposition of *dare* within M.'s poems. He points out for 12.10 that the order of the verbs *habere*, *captare*, and *dare* is logically reversed in order to highlight Africanus' avarice. Mateu-Areste (1986: 134) restricts his treatment to an investigation of the overall structure adopted in M.'s epigrams that feature a proverb. He classifies the usage at 12.10 among those poems which display "latent projection"; i.e. that the poet's persona does not feature in the poem and is unaffected by the actions (see 12.13). Sullivan (1991: 55) places 12.10 among other poems (12.48.2-4, 12.73) concerned with *captatio* in Book 12, whilst Nixon (1927: 89) demonstrates the range of subsequent imitations that this epigram inspired in later literature. Finally a comparable treatment on the theme of wealth, here viewed through a pauper's perspective, is offered in 5.81 with Cannobio (2011: 583-4) and Nixon (1927: 152-3):

*Semper pauper eris, si pauper es, Aemiliane:  
dantur opes nullis nunc nisi divitibus.*

### Intertextual Links

Craca (2011: 104) observes that the whole second line is a repetition of Appius Claudius Caecus's own *sententia*: *Fortuna multis nimium dat, nulli satis* (App. Cl. *Sen.* 324R). Such a borrowing from the ancient republican consul should naturally be seen as casting even more shame onto the corrupted, aristocratically titled, Africanus: old-fashioned virtue is here actively voicing censure at contemporary depravity. The proverb and its sentiment receives wide representation in Latin, the following illustrative examples, which all unlike M. address the moral solely in an abstract manner, may be recorded to attest to its popularity:

*CIL* 1.1219.5: *Fortuna spondet multa multis praestat nemini.*

Cicero *Paradoxa Stoicorum* 52: *Nec quisquam adhuc inventus est, cui, quod haberet, esset satis.*

Publilius Syrus *Sent.* A299 *Fortuna dat multa usu, mancipio nihil.*

Lucan offers the following epigram (see Morel, 1927: 130): *Nemo nimis cupide sibi rem desideret ullam,/ ne cum plus cupiat perdat et hoc quod habet.*

Subsequently John Owen provides a later rendering of M.'s own poem (*Ep.* 7.35): *pauper in orbe parum, mendicus nil habet usquam;/ Dives habet nimium, quis, nisi nemo satis.*

Many more examples could be cited, e.g. Hor. S.1.61-2 with Brown (1993: 94-5).

Philosophical works, as disparate as Epicurean and Stoic approaches, could be advanced to counter the view (e.g. for the theme of contentment with one's lot and living in accordance with nature); see Sen. *Ep.* 16.7 (*si ad naturam vives, numquam eris pauper; si ad opiniones, numquam eris dives*), Sen. *Ep.* 119.8 (*quod naturae satis est, homini non est*), Lucret. *De rer. nat.* 5.1189-9 (*divitiae grandes homini sunt vivere parce,/ aequo animo; neque enim est umquam peniuria parvi*). Beyond the confines of overt philosophical works, the trope receives noticeable articulation; see e.g. Hor. C.2.16.13, Tib. 1.25 with Murgatroyd (1980: 54).

Bibliographical suggestions, concerned with the function of proverbs and mock philosophy in the epigrammatic genre, can be briefly detailed. For the rôle of proverbs in Greek epigram see Labarbe (1967: 349-86). The use of *sententiae* in M. receives less concentrated treatment: there are scattered references to be found in Sullivan (1991: 225), Mendell (1922: 16), Grimal (1989: 175-83) portrays the broad function of Stoic thought, as influenced by Seneca, on M.'s work and *sententiae*. It is, however, much more common, if assigning any philosophical outlook onto M.'s epigrams, to promote the adoption of an Epicurean stance; see Sullivan (1991: 373 *index: Epicureanism*). Although proverbs and *sententiae* had an important function in education and rhetoric, such techniques could rapidly degenerate into triteness.<sup>70</sup> For ancient and modern testimony on the benefits and weaknesses of proverbial thought see McCartney (1947: 74-6). For a practical and humorous demonstration of sententious tedium see Ganymedes' speech in Petr. *Sat.* 44, with Smith's (1974: 106-13) notes and Frost Abbott's (1907: 48) rather conservative list of proverbial expressions in Petronius. For an extensive overview of the language of the freedmen in Petronius see Boyce (1991).

---

<sup>70</sup> See Edward's commentary (1928: xxxiv-v) on the importance of *sententiae* in Seneca's *Suasoriae*.

**1. Africanus:** The name occurs elsewhere at 4.14.5. There are also ten references to *Afer* (4.37.6 & 10, 4.78.9, 6.77.5, 9.6.1 & 4, 9.25.2 & 10, 10.84.1, 12.42.1), two instances of *Afra* (1.100.1, 9.75.8) and one occurrence of *Africa* (2.2.1) which may warrant attention. The name, *Africanus*, recalls distinguished origins. The Scipios are referenced by *Africanus* at 4.14.5, as they are likewise in the sole reference to the geographical area, *Africa* (2.2.1). Although Bowie (1988: 78) plausibly interprets the humour of this epigram, by commenting on the absurdity of someone with an aristocratic name practising *captatio*, the associations can be widened a little further. One could instead view the use of *Africanus* here as a reference to Rome's imperial expansion and consequent moral decline. Such a reading can be viewed in two ways: (1) viewing Africanus as a foreigner who is corrupting Italians; (2) viewing Africanus as the descendant of Roman soldiers, whose virility has been corrupted by luxury. The first example finds its best articulation in the mouth of Umbricius in Juvenal's third satire (e.g. 3.61-2). There is, however, no shortage of corrupt foreigners in M.'s own epigrams; see Sullivan (1990: 169-70) for a brief, but clear, appraisal on the characterisation of different ethnicities in the epigrams. The second example is a little more satisfying as it essentially expands upon the humour already noted by Bowie. The use of a geographical part of the empire to denote a *captator* is not exclusive to the present epigram; in 9.8 (9) the character Bithynicus is also a legacy hunter. Given Velleius Paterculus' (2.1.1) view that conquest and corruption were the bequest of the Scipios' to the Roman people and the great enmity between Rome and Carthage, the present usage could be seen as slightly more apt than 9.8. For an examination of this approach see Vallat's (2008: 422) overview of the name and its associations with Carthaginian perfidiousness. It is, nevertheless, a commonplace in Latin literature to associate imperial conquest with moral degeneracy, although the exact period and cause is contested by the Roman historiographers and poets: for such divergent views see Zanda (2013: 7-27) and Lintott (1972: 626-38). The point emphasised here is that a traditional, if not particular, disapproval of the sins of empire adds to the humour here. For the spread and status of the name see Kajanto (1965: 205); he interestingly notes the high concentration of epigraphical coincidence of the name within Africa.

**miliens:** There are two usages of this adverb in M.'s work (1.99.17 = *milies*, 12.10.1). In each instance ellipsis is employed. Properly understood, the phrase would be fully rendered: *miliens centena milia sestertium* (100,000,000 sesterces). For the particular employment see *OLD miliens* b with relevant citations. It is, however, unnecessary to understand the figure literally, since it is merely a shorthand means of denoting extraordinary wealth: cf. the logic of 1.99, which shows this via its differentiation of *centies* (1.99.4 & 9) and *milies* (1.99.17). For comparative purposes the seven instances of *centies* (1.99.4 & 9, 3.22.2, 5.70.2 & 5, 6.49.5, 8.42.3) are often similarly employed: in all instances, save 6.49.5 and 8.42.3, the phrase means *centies centena milia sestertium* (1,000,000 sesterces). A monetary understanding also underlies the usage at 8.42.3, as *centies* here hints at an entrance fee for the baths; see Schöffel (2001: 372). Concerning the word's orthography recent editors (Heraeus, Shackleton Bailey) follow Lindsay (1904: 36) in printing the older form *miliens* in

12.10.1 and *milies* in 1.99.17; earlier editors (Schneidewin, Friedlaender, Gilbert) favoured *milies* on both occasions. The adverb, whatever spelling is adopted (whether with repeated “l” after the first syllable, or with an “n” before the “s” at the conclusion, or indeed both or neither), is always of cretic form. Lindsay based his preferences on the general support the manuscripts provided in each poem. Given the widespread occurrence of forms like *quotiens*, *totiens et al.* in Latin literature, it is somewhat difficult to gauge whether or not *miliens* would have been deemed an archaism, or even a particularly striking usage.

**tamen:** The conjunction is very powerful here and lends a concessive force to the first clause as well as emphasising the separation of the final metron of the scazon. The usage should be noted as unparalleled in M.’s corpus (despite *tamen* being employed 121 times) in beginning its clause and underlies the metrically deficient addition of *et*, which precedes *tamen* in de Blavis (1483), Gallet (1701), Moretus (1594), and Schneidewin’s (1842) apparatus. Indeed the addition of *et tamen* may well have been suggested by the observation of the continual refrain in 1.77.1-6 at this position of a poem in the choliambic metre. So alien is the present use of the conjunction to M.’s habit that the striking placement of *tamen* at the conclusion of its clause is actually more frequent: 4.43.9, 5.48.2, 9.37.9. For the emphatic initial placement of *tamen* elsewhere see Terence *Eun.* 1.20.90; Cic. *Marcell.* 2.4; Livy 21.55.10.

**captat:** There are thirteen usages of the conative form *captare* (0.13.6, 2.18.1 & 1 & 2, 6.63.1 & 1 & 2, 7.20.3, 8.38.3, 9.88.1, 11.55.3, 12.10.1, 12.82.3) found in M.; Siedschlag’s (1979: 164) citation of *captas* at 14.217.2 is to be excluded and added to his thirty-nine findings for *capere* instead. The employment of *captare* is variously used by M. On one occasion it means “to hunt” an animal (0.13.6); one instance it means “to catch” a ball (12.82.3); on four occasions it is used in the specialist sense of “hunting for” a dinner (2.18.1 & 1 & 2, 7.20.3). All these usages have direct objects that qualify the action of the verb. Elsewhere it is found in the sense of hunting for legacies (6.63.1 & 1 & 2, 8.38.3, 9.88.1, 11.55.3, 12.10.1). Except for 9.88.1 (*me*), these instances have no expressed direct object. The object, properly understood in these instances, should be *testamentum* (sg.) or *testamenta* (pl.); cf. Hor. S. 2.5.23 (the first instance of the usage in Latin). It seems to be the case that without an expressed direct object, a reading of M. would dictate that “legacy hunting” is to be interpreted; for the usage see *OLD capto* 9b.

The theme of *captatio* was particularly prominent in contemporary literature; cf. e.g. Plin. *Ep.* 2.20 with Sherwin-White (1967: 95), Juvenal S. 1.37-41 and 3.161, and, albeit with the obvious caveat that the events described relate to an earlier (Neronian) period, Tac. A. 15.19 with Miller (1994: 67-8). A related concern expressed in literature of the period is the portrayal of *delatio*, in order to typify the corruption of the earlier Domitianic reign; cf. Juv. S.1.33 with Morton Braund (1996: 84), Plin. *Ep.* 4.9.5 and *Pan.* 34.1, and later, with views for



and against Domitian's actions towards *delatio*, Suet. *Dom.* 9.3 and 12.2 with Jones (1996: 83 & 102). In addition to these citations, we can add Pliny's comments on Domitian's excessive greed, which chimes with the concluding line; see *Pan.* 50.5 (*qui tam multa concupiscebat, cum haberet supervacua tam multa*). Despite the frequent employment of both themes in contemporary literature, *captatio* (and for that matter *delatio* also) should not be viewed as particular to the Domitianic period. The concern receives treatment throughout Latin literature, particularly satire: cf. Tiresias' instruction in the art of *captatio* in Hor. *S.* 2.5 with Muecke (1993: 177-80), or the depiction of Croton as the land of *captatores* in Petr. *Satyr.* 116.7. The origin for the practice lies within the Republican period, various societal factors are often adduced to explain the phenomenon. The most prominent tend to include the large number of wealthy childless individuals to be preyed upon, owing to the low-birth rate and a concomitantly high infant-mortality rate. The bond of *amicitia* also influenced matters, as it demanded recognition in the form of a bequest from a true *amicus*. Furthermore the societal stigma against any trade, save agriculture, would likewise limit the commercial opportunities of the nobility. For the theme of *captatio* in Latin literature, with concentration on the ruses employed by both the legacy hunter and his patron, see Tracy (1980: 399-402); Kay (1985: 165-6) supplies a good overview to the topic, and Sullivan (1990: *index* "legacy-hunting") provides examples for the prominence of the theme in M.'s corpus.

**2. Fortuna:** There are thirteen usages of the noun in M. (1.12.9, 2.24.1, 2.91.5, 4.18.7, 4.40.10, 5.42.7, 6.76.3, 6.79.1, 6.83.1, 8.0.12, 8.65.1, 10.76.1, 12.10.2). A further example, ascribed to M. and supplied by the Salmasian Codex in the *Anthologia Latina*, may be worth considering; see Shackleton Bailey (1982: 197).<sup>71</sup> No epithet is applied in all, save three cases. In two of these instances the adjective references the hostile aspect Fortuna can assume (2.24.1 *iniqua*, 4.18.7 *saeva*); in the remaining case the phrase *summae fortunae* (8.0.12) is used in an abstract manner and is tantamount to *maximarum divitiarum*. Given the dual function that the noun can serve - either denoting fortune as a deity or an abstraction - difficulties arise when trying to classify Fortuna. In M.'s treatment Fortuna can appear characterised as a divinity, as in 12.10, but the noun can be used in a more abstract manner, where any divine status or characterisation is minimal; cf. 6.83.1, 8.0.12. It should come as little surprise that M. offers several depictions of the goddess herself being defeated or outwitted in some fashion; see 4.40.10, 5.42.7, 6.79.1. Generally Fortuna plays a marginal rôle within the epigrammatic genre. There are some epigrams, not many, which concern the Greek equivalent Τύχη, see A.G. 9.134-5, 9.180-3. These examples focus upon the defeat or the denial of the goddess; e.g. the cluster 9.180-3 concentrates on the irony of a temple, belonging to Τύχη, being commandeered for another purpose. There is also a late Latin example (*Ep. Bob.* 27), which concerns the hackneyed trope of fortune's variability. Canter (1922: 82) offers a summary of the frequency with which Fortuna occurs in Latin

<sup>71</sup> The clumsy technique (usage of a fourth foot trochaic caesura in the opening line and some ugly elisions) seems to deny M.'s authorship.

literature; he finds that the occurrence is low in M., Catullus, and didactic literature, but concentrated within epic, tragedy and comedy, and the works of Ovid.

For further on the societal and literary rôle of Fortuna within Rome, see Canter (1922: 64-82); for treatment of the Greek equivalent Τύχη, see Matheson (1994: 18-33).

**multis nimis, satis nulli:** The respective opposition of these phrases finds limited expression elsewhere in M.'s work. The contrast of *multus* and *nullus* features at 11.64.1-2 and, in less pronounced fashion, at 14.25.1-2. When he counters *multus*, M. prefers *unus* instead; see 1.108.7-8, 3.5.2-3, 4.10.7-8, 8.75.15, 12 *pr.*16. The contrast of *nimis* and *satis* is even less frequently attested; see 7.99.7-8 and 8.3.1-2. Finally for the poetical employment of *nullus* rather than *nemo* in M., see Cannobio (2011: 584) on 5.81.2.

## 12.11

*Text:* Parthenio dic, Musa, tuo nostroque salutem:

nam quis ab Aonio largius amne bibit?  
cuius Pipleo lyra clarior exit ab antro?  
quem plus Pierio de grege Phoebus amat?  
et si forte - sed hoc vix est sperare - vacabit, 5.  
tradat ut ipse duci carmina nostra roga,  
quattuor et tantum timidumque brevemque libellum  
commendet verbis: "hunc tua Roma legit."

*Translation:* Muse, give greetings to your and my Parthenius: for who drinks more deeply from the Aonian stream? Whose lyre goes out more clearly from the Piplean cave? Whom of the Pierian flock does Phoebus love more? And if by chance - but this is hardly to be hoped for - he will have a moment, ask that he himself hands over my poems to the emperor, and recommend my timid and small little book in only four words: "your Rome reads this."

### Structure and Content

The epigram is essentially divided into two equal parts; each half then displays a further logical division. In the first section (ll. 1-4) a Muse is directed to greet Parthenius (l.1). The selection of the Muse becomes immediately apparent as Parthenius is then flattered for his poetical abilities over the next three lines. The second section (ll. 5-8) reveals that the purpose for the appeal is to hand over M.'s book to the emperor (ll. 5-6); secondarily, he guides Parthenius in the manner with which this should be done and assures the addressee, and the audience at large, of the work's popularity (l. 7-8).

The boundaries between the two halves of this epigram are explicitly demarcated through the adopted diction. In the first section a catalogue of learned geographic terms, from the register of high poetry and Callimachean aesthetics, are employed to distinguish the perceived poetical abilities of the addressee; see Mayer (1986) for the employment of such geographic expressions in Latin poetry. The structure of this section is also rhetorically fashioned to suit the inflated context. Lines 2-4 provide a triple employment of rhetorical questions, distinguished with a tricolon use of the interrogative pronoun, which is further emphasised through polyptoton. Additional techniques include a triple use of comparative adjectives (*largius*, *clarior*, *plus*), and the triple use of three geographic terms (*Aonio*, *Pipleo*, *Pierio*) essentially denoting the same function: settings for the Muses. In the second section, by contrast, the focus shifts to M.'s own poetry; an immediate severance of the style thus far

adopted is noticeable. M. signals this division with a staccato employment of six monosyllables in the opening seven words of the fifth line. This usage, not only hints at the stuttering trepidation M. wishes to communicate to the grandeur of his addressee (Parthenius and, ultimately of course, the emperor), but also it is a deliberate assertion of a style appropriate to his own genre; see Sturtevant (1921: 73-6).<sup>72</sup> After noting this distinction at the outset of the second half, M. concludes in similar fashion. He registers his respect and fearful awe for the personalities he is dealing with again (*timidumque brevemque libellum*), this time employing assonance and alliteration to mark the tone; note the pronounced use of the letter “t” and the hesitation conveyed through the repeated “um” sounds. Nevertheless, he once again expounds upon the qualities and popularity of his work (*hunc tua Roma legit*). This division between the two styles of poetry is already signalled in the initial line. The pronominal adjectives (*tuo nostro*) employed after *Musa*, although syntactically applied to Parthenius, by their placement attest to this distinction. In sum 12.11 can be read as a repetition of a theme more forcefully expressed elsewhere concerning the generic separation and purpose of epigram; cf. e.g. 10.4. In 10.4 M. catalogues and derides the use of mythological tropes employed in the higher genres (10.4.1-7). He emphasises the artificiality and tediousness of these conventions and also notes his lack of association with certain Callimachean poetical conventions; see 10.4.12. Contrasted with the staleness of the higher genres, a personified life (*vita*) says, again utilising a direct speech to describe the status of M.’s work, that M.’s poetry concerns reality and is rooted among mankind; see 10.4.8 & 10. Although an element of disparagement may be omitted, the structure of 12.11 does suggest that poetical differences are being exercised and a tactful *recusatio*, or defence of the epigrammatic genre, is supplied.

A few more details can be registered. Although lines 2-4 could be criticised for communicating the same idea and ultimately characterised as prolix flattery, there are some differences that may suggest a more thoughtful rationale. First, it can be noted that each line recounts a different function. Initially (l. 2), the focus is directed upon the act of drinking from the sacred spring as a source of poetic inspiration. Next, concentration shifts onto the instrument which accompanies the poet (*lyra*: l. 30). Finally, the poet himself is mentioned (*quem ... Pierio de grege*); thus the polyptoton alteration attests to a progression from the source, to the instrument, to the poet himself. There also remains the possibility, though this is laden with problems, that each line refers to a different genre (elegy, lyric, and epic respectively), which Parthenius would be seen as excelling in. To justify this position it can be observed that the *Aonius amnis* referenced in the second line is Aganippe, which Maas views as the spring appropriate to elegy; see Crowther (1979: 1) and Knox (1985: 119). The use of *lyra* (l. 3) naturally suggests lyric poetry. The phrase *Pierius grex* (l. 4), a coinage of

---

<sup>72</sup> Sturtevant notes that the use of monosyllables and disyllables is particularly pronounced in M.’s works. For the use of monosyllables M. is only surpassed by Horace *Sermones*, Plautus, and Terence; in disyllables only by Seneca *Tragoediae* (trimeters and lyrics). Taken together it will be seen that the use of both sets of data stress the colloquial tone that M. frequently cultivates.

M.'s, is only used elsewhere in reference to the epicist Silius Italicus (see 9.86.3); there is also a strong trend in M.'s work to employ the adjective *Pierius* to denote the epic genre. As such, the present epigram could be read as a commendation for Parthenius' skill in the higher genres, and a reminder at the conclusion ("*hunc tua Roma legit*") of M.'s abilities within the epigrammatic realm in the form of a polite *recusatio* (as noted above); cf. 12.94, where M. lists the genres (in descending order) he has practised and surrendered before settling upon the lowly epigram. The problem with this interpretation is the fact that the boundaries outlined above are by no means secure. Although Aganippe is viewed as the source for elegiac poetry, such distinctions are too confused and contradictory in their employment within Latin literature to state confidently; cf. e.g. Ovid (*Epist. ex Pont.* 4.2.47) where the *Aonius fons* is used as the inspirational spring for the epicist Cornelius Severus, and see Crowther (1979: 11) for the inherent problems with the taxonomy of poetic springs. The use of *lyra* is often employed by M. to designate lyric poetry, but not exclusively; cf. 7.23.2 in reference to Lucan. A similar problem concerns *Pierius*; with its employment M. often references epic (cf. 7.63.3, 9.86.3, 10.64.4, 11.3.8, and possibly 12.52.1), but it is also found in reference to the genre of lyric (7.69.8), elegy (8.70.5), M.'s own epigrams (9.84.3, 10.58.6, 12.68.4), to poets and poetry generally (12.2(3).8), and to poets whose generic range is unknown (1.76.3, 11.93.1). In consequence, the notion that lines 2-4 advance a progressive generic scale from elegy to epic, to fall to epigram at the conclusion can only be advanced tentatively, since all these boundaries are open to question.

The structure and content of this epigram can also be viewed as betraying close associations with the genre of epistolography. The phraseology of the opening line (*Parthenio dic ... salutem*) is immediately suggestive of the introductory format of correspondence. Given this hint, the conclusion of the poem gains a new significance. The use of the deictic pronoun (*hunc*) is deliberately ambiguous; logically it could stand for the poet's *liber* or the poet himself. If viewed as the latter, the pronoun provides a secondary function as a signatory sphragis; cf. 12.2(3).18. Thus the epigram can be seen as penned in the form of a letter with a conventional introductory formula, supplemented with a signature at its termination. Indeed, if concentration is paid to the use of *libellus* (l.7, see the lemma entry), the association can be further refined to suggest that the poem mimics the appearance of a formal petition (*libellus*). Judged in this manner, the allusions to Parthenius' poetical abilities (ll. 2-4) will be seen as provided in lieu of the honorific titles that would customarily accompany the imperial referent, after the direct address.

The structure of this epigram has been discussed by several scholars. Colombo (2013: 172) divides the poem into two equal halves. Lines 1-4 are devoted to greetings and flatteries; lines 5-8 expose the petition, which is in the form of a protasis (l. 5) and an apodosis (ll. 6-8) fashioned with two syntactically related propositions. Siedschlag (1977: 11-2 & 109-10) offers observations on the structure of the beginning and conclusion of the epigram. He

compares the start of the poem around the framework of other epigrams ordered to depart to and greet (*salutem*) a patron, thus 12.11 is seen as a variant on the travelling book motif (cf. 12.2(3), 12.5(2)); he notes the earlier Latin precedents and demonstrates that the convention is used for introductory or dedicatory epigrams. He also observes that the use of a direct speech at the termination of the poem is favoured elsewhere by M. (cf. e.g. 7.72.16), and has some minor precedents in Greek epigram (cf. Nicarchus (?) 11.121). Finally, Fenger (1906: 44), in his work on the use of metonymy in M., emphasises that lines 2-4 can be viewed as an extended metonym for a simple question (*quis est poeta nobilior?*). Given the flattering circumlocutions, Fenger's observation can be contrasted to the insistence upon brevity that characterises appeals to individuals in a position of power (cf. l. 5).

**1. Parthenio:** Parthenius was a freedman of Nero who occupied the rôle of a *cubiculo* in Domitian's, and later Nerva's, court. Naturally, owing to his privileged access to the emperor, he was a personality worthy of cultivation. Aside from the references in M., Parthenius only features in Latin literature with reference to his involvement in Domitian's assassination and his own demise in retribution.<sup>73</sup> The accounts tend to portray Parthenius' rôle as more instrumental in Domitian's downfall the later they appear. Starting with a near contemporary source, Suetonius (*Domitian* 16.2 and 17.2) shows that Parthenius played a quite minimal rôle; his only involvement is to direct Domitian to encounter his assassin. In the third century, Cassius Dio provides a fuller account. Dio includes the following additions: 1) at 67.15.1.2 he states that Parthenius is so honoured by Domitian that he is granted the privilege of wearing a sword, a distinction usually restricted to generals (ξίφηφορπεῖν).<sup>74</sup> 2) At 67.17.1 Parthenius is explicitly named as the person who removed the blade from Domitian's dagger, with which he might have defended himself; the episode features in Suetonius' account, but no culprit is identified (see Jones 2001: 129-30). 3) In 68.3.3-4 Nerva, despite offering his own neck, is depicted as powerless in resisting the demands of Casperius Aelianus for the execution of Parthenius and Petronius as retribution for Domitian's assassination. Cassius Dio seems to see a connection between Parthenius' death and Nerva's impotence, since the next act mentioned is Nerva's adoption of Trajan. In the fourth century the account does not alter much from Dio's, save for the addition of some lurid details. Aurelius Victor (*Epitome de Caesaribus* 12.7-8) relates Parthenius' death, in the following manner: *Parthenium vero, demptis prius genitalibus et in os coniectis, iugulavere*. Some fourth-century sources also provide some (seemingly) gross exaggeration: Aurelius Victor (*Epitome de Caesaribus* 12.2) has Parthenius reassuring Nerva, since he is worried that the reports of Domitian's escape from assassination are true, whilst Eutropius (8.1) goes so far as to state that Parthenius was the *interfecto*r of Domitian. The only inscriptional evidence is *CIL* VI 8761 (= *ILS*, 1736): *Ti Claudius Eutomus Partheni Aug(usti) lib(erti) a quibiclo (sic) libertus*. For further see *RE* 18.4.1901.(19), Grainger (2003: index *Parthenius*) and Jones (1992: index *Parthenius*).

<sup>73</sup> See below for a potential reference by Juvenal.

<sup>74</sup> For discussion on this issue and the disputed suggestion that Parthenius retained the privilege in Nerva's reign, see Jones (2001: 130).

M.'s acquaintanceship with Parthenius stretches back to 88 AD, as his first appearance is in Book 4. The following citations concerning Parthenius may be recorded: 4.45.2 (a *genethliakon* for his son *Burrus*), 4.78.8 (a passing reference linking him with another member of the *familia Caesaris*), 5.6.2 (as in the present case, an indirect request *via* the Muses to present M.'s book to the emperor), 8.28.16 (an acknowledgement for a toga given to M.), 9.49.3&10 (an acknowledgement of the toga), 11.1.3 (travelling *liber* asked not to disturb the ever busy Parthenius). He does not feature in Statius' *Silvae*. There is a reference to a Parthenius in Juvenal (S. 12.44: *ille nec argentum dubitabat mittere, lances / Parthenio factas*). Opinions are split concerning the Juvenalian reference. The man named Parthenius here is either a silversmith, who manufactured the expensive tableware; see Ferguson (1987: 174). Alternatively, he could be the famous chamberlain of Domitian, who presumably had a well-known taste for expensive finery; see Courtney (2013: 460). Although M. addresses epigrams to several other members of the *familia Caesaris* throughout his books, Parthenius is the most frequent of such addressees; for the imperial slaves and freedmen M. acknowledges see Vallat (2008: 100-1). Sullivan (1991: 162-3) also provides a serviceable outline on the diplomacy with which M. addressed imperial slaves, contrary to his usual attitude to social upstarts; Weaver (1967) provides a more general framework for the same phenomenon, which is not limited to M.'s period. Kay (1985: 53), when discussing 11.1, observes that M.'s act of including Parthenius in the opening poem to Book 11 (December 96 AD) was a political act by M. to signal his attachment to the Nerva regime.

Parthenius' appearance in Book 12 is unchronological, as he was assassinated in 97 AD. This epigram, like other chronologically discordant poems in Book 12, is omitted from the *γ* family. The supposition is, as noted in the introduction to the commentary, that these epigrams were added posthumously to Book 12 to include stray epigrams, which did not feature in the first edition; see Sullivan (1991: 55 & 321). As this is the case, it is interesting to speculate, though impossible to prove, under which emperor this poem was originally composed. Given the fact that the flattery of imperial freedmen seems consonant with M.'s work in the Flavian period and somewhat dissonant under the *libertas* instituted by Nerva and Trajan (but *cf.* 11.1), the tone of the poem may be thought fitting for the Domitianic period. Although there is much to commend Howell's (1998: 184-5) view, including most obviously Pliny *Epistulae* 4.22.4, that provided the new political sentiments were paid due lip-service there would be little to trouble M. in Nerva or Trajanic Rome, it may well be the case that 12.11 represents a refugee poem from the first edition of Book 10, which was subsequently revised to accord with the new political climate. The difference between the attitudes expressed by the Flavian and Trajanic writers regarding the power of imperial slaves is succinctly observed by Fabre (1994: 337-8), who cites Pliny *Paneg.* 42.2.3&4, *Epist.* 7.29 and 8.6 (against Pallas), and Tacitus *Agr.* 19.3, *Germ.* 25.3, *Dial.* 13.4 among other Trajanic period literature to demonstrate the perceived hostility towards the unchecked

power of imperial slaves. Similarly on the same theme, Jones (1992: 61) notes the humiliating power that the emperor's *cubicularii* exercised, with an apt quote from Epictetus (1.19.17-8); and Nauta (1995: 6) suggests that M. earlier owed his promotion to equestrian status due to the help and position of the mime actor Paris (a favourite of Domitian until he fell into disfavour).

Finally, further points may be made on the associations that the name Parthenius may initiate. The most famous poet of this name is Parthenius of Nicaea, who was Virgil's tutor and is believed to have influenced the poetry of Cinna and Gallus. He is also credited for the introduction of Euphorion's style of poetry into the literary consciousness at Rome; see Crowther (1976) and Seth-Smith (1981) on Parthenius of Nicaea. If Parthenius of Nicaea is the personality criticised in an epigram by Erychius (*A. G.* 7.377), the fashioning of 12.11 may be carefully textured to counter such associations.<sup>75</sup> It is to be noted that by his promotion of poetry which can be broadly dubbed Callimachean, i.e. learned and concerned with brevity, Parthenius is criticised for vomiting upon the Muses and attacking Homer. If it was common currency that a poet named Parthenius was widely depicted as polluting the Muses in Roman literary circles, the over-emphasis upon Parthenius' harmony with the Muses in 12.11 may be deemed necessary to distinguish this difference. Given the wide use of Grecian geographical adjectives in the poem, it may be worth recording that Parthenius could itself suggest the area of Arcadia, via a reference to Mount Parthenion; *cf.* Prop. 1.1.11 (*Partheniis ... in antris*). For a further association that the name Parthenius may provide see the lemma entry on *clarior* (below).

**Musa:** For similar contexts see 3.20.1 (addressed to Canius Rufus): *dic, Musa ...* and 5.6.2 (addressed to Parthenius) *Musae, Parthenium rogate vestrum*. If the singular use here is assumed to be intentional and personal, rather than merely conventional, it will refer to M.'s *Musa iocosa* (2.22.2): *Thalia*, see 9.26.5 *parva Musa... Thalia*, 8.3.9 *nona sororum*. Given the fact that *tuo* links *Parthenius* and the *Musa*, it may, alternatively, refer instead to Parthenius' Muse; e.g. possibly *Erato* the muse of lyric poetry, due to the later reference to *lyra* (line 3). The invocation to the Muse(s) is a convention dating back to the origins of poetry (*cf.* Hom. *Il.* 1.1 θεά, and, more precisely, *Il.* 2.484 μοῦσαι), the Muses are used to bestow a divine authority onto the poetry and to obscure the personality of the poet. Prose works, particularly historiography, broke with this trend by rejecting the authorial function of the Muses; *cf.* e.g. Herodotus *Hist.* 1.1, Thucydides 1.1. Given the lowly status of epigram, it is not surprising to find a promotion of the personal element in M.'s poetry, and an infrequent use of the Muses. When employed with reference to M.'s poetry, the Muse is frequently found with an adjective that shapes its meaning in accordance to the genre; see the citations above. A strong indication for the predominance of the personal element in M.'s poetry is

---

<sup>75</sup> Both Crowther and Seth-Smith interpret *A.G.* 7.377 as a reference to Parthenius of Nicaea; earlier interpretations saw the reference to a poet of Hadrian's period; see Paton (1919: *ad loc.*).



noted by the fact that *ego* is used 653 times, this makes it the eighth most employed word in the corpus (it is outstripped only by *quis, sum, et, tu, -que, non, hic*), *Musa*, by comparison, is employed 24 times. Given the fact that a Muse should conceal the personal element, the employment of the two subsequent pronominal adjectives should be noted.

**tuo nostroque:** The pronominal adjectives have different functions; *tuo*, applied to the *Musa*, suggests that Parthenius is a poet, *nostro*, applied to M., is meant to signify that Parthenius is an *amicus*. The use of 5.6.2 (cited above), likewise links Parthenius to the Muses with a pronominal adjective.

**salutem:** Since Parthenius was long dead (97 AD) before the publication of Book 12 (*circa* 101 AD) and the possibility that our version of Book 12 was a posthumously compiled work, the greeting may be considered unintentionally perverse. Customarily in the epigrammatic genre, the dead would address the living *via* an epitaph; wishing good health to a corpse seems unduly optimistic. As noted by Howell (1995: 82), epigram 5.6.3-4, the analogue to this poem (likewise addressed to Parthenius) contains another ironical sentiment that can only be appreciated anachronistically. To a man later complicit in Domitian's assassination, M. states: *sic te serior et beata quondam / salvo Caesare finiat senectus*. For the use of the noun in epistolography see the introduction.

**2. Aonio ... amne bibit:** The adjective *Aonius* signifies "Boeotian"; as noted above, the *Aonius amnis* refers to Aganippe. Its origin seems to be rooted in Callimachus' poetry (see Fragment 572 Pf.), rather than a Boeotian poet like Hesiod or Pindar. In Latin literature it is introduced in Catullus' neoteric poetry (61.28); for further see Mayer (1986: 48) and Hollis (2007: 238), and for the use of poetic diction in M. see Watson (2002: 248-51). Although Hesiod (*Theog.* 1-34) mentions the springs at Helicon and Pindar (*Ol.* 6.84-7) records that he is to drink from the spring at Thebe, the inspiration derived from a draught of the Heliconian spring seems to originate with Callimachus; see Knox (1985: 109) and Crowther (1979: 2-5). The Callimachean evidence is minimal, fragmentary, and inexplicit; *cf.* 1fr. 2 Pf. In later Greek epigram, however, he is represented, often in opposition to earlier poets (Homer, Archilochus, *et al.*) as a teetotaler, who prefers sacred spring water to wine; see Knox (1985: 111). If M. extends the trend of a distinction between water and wine as a source and symbol of inspiration, his preferences are for wine (see 12.12.1 *bibisti* entry); for the continuation of this distinction noted in Latin literature see Horace *Ep.* 1.19.1-11 with Crowther (1979: 9). The use of poetical springs as sources for inspiration is widespread in Latin literature, the first unambiguous reference is provided by Lucretius (1.927-8), but Ennius and Lucilius may have employed the trope earlier; see Crowther (1979: 6).

The two closest parallels to the phrase are found in Ovid *Epist. ex Pont.* 4.2.47 and Juvenal *S.* 7.58-60 (... *cupidus silvarum aptusque bibendis / fontibus Aonidum. Neque enim cantare sub antro / Pierio*); see Courtney (2013: 312-3). The example from Juvenal is worth noting with reference to Nauta's (1995: 6-7) contention that M. and Juvenal employ the language of poetic inspiration (Apollo, the Muses) around an incongruous context, which centres upon more earthly, often financial, requests or complaints. Such a context informs the present poem in two ways, it notes the tonal shift in the second half of the poem and the nature of the appeal that characterises 12.11. Finally, in Anyte's bucolic epigrams it is suggested that the use of poetic scenery such as springs and shade are used in a programmatic manner at the start of a work in order to provide a fictive scene for the reader to start reading in comfort; see Fain (2010: 46). If the references to springs here are to be interpreted as "poetic furniture", the poem is to be viewed as a rather delayed programmatic poem (originally, of course, given its odd transmission, it may have featured in an earlier position in an alternative volume of poetry).

**largius ... bibit:** For a comparable reference on Nerva's poetical abilities, see 8.70.3-4: *cum siccare sacram largo Permessida posset / ore.*

**3. cuius:** For the avoidance of a spondaic disyllable (and spondees more generally) in the first foot of the hexameter see Winbolt (1903: 106-7). It was felt to undermine the dactylic origin of the metre. In Book 12 there are eight first foot spondaic disyllables (12.11.3, 12.17.1, 12.28.7, 12.28.15, 12.35.1, 12.40.3, 12.74.5, 12.92.3). Two monosyllables forming a first foot spondee is much more prevalent, there are fifteen instances in Book 12 (12.2(3).9, 12.11.5, 12.14.9, 12.14.11, 12.17.9, 12.29.5, 12.29.15, 12.35.3, 12.38.1, 12.60.3, 12.62.11, 12.62.15, 12.74.7, 12.78.1, 12.96.7).

**Pipleo ab antro:** *Piple(i)us*, elsewhere in Latin *Pimple(i)us*, designates a spring, a mountain or a place in Pieria (in the region of Macedonia); see van Dam (1984: 216-9) *ad Stat. Silv.* 2.2.37 and Porphyrio *Comment. in Horat. Carm.* 1.26.9 (*Pipleides Musae dicuntur a Pipleo fonte Macedoniae*). Beyond the Greek names the quantity of the penultimate syllable here lends a Greek quality to the verse; see Postgate (1923: 24-5) for the use of Greek quantities in Latin poetry. The only other instance of *Pipleus* in M.'s corpus is found in the use of its cognate noun with reference to M.'s own poetry; cf. 11.3.1 (*Non urbana mea tantum Pipleide gaudent*).

**lyra:** It could be assumed here that Parthenius is a lyric poet, but note 7.23.2 in reference to Lucan and the genre of epic. Of the eight citations (1.76.9, 2.7.6, 5.30.2, 7.23.2, 8.6.6, 12.11.3, 12.94.5, 14.167.2) the use of the *lyra* is applied to other individuals. The sole

exception is 12.94.5, which recounts all the genres of poetry M. practised and surrendered before settling on epigram.

**clarior:** Although Gallet's (1701: *ad loc.*) prose translation / explanation restricts the term by rendering it as *nobilior*, it is here a considered usage that draws on its full semantic range, suggesting as it does sound, renown and brightness. In the 19 usages of *clarus / clare* there are three other examples where the word conveys a meaning of sound: 7.92.5, 12.90.1, and (potentially, as applied to school-masters' canes) 14.80.2. In the remaining citations (1.55.2, 1.70.11, 3.35.1, 4.44.6, 4.55.6, 6.58.10, 8.36.4, 9.0.2, 9.83.2, 10.33.3, 11.9.1, 11.22.8, 12.3.12, 14.60.2, 14.69.2) the primary meaning suggests fame or, when connected with an astral body, Rhodes, or a time-frame, brightness. It can also, of course, play with both meanings as at 12.2(3).12 (*clarus Stella*). By its associations with brightness, it is applied with purpose to Parthenius, whose name suggests purity and whiteness (see Liddell and Scott *παρθένιος* 2), and anticipates the later usage of Phoebus (the sun god); for M.'s word play with *παρθένιος* see 8.28.16 with Schöffel (2002: 273) and Vallat (2008: 123), and 9.49.3 with Henriksén (2012: 214).

The adjective here may be seen as a transferred usage properly belonging to the poet rather than his instrument; even this usage, however, seems somewhat odd as it is usually the poet who bestows fame. There is precedent for the use of *clarus* with an instrument, though it seems restricted to sound rather than fame; *cf.* Verg. *Aen.* 5.139 (*clara dedit sonitum tuba*), Sen. *Agam.* 428 (*et clara laetum remigem monuit tuba*). There is precedent for a poet / musician achieving fame through his instrument; see Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 2.3.3 (*propter quod Timotheum clarum in arte tiliarum*). Nevertheless, the usage of *clarus* attached to the renowned individuals or cities poets celebrate with their instrument seems more natural; *cf.* e.g. Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 4.3.17 (... *canerent ad tibiā clarorum virorum laudes et virtutes*), Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 10.1.62 (*maxima bella et clarissimos canentem duces et epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem*). If *clarior* were felt to relate to the style of Parthenius' poetry it could be deemed analogous to the rhetorical form of *σαφήνεια* (*perspicuitas* in Latin); see Lausberg (1998: 240-2). This would suggest that Parthenius focused upon rhetorical themes, but it is noticeable that the use of obscure geographical references in 12.11 seem to exclude the quality of *perspicuitas* being an innate feature of Parthenius' style.

**exit:** The verb is found elsewhere for the emanation of sound, but not in M.; see *OLD exeo* 2d. Bowie (1988: 81) perceptively notes that, since this use of *exire* is unprecedented in M., the use of *lyra clarior exit* could be considered a metaphor, which relates to the fine poetry Parthenius has published.

**4. quem ... Pierio de grege:** The phrase *Pierius grex* is found elsewhere at 9.86.3; variations occur at 6.47.4 (*Camenarum de grege*) and 7.12.10 (*Castaliumque gregem*). The phrase is peculiar to M. and in all the examples cited refers to the *Musae*. Since all the previous examples were a periphrastic reference to the Muses, Shackleton Bailey (1989: *ad loc.*) emended *quem* to *quam*; i.e. *quam ... Pierio de grege* (Which of the Pierian flock / Which of the Muses). Such an emendation is logical and worthy of consideration. Nevertheless, it does disturb the uniform application of the interrogative pronoun to a single individual and adversely impacts upon the epigram's architectural arrangement. As this is the case, the reading of the  $\beta$  manuscripts should be defended and an explanation sought. If *quem* is maintained and the prepositional phrase is applied, the phrase would mean either "which man (poet) of the Muses" or, taking the Pierian flocks to designate poets generally, as Bowie (1988: 81) suggests, "which man of the poets / which of the poets". The first option finds support in Ovid *Am.* 1.1.6 (*Pieridum vates*). Elsewhere Nerva's brow is described as Pierian (8.70.5: *Pieriam ... frontem*); see Colombo (2013: 174-5) for further references. Given these instances, the application of *Pierius* need not suffer the restrictions that Shackleton Bailey imposes. Another option, though less satisfactory, would be to apply the prepositional phrase to *Phoebus*, i.e. *Phoebus Pierio de grege* (Phoebus from/ of the Pierian flock); cf. Statius *Theb.* 6.337-9 (... *credi nec degener illo / de grege, Castaliae stupuit qui sibila cannae / laetus et audito contempsit Apolline pasci.*). Despite the tidiness of Shackleton Bailey's emendation, the manuscript reading as it stands does not create enough intrinsic difficulties to warrant any adjustment. Indeed, given the slightly stale and conventional poetic diction that marks out this poem, the somewhat amorphous meaning and adjusted application of this phrase, coined by M., can be viewed favourably.

The use of the prepositions *de* or *ex*, instead of the partitive genitive, is commonly found with pronouns; see Gildersleeve and Lodge (1895: 237). The preference for *de* here is presumably to avoid any elision; for the use of the prepositions in M. see Lowther (1906: 32-6) and for later intrusions into the genitive case from both prepositions see Adams (2013: 299-308).

**5. vacabit:** Once again a hectic lifestyle is used to designate an addressee's importance; see the lemma entry (*vacui*) on 12.4(5).3, and for Parthenius' lack of time cf. 11.1 (esp. 11.1.6 *nec Musis vacat, aut suis vacaret*).

**6. tradat ... duci:** The act of requesting the audience to carry a message to the intended recipient is a convention of sepulchral epigrams. One need only recall Simonides' famous couplet A.G. 7.249 to see this:

ὦ ξείν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῆδε  
κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.

Book 7 of the *Anthologia Graeca* furnishes many more examples. Although 12.11 toys with the idea as the message is already said to have been read by all Rome, it is merely a sophisticated engagement with, not a departure from, the topos.

A more troublesome issue is raised by the actual identity of the *dux*: is it Domitian or Nerva? Unfortunately M.'s use of *dux* elsewhere sheds no light; it is applied to Domitian (1.70.6, 4.2.4, 5.5.4, 5.19.5&16, 6.25.8, 6.76.2, 6.83.2, 6.91.1, 7.2.8, 7.60.2, 8.4.2, 8.11.7, 8.21.10, 8.65.6, 9.31.2, 9.35.5, 9.79.1, 14.34.1), Trajan (10.6.2, 12.8.6), and Nerva (11.4.7, 11.5.9, 12.6.6). Kay (1985: 53) and Howell (1995: 82), due to the death of Parthenius prior to Book 12, view the emperor in question as Nerva. They believe that the *libellus*, which Parthenius is to commend, is the abridged version of Books 10 and 11 dedicated to Nerva (12.4(5)). Although their inference is reasonable, Sullivan's (1991: 55) view, that this poem is a remnant from the first edition of Book 10, is equally possible. In such a case Domitian has a claim to be the *dux*; see the lemma entry on Parthenius (above).

**7. timidumque brevemque libellum:** For the closest parallel - again involving Parthenius - see 5.6.7 (*timidum brevemque chartam*); also cf. 8.24.1 (*timido gracilique libello*). The antithesis of this phrase is provided in 12.61.1 (*breve vividumque carmen*), which describes an invective poem.<sup>76</sup>

**timidum:** The adjective is found six times in M. (1.6.2, 1.104.18, 4.74.2, 5.6.7, 8.24.1, 12.11.7). The three final examples are applied to M.'s work and personify the poet's emotions through a transferred usage. Ultimately, this expression finds its origin, like much of the inspiration for M.'s use of the travelling-book motif (see 12.2(3) introduction), in Ovid's exile poetry; cf. Ovid *Tristia* 3.1.1 (*timide liber*). There are, however, a few more examples that may be compared. Macrobius (*Sat.* 2.4.2) reports the trepidation with which a *libellus* is handed to Augustus (*idem Augustus, cum ei quidem libellum trepidus offerret, et modo proferret manum modo retraheret, "putas," inquit, "te assem elephantis dare"*). Elsewhere, Cicero (*Fam.* 5.12), while trying to lobby the historian Lucceius to write about his

---

<sup>76</sup> A variant reading provided in a single manuscript is supplied by Schneidewin (1842: ad loc.), which would emphasise the sound effect to the point of cacophony: *tantum tumidumque brevemque libellum*. The cacophony alone could exclude this reading, nevertheless the suggestion of "swollen brevity", although insensible as a descriptor for M.'s book does suit the competing styles of this epigram quite well. There is only one real use of cacophony in Book 12; 12.40.3 (*pedis dissimulo*). There are, however, partial instances, which are weakened either by a change of quantity or by the repetition of an open vowel; see 12.48.5 & 17, 12.50.7, 12.52.7 & 10, 12.58.2, 12.59.11, 12.60.10, 12.66.6, 12.70.4, 12.74.4, 12.77.2, 12.82.5, 12.85.2, 12.87.1, 12.94.6, 12.98.4 & 6. Ultimately, the variant is rightfully rejected in later editions and ignored in their *apparatus critici*.

achievements, notes that a letter can shamelessly request what the author's modesty cannot (*coram me tecum eadem haec agere conantem deterruit pudor quidam paene subrusticus, quae nunc expromam absens audacius epistola enim non erubescit*). For further depictions of the timorous book in M. cf. e.g. 4.8.11 (*gressu timet ire*) with Moreno Soldevila (2006: 147) and 4.86.7.

**brevem libellum:** The phrase, with its striking meiosis, is peculiar to M.; cf. 1.45.1 and 12.1.3. The only comparable examples, found on a PHI search, are late and restricted to prose; cf. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae Trebelli Pollionis Tyranni Triginta* 1.2.9 (*in unum eos libellum contuli et quidem brevem*) and, with a little variation, Scaurus *De Adverbio et Praeposit.* 33.11 (*brevitatem huius libelli*). This phrase demonstrates a hyperbolic extension of Callimachean aesthetics of scale, comparable to the stylistic convention of συντομία in oratory; see Lausberg (1998: 141-3). It can also, given its address to Parthenius, be interpreted as a prudent emphasis upon its smallness. A *libellus* can be interpreted as a petition of the type emperors and their staff deal with on a daily basis; indeed, at 11.1.5 M. forbids his book to disturb Parthenius, since he has no time for books (*libros*), he only reads petitions (*libellos*). Thus the present usage may contain, besides overt modesty, a trap tailored to capture the attentiveness of its audience. For the need to be brief when treating imperial powers, consider the many breviaries addressed to and commissioned by emperors in the later empire. Festus' introduction testifies that his work is to be counted, not read, its focus is upon briefly treated dates, themes, scales; Festus *Brev.* 1.1 (*Brevem fieri Clementia tua praecepit. Parebo libens praeceptis; quippe cui desit facultas latius eloquendi: ac morem secutus calculatorum, qui ingentes summas aeris brevioribus exprimant; res gestas signabo, non eloquar*).

**-que ... -que:** For the gemination of *-que* in two neighbouring words in the second hemistich of the hexameter before a trisyllabic ending (excluding those that exhibit elision) in M. see the following sixteen examples: 1.14.1, 1.31.7, 1.76.3, 2.50.3, 4.31.1, 6.34.5, 6.35.5, 7.35.5, 9.3.11, 9.48.7, 9.71.9, 12.11.7, 12.38.1, 12.64.1, 12.72.5. Its introduction into Latin seems to have been a neoteric convention, analogous to Greek τε ... τε; see Bishop (1972: 294).

**8. commendet** Of the fifteen usages all, except four examples (two from the *Xenia* and *Apothoreta*), are concerned with the recommendation of poetry or poetry books; see 1.52.1, 3.5.1&11&12, 4.29.5, 4.64.26, 4.82.1, 7.46.1, 7.68.1, 7.80.6, 12.11.8. Of particular note is the example in 3.5, where M.'s *liber* is directed to Julius Martialis: on this occasion M. states that the *liber* needs no commendation due to the intimacy between Julius Martialis and himself. All the above examples concern M.'s own work except 7.46.1, which relates to Priscus' poetry. Although the use of *commendare* with *liber* or *libellus* is restricted to M., the expression is ultimately Ovidian, as Ovid employs *commendare* with *carmen* in the following: *Ars Amatoria* 2.283.4, *Tristia* 3.14.14-5, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.4.71-2. The four exceptions to

M.'s customary employment of *commendare* are 5.34.2 (where the dead Erotion is recommended to M.'s parents care in the underworld), 10.92.4 (Marius is entrusted with M.'s Italian land and its deities as he is leaving for Spain), 13.33.1 (Trebullan cheese), 14.135.1 (cloaks).

**hunc tua Roma legit:** The boast is a frequent one in M. and counters the modesty of the preceding line to provide a tonal change at the conclusion. Often the claim is not limited to Rome; in his very first epigram of Book 1, M. states that *hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris, / toto notus in orbe Martialis* (1.1.2). Elsewhere he maintains that even semi-barbaric regions recite his verses; see e.g. 7.88 (Vienna) and 11.3.5 (Britain). This trope too has an Ovidian feel and finds precedents in Ovid's use of a sphragis in the formula *ille ego* attesting to his fame, see *Amores* 2.1.2, *Amores* 3.8.23, and *Tristia* 4.10.1; for further see Booth (2007: 99). There is, it should be noted, a modification in the present poem from its analogue in Book 5 (5.6): at 5.6.16-9 Parthenius is instructed to hold the book as if it were valueless and not to offer it, since the emperor's poetic sensibility will ask for the book of its own volition. In the present context it seems that M. is no longer quite so trusting in the poetic good taste of the emperor, as a direct recommendation laced with a populist endorsement seems to be required. It need not, however, be assumed that this alteration suggests a different emperor is the intended audience or that the first attempt was in consequence unsuccessful. For the use of the deictic pronoun here *cf.* 12.4(5).4.

**tua Roma:** The phrase is rather telling and frequently limited in application to the emperor, see Statius *Silvae* 1.6.101, *Silvae* 4.1.19, M. 7.6.7-8 and 8.26.3. Exceptions to the trend are found at M. 8.26.3, Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.59, and Lucan *Bellum Civile* 7.29 (applied to Pompey). If in M. the use of *tua Roma* will suggest the emperor and his control of the city, the use of *mea Roma*, encountered only twice, is solely employed to witness the sway M.'s poetry exercises in Rome; *cf.* 5.16.3 (*qui legis et tota cantas mea carmina Roma*), 6.60.1 (*laudat, amat, cantat nostros mea Roma libellos*) and, with similar sentiment, 9.97.2 (*quod me Roma legit, rumpitur invidia*). For such instances of metonymy in M., where a city usurps the actions of its citizens, see Fenger (1906: 15).

## 12.12

*Text:* Omnia promittis cum tota nocte bibisti;  
Mane nihil praestas. Pollio, mane bibe.

*Translation:* You promise everything when you have drunk all night; in the morning you provide nothing. Pollio, drink in the morning.

### Structure and Content

The poem details how Pollio's character adjusts over two timeframes (night / day) and two conditions (drunk / sober). To prevent Pollio reneging on his promise during the second timeframe, the speaker, through a simple logic, suggests that the same condition, under which the promise was made, be maintained. The structure of the poem is calculated to accord with such tidy reasoning. If one punctuates heavily before *Pollio*, each of the four clauses are contained within their own hemistich (for the frequency of such an arrangement in M. see 12.4: *intro*). Repetition also maintains this veneer of harmony: *mane* (x 2: line 2); *bibisti* (line 1: end) and, albeit with inflected alterations, *bibe* (line 2: end). Alongside repeated terms, antitheses are provided to make each detail cohere: *promittis* (line 1) vs. *praestas* (line 2); *omnia* (line 1) vs. *nihil* (line 2); *tota* (line 1) vs. *Pollio* (line 2: see below). Finally every verb is placed at the end of each hemistich and audibly distinguished through the predominance of mute consonants. These linking factors sustain the seemingly clear logic; as will be noted, however, the rationale necessarily involves a greater intrusion on societal norms. To underscore this perversity a dissonant close is provided by the short open vowel in the concluding word (for the device see *mane bibe* entry).

The structure also supports another theme that is engaged with in 12.12: a diminishing scale. It will be observed that the words denoting scale are often carefully positioned: *omnia* (line 1) provides the initial word; *tota* (line 1) is contained alone within the fourth foot; *nihil* (line 2) is not underlined by its placement, but *Pollio* (line 2), derived from *Paulus*, begins the second hemiepes. As is clear the scale diminishes over the two lines: words denoting largeness (*omnia, tota*) feature in line 1; those betraying smallness (*nihil, Pollio*) in line 2. This is in perfect agreement with the emergent hollowness of Pollio's promises. Finally one may note that the poem engages intelligently with the popular adage *in vino veritas*. Although Pollio reneges on his inebriated pledges (suggesting that there is no truth in wine), he reveals by his behaviour his vain and trivial character (as noted by the diminishing scale



and his own name). For a broader appraisal of the poem's structure one may compare the following epigrams (see Siedschlag, 1977: 84):

2.25

*Das numquam, semper promittis, Galla, roganti.  
si semper fallis, iam rogo, Galla, nega.*

4.76

*Milia misisti mihi sex bis sena petenti:  
ut bis sena feram bis duodena petam.*

Finally it should be noted how economically the poem avoids any unnecessary words through its asyndetic construction: *You promise everything, when you have drunk all night; (but) you provide nothing in the morning. (Therefore) Pollio, drink in the morning.* Such constructions are, of course, quite suited for epigrams and are often remarked upon in treatments of Ovid's style; see Tate (1835: 20-1).

### Allusions and Literary Background

Besides the adage *in vino veritas* (see above), the poem counters another drinking proverb; the mercenary speaker subverts the maxim that concludes 1.27.7: μισῶ μνάμονα συμπίταν: see Citroni (1975: 94) and Howell (1980: 167) for the trope. Indeed it could be claimed that it is the speaker himself, not Pollio, who is contravening acceptable behaviour. He does so by introducing norms governing the daytime business sphere onto the leisurely evening symposium. This flippant attitude towards promises is noted in other leisurely domains, e.g. courtship: cf. Ovid *A.A.* 1.443 (*promittas facito: quid enim promittere laedit*) and *A.A.* 1.631 (*nec timide promitte: trahunt promissa puellas*). Counter to this it could be advanced that, during an age where oral acknowledgement would predominate, policing its value would be necessary. A dictum, variously attributed to P. Syrus or Seneca, may be supplied to note the importance placed upon promises: *priusquam promittas, deliberes, et, cum promiseris, facias*; for the function of proverbs in *M.* see 12.10 (*intro*).

A wealth of Greek epigrams from the convivial poems in Book 11 could be marshalled for an assessment of 12.12. An Epicurean *carpe diem* trope is often articulated in such poems; see e.g. *A.G.* 11.47 (Anacreon), 11.62 (Palladas). It will be noted that the speaker of 12.12, by hankering after the morning and a subsequent profit, is at odds with the general spirit. Such mercenary characters are noted in sympotic epigrams; sober men in convivial gatherings are distrusted on the grounds that they are recording matters for their own advantage: *A.G.*

11.31 (Antipater of Thessalonica), 11.429 (Lucian). Alcoholic deaths, which may be felt in the conclusion to 12.12 (see *mane bibe* entry), are documented in A.G. 11.45 (Honestus) and 11.49 (Evenus). Contrasted against the *topos* of an avaricious drinking-companion, the magnanimity of inebriates is also acknowledged: A.G. 11.56 (Anonymous). At A.G. 11.63 (Macedonius the consul) intoxication is viewed as the means to escape from poverty, rather than (as at 12.12) enrichment. Two epigrams deserve especial emphasis for a treatment of the present poem. Automedon of Cyzicus (A.G. 11.46) contrasts the humanity of people drinking together at night against their beastly nature during the day, whilst Macedonius the consul (A.G. 11.366) describes a pauper's enrichment via a simplistic logic comparable to 12.12. The pauper, who dreamt that he had become rich, realised upon awakening that this was not the case; his tactic, to extend his night-time wealth and to reverse the temporal and financial circumstances, was to resume his slumber. Finally in Greek comedy one could compare the simplistic solution of 12.12 to Strepsiades' idea of stealing the moon to avoid paying his debtors on a specific date; see Arist. *Cl.* 749-756.

Beyond these generic allusions, the epigram promotes alternative interpretations. The poem could be viewed through an erotic lens. Pollio would in this case be identified as a tease, and the conclusion would provide a threat of irrumation. The risqué potential of the vocabulary (*omnia, promittere, nox, bibere*) will be detailed in the lemma entries to support such a possibility. Another interpretation would regard the theme of *captatio* and demise as paramount. In such a context the conclusion would be deemed a euphemism for the imperative *morere*. The associations with death and alcoholism will likewise be treated in the lemma entries (see esp. *mane bibe*).

### Textual Variants

Although the transmitted text is largely uncontentious (see *Pollio* entry for a variant reading), a bastardised version was also supplied under the name Marcialis Coquus.<sup>77</sup> This version coupled the opening line of 12.12 with 10.48.24 in two slightly adjusted forms:

- 1) Omnia promittis cum tota nocte bibisti  
non facient quemquam pocula nostra reum
  
- 2) Omnia promittis cum tota nocte bibisti  
non faciunt quicquam pocula nostra reum.

---

<sup>77</sup> For the title applied to M. in the Middle Ages (under the misguided belief that the contents of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* argued that their author was a cook) see Sullivan (1990: 261-2).

Each version can be found in the respective *apparatus critici* of Schneidewin (1842: ad 12.12) and of Friedlaender (1886: ad 12.12).

**1. omnia promittis:** The verb is used eighteen times. It is often found in the context of imperial benefits (0.9.2; 0.20.2; 0.26.3; 6.3.1; 8.2.7; 8.50.23) and features in related topics: goodness / glory (7.69.1; 10.26.3); treason (4.11.7). Outside of these examples its employment is restricted to erotic (2.25.1; 4.81.4; 8.50.23; 9.37.9; 10.81.3; 11.58.7) or financial circumstances (5.82.1; 9.37.9; 10.17.1; 11.58.7; 12.12.1). A reader, familiar with the corpus, would naturally expect the promise to go unfulfilled in sexual or monetary situations; the only promise that is satisfied from such examples is 10.81 (whose outrageous solution bears comparison to 12.12 in its simplicity). The only other poem that couples *promittere* with *praestare* is 0.9.2; coincidences of *promittere* with *dare* are not infrequent (2.25.1; 4.11.7; 5.82.1; 8.49.10; 10.17.1 with *donare* also; 10.81.3). The nearest verbal echo to the present poem is provided by Seneca *N.Q.* 6.1.15 (in a reference to earthquakes): *sibi omnia promittentibus in mentem non venit, id ipsum supra quod stamus stabile non esse*.

Beyond the noted erotic associations of *promittere*, *omnia* has the capacity to be a veiled substitute for *coitus*; see Adams (1982: 190). For the use of *promittere* in amorous elegiac contexts (often twinned with an euphemistic *noctem*) see Pichon (1902: 241). Granting this, the clause *omnia promittis* would easily promote the suspicion of an erotic theme; in M.'s treatment *omnia* would necessarily entail sordid interpretations: cf. 12.79 (especially line 4: *quisquis nil negat, Atticilla, fellat*). As such the second use of *bibere* would be a double-entendre; for sexual understandings of *bibere* and related words see Adams (1982: 138-41).

**tota nocte:** The noun is included forty-three times in M.'s work. A predominant number of its usages can be restricted to the following themes (occasionally there is some blurring and merging between such boundaries): it denotes the period of time devoted to drinking in eight epigrams (1.27.1; 1.106.5; 2.89.1; 6.89.1; 8.45.5; 10.87.11; 11.82.2; 11.104.3) and to dining in two (7.10.6; 8.49.2). It features in erotic situations eight times (1.106.5; 8.44.17; 9.2.7; 9.67.2; 11.23.5; 11.97.1; 11.104.22; 12.65.1); two more usages (4.7.4 and 10.38.4) should be cited as related to this theme. The amorous associations of *nox* are frequent in the elegists; for *nox* indicating nights with or without lovemaking see Pichon (1902: 216). The night occurs in fatal or injurious circumstances four times (8.75.1; 10.71.5; 11.82.2; 12.32.6); elsewhere in Latin literature the night may distinguish fatality, see *OLD*: *nox* 1g. Twinned with *dies* it is analogous to *semper*; ten such collocations occur (2.5.2; 2.43.2; 7.20.3; 9.62.2; 10.82.2; 11.56.6; 11.59.2; 12.38.1; 12.49.10; 12.57.5). Besides these primary themes, *nox* is found in other scenarios: e.g. sleep (2.90.10); colour (1.115.4); noise (9.68.9); client service (10.82.2), the dole (1.80.1).

Besides the noun's repeated occurrence in bibulous, fatal, or amorous situations, the night, as the appropriate period for carefree leisure, is often demarcated from the day. Poems that treat the divisions of activities according to their suited hour are plentiful: for nighttime activity see e.g. 10.20.12-13; 11.104.22. Epigram 7.10.6 may be cited as evidence for the impropriety of a late-night dinner extending beyond its allotted bounds; 8.3.18 can be used to show how the overly earnest (in contrast to M.) spend the night at work. A golden mean courses through such borders: this mean is also found in M.'s wish for nights spent with a moderation of alcohol (e.g. 10.47.9). Finally Candidius (2.43.2) may be deemed an antithesis of Pollio: he spends his days and nights pestering M. for gifts.

The same phrase, with *tota*, appears on four other occasions (7.10.6; 9.67.1; 9.68.9; 12.65.1). It is to be noted that, when using *nox*, M. always employs the ablative to denote the duration of time; such constructions always involve *tota*. Bowie's (1988: 83) contention that *tota* is employed for butch overstatement is worth considering; in the treatment offered above, the scale it helps buttress is emphasised instead. The use of the ablative rather than the accusative to detail duration is not unexpected in imperial Latin literature. It is less frequent in earlier periods, nevertheless some late Republican writers (Cicero, Catullus, and Caesar) provide scattered examples: Cat. C. 109.5; Cic. *de Off.* 3.8.2; Caes. *B.G.* 1.26.5; the shift in use and its employment with *totus* are treated by Gildersleeve and Lodge (1895: 252-3). Gildersleeve and Lodge also provide the following example that may be recorded for 12.12: *Poet. Lat. Min* 4.155: *nocte pluit tota, redeunt at mane serena*.

**bibisti:** The verb is applied 65 times. Since it is positioned at the end of each line here, a brief overview of its placement is provided. In total it occurs twenty-nine times at the end of a line (44.61%). A further breakdown of such instances according to the metre employed shows the following: in thirty-six pentametric lines twenty-three uses occur at the end (63.88%); in fourteen hexametric lines four instances are provided (28.57%); in eleven hendecasyllabic lines there are two examples (18.18%); finally there are no occurrences in four choliambic lines. The use of *bibere* in M. often suggests alcohol, but not exclusively so. The usages can crudely be subdivided thus: *bibere* used with alcohol provides forty-one instances; *bibere* employed with water (often denoting geographical extent or poetical inspiration) features ten times. Of the remaining examples nine are unspecified or associated with wine, but not its consumption: (1.37.2; 3.82.3; 7.51.13; 9.96.2; 10.36.8; 11.82.6; 12.40.2&2; 14.93.2); three describe poor *vinum* as *venenum* (6.78.8; 6.92.3; 9.2.6). Finally there are two metaphorical uses of *bibere* (1.42.5 and 13.32.2); the cognate adjective *bibulus* (11.32.2) is likewise metaphorical. For comparative purposes M.'s handling of *potare* exhibits similar results: from twenty-five examples fourteen are used with alcohol; eight with water; two with poisons / medicines; one unspecified (11.11.5: probably alcohol). The location for the consumption of alcohol is routinely unacknowledged. Given the symptomatic

ambience cultivated in M.'s epigrams, one may generally imagine a private gathering rather than a more public setting; this inference may be gained from a few instances (1.106; 3.82; 4.85; 5.78; 6.89; 8.6; 9.2). There are, however, some epigrams that exhibit drinking in a public environment: 1.26 (the games), also note the eight occurrences of *copo*, which suggests an inn as the setting. From M.'s treatment of *bibere* the following instances may be considered for 12.12. Alcoholism and its fatal or ill effects are treated in four poems (1.77; 6.78; 6.86; 9.96). An alcoholic character (Acerra) elsewhere drinks until dawn at 1.28.

The rôle of alcohol in M.'s epigrams is treated by La Penna (1999: 163-8); the "real" or "fictitious" sympotic setting is explored by Nauta (2002: 96-105); sound observations are also provided by Morelli (2009: 38-43). From the Greek epigrammatists Asclepiades is believed to have died from alcohol; for Asclepiades' attitude towards drinking and death see e.g. A.G. 12.50 and for recent treatment on the poet's drinking see Cairns (2016: 245-6); for the importance of the symposium in Greek epigram generally see Giangrande (1967: 91-178). The ill effects of alcohol are also handled by more serious writers: the philosophers Seneca and Lucretius worried about their injurious effects to health and morality as did Pliny the Elder; for Seneca's stance on drunkenness (with comparable citations from Lucretius) see Motto and Clark (1990: 105-110), for Pliny's attitude see *N.H.* 14.28. Elsewhere in classical literature two of Philo's works on the Old Testament may be considered relevant: *De ebrietate* and *De sobrietate*. Given the fact that ancient methods of fermentation were not as advanced as modern methods and that the alcohol content would be greatly reduced, one may wonder why ancient alcohol (in a Roman context: principally wine) was as potent as recorded. It is probable that the explanation lies in the aging process and a subsequent toxicity; for alcohol in the ancient world see Phillips (2014: 6-44), for the aging process and Opimian wine see Baldwin (1967: 173-5).

**2. mane:** The adverb is recorded thirty-four times in M.'s work. As with *nox* many of its usages accord with an activity suited to its timeframe. Since the morning began the business hour and heralded the start of a client's duties, the adverb is employed in contexts involving the clients' *salutatio* thirteen times. Several occurrences throw greater light on the gulf between day and night: 11.17 demonstrates its distinction by claiming that not every page in the book is nocturnal (i.e. promoting obscenity), some poems are suited to the daytime (i.e. decorous). At 10.48.21 M. promises that his evening dinner will be among friends, who will have no need of regretting anything said in the morning. Epigram 9.37.6 similarly treats the distinction between the artificiality of daytime manners and nocturnal truth: Galla removes her face at night. When the distinctions between day and night are infringed upon it either relates to a holiday season: 5.65.8 (imperial games); or retirement: 1.49.36 (sleep in the morning at Bilbilis); or deviancy: 10.81 (Phyllis has sex in the morning), 12.65 (Phyllis demands alcohol in the morning as compensation for sexual services rendered during the night).

**nihil:** According to Siedschlag's (1979: 539-42) reckoning there are 174 occurrences of this noun; *nihil* features ninety-eight times, *nil* seventy-six. These findings may vary slightly according to the edition consulted: elsewhere *nil* may be read on two occasions (5.69.1 and 13.59.2) where Siedschlag (and Shackleton Bailey) reads *nihil*. Both the edited texts and the relevant commentaries (Cannobio, Howell, Leary) are silent as to the motives for their preferences in these instances. The alternative forms (*nihilum* / *nilum*) are not employed. The word is found, in either form, across M.'s principle metres: *nihil* occurs 72 times in elegiacs (34 in the hexameter; 38 in the pentameter), 17 in hendecasyllables, 9 in choliamb; *nil* occurs 58 times in elegiacs (21 in the hexameter; 37 in the pentameter), 17 in hendecasyllables, 1 in choliamb. In his elegiacs M. does not strictly adhere to the Ovidian treatment of the word in the fall of the first foot as outlined by Housman (1919: 56-9).<sup>78</sup> Housman believes that Ovid restricted the word to the pyrrhic form *nihil* in the fall of the first foot to provide a dactylic opening. It is certainly the case that M. overwhelmingly prefers *nihil* in the first foot and the consequent initial dactyl afforded. As a pyrrhic *nihil* constitutes the two syllables of the fall seventeen times (1.39.6; 1.43.11; 1.48.4; 2.43.16; 2.76.2; 3.38.7; 3.45.4; 3.72.7; 3.75.3; 4.5.10; 4.66.2; 7.88.9; 9.22.15; 9.28.5; 9.41.3; 10.63.4; 11.56.14); in iambic form, with the final syllable lengthened by position, it supplies the ultimate syllable of the fall seven times (1.110.2; 2.3.1; 2.14.5; 3.46.1; 3.61.1; 3.87.2; 8.20.2; 12.12.2). There is, however, an example (1.98.2) where M. concludes the first foot with *nil*, thus prompting a spondaic beginning. M.'s usage of *nihil* / *nil* is, nevertheless, in perfect accord with Postgate's (1919: 52-9 & 1921: 23-5) findings on the placement of the noun, viz. that *nil* cannot appear in the fall of a foot before a vowel. This limitation is always observed by M.; for the related matter concerning the placement of the final syllable of third person singular verbs in the fall of the foot see 12.17.4 (*cenat*). Finally, given the somewhat dissonant conclusion of the present poem (see *mane bibe* entry), it may be worth observing that *nihil* is the only word in the second line that could terminate the present poem without infringing upon M.'s customary poetical techniques; elsewhere M. concludes a pentameter with *nihil* 17 times (2.8.6; 2.64.10; 4.12.2; 4.33.2; 6.20.2; 6.63.8; 7.10.16; 8.33.26; 9.2.2; 9.38.8; 9.88.2; 10.91.2; 11.32.8; 11.36.4; 12.48.6; 13.2.8; 13.55.2).

**praestas:** The verb occurs 55 times in M.; there is no particularly consistent application that unifies them. It can feature, as here, in a financial context (1.52.5; 2.34.3; 3.10.2; 5.52.1; 7.43.1&3&4; 8.38.1&8; 12.6.9; 12.40.5; 14.215.2); from these examples 12.40.5 provides the closest parallel: *nil tamen omnino praestas mihi*. The verb is also included in other circumstances relevant to 12.12; it is contained within sexual contexts (2.34.3; 2.62.3&4; 4.42.1; 12.43.7; 12.65.2; 12.96.5; 14.215.2) and situations treating mortality

<sup>78</sup> It is difficult to know which particular metrical terms find current approval. The ancient division of the foot into *arsis* / *thesis* - see e.g. Terentianus' *De arsi et thesi* in Keil (1874: 40-1) - has fallen out of favour. For the present purposes "rise" and "fall" are adopted in preference; others may favour a "princeps / biceps" division.

(3.66.6; 4.63.4; 12.14.7). Its employment, however, is so diverse as to nullify any rigid categorisation: it is used in themes concerned with the client / patron relationship (e.g. 3.36.1); duties (8.57.6); conversation (11.24.2), silence (3.82.31), imperial marvels (0.6.4). Given the fact that M. does not couple it often with *promittere* (see 0.9.2) and that *donas* could be substituted, other reasons should be sought for its use.<sup>79</sup> The following four reasons may justify its preference over *donas*: (1) It unites the antithesis between *promittis* through an audible coincidence of repeated mute consonants. (2) It may, as a compounded form of *stare*, be variously interpreted: it could (coupled with *nihil*) suggest either Pollio's inebriated state (i.e. the colloquial descriptions of inebriates as "legless", "paralytic") or, with a sexual understanding, impotent (customarily *surgere* would be used; e.g. 12.86.2). (3) It may, again as a compound of *stare*, promote verbal echoes with the two subsequent epigrams: 12.13.2 (*constat*), 12.14.7 (*praestet*). (4) Finally, it could repeat some trace of the adage already treated in 12.10: *CIL* 1.1219.5 *Fortuna spondet multa multis nulli praestet*.

**Pollio:** Pol(l)io: α β; Postume: γ (ad Pollam in γ lemma). Before proceeding to the interpretation of *Pollio*, it may be worthwhile briefly noting the possible benefits *Postumus* would furnish. From de Blavis up until Gallet *Post(h)ume* was the preferred reading. Given M.'s proclivity towards "speaking names", a character called *Mr. Late*, with its mortal and temporal associations, would suit the context quite well. It could also (through its associations) promote a reappraisal of the concluding imperative *bibe*: here understood as equivalent to *morere* via euphemism; cf. 12.40. Although the other occurrences of *Postumus* in M.'s work do not betray a particularly consistent depiction, many examples would accord with the present poem: the name *Postumus* is frequently found in scoptic poems (2.10, 2.12, 2.21, 2.22, 2.23, 2.67, 2.72, 4.26, 4.40, 5.52, 5.58, 6.19). Furthermore in two instances the character is depicted as a mean patron (4.26, 4.40) and on two occasions it plays with temporal affiliations: 4.26 (*mane*), 5.58 (an obvious riff on Horace C. 2.14). Epigram 5.58 also closes in a comparable fashion: *Postume, vixit heri*.

Despite these possible advantages, the preponderance of evidence supplied by the manuscripts (including the title of the epigram in the γ family) assures the reading of *Pollio*. Were such evidence wanting, there would still be strong thematic grounds (previously unacknowledged) for favouring *Pollio*. Before providing the solution, a quick overview of the use of *Pollio* in M. should be supplied. The name occurs on four occasions (1.113.5, 3.20.18, 4.61.9, 12.12.2). It is omitted from Vallat's study; previous commentators - Craca (2011: 110 ad 12.12.2), Fusi (2006: 223 ad 3.20.18), Moreno Soldevila (2006:427-8 ad 4.61.9), Citroni (1975: 346 ad 1.113.5) and Howell (1980: 342) - all deny (or do not discuss) any consistent character portrait being developed: indeed the usages may rightly be considered totally

<sup>79</sup> It should be noted, however, that *promittere* and *praestare* are used in antithesis quite frequently elsewhere in Latin literature; e.g. Seneca alone has thirteen such collocations: *Dial.* 11.6.3.6; *de Ben.* 2.4.3.2-3; 4.35.2.3-4; 4.36.3.2-3; 4.39.4.5-7; 5.21.1.5-6; *Ep.* 21.5.6-7; 23.6.2-3; 48.11.7-8; 71.32.1; 85.32.5-6; 94.16.14; 95.39.5-95.40.1.

unrelated. Moreno Soldevila does tentatively hypothesise that the famous *citharoedus* (the subject of 4.61.9) may underlie 12.12; for this famous personage see Juvenal *Sat.* 5.387 & 7.176-7 and Ferguson (1987: 184).<sup>80</sup> Given the absence of connections between previous examples, one could speculate that the renowned literary patron Asinius Pollio is here suggested. Such an association would suit the situation. It should be recorded, however, that this would be a unique usage by M. despite his frequent appeals for a contemporary Maecenas; see 12.3.2. A fragment by Augustus (*dicta et apophegmatmata* 5.3), tantalising in its subject and iterated diction, may be engaged with in 12.12 and support such an assumption: *fruere, mi Pollio, fruere*; for M.'s other borrowings from Augustus see 11.20. Any engagement with Pollio's own literature is now undetectable owing to its loss; for his (paltry) fragments see Morel (1927: 99).

As argued in the introduction, part of the poem's humour is dependent upon the diminishing scale that may be identified. The name *Pol(l)io* is an alternative form of *Paul(l)us*; see Lindsay (1894: 112).<sup>81</sup> A character dubbed *Mr. Little* would chime very well here and betray the character's meanness admirably. With this interpretation there is also a benefit that accrues to our understanding of the following epigram: *Pollio* (Mr. Little) is subsequently replaced by *Auctus* (Mr. Increased); for terms of scale applied to patrons (*magnus, et al.*) see Nauta (2002: 17); for Roman *cognomina* associated with smallness see Kajanto (1965: 243-4). This type of epigram, which concentrates its satiric conclusion on the lowliness of the shallow braggart, features elsewhere in M.: see 1.9 and 5.82 (especially their concluding: *pusillus homo est*), and 3.62.7-8; for a related interpretation, which focuses on the use of proper names and scale in 2.2, see Knox (2006: 299-300). The background humour to such epigrams, concerned with an aggressive deflation of the subject, and their structure may ultimately be grounded in Catullus C. 112:

*Multus homo es, Naso, neque tecum multus homo est quin  
te scindat: Naso, multus es et pathicus.*

There are also many Greek epigrams whose humour is dependant upon scale (see e.g. A.G. 11.87-111); it should be noted, however, that the surreal element that characterises many such poems (particularly those of Lucilius) is somewhat alien to M.'s treatment of this theme.

Finally some technical details may be recorded. The placement of the proper name at the start of the second *hemiepes* of the pentameter is carefully detailed by Laurens (2012: 354-5). Elsewhere in Book 12 a vocative noun (either disyllable, trisyllable, or pentasyllable)

<sup>80</sup> Friedländer (1886: ad 3.20.18) associates 3.20, 4.61, and 12.12 with this same figure.

<sup>81</sup> Note, however, that Kajanto (1965: 37) is somewhat inclined against this interpretation. He views the name as deriving from *Pollius* and does not read an association with *Paulus*.



occurs in this position seven times: six times at the close of a poem (12.23.2; 12.27.2; 12.38.6; 12.54.2; 12.64.2; 12.94.12); once in the opening couplet (12.40.2). Laurens notes that such a position, with its subsequent pause after the name, lends *brièveté* and *vivacité* to the conclusion. Further details on the singularity of M.'s employment of vocatives, with comparison to the use of other poets, are to be found in Fain (2008: 181-4). The general poetic treatment of cretic names like *Pollio* (often resolved, as here, via shortening the final syllable) is observed by Coleman (1999: 32-3 & 38), whilst the orthography of *Pollio* is treated by Lindsay (1904: 56).

**mane bibe:** The solution is seemingly logical but nevertheless perverse; for the technique see Siedschlag (1977: 84-5), Sullivan (1989: 190-2), and for verbal coincidence accentuating such paradoxical conclusions see Williams *ad* 2.12.4 (2004: 65). Although *bibere* is frequently found at the conclusion of the pentameter (see *bibisti* above), the license of terminating a pentametric line with a short open vowel is rare and dissonant. This is all the more interesting, given the fact that the simple substitution of the jussive *bibas* (*cf.* 6.35.6) was available. It seems clear that, as with M.'s polysyllabic conclusions in the pentameter, M. has deliberately cultivated a discordant conclusion to concur with the humour and to highlight its flawed logic. Giarratano (1908: 33) notes that M. employed this license sixty-four times; he goes on to observe that M. allows this license slightly more than Ovid, but employs it less than Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus. It will be noted from these usages that thirty-six occur at the conclusion of an epigram (56.25%); thus the technique often seems purposeful and deliberately aimed at ensuring an inharmonious close. Given the fact that M.'s method of composition adjusts throughout his career - see e.g. Holmes (1995: 503) on a particular noun and attribute arrangement -, it may be worth recording that this technique of a dissonant close is slightly more prevalent in M.'s earlier books; there are, however, no examples from the *Xenia* or *Liber Spectaculorum*, but four examples in the *Apophoreta*. In Books 1-6 there are thirty-four examples in 1226 pentametric lines (2.77%), in Books 7-12 there are twenty-six in 1618 lines (1.60%). Book 12 may be viewed as slightly incongruous in Books 7-12, as it uses the device six times (3.17%) 12.12.2; 12.40.6; 12.72.6; 12.76.2; 12.78.2; 12.94.6; note, however, that some earlier books provide greater percentages: Book 2 (3.74%), Book 3 (4.41%). Elsewhere a concluding imperative with short ultimate syllable is provided at 3.86.4 (*lege*), 8.27.2 (*morere*), 12.40.6 (*morere*); the infinitive *bibere* also occurs at 3.49.2. Although the placement (final word) of the imperative remarked upon is distinct, the change of verbal syntax at the conclusion is frequent in other epigrammatists (e.g. Callimachus or Catullus); see Fain (2008: 184).

The conclusion logically prompts the assumption that the speaker wishes for the indisposition or fatality of Pollio through alcoholism. Although the ill-effects of alcohol have already been detailed (see *bibisti* entry), it may be worth recording that in Roman epitaphs alcohol is frequently recorded as one of the boons and indications of life: see e.g. *CIL*

3.293,2-4 (*dum vixi, bibi libenter. bibite vos, qui vivitis*); CIL 6.18131,1-8 (*quod edi bibi, mecum habeo, quod reliqui, perdidit*); B 1500 (*es, bibe, lude, veni*); et al.<sup>82</sup> Thus the speaker may here be understood to corrupt one of life's few benefits to further his own ends. A later epigram, on a debauchee fond of wine, provides the best comparison in Latin to 12.12; Luxorius 11.5-7 terminates as follows: *plura ne futuas, peto, Lucine, / aut semper bibe taediumque plange, / aut, numquam ut futuas, venena sume*. Another later epigram to consider is an unattributed poem from A.L. 17: *Phoebus me in somnis vetuit potare Lyaeum./ pareo praeceptis: tunc bibo dum vigilo*; see Shackleton Bailey (1982: 49). The use of *mane* and its association with the spirits of the dead (*Manes*) may also hint at a malevolent wish: ("drink with death, Pollio"); for the use of the temporal adverb at the conclusion see 1.15.12 (*vive hodie*); 1.24.4 (*nupsit heri*); 5.58.8 (*Postume, vixit heri*) with Rodón Binué (1986: 293-4). Finally it will be noted that power over the times and seasons are customarily in the province of witchcraft (see e.g. Hor. *E* 5.45-6; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.9-10); consequently there may be a sense that the speaker is a malevolent sorcerer.

---

<sup>82</sup> For a later play on the same theme (humorously confusing the verb "to eat" and "to be") see John Owen 2.55: "*mors (inquit Seneca) est non esse.*" *Polynice. contra / Germanus mortem "non bibere" esse putat.*

## 12.13

*Text:* Genus, Aucte, lucri divites habent iram:  
odisse, quam donare, vilius constat.

*Translation:* The rich consider anger as a type of profit, Auctus: it costs less to hate than to give.

### Structure and Content

The epigram consists of two statements united through parataxis. The first line details that wealthy men treat anger as a profitable emotion. The sentiment is expressed as an observed societal phenomenon; it is deliberately provocative and demands a subsequent explanation. The second line provides the requisite gloss with a gnomic declaration: it outlines that hatred is strategically employed to avoid the necessity of provision. Such an arrangement provides a variation on the question and answer format (e.g. *quaeris ... cur .. + vocative noun ... , + explanation: see 12.20*), which is more frequently found to reconcile a paradox posed by an initial proposition. It is to be noted that the division between the two statements is audibly attested through the assonance on the letter “u” in the first line, in contrast to the assonance of long “o” sounds in the second.

The basic tensions of the poem are picked out through judicious word placement. At the heart of the poem a chiasmus can be observed in its principal contrast of finances and enmity: *lucri (A), divites (A), iram (B) / odisse (B), donare (A)*. Beyond this core antithesis, the epigram progresses with many phrases betraying logical relationships to their adjacent words. Initially an hierarchical antagonism could be felt between *genus* (type, lineage) and *Aucte* (increased, wealthy). The next set of phrases (*lucri divites*) connote obvious pecuniary similarities. The negative emotion *iram* at the end of the line receives comparable reinforcement by *odisse* at the head of the next verse. To conclude, *donare* is in opposition not only with the comparison of *odisse*, but also somewhat at odds with *vilius*.

Further observations on the structure and themes of 12.13 are offered elsewhere. Nixon (1927: 82-4 & 149) provides a partial thematic treatment of M.’s didactic poems. Mateu Arete (1986: 136) furnishes a structural analysis of the gnomic epigrams; he categorises 12.13 among poems that project their focus onto an individual in an overt fashion with a vocative addressee and indicative verb(s). An appraisal of a related structure (based on a tripartite paradox, question, answer format) in Latin literature is offered by Feeney (2009: 29-39). Sullivan (1990: 54) places 12.13 alongside other poems in Book 12, which treat the

theme of Rome's hypocritical patrons (12.12; 13; 25; 26; 36; 40; 48; 81), whilst Malnati (1985: 98) offers a broader investigation on the same theme (*cf.* 2.43; 3.37; 6.11; 9.2; 10.11; 12.13; 12.36).

### Position and theme

As *variatio* is the principal motivation that guides the placement of M's epigrams, it is quite rare in Books 1-12 to have two or more monodisticha placed together. The neighbouring placement of monodisticha that treat the same theme, here patronage (12.12 focused on the client; 12.13 on the patron), is even more striking. Of the 211 monodisticha in Books 1-12 the following 29 sets are placed successively: 1.37-8; 1.74-5; 1.80-1; 1.94-5; 2.20-1; 2.38-9; 2.49-50; 2.79-82; 2.87-8; 3.8-9; 3.28-9; 3.34-5; 3.39-40; 3.48-9; 3.56-7; 3.78-80; 3.83-4; 3.88-90; 3.97-8; 5.32-3; 6.90-1; 7.3-4; 11.9-10; 11.67-8; 12.12-3; 12.19-20; 12.26-7; 12.46-7; 12.88-89. Such contiguously positioned monodisticha tend to enforce their boundaries by either focusing upon separate topics for each couplet or by alternating each couplets' metres or by adopting both methods in tandem. Of these alternatives the following divisions can be noted: a) sets that employ the same metre for each couplet but vary the theme (x 12): 1.37-8; 1.74-5; 1.80-1; 2.20-1; 2.38-9; 2.79-82; 2.87-88; 3.8-9; 3.48-9; 3.78-80; 3.88-90; 5.32-3; b) sets that vary both metre and theme (x 9): 3.28-9; 3.34-5; 3.39-40; 3.83-4; 3.97-8; 12.19-20; 12.26-7; 12.46-7; 12.88-9; c) sets that vary the metre but retain the same theme (x 4): 1.94-5 (theme of sound); 6.90-1 (adultery); 7.3-4 (composition of poetry); 12.12-3 (client/ patron tactics); d) sets that deploy the same metre and theme (x 4): 2.49-50 (female sexual promiscuity); 3.56-7 (Ravenna's water); 11.9-10 (Memor); 11.67-8 (clients and requests). As the data above demonstrates the contiguous placement of thematically connected monodisticha is infrequent in M's epigrams Books 1-12. This fact is made all the more interesting when one recalls that the arrangement of the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta* is quite clearly structured around the placement of thematically linked monodisticha, predominantly in the same metre. Although the varying of the metre in 12.12-13 is somewhat different (though not unparalleled) to the arrangement of the *Xenia*'s and *Apophoreta*'s couplets, the varying focus from rich to poor in thematically related couplets in 12.12-13 can be rewardingly compared with M.'s earlier practice. For further information on the arrangement of the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta* see Leary (1996: 13-21) and Leary (2001: 10-2); for the characteristics of M.'s juxtaposition of poems see Scherf (1998: 135-6).

The theme of patronage (noted with *donare* and suggested by *divites*) in the present epigram is, of course, a topic that M. treats frequently. The epigram, however, can be better appreciated by coupling it alongside 3.37: a monodistichum that similarly treats the topic of the tactical hatred of friends for economical gain. Another epigram in the corpus that can be profitably applied to the present epigram is 5.18. In 5.18 M. examines the subject of gift giving from the pauper's point of view and, through recourse to the familiar *gifts as hooks*

trope, ironically ends the epigram by announcing that the most honourable gift a pauper can bestow a wealthy man is nothing at all. Although 12.12 does not concern *captatio*, Tracy's (1980: 399-402) brief examination of the cynical techniques devised by both patron and client can be beneficially applied for comparable fiscal stratagems in Latin literature more generally. Comedic poems against miserliness are similarly found in Greek epigram; see A.G. 11.165-73; 264; 309; 366; 391; 397. The humour of such poems tends to concern the futility of hoarding wealth as it will eventually be transmitted to an heir. The best analogue to 12.12 is offered by Lucilius (A.G. 11.172): the poem similarly concerns the severing of emotional relationships for financial benefit (in Lucilius' poem a father drowns his child after reckoning up the financial burden that the child will impose on him).

**1. Aucte:** The name Auctus definitely appears in three other epigrams: 7.51, 7.52 and 9.21; there is also a variant reading of *Eucti* / *Aucti* at 8.6.1, which is worthy of note. Concerning whether these usages relate to the same person (Pompeius Auctus), current scholarly opinion is divided. Galán Vioque (2002: 311) provides a quite reasonable case for distancing the usages at 7.51 and 7.52 as relating to Pompeius Auctus (the nomen and cognomen is only used in 7.51) from the later usages at 9.21 and 12.13 on the basis of characterisation and probability (the case at 8.6 is unconsidered). Henriksén (2012: 93), however, provides an equally worthwhile contribution by weighting the probability in favour of reading the four usages as applying to Pompeius Auctus (again 8.6 is not considered). The differences in theme and tone (scoptic) in 9.21 and 12.13 are not interpreted as evidence for a separate character: Henriksén views the poems and the use of Auctus as their addressee as M.'s way of thanking his devoted reader Pompeius Auctus for the unsolicited services he performed in 7.51-2; this outlook also underlies the outline of Pompeius Auctus offered by Vallat (2008: 70). A less nuanced contribution is provided by Watson (1998: 30-1), who sees all four usages as unquestionably related to Pompeius Auctus, Martial's friend and admirer in order that she may categorically rule out the alternate reading of *Aucti* as applied to a pretentious parvenu (8.6) in favour of reading *Eucti*. The case is certainly not as clearcut as Watson's argument suggests as both manuscript support and recent editors of M.'s poems are quite divided on the issue. Although Izaac, Heraeus and Shackleton Bailey print *Eucti* at 8.6.1, Lindsay and Ker print *Aucti*; although the Watsons' (2003: 204-5) own select commentary naturally prints *Eucti*, Schöffel's (2002: 129-30) commentary prints and defends the reading of *Aucti*. Given the appropriateness of Auctus as a name for a parvenu and the potential benefits conferred to the characterisation of the addressee at 12.13, the usage at 8.6 should not be ignored. Auctus is a common cognomen and is particularly prevalent in Rome; see Kajanto (1965: 18 & 350). Given the absence of background detail provided a location for the poem cannot be supplied, but the name and theme are suggestive of Rome itself.

Whatever view is taken from the above information, there can be little doubt about the paronomastic benefit conferred on the poem by the selection of *Auctus*. In fact it is the very

use of this name that elevates a somewhat hackneyed repetition of 3.37. It could be argued that a contemporary reader of Martial, beyond noting the somewhat challenging juxtaposition of *genus* (birth, class) beside *Auctus* (upwardly mobile), would likewise wonder whether the *Auctus* named here is really M.'s friend, who is being honoured or teased, or just a fictitious character named to service the humour, as e.g. *Chione* at 3.34. The ways to read *Auctus*' role here are legion. He could be deemed an honorary addressee unassociated with the action; he could be viewed as a recently enriched man cautioned by a friend into the prudent governance of his resources; contrariwise, generosity could be encouraged via a negative example of avarice. The poem could also, aided by the placement of *genus*, be placed within a broader framework of invective poems concerned with the boorishness of parvenus. It would then be adjudged broadly or pointedly (dependent upon how greatly the reader chooses to associate the addressee with the behaviour) as social commentary rather than instruction. For the use of etymological plays on personal names as a technique in M.'s work see Giegengack (1969), Grewing (1998: 340-5) and Sullivan (1989: 192-5).

**lucri:** The noun is employed six times by M. (8.9.3; 8.48.7; 10.41.8; 12.13.1; 13.1.8; 13.3.4). In these examples, aside from 13.1.8, the profit accrued is always somewhat ironic. Frequently the profit realised concerns a lower yield than originally expected or the maintenance of one's possessions without the necessity of further spending. The only usage with *lucrum* that betrays real gain is the compound form found at 11.49.5 (*lucrifieri*): the context concerns a woman financially preying upon her lover. Proculeia's example (10.41.8) serves as a parallel for the negative profit found in 12.12. Proculeia decided, when calculating the amount of money that her husband would spend in the fulfilment of his senatorial duties, to sever her ties with him; this act is described by M. not as divorce, but *lucrum*.

**iram:** Not only is anger asserted as a tactic to be used by friends for their own economic advantage at 3.37.1, but it is seen elsewhere in M.'s work as the quality that truly defines power and overlordship. Of the eleven other usages the noun *ira* is associated with the power of wild beasts at 0.9.3, 0.22.2, 4.74.2, 6.64.30; with imperial power at 4.11.6, 6.10.5, 7.45.7; with Medusa at 7.1.2 and the Black Sea at 7.19.4. The two remaining examples concern the emotional power that the wielder of *ira* possesses over the narrator: 11.39.10 (*paedagogus*), 5.46.2 (lover). Two further examples with the verb *irascor* illustrate the power dynamics of *ira* in M.'s own usage and suggest the subtlety implicit here, viz. that *ira* is a quality which only the *divites* can ever possess. At 4.17.2 M. is urged to anger a female by writing poems against her. The encourager of the deed, Paulus, does this so that she will give herself to him alone. Although far more complex than has been suggested here the poem shows the nexus between anger and the ability to bestow something. In 6.51.3, by contrast, in the guise of the needy and much abused client M. suggests that he will show his anger towards his negligent patron by accepting an invitation to dinner if one is offered. In

sum such emotions in M.'s epigrams are the preserve of power, as M. jokes at 12.92.4 when asked by Priscus how he would behave if he were suddenly to become rich (*dic mihi, si fias tu leo, qualis eris?*).

These associations of *ira* are not confined to M. alone. Craca (2011: 112-3) devotes a section of her commentary to highlight the philosophical treatment of *ira* offered by Cicero and Seneca. To pick out the essential points Craca makes: Cicero traces the consequent *odium* that results from *ira* in *Tusc.* 4.21 (*cf. odisse* line 2), whilst Seneca *Dial.* 4.21.7 observes that anger increases in accordance to wealth (*non vides ut maiorem quamque fortunam maior ira comitetur? In divitibus et nobilibus et magistratibus praecipue apparet cum quidquid leue et inane in animo erat secunda se aura sustulit. Felicitas iracundiam nutrit...*). Further associations are plentiful in Seneca, most notably in his philosophical works (esp. *De ira*), but even his tragedies provide examples: e.g. *Med.* 494 (*gravis ira regum semper*). Elsewhere Ovid's amatory didactics likewise caution against any revelation of such genuine emotions (here, for pragmatic reasons); *cf. A.A.* 3.373 (*ira subit, deforme malum, lucrique cupido*). In many ways Auctus may be deemed to outstrip the philosophical approaches in his mastery over his emotions. The Stoic concern trends towards such regulation for a moral and spiritual development; in 12.12, by contrast, the character marshals his emotions for more tangible reward: money. Although this commodification of the emotions betrays the priorities, limitations, and class of a petty upstart, its rational and comedic logic should not be overlooked.

**2. odisse, quam donare:** The language here and *divites* (line 1) is to be found in a similar cluster in an earlier epigram that contrasts the power relationship of patron and client at 5.18. Beyond the internal comparisons the antithesis of *odisse* here recalls and intelligently reworks, in an emotionless and businesslike way, one of Catullus' most famous seemingly heartfelt poems, 85. M. has reworked or engaged with Catullus 85 in more straightforward ways before, notably 1.32 and, later in Book 12, 12.46. Some support for interpreting the present poem as engaging at some level with Catullus 85 is to be found in M.'s only other epigram that has the "friends should hate to prosper" message, 3.37. Not only can the hyperbaton spread of *irasci* and *amici* in 3.37.1 a cute diluting and reworking of the Catullan *odi et amo*, but the use of *facitis ... facere* at the end of each hemistich in the pentameter recalls the Catullan use of *faciam ... fieri* over two lines at the centre of his chiasmically arranged poem.<sup>83</sup> Finally, to eke every Catullan possibility out of the present poem, it should be noted that Craca (2011: 113) detects in the phrase *vilius constat* a nod to Catullus poem 72 addressed to Lesbia (72.6 *multo mi tamen es vilior et levior*).

---

<sup>83</sup> The similar use of *difficilis facilis* in 12.46.1 could also be added here.

**constat:** The verb here means “to cost”; for this usage and the addition of the adverb see *OLD: consto* 11. In M.’s treatment the verb is found sixteen times and, with the exception of two citations (0.33.4; 14.57.2), it is employed in a financial context. The phrase *vilius constare* is found elsewhere in the preface to Book 1: 1. *pr. 5 mihi fama vilius constet.*



## 12.14

*Text:* Parcius utaris moneo rapiente veredo,  
Prisce, nec in lepores tam violentus eas.  
saepe satisfecit praedae venator et acri  
decidit excussus nec rediturus equo.  
insidias et campus habet: nec fossa nec agger  
nec sint saxa licet, fallere plana solent.  
non deerit qui tanta tibi spectacula praestet,  
invidia Fati sed levioe cadat.  
si te delectant animosa pericula, Tuscis  
-tutior est virtus- insidiamur apris.  
quid te frena iuvant temeraria? saepius illis,  
Prisce, datum est equitem rumpere quam leporem.

*Translation:* I caution you, Priscus, to use your tearaway Spanish steed more sparingly and not to go so violently against the hares. Often the hunter has recompensed his prey and upon being dismounted is cast down from his fierce horse, unable to return to it. Even the plain has its traps: although there is neither ditch nor mound nor rocks, the level surface usually plays its tricks. There will not be another wanting who may provide such great shows for you, but he would fall with lesser ill-will against Fate. If spirited dangers amuse you, let us lay traps for Tuscan boars, it is a safer (form of) heroism. Why do reckless reins delight you? It is more frequently given to them, Priscus, to knacker the rider rather than the hare.

### Structure and Content

The epigram affords four logical divisions in its structure. The opening couplet outlines a cautionary appeal concerning hare coursing. This section supplies the subject (*Priscus*), topic (hunting), and hints at the setting (Spain: see *veredo*, *lepores* entries). Its use of jussive subjunctives and parenthetical *monere* distinguish the cautionary concern. The second section is treated in lines 3-6. Here a catalogue of dangers is provided in order to note the potential risks. These hazards involve those of horsemanship and of the terrain. Lines 7-10 supply the third division; in this part a passive rôle (in the capacity of a spectator) or an alternative sport (boar hunting) are recommended as safer options. It is to be observed that the setting likewise seems to shift at this point away from Spain towards Italy (note the entries for *spectacula* and *Tuscis*). The conclusion is supplied by the final couplet. This section echoes the concerns expressed at the outset; the vocabulary recalls that of the initial section to distinguish a ring construction. Although such a union is created between the opening and concluding couplets, a change of rhetorical form is also marked at the finale. In

the place of the subjunctive appeals, an interrogative clause, answered by a proverbial utterance, notes the perils.

The epigram is artfully arranged to convey something of the excitement of the chase. In lines 1-2 the pronounced dactylic rhythm supports the sense of haste. The following couplet (3-4) then slows down the speed established, with its greater use of spondees, to lend a sombre emphasis to M.'s concerns. Lines 5-10 employ an equal weighting of dactyls and spondees, in order to allow the prominent dactylic rhythm in the final couplet to repeat, in metre and sense, the frenetic horsemanship and exhilaration that Priscus seeks. A noticeable use of enjambement within couplets 3-4, 5-6, 9-10, and 11-12 extends the sense of speed and recklessness that the rhythm of the opening and concluding couplets seeks to cultivate. The relatively long length of the poem allows M. to deploy a range of effective *caesurae*. The most notable of such usages here are the trochaic *caesurae* in lines 5 and 7, and the heavy coincidence of word and foot division in line 5. Along with the pronounced concentration of monosyllables in line 5 (and continued at the start of line 6) the caesural pauses here seem to acknowledge the bounding speed and the pitfalls confronting the rider. The strong bucolic diaeresis in line 11 should also be identified, as it introduces the gnomic conclusion. The final trisyllabic word (*leporem*), with the consequent discord of ictus and accent, also furnishes a disturbing sound effect to highlight the danger being run.

Beyond the rhythmic effects there is an effective use of a triple zeugma with two participles and a main verb at lines 4-5. With *excussus* it is in the ablative case ("shaken out of..."), with *decidit* it is likewise ablative ("fallen down from ..."), and with *rediturus* it is dative ("going to return to ...") or conceivably ablative again ("going to return on..."); each verb slightly alters the meaning. The sense of the hazard to the rider is conveyed *via* the *cumulatio* of prepositional prefixes (*de-*, *ex-*, *re-*) contained within the driving force of the *acri ... equo*, placed with emphasis at the termination of lines 3 and 4. The technique of a triple form of repetition is picked up in the next couplet with the polysyndeton usage of *nec* (further enforced through enjambement): this and the delayed *et* (line 5) establish a blocking technique to replicate the hurdles and dangers that will slow down and stall the rider.

There are also some rather less obvious, but nevertheless perceptible, echoes in the diction of the passage to unite the poem: *Prisce* (lines 2 and 12) placed in the same metrical position at the start of the opening and concluding pentameter; *lepores* / *leporem* (likewise 2-12). This can be further supplemented by noting the similar use of comparative adverbs (*parcius* 1; *saepius* 11) and the slight shift from *veredo* (1) to *equitem* (12). Other coincidences that may be noted for their echoes to one another are: *tanta ... spectacula* (7) and *animosa pericula* (9). Although not a humorous epigram, there is a rather amusing oxymoron *tutior est virtus* (10), which is pleasantly stressed through the alliteration of the letter *t* and anticipated aurally *via* the preceding *Tuscis* (9). It may also be worth noting that

the language in this poem is at times quite alien to M.'s general works: the terms for hunting are somewhat unique in M. (though common elsewhere): *insidias* (5) is used elsewhere only at 4.56.4 (in a context of legacy hunting); *fossa* (5) is unparalleled (though *fossor* (x 2) and *fodere* (x 6) are found); *agger* too is found only here and the words *temerarius* (x 4) and *frenum* (x 3) are infrequent. Finally the use of zeugma in *rumpere* (12: see lemma entry) repeats the effects achieved in lines 3-4 and separates *equitem* from *leporem* spatially through its own placement between them and shifts its meaning for each object to provide a characteristic and ambiguous conclusion to the epigram.

Further observations on the structure of 12.14 are offered in the following works. Siedschlag (1977: 13 & 28) concentrates upon the appeal at the start of the poem and the use of a question towards the conclusion. For both constructions he demonstrates ample earlier precedent in the Greek epigrammatic genre and catalogues similar stylistic choices in M.'s own poetry. Pertsch (1911: 54-5) itemises and details M.'s habit of terminating a poem with an antithesis (*equitem ... leporem*); he also provides comparable rhetorical devices from the realm of Greek epigram. Vallat (2008: 438) offers a conspectus for the relative position of repeated vocatives within an epigram of twelve lines. He demonstrates that such iteration in the second and twelfth line features elsewhere at 1.103 (*Scaevola*), 8.71 (*Postumiane*), and 10.68 (*Laelia*); this is consequently a customary placement for repeated vocatives in poems of this length.<sup>84</sup> Ker (1950: 23) faults the transmitted order of the poem. He finds the concluding couplet (*quid te frena ... quam leporem*) a "lame" ending to the epigram and would transfer these verses to the third and fourth lines; he offers the homoearchon of *Prisce* as the cause for a hypothesised transposition. Ker instead considers lines 9-10 (*si te delectant ... insidiamur apris*) as a more natural conclusion. In Ker's interpretation the epigram would afford the following tripartite construction (of four lines for each section): lines 1-4 would contain a warning about the dangers of hare coursing, lines 5-8 would catalogue instances of the potential dangers, the conclusion would then promote an alternative sport. Although Ker offers a rational interpretation, the careful delineation of compositional techniques provided above by Siedschlag, Pertsch, and Vallat collectively tell against his argument. One could also add that the "lame" quality supposedly identified in the conclusion is somewhat subjective and a weak basis upon which to justify such alterations. Finally Mateu Areste (1986: 135-6) notes the high concentration of proverbial sentiments in the epigram. He classifies proverbs under two types: those which are general and do not involve the poet, and those statements which note the poet's involvement or interest. Both versions are identified here: lines 3-4 and 5-6 are general in character; the conclusion (lines 11-12), addressed to his patron Priscus, exhibits personal concern.

---

<sup>84</sup> Elsewhere Vallat (2008: 438) observes coincidences of repeated vocatives in a twelve-line epigram at the first and twelfth, the first and eleventh, and the eleventh and twelfth line. As is to be noted all such coincidences recur at the final or penultimate line of these relatively long poems.

## Alternative Readings

This epigram will largely be examined in this commentary as an expression of friendship, which focuses upon the addressee's fondness for hunting. As such it will be viewed as generically comparable to the admonitory epigrams found in Book 10 of the *Anthologia Graeca*; one could also consider the hunting epigrams found in Book 6. Although the Greek epigrams do not offer a poem that may be provided as a true intertext for 12.14, the themes with which it is concerned are widely available in the two books mentioned above. Another profitable parallel to consider may be found in the trope of the *propemptikon* and its analogous concern for the traveller's welfare; for convenience see Cairns (2007: *index*) on this trope. As has been noted earlier (12.1 commentary) the present epigram serves an important function in the arrangement of Book 12 in order to signal a conclusion to the introductory poems in the book. It is tantalising to consider whether or not this formed a separate cycle issued to Priscus (whether poems 1-14 or some other arrangement beginning with our current 12.1 and concluding with 12.14) as White's, perhaps too often ridiculed, *libellus* theory would suggest. It is tantalising, but ultimately indeterminable; thus it can only be advanced as an interesting hypothesis. Beyond its clear associations with 12.1 in the present Book, 12.14 also clearly harks back to one of M.'s most famous poems in Book 1 (1.49), the 42 line praise of Bilbilis to Licinianus. 12.14, along with the rather negative portrayal of Bilbilis found in the introductory letter to Book 12, could be interpreted as a rejection of, or modification to, his earlier sentiments on his homeland. By warning his fellow Spaniard and friend, Priscus, away from the rustic temptations of Spain, M. could be interpreted as trying to dissuade Priscus from the traps of patriotism and rural charms that he, regretfully, succumbed to. Consequently *insidias et campus habet* in line 5 may be viewed as an articulation of the above; for a balanced discussion of M.'s views on Spain see Chambert (2004: 65-78).

There are, however, other views that have been advanced on the significance of 12.14; as these will not be treated in the notes, it is convenient to broadly outline them here. Stégen (1971: 216-7) offers a number of interesting interpretations: he observes that by discouraging Priscus away from hare coursing and advocating a boar hunt M. is representing himself as Charon to Priscus' Achilles. Stégen then concentrates upon the irony that hare coursing is presented as more dangerous than boar hunting. He uses two arguments to demonstrate the truth of the paradox: 1) hare coursing is more hazardous as Priscus is an incompetent rider; 2) lines 9-10 (*si te delectant ... apris*) are viewed as an allusion to the fear Mezentius inspires in the Trojans when he is cornered at *Aen.* 10.712-3 (*nec cuiquam irasci propiusque accedere virtus, / sed iaculis tutisque procul clamoribus instant*). Stégen believes that the intertext suggests that Priscus may likewise stand at a distance from the captured boar. Consequently owing to his poor horsemanship and the greater prestige a hunted boar will bestow, Priscus will gain glory from the safest form of

heroism. The approach outlined by Stégen is worthwhile and amusing. Despite the allusion to the *Aeneid* being a little tenuous, the broad outlines are cynically appealing; ultimately, however, the approach necessarily clashes with the framework of friendship and patriotism that underlies the interpretation offered in this commentary.

Woolf (2003: 213-4) provides a brief sketch of 12.14 in a broader discussion about the pleasures of the Romans that the literary record omits. His overall thesis is to minimise the exaggerated position that literary concerns have played in our appreciation of Roman society. He seeks to demonstrate that M.'s epigrams 12.1 and 12.14, like Pliny's letters 1.6 and 5.18, are attempts by both writers to intrude upon the domain of hunting and provide appealing literature to disinterested patrons. Crudely stated, Woolf's suggestion is that both literature and hunting are hobbies for a relatively narrow section of the Roman elite. Woolf's logic naturally feeds into two ideas that receive widespread and somewhat hackneyed expression currently: 1) class-based analyses (which naturally suffer due to a tremendous dearth of fundamental evidence); 2) metaliterary approaches. The second approach has been quite pronounced in literature concerned with hunting. For readers who are interested in interpreting the animals hunted through a metaliterary lens, Mader (2010: 288-95) offers an appealing interpretation of Propertius 2.19.17-26. The Propertian passage is directly contrary to 12.14; Propertius rejects the notion of hunting large game and prefers to hunt hares instead.<sup>85</sup> This preference is viewed as an expression of Propertius' bias towards the smaller confines of the elegy against the scope of epic. For further metaliterary interpretations on hunting literature see Edwards (2008: 45), who understands the three boars Pliny hunts (1.6.1) as a reference to three speeches by Marcus Aper.

Finally Penwill (2015: 188 and 92-3) aims to show, through a concentrated focus on some poems in M. Books 10-12, that an antipathetic attitude to Trajan is exhibited therein. Concerning 12.14 he highlights three passages which he chooses to read as politically subversive. The clause *insidias et campus habet* is used alongside a passage from Pliny's *Panegyricus* as an opening quotation to his thesis: it is left uninterpreted, but the impression is clearly that Trajan represents the hazardous plain. Lines 7-8, which caused Shackleton Bailey such problems (see lemma entry) are rather more interestingly viewed as a statement of diplomatic strategic safety: let others run risks with Trajan, but be mindful to avoid such confrontations yourself. Finally the image of Priscus riding recklessly across the plain (lines 1-2 and 11-12) is, so Penwill maintains, alluded by Juvenal S.1.19-21:

*cur tamen hoc potius libeat decurrere campo,  
per quem magnus equos Aurunca flexit alumnus,  
si vacat ac placidi rationem admittis, edam.*

---

<sup>85</sup> For a list of animals that bring glory to the huntsman, see Mader (2010: 291-2).

Indeed Penwill goes further and maintains that 12.14 forms the nucleus for Juvenal's introductory satire and its concerns about *libertas* in speech in Trajan's Rome. There are some provocative and interesting ideas raised by Penwill; however the evidence provided is rather spare and in some cases lacking altogether. For instance the passage from Juvenal cited above explicitly mentions Lucilius as the inspiration for and driving force of Juvenal's approach, one could also add that to link an allusion to a metaphor of travel is rather tenuous. It is difficult to think of a Latin poet who does not use the metaphor at some point in their works, so prevalent is the trope. Perhaps the most striking flaw in Penwill's approach is not the actual absence of evidence, but the methodology employed. An unsympathetic critique of Penwill's approach would suggest that the notion of a perceived political hostility has been supplied and then evidence has been identified in a *post hoc* fashion to support the contention; but if one removes the notion, is there actually anything in the poem itself to suggest that Trajan or politics of any kind is referenced? It will be the stance taken here that, at least as regards the present poem, no such politically subversive readings are ultimately justified.

**1. rapiente veredo:** In the present context *rapiente* is synonymous with *celeri* or *volante* as lanssonius (1654: *ad loc.*) makes clear; for the usage see *OLD rapio* 9. The employment of *rapiente*, however, serves to highlight the danger that courses through the poem and it is ultimately picked up and amplified by *rumpere* at the conclusion. The participle *rapiente* also characterises the loss of control that such hunting entails (cf. line 4); this sense of *rapere* is consequently often found in Bacchic contexts, perhaps most memorably in Horace *Odes* 3.25.1 *quo me, Bacche, rapis ...*; for this use of *rapere* see Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 299). In sum *rapere* is carefully chosen for its associations of speed, lack of control, and dangerous overtones. *Veredus* is in origin a Celtic word (cf. Proto-Celtic *\*uφorēdos* and German *Pferd*) that is here employed to lend a certain local colour; cf. the similar use of *vertragus* in 14.200.1 and, for examples from other poets, consider the Carthaginian *magalia* in Virgil *Aen.* 1.421 and 4.259 with Servius (*ad loc.*). M. introduces *veredus* into Latin and it is used elsewhere at 14.86.1: for M.'s habit of introducing Celtic words into Latin see Dolç Dolç (1953: 26-7) and (1986: 19), Alvar Ezquerro (1986: 77), and Watson (2002: 233). In M.'s employment of this noun it refers to a hunting horse both here and at 14.86; as Leary (1996: 145) points out, this also accords with the description of Hadrian's hunting horse, cf. *CIL* 12.1122. Later Latin uses *veredus* to refer to a light horse for couriers: cf. *Aus. Epist.* 8.13 (Green); Justinian, *Dig. Iust.* 50.4.18.22.1, 50.4.18.29.3. Ausonius' usage here deserves especial attention since he recommends the slow horse (*piger veredus*) as a safer form of travel to his friend who has no love for an *acer equus*. Isidore of Seville confused the picture even further by observing that the etymology of *veredus* was ultimately associated with (the likewise Celtic) *raeda* / *rheda*; Isidore thus assumed that the *veredus* is a horse which is hitched to a *raeda* (*Etym.* 12.1). The above caused considerable confusion for some time

and the early commentators (Ianssonius, Gallet) refer to Turnebus' rejection of Isidore to explain the usage here: Turnebus (1604: Book 18 chapter 1).<sup>86</sup> In sum, it seems safest to assume that *veredus* as used by M. and in his period referred to a Spanish hunting horse, whereas later it tended to indicate a light despatch horse; for the purposes of the poem its Hispano-Celtic associations are thematically important, given the Spanish setting and the origins of Terentius Priscus and M.

**2. Prisce:** For the importance of Terentius Priscus in Book 12 see the lemma entries on 12. *pr.*, 12.3(4) and the opening epistle. The only thing to add in the present specific context is that the concern for Priscus' welfare is a persistent theme in M.'s references to him. Our first introduction to him at 6.18 concerns the sad loss of Priscus' friend, Salonius, in Spain; at 8.45 Priscus' safe return to Rome from Sicily is celebrated and a similar hope that Flaccus will likewise return safe from Cyprus is expressed. Whether or not one interprets this an expression of sincere friendship does not matter; the important thing for the literary representation of Priscus in M. is that hazard in some sense pursues him.

**nec ... eas:** For the prohibitive construction, formed of negative *nec* or *neu* preceded by an imperative or subjunctive (*utaris*: line 1), see Clement (1900: 160). Elsewhere there is an instance where an imperative is employed: see 1.117.13 (*pete nec roges*).

**lepores:** The Celtic regions were renowned for their hare coursing: *cf.* Arrian *Cyn.* 19.1. In 1.49.25 (an epigram that should be closely read with 12.14) one of the treats Bilbilis will afford Licinianus is hare coursing on horseback. It is quite clear from both Arrian and M. 1.49 that the pursuit of hare could be considered a particular sport of the region and, alongside the earlier inclusion of *veredus*, a somewhat pronounced Hispanic background is provided. Given the progress of themes across M.'s work it may be noteworthy that what has been presented as one of many rural pleasantries Spain furnishes in 1.49.25 is now presented somewhat more negatively and ultimately ominous: *cf.* epistle to Book 12.

The associations of hares and rabbits with Spain are particularly pronounced: both Pliny *N.H.* 8.217 and Varro *R.R.* 3.12.6 remark upon the *cuniculi* as native to Spain. Indeed such

---

<sup>86</sup> For further on the etymology and meaning see d'Arbois de Jubainville (1891: 202). He views M.'s usage here as exceptional and equivalent to a horse fitted with a saddle. It is traditionally believed, however, that the saddle for a horse was introduced into the Roman sphere by nomadic tribes who entered the empire in the third century A.D.; see Reece (1969: 32). It may be worth noting that horses seem especially prominent in the region if etymological evidence is a good guide. On a related theme, the case of *caballus* could further attest to the prominence, but it is ultimately contentious. The word is certainly not Indo-European, of the possible contenders a Balkan/ Asiatic loanword is proposed by de Vaan (2008: 77), a Balkan or Celtic origin is argued for by Ernout and Meillet (1939: 124), the *OLD* and Lewis and Short assume either extreme likewise. Similar etymological observations on the Celtic origins of chariots could also be provided, for a convenient list see Harris (1974: 36).

is the close association that a hypothesised etymology of *Hispania* is made from the Punic *sphan* (“rabbit”). *Hispania* is thus interpreted as “land of the rabbits”; see Crow (1985: 7).<sup>87</sup> Etymological links to the Hispanic and wider Celtic regions can be further supplemented by studies on *lepus* and *cuniculus*. It is noted by de Vaan (2008: 335) that *lepus* is not of Indo-European formation and a Celtic origin is tentatively proposed. The etymology of *cuniculus* is likewise shaded in some mystery, but an Iberian origin seems most likely. Ballester and Quinn (2002) argue for an Iberian root and contend that it may originally have hinted at a diminutive form for a dog. Their notion is that when the animal was first observed, a dog suggested itself as the nearest equivalent. Further works to note include Doty (2001: 151-2), who concentrates upon the spread of *cuniculi* across the empire from Spain and the size and prevalence of *leporaria* reserves, and Naether (1967: 1-3), who offers a history of the domesticated rabbit across various cultures. MacKinnon (2014: 208-11) provides evidence for the various animals traditionally hunted for food (including hares and rabbits), the prices for such game (hares are more expensive than rabbits), the use of *leporaria* by hunters, and the greater rôle that wild game played in the diet of the Iberian areas than any other part of the empire. Finally Aymard (1951: 363-89) offers a review of the various hunting techniques for hares, dogs (although not mentioned at 12.14) are customarily employed; cf. 12.1.1.

**3. satisfecit:** The verb is only found elsewhere in M. at 12.78.2. The word suggests providing a suitable compensation to the injured party and is consequently often found in legal contexts; see 12.78.2. Both Loeb translators of M.’s text, Ker (1919) and Shackleton Bailey (1993), use “atonement” or “atoned” to convey the meaning; here the death of the *venator* would be the requisite punishment. For the meaning and associated citations from the jurist Ulpian see Deneffe (1919: 163) and *OLD satisfacio* 2b.

**acri ... equo:** The phrase is chiefly found in epic verse (see Virg. *Aen.* 1.444; 4.156-7; 7.163-4; 8.3; Silius Italicus *Pun.* 10.467-8; 16.328), though it also features in Germanicus *Arat.* 465 and by M. at 6.38.7. The best comparison afforded by the above is provided by Virg. *Aen.* 4.156-7 where Ascanius is portrayed somewhat recklessly delighting in the hunt at Carthage.

**4. nec rediturus:** The verb occurs 45 times by M. The meaning here is unique in M.’s treatment of the verb: the phrase is essentially a euphemism denoting “death”. The nearest parallel in M.’s work may be found, in a minor fashion, at 14.181.2: Leander could suggest that he is willing to drown either during his return journey (the clearest interpretation) or, by a sleight of hand, much later when on the point of death (a somewhat tendentious reading). Friedrich (1910: 586) believes that the usage at 12.14.3 is indebted to Seneca’s employment

---

<sup>87</sup> It may be of interest to note that in the early Medieval period Christian writers used *Hispania* to designate that part of Spain under Muslim overlordship; see Fletcher (2000: 87).



of *redire*; see *Medea* 632 and *Ep.* 36.11. Although he provides earlier precedents for *redire* signifying death, including those of Cato and Cicero, Friedrich believes that M., due to ignorance of these works, must have relied upon Seneca. This position is somewhat undermined by the additional citation of Catullus C. 3.12. Even if one could believe that neither Cicero nor Cato could have guided M., the denial of Catullan influence is unsustainable. It could also be added that the frequent association of *ire* and its derivative *perire* with death, argues against any pronounced originality in the usage. Despite the flaws in his conclusion, Friedrich supplies a useful inventory for such an interpretation of *redire*, which is absent from the *OLD* and Lewis and Short.

**5. nec agger:** For the prevalence of the use of *nec*, even before a vowel (contrary to the general practice of late Republican writers), in preference to *neque* in the literature of M.'s period see Lease (1902: 212-14). Out of 578 usages of the negative conjunction by M., *neque* is found only eleven times; this includes four instances of the form *neque enim* which is identified by Lease (1902: 214) as a specialised exception.<sup>88</sup> For the different use of the related term *atque* in poetry see Butterfield's (2008: 386-413) excellent article.

**6. licet:** When M. wishes to express a concession *licet* (or *licebit*) is the favoured form; there are 60 usages in total. Elsewhere *quamvis* (23 times) and *cum* (9 times) are used, other concessive conjunctions are avoided (e.g. *quamquam*, *etsi*); for M.'s usage here see Lease (1898: 30-1) and for the general employment of *licet* in Latin literature see Lease (1901: 1-2).

**7-8:** Throughout his works on M. Shackleton Bailey has chosen to find fault with this couplet, dubbing it "nonsense". He believes that this is the case as Priscus will be compensated for his loss of hunting merely by watching others hunt. In his first attempt to resolve the problem he identifies, he alters the couplet thus: *non deerit quo tanta tibi spectacula praestes, / invidia fati sed levioe cadas*; (1978: 292). Shackleton Bailey interprets his awkward re-rendering as follows: "There are nobler quarry for Priscus to hunt, such as boar (9-10), which would give him as good a show and, if he were to fall, a worthier death (fate would be less severely blamed)". There is no support offered by the manuscripts for such a reading; nevertheless the verbs he alters do contain third person plural variants that most *apparatus critici*, including Shackleton Bailey's own, furnish. It did not take long for Shackleton Bailey to reject his emendation, see his Teubner (1989: *ad loc.*) and Loeb (1993: *ad loc.*); but in each subsequent work he still emphasises his dissatisfaction with the couplet. Shackleton Bailey is here creating a problem that does not actually exist. Eden (2001: 585-6) answers the problem posed by noting that the couplet is not concerned with whether Priscus is satisfied by a vicarious rôle, or not. The logic here concerns M.'s self-interest: he will curse fate less

---

<sup>88</sup> Lease (1902: 213) suggests that there are twelve instances. Unfortunately these are not specified nor does he directly acknowledge a text (although Friedländer's name does occur).

(*invidia fati*) if a substitute person were to die rather than his friend and patron, Priscus. The couplet is also distinguished since it suggests a shift in the poem's direction; it logically leads into the proposed alternative sport (boar hunting) and the change of setting to Italy. The use of *spectacula* (line 7) is interesting in the present context, as it recalls the Roman games. Rimell (2009: 198) views 12.14 (and the subsequent 12.28) as a return to this most Roman of pastimes. If one were to push these two lines (perhaps too far), the use of *spectacula* (and the later *Tuscis*) could express a rejection of characteristically Hispanic recreations and a promotion of Roman ones; for a summary of the vexed question as to whether the Romans traditionally hunted for pleasure or whether it was an imported amusement see Green (1996: 222-60). Contrary to being "nonsense", the couplet engages quite effectively with the overtly Spanish overtones at the opening lines and anticipates the geographical adjustment. When comparison is made with the epigram's counterpart (12.1), it will be seen that a substitute form of hunting is customarily offered to Priscus.

**7. deerit:** It is perhaps best to take the prosody here as a spondaic contraction like Lucretius *De rer. nat.* 1.43 (*talibus in rebus communi deesse saluti*) or Virgil *Aen.* 10.378 (*deest iam terra fugae: pelagus Troiamne petamus*), although it is permissible to scan the two e's as short and have a customary dactylic opening for the first foot. On the general prevalence of a dactylic first foot in hexametric verse see Postgate (1923: 76), statistics for M.'s treatment (64.41% begin with a dactyl) can be gained from Giarratano (1908: 7) and Marina Sáez (1998: 292-5). For the prosody of *tibi* with a long second syllable and its frequency against a short syllable in M.'s work see Giarratano (1908: 77).

**8. invidia Fati:** For the phrase see 9.86.9-10 (*numina cum videas duris obnoxia Fatis,/ invidia possis exonerare deos*) and Citroni (1975: 56-7) on 1.12.9.

**animosa pericula:** The phrase is unique to M. and this is his only employment of the adjective. The nearest parallel is provided by Seneca *Ep.* 100.10 (*contra pericula animose*), nevertheless coincidences of *periculum* with the substantive *animus* are by no means exceptional; e.g. Cicero *Ad fam.* 11.3.3.5, Sallust *Cat.* 4.1.1, Livy *A.U.C.* 2.48.7. For the transference of the adjective via metonymy, likewise the usage of *tutior* in line 9, see Fenger (1906: 24).

**9. Tuscis:** The alternative Gallet (1701: *ad loc.*) provides of *tu scis* as a means of emphasising the earlier content of line 9 (i.e. *tu novisti rem ita se habere*) is a nice observation but ultimately unnecessary. The Tuscan boar were renowned (cf. 7.27.1, Juvenal *S.* 1.22-3) and the return to an Italian setting seems to have some point, see note above (7-8). It could also be interpreted as a humorous and rather sly self-invitation by M. to stay with Priscus and return to Italy: note the change from *te delectant* (9) to *insidiemur* (10).

The preference of a more dangerous form of hunting is ironic; for the ferocity of the Etruscan boar see *CIL* 14.3911 with McDonough (2011: 653-9, esp. 654-5). Elsewhere M.'s proclivity to itemise the provenance of foodstuffs has been interpreted as epicurean. Heuvel (1937: 313) employs Statius *Silv.* 4.6.8-11 as a rejection of such tendencies and a sign of enmity towards M. particularly. Heuvel's point feeds into a long-observed hostility between M. and Statius. There is ultimately very little concrete evidence to support such a contention; for further on M. and Statius see Henriksén (1998: 77-118).

**10. tutior est virtus:** The oxymoron, to some extent, obscures an interesting difference that may have existed between the Roman outlook and the views of other cultures within the empire. It seems, from the presentation of scholars concerned with hunting in antiquity, quite doubtful that the Romans viewed hunting, as the Greeks did, as an educative process to cultivate bravery (see Anderson 1985: 83-101), Spain by contrast is dubbed by Aymard (1951: 67) as "un terroir de chasse". Indeed the growth and general acceptance of hunting for pleasure and military instruction appears as a consequence of the imperial power shifting away from Romans/Italians: for hunting in the Antonine period see Badel (2007: 37-47), Aymard (1951: 492-503 on Trajan), and Anderson (1985: 101-22).

**11. frena ... temeraria:** An interesting phrase, employing both synecdoche (*frena* here stands for *equitatio*) and metonymy (*temeraria* properly refers to the quality of the horseman); it means in this context "rash riding". Fletcher (1983: 408) observes that the phrase is broadly comparable to Statius *Theb.* 6.348-9 (*effera ... frena*) and Stephenson's (1914: 414) commentary offers a different Statius citation to be considered (*Theb.* 11.243 *Frater muris circum omnibus instat Portarumque moras frenis insultat, et hostis*). Beyond the literal associations of reckless riding, ungoverned *frena* can elsewhere be used figuratively to denote unbridled and reprehensible passion; cf. Prop. 3.19.3 (... *ubi contempti rupistis frena pudoris*). Words formed with a suffix in *-arius* are frequent in M.'s work and form part of the everyday lexis, such words often denote a proclivity for or preoccupation with the root meaning of the word. The adjective *temerarius* is, however, not uncommon. For M.'s fondness of the suffix see Kay (2010: 328-9), and Watson (2002: 241-2); for a general overview and treatment of the various qualities the suffix adds to root words, see Nichols (1929: 40-63).

**12. equitem rumpere ... leporem:** A difficult phrase that requires some explanation. For the use with *leporem* we can identify a specific hunting term that implies coursing the hare until it falls prey to exhaustion: 1.49.25 with Howell (1980: *ad loc.*) and Friedlaender (1885: *ad loc.*). Although neither here nor in the comparable passage of 1.49.25 are dogs mentioned in this form of hunting, certainly the use of the *vertragus* in 14.200 in hare hunting and the evidence

offered by Arrian *Cyn.* 19.1 lends support to Anderson's (1985: 99-100) assumption that dogs would be used here. Therefore when applied to the hare, it can confidently be assumed that *rumpere* suggests "to wear out to the point of exhaustion". It is possible that the same meaning would be conceivable to explain the effect on the *equus* (*cf.* 10.56.8 where *ruptos* refers to M. being exhausted and needing medical help due to constantly running around for his patron), but an expected point at the conclusion would militate against such a reading. By looking at M.'s use of the verb at the conclusion of his epigrams, we can demonstrate that M. likes to use *rumpere* as a *double entendre* at the end of other epigrams: at 9.97 the refrain *rumpitur invidia* (he is bursting with envy) repeated throughout the poem is capped by the idiomatic usage of *rumpatur* ("be damned") at the end, with Shackleton Bailey (1993: 316-7). 10.79.9 (*ruperat*) and 10.79.10 (*rumpet*) also has the structure of a *double entendre* at the conclusion: here perhaps with the meaning *latus rumpere* implied to counterbalance the reworking of Phaedrus' fable (1.24) about a frog bursting with pride found in the preceding line. As such the structure of the epigram and earlier precedent suggest that *rumpere* when applied to the *equus* should suggest something a little stronger than the winding of the *lepus*, perhaps ultimately a mortal injury from a fall. It should be emphasised that no exact parallel for *rumpere* (meaning "to kill") is available, but even the usage of 10.56.8 used to support the first reading suggests the need of medical assistance. In the translation offered above "to knacker" is offered as the nearest synonym in English; although colloquial it happily offers the meanings of (a) to wear out through exhaustion, (b) it has associations with death: *knacker yard*; (c) as a term for the testes (knackers) it contains a comparable sexual overtone as in *latus rumpere*. For a general conspectus of the trisyllabic conclusion in a pentameter see Wilkinson (1948: 68-75), and for the particular structure of a monosyllable followed by an anapaestic trisyllable, often avoided even by Catullus, see Wilkinson (1948: 73), for the general impact gained by avoiding a disyllable at the close see 12.3(4).6 (*pigritiae* entry).

The phrase *rumpere leporem* does offer other tantalising interpretations: the phrase could reveal a pun on a piece of common folklore involving *lupi*, not *lepores*. The evidence to support such an assertion comes from Pliny *N.H.* 28.81 (***rumpi equos, qui vestigia luporum sub equite sequantur***). This powerful effect on horses by wolves has been stated earlier in the following terms (*N.H.* 28.44: *hoc idem praestare et pellis e cervice solida existimatur: quippe tanta vis est animalis, praeter ea quae retulimus, ut vestigia eius calcata equis adferunt torporem*). The notes by Ajasson (1829-33: 223 and 231) on this subject suggest that the effect on the horse from the wolf is ultimately due to electricity.<sup>89</sup> He also rather interestingly adds "C'est ainsi que le lievre, la lapin, le faisan, le perdrix, le caille, fuient dès qu'ils se trouvent sur les traces du chien". In his reading of *N.H.* 28.81 it seems that he took *rumpi* rather too literally as he calls it "une hyperbole que rien ne justifie" (1829-33: 231). Whilst the following is not cited on the presumption that M. was consciously mimicking

<sup>89</sup> Ajasson records as axiomatic that horses on a wolf's trail are effected by some left over electric charge, in the following way: "Personne n'en doute aujourd'hui: il est presumable que c'est un effet de l'electricite".

Pliny's language, if the idea of the effect of wolves on horses was reasonably well-known at Rome, the use of *leporem* at the conclusion instead of an expected *luporum vestigia* may well add an additional layer of subtlety and bathos to the conclusion. Concerning the hare's importance in folklore, readers may wish to contrast the positive and negative views that concern an encounter with a wolf or a hare in North-European traditions; see Sallybrass' translation of Grimm (1883: 1126-7). The later views of John of Salisbury (*occursum leporis timere*) and Peter of Blois (*amice charissime, nec te illorum errore involvas, qui occursum leporis timent*) found in the same volume are especially noteworthy (1883: 1127).

## 12.15

*Text:* quidquid Parrhasia nitebat aula  
donatum est oculis deisque nostris.  
miratur Scythicas virentis auri  
flammas Iuppiter et stupet superbi  
regis delicias gravesque †lusus†:  
haec sunt pocula quae decent Tonantem,  
haec sunt quae Phrygium decent ministrum.  
omnes cum Iove nunc sumus beati;  
at nuper - pudet, ah pudet fateri -  
omnes cum Iove pauperes eramus.

*Translation:* Whatever used to shine in the Parrhasian palace has been bestowed to our eyes and our gods. Jupiter marvels at the Scythian flames of green gold and is dumbstruck at the toys of the haughty king and his burdensome amusements: these are the cups which suit the Thunderer, these are those which suit the Phrygian attendant. We are all now enriched together with Jupiter; but recently - shame, a shame to admit - we were all poor together with Jupiter.

### Content and Structure

The epigram supplies three primary divisions. The first part (lines 1-2) notes, in a general manner, that the private possessions of the imperial palace are now provided for public and divine observation. A line is devoted to each timeframe to stress the attendant shift in imperial governance. The second section (lines 3-7) illustrates the generalisation outlined in the opening lines by focusing on the emperor's bejeweled cups that are displayed. This central unit can be reduced into two constituent elements. The first component (lines 3-5) delineates the sumptuous artistry of the cups as seen by Jupiter and serves to castigate the hubristic character of their former imperial possessor. The second component (lines 6-7) suggests, by a repeated formula, that the cups' qualities are only suited for divinities, either Jupiter or his cup-bearer Ganymede. The final section (lines 8-10) openly states the changed political environment. The contrast between the two timeframes are noted via repetition in lines 8 and 10 (comparing the respective blessings and miseries of Jupiter and the populace across time), with a parenthetical *cri de coeur* (line 9), which underlines the former wretched condition of Rome at the conclusion.

Taking a closer look at the structure, it will be evident that a chiasmus binds the epigram together. This pattern is based upon a chronological division that moves from the recent past

to the present in the opening lines (line 1: imperfect *nitebat*, line 2: perfect *donatum est*) and then, at the conclusion, from the present back to the past (line 8: present *sumus*, line 10: imperfect *eramus*). This division is further reinforced at the concluding section by the addition of the temporal adverbs (line 8: *nunc*, line 9: *nuper*). Beyond this general framework that unites the extremities of the poem, further coincidences can be identified. The anaphora of the deictic pronoun, with further repetitions of verbs (*esse* and *decere*) and the relative pronoun, instanced in the second section (lines 6-7) initiates a comparable use of anaphora in the third section (lines 8 and 10: *omnes cum love*). The repetitive formula in the final section is further corroborated by the iteration of the parenthetical *pudet* (line 9), and also shifts the rhetoric by encompassing an antithesis within it (line 8: *beati* vs. line 10: *pauperes*). It will be noted that the concluding section chooses to restate, in two separate ways, both the temporal antithesis and the use of repetition identified above. Each section maintains a heavy focus upon divinities: *deis* (line 2), *Iuppiter* (line 4), *Tonantem* (line 6), *Phrygium ... ministrum* (line 7), *cum love* (lines 8 and 10). The opening and closing sections are associated by the use of general reference points (line 1: *quidquid*, lines 8 and 10: *omnes*), which contrasts sharply with the specific depiction of the imperial cups (lines 3-5). It should also be mentioned that the representation of the cups (lines 3-5) is made all the more arresting by its distinct rhetorical alteration which sets it apart from the rest of the poem. In the portrait there is a noticeable use of enjambement, a foregrounding of verbs (line 3: *miratur*, line 4: *stupet*), and a visual emphasis, which demonstrates its palette via allusion (lines 3-4: *virentis auri / flammis*).

Although classical Latin poetry tends to ignore a stichic rhyming pattern, the final words of the lines in this epigram provide noticeable coincidences. In the opening two lines internal rhymes are to be observed at the principle caesural break and the line end (line 1: *Parrhasia ... aula*, line 2: *oculis ... nostris*). Thereafter such internal rhyme schemes are avoided but a jingle is to be observed at the end of the subsequent lines: lines 3-4 (*auri ... superbi*), 5-10 (*lusus ... eramus*), and (slightly) 6-7 (*Tonantem ... ministrum*), and 8-9 (*beati ... fateri*) betray a concordance of sound at the end of the lines that is somewhat alien to M.'s custom. Further sound effects to note include the assonance of the vowels "u" and "a" and alliteration of "p" in the ninth line, which serves to strengthen the emotion of the parenthetical exclamation. It could also be noted that the metonymical use of *oculis* (line 2) audibly anticipates the ostensible object of the epigram: *pocula* (line 6).<sup>90</sup>

As regards the structure of the poem, Siedschlag (1977: 17 & 122-3) concentrates his analysis in two directions. He notes other epigrams in M.'s corpus that begin by a generalisation or contain a general reference at the outset (*omnis, quisquis, quicumque, et al.*). Next he outlines the frequency in Greek and Latin poetry for the use of repeated lines, or lines that contain a concentrated amount of lexical repetition, at the conclusion.

<sup>90</sup> Fenger (1906: 32) notes that *oculus* here is used as a metonym for *aspectus*.

Siedschlag demonstrates that there is ample precedent for this device in Greek epigram and Catullus' poetry; he also interestingly shows that M. employs such formulae frequently in his hendecasyllables, as the eight instances from M.'s poetry Siedschlag identifies are all from hendecasyllabic poems. Craig (1912: 24) restricts her observations to the use of antithesis at the conclusion of M.'s poetry.

## Themes and Interpretation

There are three areas of interest that the epigram provokes: a) the defamation of the previous emperor (Domitian); b) praise for the new imperial power (whether Nerva or Trajan); c) the epigram's relationship to and imitation of M.'s earlier panegyrics to Domitian. The boundaries between these categories are far from discrete and to a great extent are dependent upon each other.

The denigration of Domitian concentrates upon his sumptuous living, reminiscent of eastern despotism (*Scythicas ... flammis*), his royal pretensions (*superbi regis*), and his impiety and meanness, which is universally detrimental (*omnes cum Iovi pauperes*). It is also essential to note that Domitian (or some metrically expedient reference, e.g. *Flavius*) is not named directly due to the *damnatio memoriae*. Contrary to Domitian's private greed, the new authority is eulogised for the largesse it bestows on the public (ll. 1-2 & 8). Among the epigrams that can be selected to qualify the picture presented in 12.15, two stand out predominantly (0.2 & 9.3). In the second poem of the *Liber Spectaculorum*, the self-same theme is engaged with. Here the public munificence offered by the Flavians is contrasted against the selfish greed of Nero; unfortunately it is unclear whether the *Liber Spectaculorum* was written under Titus or Domitian, see Coleman (2006: xlv-lxiv). The public patronage celebrated in the epigram concerns the bestowal of land, which had served as the pleasure gardens for Nero's *domus aurea*, for the site of the Flavian amphitheatre; contrast 12.15.1-2. Next, 9.3 offers a strong rebuttal against the impiety and meanness attributed to Domitian in 12.15.8-10. In epigram 9.3 it is claimed that Domitian's patronage of the deities, in the form of public monuments, has been so pronounced that Jupiter does not possess enough money to repay the emperor (9.3.14: *nam tibi quo solvat non habet arca Iovis.*); see Lorenz (2002: 199) for the potential irony inherent in 9.3, where Domitian's patronage of the divinities could easily be recast as wastefulness. For further epigrams from the Domitianic period that counter the portrayal at 12.15 see Roman (2010: 96). In sum 12.15 is a conventional panegyric offered to a new political regime; its conventionality is so pronounced that its main components can in fact be supplied and countered from earlier epigrams by the same poet. It may be seen as somewhat ironic that M. is here recycling elements of his earlier panegyrics, given the new rhetoric that was supposedly required under the new Trajanic period; cf. 10.72.12-3 (*hoc sub principe, si sapias, caveto / verbis, Roma, prioribus loquaris*). Although this particular epigram is certainly hostile to Domitian and can be shown to be



somewhat hypocritical in the construction of its critique (as the polar opposite is stated during Domitian's reign), it is important to point out that, although M. is often denounced for this volte-face, such overt attacks on Domitian are actually quite infrequent in M.'s epigrams; see Cabañero (1986: 95). Finally, it may be worth recording that such attacks (e.g. 12.15.8-10 and 12.6.10-12) have been interpreted as proof that M. did not profit substantially from Domitian and advertised this lack of remuneration as an appeal for contemporary imperial patronage; see Tennant (2000: 146-7).

A brief comment should be made with respect to the form of this epigram. Although it is most evidently a panegyric, there are certain features within the epigram that properly belong to different epigrammatic forms. The most obvious migration concerns the ecphrastic element in lines 3-7. It is noted in M.'s earlier ecphrastic epigrams of the Flavian period that a tension existed between the overt celebration of the wealth of the Flavian elite and the inherent morality of the *mos maiorum*, which cautioned against such displays of *luxus*; for M.'s use of ecphrasis see Neger (2009: 475-6). Finally, it could be observed that the iteration of the deictic pronoun (ll. 6-7) and *omnes* (ll. 8 & 10) lends something of a hymnic character to the epigram. The thing to note here, however, is that it is a very peculiar kleitic hymn; it is anonymous both in its address (Nerva or Trajan) and its background source of grievance (Domitian). Given the standard portrayal of the panegyric content, the varied employment of these different generic components is of interest.

**1. quidquid:** M. prefers this form rather than an assimilated orthography (e.g. *quicquid*); see Lindsay (1904: 39-40). For the use of a generalised expression at the start of an epigram see Siedschlag's structural comments (above).

**Parrhasia ... aula:** A lofty periphrasis referring to Domitian's palace on the Palatine hill; for further on this building see Platner Ashby (1929: 158-66); Jones (1992: 95-6), and Galán Vioque (2002: 334-8). For the "feigned reluctance" of Trajan's use of Domitian's palace see Boom (2010: 139); for the use of architecture in imperial attacks or panegyrics see Charles (2002: esp. 36-7). The adjective means little more than Arcadian (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.31 *Parrhasio Evandro*), although Παρρασία is more specifically a region in south Arcadia, so-called via its founder Parrhasius. A false etymology underlies the Arcadian allusion: the *Palatinus mons* was widely believed in ancient Rome to betray an association with Evander, an early settler from the Arcadian town of Pallanteum, cf. Livy 1.5.1 *a Pallanteo, urbe Arcadica, Pallantium, dein Palatium montem appellatum*. A detailed discussion of the etymology, and the later Roman patronage of the Arcadian town Pallanteum on this basis, is provided by Frazer (1929: 187-8). For the use of such geographic adjectives as an integral part of M.'s "poetic" language, employed in his serious epigrams and imperial panegyrics, see Watson (2002: 248-51).

The periphrasis, though used elsewhere in an encomiastic context (7.99.3; 8.36.3; 9.11.8; and *Parrhasiam ... domum* 7.56.2), affords some potentially unpleasant connotations. The word *aula* betrays a negatively regal overtone; cf. *Lib. Spect.* 2.10 (Nero), Cicero *ad Fam.* 15.4.6 (Ariobarzanes), Tacitus *Ann.* 6.43 (Abdagaeses). It should be noted that the noun may be used by synecdoche to denote the “palace” or by metonymy to allude to “imperial power”; see Sadler (1980: 157-8). This shows how a phrase used earlier to celebrate an emperor can easily be recontextualised to his detriment; here a phrase that had been used in earlier books to suggest his splendour and distinction, aided via a sincere epic periphrasis, is now recast to denote royal *hauteur*, the tone of the periphrasis now weighted towards arrogance. The adjective *Parrhasia*, when not applied to the Palatine palace in M.’s work, is associated with the Arcadian girl Callisto, who was transformed into the constellation *Ursa Maior*; cf. 4.11.3; 6.25.2; 6.58.1. As the verb *nitere* suits themes treating constellations (cf. Manilius 1.309-10; 2.537-8; 4.742) and the architect Rabirius is praised for bringing the building to the stars (cf. 7.56 and Galán Vioque, 2002: 335), an astral context is implicit here. One could interpret this as a rather indirect disavowal of the divine status achieved by Domitian in his life. Domitian was not borne to the stars as a divinity *post mortem*, as for instance Aeneas was regarded to have been; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.259-60. Instead, he only managed to reach them, in a hubristic and false fashion, during his life; cf. Seneca *Thyestes* 885-6. Another interpretation that the phrase *Parrhasia aula* provokes is to associate it as a shorthand reference to the myth of Hercules and Cacus as related to Aeneas via Evander; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.185-278. The adjective *Parrhasia* naturally suggests Evander to a Roman audience, but even the noun *aula* may hint just as deliberately at the tale, since an early meaning of αὐλή is a “cattle-yard”; see Liddell and Scott αὐλή entry and cf. Prop. 3.13.39-40. As Cacus’ death was due to his theft of Hercules’ cattle, the association is suggestive. Beyond the hints in the phrase *Parrhasia aula*, the following elements in 12.15 can be isolated to suggest an allusion to the myth of Hercules and Cacus: 1) the Palatine location was the setting for the confrontation; 2) the focus upon *pocula* as the treasures given to the people in 12.15 recall the *scyphus* left by Hercules to the Arcadians to celebrate his rites after defeating Cacus; cf. Servius *ad Aen.* 8.278; 3) the suggestion of a tyranny (lines 8-10), which hoards wealth, and a subsequent beneficial salvation. These points can be further paralleled with Pliny’s depiction of the Palatine palace; during Domitian’s occupancy it is presented, rather like Cacus’ cave, as a gloomy and savage retreat for a single tyrant. Trajan’s occupancy of the complex, by contrast, presents it as a safe *domus*, open to the people; cf. Pliny *Pan.* 49.1-2 and, in related fashion, Juvenal *Sat.* 4.145 (... *Albanam dux magnus in arcem*).<sup>91</sup> The use of the Cacus myth does provoke a rather interesting question: if the gloomy way in which Domitian is portrayed here is not meant to suggest merely tyranny but a more deliberate comparison to Cacus, why is Trajan left to be only implicitly

---

<sup>91</sup> For the tyrannical representation of Domitian (again not mentioned explicitly) in Juvenal’s fourth satire and Pliny’s contrast between Domitian and Trajan see Fögen (2009: *ad Iuvenalem* 179; *ad Plinium* 185-7).

compared to Hercules? Given the fact that Hercules killed Cacus after coming to Italy from Spain with his cattle and Trajan's own Spanish background, and given the fact that there is evidence that an association with Hercules appears to have been cultivated by Trajan - see Pliny *Pan.* 14.5 and Morton Braund (1998: 67) -, it seems somewhat curious that M. did not make this association more pronounced, if it was intended.<sup>92</sup> It should be noted that no specific addressee is actually assigned to 12.15 (even Domitian himself is not explicitly named), therefore the benefactor could be either Trajan or Nerva.

As is frequent in poetry the locative ablative here is used without a preposition. It can safely be asserted that the omission or selection of the preposition in M.'s work is primarily governed by the rest of the diction in the line and *metri causa* rather than any stylistic preference. The same phrase occurs in another of M.'s hendecasyllabic lines with the preposition *in* at 9.11.8. Given the fact that the locative ablative is used in Latin poetry in phrases such as *celsa ... arce* at Verg. *Aen.* 1.56, the use of such an ablative with a specific geographical adjective presents little difficulty. M. shows a marked preference for selecting a typical metrical position for any phrase that employs the adjective *Parrhasius*. His custom is to place the adjective just before the central caesura / diaeresis and its substantive at the end of the line. This is the case in four hexametric lines (4.11.3; 6.58.1; 7.99.3; 8.36.3), one pentametric (6.25.2) and, utilising the frequent central break of his hendecasyllables at the sixth syllable, in two hendecasyllabic lines (9.11.8; 12.15.1). The only exception is 7.56.2, where the phrase (*Parrhasiam ... domum*) is separated via a hyperbaton spread: there the adjective is placed as the initial and the substantive the concluding word in the line.

**3. Scythicas ... flammas:** The negative associations of sumptuous Eastern wealth is a standard *topos* in Latin literature; see, e.g. Tibullus 2.4.27-8 with Murgatroyd (1994: 141). Scythian emeralds are considered by Pliny (*H.N.* 37.65) to be the finest available.

**4. superbi / regis:** The phrase is used once elsewhere in M. with reference to a patron; cf. 3.7.5 (*regis superbi sportulae recesserunt*). A similar formula is found at 12.48.16 (*quos capiant mensae regna superba tuae*), likewise in reference to a patron, but also with pronounced Domitianic undertones; cf. 12.48.11 (*non Albana ... comissatio*). The phrase obviously suggests Tarquinius, the last king of Rome, who received the uncomplimentary cognomen *Superbus*; see *OLD superbus* 1b. Further contemporary associations between Domitian and Tarquinius Superbus are to be found in Pliny's depiction of the approachable and affable nature of Trajan, which is naturally contrasted against Domitian; see *Pan.* 24.4 (*... non tua superbia facit. regimur ...*). Later depictions of Domitian may also follow similar patterns; see Eutropius *Brev.* 7.23 (*superbia quoque in eo execrabilis erat*). Finally, Rimell

<sup>92</sup> It should be noted that an association with Hercules was by no means exceptional or restricted to Trajan; Martial often used to compare Domitian himself with Hercules, see Henriksén (2012: xxviii-xxx).

(2008: 195) draws attention to the fact that the adjective *superbus* is twice used favourably in a subsequent poem, when detailing the wealth of Bilbilis and the extensive resources M.'s farm supplies (12.18.9 *auro Bilbilis et superba ferro*, and 12.18.19 *surgentem focus excipit superba*).<sup>93</sup> The connection that Rimell identifies here is to be added to the structural comments of Lorenz (2002: 244); he notes that 12.15 initiates a series of poems (12.15-7) treating the theme of wealth and avarice. Given the slight verbal iteration in 12.18 to the present poem and the comparison between Roman poverty and the wealth at Bilbilis treated in 12.18, it may be advisable to extend Lorenz' observation to incorporate 12.18.

**5. gravesque lusus:** *Lusus*: β; *luxus*: Junius. The manuscript reading is retained here (note, however, the epigram is omitted from the γ family), with some hesitation. Given the standard portrait of eastern wealth, the rather facile comparison of Domitian to Tarquinius Superbus (*regis ... superbus*), and the portrait of monarchical excess that courses through the epigram, Junius' emendation to *luxus* rather than the manuscript reading *lusus* is tempting. Many parallels could be supplied to support the conventional nature of this reading; cf. Statius *Silv.* 1.3.92-3 (on Manilius Vopiscus' villa): *fronte gravis sanusque nitor luxuque carentes / deliciae*, and in the context of eastern cups; Silius Italicus *Pun.* 13.355 *poculaque Eoa luxum irritantia gemma*; finally Lucius Ampelius *Lib Mem.* 11.4.1-2 reports that the Assyrian monarch Sardanapallus *ob nimias delicias et luxuriam perditio regno, ne in potestatem hostium venirent, cum exoletis suis venenum bibit*. The reading supported above suggests that *gravis* is capable of two interpretations: 1) that the luxury was financially burdensome to the *populus*; 2) the luxury was excessive and weighty. It should, however, be noted that both Heraeus (1982: *ad loc.*) and Bowie (1988: 91) present rather convincing reasons for retaining the manuscript reading of *lusus*. The points in favour of *lusus* are that a) M., despite using *luxuria* and *luxuriosus*, never uses the word *luxus* elsewhere; b) *luxus* is rarely found in the plural; c) that *lusus* is often found in M. together with *deliciae* as a stock phrase (1.14.1; 4.87.2; 7.14.2; 10.35.9); d) the grouping of *graves* with *lusus* would provide a striking oxymoron. Although each of these points could be challenged, e.g. if *deliciae lusus* was a stock phrase by M. the slight alteration of *lusus* to *luxus* would provide point; *luxus* is found in the plural, at least in prose, in Seneca *Ep.* 83.25.7 *luxusque regales*, the arguments are still valid, collectively compelling, and consequently retained. Indeed a sound guide to the potential worth of each reading is provided by the fact that Shackleton Bailey in different editions favoured both versions (1989 = *lusus*, 1993 = *luxus*). Recent commentaries have continued this trend: Watson and Watson (2003: *ad loc.*) favour *luxus*, while Craca (2011: *ad loc.*) reads *lusus*.

**6. pocula:** Strictly, a *poculum* is a generic word to denote a cup; see Nonius Marcellus *de Comp. Doct.* Book 15 (*de genere vasorum vel poculorum*). Given the imprecision of the term

<sup>93</sup> One could also include the favourable depiction of Stella's spring too; cf. 12.2(3).13 (*fons ibi Castalius vitreo torrente superbit*).

and the amorphous nature of the cups' description (ll. 3-5), it is clear that the ecphrastic element of this epigram is somewhat muted. This is presumably to allow the denigratory portrayal of the previous regime and the panegyric of contemporary governance not to be obscured with irrelevance. As the present poem attests, cups could be an expensive possession, which designated high status. The cups, which were especially prized, were either those of ancient provenance or those manufactured at great expense; cf. 8.6.5 and 9.59.15-6. The employment of cups within the epigrammatic genre is pronounced. Since a sympotic context is often cultivated as the supposed setting for such poetry, this is only natural. Nevertheless, there are also actual inscriptions found on cups (supposedly dubbed "Nestor's") from as early as the eighth century BC; see Livingstone and Nisbet (2010: 68-9).

**Tonantem:** The depiction of Jupiter as the thunderous sky god is so conventional that the adjective does not require any substantive. The frequent comparisons of Jupiter and Domitian in M.'s work display how this adjective is used to describe either or both at the same time; see Lowther (1906: 9). The assumption of the rôle of Jupiter is not peculiar to Domitian, but one that can be traced back to the origins of the principate: the comparison is found with Augustus at Ovid *Met.* 15.858-60; Horace *C.* 3.5.1-4, *et al.* In fact, the phrase *cum Iove* (ll. 8 and 10) could apply equally to Trajan and Domitian respectively. If Pliny's *Panegyricus* is a serviceable guide, Trajan was by no means averse to such a comparison made in his favour: cf. Pliny *Pan.* 80. The use of *tonare* with an emperor does afford an opportunity for mockery at such pretensions. Cf. the humorous use to which Lucan puts a hemistich written by Nero, while he was defecating in the public latrines: Suet. *de Poet.* 47.18 *sub terris tonuisse putes.*

**7. Phrygium ... ministrum:** A further periphrasis easily understood as Ganymede due to the earlier references to Jupiter (*Tonantem*) and cups (*pocula*); the geographical adjective (*Phrygium*) further reinforces the identification. The phrase is found only here in M. and elsewhere only in the epic genre. Its epic pedigree is limited to two instances in Valerius Flaccus (*Arg.* 2.417 and 5.694), where it likewise refers to Ganymede. There is an instance of the phrase *Phrygiis ministris* (referring to the Trojan slaves who will be forced to accompany Helen to Sparta) found at Virgil (*Aen.* 2.580); the Virgilian precedent, however, is only transmitted in Servius (*ad Aen. pr.*1) and lines 567-88 are often, in consequence, deemed spurious. Ganymede was the cupbearer to the gods, a function previously held by Hebe (Roman *Iuventas*). Consequently the use of *ministrum* here points to this duty; see Cic. *De nat. deor.* 1.112 (*ac poetae quidem nectar ambrosiam epulas comparant et aut Iuventatem aut Ganymedem pocula ministrantem*), and *T.L.L.* 8.0.1002.25 for the use of *minister* denoting similar service. The Phrygian origin of Ganymede is well-attested; see e.g. Ovid *Met.* 10.155, Germ. *Arat.* 318, *et al.*

The employment of Ganymede is particularly prevalent in M.'s poetry; there are seventeen explicit references (excluding veiled allusions like 12.15.7) to *Ganymedes* (2.43.14, 5.55.4, 7.50.4, 7.74.4, 8.39.4, 8.46.5, 9.16.6, 9.22.12, 9.25.8, 9.73.6, 9.103.8, 10.66.8, 11.22.2, 11.26.6, 11.43.4, 11.104.20, 13.108.2). Given the avowed contempt for myth by M. (*cf.* 10.4), it is interesting to note that he uses Ganymede more than any other Roman writer. A PHI database search reveals the following references to Ganymede: Cicero (3), Virgil (1), Horace (1), Hyginus *Astron.* (3), *Laus Piso* (1), Ovid (2), Pliny the Elder (1), Ampelius (1), Juvenal (2), Hyginus *Fab.* (2). For the sake of completeness, the following may be added: there are three references in Petronius to a character called Ganymede; some references to a eunuch from the court of Cleopatra VII are found at *Bell. Alex.* (6), Lucan (2), Florus (1), and there are occasional scattered references in the commentaries of Porphyrio and Servius.

M.'s usages of Ganymede range from his function as cupbearer (*cf.* 13.108.2) to his sexual appeal (*cf.* 11.43.4); the paradigmatic attractiveness of Ganymede is also used as a comparative point for the slaves the poet himself lusts after (*cf.* 2.43). Elsewhere, a contemporary slave is called Ganymede at 11.22.2, and the emperor's favourite Earinus receives frequent comparison to Ganymede (*cf.* 9.16 and the phrases *Ausonium ... ministrum* and *Phryx puer* at 9.36.1-2); for the comparison of Earinus, who came from Pergamum, and Ganymede in M.'s and Statius' poetry see Henriksén (1997: 281-94). Owing to the comparisons of Jupiter and Domitian (noted above), the frequent comparison of Ganymede to Earinus may be deemed particularly noteworthy in the present poem. Finally, similar phraseology to *Phrygium ... ministrum* is found with reference to Ganymede in M.'s work; *cf.* *Dardanio ... ministro* (11.104.19) and *Iliaco ... cinaedo* (2.43.13).

**8. beati ... pauperes:** The *sententiae* at the end provides a neat conclusion. The comparison of *beatus* with *pauper* is quite common; *cf.* Cic. *de Fin.* 5.84.6-8; *Tusc. Dis.* 5.102.1-2, *et al.*, for a direct contrast *cf.* Hor. *S.* 1.3 142 (*privatusque magis vivam te rege beatus*). Nevertheless, *beatus* given its religious associations, clearly suits the context. For the paradoxical conclusion with reference to improvements rendered through imperial governance *cf.* 6.2.5-6 (*nec spado iam nec moechus erit te praeside quisquam:/ at prius - o mores! - et spado moechus erat*).

**9. pudet ah pudet:** For the repetition of *pudet* in M. and other Latin writers and the use of the exclamations *ah* and *a* see 4.67.7 with Moreno Soldevila (2006: 465-6). Besides the use with the emotional interjection *ah* (4.67.7 and 6.10.4), *pudet* is employed with the interjection *heu* twice (2.18.1 and 14.101.2) and used parenthetically elsewhere (1.37.1 and 12.23.1). Despite M.'s protestations on the limitations of Latin, in contrast to Greek, for the permissible variations in quantity afforded by the language - *cf.* 9.11.15 Ἄρες Ἄρες, with Sedgwick (1931: 153) and Henriksén (2012: 64) -, it is to be noted that M. occasionally, especially in

his hendecasyllables, adjusts the quantity of repeated words via position. Other examples from the hendecasyllables include 8.16.5 (*facis et facis*), 12.8.2 (*nihil et nihili*), 12.34.11 (*minus et minus*), 12.41.2 (*cupis et cupis*); there are examples to be found in the elegiacs also, cf. e.g. 2.2.1 (*dedit ... dedit*).<sup>94</sup> There is Catullan precedent for this change of quantity in the hendecasyllabic metre. Catullan instances include C. 15.11 (*lubet ut lubet*) and, less satisfactorily, C. 38.3 (*magis magis*). Nevertheless, Catullus' preference is to employ cognate words in the same line instead, cf. e.g. C. 3.11 (*it per iter*), C. 7.9 (*basia ... basiare*), C. 14.3 (*odissem ... odio*), *et al.*; there are also three instances of the formula *modo huc modo illuc* - without any adjustment in quantity - at C. 3.9, 15.7, and, slightly altered, 50.5 (*modo hoc modo illoc*). Finally, for the slight distinction between *pudet* and *piget* see Nonius Marcellus *de Comp. Doct.* 5.3.26 (*pudet et piget. hoc distat; pudet enim verecundiae est, pigere paenitentiae*).

---

<sup>94</sup> The instances listed are illustrative rather than exhaustive.

## 12.16

*Text:* Addixti, Labiene, tres agellos;  
emisti, Labiene, tres cinaedos:  
pedicas, Labiene, tres agellos.

*Translation:* You have auctioned three little fields, Labienus; you have bought three fairies, Labienus: you sodomise three little fields, Labienus.

### Structure and Content

The poem is formed of three clauses, all contained within their own lines in a repetitive formula. The parallelism consists of a foregrounded verb, a repeated vocative for the same individual, and a predicate formed from the iteration of *tres* and an accusative noun in the same declension group at the end of each line. The logical development of the epigram is in the style of a syllogism. The first line (A) provides one factor of the equation (Labienus has sold three fields), whilst the second line (B) furnishes the other (he has purchased three *cinaedi* with the proceeds). These two points (A and B) logically lead to the conclusion (C) in line 3 (Labienus buggers his fields / boys). Beyond the harmonious repetitions and rational progression of the poem (note especially the triple use of *tres* within three lines), ambiguities and inharmonious elements are employed to further the humour. The conclusion is ingeniously crafted as either *pedicas* or *agellos* can be read literally or figuratively with equal legitimacy. One interpretation would view the finale as an attack on Labienus' dissipation of his patrimony; here *pedicas* would be employed metaphorically: "you are bugging three fields".<sup>95</sup> Another reading, largely devoid of the societal stigma that informs the first interpretation, would take *pedicas* literally and view *agellos* as a metaphor (= *culos*): "you are bugging three arseholes"; for these readings and some literary parallels see the lemma entry for *agellos*. Granting the formulaic iterations across the three lines, those instances that diverge from the formula are necessarily the most striking. At the conclusion *agellos* (A) and *cinaedos* (B) lead to the merging of both meanings in *agellos* (C), which again can service an incongruous or logical interpretation of the humour (see the lemma entry). The use of the antonymous verbs in lines 1 and 2 (*addixti* and *emisti*) initiates an adjustment in both tense and tone in the conclusion through the present tense obscenity (*pedicas*); for M.'s technique of altering the tense of a verb at the conclusion see Fain (2008: 184). Finally it should be noted that the placement of *Labiene* and the consequent delayed caesura (see

---

<sup>95</sup> It could be felt that, by becoming a farmer of boys rather than farmland, Labienus has corrupted the only respectable means a Roman noble possessed to improve his financial standing; for the respectable and unique position agriculture occupied see Columella *De R.R.* 1 pr.10: ... *unum genus liberale et ingenuum rei familiaris augendae, quod ex agricolatione contingit.*



lemma entry) adds a dissonant element across every line of the poem that underscores the character's perversity and adds greater force to the taunting iteration.

The structure of 12.16 has received considerable attention by scholars; study principally focuses upon the iteration of the addressee as a peculiarity of M.'s scoptic approach. Many epigrams adopt such rhetorical techniques: for the triple repetition *cf.* e.g 6.26. Siedschlag (1977: 41 & 45) details examples for both M.'s repetition of proper names and for the repeated formulae of phrases. He notes, on both points, that M.'s approach is quite distinct from the Greek epigrammatists. Laurens (2012: 421-3) analyses the repeated pattern of proper names through quotations of select examples coupled with comments on the resultant effects attained; Wolff (2008: 84-6) provides a shorter, but quite serviceable, treatment on anaphora in M.'s epigrams. Fain (2008: 188) concentrates on how M. employs such rhetorical devices for the purposes of a "pointed style". Finally Vallat (2008: 427-50; see esp. 432 & 446) furnishes a lengthy treatment on the mimetic formulae in M.'s work; he considers that the syllogistic form adopted in 12.16 may well be used subversively to ridicule the methodology of philosophical schools.

Beyond structural treatments, the sexual nature of the epigram has commanded notice. Sullivan (1990: 55 & 165) initially places it among other pederastic poems in Book 12 (12.16; 33; 71; 75; 84). Elsewhere he demonstrates that within M.'s corpus excessive devotion to slave boys can have corrupting effects on the slaves' characters and the master's resources (*cf.* 2.63). Richlin (1992: 44) similarly observes the economical strains that slave boys can generate in M.'s epigrams.

Any appreciation of 12.16 must include 12.33, which resumes the theme and central character:

Ut pueros emeret Labienus vendidit hortos.  
nil nisi ficetum nunc Labienus habet.

As can be seen the application of 12.33 to 12.16 is instantly apparent. What needs emphasis, however, is the alternative means M. employs to renew the topic. Aside from *Labienus* and *emere* the lexis of each poem differs (indeed the use of *agellos*, essential to 12.16, is adjusted to *hortos*) as does the metre. The most signal alteration is the rhetoric: in place of the logical development and iterative structure of 12.16 the humour of 12.33 is conveyed by a pun on *ficetum* (see *cinaedos* entry). A perceptive comment by Scherf (2001: 39) on the nature of the rhetoric adopted in 12.16 should also be recorded. Scherf contends that the highly repetitive nature of 12.16 is purposefully devised as an *aide memoire* for the

reader, who will meet the same character much later in the book. For further comment on the cycle 12.16 and 33 see Buchheit (1960: 223-6), who includes 9.21 within his analysis. Such cycles within Book 12 are not as pronounced as in several earlier books; cf. e.g. the Silius cycle in Book 2 with Barwick (1958: 300-01) and Williams (2004: 58). If one removes from the count those epigrams that are addressed to or deal with real people, the instances of repeated fictional characters in Book 12 are quite small.<sup>96</sup> Repeated fictional characters include Labienus (16; 33), Cinna (27; 64), Aper (30; 70), Callistratus (35; 42; 80), Sabellus (39; 43), Tucca (41; 94). In these instances it is only the poems to Labienus and Aper that resume the theme as well as the character. The diptych 96-7, which treats the topic of marital fidelity in alternative ways, may also be included among these poems.<sup>97</sup> There are, of course, instances where character-types are resumed from earlier books (cf. e.g. Zoilus in 12.54, who features in sixteen epigrams from previous books). In Book 12 the purpose of the sequel seems to be to radically reinterpret the initial poem; a consequent metrical change, from hendecasyllable to elegiac, likewise underlines the division. At 12.30 (hendecasyllable) Aper is presented as a moralistic teetotaler, but once enriched at 12.70 (elegiac) he becomes an inveterate drunkard; a similar reworking, here between the active and passive sexual rôle Labienus assumes, may be felt in 12.16 and 12.33 (see *cinaedos* entry), whilst 12.96 (elegiac) and 12.97 (hendecasyllable) are in complete antithesis to each other.

**1. addixti:** The syncopated form of the second person indicative perfect active is standard for *dicere* and its cognates in M.: elsewhere *addixti* is found at 10.31.1 (likewise first word in the poem), while *dixti* is found at 4.61.4, 5.16.13, 6.30.2. The only use of the uncontracted form is found at 9.84.8 (*dixisti*). In the present context the word means “to sell at auction” and is found elsewhere with this meaning at 10.31.1; see also *TLL*. 1.0.576.15-1.0.576.60. The only other usage of the verb in M. is to be noted in its participial form at 9.2.10, where it carries the slavish connotations often associated with the word. The opening verb, with its suggestions of bondage and auctioning, immediately suggests the *infamia* that the central character will reap: this sense only grows more pronounced as the poem proceeds with the repetitive chanting of the character’s name and the disclosure that the funds are required for *luxuria* and sexual depravity. For the low opinion of auctioneers in Rome and the *infamia* accrued in being reduced to auctioning paternal estates see Cicero *Pro Quinct.* 49-50, Plautus *Stich.* 198-208 and Rauh (1989).

**Labiene:** The character always appears in a satirical context and features in the following epigrams: 2.62 (an effeminate pathic), 5.49 (a bald man), 7.66 (an unfortunate legacy

<sup>96</sup> For repeated addresses to real people the list would include Terentius Priscus (*pr.*; 1; 3(4); 14; 62; 92), Nerva / Trajan (4(5); 7; 8; 9), Marcella (21; 31), and Istantius Rufus (95; 98). There are also troubling usages to Flaccus, Maro, and Catullus; sometimes these refer to the poets at other times fictional characters.

<sup>97</sup> It is difficult to state this with certainty as the *maritus* in 96 is unnamed. A logical reading of the neighbouring poem would, however, suggest that the character *Bassus* is to be understood in both epigrams.

hunter), 12.16 (a *pedicator*), 12.33 (a *pedicator/ pathic*).<sup>98</sup> Vallat (2008: 511-2), whose study traces the etymology of Labienus to *labia*, chooses to separate 12.16 and 12.33 from the other usages, as he sees no engagement with *labia* in these epigrams. The suffix *-ienus* implies an Italian and not a Roman origin to this character. Syme (1938: 123) observes that names of this type are associated principally with Etruria eastwards to Picenum and the Sabine region and notes the relative lack of political representation people of this name achieved until the first century BC. The obscurity of names of this type may also be observed by the lack of any other name with this termination in M.'s corpus, with the possible exceptions of the alternative reading of Nasidienus for Nasidianus at 7.54 and the hypothetical speculation that the Crispus of 10.2 is Crispus Passienus; see Shackleton Bailey (1993: index of names). It is probably the case that the singularity of the suffix in M.'s corpus led to the alternative reading of *Labiane* recorded in Schneidewin's (1842: *ad loc.*) apparatus.

Granting that the humour of the present poem achieves its most logical completion through the implication that the central character, who loses his land and sinks into depravity, is a down-on-his-luck aristocrat, it may seem slightly surprising that M. did not here select a name of long patrician standing. Such reasoning would suggest that a historical character or an intertextual association may inform the humour of the present poem. Unfortunately the evidence to substantiate the hypothesis has proved elusive, though there is just about enough to record a provocative suggestion. In the Republican period there were three ill-starred members of the Labienus clan who achieved a degree of prominence. Q. Labienus along with Saturninus was killed in 100 BC by the passing of the SCU. Later in the first century BC T. Labienus achieved a measure of success as Caesar's legate until he switched to Pompey and died at Munda. Finally Labienus' son fought for Parthia, with some initial success, against the empire during the civil war. The last recorded member of the family was the embittered orator styled *Rabienus* due to his temperament in the Augustan period. For the background to these characters and the relevant ancient sources see Syme (1938: 113). Of the potential candidates the best possibility rests with Caesar's former legate and Pompey's compatriot from Picenum: T. Labienus. This is due to the fact that Frank (1919: 407-8 and 1928: 89) maintained that the character *Mentula* recorded in Catullus' poems 94, 105, 114, and 115 refers to Labienus, not Mamurra.<sup>99</sup> It can also be added that Cicero bemoaned the unjust enrichment of Labienus by Caesar; see Cic. *Ad Att.* 7.7.6 (*Labieni divitiae*). Frank primarily founded his argument on the fact that the estate owned by *Mentula* in 114 and 115 (*saltus Firmanus*) was in Picene territory, which would accord more with Labienus; he also records parallels with Cicero and the semantic associations of *labia* with

---

<sup>98</sup> Shackleton Bailey's (1993: *ad loc.*) obscene interpretation of the relationship between patron and heir in 7.66 is worth recording and would note a further consistency in the character's delineation - i.e. a bald homosexual. His interpretation is, nevertheless, open to question; see Galán Vioque (2002: 381).

<sup>99</sup> Recent proponents of this contention, who do not advance any new evidence, include Bannon (1997:132) and (tentatively) Goldsworthy (2006: 383).

*mentum* to support his contention. If it is the case that M. understood, or chose for the present purposes to understand, that Labienus underlay Catullus' veiled depiction of a paltry landowner in 114-5, who vainly tried to emulate the pleasure gardens of the wealthy without the requisite resources, the allusion in 12.16 would be quite apposite; for the interpretation of Catullus 114-5 see Harvey (1979). In 12.16 Labienus similarly converts agricultural land to another luxury item (catamites) with a consequent loss to his assets. Finally, and rather unconvincingly, the Picene origins of Labienus could be audibly noted in the humorous punchline of 12.33.2: i.e. *ficetum* = *Picetum*. There is, of course, far too little tangible evidence recorded here to build a credible argument.

The selection and placement of the name also has an impact on the style of the epigram. Owing to the prevalence of a central caesura at the fifth or sixth syllable in M.'s hendecasyllables (90.77%), any other central caesura is naturally somewhat distinctive. The particular caesura in 12.16, with a break at the seventh syllable and a supplementary caesura point at the third, occurs 109 times (5.26%); on the caesura see Giarratano (1908: 53). Although the break is by no means unparalleled, its occurrence in every single line of a poem transforms a marginally distinctive usage into a highly distinctive feature. This is the only hendecasyllabic poem in M.'s corpus that affords such a caesura in every line of an epigram through a proper name. There are twenty names in M.'s poetry of the same scansion.<sup>100</sup> Naturally if such a name occurs in a hendecasyllable, the metre dictates that such names be placed within the space between the fourth and seventh syllables. From these twenty names the following are found in hendecasyllabic verse: Coracinus (4.43.1&4&11; 6.55.4); Fabianus (12.83.1); Labienus (5.49.2; 12.16.1&2&3); Ligurinus (3.44.3); Philomusus (7.76.6; 11.63.1&5); Polytimus (12.75.1); Proculina (6.22.1&4); Theodorus (5.73.3); i.e. seventeen instances (including the three in the present poem). Of these occurrences the triple placement of Coracinus (over a much longer poem) may bare comparison with 12.16 and the repeated formula *Labiene tres* (found at 5.49.2) warrants mention. There is of course no necessity for M. to employ a name of this type; with an adjustment of the poem (through an additional word) a customary fifth or sixth syllable caesura could have been achieved with a Pyrrhic or an anapaestic name.<sup>101</sup> It could even be argued that through the selection of the anapaestic name *Phileros*, M. could have achieved an interesting engagement with an earlier epigram. In 10.43 Phileros' land is viewed as extremely profitable due to his employment of it for the burial of his wealthy wives; it would have made for a neat reversal to see that same character undone by lust. As M. had a range of options it seems quite evident that a consciously jarring effect was sought through the triple repetition of Labienus.

<sup>100</sup> Agathinus; Calocissus/Catacissus; Charidemus; Charopinus; Coracinus; Decianus; Fabianus; Labienus; Ligurinus; Philomusus; Polycharmus; Polyphemus; Polytimus; Proculeia; Proculina; Telesina/us; Telesilla; Theodorus; Theopompus.

<sup>101</sup> M. utilises eight names of Pyrrhic form, they are frequently found (44%) in hendecasyllables: Clytus; Linus; Lupus; Macer; Maro; Matho; Ninus; Titus. There are seven anapaestic names found too: Chione; Domitius; Laberius; Lalage; Ovidius; Phileros; Sabidius.

**2. emisti:** Given the concentration on every-day mundane themes exhibited by M.'s epigrams, it is unsurprising that this verb is used on 52 occasions. Its use here serves to sharpen and confirm the meaning of *addixi* as its antonym. There are two other poems, whose humour is dependent upon an incongruous relationship between purchase and sale, that reward comparison with the present poem: 7.98. and 11.70 (both instances concern characters who purchase possessions that they cannot truly afford). On five other occasions *emere* is employed to detail the purchase of slaves in M.: 1.58.6, 2.44.1, 3.62.1, 11.70.1, 12.33.1. Slave prices are a notoriously difficult topic due to the relative lack of complete and reliable information. For a collation of some slave prices and further reading suggestions see Kay (1985: 152-3).

The initial *infamia* associated with the loss of property observed at *addixi* is now reinforced and qualified by the explanation articulated here that Labienus is corrupted by *luxuria*. The *topos* of frittering away inherited wealth to finance a *louche* lifestyle is observed also at 9.2.7, where Lupus uses his paternal farm to subsidise an evening's passion; the trope is also humorously inverted at 11.70.11-12, when Tuca is cautioned that *luxuria est emere hos (pueros)... / sed multo maior vendere luxuria est*.

**cinaedos:** Aside from Books 5 and 8, both dedicated to Domitian, *cinaedi* feature in all of M.'s numbered books - i.e. not in the *Liber Spectaculorum*, the *Xenia*, or the *Apophoreta*. There are twenty-two usages of the word: 1.41.13, 2.28.1, 2.43.13, 2.86.2, 3.73.5, 4.43.1 & 4, 6.16.1, 6.37.5, 6.39.12, 6.50.3, 7.34.10, 7.58.1 & 9, 9.2.13, 9.63.1, 9.90.7, 10.40.2 & 3, 10.98.2, 11.21.7, 12.16.2. As Williams (1999: 175) observes the word, though often denoting a sodomite (as here) is not, unlike *pathicus*, confined to such an interpretation. Properly understood, it refers to a gender deviant male, who does not comply to the virile norms. The Greek etymology of the word is bound up with the concept of movement and dancing. M.'s own use of the term is perfectly consonant with Williams' interpretation: 3.73 and 4.43 obviously see passive sodomy as the defining feature of the *cinaedus* in contrast to other deviant sexual practices (oral sex). On other occasions, however, the *cinaedus* is viewed as the active partner in heterosexual relations: 6.39.12 where Cinna's son betrays his paternity by his physiognomic resemblances to the *cinaedus*. Indeed the sequel to the present poem (12.33) notes the potentially active role the *cinaedus* could assume. Although Labienus, through the use of *pedicas* (line 3), is unambiguously assigned the active rôle here, 12.33.2 concludes by ambiguously stating *nil nisi ficetum nunc Labienus habet*. The fig grove (i.e. anal sores) could be interpreted as belonging to Labienus' slaves or Labienus himself, according to the ambiguity of *habet*. Such a method of reinterpreting the humour of a previous epigram (by effectively viewing the first poem as the *Erwartung* and its sequel as the *Aufschluss*) linked by means of a common character and theme has already been observed in the introduction to 12.7 (Ligeia).

Furthermore it should be recorded that Richlin (1992: 136) observes the disparity between M.'s usage of *puer* and *cinaedus*. The former is employed, when in the context of a *puer delicatus*, to detail the objects of the poet's own (or his friends') affections, whilst *cinaedus* is restricted for attacks on satirical targets; for further on the use of *cinaedus* in M. see Rodriguez (1981: 101). Finally it should be noted that *cinaedi* generally need not necessarily be considered as of servile origin; for the prevalence of freeborn male prostitution in Rome see Krenkel (2006: 429-38).

**3. pedicas:** A primary obscenity characteristic of M.'s lexicon, meaning "to sodomise". The verb is used on eighteen occasions in M.'s corpus: 1.92.14, 3.95.13, 3.98.2, 6.56.6, 7.10.1, 7.62.5, 7.67.1, 9.69.2, 10.64.6, 11.20.6, 11.45.8, 11.63.5, 11.78.5, 11.88.2, 11.99.2, 11.104.17, 12.16.3; its cognate noun five times: 2.28.3, 2.47.3, 6.33.1, 11.87.1, 12.85.1. Given the force of the verb, it is frequently accorded a prominent place: either, as here, at the conclusion or at the start of a poem. The final line of 3.98.2, with its placement of *pedicare* at the head and *culo* at the tail of the line, can be compared to the respective juxtaposition of *pedicas* and *agellos* in the present line. The present usage of *pedicare*, however, is distinguished by being the only instance in M., where the orifice rather than a person is the object of the verb: given the tautology that such a usage implies this is not surprising and would be avoided here but for the pun implicit in *agellos*.

Since M.'s preface to Book 1 excuses its diction as an intrinsic component in the Latin language (... *ut apud illum in nulla pagina latine loqui fas est* ...), it is interesting to reflect upon the observed Greek origins of words associated with homosexuality in Latin. Adams (1982: 123) observes the general trend of Latin to employ Greek homosexual terms<sup>102</sup> (*cinaedus*, *catamitus*, *pathicus*); when supplemented by Ernout and Meillet's (1939: 721) hypothesis that the etymology of *pedicare* finds its basis in παιδικός, τά παιδικά, the present line can be profitably explored for the cultural peculiarities of Latin: viz. the plethora of sexual terms associated with agriculture (*agellos*) and Rome's rustic origins in comparison with a lack of native terminology to describe homosexuality.<sup>103</sup> For further on *pedicare*, particularly in its relationship with *futuere* and *irrumare* as the three methods of penetration, see Williams (1999: index *pedicare* & *pedicones/pedicatores*) and for its (limited) use in Latin literature see Adams (1982: 123).

<sup>102</sup> *P(a)edicare* need not, of course, be restricted to homosexuality. In fact the focus upon sexual preference is itself problematic in an ancient Roman context. The attention is rather placed on the rôles assumed: active or passive. For *pedicare* used in the context of a female see 11.78.5 and for the broader context see Williams (1999: index *pedicare*).

<sup>103</sup> A final etymological observation that Ernout and Meillet (1939: 721) record that is worthy of note is the fact that the long medial vowel "i" in *p(a)edicare* is long since it is viewed as directly antithetical to *pudicus*. This seems odd given the widespread practice and acceptance of sex with slave boys; see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 71-2).

**agellos:** The humorous conclusion works on two levels. On one level *agellos* is to be interpreted as equivalent to the *cinaedos* (line 2). The incongruous logic of the poem is here prioritised by means of repetition to demonstrate that A (*agellos*: line 1) = B (*cinaedos*: line 2), thus B = A (*agellos*: line 3). A similarly deceptive mathematical logic is to be identified at the conclusion of 9.21.4, which revolves around the same theme of land and sex; see Henriksén (2012: 92-3). The second level on which the humour operates is by means of the sexual *double entendre*, whereby *agellos* is to be interpreted as *culos*. The employment of *ager* to denote a *cunnus* is well established in Latin literature and can be dated back at least to the times of Plautus (see Plautus *Truc.* 149); examples of M.'s use of *ager* for *cunnus* can be found at 7.71.6 with Galán Vioque (2002: 407) and implicit in 9.21.1 with Henriksén (2012: 93). The use of the diminutive *agellus* for *culus* is, of course, a logical extension of such a practice.<sup>104</sup> Of the thirteen appearances of *agellus* in M.'s corpus it is only here (12.16.3) that the noun overtly conveys this sexual nuance, though, given *Priapea* 82.5 (*improbis ut si quis nostrum violabit agellum*) and the Roman fondness for equating sex and agriculture, such a usage should not be seen as peculiar to M.; for further see Adams (1982: 24; 84; 113).

Beyond the puns on *culus* provided by *ager* / *agellus*, comparable word-play is offered by similar means elsewhere in classical literature. In Greek epigram, Strato's bogus equivalence of χρυσός and πρωκτός employs a mathematical formula to sustain its logic (G. A. 12.6):

Πρωκτὸς καὶ χρυσὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ψῆφον ἔχουσιν·  
ψηφίζων δ' ἀφελῶς τοῦτό ποθ' εὗρον ἐγώ.

In Latin literature, a Priapic poem (*Pr.* 4.3-4) uses *hortus* as a synonym for *culus* at its conclusion:

*quod meus hortus habet, sumas impune licebit,  
si dederis nobis, quod tuus hortus habet.*<sup>105</sup>

<sup>104</sup> For a comparable use of measure to differentiate *cunnus* from *culus* see 12.96.9-10.

<sup>105</sup> The humour of Priapic poems, which concern an agricultural loss for a sexual gain, may indeed be considered as of wider application to 12.16.

## 12.17

*Text:* quare tam multis a te, Laetine, diebus  
non abeat febris, quaeris et usque gemis.  
gestatur tecum pariter tecumque lavatur;  
cenat boletos, ostrea, sumen, aprum;  
ebria Setino fit saepe et saepe Falerno 5.  
nec nisi per niveam Caecuba potat aquam;  
circumfusa rosis et nigra recumbit amomo,  
dormit et in pluma purpureoque toro.  
cum recubet pulchre, cum tam bene vivat apud te,  
ad Damam potius vis tua febris eat? 10.

*Translation:* You ask, Laetinus, why after so many days the fever does not leave you and you continually groan (about it). It rides about at the same time with you and bathes with you; it dines on mushrooms, oysters, sow's udder, boar; it often becomes drunk on Setine wine and often on Falernian nor does it drink Caecuban unless (it has been strained) through icy water; it is spread around with roses and reclines darkened with cardamom, and it sleeps on feathers and a purple bed. When it rests handsomely, when it lives so well at your place, would you rather your fever went to Dama?

### Structure, Style and Content

The epigram permits a tripartite division. The first part (lines 1-2) establishes the theme via Laetinus' question: he asks the narrator to diagnose why he is continually stricken with a fever. The second section (lines 3-8) concerns a descriptive account of the pleasures the fever indulges in through Laetinus' hospitality. The catalogue (riding, bathing, dining, drinking, sleeping) is a progression of a typical day for the wealthy idler and his parasitic fever (*cf.* 4.8, which itemises a Roman day and its duties hour-by-hour). It should be noted that the activities are seen as being conducted by the personified fever and not Laetinus, whose pleasures and personality have both been consumed. The third section (lines 9-10) concerns the narrator's response to the query in the first unit and logically follows from the information outlined in the second part: as the fever is so well-accommodated, why would it move and impoverish itself? The progression of the poem is thus from Laetinus' indirect question to the description of his fever's pleasures, then to M.'s response.

Beyond this basic structure, the epigram exhibits a number of iterations, word-patterning, and metrical peculiarities that warrant a closer investigation to appreciate it. The first line has an arresting ambiguity in the phrase *a te*. It is, perhaps, more straightforward to interpret it as



a prepositional phrase (with the standard repetition of the preposition *a/ab* and the compound verb *abire*). It could, however, be understood as an emotional interjection (“ah, poor you!”), with an ironic undertone.<sup>106</sup> The marked alliteration of the letter “t” in the opening line coupled with their long vowels (*quare tam multis a te, Laetine, diebus*) lends further support to a sarcastic reading of the use of *a te* outlined above. The exclamations of “t” (mimicking *te, te, te*) are audibly noted to imitate Laetinus’ complaints. The pentameter contains all the verbal elements and the subject of the indirect question. A degree of ambiguity is felt here too as *quaeris*, when coupled with *gemis*, could audibly and logically suggest the verb *quereris* being understood instead (for the conventional interrogative structure and the co-ordination of another verb with *quaerere* see the entry below). The third line repeats the effects of the first through its alliteration of the letter *t* (*gestatur tecum pariter tecumque lavatur*). This sound-effect and the enclosed chiasmic word patterning demonstrates how Laetinus is inescapably bound to his fever. It is to be noted that the variant reading (*gestatur tecum pariter pariterque lavatur*) would not overly disrupt this interpretation, since a chiasmus and the alliteration would still be marked. The selection of *tecum* has been preferred for the heavier rhythm it achieves, since in this way it would anticipate the spondaic effects in the following pentameter. It also has the benefit of emphasising the personal pronoun in a comparable fashion to the opening line (*supra*). The fourth line, through its heavy spondaic rhythm (in the first half of the line, which affords variation) and the coincidence of words terminating at the end of several metrical feet, suggests the fever becoming stuffed with food. It is a humorous image as it shows not only the sumptuous extravagance but also that the fever is exhausted by the feast and needs to take a moment to compose itself between each course. The employment of an asyndeton style (uniquely in line 4) has the benefit of showing that each course incessantly comes round without an interval. This is to be contrasted with the use of conjunctions in lines 5-8 (especially the delayed uses of *et* in 7-8), which itemise the fever’s other activities. The third couplet then echoes and reverses the effects of the second. The hexameter, by beginning with the dactylic *ebria*, immediately alters the rhythm established in the preceding pentameter; it also changes the topic from food to drink. The line, via its chiasmic arrangement, mirrors the structure of the third line. The pentameter, however, distinguishes itself from the fourth line: the dactylic rhythm shows the fever becoming tipsy, no longer heavy and stodgy with food, but lightened (perhaps overly so) by the alcohol. The fourth couplet concerns the fever’s relaxation. A number of devices can be isolated which could be argued to support the underlying sentiment. Sound-effects are quite noticeable, particularly the alliteration of nasal *m*’s and the assonance of *o* and *u*, which may well represent the noises of replete satisfaction with the *cena* or indeed snoring (*circumfusa rosis et nigra recumbit amomo, / dormit et in pluma purpureoque toro*). The use of colour is also to be noted: regal shades of red suggesting sumptuousness are implied with *rosis* and *purpureo*, the adjective is also stressed through the alliteration of *p* in the prepositional phrases at the

<sup>106</sup> For the use of comparable exclamations in Roman oratory, here focused on the emotional manipulation Cicero’s speeches could muster by direct piteous appeals to his clients, see Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 6.1.24 (*O me miserum! O te infelicem!*).

conclusion of the pentameter. The use of *nigra* may lend a temporal sense (suggestive of the nighttime) beyond its primary application to describe the *febris*. Finally the use of prepositions or prepositional prefixes (*circum-*, *re-*, *in*) pictures the fever's movements in order to make a snug nest for itself. The final couplet caps the rhetorical devices employed throughout the poem in a highly satisfactory manner. The hexameter uses the following devices: iteration of the conjunction *cum* in both its clauses, alliteration of *c* and assonance on *a* and *u*, it also echoes *recumbit* (line 7) with *recubet*, and finally it employs an unorthodox monosyllabic conclusion to the line (see the lemma entry on *apud te* for such usages in M.). The sound-effects and the employment of *recubet* link it very closely to the preceding couplet. It is difficult to precisely identify the tone. It could suggest through the iteration exasperation and moral indignation. This interpretation would view the general *cumulatio* that characterises the poem (both of content and rhetoric) as akin in tone to the *indignatio* that Juvenal's earlier satires achieved. It is possible, however, to see these effects as having no particularly pronounced censorious quality. The iteration could be viewed as leading, almost mathematically, to an expected outcome; it still links behaviour with its consequences, but does not necessarily promote a moral interpretation. This ambiguity is another attractive aspect to the poem: is M. a moralist here, or a debonair *scurra*? The choice is ultimately the reader's.<sup>107</sup> Finally the pentameter provides a tidy conclusion, since the poem in its entirety exhibits a ring composition. The use of the slave-name Dama is contrasted with the blessed Laetinus (see the lemma entries for the associations of both names). The concluding *ad ... febris eat* should be seen as a contrast to the earlier *abeat febris* (line 2); it also serves to carve a chiasmic pattern right across the poem *in toto*. In sum the epigram manages to balance these couplets effectively by using rhetorical devices and sound-effects to create harmonious links between their separate units. At the same time a number of dissonant metrical techniques are to be observed (the coincident conclusion of word and metrical foot: line 4; the monosyllabic conclusion in the pentameter: line 9; also see the entry on *te* and line 7) alongside a coincidence of theme and rhythm (lines 4 and 6).

### Themes, Interpretations, and Comparable Epigrams

The epigram is capable of multiple manners of classification. It has promoted a number of suggestions for inclusion in larger cycles of poems in Book 12 and beyond as this brief evaluation will aim to show. Lorenz (2002: 244) argues that epigrams 12.15, 16, and 17 are accordingly placed together as they treat the same themes of "Geiz" and "Reichtum" (avarice and wealth). Scherf (2001: 49) suggests viewing the *febris* as a dinner-hunter and

---

<sup>107</sup> M.'s humour, with its links to satire, is difficult to pigeonhole precisely. Various interpretations can be employed with equal legitimacy according to the epigrams selected. For example, Mendell (1922: 16-7) and Grimal (1989) suggest that M.'s humour is informed by the moral invective of Stoicism, whereas McMahon Humez (1971: 8 & 10 & 12) and Anderson (1970) would separate M.'s humour from satire due to the perceived lack of moral didacticism. As stated, both views can be sustained with appropriate selection from M.'s work, and this poem could be used in support of either contention.

consequently places it among a group of epigrams in Book 12 coalescing around the theme of *cenipeta*: 12.17; 12.19; 12.56; 12.82. He adds that M.'s rejection of a fabulous *cena* (12.48) is carefully placed in the centre of these poems. Pertsch (1911: 60) employs 12.17 and 12.18 in his categorization of the antithetical structure of M.'s poems; he here notes that 12.17 is concerned with the life of a wealthy man, whilst 12.18 concerns M.'s own life. Sullivan (1991: 55) sees its rôle in Book 12 as concerned with the "decadence of the rich" motif, and connects it to the following poems: 12.50; 12.53; 12.56; 12.70; 12.90. Beyond these instances it would not be difficult to see a medical theme promoted here to anticipate 12.20. Indeed beyond its associations in Book 12, Sullivan (1991: 167) elsewhere connects it with epigrams concerned with valetudinarianism: 2.16; 2.40; 5.9; 7.39. The first example (2.16) should be considered as analogous:

*Zoilus aegrotat: faciunt hanc stragula febrem.  
 si fuerit sanus, coccina quid facient?  
 quid torus a Nilo, quid Sidone tinctus olenti?  
 ostendit stultas quid nisi morbus opes?  
 quid tibi cum medicis? dimitte Machaonas omnis.  
 vis fieri sanus? stragula sume mea.*

The structure and theme is, of course, highly relevant to 12.17. The suggested transference from wealth to poverty at the conclusion is especially noteworthy. Given the similarities between the poems it does prompt the question about the motive of the characters Zoilus and Laetinus. Paley and Stone (1898) link both poems to 6.59. Baccara, in 6.59, is miserable because the weather is fine and he has no excuse to wear and show-off his expensive coat. If one agrees with Paley and Stone's suggestion here, it consequently alters the intentions of Zoilus and Laetinus. They are not to be viewed as hypochondriacs, rather as braggarts who feign illnesses in order to converse about or display their sumptuous lifestyles.<sup>108</sup> Alternatively one can view Laetinus' illness as genuine. Nixon's (1927: 141) brief interpretation considered this to be the case. By comparing his actions to Rousseau's drunkard (who tells his doctor to cure his fever and never mind his drinking habits) Nixon seems to suggest the humour involves M. deliberately misunderstanding Laetinus. Laetinus, as an inveterate gourmand, was merely fishing for sympathy he did not expect his pleasures to be intruded upon and criticised. This would transform an epigram that resembles the satiric genre, into a humorous piece of social misunderstandings. The associations of disease and fine living are a pronounced feature in Roman satire: see Hudson (1989: 85-6) for the fatal and immoral associations of an extravagant lifestyle. Finally the personified

---

<sup>108</sup> Shackleton Bailey's (1993: 332) index places the following poems under the rubric of "False Invalids": 2.16; 2.40; 7.39; 9.85; 11.86, he also suggests 11.7.11; 11.28; 12.56. He places 12.17 under the general heading of "Health and Sickness" with 1.78; 1.98; 3.18; 4.65; 4.80; 5.9; 6.47; 6.58; 6.70; 6.78; 6.86; 8.9; 8.25; 10.77; 11.36; 11.61; 11.74; 11.85; 11.91; 12.90, he also adds 1.10; 2.26; 4.36; 9.90; 11.28; 11.71.

fever, as Scherf suggests, can be linked to a whole host of epigrams concerning dinner-hunters. One could easily add the customary tropes of mean patrons or unwelcome guests. Elsewhere in the Greek epigrammatic genre Lucian's epigram on gout (*A.G.* 11.403) should be particularly noted. Not only is the disease personified, it is anointed, wreathed in garlands and a consumer of alcohol (compare 12.17.4-8); most importantly the epigram concerns the same division between wealth and poverty with the disease scorning the hospitality of the poor at the conclusion. Pertsch (1911: 22-3) and Salemme (1976: 75) likewise link 12.17 with Lucian's epigram in overviews of the coincidences between M. and Greek epigrams.

**1. *quare* ... *quaeris*** A traditional opening for M.'s scoptic epigrams, for similarly structured openings see: 1.57; 2.38; 2.78; 3.32; 3.98; 5.56; 6.67; 7.34; 8.12; 10.22; 10.102; 11.19; 11.60; 11.63; 12.17; 12.20; 12.22; 12.57. Siedschlag's (1977: 23) overview is still of benefit and should be consulted; elsewhere Adams (1975: 106) concentrates on the skommastic use of *quare* and *cur*. The principal things Siedschlag picks out concern the Catullan origin of the construction (*Cat.* c. 7.1) along with later examples in Latin literature and a hypothesised Greek influence. Fain's (2008: *index* Interrogatives and *quare*) more recent work provides a very sound interpretation for such constructions in Greek epigram, Catullus, and M. Beyond the general use of such a device in classical literature, the following epigram prompts some questions unconsidered by Siedschlag or Fain: the general length of such scoptic poems; the division (bipartite or tripartite); and the frequency of co-ordinating *quaeris* with another verb. Through this lens it will be seen that the present epigram is not quite as formulaic as could be considered at first, it also supplies two analogues to its structure: 5.56 and 12.57 (interestingly from the same book). At its purest level, the *quaeris*-question epigram is represented by 12.20: it is short (2 lines) and bipartite (question/answer). To illustrate the standard length see 1.57 (4 lines); 2.31 (2 lines); 2.38 (2 lines); 2.78 (2 lines); 5.56 (11 lines); 6.67 (2 lines); 7.79 (4 lines); 10.22 (3 lines); 11.19 (2 lines); 11.63 (4 lines); 12.17 (10 lines); 12.20 (2 lines); 12.57 (28 lines); 13.111 (2 lines). Other comparable epigrams with different verbs should be added: 3.98 (*requiris* 2 lines); 7.34 (*requiris* 10 lines); 10.102 (*requiris* 4 lines); 11.60 (*requiris* 12 lines); 12.22 (*vis dicam* 3 lines). Also the second person plural of *quaerere* is found at 8.12 (4 lines). As can be seen, particularly when *quaeris* is used, short poems are the norm; the three exceptions are 5.56; 12.17; 12.57. The structure can, at times, be difficult to pinpoint precisely. Those that exhibit a clear bipartite structure are 1.57; 2.38; 2.78; 3.98; 6.67; 10.22; 10.102; 12.20; 12.22. The following epigrams have a tripartite structure which consists of *statement-question-answer*: 2.31; 7.79; 11.63; 13.111; or a structure of *question-first answer-second answer*: 8.12; 11.19. Leaving aside 11.60, which is a slight anomaly since it concerns a constant comparison between two women as a response, the four epigrams that are left are all 10 lines or more and have the structure of either *question-list-answer* (5.56; 12.17); or *question-answer-list* (7.34; 12.57). Finally it should be noted that 5.56 is the only other instance that co-ordinates *quaeris* with another verb (*quaeris* ... *rogasque*) like 12.17. As should be clear from the above, although the use is conventional there are some peculiarities here in the structure of 12.17, not

unparalleled but still a little more noticeable. It should be noted that I read *quereris* at 3.32.1, not *quaeris*, hence it is ignored in this evaluation.

For the use of a spondaic disyllable at the start of a hexameter line see 12.11.3 (*cuius* entry); for the use of a spondaic disyllable at the start of the pentameter see *cenat* entry (*infra*).

**te:** For the potential ambiguity in interpretation see the section on structure (*supra*). Although the value of interpreting Latin verse through the means of *arsis* and *thesis* division is generally avoided in modern metrical analyses,<sup>109</sup> Giarratano's (1908: 22) observations here may be viewed as worthwhile. He notes that a monosyllable in the fourth *arsis* was customarily avoided by M.: there are 326 examples (9.86%). The reason for raising the issue is that the present poem has two such examples *te* (line 2) and *tam* (line 9). Considering the other metrical peculiarities in the poem (as noted at the end of the introduction), this rather incidental information may provide further evidence for metrical exploration by M. here and add to the dissonances, which mark out the epigram.

**Laetine:** The name is not found in Latin literature except in M.; it is only used elsewhere by M. at 3.43. In 3.43 it concerns an old man who dyes his hair to feign youth; ultimately, however, he will not be able to deceive death in the form of Proserpina. If the same character is to be understood across the poems mortality and illness may be the link, but it is not particularly pronounced. In the present instance the name is selected for its associations with *laetus*, which, as Vallat (2008: 505) suggests, is synonymous with *felix* or *divus*, and is thus contrasted with the servile Dama. For a comparable contrast between wealth and servility through the selection of character's names see *Laetoria/Lygdus* in 6.45 with Grewing (1996: 319) and Giegengack (1969: 92-3). Vallat also notes that the use of *tam bene* (line 9) echoes the interpretation of the character's name. This point should be emphasised as there is some ambivalence in the name: the reader could interpret it as denoting the happiness or wealth of the character himself or for the benefit of the parasitic fever. The etymology of *laetus* has been the subject of some debate. De Vaan (2008: 323) limits its meanings to "flourishing, rich, happy". He argues against the earlier suggestions of Walde-Hofmann, who contended that the original meaning was "fat, rich" and connected it with *laridus* (bacon) and *largus* (generous). Elsewhere, Ernout and Meillet (1939: 518) confirm Walde-Hofmann's interpretation, as they likewise associate *laetus* with a rustic meaning of "fatness" ("gras"). Such an association would be apposite in the present instance. Varro (*de Lingua Latina* 6.50), if representative of the ancient view, associated the etymology of *laetus* with the sense of emanating out (*latius*) and viewed *macer* (lean, thin) as its antonym. Thus it seems possible, given the works of Varro, Ernout and Meillet, and

---

<sup>109</sup> See Halporn, Ostwald, and Rosenmeyer (1963: 122).

Walde-Hofmann, that some association with food, beyond the clearer suggestions of wealth and happiness, may be active in the selection of the name by M.

*Laetinus/a* is a recorded cognomen, but infrequently found. Kajanto (1965: 260-1) records 15 uses (6 with men and 9 with women) and lists it under names denoting “gentleness of character”. Given its infrequency and the indeterminacy of setting in the present epigram, readers may wish to consider a possible Spanish origin for the character. For epigraphical evidence of the name *Laetinus* in Roman Spain see Solin (2014: 371) and Ramírez Sádaba (1993: 430).

There is no real need to change *Laetine* here. Some earlier editions, however, print *Lentine*; cf. Farnaby’s commentary and Sherburne’s (1651) translation (printed in Sullivan and Boyle, 1996: 74). Such a reading would still have some merit as it would suggest the gourmand’s idleness; see Forcellini (II, 4b) for the moral associations of *lentus*. *Lentinus* is not employed by M. elsewhere, although, given the limited usage of *Laetinus*, this is not a particularly strong argument against it. What is more convincing is the fact that only Schneidewin (1842) among the textual editors records *Lentine* in his apparatus, suggesting a lack of manuscript support.

**2. febris:** The noun is found eleven times in eight epigrams (2.16.1; 2.40.8; 4.80.1 & 5; 5.9.4; 6.31.2; 6.70.8; 10.77.2 & 3; 12.17.2 & 10); there is also a single instance of the cognate verb *febricitare* (11.98.20). The employment of *febris* shows a heavy tendency to occur in M.’s scopic poems, particularly those targeting doctors. Medical incompetence is to be found at 5.9.4, here a slight ailment is aggravated into a full fever by medical ministrations. In 6.31.2, a man, who allows his wife to carry on an illicit affair with a doctor, is cautioned that he will die without a fever (i.e. he will be murdered). In 6.70, Marcianus’ health is said to result from his wise avoidance of doctors; here (at 6.70.8) one’s lifetime is calculated by the healthy years one lives, the time spent with a *febris* is excluded from the reckoning. Finally at 10.77.2 & 3, the *febris* is criticised as being fatal and depriving from the medical team the thrill of causing the patient further agony and accruing wealth thereby. Other associated themes, include the links between sumptuous living and a *febris* (2.16.1 see introduction); in related manner, a *febris* can also be used by a wealthy patron as a ruse to collect fine gifts from clients, who anticipate subsequent benefits after the patron’s death (2.40.8 - Caecuban, Falernian, and Opimian wines). The final stray examples include 4.80.1 & 5, where Maro declaims in a fever, and 11.98.20, in which M. complains that kissers haunt Rome and even offer their kisses when he is plagued by a fever.<sup>110</sup> As the instances show

---

<sup>110</sup>The usage at 4.80 is not so distant from 12.17 as it may appear at first. Maro’s addiction to speaking and inability to keep silent (4.80.5) suggests the delirium and groaning (*gemere*) that a *febris* produces; on this basis Moreno Soldevila (2006: 508) argues that 4.80.5 should be read alongside 12.17.2.

the humour in 12.17, given the absence of medical practitioners, concerns the penalties imposed on sumptuous living (like 2.16); see the introduction. It could also be considered that Laetinus purposefully exaggerates or prolongs his disease to accrue gifts to sustain this lifestyle (*cf.* 2.40).

**3. *gestatur tecum pariter tecumque lavatur*:** T; *gestatur tecum pariter pariterque lavatur*: PQf; *gestatur tecum sella tecumque lavatur*: N (13th-century florilegia). My reasons for preferring the first reading are provided in the essay on structure (*supra*); for the possible value of the third reading, which is largely ignored, see below (*cenat*). From these options, editors who read *tecumque* include Lindsay (1901); Ker (1920); Izaak (1961); Dolç (1955); Bowie (1988); those who read *pariterque* include Schneidewin (1842); Gilbert (1885); Friedlaender (1886); Paley and Stone (1898); Heraeus (1982); Shackleton Bailey (1989 & 1993); Valverde and Cartelle (2005); Craca (2011); Nisbet (2015).

**gestatur:** Citroni (1975: 56) interprets the verb in travelling contexts as comparable to *vehi*; *cf.* 1.82.5; 4.52.1; 7.76.4; 12.17.3. He also notes that this meaning is limited to contemporary or near contemporary authors and poets: i.e. a silver-age usage. A comparable structure to the present line is observable in the hendecasyllabic 7.76.4 (*gestatur iuvat et iuvat lavari*): see Galán Vioque (2002: 437).

**4. *cenat*:** The use of a spondaic word at the start of the pentameter is infrequent in M. (144 instances: 4.35%), and is viewed by Giarratano (1908: 28) as an arrangement avoided by the best Latin poets. It should be further noted that Giarratano (1908: 12) observes that the linking of a spondaic hexameter and pentameter is slightly rare in M.: he finds 197 such examples (17.64%).<sup>111</sup> Although one can disagree with Giarratano's reasonings, his analysis on the rhythmic peculiarities and word arrangement is profitable. A deliberate technique is employed here to emphasise the list. The coincidence of word and foot division in a catalogue finds a neat precedent in the hendecasyllabic line 5.20.9; see Howell (1995: 9).

**boletos, ostrea, sumen, aprum:** All the foods (and the wines in lines 5-6) are expensive and morally pointed. Wolff (2008: 57-9) discusses their frequent occurrence often coupled with such luxury foods as *rhombi, mulli, lepores, clunes turtures*. These same foods are likewise used in a cumulative asyndeton list elsewhere in M.: see 7.78.3 (*sumen, aprum, leporem, boletos, ostrea, mullos*) with Galán Vioque (2002: 437). The variety here should be

---

<sup>111</sup> It should be observed that Giarratano seems to use spondaic here as meaning a preponderance of spondees in the hexameter, i.e. at least three out of the four variable feet. The alternative reading of *gestatur tecum sella tecumque lavatur* would provide a truly spondaic hexameter and pentameter couplet.

noted, however, as the coincidence of word and foot conclusion is avoided save in the final two feet, which is quite standard.

**5-6.** The wines (Setine, Caecuban, and Falernian) are, like the foods, particularly fine. The omission of Opimian, which was made scarce due to Nero's interventions (see Pliny *H.N.* 14.61), is noteworthy; it does not, however, lessen the costly and desirable nature of the beverages. For the taxonomy and use of wines in M.'s work (particularly those categorised at the end of the *Xenia*) see Leary (1999: 34-41) and, on the values of food and wine in Roman satire, compare Schmeling's (1970: 248-51) tabulated evaluation of Trimalchio's menu.

**6. per niveam ... aquam:** The Romans would customarily mix their wine with water. Nevertheless, the craze for using ice or snow specifically seems to have its origins in the first century A.D.; see Leary (1996: 165). As 14.103 shows, if snow were used to cool the beverage, the wine would be strained through snow to remove any impurities. Another method to chill and dilute wine would be to use *aqua decocta* (boiled water, which is then turned to ice by being cooled with snow). This method was supposedly invented by the emperor Nero; see Pliny *H.N.* 31.40. For the use of snow or ice with reference to wine in M. see 14.103, 14.104, 14.116-8 with Leary (1996: *ad loc.*). Beyond M.'s genre see Geer (1935) for a general understanding and Woods (2009) for the possible medical rationale that underlay the use of iced water or snow in wine.

**7.** Giarratano (1908: 24) certainly does not mince his words when he condemns the employment of three feminine *caesurae* in the second, fourth, and fifth feet respectively: *sed omnium maxime vituperandi sunt versus tres caesuras trochaicas simul praebentes*. The twelve examples of this usage in M. are 1.100.1; 4.13.9; 6.11.5; 9.14.1; 9.29.11; 10.6.3; 10.58.11; 11.56.7; 12.17.7; 12.60.3; 12.62.15; 12.96.1. The prominence of the examples above from Book 12 is striking and illustrates an increasing metrical experimentation, which Sullivan (1991: 231) perceptibly draws attention to through a footnote. Sullivan merely hints at the fact of this experimentation and sees its growth from Books 9 to 12. Therefore far from being reprehensible, as Giarratano views the matter, it more than likely betrays a deliberate artistic choice by M. A closer look at the feminine caesura in the fourth foot for M.'s hexameters does not exactly demonstrate the trend Sullivan observes, but does confirm the striking rhythms M. sought to achieve in Book 12. From the 107 examples across M.'s corpus (3.23%), M. has 15 examples in 189 lines of a feminine caesura in the fourth foot in Book 12 (7.93%). This fact becomes more pronounced when we look at the totals for the other books: Book 1: 8 in 248 lines (3.22%); Book 2: 3 in 187 lines (1.60%); Book 3: 4 in 204 lines (1.96%); Book 4: 7 in 209 lines (3.34%); Book 5: 2 in 180 lines (1.11%); Book 6: 9 in 198 lines (4.54%); Book 7: 11 in 261 lines (4.21%); Book 8: 4 in 252 lines (1.58%); Book 9: 17 in 350 lines (4.85%); Book 10: 8 in 270 lines (2.96%); Book 11: 11 in 297 lines (3.70%);



Xenia: 4 in 135 lines (2.96%); Apophoreta: 1 in 220 lines (0.45%); Lib. Spect.: 3 in 108 lines (2.77%).<sup>112</sup> It may be worth considering whether the caesura points here establish a rhythm that is somewhat purposeful and, with its pauses, closer to the feel of M.'s hendecasyllabic poetry. In both theme and length the epigram certainly affords comparison to M.'s hendecasyllables.

**rosis ... purpureoque:** Grewing (1998: 345) draws attention to the fact that the redness of the *rosa* is often emphasised by another word (whether relating to the noun or not) denoting some comparable colour. A similar technique, here involving antithesis, can be observed with the use of *niveam* (line 6) and *nigra* (line 7); for the use of *niveus* denoting whiteness elsewhere in M. see Moreno Soldevila (2006: 278). It may be worth observing that these polychrome techniques occur in the present poem after the *febris* is intoxicated.

9. The manuscript tradition is confused here. The various options are: 1) *cum recubet pulchre ...* :T; 2) *cum sit ei ...* :β; 3) *cum si te ...* :γ; 4) *cum sit tam ...* :N. The first option has found most favour. Editors who print *recubet* include Schneidewin (1842); Gilbert (1885); Paley and Stone (1898); Lindsay (1901); Izaac (1961); Heraeus (1982); Bowie (1988); Craca (2011). Nevertheless, *cum sit ei* is found in Friedlaender (1886) and Ker (1920), whilst Farnaby (1613) reads *cum sit tam*, as does the recent work by Nisbet (2015).<sup>113</sup> The most convincing editor on this matter is Heraeus: in his apparatus he carefully distinguishes the avoidance of the dative *ei* and its iambic rhythm in poetry. It should, however, be observed that *recubare* is not used elsewhere in M. (although *recumbere* [line 7] is employed on 11 occasions). This issue led Shackleton Bailey to advance a highly perceptive alternative. Shackleton Bailey (1989: *ad loc.*) notes in his apparatus that *recubet* has some support in the manuscripts but sees it as an interpolation under the influence of line 7 (*interpolatum ex v.7, post quem misere flaccet*). He, nevertheless, takes Heraeus' concerns about *ei* seriously and proposes the following reading, replacing the two uses of the conjunction *cum* with relative pronouns: *cui sit tam pulchre, quae tam bene vivat apud te*. The logic is highly appealing and has the added benefit of repeating *tam* as well as the relative pronoun and substituting the problematic *ei* with *cui*. It would, however, render an unusual line with six monosyllables. There is, nevertheless, some precedent in M.'s work for the rhetorical devices Shackleton Bailey has selected: in *Lib. Spect.* 3.1 and 10.66.1 a relative form and the adverb *tam* are repeated; also the iteration of *tam* in a single line finds expression on six other occasions in: 1.86.10; 6.42.19; 10.42.1; 11.45.7; 12.21.3; 14.203.1. Although Shackleton Bailey's example has not been followed here, it is very worthwhile and should be considered.

---

<sup>112</sup> For the specific line references consult Giarratano (1908: 24).

<sup>113</sup> Note that Farnaby also reads *belle* instead of *bene*.

**vivat:** The alternative reading *bibat* has found no favour among editors. It could, however, in repeating the events from earlier in the epigram (lines 5-6) lend support to those who view *recubet* (repeating an idea in line 7) as an interpolation. For the slight metonymy involved here, where *vivere* signifies the manner in which life is lived, see Fenger (1906: 41).

**apud te:** A final monosyllable is an unusual conclusion to the hexameter; M. has 48 such examples (1.45%): see Giarratano (1908: 27). The work of Marina Sáez (1998: 153-8) provides a comprehensive overview on the use of a concluding monosyllable in M. The use of a monosyllable preceded by a disyllable is peculiar to the later books of M. and the preposition *apud* with a personal pronoun is marked here. The five examples are as follows: *apud me* (9.35.11; 11.52.1), *apud te* (11.83.1; 12.17.9), *habet cor* (11.84.17); see Marina Sáez (1998: 157-8) and Sullivan (1991: 231). Although it may be advanced that an enclitic pronoun with a preposition could be read as a single trisyllabic word, as Marina Sáez correctly states the scarcity of such examples (5 [including *habet cor*] in 3308 lines) and the observance of hexametric composition in other poets argues against such a simplistic dismissal. For further on the use of the monosyllabic conclusion in the hexameter see Harkness (1910: 154-74) and Hellegouarc'h (1964).

**10. ad Damam:** The name is selected to provide the contrast between wealth and poverty. It is particularly associated with Horace's *Saturae* (1.6.38, 2.5.18 & 101; 2.7.54), and found in Persius (5.76) and Petronius (*Sat.* 41) to denote slaves; Muecke's (1993: 220) commentary also adds that it is used to typify slaves in Latin legal contexts. It is found elsewhere in M. only at 6.39. The servile overtones of the name are operable in 6.39 also: he is one of seven men (all of whom have characteristic slave names) who fathered Marulla's children; see Giegengack (1969: 128). Vallat (2008: 380), beyond confirming this point, supposes that the name betrays a foreign origin: either a Greek man derived from δῆμος, or a Syrian/Eastern Greek originating from Damascus. As slaves would typically be foreign the suggestion seems quite reasonable. It may be worth considering whether the line could be metrically adjusted to accommodate reading *Latine*, thus anticipating the contrast between Rome and the provinces in the next epigram.

## 12.18

*Text:* Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras  
clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura  
aut collem dominae teris Dianae;  
dum per limina te potentiorum  
sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque 5  
maior Caelius et minor fatigant:  
me multos repetita post Decembres  
accepit mea rusticumque fecit  
auro Bilbilis et superba ferro.  
hic pigri colimus labore dulci 10  
Boterdum Plateamque - Celtiberis  
haec sunt nomina crassiora terris -:  
ingenti fruor improboque somno  
quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora,  
et totum mihi nunc repono quidquid 15  
ter denos vigilaveram per annos.  
ignota est toga, sed datur petenti  
rupta proxima vestis a cathedra.  
surgentem focus excipit superba  
vicini strue cultus iliceti, 20  
multa vilica quem coronat olla.  
venator sequitur, sed ille quem tu  
secreta cupias habere silva;  
dispensat pueris rogatque longos  
levis ponere vilicus capillos. 25  
sic me vivere, sic iuvat perire.

*Translation:* While you, Juvenal, perhaps are restlessly wandering in the noisy Subura or wearing away the hill of the task-mistress Diana; while your sweat-provoking toga agitates you along the thresholds of mighty men and the larger and smaller Caelian mounds tire you out as you rove: my Bilbilis, proud in gold and steel, reclaimed after many Decembers, has welcomed me and made me a country bumpkin. Here, lazy with sweet work, I honour Boterdus and Platea - these are the rather gross names in the Celtiberian lands -: I enjoy profound and reprehensible sleep, which often not even the third hour interrupts, and now I repay myself in full for every little thing which I had stayed awake for during three decades. The toga is unknown, rather the nearest garment is given to my search from a broken chair. Upon rising, the hearth, adorned with a proud pile of local oak, welcomes me; (the hearth) which the bailiff's woman is crowning with many a pot. The huntsman follows, but one whom you would crave to have in a secluded wood; the smooth-skinned bailiff pays my boys and

asks to cut their flowing locks. In such a manner it delights me to live, in such a manner it delights me to pass away.

## Structure and Content

In its simplest form this epigram is bipartite in its basic division. It notes a distinction between the urban rat race at Rome endured by Juvenal (lines 1-6) against the self-sufficient, rural paradise at Bilbilis enjoyed by M. (lines 7-26). The extensive section at Bilbilis is, of course, divisible. M.'s return to Spain is treated in lines 7-9 and his inactive lifestyle at Bilbilis and its immediate surroundings are sketched out in lines 10-12. Subsequent to this general overview the epigram then proceeds to detail a typical day for M. in retirement; *cf.* the itemisation of Laetinus' activities in the prior poem (12.17).<sup>114</sup> In lines 13-16 M. boasts that he takes pleasure in rising late in the morning and contrasts it to his lifestyle at Rome; at lines 17-18 he notes that he no longer has to don formal dress but wears whatever comes to hand; lines 19-21 concern the cosiness of his surroundings and the breakfast prepared for him by his *vilica*; lines 22-25 treat the joys of hunting that the countryside furnishes and the amatory pleasures at hand from his retinue of attractive attendants. The conclusion, supplied in line 26, summarises the bipartite nature of the poem as a whole in its construction, fashioned as it is from two clauses divided more or less centrally, and acknowledges that M. delights in his surroundings and will remain there until death. In both theme and development the epigram is somewhat conventional and can be broadly compared to similarly motivated poems such as Horace *Epode* 2 and Tibullus 1.1 (especially lines 1-44); see Murgatroyd (1980: 47-52) and Mankin (1995: 62-4) for the theme and arrangement of these poems and the section below on intertextuality.<sup>115</sup> Further structural comparative points from M.'s corpus would include the following. The itemisation of time spent at Rome (lines 1-6) finds an analogue at 3.20, where M. speculates upon the sundry ways Canius Rufus could be spending his time (primarily at Rome). The contrast of activities pursued by M. and another individual in a different geographical location is also found in other epigrams; interestingly Rome is often compared as providing a safe and pleasant environment in these instances. To give some examples: in 9.84 M. contrasts his easy life at Rome composing poetry against the dangers that pursue his friend, Norbanus, on military service; similarly, M. and the Roman populace at large are contrasted with Domitian's personal attendance in foreign campaigns (e.g. 7.7); finally, a humorous comparison is provided by 4.57, where M.,

---

<sup>114</sup> The broad structure, which itemises the daily routines in both Rome and Bilbilis, and the marked employment of personification, *clamosa* ... *Subura* (line 2); *sudatrix toga* (line 5); *maior Caelius* ... *minor* (line 6); *Bilbilis* ... *superba* (line 9); *tertia* ... *hora* (line 14); *focus* ... *superba* (line 19), can also be seen as a further correspondence to the previous epigram, which catalogues a personified fever's routine.

<sup>115</sup> The association with Tibullus' priamel is quite pronounced. M.'s poem is similarly weighted with a stronger emphasis on the contrasting catalogue of the constituents of the good life, whereas the incommodities, noted in the foil at the outset, are briefly outlined.

suffering from the climate at Baiae, angles for an invitation from Faustinus to Tibur, see Moreno Soldevila (2006: 406).

Taking a closer look at the content and arrangement of the epigram, it is evident that a number of correspondences and contrasts are employed to note the differences between each setting. At Rome the inconveniences that beset Juvenal include the noisiness of the environment (*inquietus*: line 1; *clamosa*: line 2), the necessity for exhaustive travel (*erras*: line 1; *teris*: line 3; *fatigant*: line 6), and the requirement to pay his dutiful respects to powerful patrons (*limina ... potentiorum*: line 4) in the uncomfortable garb demanded of a client (*sudatrix toga*: line 5). It is also noted that Rome is characterised through three districts. The topographical spread of the areas Juvenal covers does not encompass the whole city: his journeys are restricted to the Subura (line 2) in the centre, the Aventine (line 3: *collem dominae ... Dianae*) in the south, and the Caelian hills (line 6) in the south east. Nevertheless, it is clear that M., through his portrait of Juvenal as the typical client, wishes the journeys to be understood as representative of an exhaustive and disagreeable dash across the whole city. Each Roman encumbrance finds a pleasant echo in Bilbilis. Contrasted with the noisy rush that confronts Juvenal, M. spends his days in peaceable idleness (line 10: *pigri* and *labore dulci*) and undisturbed rest (line 13: *ingenti ... improbo somno*); it is to be noted that M. compounds the latter point by referring to his former life at Rome (lines 15-7). In contrast to the formal dress of a client, M. gleefully reports that his wardrobe is now governed by happenstance and that the toga is excluded (line 17). The need to pay court to patrons is likewise relegated to the past; M. reveals that he now sleeps beyond the hour that would be permitted to a client (line 14). Indeed the picture is so reversed that M. is portrayed as the patron of a bevy of dutiful, or otherwise appealing, servants (line 21: *vilica*; line 22: *venator*; line 24: *pueris*; line 25: *vilicus*). The use of three locations to distinguish Rome, likewise finds a parallel in M.'s description of his environs in Spain, noted by three regions (line 9: *Bilbilis*; line 11: *Boterdum Plateamque*). In sum the epigram is carefully crafted to ensure that each Roman irritation is remedied by a Spanish compensation.

### **Length, Themes and Intertextual Approaches**

Due to the plethora of associations that 12.18 initiates, the following examination will be necessarily brief and merely trace the approaches advanced. There are five separate topics that will be treated here: 1) length; 2) Juvenal; 3) literary intertexts; 4) intratextuality with 12.2(3), 1.49 and 4.55; 5) funerary associations. For general background details on the epigram see the following monographs on M.: Wolff (2008: 16-7, 48, 50, 79-80, 125, 136); Sullivan (1991: 54-5, 161, 164, 183-4, 162 *ad* 12.18.5, 181 *ad* 12.18.9, 25 *ad* 12.18.12);

Rimell (2008: 193-7); Howell (2009: 11-12, 20-21, 29-31, 49, 51, 61, 67-68, 82-83, 90-91, 97-98, 101, 111).<sup>116</sup>

1) The longer epigrams have commanded considerable critical attention. It is clear from M.'s own statements (e.g. 6.65: which offers an *apologia* for the lengthy poem that precedes it) that scrutiny of such poems was anticipated. Despite the interest, no scale has been universally accepted to determine a long epigram in M.'s work. Buongiovanni (2012: 13) demonstrates that a range between 11 to 22 lines has been advanced by different scholars as a demarcation point. Whichever metric is preferred, 12.18 can comfortably be judged long. In Book 12 the following epigrams (under certain scales at least) can be deemed long: 12.2(3) (18 lines); 12.18 (26 lines); 12.28 (22 lines); 12.29 (16 lines); 12.32 (25 lines); 12.48 (18 lines); 12.57 (28 lines); 12.62 (16 lines). It should also be observed that Book 12 contains a high proportion of *monodisticha*, which will necessarily make the longer poems in Book 12 seem still greater. Several general points that coalesce around the treatment of M.'s long epigrams pertain to the present poem. Such epigrams are often signalled via neighbouring poems. In the present case, 12.17 not only anticipates certain themes (see above) of 12.18, but its length (10 lines) helps to introduce this long poem. Similarly the two *monodisticha*, 12.19 and 12.20, are used as a necessary adjustment and interval before the Spanish theme is resumed again in 12.21. M.'s longer poems reverse the metrical norms that govern his traditional practice: in the longer poems elegiac distichs become less frequent; other metres, particularly the hendecasyllable (as here) or choliamb, are more pronounced. Finally, and most importantly, such epigrams often indicate a change of genre. Grewing (1996: 406) records that many long epigrams transform into the *invektivisch-satirische* genre. Although 12.18 does not exhibit the invective element (hence its omission from Grewing's list), the notion of generic transformation, particularly in an epigram addressed to the satirist Juvenal, is evident. It is also to be noted that M. chooses to honour his homeland of Bilbilis with lengthy epigrams: 1.49 (42 lines), 4.55 (29 lines) and 12.18 (26 lines) are the outstanding examples, but even the remaining three - 1.61 (12 lines), 10.103 (12 lines), 10.104 (19 lines) - are considerably above the average length of M.'s epigrams. Finally, although modern scholarship has added considerably to the discussion, Scaliger's view that true epigrammatic *brevitas* is to be judged on a qualitative not a quantitative basis should be recorded.<sup>117</sup> Scaliger suggests that certain themes necessarily entail a longer treatment (in quantity) but that does not automatically debar such poems from being viewed as *brevis*; for an outline of Scaliger's views see Enenkel (2009: 19). For further on M.'s long epigrams see Szelest (1980: 99-108) and Scherf (2008: 195-216). Among the commentators Buongiovanni (2012: 13-25) and Grewing (1996: 405-7) are useful.

---

<sup>116</sup> Note that Howell (1998: 176-9) also provides another interpretation of 12.18 (here paying particular attention to the Spanish setting).

<sup>117</sup> On this theme M. himself makes reference; see 2.77 (esp. line 7).

2) *Iuvenalis* is mentioned on two other occasions, both in Book 7 (7.24, 7.91). Scholars who concentrate on either M. or Juvenal tend to see these citations as references to the satirist; for the contemporary literary writers M. addresses see Wolff (2008: 17) and, for Juvenal specifically, Mindt (2013: 186-7). There are only two scruples raised against this identification and neither are particularly convincing. The name *Iuvenalis* is attested elsewhere, also names denoting youth are relatively common; see Kajanto (1965: 300). It is also sometimes noted that M. does not make overt reference to Juvenal's work as a poet; the use of *facunde* at 7.91.1 is the nearest acknowledgement, but M. uses the adjective for poets and rhetors alike. Against the second reservation it could be advanced that the opening six lines of 12.18 function as an advertisement for the themes Juvenal's first satires explore: the hardships of the client's life receive extended treatment in the first, third, and fifth satires of Juvenal's first book. As such we may compare these six lines to similar advertisements for forthcoming literary works: e.g. Propertius 2.39.61-66 on Virgil's *Aeneid*. It could be possible to extend the reference and to interpret M. as ceding a literary ground to another poet like Propertius (here satire focused on Rome), and to proclaim his own focus (poetry based on Spain). The metre selected and the length is similarly provocative with reference to the addressee. Given the tendency of M.'s longer poems to transgress generic boundaries (see above), it may promote the thought that M. is encroaching upon Juvenal's domain; for the polite withdrawal of poets from genres practised by their *amici* see 11.10, 12.44, 12.94 *et al.* The potential impoliteness of the intrusion is, however, reversed by the choice of metre. M. elects to employ the hendecasyllable, which will be heavily distinguished from the satirist's stichic hexameters; *cf.* Statius *Silv.* 2.7 where hendecasyllables are employed to commemorate the famous epicist Lucan.

The respective relationship between the two poets is the subject of much dispute. Vallat (2008: 57-8) on the basis of 7.24 views their relationship as one of close intimacy. Concerning 12.18, Vallat views the tone as playful and engaging with Juvenal's satiric works. Hightet, by contrast, views 12.18 as indicative of malice on M.'s part.<sup>118</sup> What largely informs Hightet's viewpoint is the proposition of Juvenal's exile, attested in a mangled way by the fourth-century scholia; for the reference see Ferguson (1987:123). In Hightet's interpretation M. in Book 7 would have professed loyal friendship to Juvenal, who was then soon after exiled by Domitian. M. then stays silent about Juvenal throughout the Domitianic and Nervan period only to break his silence with this epigram which boasts about his own good life and mocks Juvenal's hardships upon returning to Rome. From the two positions Vallat's seems the least contentious; Hightet's view necessarily has to fill a lot of gaps without any really solid evidence. Although the absence of references to Juvenal from Book 7 until Book 12 is noticeable, it does not necessarily follow that exile was the motive or indeed that there was a motive.

---

<sup>118</sup> Hightet's work on Juvenal is synonymous with the autobiographical approach to Latin literature. His work on Juvenal must necessarily be used with caution.

Although Juvenal never mentions M. explicitly in his work, such is his dependence upon M.'s work that several sections of Juvenal's satires have been interpreted as a veiled reference; see Colton (1991) for Juvenal's pronounced use of M.'s poetry and themes. The most frequently cited, though rather oddly always hinted at rather than argued for - see e.g. Courtney (2013: 129) - is to identify M. with Umbricius in *Satire* 3. It would make for an interesting response by Juvenal. If felt, the name Umbricius would not only acknowledge M.'s recent withdrawal or death but would contrast with the youthful associations of Juvenal's own name. Baldwin (1972: 101) argues against such an identification. Although he concedes that the satire would respond well to 12.18 and notes a correspondence with the use of the toga (3.172), he considers that Umbricius' characteristic Italian xenophobia would debar such an identification. He also observes that M.'s concentration on bucolic pederasty and the receipt of aristocratic handouts are alien to Umbricius' representation. In Baldwin's estimation Umbricius is to be regarded as a real person and not a speaking name. In contrast to both the views above see Fögen (2014: 85-7), where Umbricius is examined as a stock character from the satirical genre. Elsewhere, Nauta (1995: 5-6), who like Highet sees enmity in Juvenal's relationship with M., believes that M. may underlie the reference at 7.92 (*praefectos Pelopea facit, Philomela tribunos*). According to Nauta's reasoning this would be a sideswipe at M. coming immediately after a similar dismissal of Statius. In sum, despite the frequent echoes of M.'s themes in Juvenal's work, no direct acknowledgement of M. is recorded in Juvenal's Satires and the perceived veiled references are overly speculative and not particularly convincing.

The influence of M. upon Juvenal's work is widely known and most studies on Juvenal acknowledge it to varying degrees. The most wide-ranging survey of the coincidences between the two poets is provided by Colton (1991); see also Wilson (1898: 193-209) and Carrington (1972: 242-6). Although dated, Wilson supplies a helpful analysis for the manner of Juvenal's borrowings; he concludes that Juvenal primarily aimed at thematic similarity and often deliberately avoided verbal repetition of M.'s work. Studies that focus upon tonal similarities or differences are provided by Mason (1963: 93-177) and Anderson (1982: 362-96). For Juvenal's borrowings of proper names and for biographical details see Ferguson (1987: 10-12; 123-9: *ad Iuvenalem*; 148-50: *ad Martialem*).

3) The most obvious case of intertextuality is provided in line 4 by *potentiorum ... limina* recalling Horace *Epode* 2.8. Given the (unrealistic) rustic bliss cultivated by Alfius in the poem, the intertext serves to introduce the theme of 12.18 in a general manner. Further correspondences with Horace can be felt in the epigram: the pleasures of rural anonymity, late rising and lazy carefree hours contrasted to the urban rat race are all found in Horace *Sat.* 1.6.89-131. The structure and gentle humour of 12.18 may be considered broadly Horatian: instead of a pointed conclusion the epigram ends with a thematic shift from the



pastoral to the erotic genre (lines 22-5) in a similar manner to the tonal changes of an Horatian Ode.

The epigrammatic genre also offers precedent for the themes in 12.18. Two epigrams will suffice to note this. A Senecan epigram (A.L. 431 S.B.) provides a good analogue with its focus upon the desirable absence of urban inconveniences (especially the need to attend to the powerful) and the substitution of rural peace and anonymity. The best example from the Greek epigrammatic genre is represented by another famous exile, Leonidas of Tarentum.<sup>119</sup> In A.G. 7.736 Leonidas contrasts the miseries of a life of wandering with a simple life; see Clack (1999: 134-5) and Fain (2010: 71). It should be noted that the Cynic philosophy that may have informed Leonidas' poem, is contrasted in M.'s version of the same trope. Whereas Leonidas concentrates on the bare necessities *via* diminutives that emphasise their lowly status, M.'s more Epicurean take promotes his rustic possessions with a vocabulary more peculiar to urban luxury (e.g. *superba, levis, cultus*). Despite these temperamental differences, both poets accord with their presentation of simple rustic living, which consists of shelter, fire, and food; M., of course, goes on to list a few added niceties (hunting and amatory pursuits) after the necessities have been acknowledged. Although an emphasis on rusticity can be identified as pronounced in the Hellenistic period, Anyte's epigrams are the most obvious testimony as well as Theocritus' work, bucolic features in Greek epigram do not overly influence 12.18; for further on the rustic theme in Greek epigram see Whitmore (1918).

4) There are three intratexts whose coincidences to 12.18 deserve especial emphasis: 12.2(3), 1.49 and 4.55. Epigram 12.2(3) is echoed by 12.18 in a manner that stresses their variations. The broad structures of both lengthy poems are in complete opposition; 12.2(3) begins in Spain and concludes in Rome, 12.18 reverses the direction of travel. The weighting of these elements are also adjusted. The section that treats Spain in 12.2(3) is relatively short (lines 1-4), whereas the section on Rome is extensive (lines 5-18); in 12.18 Rome is briefly treated (lines 1-6), then Spain dominates the rest of the poem (7-26). Although the praise of the region of Bilbilis is to be noted in both poems (12.2(3).2-3 *auriferi ... potens*, 12.18.9 *auro ... ferro*), the representation of Rome differs between the two poems. The temple thresholds that M.'s book will visit (12.2(3).7) and Stella's hospitality in the *Subura* (12.2(3).9) betray a kindly reception that eludes Juvenal (12.18.2 & 4). Epigrams 1.49 and 4.55, both addressed to the fellow Bilbilitan, Licinianus, are both lengthy encomia that testify to M.'s patriotism. The coincidences help to demonstrate the consistent picture M. presents across the poems. In 1.49 Bilbilis' strength is acknowledged (1.49.3-4 *cf.* 12.18.9) and its wealth (1.49.15 *cf.* 12.18.9); the neighbouring territory of Boterdus is noted (1.49.7 *cf.* 12.18.11) and hunting is elaborated upon at length (1.49.23-30 *cf.* 12.18.22-4). The following phrases also find analogues: 1.49.27 *vicina in ipsum silva descendet focum*; 1.49.29 *vocabitur venator cf.* 12.18.19-20 and 12.18.22. The toga is absent in both poems (1.49.31

---

<sup>119</sup> For Leonidas' exile see A.P. 7.715.

cf. 12.18.17), whilst sleep is undisturbed and extensive: 1.49.35-6 (*non rumpet ... somnum reus / sed mane totum dormies*) cf. 12.18.13-6. Finally both poems conclude with an avowal that Bilbilitan life is superior to an urban one. 4.55 adds a little more to the picture: it is similarly in the hendecasyllabic metre; Bilbilis is praised for its strength (4.55.11-2); Platea is mentioned (4.55.13); the striking use of *ilicetus* is attested in the region of *Burado* (4.55.23). Finally idle travel in the neighbourhood (4.55.24 *piger ... viator* cf. 12.18.10-11, 15) and the overt acknowledgement of odd-sounding Spanish toponyms (4.55.27-8 cf. 12.18.12) are highlighted. Two further poems offer verbal coincidences on specific themes treated in 12.18 that may be briefly treated here. The ideal portrait of M.'s rustic home, finds an analogue in his earlier depiction of Faustinus' villa at Baiae in 3.58. In both poems attention falls on a well stocked hearth (3.58.22-3 and 12.18.19-20) and a bailiff attended by attractive long-haired boys (3.58.30-1 and 12.18.24-5). Elsewhere the theme of the miseries attendant on the client's lot are noted in similar manner to that of M.'s portrayal of Juvenal's journeying. At 8.44 the verbs *sudare* (8.44.5: *sudas*) and *conterere* (8.44.4: *conteris*) can be seen as echoed in 12.18 by the use of *sudatrix* (12.18.6) and *teris* (12.18.3); for a further discussion on both these intratextual references see Salemme (1976: 90 & 92).

5) A number of lexical and thematic features are reminiscent of gravestone formulae. The following elements can be isolated to support the contention. Lines 1-6, addressed to the traveller Juvenal, could easily be collapsed to imply the customary addressee of an epitaph: *viator*. Lines 7-10 echo certain traditional inscriptional language that records the deceased and dedicatee with *facere* (*me ... fecit .... Bilbilis*; cf. 9.15). The use of deictic words *hic* (line 10), *haec* (line 12) is also suggestive. The concentration on topography - *Bilbilis* (line 9), *Boterdum Plateamque* (line 11) - provides a sense of familial origin, whilst the references to time - *multos ... Decembres* (line 7), *tertia hora* (line 14), *ter denos ... annos* (line 16) - and the acknowledgement of occupations (here leisurely ones) - lines 10-12, 17-23 - find general precedents in tombstone inscriptions which record the age and career of the deceased. The arresting use of *levis*, which frequently provokes attention (for different reasons), and *ponere* (line 25) can, when removed from their actual context, also initiate thoughts concerning the interment of the departed (e.g. the formula: *sit mihi [or tibi] levis terra*). Finally the conclusion, with its opposition of life and death (*vivere ... perire*), naturally indicates such a potentiality. Given the frequent idea in epitaphs that the inscription points to the future circumstances of the addressee (cf. *C.I.L.* 8.9913 *Viator! Quod tu, et ego; quod ego, et omnes*; *C.I.L.* 11.6243 *Viator, Viator! / Quod tu es, ego fui; quod nunc sum, et tu eris*), this epigram's concentration on Juvenal's drudgery at Rome (which M. has experienced and escaped) does not necessarily, even if viewed through a biographical lens, support the contention that 12.18 is "rather cruel" (Highet, 1954: 18). It could be interpreted not as "Look at me!" but "Look at what you shall be".

**1. erras:** An interesting comparison to Juvenal's plight at Rome, involving fruitless and humiliating begging at thresholds, is provided by Ovid's curse on his (unnamed) enemy in *Ibis* 113-4 (*Exul, inops **erres**, alienaque **limina lustres**; / exiguumque petas ore tremente cibum*).

**2. clamosa ... in Subura:** Adjectives terminating in *-osus* are particularly prevalent in the lower genres (notably satire and epigram). Although it may be felt to initiate colloquial connotations, it should not be automatically assumed. In his survey of the suffix in poetry Knox (1986: 90-101, see esp. 99) suggests that the adjectives ought to be carefully distinguished between those that are formed with a stem from a concrete and those from an abstract noun. He views only those *-osus* adjectives formed from an abstract noun as promoting a colloquial tone. The use of *clamosus* supports Knox's general principle: although it features prominently in Martial (6 usages: 5.84.2; 7.18.13; 10.37.13; 10.53.1; 11.98.15; 12.18.2) and Juvenal (3 usages: 8.186; 9.144; 14.191), it also occurs in the following epicists: Lucan *Bellum Civile* 4.440; Silius Italicus *Punica* 14.269; Statius *Thebais* 4.48; finally it features in Seneca *Hercules Furens* 172 and Statius *Silvae* 3.5.16. Although the above evidence accords with Knox's analysis, a closer look at the instances tells somewhat against his conclusion. As *clamosa* is employed with the seedy quarter of the Subura and is placed beside Juvenal (whose first satires, though as yet unpublished, may well have been known), the adjective could still (possibly) be felt to betray a vernacular tone. From the citations above it can also be demonstrated that the adjective in the lower genres is applied to Roman locations: the circus (Juv. *Sat.* 9.144; M. 10.53.1); the theatre (Statius *Silv.* 3.5.16); the forum (Seneca *H.F.* 172; the only example from a higher genre). The two examples used with geographical substantives in the epicists occur outside of Rome: Statius *Theb.* 4.48 (*clamosae ... valles*); Silius Italicus *Pun.* 14.269 (*clamosus Helorus*). For statements of disgust with the Subura (here as symptomatic of Rome) in Juvenal see *Sat.* 3.5, where the satirist claims he would prefer to be on a barren island than in Rome: *...ego vel Prochytam praepono Suburae*. Courtney's commentary (2013: 2) also notes that in 12.18 Juvenal is represented as an inhabitant of the humbler parts of the city and frequenting the more expensive regions for patronage. For further on the Subura see the entry at 12.2(3).9.

**3. collem dominae ... Dianae:** Cf. 7.73.1 *... domus est tibi colle Dianae* and 6.64.13 *laudat Aventinae vicinus Sura Dianae*. In a similar manner to 12.18, epigram 7.73 shows a character (here M.) hurrying on a quest over different regions of Rome. This particular method of describing the Aventine (*collis Dianae*) is peculiar to M.; for details about the Aventine and its famous temple to Diana see Platner and Ashby (1926: 65-7; 149-50). There is a peculiarity in the choice of location here (and also with the *Subura*) in that the area of the Aventine was not noted for its wealth. It had strong plebeian associations and, despite attracting some wealthy residential development, it is described as being "a comparatively unimportant part of the city and contained few monumental structures" (Platner and Ashby

1926: 67). Although it may well be the case that the Aventine was considered a backwater, in the few references by M. (either in the form of *collis Dianae* or *Aventinus*) it appears as a location for the pursuit of (unsuccessful) patronage: 10.56; 7.73; 12.18, or it contains the residence of a powerful and influential figure: Sura in 6.64.13. Thus it seems that the topographical choice of the Aventine for wealthy patrons is not without precedent in M.; cf. Stella's home in the *Subura* at 12.3.9. The use of *collis* to describe the Aventine is noteworthy; Platner's (1907: 463-4) taxonomy for the hills at Rome distinguishes the Aventine (along with the Palatine, Capitoline, Esquiline, Oppius and Cispius) as a *mons* and not a *collis*. If weight is placed on Platner's classification, the use of *terere* here might suggest that the constant grind of client service pursued by Juvenal, and hosts more besides, has reduced a mighty *mons* to a mere *collis*. Nevertheless there is precedent for the use of *collis* to distinguish the Aventine outside of M.'s own work; cf. Virgil *Aen.* 7.659. It is also to be observed that strictly speaking *collis* is qualified by *Dianae* not *Aventinus*, which may, in light of 7.73.1, be thought to reduce its impressiveness. Given the urban and rural opposition throughout the poem and the later use of *colimus* (line 10) and *cultus* (line 20) with reference to Spain, Varro's etymological understanding of *collis* may be profitably considered. Varro (*de Ling. Lat.* 5.36) believed that *collis* has its etymological basis in *colere*. If Varro's etymology was widely accepted, M. may here be nodding to the overdevelopment of Rome (as noted by the fact that Diana is a rural goddess, who has now been transformed into a representative of haughty Roman patronage) in a traditionally underdeveloped part of the city in contrast to the natural state of Spain; for the actual etymology of *collis* (unrelated to *colere*) see de Vaan (2008: 124) and for the depiction of the Aventine as a wooded region with few inhabitants see Dion. Hal. 3.43.1 and 10.31.2.

**5. sudatrix toga** The adjective is a neologism coined by M. and this instance is the sole usage in Latin literature. Such coinages in M. (cf. especially: *tractatrix* 3.82.13; *ructatrix* 10.48.10) have naturally commanded critical attention; for a convenient list see Wolff (2008: 80-1) and for an extended discussion on *sudatrix* see Watson (2002: 234; 238; 240; 244). Three points emerge from Watson's examination. 1) The suffices *-tor* and *-trix* are widely used by M. and are typical of popular parlance. 2) M. uses the suffix frequently to denote "banausic" occupations, hence they often betray servile undertones. 3) The interpretation of the adjective is ambiguous. It could be rendered "habitually sweating" via a transferred usage from the client to the garment (cf. 14.135.2 *algentes togas*) or the suffix may imply causation: "making one sweat" (cf. 10.48.10 *ructatrix mentha*). Thus given the lowly status the adjective implies and the grandeur that is appropriate to the toga (*vide nota 17 infra*), the phrase can be considered as an innovative oxymoron. Although the woollen toga would doubtless be somewhat uncomfortable in the urban heat and throng, it may be added that the motive for the client's sweating is ambiguous. It could be felt that the perspiration is due to the exhaustion of the journey or the client's anxiety concerning his reception by the patron, or indeed a mixture of the two. In M.'s usage perspiration (*sudare*), when linked to the client's service, is occasioned by arduous work or roving over Rome (cf. 8.44 and

9.22.9), but this does not necessarily exclude fear as a motivating factor here.<sup>120</sup> Additionally 12.82.12 can also be considered for the link between a client's attendance on a patron and perspiration: here Menogenes' persistent attendance (by a humorous reversal) prompts his patron to perspire with fear or weariness (*frontis et umorem colliget usque tuae*). Elsewhere in M. the associations of the toga, denoting free-born *Romanitas*, are shown to be corrupted by the garment's requirement for patronage: cf. 3.46.1 *exigis a nobis operam sine fine togatam*. The toga is further seen as an unremunerative inconvenience: at 4.26 the garment costs more than M.'s services as a client achieve; for the costs associated with clothing see Vout (1996: 211) and Rollason (2016: 40-1). This inversion of the toga's status and the consequent servile links with patronage (here with concomitant allegations of prostitution) finds its precedent in Cicero's representation of Curio's patronage of Antony: Cicero *Phil.* 2.44 *sumpsisti virilem, quam muliebre togam reddidisti*. Understood in this fashion, the toga is seen as a symbol of the slavery Rome metes out to its citizenry; again Cicero can be cited for the retreat from urban servility to rural release: Cic. *de Orat.* 2.22 (*cum rus ex urbe tamquam e vinclis evolavissent*). Given the theme of patronage that *sudatrix toga* implies and the formation of the adjective, readers may compare the coinage of *salutatrix* (instead of the common *saluator*) which is peculiar to M. (7.87.6, 9.99.2) and Juvenal (5.21: *salutatrix turba*); see Watson (2002: 244) and Colton (1971: 56). For further details about the use of the toga in 12.18 see Salemme (1976: 119-20) and the further entry below.

**6. maior Caelius et minor:** This is the only occasion where M. refers explicitly to the Caelian hills. Elsewhere the usages of *Caelius/a* refer to male or female characters: see 4.61.8; 7.30.1; 7.39.4&9; 11.75.2&8. The wealth of the Caelian district was the result of a fire in A.D. 27 (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.64), which paved the way for the redevelopment of the area. As noted here the Caelian zone could be divided into two hills, the smaller one is sometimes referred to by a diminutive as *Caeliolus* or *Caelioloum*; for further details see Platner and Ashby (1926: 87-89). Finally it may be worth noting that Carrington (1972: 256) observes, in a note on the lasciviousness of *Caelia* (7.30), that both M. and Juvenal employ Roman toponyms in their respective works for immoral characters.

**9. Bilbilis:** Although it has loomed over many of the previous poems (12.2(3); 12.5(2) and with Priscus' imminent return we can add 12. *pr.*; 12.1; 12.3(4); and 12.14) this is the first explicit reference to Bilbilis in Book 12. As already mentioned in the introduction M. distinguishes his home with lengthy poems. For background details see especially Dolç (1953: 107-69); Sullivan (1991: 172-84) is also helpful. The clearly Celtic sounds of the toponyms (consider too the later use of *iliceti*) receive explicit reference in line 12 and attention should be drawn to this innovative and provocative aspect of M.'s work. One need only recall Quintillian's (*Inst. Or.* 8.1.3) injunctions against the use of colloquialisms to demonstrate that such words would be quite marked: *quare, si fieri potest, et verba omnia, et*

<sup>120</sup> For clothes (ostensibly) causing sweating see the comparison between M. and Zoilus at 5.79.

*vox huius alumnum urbis oleant; ut oratio Romana plane videantur, non civitate donata.*

Further support can be found in the mockery of Hadrian's provincial (*agrestius*) accent at the senate as recorded in *Hist. Aug. de Vita Hadr.* 3.1.1; see 12 *pr.* (*Hispanus* entry). On the Celtiberian language and alphabet Dolç (1953: 119-29); numismatics also adds to this topic as there are several coins which record Bilbilis in the Celtiberian script.

**10. hic pigri colimus labore dulci:** Cf. 10.103.9 *moenia dum colimus dominae pulcherrima Romae*. Beyond providing a parallel for the use of *colimus*, the passage cited is framed in the context of M. bidding farewell to Rome and cautioning Spain that if he is not received kindly he will return. The use of *pigri* here echoes the conclusion of 12.3(4) (*pigritia*). Howell (1998: 177) observes that the line contains a double-oxymoron as cultivation (*colimus*) is opposed to idleness (*pigri*) and hard work (*labore*) is not often sweet (*dulci*). We could press Howell's observation further and show how M. represents his entire time at Spain in 12.18 through such oxymoronic *iuncturae*, frequently linking rustic elements with an urbane sumptuousness.

**11. Boterdum Plateamque:** Both toponyms are unique to M.; *Boterdus* is recorded elsewhere at 1.49.7, *Platea* at 4.55.13. For both locations the following notes are indebted to the work of Dolç (1953: 189-92 *ad Boterdus*; 210-214 *ad Platea*) and Solà Martín (2015: 6-7 *ad Boterdus*; 7-9 *ad Platea*). *Boterdus* is easily distinguished as of non Indo-European origin; the suffix *-erd-* is common in pre-Roman toponyms around the Ebro valley (cf. *Ilerda*; *Osicerda*). Some caution should be taken over *Boterdus* as Dolç (1953: 189) records that it is uncertain whether or not the noun should end in *-us* or *-um*.<sup>121</sup> From the more complete picture provided in 1.49 one can surmise that the area was noted for its orchards (1.49.7-8: *Et delicati dulce Boterdi nemus / Pomona quod felix amat*). Thus one may suppose - with this reference and the suggestion of easeful rest (*pigri*) - here a village in the vicinity of Bilbilis, which provided an amenable spot for a picnic. The most recent suggestion for its geographical location is to equate it with the site named *Batrur* in Arabic (on the basis of consonantal coincidence); see Solà Martín (2015: 7). The reference to *Platea* is rather more troublesome. At first sight it looks more Graeco-Roman than Celtic; Dolç (1953: 210-11) suspects the loss of certain letters, which would clearly signal the alien sound of the name (hence line 12). Solà Martín (2015: 8-9) speculates that it should be associated with the modern *Peitas*. The location also, with its only other reference emphasising its metal manufacturing works (4.55.13: *Et ferro Plateam suo sonantem*), does not seem to present the peace and tranquility we may justifiably associate with *Boterdus*; for the suggestion that *Platea* played a significant rôle in local metallurgy see Pailler (2005).

---

<sup>121</sup> Dolç still had the same reservations later; see Dolç (1986: 20).

**Celtiberis:** The negative portrayal of Spanish provincialisms here (and elsewhere in M.'s work) led Herrmann (1958: 110) to an erroneous emendation for 5.17.4. Herrmann, in line with certain manuscript traditions, wished to alter *cistibero* to *Celtibero* to demonstrate that the aristocratic woman criticised for her choice of spouse has sunk to the level of marrying a provincial non-entity. Unfortunately, as Cannobio's commentary (2011: 223-4) ably demonstrates, the reading *cistibero* should stand, even if one were to ignore the obvious metrical problems that *Celtibero* would present.

**13. ingenti ... improbo somno:** Both adjectives are quite unusual in being applied to *somnus*. The use of *ingenti ... somno* could be a nod to a usage by C. Licinius Calvus *cum gravis ingenti conivere pupula somno*; see Hollis (2001: 66). Calvus' citation has been transmitted as a fragment and is therefore of questionable intertextual value. Hollis suspects that the fragment's context involves Mercury putting Argus to sleep. Interestingly Hollis argues for the retention of *ingenti* (rather than a proposed *urgenti*) on the basis of M.'s usage here. In Valpy's (1822: *ad loc.*) commentary on M., however, similar scruples emerge with reference to M.'s usage and two suggested emendations are recorded in the *apparatus*: *ingenti non placebat Grutero; neque mihi arridet. An repetend. h.1. tò hic, et legend. hic pingui (De Rooy); urgenti (Gruterus) ingentis (cod. Palat.)*. Despite such earlier qualms, modern editors have not found any reason to emend the text or include any such concerns in their *apparatus*. The second adjective, *improbus*, is interpreted by Friedrich (1908: 631) as meaning "unnatürlich lang". Friedrich employs two passages from Statius (*Silvae* 1.3.7 and 2.1.106) to support his claim that *improbus* signifies going beyond the natural limits. It is important, however, not to lose sight of the customarily negative associations that *improbus* suggests. This is especially pronounced due to M.'s portrait of Spain here, which uses terms frequently applied to urban life in his portrayal. One may consider the double usage of *superba* (lines 9 and 19) as being further emphasised with this use of *improbus*, since *probus* is an antonym of *superbus*; see De Vaan (2008: 490-1). The theme of urban noise and insomnia has been treated in the intertexts cited in the introduction; it should be added here that the relaxation M. sought from Spain is later presented as refused to him. In line with the opening epistle M.'s life in Bilbilis is pictured later in Book 12 as bothersome, even the rest he cultivates is denied by troublesome morning-callers; *cf.* 12.68.5-6 (*otia me somnusque iuvant, quae magna negavit / Roma mihi: redeo, si vigilatur et hic*). Elsewhere sleep is customarily characterised by the solace it brings; *cf.* the description of sleep at *Ilias Latina* 123 (... *curarum operumque levator*).<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Although it may be deemed not strictly relevant, there is a fine Neo-Latin epigram that similarly attests to the charms of sleep and concludes with a comparable division between life and death; see Edwards' (1821: 413) poem to *Somnus* (*Somne levis, quanquam certissima Mortis imago, / consortem cupio te tamen esse tori; / Alma Quies, optata veni! nam sic sine vita / vivere, quam suave est; sic sine morte mori.*).

**14. nec tertia ... rumpit hora:** It must be borne in mind that this would be quite a late hour to wake up in the ancient world (equivalent to say 12 noon - 1 p.m. today).<sup>123</sup> Due to the general absence of widespread artificial lighting, which would of course be particularly pronounced in rural regions, the sun would regulate human life in a more fundamental fashion. In 4.8, an epigram which traces the schedule of a Roman day, the hours for *negotium* fall between the first and the fifth hours (the first - second hours concern attendance on a patron; the third is devoted to legal matters in the forum; the fourth - fifth are consumed with other [unspecified] tasks). Thus M. here declares that whilst Juvenal is habitually scuttling about at Rome attending patrons at these times, the same hours find M. still abed. By concentrating primarily on information gleaned from M., Spaeth Jr. (1924) provides a convenient outline for the daily schedule of a Roman *equus* of the period.

**17. ignota est toga:** The absence of the toga, with a resultant release from the obligations of a client, is depicted as a constituent of the good life; cf. 1.49.31 (*nusquam toga*), 10.47.5 (*toga rara*). The phrase is somewhat double-edged. If the adjective is viewed as transferred from the garment to M. the anonymous associations could be viewed in a positive or negative light. Anonymity is linked with rustic bliss in Virgil *Georg.* 2.486-7 (*rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes / flumina amem silvasque ingloriosus*) and in lines 7-8 of the Senecan epigram (A.L. 431 S.B.) referenced in the introduction. Nevertheless, in M. anonymity is usually something to be avoided. At the outset of Book 1, M. advertises himself as renowned (1.1.1-2: *hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris, / toto notus in orbe Martialis*) and he frequently cautions his enemies that they will remain unmentioned in his works; cf. e.g. 12.61. Also the phrase may, when coupled with the fear of a Spanish character overtaking the work (12. *pr.* 30: *non Hispaniensem librum mittamus, sed Hispanum*), prompt the suggestion of a retreat by M. from *Romanitas* in the form of the toga. Despite such possibilities, it should be remembered that, although the toga is *the* symbol of *Romanitas* (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.282: *Romanos, rerum dominos gentemque togatam*), it was essentially a garment for ceremonial (being worn by Romans in their capacity as orators or clients), not everyday, use: cf. Juvenal *Sat.* 3.149 (*nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus*) and Livy A.U.C. 3.26.9.5, where Cincinnatus' wife is ordered to fetch and shake the dust off his toga. It is the contention of Vout (1996) that the toga's function was primarily ideological, that other clothing would have been seen more frequently, and that even its ceremonial use was taken over in the fourth century by the pallium and the paenula (Vout 1996: 212-3).

**18. rupta ... a cathedra:** Rickety furniture is a hallmark of rustic simplicity, cf. 1.55.11 *pinguis inaequales onerat cui vilica mensas*, with Howell (1980: 239). It should be observed that another dissonant element has, however, crept into M.'s rustic simplicity. The *cathedra*, a chair with a high-back and armrests, is usually either a chair for females or magistrates; for

---

<sup>123</sup> The suggested times are necessarily somewhat arbitrary: 12 noon - 1 p.m. is the timeframe provided by Hightet (1954: 18).



the associations see 3.63.7 and Paoli (1990: 80). Note too how the chiasmic arrangement pictures the chair's distinctive shape.

**19. focus:** Aside from the echo of the description of Faustinus' villa (3.58.22-3) noted in the introduction (section 4), a fully stocked fire is an essential constituent of the rustic good life; cf. Tib. 1.1.6 (*dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus*).

**20. vicini ... iliceti:** The notion of self-sufficiency and the ease with which the requisite supplies are provided is a *topos* of such rustic depictions. The noun *ilicetus* is not found outside of M.; the only other usage occurs at 4.55.23 where the grove is located at Burado. For the use of unpoetical technical language in M. see Wolff (2008: 79) and P. Watson (2002: 233-4). Moreno Soldevila's (2006: 398) commentary suggests that the worship of oak trees was a feature of Celtiberian religion. The worship of oaks, of course, was not only limited to the Celtiberians, the oracular oak at Dodona was likewise venerated; for the primacy of the oak, as the tree par excellence, and its use to denote trees generally see Forster (1936: 98). It may also be added that the etymology of *illex* (and its cognates) is obscure; Ernout and Meillet (1939: 474) state that it is "sans doute d'origine dialectale" and propose a tentative Mediterranean origin, whilst De Vaan (2008: 298) provides no etymology at all. It could be surmised, by observing the prevalence of the prefix *il-* and the repetition of the vocal *i* (for this last point see Dolç 1953: 110) that an Iberian origin is to be suspected.

**21. vilica:** For the various (primarily household) functions of a *vilica* see Columella *De re rust.* Book 12; see esp. 12.1 where Columella notes that the bailiff's wife ought to be of good character and middling appearance, not too pretty that she distracts the bailiff's attention from his duties, nor so ugly that she disgusts him. The present instance, conforms to Columella's portrait; the *vilica* (unlike the *vilicus*) does not seem to be a convenient, near at hand, lover for M., instead she is represented as an industrious worker in the household. It should be noted that the use of a *vilica* and a *vilicus* on what is supposedly a small farm is another instance of hyperbolic extravagance that M.'s rural ideal presents. Nevertheless, there are instances recorded in inscriptional evidence of *vilici* being responsible for relatively small holdings, even those with freedmen masters; see Houston (1996: 207). It is also to be noted that *vilici* could sometimes, especially those of the *familia Caesaris*, be put in charge of other properties (such as bathing establishments, warehouses, or shrines) and that, in such settings, there could be more than one *vilicus*; see Houston (1996: 205-8) and Dorsey (1989: 293-5). Despite this complication to the picture, it seems quite clear that, by staffing his (supposedly) small farm with a squadron of workers appropriate to a great estate, M. is using hyperbole to brag about the comfort of the existence lived in Bilbilis. For details on the functions of the *vilicus* (line 25) see Columella *De re rust.* Book 11; and for further details on the pair of functionaries see Forster (1950: 126) and Fögen (2009: 189-91 & 193-6).

**22. venator sequitur:** For the citation of an attendant hunter as a necessary constituent for M.'s life in Bilbilis *cf.* 1.49.29 *vocabitur venator*. This usage hints at two changes: 1) M.'s rôle is that of a patron who has underlings to court him, *cf.* 2.57.5 (*quem grex togatus sequitur et capillatus*) for *sequi* denoting the status of a client; 2) the alteration of theme (from pastoral to amatory) is anticipated here since the diction of hunting is frequently employed in erotic contexts by elegists; *cf.* Ovid *Am.* 2.9a.9 *venator sequitur fugientia, capta relinquit*.

**sed:** This particular colloquial employment of *sed* (= *et quidem*) is found 18 times in M.'s work; see Citroni *ad* 1.43.9 (1975: 144) for the examples. Citroni observes that although featuring in earlier Latin (e.g. Plautus), this intensive usage is more pronounced in silver and late Latin (from Phaedrus to Apuleius). Elsewhere similar observances, albeit with different examples (including two instances from Ovid contrasted against the prevalence of the intensive use of *sed* in M. and Juvenal), are provided by Palmer (1874: 391-2). The usage is often coupled with *et*, but not so here. For the general employment of colloquialisms in M. (not including this specific usage) see Kay (2010: 318-30).

**tu:** The monosyllable at the conclusion of a hendecasyllabic line is noteworthy. There are 20 examples (0.97%); see Giarratano (1908: 54). From the examples, the only pronouns found at the termination are *se* (once: 4.21.2); *quis* (once: 7.17.3) and *tu* (once: 12.18.22). Given the address to Juvenal and the associations of generic transformation that M.'s longer poems promote, the usage here could be seen as an echo of a style cultivated by satirists. Roman satirists sought to distinguish their use of the hexameter by effectively deadening its poetical force and developing a prosaic tone through such devices as the employment of unimportant or monosyllabic words at the conclusion of the line; see Llewelyn Morgan (2010: 325-6). This trend can be simply supported by citing the usages of *tu* at the end of the line in the hexameters of Horace and Juvenal: Horace *Serm.* (7 examples): 1.3.19; 1.3.21; 1.9.69; 2.3.185; 2.3.322; 2.5.107; 2.6.53; *Epist.* (4 examples): 1.14.4; 1.16.27; 1.16.32; 1.18.67; Juvenal *Sat.* (8 examples): 4.23; 8.26; 8.52; 8.112; 9.77; 10.342; 13.192; 14.73.<sup>124</sup>

**23 secreta cupias habere silva:** The setting *secreta ... silva* with its literary antecedents from the elegiac genre (*cf.* Ovid *R.A.* 591, 606-7; *Met.* 7.75; Tibullus 3.19.9 *sic ego secretis possum bene vivere silvis*) neatly signals the adjustment to an erotic theme in these final lines.<sup>125</sup> Despite marking a change, *silva* could be viewed as signalled by the employment of *illiceti* in line 20. For the preference of forest surroundings to that of the city as a *topos* in

---

<sup>124</sup> The evidence supplied only concentrates on the nominative case of the pronoun, declined cases which result in a monosyllable would doubtless increase the list as would an inclusion of other monosyllabic pronouns. Persius provides no examples for this highly focused treatment.

<sup>125</sup> The use of *cupiunt silvae* at Calpurnius Siculus *Ecl.* 7.2 is unimportant.

Latin literature see Hughes (1983: 438). The use of *secreta* could also be felt to add to the anonymity of M.'s life at Bilbilis (see the note on *ignota est toga*) since it can be synonymous with *ignotus*; see Forcellini II.1. The phrase *cupio habere* is quite widely attested but largely restricted to prose. Despite the sexual undertones both verbs are capable of initiating - see Adams (1982: 187) on *habere* - the employment here, with an obvious sexual reference, is surprisingly somewhat singular. For the standard use cf. Cicero *Ep. ad Quint.* 3.2.3.6 *consules comitia habere cupiunt*; Seneca *Ep.* 9.15.2 *hos (= amicos) cupit habere quam plurimos*; for a poetical example: Morel (1927: 153) *Anonymi versus in Caesares Romanos ex Hist. Aug.: in Commodum* 1.1 *Commodus Herculeum nomen habere cupit*.

The introduction of pederasty here has prompted a considerable amount of biographically focused (and consequently somewhat methodologically questionable) speculation concerning both M.'s and Juvenal's predilections. Watson (2003: 47) uses this passage, and the fact that no spouse or family members are mentioned by M. at Bilbilis elsewhere, to argue that M. was not married when he retired to Spain.<sup>126</sup> With reference to Juvenal, Highet (1954: 269) uses this passage and internal evidence from Juvenal's work to contend that Juvenal was a pederast.<sup>127</sup> Elsewhere, and a little more satisfactorily, Wiesen (1963: 455-8) argues that the reference here may well be viewed as having a generic, not a biographical basis. He accepts that the reference is unambiguously pointed at Juvenal and not impersonal (noted clearly by *tu* in line 22), but interprets the sense as an admission that obscene themes are common to both satire and epigram. Thus the hunter would be an appropriate character for Juvenal to write about as well as M. himself. Beyond the usage here, there is precedent for a poet to comment upon the pederastic tendencies of a fellow versifier; see Theocritus (*A. G.* 9.599) on (the admittedly long dead) Anacreon.

**24-5 rogatque longos / levis ponere vilicus capillos:** There are three potential recipients of the haircut that have been proposed. 1) The most widely accepted understanding is that the bailiff is requesting permission to cut the boys' hair (*pueris* line 24). The motive advanced is usually that he wishes to transform these sexual playmates (*capillati* would suggest *delicati*) of M. into productive farmhands on the estate. It could also be considered that jealousy is the motivating force. The bailiff is tellingly described as *levis*, as such he could be aiming to remove any rivals for M.'s affections. 2) It has been advanced that the bailiff is here requesting permission that his own locks be cut; Shackleton Bailey's (1993: 104) Loeb follows this interpretation. Those who follow this reasoning believe that the bailiff wishes to be promoted to maturity and remove all boyish traces (*levis, capillos*). The use of *vilica* (line 21), however, somewhat undermines this rationale. If the bailiff is already in a relationship or marriage with a woman it would necessarily indicate an achieved maturity. 3) The final

<sup>126</sup> M.'s marital status has been the source of much conjecture; beyond Watson see Ascher (1977: 441-4), Sullivan (1979: 238-9) and Sullivan (1991: 25-6).

<sup>127</sup> Although Highet's view is somewhat crude in its method, it could defensibly be argued that M. tends to tailor the constituent elements of his poems in accordance with the tastes of his addressees.

reading, advanced by Curchin (2003: 222-4), understands that the bailiff is asking to cut M.'s own hair. The associations here coalesce around rustic *simplicitas*: M. would be pictured as getting a simple homely haircut, rather than a pretentious trim from an urban *tonsor*. 10.65.6-9 can be supplied to support this view: there M. is contrasted advantageously via his Hispanic masculinity and unkempt hairiness against Charmention's Greek grooming and femininity. It should be added in support of this point that hirsuteness could have been viewed as a defining feature of the Iberian; see Sullivan (1991: 172) for references. Since each view (especially 1 and 3) has its virtues, it will ultimately be down to the individual reader's judgement to decide whether the homosexual theme, introduced in lines 22-3, is here being amplified or whether a separate example of rustic *simplicitas* is provided. Both interpretations are thoroughly consonant with the themes in the epigram; due to the Horatian tonal shift introduced in line 22, the first option is preferred in the translation above.

**26.** The contrast between life and death is a facile trope found throughout Latin literature. To demonstrate the broad span of the rhetorical theme cf. Plautus *Pseud.* 39 *repente exortus sum, repentino occidi* with an epigram by Naucellius (fourth century AD) *Epig. Bob.* 5.7 *vivere sic placidamque iuvat proferre senectam*. For the specific contrast of *vivere* and *perire* cf. Seneca *Controv.* 3.4.1.13 *fili, si vivere mihi non licet, cur perire non licuit*. In his epigrams Seneca provides two examples which may warrant consideration in the context of 12.18. In an epigram (A.L. 228 S.B.) concerning his exile at Corsica, he uses diction associated with epitaphs to appeal to the island (line 8): *vivorum cineri sit tua terra levis*, whilst in another epigram (A.L. 404 S.B.) Seneca advocates self-concern and cautions against the cultivation of wealthy *amici* because death quickly approaches (lines 7-8): ... *vivere doctus / uni vive tibi; nam moriere tibi*.

For M.'s own use of the contrast cf. 10.58.8 *et in sterili vita labore perit*. This example is particularly apposite: it states how the hard life at Rome is ultimately fatal and consequently presents a logical contrast to the pleasant death anticipated in 12.18 at Spain. It may also be observed that M. frequently uses *vivere* or *vita* to signify living a good life not merely eking out an existence; see Spisak (2007: 128) for the references. The best example for this use of *vivere* also affords a fine structural comparison to the conclusion here. The final line of the hendecasyllabic epigram 6.70 is similarly divided at the fifth syllable with infinitive forms balanced in each section; see 6.70.15 *non est vivere, sed valere vita est*. The use of *perire*, with its semantic basis implying "movement", deserves mention given the context of M.'s promotion of indolence in 12.18. The line also prompts two more general ideas concerning Book 12. Lorenz (2002: 232) employs this line to demonstrate how M. deliberately signals the closure of his poetical career in the Spanish Book 12. Finally, if there is any validity to Bellinger's (1928: 435) suggestion that 12.46(7).2 (*nec tecum possum vivere nec sine te*) is a reference to Rome, then this usage at Spain should be seen as later qualified within the

same book; for M.'s contrast of Spain and Rome in Book 12 see Scherf (2001: 50) and, more generally, Stanley Jr. (2014).

## 12.19

*Text:* in thermis sumit lactucas, ova, lacertum  
et cenare domi se negat Aemilius.

*Translation:* Aemilius takes lettuces, eggs, a mackerel in the baths and he says that he is not dining at home.

### Structure

The structure of this epigram is quite straightforward. The opening line provides the scenario: a man having a snack at the baths. There is nothing in the menu choice or setting to suggest anything obviously inappropriate in the character's behaviour. This same salad features in M.'s own dinner parties and is attested elsewhere (see the lemma entries on the separate food items). The perceptive reader may, however, have noticed that an element of meanness may be detected, since the poem itself is a *monodistichum* and this meal usually features among selections of other hors d'oeuvres before main courses and desserts. Elsewhere, when mentioned, it initiates a lengthy list of food items, whereas here the brevity of the poem suggests that an expected *cena* will be intruded upon in some fashion. Although a degree of alliteration will be observed in the list (*lactucas, ova, lacertum*), the recipe seems quite conventional and no perceptibly sustained audible sound-effects are maintained in this poem. The second line provides the humorous interpretation: it does so via an ambiguity in the phrase *cenare domi* (see below), and by the choice and placement of the character's name *Aemilius*. The name is selected to suggest wealth and nobility and, as a tetrasyllabic word, to disturb any harmonious coincidence of ictus and rhythm at the close of the pentameter: for this technique see the note on 12.4.6 (*pigritiae*) and for the associations of the character's name see the interpretation below.

### Interpretation

There are two equally legitimate ways to read this poem. The first reading would view the character as a man too poor to eat at home; thus he has to rely upon a simple snack in the baths to sustain him. The humour for this explanation is largely dependant upon the associations which the name *Aemilius*, redolent of wealth and good-breeding, initiates. By stating that he is not dining at home, *Aemilius* either unconsciously reveals his poverty, or, more likely, he is to be viewed as a man pathetically hankering after an invitation to dinner by telling everyone he encounters that he is receptive to such a summons. There is, of course, some degree of humour elicited in depicting someone so eager for an invitation to

dine, while he is currently eating. There are many examples of such pathetic characters in M.'s work and the setting of the baths is the traditional habitat for such parasites; the lemma entries below will provide the evidence to support such a reading. It could also be viewed that Aemilius is not angling for an invitation but boasting that he has received one: the fact that he needs to have a snack at the baths puts the lie to his claim.

The second interpretation, which is equally well-attested in M.'s work, would view Aemilius as a mean patron: he tells everyone he meets at the baths that he is not dining at home in order to avoid any of their appeals for an invitation to dine with him. In this case the traditional associations of Aemilius' name would be operable, since he would be viewed as a wealthy aristocrat. This explanation would also place the poet, and the reader, as potential parasites, who are anticipated and dismissed by Aemilius' ruse. In his work M. casts himself in both rôles: the provider (5.44) and pursuer of dinner invitations. We could also provide two separate motives for Aemilius' meal at the baths. He is either to be viewed as a man so miserly that he even begrudges himself a meal at home, let alone others, and survives on the bare necessities, or he is using his snack at the baths as camouflage to refuse bothersome parasites. The stratagem of Nasica, a name associated with the Aemilian *gentes* through their links with the Scipios, is comparable to 2.79; here Nasica only invites M. to dinner when he is aware that M. will be unavailable. The lemma entries below will provide further comparisons. Beyond M.'s own treatment the theme of a banquet is a traditional topos of Roman satire, prominent examples include Hor. S. 2.8, Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*, and Juvenal S. 5. The use of the trope in ancient satire is essentially an ethical concern which features in other genres, e.g. Pliny's letters (*cf. Ep. 2.6*). For the use of a *cena* to symbolise deeper ethical concerns (notably egalitarian treatment) see Fögen (2017: 45-50) on Pliny *Ep. 2.6*. Elsewhere, Heraeus (1915: 27) notes the use of a *gustatio* taken at the baths is common to this epigram and Trimalchio's depiction by Petonius.

In both interpretations ambiguity is also provided by the way we choose to understand the aspect of the infinitive in the indirect statement in line 2. Should the present infinitive be regarded as a simple present or a present progressive? Might it be that Aemilius has meant to say to M. that he "is not dining at home" (progressive sense) on this particular day (because he is not hungry, ill, too busy, etc.) and M. has slyly chosen to suggest that he means that he "does not dine at home" (simple present) as a general rule (because he is indigent, miserly, etc.)?

A final interpretation, which reads *foris* instead of *domi* in the second line, will be considered of secondary importance and as such is relegated to the lemma entry on *domi* below.

**1. in thermis** Beginning in this fashion M.'s reader may anticipate the nature of the poem, since *thermae* and *balnea* were conventional haunts for parasites. Elsewhere in M.'s work Silius (2.14) scours Rome including the baths for an invitation, Dento (5.44) used to pursue M. at the *thermae*, and Menogenes (12.82) is a persistent pest at the baths. Contrary to the readings above, 3.36.5 offers a witty reversal: the patron there makes his clients trudge all round Rome including to the baths after him. The *thermae* are viewed by M as an element of the good life Rome offers (5.20, 10.51) and an area free from women (at least on the evidence of 3.68.3). The *thermae* as the present poem suggests also provided dining facilities; see 5.70 for food (*balnea*) and 12.70 for drink. Although food was available at the baths, Aemilius' reliance on this snack runs counter to the norms of the bathing establishments. Elsewhere (e.g. 6.53) bathing is seen as a preamble to a subsequent dinner among friends. For further information on dining customs in bathing establishments see Dalby (2000: 220-1), who offers an interesting passage from Pollux, *Phrase Book*, 21-2 which shows the range of foodstuffs available (including the salad described in 12.19).

**sumit** The 27 usages of this verb in M. exhibit the following range of meanings: to drink (x1: 2.50.2); to eat (x5: 3.60.3&5; 12.19.1; 13.29.2; 13.31.1); to assume an appearance or behaviour (x2: 5.7.4; 9.28.5); to take / pick up (x6: 2.16.6; 6.30.2; 12.82.7; 13.12.2; 13.110.2; 14.108.2); to wear clothing or perfume (x9: 6.59.8; 8.48.8; 11.39.11; 13.101.2; 14.1.2; 14.65.2; 14.131.1; 14.145.2; 14.207.1); to fornicate (x1: 10.81.2); to use for a purpose (x2: 14.56.1; 14.86.1). The distinctions are sometimes somewhat blurred of course (e.g. 14.56 concerns toothpaste which could have been viewed as being worn rather than used). Despite the limited range of meanings it may be felt that in the present poem the verb is selected not only for its primary association with the consumption of food, but also to suggest that the character is using the food for the practical purpose of fending away parasites; see Lewis and Short (2.D). The verb also as a derivative of *emere* suggests expense, which is here somewhat at odds with the needy state of the character. For the suggestion of reading the Aemilian sumptuary laws into the choice of the verb see the entry on Aemilius (*infra*).

**lactucas, ova, lacertum** The same *gustatio* is mentioned at 10.48, 11.52, and (with slight variation) at 5.78. Lettuce is seen as the traditional starter for the *cena* at 3.50.4 and 13.14, and when better fare is available there are requests to forego it in order to maintain an appetite (13.53). It may be that a medical complaint is hinted at here as *lactucae* are recommended for a constipated man at 3.89. Egg, lettuce, and neither soft nor hard fish also feature (among other foods) in Celsus' (*de Med.* 2.20) recommended list of foodstuffs of *boni suci*. There is not enough evidence, however, to suggest that a fad diet or a medical joke is being considered here, though its placement before 12.20 is interesting. As well as being a traditional element of the *gustatio* an element of stinginess may be observed in the singular use of *lacertum*. As Pliny *N.H.* 32.146 makes clear the *lacerta*, at least the ones from



Baetica, were very small. It may be felt that the secondary meaning of *lacertum* (arms, brawn) is punned upon as it is coupled with *sumere* to echo the traditional phrase *sumere arma*: compare Propertius *Eleg.* 1.3.16 with Camps (1961: 49-50). Here the phrase would suggest that Aemilius is actually fortifying himself for the trials ahead. Food is, of course, a conventional theme in Roman satire, often the humour concerns sumptuous extravagance: see Hudson (1989: 69-89). In the present case it is the character's meanness or poverty that is being mocked. For the use of food in M.'s work see Gowers (1993: 245-67, esp. 264 where 12.19 is briefly treated).

**2. cenare domi** The theme of *captatio cenae* is of course a persistent theme in M.'s epigrams, given its dominance in Book 2 the theme is well treated by Williams (2004: 58). To dine alone is viewed as the ultimate indignity for the dinner hunter and M. coined a neologism for it *domicenium*: found at 5.78.1 (with Howell, 1995: *ad loc.*) and 12.77.6. Despite the indignity involved it is sometimes portrayed as preferential to dining with a boring host (e.g. 3.50). Although the theme is pronounced in M. there are many earlier precedents. A shorthand for the trope, seen through a parasite's eyes, is provided by Gelasimus' introductory soliloquy in Plautus' *Stichus* 185-92. Here Gelasimus contrasts the generosity of the patron's in the past with the mean-spirited ones available to him: a theme and sentiment that is frequently re-worked in M.'s epigrams (some 250 or more years later).

**domi** As Shackleton Bailey's (1989: *ad loc.*) apparatus notes this is the reading of a single manuscript (T) in the  $\alpha$  family of manuscripts. The better attested reading, which featured more often in editions of M.'s work before Schneidewin (1842), is *foris*: found in the  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  families of manuscripts. Farnaby's (1625: *ad loc.*) interpretation for such a reading is as follows: *In balneis potabant non raro, sed et quandoque cibi aliquid sumebant. Lautiores una lavantibus distribuebant cibos gustandos, hos voravit Aemilius, ita ut sibi non esset opus captare cenam, quod cum sordidum esset, iactavit se non cenare foris.* Farnaby provides an interesting rationale that complements M.'s earlier treatments on the theme of dinner-hunting. Here the undomestic setting and the everyday nature of the food being snatched would substantiate Aemilius' claim in a strictly literal sense. The amusement is also aided by Aemilius' proud and deeply disingenuous assertion that he does not pursue such patronage. There are problems, however, with this reading. Firstly, there is no real suggestion in the poem that the food is provided by another party, although there were gifts of food in public settings (e.g. Plutarch *Cato Minor* 46.3 records donations of food at the theatre), it is somewhat difficult to assume this here. Secondly, the verb selected (*sumit*) does not particularly support Farnaby's reading. Although *sumere* can be viewed as a synonym of *capere* (see Forcellini) the use of *cepit* or *rapuit* would give a far better sense to the practical greed of Aemilius that Farnaby understands here. There is, of course, an amusing explanation that Farnaby does not consider with this reading: that Aemilius is asking people to dine with him by stating that he is not dining out himself. If this were the case we have to

assume that his presence would be so repulsive that even the offer of a *cena* would not prove sufficient compensation for the horror of his company: compare e.g. 3.50, 3.82, and Horace *Sat.* 2.8. Here again though it could be argued that more concrete support should be provided in the poem to ascribe this view. As such, despite the weight of the manuscripts' support for *foris*, the reading of *domi* will be maintained here.

**Aemilius** The name is used only here in M.; elsewhere the name *Aemilianus* is used for a host, who has a cook with a pretentiously grandiloquent name (1.50), and in an axiomatic poem which states that the poor will always be poor, the rich always rich (5.81). Beyond these usages *Aemilia* is found to describe the famous Aemilian road (3.4.2; 6.85.6; 10.12.1). As the interpretation (*supra*) shows, the name is selected for its connotations with wealth and status; for comparative purposes see Juvenal 7.124 with Ferguson (1987: 19). Aside from this principal reason, there are two other possible motivations for the selection of the name. Due to the context of dining, the menu choice, and the employment of *sumere*, readers may have been expected to perceive a reference to the Aemilian sumptuary legislation of 115 and 78 BC recorded in Gellius 2.24.12. The law concerns old-fashioned strictures and ancient frugality: it was designed to limit the kind and quantity of foods being consumed. A second possibility, more remote, may suggest that a reference to "Aemilius Macer" (Aemilius the thin) is noted. Macer wrote a work entitled *De Herbis* from which a few, not very illuminating, fragments have survived; see Morel (1927: 109). It is, of course, very difficult to gauge whether either of the above had any popular currency when M. was composing Book 12, let alone whether an intentional reference is to be implied. Nevertheless they can be offered as potential sources that would add to the complexity of the poem as they do not intrude upon the straightforward interpretations but rather complement them.

## 12.20

*Text:* quare non habeat, Fabulle, quaeris  
uxorem Themison? habet sororem.

*Translation:* Fabullus, you ask why Themison does not have a wife? He has a sister.

### Structure

The structure is artfully patterned around an intricate chiasmus. In each line the first and last words are linked to each other: in line 1 *quare* and *quaeris* are united by means of initial alliteration; in line 2 *uxorem* and *sororem* are linked by their case, sound repetitions (here, by contrast to line 1, at the end of the words *-orem -ororem*), and in the logic of the epigram are made equivalent via Themison's perversity. At the heart of each verse a pattern cuts across the two lines, dividing the associations noted above: *habeat* (line 1) finds its link through the repetition of *habet* (line 2). The harmonious quality of the structure assists with the immorality the humour highlights. It should be noted that the placement of *Themison* is quite provocative, since one could place the question mark after *uxorem* and begin the second sentence with *Themison* (*Fabullus, you ask why he does not have a wife? Themison has a sister.*). As such Themison gravitates between the bounds of *uxorem* and *sororem* not only sexually but semantically here. Although the structure and incestuous theme is reminiscent of Catullus, particularly C.85 (for the structure), and the use of *Fabulle* (see lemma entry) adds to such an impression, it could be viewed that the logical arrangement in the epigram adds an extra bite to the humour. If we assume that the main character is a doctor (see the lemma on *Themison*), we could view the rational order and shocking solution as a parody of a doctor's prescriptions: Problem: no sex; Cure: do you have a sister? It should be borne in mind that medics, like philosophers, were viewed in some quarters with suspicion as irreligious transgressors. Doubtless medical prescriptions and methods would affront traditionalists; thus the ostensible mimicry of a doctor's methods of diagnosis and treatment would provide another level to the humour.

### Interpretation

This epigram is capable of many interpretations triggered by the ways in which the reader elects to understand *habere*; for the sexual interpretation of the verb see Adams (1982: 187).

The most obvious way to interpret the epigram is to view *habere* in line 1 as indicating possession and in line 2 as denoting *coitus*:

*Fabullus, you ask why Themison does not have a wife, he has sex with his sister.*

The joke can, of course, function just as effectively by providing a sexual reference to both instances of *habere* (here suggesting a preference by Themison for his sister):

*Fabullus, you ask why Themison does not have sex with his wife, he has sex with his sister.*

Alternatively, one can ignore the sexual undertones of the verb altogether and view the sentiment of the poem as an articulation of Themison's misogyny (i.e. the experience of having a sister and the horror of a household dominated by a woman deters Themison):

*Fabullus, you ask why Themison does not have a wife, he has a sister (that is enough).*

It should also be noted that the epigram is capable of different readings if we interpret *sororem* as "a girlfriend" or, less likely, "a nurse", whether we read *Fabulle* or *Fabulla*, or change Themison's name and supply *non* to the final sentence: see the lemma entries below. In sum this epigram forces direct and active engagement on the reader's intellect. Siedschlag (1977: 94) offers an investigation of M.'s epigrams that pose interpretive problems; he classifies 12.20 among 3.80 and 4.34 as riddles which are resolved at the conclusion.

**1. quare ... quaeris:** For the construction see 12.17 (note 1); for the use of a question to add curiosity to a concluding point see Moreno Soldevila (2006: 495 *ad* 4.77.4).

**Fabulle:** The masculine is used on nine occasions in M. always in the vocative case: 3.12.4; 4.87.1; 5.35.8; 6.72.3; 9.66.2; 11.35.4; 12.20.1; 12.22.2; 12.85.2. The character is used in two different ways: Fabullus can either be an active character in the epigram with whom the poem is concerned (e.g. 9.66). In such instances he is often satirically attacked. A more frequent use of Fabullus, however, is to fulfil a functional rôle as a witness who has no active involvement: essentially this usage lends a suggestion of a convivial setting for the epigram; for the use of the "isolated vocative" in M. see Vallat (2008: 411-2). The second usage is by far the most frequent employment of Fabullus; it should be noted that there are cases, such

as 12.85, where it is difficult to say categorically whether Fabullus is involved or not. The most important function of Fabullus, Fabulla, or Fabullinus in M.'s epigrams is perceptibly observed by Vallat (2008: 491-2): the name is used for its analogy to *fabula* to lend a suggestion of lying or concealment, of action or speech, in the relevant epigrams. In the present instance the associations of "rumour" may be deemed more apposite; a study on the function of rumour in M.'s epigrams is offered by Greenwood (1998: 278-314, see esp. 290-1 for *fabula*). Elsewhere on this topic Guillén Cabañero (1987: 124-7) offers an account of M.'s condemnation of immorality, which concludes with a selection of poems focusing upon the function of gossip and morality in the epigrams.

It should be noted that *Fabulle* is the reading of the  $\beta$  family of manuscripts, the reading of the  $\gamma$  family is *Fabulla*. This reading is quite interesting as it subtly changes the whole tone of the epigram. Fabulla here, as posing the question to M., could be interpreted as wishing to marry Themison and inquiring as to the reason for his refusal. Given the consistent other usages of Fabulla (1.64.3; 2.41.11; 4.81.1&4; 6.12.2; 8.33.17; 8.79.5) as an old woman obsessed with her appearance, Themison's refusal would be expected by M.'s audience. For other instances of a bachelor wisely refusing a prospective wife's advances see 9.10 and Nixon (1927: 118). The reason for the preference for *Fabulle* rather than *Fabulla* is primarily because the  $\gamma$  family also records the title of *ad Fabullum* for this epigram; see Shackleton Bailey (1989: *ad loc.*). Since the titles of Books 1-12 are so heavily contaminated (see Lindsay 1903: 34-55), this reasoning is not as convincing as may be assumed; a better reasoning, though still far from conclusive, would argue on the basis of the function of each character: Fabullus is always used in the vocative, whereas Fabulla is in the vocative on three occasions (1.64.3; 4.81.4; 8.79.5), but not exclusively.

The name *Fabullus* is instantly associated with Catullus' friend (often twinned with Veranius): 12.15&17; 13.1&14; 28.3; 47.3; indeed such was the association that Pliny *N.H. pr.1* referred to Catullus' work *via* Fabullus and Veranius. The only other use in Latin literature is the feminine form *Fabulla* found in Juvenal *S. 2.68* for a sexually promiscuous woman; see Ferguson (1987: 94-5). M. is the only writer to use both the masculine and feminine forms as characters in his poetry.

**2. uxorem:** The 62 usages of *uxor* would suggest that in M.'s epigrams a character is wise to avoid such a relationship altogether. The associations of an *uxor* in M. coalesce frequently around the theme of sexual dissatisfaction: either infidelity (by one partner at least) or celibacy (usually due to the ugliness of a partner married for financial motives). There is often some overlap between the categories. For the 28 clear instances of infidelity see 1.73.2; 2.49.1; 2.54.1; 2.56.1; 2.60.1; 3.26.6; 3.70.3; 3.82.2; 3.85.3; 3.92.1; 4.5.5; 5.61.1&7&13&14; 5.75.2; 6.31.1; 6.45.4; 6.90.2; 7.10.13; 8.31.5; 10.69.2; 11.43.1&12; 12.58.1; 12.96.7; 12.97.1&5; for 10 instances of a sexless marriage: 9.66.1; 10.98.3;

11.43.1&12; 11.78.8; 11.104.1&14; 12.96.7; 12.97.1&5. In fact there are only two unambiguous examples of a good wife (10.30.5 and 10.35.19); one could also add the chaste exemplar at 11.15. Death is often presented as a hoped for release from an *uxor* (e.g. 4.24.2), and a particular hope of M.'s characters is to gain children (and presumably the attendant rights) without the hassle of an *uxor* (e.g. 1.84.1; 2.92.3). Given the customary portrayal in M.'s epigrams the reader is kept guessing until the last word whether the avoidance of taking a wife will be sympathetically or suspiciously portrayed.

**Themison:** This character is employed only here in M.; a doctor of the same name is provided also at Juvenal S. 10.221, see Ferguson (1987: 224-5). The name suggests the famous Augustan doctor, Themison of Laodicea, founder of the Methodic school: see Pliny *N. H.* 29.6; Celsus *de Med.* 1.11; 1.54; Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 95.10. The names of renowned practitioners tended, however, to be assumed, like titles, by later disciples within the same profession; see Ferguson (1987: 10). Thus it is not surprising to find a doctor called Themison in Apuleius *Ap.* 48.6. Although attested quite frequently in Greek for those unconnected with the medical profession, the employment of the name in Latin literature suggests that the medical associations would be most pronounced. Given the negative portrayal of doctors in M. either as incompetent butchers (e.g. 1.30) or sexual predators (6.31; 11.71), the name is aptly chosen for the theme of sexual deviancy here. This is further reinforced, of course, by the actual moral associations of Θέμις, suggesting as it does *rightness* or *lawfulness*.<sup>128</sup> Thus, as with M.'s attacks on philosophers (e.g. 9.47), sexual transgression is coupled with hypocrisy. The evils associated with the medical profession, including sexual improprieties, are observed by Pliny *N.H.* 29.20; a general evaluation of doctors in Rome is provided by Huxley (1957: 132-8); for M.'s own treatment of medics see Sullivan (1991: 167-8) and Nixon (1927: 124-5); and for an amusing inversion, where a doctor's own wife is seduced, consider 4.9. Finally it may be worth recording that another name derived from Θέμις is Themisto, who likewise committed crimes against her closest relations. Themisto, like Medea or Procne, was an infamous, though unwitting, murderess of her own children; see Hyginus *Fab.* 1 & 4 and, for her limited representation in epigram, *A.L.* 61 (Shackleton Bailey 1982).

Schneidewin's (1842: *ad loc.*) *apparatus criticus* provides an interesting reading that has been omitted by subsequent *apparatus critici*: *Themis non*. The reading provided would not suit M.'s style as it would necessitate a hiatus, such as may be found in Ausonius' epigrams or those of the *Latina* but not a poet of M.'s capabilities. Nevertheless the balance of negatives applied to each use of *habere* in the first and second line would render a well-balanced epigram even more symmetrically attractive. A solution, to accommodate the negative *non*, could be found by selecting a metrically acceptable alternative to *Themison*

---

<sup>128</sup> It could also be added that, as Θέμις may be viewed as "custom" (equivalent to Latin *mores*), the name suggests that sexual misbehaviour is innate to the profession.

such as *Maro*, *Matho*, or *Philo*, all attested elsewhere in M.'s work. Although *Matho* is used on one occasion elsewhere in a sexual context (7.10.3-4) the other usages in M. (or the lawyer, called *Matho*, in Juvenal) do not particularly promote the characteristics sought for here; the use of *Maro* would obviously suggest Virgil, which is again not particularly illuminating. The final option *Philo* has more potential: through its etymology it would naturally concord with a sexual theme. The only attested usage in M. is provided at 5.47 in a monodistich, which contains resonances (though not concerning depravity) to 12.20:

*Numquam se cenasse domi Philo iurat, et hoc est:  
non cenat, quotiens nemo vocavit eum.*

If the negative *non* recorded in Schneidewin were added, it would of course limit the possible interpretations of the epigram considerably: *Fabullus, you ask why someone doesn't have a wife, he does not have a sister*. Consequently that would leave only three interpretations: 1) that the character is so unappealing he could only resort to incest to be considered wed; 2) that the attack is directed at a man as the epitome of an alien cultural practice, e.g. Egypt's distinction for brother/sister unions; 3) that *sororem* should be interpreted as "a girlfriend"; this would lend an absurd form of logic to the poem: "you ask why he does not have a wife? He does not even have a girlfriend!" Although the choice of *Themison* is a reading which is almost certainly correct and should not be obscured, Schneidewin's reading is by no means as insignificant and vacuous as later editors seem to have concluded; here as elsewhere his fuller *apparatus* prompts a wealth of profitable speculation.

**sororem:** In the present instance *sororem* could, despite Housman's refutation and Watson and Watson's (2003: 256-7) reiteration, be somewhat ambiguous. It is, of course, obvious that the joke works best with the harshest, and most evident, interpretation of *soror* as a sister; see Wolff (2008: 64) and Richlin (1992: 246, *note* 44) for the use of *soror* and *frater* to denote incest in M. Thus this will be comparable to the Gellius cycle found in Catullus; see Watson (2006: 35-48). Although incestuous relationships are not treated often by M. they are evidenced at 2.4 and 4.16 (both concerning mother/son incest).<sup>129</sup> On the comparison of *uxor* and *soror* the alternative reading at 4.45.5-6 may be considered:

*sic te tua diligit uxor  
gaudeat et certa virginitate soror*

---

<sup>129</sup> It has also been proposed by L. Watson (1983: 260-4) that Rufus in 1.68 is incestuously enamoured of his stepmother, Naevia. This contention is an interesting interpretation of 1.68 and well argued by Watson; see Morelli (2009: 43), however, for a convincing critique of Watson's position.

The above often has *arbor* instead of *uxor* and its context - Apollo is requested to provide assistance for Parthenius' son - seems to suggest the orthodox reading is sound. It should, in the present context, be considered worthy of comment though; for further see Moreno Soldevila (2006: 337). *Soror* could, however, also suggest "a girlfriend" or a *turpis amica*; this would make the joke a little softer of course and would to some extent involve the primary meaning of *soror* as a sly darker reading: "Why doesn't Themison have a wife? He has a relation ... ship." This is the way Forcellini's dictionary (II 1b) interprets the present passage (and 2.4 also, along with Petron. *Sat.* 127). Given the uses of *soror* to describe those who pursue the same religious practices or things of the same type (Forcellini II 1d-e, II 2b) and the habit of some other European languages to dub nurses "sister", it may be a joke about the seediness of medical practitioners as a type: "Why does Themison not have a wife, he has his nurse instead." It has been particularly frustrating that no such usage has been discovered in classical Latin, but there is just enough in the evidence above to offer it as a tentative suggestion. Finally it may be worth noting as an aside that *soror* in Christian Latin functions as a synonym for *uxor*; see Forcellini, I 3. For a comparable use of *frater*, functioning as a synonym for *maritus*, see Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 32.10 with Bush and Cerutti (1986: 37-9).

For the use of the word at the end of a poem to serve the point, compare 2.4.8 and 10.65.15. Traditional placement and rhetoric meet happily here: *sororem* was always going to be the last word in this epigram as in M.'s hendecasyllables (11 usages) and his elegiacs (17 usages) the declined cases of *soror* always occur at the end of the line; the exception is reserved for the nominative singular in which case it features on the 7th-8th syllables in the hendecasyllables (2.4.3 and 10.98.4) and can appear in the first hemistich of the pentameter at 11.4.4. In the choliambic poems it is placed on the 3rd-5th syllables (i.e. spreading the first and second metra) in its 3 usages. This placement is by no means particular to M.; Statius' *Silvae* provide the same results: *soror* in its declined cases is always the last word in a line. Catullus differs slightly as at C. 100.3 *sororem* spans the 2nd and 3rd feet of a hexametric line, but the other 5 usages conform to the observations above.

It may also be of interest to observe something odd about M.'s use of *soror*: since M. often makes the distinction between his work and mythological epic or tragedy (e.g. 10.4) it is noteworthy that of the 31 instances of the noun in M. there are only 8 examples in 6 poems which refer to actual human characters (2.4.3&7&8; 6.39.18; 8.32.5; 10.98.4; 12.20.2; 12.32.5); elsewhere there are 20 mythological references: 8 for the Muses (1.70.15; 1.76.3; 2.22.1; 4.14.1; 4.31.5; 5.6.18; 8.3.9; 9.42.3); 5 for the Fates (4.54.9; 4.73.3; 6.58.7; 9.76.6; 11.36.3); 3 for Diana (4.45.6; 9.34.5; 11.4.4); 1 for Helle (8.50.10); 1 for Helen of Troy (9.103.4); 1 for Juno (11.4.4) and 1 for local deities at Antium (5.1.3). To complete the usages there are 2 examples where *soror* refers to objects: at 8.81.6 *sorores* (and *fratres*) are used figuratively to denote the pearls which Gellia adores, at 14.148.2 *sorores* describe



rugs sewn together to form a large blanket; finally at 10.65.15 *soror* signifies a demeaning form of address to an effeminate man. The use of *frater* in M. is not comparable, it frequently refers to actual characters. In his use of *soror* M. is much closer to Statius' *Silvae* than Catullus' poems. With the exception of C. 64, where one expects mythological usages, the other three Catullan examples of *soror* in the epigrams proper refer to human characters: 88.1; 89.2; 100.3. Statius by contrast has only two uses of *soror* for human characters (*Silv.* 2.1.33 and 2.6.5) compared to 19 for mythological figures.

## Bibliography

### Editions and Translations of Martial

de Blavis, T. (1483) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammata*. Venice.

Dolç Dolç, M. (1955) *M. Val. Marcial Epigrames*. Barcelona.

Farnaby, T. (1615) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri*. London.

Fernández Valverde, J. & Ramírez de Verger (1997) *Marcial Epigramas*. Madrid.

Friedländer, L. (1886) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Leipzig.

Gallet, G. (1701) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammata*. Amsterdam.

Giarratano, C. (1919) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Turin.

Gilbert, W. (1885) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Leipzig.

Heraeus, W. (1982) *Martialis recognovit W. Heraeus, editionem correctiorem curavit I. Borovskij*. Leipzig.

Ianssonius, I. (1654) *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammata*. Amsterdam.

Izaac, H. J. (1961) *Martial Epigrammes*. Paris.

Lindsay, W. M. (1903) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammata*. Oxford.

Ker, W. C. A. (1919) *Martial Epigrams*. London.

Michie, J. (1978) *Martial. The Epigrams*. Harmondsworth.

Nisbet, G. (2015) *Martial. Epigrams with Parallel Latin Text*. Oxford.

Schneidewin, F. W. (1842) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Grimae.

Shackleton Bailey (1989) *Marcus Valerius Martialis epigrammata*. Munich / Leipzig.

Shackleton Bailey (1993) *Martial Epigrams*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Valpy, A.J. (1822) *Marci Valerii Martialis Epigrammata ex editione Bipontina cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini variis lectionibus notis variorum recensu editionum et codicum et indice locupletissimo accurate recensiti*. London.

### **Commentaries on Martial**

Bowie, M. N. R. (1988) *Martial, Book XII: A Commentary*. Oxford (Diss).

Buongiovanni, C. (2012) *Gli Epigrammata Longa Del Decimo Libro di Marziale: Introduzione, Testo, Traduzione e Commento*. Florence.

Canobbio, A. (2011) *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber quintus*. Naples.

Citroni, M. (1975) *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus. Introduzione, testo, apparato critico e commento*. Florence.

Coleman, K. M. (2006) *M. Valerii Martialis liber spectaculorum. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Craca, C. (2011) *Dalla Spagna. Gli epigrammi 1-33 del XII libro di Marziale*. Bari.

Fusi, A. (2006) *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber tertius. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento*. Hildesheim.

Galán Vioque, G. (2002) *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary, translated by J. J. Zoltowski*. Leiden.

Grewing, F. (1997) *Martial, Buch VI: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen.

Heil, A. & Damschen, G. (2004) *Marcus Valerius Martialis. Epigrammaton liber decimus. Das zehnte Epigrammbuch. Text, Übersetzung, Interpretationen. Mit einer Einleitung, Martial-Bibliographie und einen rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Anhang*. Frankfurt am Main.

Henriksén, C. (2012) *A Commentary on Martial, Epigrams Book 9*. Oxford.

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

Howell, P. (1995) *Martial Epigrams V: Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.

Leary, T. J. (1996) *Martial Book XIV: The Apophoreta. Text with Introduction and Commentary*. London.

Leary, T. J. (2001) *Martial Book XIII: The Xenia. Text with Introduction and Commentary*. London.

Kay, N. M. (1985) *Martial Book XI: A Commentary*. London.

Moreno Soldevila, R. (2006) *Martial, Book IV: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Paley, F. A. & Stone, W. H. (1898) *M. Val. Martialis epigrammata selecta*. London.

Schöffel, C. (2002) *Martial, Buch 8: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Stuttgart.

Stephenson, H. M. (1914) *Martial: Select Epigrams*. London.

Watson, L. & Watson, P. (2003) *Martial: Select Epigrams*. Cambridge.

Williams, C. A. (2004) *Martial: Epigrams Book Two, Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Williams, C. A. (2011) *A Martial Reader. Selections from the Epigrams*. Mundelein.

### **Editions and Commentaries on Other Greek and Latin Authors Cited in the Commentary**

Barsby, J. (1991) *Ovid Amores I. Edited with Translation and Running Commentary*. London.

Booth, J. (2007) *Ovid Amores II. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.

Brown, P. M. (1993) *Horace Satires I with an Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.

Cameron, A. (1976) *Flavius Cresconius Corippus: In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*. London.

Camps, W. A. (1961) *Propertius Elegies Book I*. Cambridge.

Canali, L & Nocchi, F. R. (2011) *Epigrammata Bobiensia*. Rubbettino.

Clack, J. (1999) *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum: The Poems*. Wauconda.

Coleman, K. (1998) *Statius Silvae IV*. London.

Courtney, E. (2013) *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. Oxford.

Damon, C. (2003) *Tacitus Histories Book I*. Cambridge.

Duff, J. D. (1958) *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura liber primus. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Index.* Cambridge.

Edward, W. A. (1928) *Seneca the Elder Suasoriae.* London.

Ellis, R. (1887) *The Fables of Avianus. Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary Excursus, and Index.* Oxford.

Ellis, R. (1889) *A Commentary on Catullus.* Oxford.

Fordyce, C. J. (1961) *Catullus. A Commentary.* Oxford.

Frazer, J. G. (1929) *Fastorum Libri Sex. The Fasti of Ovid Volume 2: Commentary on Books 1 and 2.* Cambridge (2015 reprint).

Green, R. P. H. (1991) *The Works of Ausonius, Edited with Introduction and Commentary.* Oxford.

Hollis, A. S. (2007) *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC - AD 20.* Oxford.

Jones, B. W. (1996) *Suetonius: Domitian.* London.

Kay, N. M. (2001) *Ausonius, Epigrams. Text with Introduction and Commentary.* London.

Kay, N. M. (2006) *Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina. Text, Translation and Commentary.* London.

Keil, H. (1874) *Grammatici Latini. Volume 6: scriptores artis metricae.* Cambridge (2009 reprint).

Kenney, E. J. (1996) *Ovid Heroides 16-21.* Cambridge.

Leary, T. J. (2014) *Symphosius The Aenigmata: an Introduction, Text and Commentary.* London.

- Lindsay, W. M. (1903) *Nonii Marcelli De conpendiosa doctrina libros XX*. Leipzig.
- Mackail, J. W. (1906) *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. London.
- Mankin, D. (1995) *Horace Epodes*. Cambridge.
- McKeown, J. C. (1987) *Ovid Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*. Liverpool.
- Morel, W. (1927) *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* Stuttgart.
- Morton Braund, S. (2008) *Juvenal Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Muecke, F. (1993) *Horace Satires II with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1980) *Tibullus I*. London.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1994) *Tibullus II*. Oxford.
- Newlands, C. E. (2011) *Statius: Silvae II*. Cambridge.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. & Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book I*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. & Hubbard, M. (1978) *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book II*. Oxford (2004 reprint).
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R. M. & Richmond, I. A. (1967) *Tacitus: Agricola. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Page, D. (1978) *The Epigrams of Rufinus*. Cambridge.

Quinn, K. (1973) *Catullus. The Poems*. London

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1982) *Anthologia Latina*. Stuttgart.

Sherwin White, A. N. (1967) *Fifty Letters of Pliny. Selected and Edited with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford.

Smith, M.S. (1974) *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis*. Oxford.

Thomas, R. F. (2011) *Horace Odes Book IV and carmen saeculare*. Cambridge.

van Dam, H. J. (1984) *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II. A Commentary*. Leiden.

Watson, L. & Watson, P. (2014) *Juvenal Satire 6*. Cambridge.

West, D. (1995) *Horace Odes I carpe diem. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.

West, D. (1998) *Horace Odes II vatis amici. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.

West, D. (2002) *Horace Odes III dulce periculum. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.

### **Monographs Referenced in the Commentary**

Adams, A. J. (1975) *The Nature of Martial's Epigrams*. (Diss.) Indiana University.

Adams, J.N. (1982) *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.

Adams, J. N. (2013) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Ajasson de Grandsagne, M. (1829) *Histoire naturelle de Pline*. Paris.

Anderson, J. K. (1985) *Hunting in the Ancient World*. Berkeley.



Andre, J. M. (1962) *Recherches sur l'Otium Romain*. Paris.

Aymard, J. (1951) *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines a la fin du siècle des Antonins (Cynegetica)*. Paris.

Balland, A. (2010) *Essai sur la société des épigrammes de Martial*. Bordeaux.

Bannon, C.J. (1997) *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal "Pietas" in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*. Princeton, New Jersey.

Beard, M. (2014) *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking Up*. Berkeley.

Bennett, J. (1997) *Trajan, Optimus Princeps*. London.

Boyce, B. (1991) *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*. Leiden.

Cairns, F. (2007) *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry: Corrected and with New Material*. Ann Arbor.

Cairns, F. (2016) *Hellenistic Epigram: Contexts of Exploration*. Cambridge.

Carrington, A. G. (1960) *Aspects of Martial's Epigrams*. Eton.

Casson, L. (1979) *Travel in the Ancient World*. London.

Casson, L. (2002) *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven.

Cockayne, K. (2003) *Experiencing Old Age in Ancient Rome*. London and New York.

Colton, R. E. (1991) *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams: A Study of Literary Influence*. Amsterdam.

Craig, V. J. (1912) *Martial's Wit and Humor*. Philadelphia.

Crow, J. A. (1985) *Spain: The Root and the Flower. An Interpretation of Spain and the Spanish People, Third Edition, Expanded, and Updated*. Berkeley (2005 reprint).

Curchin, L. A. (1991) *Roman Spain: Conquest and Assimilation*. London.

Dalby, A. (2000) *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World*. London.

Dansey, W. (1831) *Arrian on Coursing: the Cynegeticus of the Younger Xenophon, Translated from the Greek, with Classical and Practical Annotations, and a Brief Sketch of the Life and Writings of the Author. To Which is Added an Appendix, Containing Some Account of the Canes Venatici of Classical Antiquity*. London.

de Vaan, M. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden.

Dickey, E. (2002) *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.

Dickey, E. (2016) *Learning Latin the Ancient Way: Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World*. Cambridge.

Dolç Dolç, M. (1953) *Hispania y Marcial*. Barcelona.

Drew Griffiths, R. & Marks, R. B. (2007) *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Agora: Ancient Greek and Roman Humour*. Kingston, Ontario.

Eck, W. (1970) *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian*. Munich.

Ernout, A. & Meillet, A. (1939) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.

Fain, G. L. (2008) *Writing Epigrams. The Art of Composition in Catullus, Callimachus and Martial*. Brussels.

Fain, G. L. (2010) *Ancient Greek Epigrams: Major Poets in Verse Translation*. Berkeley.

- Fantazzi, C. (2012) *Michael Marullus: Poems*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Fayer, C. (1976) *Il culto della dea Roma - Origine e diffusione*. Pescara.
- Fenger, R. (1906) *De metonymiae in epigrammatis Martialis usu*. Jena.
- Ferguson, J. (1987) *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal*. Brussels.
- Fitzgerald (2007) *Martial. The World of the Epigram*. Chicago.
- Forcellini, E. (1771) *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*. Padua.
- Frank, T. (1928) *Catullus and Horace: Two Poets in Their Environment*. New York.
- Garland, R. (1995) *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World*. Ithaca, New York.
- Giarratano, C. (1908) *De M. Val. Martialis Re Metrica*. Naples.
- Giegengack, J. M. (1969) *Significant Names in Martial*. New Haven.
- Gilbert, W. (1883) *Ad Martialem quaestiones criticae*. Dresden.
- Gildersleeve, B.L. & Gonzalez Lodge (1895) *Latin Grammar*. London (2005: reprint).
- Goldsworthy, A.K. (2006) *Caesar: Life of a Colossus*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Gowers, E. (1993) *The Loaded Table. Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford.
- Grainger, J. D. (2004) *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of AD 96-99*. London.

- Grimm, J. (1883) *Teutonic Mythology: Volume 3. Translated by J. S Sallybrass (2013)*. Cambridge.
- Halporn, J. W., Ostwald, M. & Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1963) *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. Strand.
- Hardie, P. (2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1964) *Le monosyllable dans l'hexamètre latin. Essai de métrique verbale*. Paris.
- Hennig, J. L. (2003) *Martial*. Paris.
- Heyworth, S. J. (2007) *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Hightet, G. (1954) *Juvenal: The Satirist*. Oxford.
- Holzberg, N. (2012) *Martial und das antike Epigramm. Eine Einführung 2. Auflage*. Darmstadt.
- Howell, P. (2009) *Martial*. London.
- Humez, J. M. (1971) *The Manners of Epigram: A Study of the Epigram Volumes of Martial, Harington, and Jonson*. Yale (Diss.).
- Janson, T. (1964) *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm.
- Johannsen, N. (2006) *Dichter über ihre Gedichte*. Göttingen.
- Jones, B. W. (1992) *The Emperor Domitian*. London.
- Kajanto, I (1965) *The Latin Cognomina*. Helsinki.

Keil, H. (1874) *Grammatici Latini. Volume 6: Scriptores Artis Metricae*. Cambridge (2009: reprint).

Laurens, P. (2012) *L'Abeille dans l'Ambre: Célébration de l'Épigramme de l'Époque Alexandrine à la Fin de la Renaissance*. Paris.

Lausberg, H. (1998) *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Foreword by G. A. Kennedy, Translated by M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D. E. Orton; Edited by D. E. Orton & R. D. Anderson. Leiden.

Lavan, M. (2013) *Slaves To Rome: Paradigms Of Empire In Roman Culture*. Cambridge.

Lindsay, W.M. (1894) *The Latin Language: An Historical Account Of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions*. Oxford.

Lindsay, W. M. (1903) *The Ancient Editions of Martial: With Collations of the Berlin & Edinburgh Manuscripts*. Oxford.

Livingstone, N. & Nisbet, G. (2010) *Epigram*. Cambridge.

Lorenz, S. (2002) *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser*. Tübingen.

Lowther, H. S. (1906) *Notes on the Syntax of Martial*. Lancaster.

Marina Sáez, R. M. (1998) *La métrica de los epigramas de Marcial*. Zaragoza.

McMahon Humez, J. (1971) *The Manners of Epigram: A Study of the Epigrams of Martial, Harington, and Jonson*. (Diss.) Yale University.

Mellor, R. (1975) *Θεὰ Πώμη. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Göttingen.

Mindt, N. (2013) *Martials "epigrammatischer Kanon"*. München.

Morgan, L. (2010) *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford.

- Naether, C. (1967) *The Book of the Domestic Rabbit*. New York.
- Nauta, R. (2002) *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden.
- Nisbet, G. (2003) *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire. Martial's Forgotten Rivals*. Oxford.
- Nixon, P. (1927) *Martial and the Modern Epigram*. New York.
- Paoli, U. E.; R.D. Macnaghten (tr.) (1990) *Rome: Its People, Life and Customs*. London.
- Pertsch, E. (1911) *De Valerio Martiale Graecorum poetarum imitatore*. Berlin.
- Phillips, R. (2014) *Alcohol: A History*. North Carolina.
- Pichon, R. (1902) *De Sermone Amatorio apud Latinos Elegiarum Scriptores*. Paris.
- Pinto Andrade, J. P. (2011) *Dendrochronology Applied to the Humanities: Dendrochronological Analysis of Historical and Archaeological Timbers from the Netherlands*. Coimbra (Diss.).
- Platnauer, M. (1951) *Latin Elegiac Verse. A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid*. Cambridge (2013 reprint).
- Platner, S. B. and Ashby, T. (1926) *A Topographical Dictionary of Rome*. Oxford.
- Postgate, J. P. (1923) *Prosodia Latina*. Oxford.
- Rapezzi, P. (2008) *Marco Valerio Marziale. Temi e forme degli epigrammi*. Borgomanero.
- Raven, D. S. (1965) *Latin Metre*. London.
- Richardson Jr., L. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.

Richlin, A. (1992) *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality & Aggression in Roman Humor, Revised Edition*. New York and Oxford.

Riley, H.T. (1891) *A Dictionary of Latin and Greek Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims, and Mottos, Classical and Medieval*. London.

Rimell, V. (2009) *Martial's Rome. Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.

Rollason, N. K. (2016) *Gifts of Clothing in Late Antique Literature*. London / New York.

Ronning, C. (2007) *Herrscherpanegyrik unter Trajan und Konstantin*. Tübingen.

Salemme, C. (1976) *Marziale e la poetica degli oggetti: struttura dell'epigramma di Marziale*. Naples.

Scherf, J. (2001) *Untersuchungen zur Buchgestaltung Martials*. Leipzig.

Siedschlag, E. (1977) *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*. Berlin.

Siedschlag, E. (1979) *Martial-Konkordanz*. Hildesheim / New York.

Speer, J. H. (2010) *Fundamentals of Tree-ring Research*. Tucson.

Spisak, A. L. (2007) *Martial: A Social Guide*. London.

Sullivan, J. P. (1991) *Martial the Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge.

Sullivan, J. P. & Boyle, A. J. (1996) *Martial in English*. London.

Swann, B. W. (1994) *Martial's Catullus. The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. Hildesheim.

Tate, J. (1835) *Richmond Rules to Form the Ovidian Distich with Some Hints on the Transition to the Virgilian Hexameter*. London.

Torelli, Mario (1995) *Studies In The Romanisation Of Italy. Edited and Translated by H. Fracchia & M. Gualtieri*. Alberta.

Vallat, D. (2008) *Onomastique, Culture et Société dans les Épigrammes de Martial*. Bruxelles.

Van Dam, R. (2008) *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. Cambridge.

Vatri, A. (2017) *Orality and Performance in Classical Attic Prose: A Linguistic Approach*. Oxford.

Walde, A. & Hofmann, J. B. (1930) *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.

Watson, L. C. & Watson, P. (2015) *Martial*. London.

Winbolt, S. E. (1903) *Latin Hexameter Verse: An Aid to Composition*. London.

Wolff, E. (2008) *Martial ou l'apogée de l'épigramme*. Rennes.

Zanda, E. (2013) *Fighting Hydra-like Luxury. Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic*. London.

### **Articles Referenced in the Commentary**

Alvar Ezquerro, A. (1986) "Marcial visto desde sí mismo". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.71-86.

Anderson, W. S. (1970) "Lascivia vs. Ira: Martial and Juvenal". *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 3, 1-34.

Ascher, L. (1977) "Was Martial Really Unmarried?". *Classical World* 70, 441-444.

Baldwin, B. (1967) "Opimian Wine". *American Journal of Philology* 88, 73-5.



Baldwin, B. (1972) "Three Characters in Juvenal". *Classical World* 66, 101-04.

Ballester, X. & Quinn, R. (2002) "Letter to the Editor. Cuniculus Rabbit A Celtic Etymology". *World Rabbit Science* 10, 127-9.

Barwick, K. (1958) "Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleinen Gedichten des Catull". *Philologus* 87, 63-79.

Batinski, E. E. & Clarke, W. M. (1996) "Word-Patterning in the Latin Hendecasyllable". *Latomus* 55, 63-77.

Batstone, W. W. (1998) "Dry Pumice and the Programmatic Language of Catullus 1". *Classical Philology* 93, 125-35.

Batty, R. B. (1994) "On Getic and Sarmatian Shores: Ovid's Account of the Danube Lands". *Historia* 43, 88-111.

Bell Jr., A. A. (1984) "Martial's Daughter?" *Classical World* 78, 21-4.

Bellinger, A. R. (1928) "Martial, the Suburbanite". *Classical Journal* 23, 425-35.

Best Jr., E. E. (1969) "Martial's Readers in the Roman World". *Classical Journal* 64, 208-12.

Bishop, J. D. (1972) "Catullus 76: Elegy or Epigram?". *Classical Philology* 67, 293-4.

Boom, D. (2010) "The *Vernae Caprenses*: Traces of Capri's Imperial History After Tiberius". *Papers of the British School at Rome* 78, 133-43.

Braund, D. (1983) "Treasure-Trove and Nero". *Greece and Rome* 30, 65-9.

Bruno, V. J. (1973) "The Mystery of the Etruscan Coastline". *Archaeology* 26, 198-212.

- Buchheit, V. (1960) "Feigensymbolik im Antiken Epigramm". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 103, 200-29.
- Bush, A. C. & Cerutti S. (1986) "A Use of the Term Frater in the *Pro Caelio*". *Classical Journal* 82, 37-9.
- Butterfield, D. J. (2008) "The Poetic Treatment of atque from Catullus to Juvenal". *Mnemosyne* 61, 386-413.
- Byrne, S. N. (2004) "Martial's Fiction: Domitius Marsus and Maecenas". *Classical Quarterly* 54, 255-65.
- Cameron, A. (1995) "Ancient Anagrams". *American Journal of Philology* 116, 477-84.
- Campbell, D. B. (1989) "A Chinese Puzzle for the Romans". *Historia* 38, 371-6.
- Canter, H.V. (1922) "*Fortuna* in Latin Poetry". *Studies in Philology* 19, 64-82.
- Carrington, A. G. (1972) "Martial". In D. R. Dudley (ed.) *Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I*. London, 236-71.
- Chambert, R. (2004) "L'Espagne de Lucain et de Martial". In J. M. André *Hispanité et romanité*. Madrid.
- Charles, M. (2002) "*Calvus Nero*: Domitian and the Mechanics of Predecessor Denigration". *Acta Classica* 45, 19-49.
- Charles, M. (2006) "*Domitianus* 1.1: Nerva and Domitian". *Acta Classica* 49, 79-87.
- Clement, W. K. (1900) "Prohibitives in Silver Latin". *American Journal of Philology* 21, 154-69.
- Coleman, K. (2005) "Martial Book 6: A Gift for the *Matronalia*?". *Acta Classica* 48, 23-35.

Coleman, R.G.G. (1999) "Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse and the Poetic Register". In J.N. Adams & R.G. Mayer (eds.) *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford, 21-96.

Colombo, M. (2013) "I liberti imperiali negli *Epigrammaton libri* di Marco Valerio Marziale". *Wiener Studien* 126, 145-76.

Colton, R. E. (1971) "Some Rare Words Used by Martial and Juvenal". *Classical Journal* 67, 55-7.

Courtney, E. (1965) "Ovidian and non-Ovidian *Heroides*". *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 12, 63-66.

Crowther, N. B. (1976) "Parthenius and Roman Poetry". *Mnemosyne* 29, 65-71.

Crowther, N. B. (1978) "Horace, Catullus, and Alexandrianism". *Mnemosyne* 31, 33-44.

Crowther, N. B. (1979) "Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration". *Mnemosyne* 32, 1-11.

Curchin, L.A. (2003) "Whose Hair Wants Cutting in Martial 12.18?". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 146, 222-24.

d'Arbois de Jubainville, H. (1891) "La civilisation commune aux celtes et aux Germains pendant le V<sup>e</sup> et le IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.C.". *Revue Archéologique* 17, 187-213.

Deneffe, A. (1919) "Das Wort *satisfactio*". *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 43, 158-75.

Dolç Dolç, M. (1986) "Marcial, entre *Roma* y *Bilbilis*". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.9-22.

Dorcey, P. F. (1989) "*Silvanus Villicus?*". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 79, 293-5.

Doty, R. E. (2001) "Romans and Rabbits: Saliens de Tramite Cuniculorum" *Classical Outlook* 78, 151-2.

- Durand, R. (1946) "In Martialem". *Latomus* 5, 257-61.
- Dyson, S. L. (1995) "Horace, Martial, and Rome: Two Poetic Outsiders Read the Ancient City". *Arethusa* 28, 245-63.
- Eden, P. T. (2001) "Marginalia on Martial". *Mnemosyne* 54, 582-6.
- Edwards, C. (1821) "Latin Epigram and Translations: Charles Edwards". *Cambro-Briton* 2, 413-4.
- Edwards, J. (2001) "Philology and Cuisine in *De Re Coquinaria*". *American Journal of Philology* 122, 255-63.
- Edwards, R. (2008) "Hunting for Boars with Pliny and Tacitus". *Classical Antiquity* 27, 35-58.
- Ehrhardt, C. T. H. R. (1987) "Nerva's Background". *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 12, 18-20.
- Enenkel, K. A. E. (2009) "Introduction: The Neo-Latin Epigram: Humanist Self-Definition in a Learned and Witty Discourse". In S. De Beer, K. A. E. Enenkel & D. Rijser (eds.) *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre*. Leuven, 1-23.
- Fabre, G. (1994) "Affranchis et esclaves impériaux sous Domitien". *Pallas* 40, 337-55.
- Feeney, D. (2009) "Catullus and the Roman Paradox Epigram". *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 61, 29-39.
- Fear, A. T. (2000) "Prehistoric and Roman Spain". In R. Carr (ed.) *Spain. A History*. Oxford.
- Fearnley, H. (2003) "Reading the Imperial Revolution: Martial, Epigrams 10". In A. J. Boyle & W. J. Dominik (eds.) *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden, 613-36.
- Ferguson, J. (1970) "A Note on Catullus' Hendecasyllables". *Classical Philology* 65, 173-5.
- Finley, M. I. (1981) "The Elderly in Classical Antiquity" *Greece and Rome* 28, 156-71.

Fiske, G. C. (1900) "Notes on the Worship of the Roman Emperors in Spain". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 11, 101-39.

Fletcher, G. B. A. (1961) "Propertiana". *Latomus* 20, 85-92.

Fletcher, G. B. A. (1983) "On Martial". *Latomus* 42, 404-11.

Fletcher, R. (2000) "The Early Middle Ages". In R. Carr (ed.) *Spain: A History*. Oxford, 63-89.

Fögen, T. (2009) "Flavius ultimus: Juvenals Auseinandersetzung mit der Zeit Domitians". In F. Felgentreu, F. Mundt, N. Rücker (Hrsg.) *Per attentam Caesaris aurem: Satire - die unpolitische Gattung?*. Tübingen, 167-191.

Fögen, T. (2014) "Sprache und Kommunikation als Gegenstand der Satiren Juvenals". *L'Antiquité Classique* 83, 79-99.

Fögen, T. (2017) "Gattungsvielfalt in den Briefen des Jüngeren Plinius". *Gymnasium* 124, 21-60.

Fontán Pérez, A. (1986) "Estacio y Marcial: Dos vates contemporáneos, dos poeticas opuestas". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.339-55.

Forster, E. S. (1936) "Trees and Plants in Homer". *Classical Review* 50, 97-104.

Forster, E. S. (1950) "Columella and His Latin Treatise on Agriculture". *Greece and Rome* 19, 123-8.

Fox, B. L. (1961) "Latin and the Epigram". *Classical Outlook* 47, 76-8.

Frank, T. (1919) "Cicero and the *Poetae Novi*". *American Journal of Philology* 40, 396-415.

Friedrich, G. (1908) "Zu Martial". *Hermes* 43, 619-637.

Friedrich, G. (1910) "Zu Seneca und Martial". *Hermes* 45, 583-94.

Frost Abbott, F. (1907) "The use of language as a means of characterization in Petronius". *Classical Philology* 2, 43-50.

García-Hernández, B. (1986) "Estructuras Léxicas en los Epigramas de Marcial". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.237-58.

Geer, R. M. (1935) "On the Use of Ice and Snow for Cooling Drinks". *Classical Weekly* 29, 61-2.

Geysen, J. (2007) "Ovid's Addresses to the Book in *Tristia* 1.1". *Latomus* 66, 374-83.

Giangrande, G. (1967) "Symptotic Literature and Epigram". In A.E. Raubitschek (ed.) *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Geneva, 91-178.

Gilbert, W. (1885) "Beiträge zur Textkritik des Martial. II". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 40, 210-22.

Grebe, S. (2010) "Why Did Ovid Associate his Exile with a Living Death?". *Classical World* 103, 491-509.

Green, C. M. C. (1996) "Did the Romans Hunt?". *Classical Antiquity* 15, 222-60.

Grewing, F. (1998) "Etymologie und etymologische Wortspiele". In F.Grewing (ed) *Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart, 315-56.

Grimal, P. (1989) "Martial et la pensée de Sénèque". *Illinois Classical Studies* 14, 175-83.

Guillén Cabañero, J. (1986) "La Moralidad de Marcial". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.89-144.

Hack, R. K. (1914) "The Law of the Hendecasyllable". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 25, 107-15.

- Harkness, A. G. (1910) "The Final Monosyllable in Latin Prose and Poetry". *American Journal of Philology* 31, 154-74.
- Harris, H. A. (1974) "Lubrication in Antiquity". *Greece and Rome* 21, 32-6.
- Harvey, P. (1979) "Catullus 114-115: *Mentula, bonus agricola*". *Historia* 28, 329-45.
- Havet, L. (1903) "La Prose Métrique de Martial". *Revue de Philologie* 27, 123-4.
- Henriksén, C. (1997) "Earinus: An Imperial Eunuch in the Light of the Poems of Martial and Statius". *Mnemosyne* 50, 281-94.
- Henriksén, C. (1998) "Martial und Statius". In F. Grewing (ed.) *Toto notus in orbe*. Stuttgart, 77-118.
- Heraeus, W. (1915) "ΠΡΟΠΕΙΝ". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 70, 1-41.
- Herrmann, L. and Paladini, M. L. (1958) "Notes de Lecture". *Latomus* 17, 110-14.
- Heuvel, H. (1937) "*De inimicitiarum, quae inter Martialem et Statium fuisse diuntur, indiciis*". *Mnemosyne* 4, 299-330.
- Hewitt, J. W. (1921) "The Humor of the Greek Anthology". *Classical Journal* 17, 66-76.
- Hinds, S. (2007) "Martial's Ovid / Ovid's Martial". *Journal of Roman Studies* 97, 113-54.
- Holmes, N. (1995) "*Gaudia Nostra: A Hexameter-Ending in Elegy*". *Classical Quarterly* 45, 500-3.
- Holzberg, N. (2004/2005) "Martial, the book, and Ovid". *Hermathena* 177/8, 209-24.
- Howell, P. (1998) "Martial's Return to Spain". In F. Grewing (ed.) *Toto notus in orbe*. Stuttgart, 173-86.
- Housman, A. E. (1889) "Notes on Latin Poets". *Classical Review* 3, 199-201.

Housman, A. E. & Garrod, H. W. (1917) "The Thyestes of Varius". *Classical Quarterly* 11, 113-8.

Housman, A. E. (1919) "Nihil in Ovid". *Classical Review* 33, 56-9.

Houston, G. W. (1996) "Onesimus the Librarian". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 114, 205-8.

Hudson, N. A. (1989) "Food in Roman Satire". In S. H. Braund *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter.

Hughes, J. D. (1983) "How the Ancients Viewed Deforestation". *Journal of Field Archaeology* 10, 435-45.

Huxley, H. H. (1957) "Greek Doctor and Roman Patient". *Greece and Rome* 4, 132-8.

Immisch, O. (1911) "Zu Martial". *Hermes* 46, 481-517.

Jansen, J. (2009) "The Microcosmos of the Baroque Epigram: John Owen and Julien Waudré". In S. De Beer, K. A. E. Enenkel & D. Rijser (eds.) *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre*. Leuven, 275-300.

Jones, C. P. (1970) "Sura and Senecio". *Journal of Roman Studies* 60, 98-104.

Kay, N. M. (2010) "Colloquial Latin in Martial's Epigrams". In E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge, 318-30.

Kenney, E. J. (1982) "Ovid". In E. J. Kenney (ed.) *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Volume II, Part 3, The Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, 124-61.

Ker, A. (1950) "Some Explanations and Emendations of Martial". *Classical Quarterly* 44, 12-24.

Knox, P. E. (1985) "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 89, 107-19.



Knox, P. E. (1986) "Adjectives in -osus and Latin Poetic Diction". *Glotta* 64, 90-101.

Knox, P. (2006) "Big Names in Martial". *Classical Journal* 101, 299-300.

König, A. (2013) "Martial and Frontinus, under Nerva and Trajan". *Working Papers in Nervan, Trajanic and Hadrianic Literature* 1.11. (accessed online 04/10/2017; volume "Roman Literature under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions A.D. 96-138" to be published in 2018).

Krenkel, W. (2006) "*Pueri meritorii Romani*". In W. Krenkel *Naturalia non turpia: Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Hildesheim, 429-38.

La Penna, A. (1999) "*Immortale Falernum: Il Vino di Marziale e dei Poeti Latini del Suo Tempo*". *Maia* 51, 162-81.

Labarbe, J. (1967) "Aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque". A.E. Raubitschek (ed.) *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Genève, 349-86.

Lacey, W. K. (1970) "*Boni atque Improbi*". *Greece and Rome* 17, 3-16.

Laidlaw, W. A. (1968) "*Otium*". *Greece and Rome*, 42-52.

Leary, T. J. (1999) "Martial's Christmas Wine List". *Greece and Rome* 46, 34-41.

Lease, E. B. (1898) "Concessive Particles in Martial". *Classical Review* 12, 30-1.

Lease, E. B. (1898) "*I nunc* and *I* with Another Imperative". *American Journal of Philology* 19, 59-69.

Lease, E. B. (1901) "*Licet* and its Use". *New York Latin Leaflet* 1, 1-2.

Lease, E. B. (1902) "On the Use of *Neque* and *Nec* in Silver Latin". *Classical Review* 16, 212-14.

- Lee, F. H. (1914) "Etymological Tendencies of the Romans". *Classical Weekly* 7, 90-6.
- Lightfoot, C. S. (1990) "Trajan's Parthian War and the Fourth Century Perspective". *Journal of Roman Studies* 80, 115-26.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1904) "The Orthography of Martial's Epigrams". *Journal of Philology* 29, 24-60.
- Lindsell, A. (1937) "Was Theocritus a Botanist?". *Greece and Rome* 6, 78-93.
- Lintott, A. W. (1972) "Imperial Expansion and Moral Decline in the Roman Republic". *Historia* 21, 626-38.
- Longden, R. P. (1931) "Notes on the Parthian Campaigns of Trajan". *Journal of Roman Studies* 21, 1-35.
- Lorenz, S. (2004) "Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial's *Epigrammaton Liber Quartus*". *American Journal of Philology* 125, 255-78.
- Lucot, R. (1957) "*Domus Remi*: (Properce IV, 1 9-10)". *Pallas* 5, 63-70.
- MacKinnon, M. (2014) "Hunting". In G. L. Campbell (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*. Oxford, 203-15.
- Mader, G. (2010) "Big Game, Small Game, Poetic Game: the Artful Hunter at Propertius 2.19.17-26". *Hermes* 138, 288-95.
- Malnati, T.P. (1987) "Juvenal and Martial on Social Mobility". *Classical Journal* 83, 133-41.
- Mandaraki, E. (2012) "Imperial and Rhetorical Hunting in Pliny's *Panegyricus*". *Illinois Classical Studies*, 175-98.
- Manning, C. E. (1985) "*Liberalitas* - The Decline and Rehabilitation of a Virtue". *Greece and Rome* 32, 73-83.

Marconi, G. (1998) "Le Origini di *Centumcellae*". *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 40, 195-214.

Marsh, D. (2006/2007) "*Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*: Martial and Morality in the Quattrocento". *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 51/2, 199-209.

Mason, H. A. (1963) "Is Juvenal a Classic?". In J. P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire*. London, 93-177.

Mateu Areste, F. J. (1986) "Formas de Proyeccion del Enunciado Gnomico en Marcial". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 1.131-9.

Matheson, S.B. (1994) "The Goddess *Tyche*". S.B. Matheson (ed.) *An Obsession with Fortune: Tyche in Greek and Roman Art*. New Haven, 18-33.

Mayer, R. (1986) "Geography and Roman Poets". *Greece and Rome* 33, 47-54.

McCartney, E.S. (1947) "The Quoting of Proverbs and Maxims as a Social Grace and Fault". *Classical Weekly* 40, 74-6.

McDermott, W. C. & Orentzel, A. E. (1977) "Silius Italicus and Domitian". *American Journal of Philology* 98, 24-34.

McDonough, C. (2011) "Back in the Saddle Again (*CIL* 14.3911)". *Mnemosyne* 64, 653-9.

McGready, A. G. (1968) "Egyptian Words in the Greek Vocabulary". *Glotta* 46, 247-54.

McLeod, C. W. (2007) "Catullus 116". In J. H. Gaisser (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Catullus*. Oxford, 35-45 (article originally published in 1973).

Mendell, C. W. (1922) "Martial and the Satiric Epigram". *Classical Philology* 17, 1-20.

- Morelli, A. M. (2009) "Sighs of Lost Love: The Rufus Cycle in Martial (1.68 and 1.106)". *Classical Philology* 104, 34-49.
- Morton Braund, S. (1998) "Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny". In M. Whitby (ed.) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden, 53-76.
- Motto, A.L. & Clark, J.R. (1990) "Seneca on Drunkenness". *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 32, 105-110.
- Muss-Arnott, W. (1892) "On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 23, 35-156.
- Neger, M. (2009) "Review: Martial's Ecphrastic Epigrams: il migliore dei mondi possibili. Gli epigrammi ecfrastrici di Marziale per amici e protettori. (Studi e testi 26) by D. Fabbrini". *Classical Review* 59, 475-6.
- Nichols, E. W. (1929) "The Semantics of the Termination -ARIO-". *American Journal of Philology* 50, 40-63.
- Nock, A. D. (1926) "Intrare sub iugum". *Classical Quarterly* 20, 107-09.
- Norman, J. Tsu-lin Mei, Coblin, W. S. (2015) "Inner Asian Words for Paper and Silk". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 135, 309-17.
- Pagán, V. E. (2010) "The Power of the Epistolary Preface from Statius to Pliny". *Classical Quarterly* 60, 194-201.
- Pailler, J. M. (2005) "Platea <<le fer forgé>> des Celtibères? Un clin d'oeil de Martial". *Pallas* 67, 365-76.
- Palmer, A. (1874) "Coniectanea". *Hermathena* 1, 381-92.
- Palmer, L. R. (1938) "Macte, Mactare, Macula". *Classical Quarterly* 32, 57-62.
- Palmer, L. R. (1941) "Macte Mago?". *Classical Quarterly* 35, 52-7.

Parson, P. J. (2002) "Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram". In F. Montanari & L. Lehnus (eds.) *Entretiens Sur L'Antiquité Classique, Tome XLVIII: Callimaque*. Geneva, 99-142.

Penwill, J. (2015) "Compulsory Freedom: Literature in Trajan's Rome". In H. Baltussen & P.J. Davis (eds.) *The Art of Veiled Speech: Self-Censorship from Aristophanes to Hobbes*. Philadelphia, 176-208.

Petersen, H. (1962) "The Numerical *Praenomina* of the Romans". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93, 347-54.

Pitcher, R. A. (1984) "Flaccus, Friend of Martial". *Latomus* 43, 414-23.

Platner, S. B. (1907) "*Mons and Collis*". *Classical Philology* 2, 463-4.

Postgate, J. P. (1882) "Etymological Studies". *American Journal of Philology* 3, 329-39.

Postgate, J. P. (1921) "*De Nihilo Nihil*". *Classical Review* 35, 23-5.

Postgate, J. P. (1920) "On Some Quantities in Phaedrus". *Hermathena* 19, 52-63.

Puhvel, J. (1975) "*Remus et Frater*". *History of Religions* 15, 146-57.

Radice, B. (1968) "Pliny and the *Panegyricus*". *Greece and Rome* 15, 166-72.

Ramírez Sádaba (1993) "Teónimo y antrónimos nuevos en la provincia de Lusitania y zonas próximas". Untermann (ed.) *Lengua y Cultura en la Hispania Prerromana*. Salamanca.

Rauh, N. (1989) "Auctioneers and the Roman Economy". *Historia* 38, 451-71.

Reece, D. W. (1969) "The Technological Weakness of the Ancient World". *Greece and Rome* 16, 32-47.

Rendsburg, G. A. (2017) "The Etymology of *χάρτης* Papyrus Roll". *Scripta Classica Israelica* 36, 149-69.

- Rice, A. H. (1912) "Salvage and Losses from Latin Literature". *Classical Journal* 7, 204-11.
- Richlin, A. (1984) "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire". *Arethusa* 17, 67-80.
- Rodón Binué, E.(1986) "La Expresividad Léxica en Marcial". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 2.289-300.
- Rodriquez, M. T. (1981) "Il linguaggio erotico di Marziale". *Vichiana* 10, 91-117.
- Roman, L. (2010) "Martial and the City of Rome". *Journal of Roman Studies* 100, 88-117.
- Rumpf, A. (1951) "*Parrhasios*". *American Journal of Archaeology* 55, 1-12.
- Sadler, J. D. (1980) "Metaphor and Metonymy". *Classical Journal* 76, 157-60.
- Sage, E. T. (1919) "The Publication of Martial's Poems". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 50, 168-76.
- Scherf, J. (2008) "*Epigramma Longum* and the Arrangement of Martial's Book". In A. M. Morelli (ed.) *Epigramma Longum. Da Marziale alla tarda antichità. From Martial to Late Antiquity*. Cassino, 1.195-216.
- Schmeling, G. (1970) "Trimalchio's Menu and Wine List". *Classical Philology* 65, 248-51.
- Sedgwick, W. B. (1931) "Ancient Jeux d'Esprit and Poetical Eccentricities". *Classical Weekly* 24, 153-7.
- Segal, C. (1970) "Catullan *Otiosi*: The Lover and the Poet". In J. H. Gaisser (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Catullus*. Oxford (reprinted in 2007).
- Seth-Smith, A. (1981) "Parthenius and Erucius". *Mnemosyne* 34, 63-71.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1978) "Corrections and Explanations of Martial". *Classical Philology* 73, 273-96.

Skutsch, O & Rose, H. J. (1938) "*Mactare-Macula?*". *Classical Quarterly* 32, 220-3.

Skutsch, O. & Rose, H. J. (1942) "Once More *Macte*". *Classical Quarterly* 36, 15-20.

Solà Martín, M. A. (2015) "A propósito de los topónimos *Boterdus*, *Platea* y *Vadavero* de Marco Valerio Marcial. Argumentos para su reducción geográfica a Valdeherrera, Calatayud y Castillos de Armantes". *IX Encuentro de Estudios Bilbilitanos Calatayud*, 13-15 de noviembre de 2015 (pp.6-7 *ad Boterdus*; 7-9 *ad Platea*).

Solin, H. (2014) "*Analecta epigraphica CCXCII-CCCV*". *Arctos* 48: 347-415

Spaeth Jr., J. W. (1924) "The Daily Life of a Roman Gentleman in the First Century AD". *Classical Weekly* 17, 90-95.

Spaeth Jr., J. W. (1930) "Martial and Vergil". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 61, 19-28.

Stanley Jr., F. H. (2014) "Observations on Martial's Imagery of Provincial Spain". *Glotta* 90, 192-215.

Steele, R. B. (1918) "Roman Personal Names". *Classical Weekly* 11, 113-8.

Stégen, G. (1971) "Sur trois épigrammes de Martial (I,46; XII,14, XIV,71)". *L'Antiquité Classique* 40, 215-7.

Steiner, G. (1954) "Columella and Martial on Living in the Country". *Classical Journal* 50, 85-90.

Sturtevant, E. H. (1921) "On the Frequency of Short Words in Verse". *Classical Weekly* 15, 73-6.

Sullivan, J. P. (1979) "Was Martial Really Married? A Reply". *Classical World* 72, 238-9.

Sullivan, J.P. (1986) "The Social Structure of Martial's Epigrams". In *Actas del Simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, Poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma*. Zaragoza, 1.183-98.

Sullivan, J.P. (1989) "Martial's 'Witty Conceits': Some Technical Observations". *Illinois Classical Studies* 14, 185-99.

Syme, R. (1938) "The Allegiance of Labienus". *Journal of Roman Studies* 28, 113-25.

Syme, R. (1983) "Eight Consuls from *Patavium*". *Papers of the British School at Rome* 51, 102-24.

Syme, R. (1987) "Exotic Names, Notably in Seneca's Tragedies". *Acta Classica* 30, 49-64.

Syme, R. (1988) "Military Geography at Rome". *Classical Antiquity* 7, 227-51.

Szelest, H. (1980) "*ut faciam breviora mones epigrammata, Corde ...* Eine Martial-Studie". *Philologus* 124, 99-108.

Szelest, H. (1996) "*Perge, o libelle, Sirmium: Zu Auson. Ep. X Prete*". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 139, 334-43.

Tennant, P. M. W. (2000) "Poets and Poverty: The Case of Martial". *Acta Classica* 43, 139-56.

Thiele, G. (1911) "Spanische Ortsnamen bei Martial". *Glotta* 3, 257-66.

Thomson, J. O. (1951) "To the World's End". *Greece and Rome* 20, 137-9.

Toynbee, J. M. C. (1944) "Dictators and Philosophers in the 1st Century A.D." *Greece and Rome* 13, 43-58.

Tracey, V. A. (1971) "The Authenticity of *Heroides* 16-21". *Classical Journal* 66, 328-30.

Tracey, V. A. (1980) "*aut captantur aut captant*". *Latomus*, 399-402.



- Travis, A. H. (1952) "Monuments of Roman Spain". *Archaeology* 5, 3-10.
- Tzounakas, S. (2006) "The Personified Patria in Cicero's First Catilinarian: Significance and Inconsistencies". *Philologus* 150, 222-31.
- Vout, C. (1996) "The Myth of the Toga: Understanding the History of Roman Dress". *Greece and Rome* 43, 204-20.
- Walton, F. T. (1946) "My Lady's Toilet". *Greece and Rome* 15, 68-73.
- Warde Fowler, W. (1913) "Passing Under the Yoke". *Classical Review* 27, 48-51.
- Watson, L. (1983) "Three Women in Martial". *Classical Quarterly* 33, 258-64.
- Watson, L. (2005) "The Unity of Martial's Epigrams". In R. R. Nauta, H. J. van Dam & J. J. L. Smolenaars (eds.) *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden, 285-98.
- Watson, L. (2006) "Catullus and the Poetics of Incest". *Antichthon* 40, 35-48.
- Watson, P. (1999) "Martial on the Wedding of Stella and Violentilla". *Latomus* 58, 348-56.
- Watson, P. (2002) "The Originality of Martial's Language". *Glotta* 78, 222-57.
- Watson, P. (2003) "Martial's Marriage: A New Approach". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 146, 38-48.
- Watson, P. (2005) "Contextualising Martial's Metres". In R. R. Nauta, H. J. van Dam & J. J. L. Smolenaars (eds.) *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden, 285-98.
- Watt, W. S. (1975) "Propertius 4.1.9". *Classical Quarterly* 25, 155-6.
- Weaver, P. R. C. (1967) "Social Mobility in the Early Roman Republic: The Evidence of the Imperial Freedmen and Slaves". *Past and Present* 37, 3-20.

White, P. (1974) "The Presentation and Dedication of the *Silvae* and the Epigrams". *Journal of Roman Studies* 64, 40-61.

Whitehouse, D. (1999) "Glass in the Epigrams of Martial". *Journal of Glass Studies* 41, 73-81.

Whitmore, C. E. (1918) "Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram". *Classical Journal* 13, 616-20.

Wiesen, D. (1963) "Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction". *Latomus* 22, 440-71.

Wilkinson, G. A. (1948) "The Trisyllabic Ending of the Pentameter: its Treatment by Tibullus, Propertius, and Martial". *Classical Quarterly* 42, 68-75.

Wilson, H. L. (1898) "The Literary Influence of Martial Upon Juvenal". *American Journal of Philology* 19, 193-209.

Woodman, A. J. (1966) "Some Implications of *otium* in Catullus 51.13-16". *Latomus*, 217-26.

Woodman, A. J. (1983) "Juvenal 1 and Horace". *Greece and Rome* 30, 81-4.

Woods, D. (2009) "Curing Nero: A Cold Drink in Context". *Classics Ireland* 16, 40-8.

Woolf, G. (2003) "The City of Letters". In C. Edwards & G. Woolf (eds.) *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge.

Wright Duff, J. (1920) "Martial: Epigrams by Walter C. A. Ker". *Classical Review* 34, 176-7.

Zetzel, J. E. G. (1996) "Poetic Baldness and its Cure". *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 36, 73-100.

