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ABSTRACT

This thesis represents the first full-scale commentary on Book 10 of Martial’s Epigrams. Jenkins’ commentary on Book 10, a thesis from Cambridge in 1982, is the other detailed commentary on Book 10, but examines only 23 of the 104 epigrams from the book, selected according to significance or as being representative of broad categories and themes. My primary purpose is to present a literary analysis of the complete book, taking into account the literary tradition, and explaining the poems from a historical, social and political perspective. Most commentaries follow a traditional approach where the focus is investigation of the philological aspects of each epigram. These commentaries in their analysis of individual poems often fail to provide insight into Martial’s literary intentions for a particular poem, and the book as a coherent whole is generally not taken into consideration. My commentary provides an exploration of programmatic and structural issues which contribute to the book’s thematic continuity and unity. Aspects for consideration include the function and application of themes and motifs throughout the book, interrelationships of poems and their position within the book. Examination of these features is fundamental towards understanding Martial’s literary objectives in Book 10.
A commentary on Book 10 of Martial's Epigrams is much needed given the growing scholarly interest in Martial. It is also one of the few books of the corpus still lacking a full length commentary (the others being Books 3 and 4). I owe much to John Jenkins' 1982 Cambridge dissertation, which provides valuable literary and philological information but covers only 23 of the 104 poems (1-10; 20(19); 30; 34; 35; 38; 48; 50; 53; 61; 63; 72; 92; 101). Whilst this is the first commentary on the entire Book, such an endeavour is an ongoing process, and I cannot claim that my commentary covers all the possibilities within such a work, but I trust that it is sufficient within its own limitations.  

The present commentary departs somewhat from the more traditional form of commentaries which are primarily concerned with philological details, that is with aspects such as grammatical issues, syntactical oddities and lists of verbal parallels with other works. Philological scholarship does feature here, but my primary objective is rather to examine the book from a literary perspective, in particular thematic structure and continuity. Each epigram is assessed according to both its individual and intratextual impact. A critical emphasis on thematic development and coherence within an apparently heterogeneous collection, rather than an involvement with linguistic and grammatical detail, enables us to appreciate better, I believe, Martial's compositional techniques and literary aims across an entire volume.

Topics such as Martial's biographical details, his contribution to the epigrammatic tradition, general stylistic features of his epigrams, textual traditions and nachleben have been given thorough treatment elsewhere, not only in other

---

commentaries but also in full scale works on Martial’s life and writing, such as Sullivan’s *Martial: an Unexpected Classic* and Holzberg’s *Martial und das Antike Epigramm*. I simply refer the reader, therefore, to the readily available discussions on these issues in the books mentioned, concentrating instead on elements relating specifically to Book 10. I will provide in the introduction an overview of the most prominent themes of Book 10, but leave more detailed discussion for the commentary itself.

I wish to acknowledge all the help I have been given during the writing of this thesis. Firstly, I am greatly indebted to my supervisor John Garthwaite for his invaluable advice and insights, guidance and moral support. William Dominik co-supervised my work and I am grateful for his many useful suggestions and encouragement. I wish to express my gratitude towards the Classics Department faculty at the University of Otago for their support, both financial and motivational, throughout the production of this commentary. Thanks to my colleagues in the Postgraduate Office, especially Nick, for their contributions in the way of helpful and enlightening discussions, and also to Morag for providing continual technical assistance, encouragement, and, above all, friendship. I wish to thank my mother for her patience in undertaking the impossible task of proof-reading the entire manuscript and for which I am enormously grateful. Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to Alex for his support, understanding and friendship, and for being a constant source of inspiration.
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INTRODUCTION

1. THE DATE OF BOOK 10

The dating of Martial’s entire corpus has been covered quite comprehensively in numerous works, for which Friedlaender’s suggestions are the primary point of reference. With regard to Book 10, there is little disagreement on the estimated date of publication, but we must keep in mind that there were two editions, even though only the contents of the second revised edition survive today. Book 10 is the only volume to which Martial specifically refers as a revised edition of a work which has already been published (10.2). Book 9 was published in late 94 or early 95 CE which is therefore the *terminus post quem* for the first edition of Book 10. Martial published his volumes approximately a year apart, so it is estimated that the first edition of Book 10 appeared in December of 95. It is clear from imperial poems to Nerva in Book 11 (where he is clearly still alive) that Book 11 appeared before the second edition of Book 10, in which the emperor is now Trajan. This places Book 11 as the *terminus post quem* for the second edition of Book 10. We can assume therefore that, following the assassination of the emperor Domitian, the first edition was withdrawn for revision, and the second edition of the book was not published until after the death of Nerva in 98 and the accession of Trajan shortly thereafter. Therefore, the obvious

---

terminus ante quem for the date of the second edition is the reference in Book 12 that his last book was published three years prior. Book 12 is chronologically the next volume published after the second edition of Book 10 and was published either towards the end of 101 or at some point during 102. This three year hiatus is referred to in the opening epistle to Priscus: *scio me patrocinium debere contumacissimae trienni desidiae (12 praef.1).*

Trajan was proclaimed emperor on the death of Nerva on January 28, 98, *in absentia* in the Rhineland where he remained until he turned his campaigns towards the Danube at some point during 98; his return to Rome did not occur until the spring of 99. 4 10.6 and 7 refer to the anticipated arrival of the new emperor in Rome from his campaigns on the Rhine. Therefore, this edition of Book 10 was published at some point after his proclamation. 6 The book also announces Martial’s preparations to return to his homeland in Spain, and Jenkins suggests that for this reason he would not have travelled during the winter, which would place the book at some point during the summer of 98. 7

Book 10 is striking in that it is the only book in which Martial tells the reader that it has been revised for republication. Clearly, the motive for such withdrawal was the change of regime, although his stated reason in 10.2 is that the first edition was too hasty in its publication. It is a fair guess that poems in the original Book 10 that contained references to Domitian have been removed and replaced with poems that paid tribute to the new regime under the emperor Trajan, although the actual number

---

4 Bowie 1988: 2; Sullivan 1991: 52. It is also interesting that 12.4 (5) refers to a collection of poems from Books 10 and 11 presented to Nerva which would have appeared between the publication of Book 11 and the revised edition of Book 10.
6 cf. Jenkins 1982: 2-3, on 10.2; Friedlaender 1886: 64.
7 Jenkins 1982: 3, on 10.2; Sullivan 1991: 48.
of new poems is impossible to determine. Although it is not possible to distinguish how many poems have been retained from the first publication, some poems, especially those dedicated to Trajan, which would have been inserted specifically for the second edition, assist in establishing an approximate date for the second edition. There are several poems referring to special occasions and appointments of patrons and friends, which assist in the dating and can determine whether a poem has been re-issued from the first edition. For example, Macer of 10.18 was curator of the via Appia in 95 CE, which could place this poem as preserved from the first edition, whereas at 10.78 (if it can be presumed to be the same person) he is preparing to leave Rome for Dalmatia to serve as governor. This establishes the second poem as a new poem of the second edition. Elsewhere, there are references to events which occurred subsequently to the first edition, and their sole inclusion in this second edition can be corroborated by poems in other books. The charioteer Scorpus, who is clearly alive at the beginning of Book 11 (11.1), is eulogised in two poems in Book 10 (50; 53), which indicates that he died between the publication of Book 11 and the revised edition of Book 10, sometime after 96.

Although perhaps not so useful towards the dating of this book, some epigrams in Book 10 provide important information on the poet's life and career as he prepares for his retirement from Rome for his homeland Spain. For the first time in his epigrams he reveals his age to be fifty-seven (10.24), and even if it cannot be fully determined whether this is a new poem for the second edition, it does help establish an approximate date of birth between 38 and 41. At the very close of the volume he

---

8 Sullivan 1991: 46-9 approximates that between twenty-five and thirty poems were replaced in the revised edition, and suggests examples of new poems: 10.6; 7; 13; 34; 72; 78; 92; 96; 103; 104. This will be discussed in the following analysis of individual poems.
9 These details are given further discussion in the commentary.
10 Sullivan 1991: 2, 49.
tells the reader that he has lived in Rome for thirty-four years, and because the poem is concerned with his imminent departure it is likely that this is a new poem (10.103). From this, Martial’s arrival in Rome can be identified as the year 64.11

Regardless of whether poems are originally from the first edition, some poems refer to certain times of the year, and with a few exceptions a seasonal course through the year can be plotted in concurrence with the progression of the book. We seem to begin at the end of January upon the proclamation of Trajan as emperor and the hopeful anticipation of his return to Rome (10.6; 7). Although there is a slight digression from this path with 10.12, in which Martial wishes Domitius Apollinaris well on his summer holiday, 10.24 refers to Martial’s own birthday which occurs in March. Towards the centre of the volume, there is a series of poems which directs the reader through the end of winter and the arrival of spring in April and May (10.51) to the onset of summer in July (10.58) and the blazing heat of the summer months until school begins again in October (10.62). 10.87 celebrates the birthday of Restitutus on the Kalends of October, and the book draws to a close seemingly with the imminent arrival of winter with its cold northerly winds (10.82).

2. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS: LENGTH AND METRE

Length of poems and the length of the book are cited by Martial as a significant stylistic issue. This begins in the opening poem, where the poet acknowledges that this book is longer than any other. Book 10 consists of 104 poems and there is no prefatory essay or epistle accompanying the poems, just as with Books 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 11. In terms of the number of lines, Book 10 at 878 lines is the longest of Martial’s volumes. Of the rest, only Books 1 (825), 9 (855), and 11 (804) surpass 800

11 Sullivan 1991: 3
Book 10 does not contain the highest number of poems, 104 in contrast to Book 1 (118 poems) and Book 11 (108 poems). The following table compares Book 10 with the other numbered books to show the number of poems and the spread of poems in terms of length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>couplets</th>
<th>3-4 lines</th>
<th>5-9 lines</th>
<th>10-14 lines</th>
<th>15 lines or longer</th>
<th>Lines total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 10</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 1</em></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 2</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 3</em></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 4</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 5</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 6</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 7</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 8</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 9</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 11</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Book 12</em></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of Book 9, there are far fewer poems of two lines, and it would seem that they are employed to break up a series of long poems, and also to provide thematic contrast. For example the first couplet 10.8 follows a series of poems of considerable length and completely alters the thematic direction of the book. For the benefit of variety the long poems are generally arranged next to short poems;

---

12 Grewing 1997: 24 n.32, gives the number of lines for all of Martial's books. Also see Table below.
examples include: 77-78; 91-92; 87-88; 43-44; 46-47. There are 12 poems which are 15 lines or longer, exactly the same number as in Book 11; but in comparison the number of poems over 10 lines is far greater. But it is also common to find clusters of poems which are over 10 lines in length and barely separated by short poems (e.g. in poems 68 to 79 only four poems are shorter than ten lines, and seven of the others are over 10 lines in length). The longer poems (i.e. those 15 lines or longer) occur at relatively regular intervals over the book from the very beginning to the end of the book: 5; 20; 30; 35; 37; 48; 51; 65; 78; 87; 82; 104.

Martial uses only his three most common forms of metre in this book, elegiac couplets (74 poems), hendecasyllables (22 poems) and choliambics (8 poems). The two lesser metres are distributed randomly throughout the book and for the sake of variety no two hendecasyllable poems or two choliambics appear alongside each other. In this volume, there are only 8 poems in the choliambic metre (3; 5; 22; 30; 62; 74; 92; 100), traditionally associated with satire and invective. In 10.3, 5 and 100, the use of this metre strengthens the thematic relationship between the poems. 10.3 laments the fact that fame and popularity have made Martial a target of poets publishing defamatory material in his name. 10.5, which invokes a curse against a poet who publishes slanderous material, is an obvious sequel to 10.3 and the same idea is perhaps recalled at 10.100 which is on a similar theme of another poet mixing his poems with Martial's. The remainder in this metre make use of satire and irony,

---

13 Metrical devices on select poems in Book 10 are examined in Jenkins' Appendix. From the 1556 epigrams, 1235 (79%) are elegiac couplets, 238 (15%) are hendecasyllabic metres, the remainder are in the choliambic metre or scansion (77 or 5%) and eleven other metres are used infrequently, see Sullivan 1991: 227-30.

14 For an analysis of Martial's metrical variety see Watson 2006: 285-98.

some in typical fashion, such as 22, 62 and 74, and others where the satirical tone is less apparent (30; 92).\textsuperscript{16}

3. THEMES

Individual themes are discussed in detail in the course of the following commentary. For the moment I limit my remarks to a brief synopsis of the more prominent topics of Book 10. As in all of Martial’s volumes, there are several themes or subjects which form the structural frame of the work. This revised edition was intended to be Martial’s final literary production in Rome, before his withdrawal to his homeland in Spain. Consequently, the ideas presented in this book convey his feelings about leaving Rome, his attitudes towards Rome, and his reasons for his departure. This book represents a significant turning point in Martial’s career as his final publication in Rome, and expressions of sentimentality for the city he lived in for thirty-four years are combined with images of the less agreeable aspects of Rome which in part constitute his motive for leaving the city. The main thematic categories include Martial’s literary programme, personal information about the poet including his departure from Rome, city life versus country living, and social topics such as the patron/client system and marriage and other personal relationships. Imperial poetry, which serves as a significant motif in previous books, is again an important theme, since this is Martial’s first book published under the reign of Trajan. Overlaps in these categories are unavoidable, and there are other poems which do not fit into any group or theme (e.g. 25 and 85).

\textsuperscript{16} Although Jenkins 1982: 1 on 10.92, sees the metre of 92 as anomalous to the tone of the poem, aspects of the poem convey a less than attractive portrait of Martial’s Nomentan farm.
3.1 Epigrams on a Literary Theme

Literary matters that concern Martial's own poems and poetic principles or the reception of his poetry contribute significantly to the thematic layout of the book. The first five poems introduce the major literary themes that are raised throughout the book, including length of both the book itself and of individual epigrams (1; 59), literary fame and immortality (2; 9; 26; 78; 103) which includes Martial's readership (2), the process of writing and publication, and the detrimental effects of this fame, exemplified by the circumstance of other writers publishing slanderous material in his name (3; 4; 33). There is also the subject of plagiarism (102), which he insists is not part of his literary agenda (33). Emphasis is placed on the social relevance of his poetry in contrast to other literary genres considered more praiseworthy and the ranking of his type of poetry amongst the literary genres (4; 21; 59; 87; 103). Amidst this representation of real life matters he is determined to confirm that his poems do not attack real individuals, in contrast to the poems of other poets (3; 5; 33; 101). Variety of subject matter is a characteristic of Martial's books, and he reminds the readers who restrict themselves to his more salacious poems that there are also poems which are milder in tone (45). His concern over the subject matter and nature of his poetry culminates at 72 in the banishment to the farthest Parthians of the flattering language of his poems for Domitian in previous books (72).

Other poets mentioned in Book 10 include Sulpicia, whom he compliments for her composition of salacious, but morally inoffensive, material in a way which mirrors Martial's defence of his own poetry (35; 38). He claims Catullus as his
literary model (87; 103), but rejects Callimachus (4), whose arcane style and obscure mythologising are inappropriate for contemporary society (cf. also 21).\textsuperscript{17}

There are six dedicatory poems in the book distributed evenly throughout the volume, referring to the presentation of the poem or a book of poems to a friend or patron (18 to Macer; 20 to Pliny; 64 to Polla Argentaria; 87 to Restitutus; 93 to Clemens and Sabina; 104 to Flavus).\textsuperscript{18} The position of poets and attitudes towards them in Rome is strongly emphasised in the book, in complaints that the city offers no time for Martial to compose his epigrams (58; 70) and the financial strain of such a profession especially in comparison to more lucrative but less reputable trades (74; 76; 87).

3.2 Imperial Poems

The following table shows the number of imperial poems in each book in comparison with Book 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Epigrams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 10</strong></td>
<td>6; 7; 34; 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 1</strong></td>
<td>4; 5; 6; 14; 22; 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 2</strong></td>
<td>2; 91; 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 4</strong></td>
<td>1; 3; 8; 27; 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 5</strong></td>
<td>1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 8; 15; 19; 63; 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 6</strong></td>
<td>1; 2; 3; 4; 19; 76; 80; 83; 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 7</strong></td>
<td>1; 2; 5; 6; 7; 8; 12; 60; 61; 74; 80; 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 8</strong></td>
<td>praef.; 1; 2; 3; 4; 11; 15; 21; 24; 26; 36; 39; 49; 53; 55; 56; 65; 66; 78; 80; 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} On Martial’s ambiguous view of Callimachean principles, see Spisak 1994: 291ff.

\textsuperscript{18} Vioque 2002: 10-11.
The table above shows the relative rarity of imperial poems in Book 10, and although it does not differ dramatically in the number of imperial poems from some books it shows that they are less prominent at the opening of the book. It is usual to find poems mentioning or addressing the emperor begin a volume (e.g. 1.4; 4.1; 5.1; 6.1; 7.1-4; 8 praef; 1) or they appear very early in the book as a cycle of poems (e.g. 2.2; 11.2; 4; 12.4; 5; 8; 9). Only Book 3, written in Cisalpine Gaul, has no such imperial dedication. Of the other numbered books, none delays an acknowledgement of the emperor as long as Book 10, where literary themes have assumed priority thus far. In Book 10 however, the first of the four imperial poems is delayed until the sixth poem (6; 7; 34; 72), and there is only one in which the emperor is directly addressed (34). Although there are poems for the new emperor, Martial betrays uncertainty about the reaction he will receive from an emperor yet to return to Rome. The tension resulting from the change in regime, which is apparent in the epigrams dealing in literary theft (3; 5), may be the reason for the absence of imperial poems, and also may explain their delayed position.

This is the first book Martial published under the reign of the emperor Trajan, after the Liber de Spectaculis during the reign of Titus, the first nine books as well as Books 13 and 14 (known as the Xenia and Apophoreta respectively) for Domitian and Book 11 during Nerva's reign. In Book 10, the number of imperial poems is dramatically reduced, and in fact there are only four poems which refer to the
emperor.\textsuperscript{19} As the second edition, all imperial poetry to Domitian has been erased in deference to the new emperor Trajan. The first two poems, 10.6 and 7, anticipate the triumphant return of the newly proclaimed emperor to Rome, but the next does not occur until 10.34, which refers to the edict restoring rights to exiled patrons and is the only poem in the book which addresses Trajan by name. 10.72 is a rejection of the former panegyrical language used previously for Domitian and the prospect of a new era under Trajan in which, claims Martial, praise is sincere and truth is restored. 10.101 continues this idea with the dismissal of the rustic witticisms of the jester Gabba under Augustus in favour of the sophisticated wit of Capitoinus in the new reign of Trajan. Although no specific Caesar is mentioned, 10.28 refers to the closure of the gate of the temple of Janus as a symbol of peace, which probably occurred during the time of Nerva, although there is no specific mention of Nerva throughout the book. Whilst the book conveys Martial’s intention to dissociate himself from Domitian, it also suggests a tentative approach towards the new emperor.

3.3 Patronage and Friendship

An integral theme of many of Martial’s books is the subject of patrons and the treatment of clients, which personally involved Martial as a poet and client in Rome. Throughout Book 10, as in earlier books, he aims his criticisms towards patrons who neglect their obligations towards their clients or mistreat them through stinginess (19; 29; 49; 56; 57; 70; 74; 82; 97), and the onerous duties endured by the clients such as the salutatio for an insignificant reward (10; 56; 58; 70; 74). It is just as irksome

\textsuperscript{19} The significance of this decrease in imperial poems is given further analysis in Fearnley 2003: 613-35.
when wealthy individuals flaunt their extravagance for their own personal ends (14; 98) or poorer characters feign such opulence (31; 54; 79). Although the criticism of the amicitia relationship is continued throughout, there are several poems addressed or presented to patrons who are clearly superior in status to the poet, and who are presented in tones of respect and gratitude of their beneficence: Domitius Apollinaris (12; 30); Macer (18; 78); Pliny (20); Faustinus (51); Frontinus (58); Argentaria Polla (64); Severus (73); Restitutus (87); Clemens and Sabina (93). Martial calls upon many old friends and patrons in the book, some who have not been mentioned since the early books of Martial, such as Maternus, Ovidius, Martialis, Avitus, Stella, Nepos, Canius, Flaccus, Apollinaris, Macer, Faustinus, Polla, Severus. For others, this is the only occasion in which they are mentioned, such as Manius, Marrius, Sulpicia, Pliny, Frontinus, Clemens and Sabina. Related to the topic of patronage is the concept of friendship, and the ideals of both good and bad friendship are spread throughout the book, sometimes in juxtaposition. The actions of bad friends are criticised at 11 (cf. his good friend Manius at 13), 15, 17, 18 and 36 (cf. 37 to Maternus), especially in situations of parsimonious behaviour and the absence of gifts which are obligatory in the duties of friendship. Examples of true friendship are distributed throughout the book, where the tone of the relationship appears on an equal footing: to his childhood friend Manius (13); to Antonius Primus (23; 32); Maternus (37); Quintus Ovidius (44); Julius Martialis (47); fellow poets Stella; Nepos; Canius; Cerialis; Flaccus and Lupus (48); Marrius (92); Avitus (96).

3.4 Urban/Pastoral Contrasts

Many poems in this book are concerned with the contrast between city life and country life; these poems compare the struggles of city life with the pleasures
bestowed by country living.\textsuperscript{20} The city/country contrast is a favourite topos of Roman satire in particular, and although it appears in a handful of epigrams from other volumes, this is the first and only occasion in Martial where it appears as a prominent theme.\textsuperscript{21} In 10.12 Martial addresses Domitius Apollinaris, who is temporarily leaving the demanding life at Rome to holiday at some country retreat. Further in the book, he offers consolation to those (including Apollinaris at 30) who are unable to leave their business activities at Rome for more pleasurable and relaxing pursuits (30; 37; 51 58). In contrast, city life is described as unrewarding and tiresome for patron and client alike (10; 70; 74; 82). At the heart of the pastoral ideal is 47 which lists the ingredients for a happier life achievable through a lifestyle of simplicity and self-sufficiency. 10.48 continues this theme with a description of a pleasant dinner party which reflects the ideals of this way of life. Martial’s homeland, Bilbilis, is presented as the ideal image of country life; this explains his desire to return there at the end of the book (13; 37; 96; 103; 104).

3.5 Martial’s Departure from Rome

More personal information about Martial is revealed in this book than in any other. He addresses a childhood friend from Spain (13), twice mentions his birthday and his age (24; 29), reveals his philosophy on the ideal way of life (47; 96), and provides a description of his appearance (65). A detailed description of his estate at Nomentum and its produce is also presented (92; 94) and the tomb of his child slave Erotion is commemorated despite her death several years ago. There also seems to be added emphasis on his status as a poet and his hopes for literary immortality (2), to be

\textsuperscript{20} This is given extensive coverage as a prominent theme of Book 10 in Spisak 2002: 127-41. 
\textsuperscript{21} E.g. 1.49; 2.90; 4.66; 5.20; 12.18; also see Hor. S. 2.6; Juv. 3.
regarded second only to Catullus (78), and also for his homeland to revere him in the same way that Verona does Catullus (103). The poet discloses that he is only able to publish one book a year for the reason that he spends so much time fulfilling his obligations as a client (70). He announces his intention to leave Rome for his homeland at 96, but throughout the book and more so than in any other he glorifies the image of his homeland in his desire to return (13; 103; 104). This theme is closely related to the urban/pastoral theme as he frequently complains of the life of the client and also of the poet in Rome (70; 74; 76). It is clear that departure from, and arrival in, Rome is a recurring feature of this theme. The book begins with the anticipated arrival of the emperor Trajan (6; 7), and concludes with the despatch of the book to Spain followed by the departure of the poet himself. In between, the book is filled with departures and arrivals (12; 26; 30; 44; 72; 78; 93).

3.6 Marriage, Divorce and Adultery
Again, this is a common theme throughout the books, but given more space in Book 10. The topics range from legacy hunters (8), murder of a spouse (16; 43), adultery (40; 52; 67; 68; 69; 90; 95) and illegitimate children (95; 102), the correct sexual behaviour for virtuous wives (33; 35; 38) and divorce (41). The prominence of this theme culminates in 10.47 on the components necessary to achieve the ideal lifestyle which includes a marriage where sex is neither too chaste nor too licentious. Martial's approach to this theme is double-edged in so far as he praises some relationships as examples of enduring, loving marriages, yet satirises some spouses (especially wives) for their immoral behaviour.
3.7 Concluding Remarks

Although the themes mentioned above are prominent in Book 10, it should be noted that most of these themes are also common in Martial’s other books. Topics such as the iniquities of patronage, women who ignore the conventions of marriage, the idea of pastoral versus urban living, and poems on the process of literary creation appear throughout the corpus. The notion of arrival and departure is occasionally raised in other books but not with the same attention as in this present volume. Despite the fact that many of these themes are shared by other volumes, the nature of their arrangement assumes special significance to this particular collection, and the following section will show how these themes interconnect to form some semblance of structure.

4. STRUCTURE AND UNITY

The interconnection of the themes and motifs mentioned above also contributes to the book’s structure as a self-contained literary work. Despite the initial appearance of a book as a heterogeneous and haphazard collection of epigrams, recent studies of Martial’s books have begun to observe the structural complexity and coherence of each book. Readers can now appreciate the poet’s meticulous attention to the arrangement of poems within a volume. The opening poems of each volume, for example, as Fowler has demonstrated, establish the thematic programme of the book as a whole; these poems set the tone for the rest of the book. Similarly, in an earlier study, Fowler established that the close of a book does not finish abruptly or at

---

22 For example, the opening of Book 3 is on the subject of sending the Book to Rome from Cisalpine Gaul.
23 For a full list of scholarship on this subject, cf. Scherf 1998: 119-38; Merli 1998: 139-56
random but that the final poems represent a well-defined conclusion.\textsuperscript{25} The concept of thematic cycles within a particular book was first raised by Barwick to demonstrate structural unity.\textsuperscript{26} The term ‘cycle’ essentially applies to groups of three or more poems linked by a common theme; this theme is developed through the course of these poems.\textsuperscript{27} Modern scholarship has begun to view these cycles within the context of the book and their relationship with surrounding poems rather than as independent units.\textsuperscript{28} These studies demonstrate how the poems in a particular book interact with each other to produce a coherent thematic unit.\textsuperscript{29} These theories are not limited to Martial’s poetry, but are demonstrated in scholarship of other works such as Catullus’ poems, Horace’s \textit{Odes} and Propertius’ \textit{Elegies}.\textsuperscript{30} I intend to apply this approach to my analysis of Book 10.

Although variety is an inherent feature of the books of epigrams, a thematic progression of ideas is evident throughout Book 10. Although many of the themes of Book 10 are repeated in other books, it is impossible to provide here a full analysis of the intertextual relationships between books. Instead, references and comparisons with poems of the other books are provided in the body of the commentary.

Cycles of poems are an important feature of Martial’s epigrams, where poems on the same theme or addressed to the same person are dispersed throughout the book. In addition to the main thematic ideas there are also several minor cycles and pairs of poems which generally fit into other categories: on the death of Scorpus (50; 53),

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{25} Fowler 1989: 107-122.
\bibitem{27} Henriksen vol.1 1998: 16.
\bibitem{29} On Book 2, see Garthwaite 2001: 46-55; on Book 3 see Garthwaite 2006 405-16; on Book 4, see Lorenz 2004: 255-78; on Book 9, see Garthwaite 1993: 78-102.
\bibitem{30} \textit{eg} for Catullus see Hubbard 1983: 218-37; Skinner 1988: 337-40; for surveys on this topic in Horace see Fowler 1993: 308-12; Harrison 19995b: 108-27; for Propertius see Sullivan 1976: 3-8; Hutchinson 1984: 99-106. This list is not intended to be exhaustive.
\end{thebibliography}
those to Domitius Apollinaris (12; 30); Antonius Primus (23; 32); Trajan (6; 7); Macer (18; 78); Sulpicia (35; 38); on the ideal lifestyle (47; 48); on Anxur (51; 58); to Polla (40; 69; 91); Galla (75; 95); school teaching (60; 62). Minor cycles of poems include those on death and burial (26; 43; 61; 50; 53; 63; 67; 71, 97); birthdays (24; 27; 39); old age versus youth (23; 24; 32; 39; 42; 66; 67; 71; 83; 86; 90; 93; 98).

It is impossible to divide the book into easily definable clusters as the work is still too diverse to warrant such a structure, but it is noticeable that there is a tendency to dwell on particular subjects at certain moments in the book. A series of poems, seemingly unrelated in subject matter or tone, can be linked thematically by ideas or verbal motifs or by the method of juxtaposing several themes in alternate epigrams. For example, a significant moment occurs at 34, which reminds the reader that the poems are concerned with social faults but are not directed toward specific individuals. The poem is intended also to celebrate the marriage of the daughter of Munatius Gallus, and she is praised for her virtue and chastity. At this point the topic of marriage is also introduced with the praise for the poetess Sulpicia, whose poetry is risqué and playful yet remains within the boundaries of marriage appropriate to a Roman matrona. Martial follows this with a progression of poems which contrast this image of ideal married life and virtuous women, with poems on the subjects of marriage in terms of adultery, divorce, widowhood, and women who are sexually promiscuous in general (39; 40; 41; 43). The latter topics occur in several clusters throughout the volume (55; 63; 67; 68; 69; 75; 81; 84; 90; 91; 95). Not all the poems in the book can be connected to each other, nor are they intended to be. There are noticeable ties between certain groups of poems which hold the thematic momentum of the book. These poems frequently occur in clusters but before the cluster becomes too monotonous, the series is broken up with a change in thematic direction.
Martial’s treatment of the opening (and also the closing) sequence of poems in his books has generated considerable scholarship in attempts to determine structural significance in the books. In general, the opening poems focus on a central theme or two contrasting themes which then appear throughout the book in cycles. The book, its contents and its dedicatee are generally the central themes of the opening epigrams, and on some occasions Martial addresses the book itself as a separate entity. It is not uncommon for Martial to open his books with poems of a literary flavour or a series of poems/succession of poems on a similar theme. Several of the books open with a dedicatory prose preface to a particular individual. In the first nine books, literary themes are frequently interspersed with poems on an imperial theme (Books 1, 2, 7 and 8) or where poems to the emperor completely dominate the opening of the books (Books 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9). Excluding the prefatory epistles, Martial often addresses his book in the opening poem, either to advise it of its destination and/or to reveal its dedication as a present to a particular recipient (3.1; 5.1; 6.1; 8.1; 11.1). In Book 10 the first five poems are based around the literary content of the book and imperial poems for the new emperor Trajan are delayed until the sixth poem. This pattern is resumed in Books 11 and 12 where the opening poems set the literary tone of the book and then imperial poems appear subsequently (11.4 and 11.5 are poems to the emperor, and in Book 12 the first imperial poem is 12.5). The themes of the first five poems of Book 10 are common to the opening poems of other books but do not appear together elsewhere with the same concentration as a sequence of poems.

32 See Fearnley 2003: 613-35. The motives for the delayed imperial epigrams will be discussed in 10.6 and 7.
As in all of Martial's books, the opening sequence of poems in Book 10 shares a common thread and introduces the tone of the book. These five poems form a clearly definable group based on literary themes and interlinking ideas. 10.5 concludes the introductory collection, and the use of the perfect tense for the ultimate word *scripsi* offers a sense of finality. 10.6 commences another sequence of ideas with two consecutive poems for the emperor Trajan. The presentation of literary themes in Book 10 is strongly reminiscent of the opening contents of Book 1 including the *praefatio*. The introduction to Book 1 lays the foundation for Martial's literary programme in the following books, in particular that his witticisms are not malicious attacks aimed at specific people. This theme also features strongly in the opening to Book 10 (3 and 5), and perhaps the reason for this is to give Martial the opportunity not only to reinforce his literary programme but also to reintroduce it at the beginning of the new regime under Trajan. 10.5, a curse against a slanderous poet, is placed directly before the first poem of Book 10 mentioning the emperor Trajan. The deliberate positioning of this is evidenced by 10.33, the next poem in the cycle on literary theft, which is likewise followed by a poem addressing Trajan.

Poems 1-5 are all based on literary themes from extremely different angles. These themes include *brevitas* (10.1; also see 2.1; 8.3; 12.1), literary fame and immortality (10.2; 1.1; 8 *praef*.; 8.3; 9 *praef*.; 11.3; 12.4), which includes Martial's readership (10.2; 1.2; 3; 3.1; 2; 6.1; 12 *praef*.), the fact of writing and publication (10.3; 5; also see 2.6; 8) and the detrimental effects of this fame (8.3; 12 *praef*.), and the social relevance of his poetry in contrast to other literary genres considered more

34 For further comparisons with Book 1, see Fearnley 2003: 632-4.
35 Martial does not use the preface to Book 1 as a justification for his choice of genre, unlike 10.4; see Howell 1980: 96.
36 This will be developed further with 10.72; see Fearnley 2003: 619ff.
praiseworthy (10.4; 1 praef.; 2 praef.; 8.3; 7.3; 4). Although these ideas are not unique to Book 10, the innovation is that these are gathered together to form a definable group of poems at the opening of the book. These themes occur at various intervals in various ways throughout the rest of the book.37

Following this introductory sequence of poems and the two imperial poems, there is a lengthy series of poems on interrelated social issues which forms the backbone of the volume. In his literary programme set out in these opening poems, Martial confirms that his poems are concerned with real life relevant to Roman society.38 These issues (from the major themes mentioned above) include the problems of the patron/client relationship, examples of good and bad friendship, and the prospect of leaving Rome (12). It is significant that complaints of this patron/client relationship and examples of unequal friendship are accompanied by poems addressed to individuals who are temporarily leaving Rome for holiday pleasures elsewhere, and which also contrast the hardships of Rome with idyllic country living (poems 10 to 22). These issues appear together in clusters on several occasions further in the book (29; 30; 31; 36; 37; 44), and located towards the centre is the discussion of the ideal lifestyle reflected in country living (47), closely followed by a similar series of poems on the above topics (48; 49; 51; 56; 57; 58). The next sequence on these subjects appears twelve poems later and reveals how much these matters affect the poet himself, as such client obligations interfere with his poetic exertions (70; 72; 73; 74; 76; 82; 87). This progression throughout the book clearly sets up Martial’s announcement that he is permanently leaving Rome for

37 The literary cycle following 10.1-5 can be identified as 10.9; 18; 20; 21; 26; 33; 35; 45; 58; 59; 64; 70; 74; 76; 78; 87; 93; 100; 102; 103; 104. Also see Spisak 2002: 131 n.16.
38 Although this is a common feature of Martial’s poetry in general, this is a defining element towards the thematic structure of Book 10 and he takes especial pains to reinforce the nature of his poetry throughout (34; 45; 59).
his hometown Bilbilis (78; 96) and poems in the latter section signify the finalisation of his affairs and estate in Rome before his departure (92; 93; 94; even 61). Similarly, at 72 Martial dismisses the language of his former poems to farthest Parthians as deemed not appropriate for the current situation in Rome.

The final section of the book briefly revisits the literary themes established in the opening five poems, in particular the topics of plagiarism and the composition of bad poetry in contrast to his own (100; 101; 102). The pair of poems 103 and 104 forms the well-defined ending to the book and functions simultaneously as his farewell to Rome and as greeting to the inhabitants of Bilbilis who, he hopes, will receive him with open arms on account of his fame (103), which is also a motif from the opening epigrams. As Martial has addressed many individuals on their departure from Rome throughout the book, it is fitting that the book concludes with the poet’s own permanent withdrawal from Rome. The poet’s departure is represented through the departure of the book itself, where he sends his book in advance to greet and re-establish his ties with his Spanish friends, and where the book acts as intermediary between poet and recipient (cf 20; 93). The departure of the book for Spain provides a fitting conclusion to the volume.

5. MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

Discussion of the manuscript tradition and history of the manuscripts has been comprehensively supplied in earlier editions and commentaries of Martial. For this reason, a brief textual introduction will suffice. The sources for the textual traditions are based on the work of F.G. Schneidewin, who divided the manuscripts into three

39 Sending the book in the poet’s place is a common motif, and occurs at 20 and 93.
distinct groups, and this was expanded by Lindsay, who traced these groups to three ancient editions.\textsuperscript{41} The three main manuscript families for the editions of Martial are denoted by the Greek letters $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$, which represent the largest number of manuscripts including E, X, V and A. $\alpha$ is represented by florilegia of the ninth and ninth-tenth centuries, H, T and R, and the only manuscripts in which is preserved the \textit{Liber de Spectaculis}. The $\beta$ family is represented by L, P Q and f, and is derived from a recension made in 401 by Torquatus Gennadius. $\gamma$ is represented by manuscripts from the tenth and eleventh centuries including E, X, V and A (also B, C, F, G and N), and it although includes the largest group, it is not necessarily the most reliable.

The text of book 10 given in the following commentary is based on that of the 1990 Teubner edition revised by Shackleton Bailey. This edition contains a number of emendations which differ from earlier editions, some of which are discussed in Shackleton Bailey’s Loeb edition and in his supplementary explanatory articles. Textual problems and departures from Shackleton Bailey’s text are dealt with as they occur in the commentary.

6. THE USE OF THIS COMMENTARY

The structure of the commentary follows the standard pattern of individual analysis of each poem. This comprises two sections, an introductory essay followed by discussion of individual sections. In each essay, the meaning of the particular poem is explicated and is placed in its literary, social and historical contexts. A substantial component of this section is devoted to themes significant to the progression and development of the book. These are highlighted and discussed, especially in terms of their effect upon the position of a poem and its relationship with the surrounding

\textsuperscript{41} Lindsay 1903a.
poems, and also the ensuing effect on the thematic continuity of the entire book. In addition, as a means to shed further light on a particular poem's literary impact, intratextual links are identified not only between the epigrams within this particular volume but also throughout the entire corpus of Martial.

In the second section, the lines of the poem are presented in full, though separated according to topic, and the commentary follows immediately from the particular lines upon which it comments. Some lines are given individually and others in groups, depending upon the detail of explanation required. Within these lines, terms, expressions and phrases are selected and explained in terms of their literary, philological or historical applications where fundamental to the sense of the poem.
COMMENTARY

10.1

Book 10 begins with a direct address to the reader on the subject of the length of this particular book. This poem does not directly address the reader (this occurs in the following poem), but the anonymous reader is given permission to alter the length of the book. Like Books 3 and 11, there is no prose preface or epistle (for which see Books 1, 2, 8, 9, and 12) or dedicatory epigram to a particular recipient (Books 4, 5, 6, and 7). We can distinguish various types of introductions to the books. A specific addressee can be identified in the opening dedicatory poem of various volumes, such as the emperor (4.1; 5.1; 7.1; 9.1), particular patrons or friends (6.1; 11.1), the general reader (1.1; 3.1), even the book itself (2.1; 8.1). Included amongst these are the prefatory epistles to private individuals such as Toranius (9 praef.) and Priscus (12 praef.), whilst a number of books open with either a letter (8 praef.) or a dedicatory group of epigrams to the emperor Domitian (4.1-3; 5.1-5; 7.1-8). There are books which open with a poem which directs the destination of the book (e.g. Book 3 from Gaul to Rome, especially 3.1-5), or poses the question of dedication to the book itself (11.1). As there is no such dedication at the opening of Book 10, the identity of the reader addressee remains generic (cf. 1.1).
10.1 recalls opening epigrams from earlier books such as 1.1 and 2.1, which draw attention to the creation of the book. A relationship between author and book is established in Book 1 where the poet addresses the book (1.4; 70; 4.86; 89; 8.1; 72; cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. Epigram). This feature occurs not only in Martial, but is common to Roman poetry (cf. Catul. 35; Ov. Tr. 1.1; 3.7; Pont. 4.5; Hor. Ep. 1.20; Stat. Silv. 4.4). The book’s image as a separate entity is a regular feature, particularly in the opening group of epigrams of a book. For example, Book 1 develops the image of the book as a naughty pet-slave (1.3; 52), even sent in loco domini to the morning salutatio (1.108). At times the writer is pleased to associate himself with the book (e.g. 6.60 nunc nobis carmina nostra placet), but at other times, the writer is detached from his composition (3.100; 4.89; 5.80; 8.72.9 quam vellem fieri meus libellus!; 11.1; 15; 12.2). Martial treats the books as though they were his own, in the manner of a playful slave or child who at times thwarts his authority; and he frequently addresses them in affectionate terms (1.3.2; 3.2.1 libelle; 3.5.2 parve liber; 4.86.2; 89; 7.97.1; 8.72.3; 10.104.1; 11.1.1 otiose liber).

This image of the book and the poet’s address to his creation follows a long literary tradition (Pind. Nem. 5.2; Strato AP 12.208), and was adapted by Roman literature (Catul. 35; Hor. Ep. 1.20; Ov. Tr. 1.1; 2.1; 3.7(8).1; for further examples see Howell and Citroni on 1.3). There are other epigrams where the speaker is an object or person other than the author, such as a crumb (2.59.1 mica vocor) or a statue of Priapus (6.49.1 non sum de fragili dolatus ulmo; also cf. 9.28.1-2 Latinus ille ego sum; 10.53.1 ille ego sum Scorpus). This is not only a conventional practice of personification in Roman literature (cf. Hor. S. 1.8.1-3; see Zetzel 1980: 59-77, especially 61), but also an element of the epigraphical tradition.
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10.1

It is not uncommon for a Roman poet to assume a persona. In fact, 'the creation of the persona is an integral part of the literary endeavours of Roman satiric poets' (Winkler 1983: 72). The persona acts as the mouthpiece for the author, forming a bridge between author and reader. In these epigrams, the book itself forms a separate entity, allowing the speaker to address the book itself (e.g. 1.70 *quaeris iter, dicam*). Personification is developed in each of the books, even to the point where the book is controlling its creation (e.g. 4.89). Yet, at the same time, the speaker also discusses the process of writing these epigrams (5.15 and 16; 7.11, 7.85 *sed librum scribere difficile est*).

10.1 cleverly reverses the roles of author and composition, in that instead of the poet/speaker defending the length of the book (which the reader would probably expect, cf. 2.1), the book itself is the speaker. In a tone of mock-modesty, the book is deferential to the reader and apologises for the length of the work, even going so far as to tell the reader not to read the entire work, but only a few epigrams. This address to the reader seems to conform to the principles of rhetoric: securing the goodwill and attention of one's audience is a standard feature of the *exordium* or *principium* to a speech before the speaker begins the formal subject matter of the speech (*Rhet. Her.* 1.4-5; *Cic. De Orat.* 1.143; *Quint. Inst.* 4.1). Similarly, the book is attempting to make its reader more favourably disposed towards it by allowing him/her to decide its length and the number of poems he/she wishes to read.

10.1 is unusual in that the book itself addresses the reader in the first person without the service of the poet. This is the only occasion in Martial's books where the book can be identified as addressing the reader. The personification of the book was a particular development of the Alexandrian poets, and performed a role in representing
approval (or disapproval) from its creators and establishing the author’s programmatic position (AP 9.63; Callim. Epig. 6; Bing 1988: 29-33). This is used on only two other occasions in Roman literature, both in Ovid (though another later example might possibly be the prologue to Apuleius’ Metamorphoses where the identity of the speaker is quite ambiguous), in the Tristia and the opening poem to Amores 1, which also happens to be a second edition. In the Tristia, the book as narrator acts as guide to the emperor’s palace in place of the poet, who in exile is unable to do so: *missus in hanc venio timide liber exulis urbem* (Tr. 3.1.1; Pitcher 1998: 60). 10.1 is also influenced by the introduction to Amores 1, where the poet has edited the work to enhance the reader’s enjoyment: *at levior demptis poena duobus erit* (4; Roman 2001: 136).

In 10.1, however, there seems no identifiable reason why the book is speaking rather than the author. Martial is still working within the limits of the literary tradition in his use of the speaking book, but the notion of the book having authority to address the reader without the poet displays an innovative approach to this literary tradition.

The poem ends with the book telling the reader that he/she can determine the length of the book, a device used also in the Apophoreta, where the reader is given permission to finish the book at any time: *quo vis cumque loco potes hunc finire libellum* (14.2.1). The length of epigrams and books is a common topic in Martial (1.45; 1.118; 2.1.1; 4.89; 11. 108; 12. 4 (5)), due in part to the very nature of the epigram. Martial’s approach to brevitas in the epigrams (e.g. 2.1; 2.77; 6.65; 8.29) is a continuation of the Alexandrian conventions in the struggle between the long epic poem and the paradoxically more meritorious short poem (Newman 1990: 89ff.). The
preference for the short poem is succinctly expressed in the fragment attributed to Callimachus, which confirms that a 'big book is a big evil' (e.g. frs. 465 and 1.5 support the small poetic form, see Cameron 1995: 52). The prologue to the Aetia is the prime example of Callimachean attitudes towards lengthy poetry in favour of the short poem, but Callimachus concentrates on poetic skill or the lack of it, which makes a poem seem never-ending (Brink 1971: 71, contra Cameron 1995: Chapters 11 and 12, also cf. 356-7 where he argues that the prologue is a reply to his own critics with an attack against second-rate long poetry). The first person of the epigram is assuming that the reader does not wish to read the whole book at once, so that he/she is not bored. This is also present at 2.1.2, where the speaker/writer asks the book who could bear 300 epigrams: 'sed quis te ferret perlegeretque, liber?'. Conversely, see 4.29 where the poet represents the genre of epigram as a lengthy work (4.29.1-2 obstat, care Pudens, nostris sua turba libellis/ lectoremque frequens lassat et implet opus; Newman 1990: 94). In this particular epigram, the writer apologises for the length. This motif returns at 10.59, where the reader is rebuked for selecting only the shorter poems, although this time the speaker would appear to be the poet.

The very nature of the epigram evokes the image of a short poem, and the book characterising itself as too lengthy reveals a humorous element. Martial introduces this idea in a variety of ways in other books to establish this interplay between the epigrammatic genre and the concept of length, where his main concern is that the reader is not bored with his poems (Roman 2001: 123). In this poem there is continual comical emphasis on the subject of length, made more telling by its length of four lines, and there are contrasts between *nimius* and *longus* in line 1 and in the
10.1

next three lines, with terms such as *pauca, libellus, parvo*; and the concluding word is *breuem*. The deliberate interplay between *brevitas* and the epigrammatic genre creates comic tension for the benefit of the reader, particularly by the fact that this book is one of the longer books of Martial.

These four lines of 10.1 continue the themes and structure of the last three epigrams of Book 11, a significant feature given that 11 was published before the second edition of this material (Lorenz 2002: 221). 11.106, 107, and 108 are each four lines in length and are linked by the length of the book and the obligation of the reader to read the whole book (see Kay on 11.106). Martial indicates his deference to the reader who has better things to do, and is watchful lest his reader should become bored or fatigued by the length of the book: 11.106.2 *hoc tantum lege*; 11.107.2 *quasi perlectum*; 108.1 *quamvis tam longo possis satur esse libello*. The opening epigram of Book 10 pursues this idea further by assuming the identity of the book, telling the reader to make the book as short as he pleases by reading only a few epigrams. There is also a suggestion that the second editions of Book 10 and Book 11 were published together, which may link these epigrams further, but this remains mere conjecture (Fowler 1995: 31-58, n.28). The writer makes a number of references to the advantages of reading epigrams, by the very fact that they are short, and that the reader can read as many as he wishes (for example 8.3, the preface to 9 and 9.50). Numerous allusions are made about the triviality of epigrams compared with those more elite forms such as epic and tragedy, yet the speaker/writer draws attention to the great number who read his epigrams (4.49: *laudant illa, sed ista legunt*). This could be a tongue in cheek reference to the fact that although the book may appear too
long, unlike other genres, epigrams are not longer than 51 lines, and the reader can finish at any point without being made to finish the book.

Si nimius videor seraque coronide longus

There is continual emphasis on the first person (videor; ero; mihi; me) throughout this epigram to establish the book as the speaker. This also creates a bond between the reader and the book. The book’s primary intention is that the reader not be bored by its length and the long poems within (cf. 2.1; 4.82.5; 89; 11.106; 13.3.8; 14.2; Plin. Ep. 9.4).

The coronis was a diacritical mark which designated the end of the book. This sign is frequently referred to as a metaphor for the end and even assumes its own persona in the Garland of Meleager, which suggests that such poems were placed at the end of the scroll (AP 12.257; Philodemus 11.41; further see Bing 1988: 34-5; on the coronis see Stephen 1959: 3-14). It is therefore unusual for the coronis to feature in an opening poem, and its mention represents the poet’s play with literary conventions. The end of the book is brought to the reader’s attention at the opening of it, and, by so doing, alerts the reader to the finite quality of the book as opposed to one that seems never-ending. Callimachus argues that the concept of brevity in terms of poetry is linked to the concept of artistry, where the lack of skill makes a poem seem too long and endless (Prologue to the Aetia; Cameron 1995: 356-7). The superiority of Martial’s genre is that the reader can stop at any time.

Rather than the author telling the reader how to approach the book, the book itself is giving the reader the right to adjust the length of the book to his own pleasure. This can also be compared perhaps to 12.5 where the writer/speaker appeals to Nerva.
to read some of the epigrams (or perhaps in a selection) (White 1974: 40-61): *haec lege tu, Caesar; forsan et illa leges*, with the implication that the emperor will wish to read the volume in its entirety after sampling a few poems (Bowie on 12.5).

**esse liber, legito pauca: libellus ero.**

*liber* and its diminutive are deliberately placed at either side of the line. The two words are frequently interchanged in the books; for example, see 11.1.5 *libros ...libellos* where the words have different meanings (books and petitions) but are playfully used in the one sentence (Catul. 27.4; Kay on 11.1.5). These words can be interchangeable for metrical convenience, and Martial is playful with them in his epigrams (Tanner 1986: 2667). The term *libellus* covers a wide variety of meanings which include: a volume or a small book; a defamatory publication; a register or notebook; a formal communication; list or inventory; placard; and a programme of an entertainment (cf. *OLD* s.v. *libellus*). White refers to *libelli* as individual poems, or cycles of poems, dedicated to specific people; pamphlets presented to patrons before being collected and published as books (White 1974: 40ff.). For example, at 5.2.4-5, there is no differentiation between the meaning of *libellos* and *liber*: *lascivos lege quattor libellos:/ quintus cum domino liber iocatur* (see also 8.3.1-4).

*liber* here signifies the whole book, whereas *libellus* refers to the number of epigrams selected by the reader at a single reading (1.2 with Howell and Citroni; 1.113; 1.117.13; 3.2; 3.5; 4.72; 13.3.1-4; Grewing on 6.1.1). Pliny's letter on the death of Martial refers to Martial's poems as *versiculi* (3.21), and other terms used by Martial for his works are *nugae* (1.113.6; 2.1.6; 4.10.4), *ioci* (1 praef.; 1.4.3; (1.14.1; 35.13; 4.14.12), *nequitiae* (5.2.3; 6.82.5; 11.16.7) and *lusus* (1.14.1; 35.13 6.64.7;
82.5; 85.9; for a fuller discussion of these terms see Spisak 1992: 135ff). Statius differentiates between using *liber* to mean the entire book, and *libellus* to mean just one poem (*Silv.* 4.9; Grewing on 6.1.1). The poetic tradition of the diminutive is worth consideration, where its uses convey affection or superiority (cf. Catul. 1.1: *cui dono lepidum novum libellum*).

*terque quaterque mihi finitur carmine parvo pagina: fac tibi me quam cupis ipse brevem.*

The speaker appeals to the reader by asserting that the book’s pages frequently (*terque quaterque*) end with a small poem so that the reader is not bored by very long ones. This interpretation uses the reading of *parvo* instead of *parva* so that the poems are short, rather than the pages as according to Shackleton Bailey’s interpretation (*contra* SB1: 315). The reading of *parvo* is favoured here as it might suggest either that the reader read the short poems at the end of each page (Friedlaender on 10.1.3-4), or, preferably, that the reader may stop reading at any point where a short poem ends the page (Housman *CP* 2: 715, cf. Jenkins on 10.1.4). This increases the irony that most of Martial’s poems are short from the very nature of the epigrammatic genre. Just as the first line ends with *longus*, the final word in this epigram is *brevem*, an ironic feature for the reader as the next number of epigrams are all over 10 lines in length and do not fit into the category of *brevitas*.

The juxtaposition of *tibi me* strengthens the relationship between the unspecified reader and the speaker of the poem (although this reader is not addressed as *lector* until the following poem; cf. 1. *praef.;* 1.1; 2.3.1; 10.2; 11.16; 13.2; 13.14.2).
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This poem reveals that this present volume is a revised edition of Book 10, containing mostly new material. Book 10 was originally published in 96 CE but, following the assassination of the emperor Domitian, was withdrawn, and the second edition was not published until about 98, after the publication of Book 11. We would naturally assume that poems which contained references to Domitian were removed and replaced with poems which paid tribute to the new regime under the emperor Trajan, though it is impossible to determine the actual number of new poems. Martial's stated reason for the re-editing, however, is that the first edition had been published too hastily.

Book 10 is striking in that it is the only book in which Martial tells the reader that it has been revised for a second edition, although 12.5 also suggests a special edition possibly containing either Books 10 and 11 or poems from 10 and 11 dedicated to the emperor. The precedent for a poet to introduce a revised work is Ovid in the preface to his *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.

The acknowledgment of revision contradicts the notion of the epigram as an impromptu piece dashed off in a matter of moments, as claimed by Statius, for example, who refers to the spontaneous nature of epigrams and admits that poems in his *Silvae* are written *quasi epigrammata: in arborem certe tuam Melior, et psittacum scis a me leves libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos* (*Silv.* 2 praef.). Whilst Martial frequently reminds his reader of the spontaneous nature of the epigram
throughout his books, the expression *lima rasa* (10.2.3) indicates the conscious labour of composition of the poems for the literary quality which will ensure their survival (cf. 4.10; Catul. 1.1.10; see White 1974: 42). This idea is seemingly at odds with the common derogatory attitude towards epigram as a literary genre. Martial follows this tradition by referring to his poetry in such deprecating terms as *nugae* and by using the diminutive *libellus* (recalling Catullus' references to his poetry e.g. *Carm. 1*), elsewhere arguing the superiority of his genre (cf. 10.4). The genre of epigram is based on the notion of ephemeral usefulness, which is in keeping with Martial's claims to literary fame and immediate publication during his lifetime. Martial expresses his gratitude to his current readership (*opes nostrae*), although such a notion is contrary to the Callimachean tradition of maintaining literary integrity by preference for the *labor limae* of Horace and Catullus (Hor. *Ars* 291; Catul. 1.1; see Roman, 2001: 122-3).

Martial refers to his popularity with current Roman readership, where the *lector* is formally addressed as the reward acquired through his literary efforts. His fame and readership is a frequent theme in his poems, although such a notion contradicts the Alexandrian principle of literature where preference was for an elite audience rather than the enjoyment of widespread contemporary fame (cf. Callim. *Aet. 25-6; Hor. S. 1.10.74 contentus paucis lectoribus*). Martial presents his popularity as a gift from personified Roma herself.

Martial combines the idea of contemporary fame with the assertion that his poetry will outlast even marble, and alone of all monuments will survive for future generations. His claims of popular favour from his readership do not conform to Callimachean principles, but demonstrate his refusal to follow any set theory of
epigram. The literary precedents for the poet’s claims to immortality are extensive, and Martial’s aspirations echo claims made by Catullus, Horace, Propertius and Ovid. This convention extends back to the Callimachean principle, which asserts that literature will outlast the transitory splendour of material gifts (Callim. lamb. 12; Aet. fr. 1.7.14), and which was subsequently adopted by the Roman poets. Martial accepts the long standing convention for literary immortality in the conclusion to this poem, which deliberately echoes a phrase from Horace: *exegi monumentum aere perennius* (Carm. 3.30.1). In Martial’s poetry, the notion that epigram brings instant fame creates an unresolved tension with the Callimachean concept of enduring recognition (Roman, 2001: 122-3). Martial creates many paradoxes in his poetry, not least of which is the contrast between the frivolous and trivial subject matter of the epigram and its elevation to the ranks of immortal literature in his adaptation of the Horatian concept of the monumental work as immortal. Martial incorporates aspects from the neoteric programme (such as the guarantee for future fame), which suit his own literary standing towards a broader contemporary readership as well.

After the opening epigram, the next four poems are arranged in a chiastic sequence, followed by two consecutive epigrams in honour of Trajan. 10.2 and 10.4 separate ideas addressed together in 8.3, where Martial considers both his own readership and immortality in the first section (corresponding to 10.2), and in the second provides his reasons for writing in the epigrammatic genre and not in the more serious literary genres (cf. 10.4). The division of these two themes into two separate poems strengthens the link between 10.2 and 10.4 and also that between the other poems of the opening sequence. Themes such as his literary popularity and reputation
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return in 10.3, for example, where literary fame makes him a target of poets publishing defamatory material in his name.

_Festinata prior, decimi mihi cura libelli_  
elapsum manibus nunc revocavit opus._

Martial's formal explanation for this revised edition is that the first edition was published too hurriedly. It is likely that the first edition contained epigrams in honour of the emperor Domitian, and after his death and subsequent _damnatio memoriae_ (Plin. _Pan._ 52.5; Jones 1993: 160), Martial revised this book for republication. A similar expression is found at 2.91.3 in reference to previous publications of books which may have been precipitous: _si festinatis totiens collecta libellis._

To avoid the confusion that it will be regarded as a completely new book, Martial is careful to identify this as the tenth book in his corpus, probably due to the fact that this edition was published after the circulation of Book 11. Throughout his volumes, Martial draws attention to the numbering of a book for the benefit of the reader (e.g. 2. 93; 5.15; 6.1; 8 _praef_; cf. also Bowie on 12.4(5).1, where Martial presents a collection of poems from Books 10 and 11 to the emperor Nerva). In 10.2, his poetry is referred to as _cura_, a term he uses in this sense on only three other occasions, all of which are in Book 1 (1.45.1; 1.66.5; 1.107.5; Ov. _Pont._ 4.16.39; cf. Howell and Citroni on 1.45 for the use of _cura_ in Roman poetry). Two of these similarly use the term in association with the process of publication (1.45.1 _edita ne brevibus pereat mihi cura libellis_; 1.66.5 _secreat quaere carmina et rudes curas_). The sense of the term also conveys an element of care taken into the revision, which obviously contradicts the notion of epigram as a spontaneous composition.
Nota leges quaedam sed lima rasa recenti;
pars nova maior erit: lector, utriqé fave,
lector, opes nostrae: quem cum mihi Roma dedisset,
‘nil tibi quod demus mains habemus’ ait

It is virtually impossible and indeed pointless to guess which are the new or
substituted epigrams. It has been suggested that the original edition contained twenty-
five to thirty epigrams for Domitian, which now must be omitted due to the
commencement of the new regime under Trajan (Sullivan 1991: 44). Some poems
which are obviously new include the poems for Trajan (6; 7; 34; and 72), and also
probably those which mention the poet’s impending return to Spain (13; 78; 92; 96;
103; 104; cf. also perhaps 3; 5; 50; 53; 74; 80; 100).

The term lima is a conventional term in Roman literary criticism when
referring to revision of a work (Mart. 5.80.13; 12. 4(5).2; Stat. Silv. 4.7.26; Hor. Ars
291; Ov. Tr. 1.7.30; Apul. Met. 8.8; see Bowie on 12.4.2). This notion of Martial
polishing his poems contrasts with the impression of spontaneity in the process of
writing epigrams (see cura above).

Martial appeals to the reader to favour both the poems retained from the
original edition and those newly inserted. While the term faveo can simply denote the
meaning ‘to promote’ (cf. 7.51.22), it is commonly applied in the context of religious
invocations (7.22.2; 10.87.3; 104.2; see Vioque on 7.22.2). The appeal to the reader
here evokes such a ritual, as this generic reader controls Martial’s fame and
reputation. In place of monetary wealth, having readership is acknowledged as
reward enough for Martial’s labour.

Addressing an unspecified lector is not a common device in Roman literary
tradition, and the only precedent is Ovid’s Tristia (Tr. 1.7.32; 1.11.35; 3.1.2; 4.1.2;
5.1.66; cf. also Apul. *Met.* 1.1). Martial addresses the reader as *lector* on ten occasions in his writings and employs similar terms of admiration towards this unnamed reader (1.1.4 *studiose lector*; 113.4; 2.8.1; 4.55.27 *delicate lector*; 5.16.2 *lector amice*; 9 praef.; 11.16.1; 108.2; for the address to the reader in Martial, see Citroni on 1.1.4.). Throughout his works, Martial is extremely conscious of his readership, which brings him fame; and this appreciation towards his readers appears at the beginning of Book 1, where he expresses his gratitude to them for bestowing upon him his current fame and future glory: *cui, studiose lector, quod didisti/ viventi decus atque sententia/ rari post cineres habent poetae* (1.1.4-6; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.131-2: *sive favore tuli, sive hanc carmine famam/ iure tibi grates, candide lector, ago*).

Whilst literary immortality is the ultimate goal, Martial never forgets that it is his current readership and popularity which will guarantee such an achievement. For example, at 1.25, Martial encourages Faustinus to publish books now, so that they may be famous whilst the writer is still alive: *post te victurae per te quoque vivere chartae/ incipient: cineri Gloria sera venit* (1.25.7-8). Martial boasts of enjoying a wide readership, and of his poetry not being confined to Rome and the Imperial court, but distributed throughout the Roman world (1.1; 11.3; 12.2 (3)).

This gift of readership and fame is represented as a gift from personified Roma. The concept of Roma personified dates back to the early Republic, but achieved greater significance under the reign of Augustus where the cult of Roma was honoured as a symbol of imperial power (Mellor 1981: 950-1030). In Augustan poetry, Roma is portrayed in various images as city, state and goddess, alongside Augustus as the proclaimed guardian (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.44 *o tutela praesens/ Italiae dominaeque Romae*). This device was revived by Flavian poets, and is popular
in the works of Silius Italicus (2.32; 6.483) and Statius (Silv. 1.6.101; 4.1.28). Roma is personified a number of times in Martial for different purposes. For example, she is glorified as a military and cultural power through the protection of the emperor Domitian (8.65.5-6; cf. 3.66.4), and similarly at 11.3 where she is the intended beneficiary of the rewards which Nerva's reign promises. The imperial associations with Roma are also applied to the reign of Trajan at 12.5.7; and 12.8. In 10.2, Roma is presented as the poet's muse, the source of inspiration for his literary endeavours (Jenkins on 10.2.7). Although the poet claims literary fame throughout the world, he recognises that the origin of his fame lies in the city of Rome. The reference to one's muse is a common poetical convention in defining the poet's literary genre, but on this occasion, Roma confers on Martial his audience, by which he will achieve literary immortality. Similarly at 10.53, Roma is addressed as the symbol of the prestige and reputation enjoyed by the famed charioteer Scorpus. Martial directly appeals to Roma on four more occasions in Book 10, more than in any other of his volumes (10.19 (18).4; 54; 72.1; 74.1), and so her role as muse here establishes a special relationship between poet and city, which creates a significant impact on thematic structure of the work (see Introduction).

'pigra per hunc fugies ingratae flumina Lethes et meliore tui parte superstes eris

The prospect of the poet escaping death is expressed in metaphorical language represented by the waters of the river Lethe which brings forgetfulness and oblivion (cf. Stat. 1.4.56-7 dulce opus. hinc fessos penitus subrepsit in artus/ insidiosa quies et pigra oblivio vitae; Theb. 10.89). Such periphrasis for death is a recurring feature in
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Roman poetry (Mart. 7.47.4 *gustata lethes paene remissus aqua*; 10.23.4; Stat. *Theb.* 4.567 *fugit ille per avia Lethes*; 8.97; Hor. *Epod.* 1.4.1-4; Otto: 192; for further literary examples see Vioque on 7.47.1-4).

The means by which Martial will avoid the obscurity of death is derived from his poetry, which is destined to long outlive him. This idea follows an extensive literary tradition and this passage is an obvious echo of Ovid *Amores* 1.15.2: *vivam, parsque mei multa superstes erit* (cf. Williams 2002b: 42ff.; also cf. *Met.* 15.875-6; Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.8; 3.30.6; Prop. 4.1.57-64; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 60; Williams 1978: 28). This motif is continued until the poem’s conclusion.

*marmora Messalae findit caprificus, et audax dimidios Crispi mulio ridet equos:*

Two examples of decay and ruin convey the notion that material objects of stone, however durable, will perish due to the inevitability of time. The parallel between the endurance of literature in comparison to the hardiest of materials such as marble in the form of buildings and statues is a familiar concept in Greek and Roman poetry as a means to emphasise the significance of the poet and his work (cf. Prop. 3.2.17-20 *fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello!/ carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae; Eleg. In Maec. 1.37-8; Ov. *Met.* 15.871; Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.2-5 *regalique situ pyramidum altius,/ quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens/ possit diruere aut innumerabilis/ annorum series et fuga temporum; Simonides 531; Pindar *Pyth.* 6.7; *AP* 7.17; Juv. 8.1-5 with Colton 1991: 327). This passage echoes one of Martial’s earlier poems where he claims his current fame will bring everlasting glory, and he even replicates the example of the monuments of Messalla:
et cum rupta situ Messallae saxa iacebunt
altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt,
me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes
ad patrias sedes carmina nostra feret. (8.3.5-8).

Messalla refers to Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus, wealthy patron of the poet Tibullus, who contributed to the construction of a number of buildings in Rome and the reparation of part of the via Latina (PIR¹ 3.90). The monument referred to here is his tomb, which was obviously a prominent landmark at Rome (cf. 8.3.5 saxa Messallae; for marmora in this sense cf. 8.8.6; 6.28.4; 10.21.2; 63.1). Martial presents the image of the proverbial destructive fig tree whose strength enables it to wreck marble monuments (cf. Juv. 10.144-6 ad quae/ discutienda valent sterilis mala robora fici,/ quando quidem data sunt ipsis quoque fata sepulcris; see Colton 1991: 374; also Pers. 1.25; Hor. Epod. 5.17; Prop. 4.5.76). Messalla was the epitome of literary patronage, the implication being that the literature itself outlives the material reminders of its patrons.

The crumbling statue is of Crispus, whose identity is generally accepted to be C. Sallustius Passienus Crispus, stepfather of Nero at the time of Nero, and for whom a statue was erected in the Basilica Julia (PIR¹ 3.109, SB² 2: 324, Friedlaender on 10.2.10). There is a possibility that Crispus refers to Quintus Vibius Crispus, a delator and close friend of Domitian who died in 93 (Mart. 4.54.7; 12.36.9; PIR¹, 379; Jenkins ad loc.). Jenkins suggests that if the latter Crispus is intended here, the crumbling statue may allude to the actual destruction of a monument in honour of an individual closely associated with the former regime, in a manner similar to the mass destruction of Domitian’s own statues (Suet. Dom. 23; Plin. Pan. 52; Jenkins ad loc.). Further, this statue of Crispus is an equestrian statue, and its mention here may be
intended to recall one of the more famous statues of Domitian, the massive *Equus Domitianus*, which is the subject of Statius *Silvae* 1.1 (cf. Suet. *Dom.* 15.2). On Domitian's death it was destroyed along with other statues of him (Suet. *Dom.* 23.1; Jones 1996: 126, 155). It is possible that the disintegration of Crispus' statue seeks to mock the assertion made by Statius that Domitian's statue will prevail forever: *stabit, dum terra polusque,/ dum Romana dies* (*Silv.* 1.1.93-4). Not only are the statues falling to pieces (for *dimidios*, cf. Juv. 8.4 *et Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem*), but are mocked by the common mulio, driver of Roman carriages, whose profession afforded little respect (Kay on 11.38.1; Hor. *S.* 2.8.72; Pers. 5.76; Otto: 232). The deliberate contrast between the *dimidios*...*equos* and the *audax mulio* heightens the sense of irony. The contempt for the *mulio* appears in a similar example of ironic contrasts at 10.76.8-9 between the poor Roman-born poet who shivers in a flimsy cape and the foreign *mulio* who boasts a rich cloak.

*at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt, solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori.*

Unlike monuments of stone and marble, Martial's poetry will achieve true immortality, a well established device in literary tradition (see above). These lines deliberately echo the conclusion to Horace *Odes* 3.30.1 *exegi monumentum aere perennius* (cf. Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 368; also see Williams 2002b: 423; cf. Prop. 3.2.18 *carmina erant formae tot monumenta tuae*; Catul. 95b *parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta*). The term *monumenta* evokes the image of a tombstone and conveys the sense of a monument both physical and literary, in contrast with the mere marble tombstone mentioned above (see also Juv. 10.146 *data sunt ipsis quoque fata*
10.2

sepulcris). In accordance with the Callimachean concept of literary immortality, Catullus, in true neoteric style, rejects contemporary fame in favour of the prospect of future fame (1.10 plus uno maneat perenne saeclo), and is concerned only with the readership of his fellow scholars (at populus tumido gaudeat Antimachus 95.10; cf. Newman 1990: 112-13; 370-1). Throughout his books, however, Martial embraces the idea of contemporary fame along with the ultimate reward of his poetry outlasting even marble and, as such, it alone will survive for future generations (cf. 5.10.12 si post fata venit gloria, non propero; 8.3.1-8).

10.3

Martial’s popularity and reputation as a poet is considered from a different perspective from that of 10.2. Here his fame makes him a target of poets publishing defamatory material in his name. 10.5, which invokes a curse against a poet who publishes slanderous material, is an obvious sequel to 10.3, and the motif returns again at 10.33 and 72. The threat of other poets presenting such poetry in his name is not new to Book 10 (cf. 7.12; 72), and similar complaints of literary theft and plagiarism are prominent throughout the books (1.29; 66; 72; 2.20; 10.100; 11.94; 12.63, see Howell and Citroni on 1.29; Bowie on 12.63). Whilst Martial’s fame is a gift from Roma herself, as stated in the previous poem, such fame would undoubtedly have made his name and his works susceptible to exploitation through the distribution of damaging literature (7.12.10).

Freedom of speech was a sensitive issue during the Empire, and a number of writers were punished for scurrilous verses. Augustus extended the lex Julia Maiestatis to control the publication of scurrilous pamphlets against members of the
nobility (Tac. Ann. 1.72; Suet. Aug. 55; White 1993: 149-54). This law was enforced during Tiberius’ reign. Tacitus relates the episodes of the burning of Cremutius Cordus’ works (Annales 4.34-5; cf. Dio 57.24), and the exile of Cassius Severus for his slanderous pamphlets (Tac. Ann. 4.21; cf. Mayor on Juv. 11.53 for a list of writers punished for their works; Coffey 1989: 98-9). Although the actual extent to which such verses were distributed in Martial’s name cannot be determined, such a matter was of genuine concern to him as Domitian enforced similar laws regulating the defamation of important individuals: *scripta famosa vulgo edita, quibus primores viri ac feminae notabantur, abolevit non sine auctorum ignominia* (Suet. Dom. 8.3; Coleman 1986: 3111-15). So it is perhaps with good reason that Martial is so emphatic in his denial of authorship of such verses in his works published during the reign of Domitian. Although Pliny contrasts the oppressive atmosphere under Domitian with the more tolerant rule of Trajan (Plin. Ep. 1.10.1; 1.31.1; 3.18.5, Coleman 1986: 3113-14), it is possible that the presence of this topic here reflects Martial’s uncertainty over attitudes towards censorship under the new regime. Censorship and public attacks on individuals would be a particularly sensitive issue at the start of a new regime under a new emperor, whose policies would be as yet unclear. Thus, this poem can be plausibly regarded as a new insertion in the second edition, published at the beginning of Trajan’s reign, and as a result its prominence at the opening of this book assumes special significance.

These themes are strongly reminiscent of the literary programme presented in the opening to Book 1, where there is particular emphasis on the harmlessness of his material towards actual people (1 praef; 1.1-4; for further comparisons with Book 1, see Fearnley 2003: 632-4; Howell on 1 praef. notes that Martial does not use the
preface to Book 1 as a justification for his choice of genre, unlike at 10.4). Therefore, it would appear that these poems are designed not only to reinforce his literary programme but also to reintroduce it at the beginning of the new regime under Trajan (cf. 10.72; see Fearnley 2003: 619ff.). 10.5, a curse against a slanderous poet, is the next poem in the cycle, and is placed directly before the first poem mentioning the emperor Trajan in Book 10. The deliberate positioning of this is evidenced by 10.33, also on literary theft, which is likewise followed by a poem addressing Trajan. These two poems are also presented in the choliambic metre, traditionally associated with satirical themes and verbal abuse, to illustrate the degradation of moral values (Quinn 1970: xxxiii). There are only eight poems in this metre in Book 10, the remainder being elegiac couplets or hendecasyllables, so the prominence of these two poems in this metre at the opening of the book suggests a special significance and relationship. The choliambic metre was a form embraced by the Alexandrian poets, such as Callimachus in his Iambi, and adopted by Catullus in a number of his poems. The usage of a metre so especially associated with Callimachus in two poems which enclose Martial’s rejection of Callimachus demonstrates Martial’s conflict with his literary predecessors and his flexibility with literary traditions.

Martial’s fear of punishment for the penmanship of such works is cloaked in humour and biting irony against their actual unknown author. By portraying himself as the victim of this anonymous poet and by refuting the authorship of such works in his own published epigrams, Martial effectively obtains the sympathy of his readers and patrons.
Vernaculorum dicta, sordidum dentem,  
et foeda linguae probra circulatricis,

The offending material comprises language more in keeping with that used by slaves and street vendors, and implies that it is low bred and vulgar. Throughout the poem there is a sequence of unusual terminology, perhaps to distinguish Martial’s superior vocabulary from that of his adversaries (cf. circulatrix, proxeneta; clancularius; ascaules).

The first of these is vernacula, derived from verna, a common term for a domestic or native born slave, though it can also incorporate someone of low-breeding and vulgar wit (Suet. Vit. 14.4 nullis tamen infensor quam vernaculis et mathematicis; cf. OLD s.v. vernaculus; verna). Their language/behaviour is similarly categorised as pertaining to street sellers by Seneca (Ben. 6.11.2 alter apud circulatorem resedit et, dum vagus atque erro vernaculis congregatur et ludit). It is not always a reprehensible quality, as Martial refers to his own book as verna at 3.1.6, but that is to highlight its position as native to Rome. Thus the phrase vernaculorum dicta reflects the impertinence and vulgar wit characteristic of household slaves, which sometimes was even encouraged, thus adopting both senses of verna (e.g. Horace S. 2.6.66; Petr. 24.2; Sen. Dial. 2.11.3; for further examples see Howell on 1.41.2). This is the only occasion Martial uses the diminutive vernaculus, although verna occurs many times in his epigrams (cf. 10.30.21; Citroni on 1.41.2). At 1.41, verna is used to describe the wit of Caecilius which opposes all that is urbanus: urbanus tibi, Caecili, videris./ non es, crede mihi. quid ergo? verna es./ hoc quod transiberinus ambulator,/ qui pallentia sulphurata fractis (1.41.1-4.). Its meaning frequently expresses the opposite of urbanus, which denotes sophistication or
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elegantly amusing wit (Pl. *Am.* 1033, Juv. 9.10; cf. Citroni on 1.41.2). The two
applied together denote irony towards wit (e.g. Petr. 24.2 *hominem acutum atque
urbanitas vernaculæ*; Tac. *Hist.* 2.88.4 *vernacula utebantur urbanitate*).

Additionally, the language is also the product of *sordidum dentem*, which is
figurative of the black tooth of *invidia*, the destructive power of envy, which bites,
gnaws and carps at its victim (Hor. *Carm.* 4.3.16 *iam dente minus mordeor invido*;
Cicero *Balb.* 57; Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.74; Mart. 12 *praef.* 15; Dickie 1981: 201; for further
examples cf. Otto: 107-8; Jenkins on 10.3.1). The tooth is characteristically presented
as black to indicate decay, and its colouring is reflected here by the adjective
*sordidum* (5.28.7 *robiginosis cuncta dentibus rodit*; Ov. *Met.* 2.776; Hor. *Epod.* 6.15
*atro dente*; Sen. *Phaed.* 493 *dente degeneri*; Dickie 1981: 201). The impact of *invidia*
as a characteristic trait of other poets is a recurrent device in Martial’s epigrams, and
whilst he maintains that his own poetry is free from such a vice, those who publish
malicious works in his name do so as a result of envy (cf. 10.33; 1 *praef.*; 7.12.9
*ludimus innocui*).

The feminine form *circulatrix* is used attributively in place of *circulator* to
refer to the street vendor or performer who attracts an impromptu crowd (cf. Petr.
68.6; Plin. *Ep.* 4.7.6; *OLD* s.v.). This form appears only once in Martial and is found
in only one other example in Latin literature (*Priap.* 19.1 *hic quando Telethusa
circulatrix*). Similar word formations are a common feature of Martial’s poetry (e.g.
*spoliatrix* 4.29.5; *amatrix* 7.15.4; 7.76.9; 10.4.5; *salutatrix* 7.87.6; 9.99.2; *ructatrix*
10.48.2; *futatrix* 11.22.4; 61.10; cf. Jenkins on 10.3.2).
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quae sulphurato nolit empla ramento
Vatiniorum proxeneta factorum

At this time, a popular livelihood on the streets was the trade of sulphur tipped matches in exchange for bits of broken glass by dealers or hawkers (cf. 1.41.2-4 hoc quod transtiberinus ambulator/ qui pallentia sulphurata fractis/ permutat vitreis; 12.57.14; Stat. Silv. 1.6.73-4; Juv. 5.47-8; cf. Harrison 1987: 203-7). Such fragments of broken glass were proverbially associated with cheapness or objects of no value (Petr. 50.10; 10.1; Dio 60.17.6; Howell on 1.41.5). Vatinian glass refers to the drinking vessel with a large spout named after Vatinius of Beneventum, the infamous buffoon and delator in the time of Nero (Tac. Ann. 15.34; also cf. Mart. 14.96; Juv. 5.46; Leary on 14.96). Given the notoriety he earned for his slanderous invective, the reference to his name is deliberately appropriate.

Martial selects the unusual Greek term, proxeneta, to denote an ‘agent’ or ‘broker’, which appears only once in his poetry and is rarely found in Latin literature (Sen. Ep. 119.1; Justinianus 50.14). Its application in this context denotes Martial’s contempt for his cheap imitators since such a distinctly technical term contrasts with the limited vocabulary of such poets.

poeta quidam clancularius spargit
et vult videri nostra. credis hoc, Prisce?

The poet who is spreading such material is anonymous; this is denoted by a neologism not used elsewhere, clancularius, derived from clanculum, a term commonly found in the comedies of Plautus and Terence. The unusual nature of the term perhaps intensifies the contemptuous tone towards this unknown poet who composes scurrilous verses in Martial’s name.
In other poems dealing with the topic of literary theft, Martial is frequently compelled to call upon friends and patrons in defence of his literary reputation (e.g. 7.12 to Faustinus; 7.72.12-16 to Paulus; to 12.63 Corduba; cf. 1.29; 38; 53; 72 to the plagiarist Fidentinus who is stealing Martial’s work). It is possible that the addressee is Terentius Priscus, a friend of Spanish birth, to whom Book 12 is dedicated (12 praef.; 12.3; 62; also 8.45; cf. Bowie on 12 praef.). Priscus is a very common cognomen throughout the books, but confusion still remains over whether such references are to a fictitious person (SB1: Index s.v. Priscus; also cf. 1.112; 2.41.10; 7.46; 8.12; 9.10, or Jenkins 1.112; 2.41; 10.5; 12.92) and/or a real person, presumably Terentius Priscus (6.18; 7.46; 8.12; 9.77; 12.14; 62; PIR1 P 716). There is the suggestion that the Priscus of these poems refers to two people, a father and son (12.62), where 9.77 is the last poem addressed to the father. If this is the case, then this present poem is addressed to the son (cf. Jenkins on 12.3.6).

voce ut loquatur psittacus coturnicis
ut concupiscat esse Canus ascaules?

Two different examples contrast the difference between the quality of Martial’s poetry and the work of this anonymous poet. Both rely on comparisons of the noises made by birds and musical instruments, where the one is beautiful and elegant like Martial, the other harsh and strident. In comparison to Martial, this other poet’s material sounds like a quail rather than a parrot, or bellows like the bagpipes instead of the music of the flute player.

The use of bird imagery as a metaphor for literary criticism follows an extensive literary tradition in Greek and Latin poetry, where certain birds are
categorised amongst good and bad poets according to their voices (e.g. Pindar *Ol.* 2.86-8). The swan invariably represents a good poet (cf. 1.53, also the nightingale, the goldfinch, and the eagle) and the bad poet is represented by cacophonous birds such as the crane, the swallow, the jay, the hoopoe, the goose, the jackdaw, the screech owl and the crow (for literary examples, see Myers 2002: 193 n.27). Parrots seem to have been traditionally associated with bad poets (Callim. *Iamb. II* fr. 192.11), and Persius explains the reason as being due to their mindless imitative nature (Pers. *Pr.* 8-14, Myers 2002: 194). Here Martial, the good poet, is denoted as the parrot, and the anonymous bad poet is the quail. A similar comparison between these two kinds of birds is seen in Ovid *Amores* 2.6.25-8, where the parrot is admired for its beauty and talent for mimicry (see also Pers. *Pr.* 8-14; Plin. *Nat.* 11. 132; Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.2; Apul. *Fl.* 12), whereas the quail was notorious for its noisy aggression (Arist. *Hist. an.* 4.9.563A; Plin. *Nat.* 11. 268; for references to the quail cf. Pl. *Capt.* 1003; Var. *R.* 3.5.2; Lucr. 4.641; Plin. *Nat.* 11.268; Juv. 12.976). Compare also 1.53 where Martial’s poetry and the poems of a plagiarist are likened to songs of swans and ravens, nightingales and magpies respectively: *sic niger in ripis errat cum forte Caystri,/ inter Ledaeos ridetur corvus olores,/ sic, ubi multisona fervet sacer Athhide lucus,/ improba Cecropias offendit pica querelas* (1.53.7-10).

The second example contrasts the raucous sound of the bagpipes, a less dignified instrument, with the more refined refrain produced by the flute. The playing of the flute is represented by Canus, a famous flute player of the period, renowned as a favourite of Galba (cf. 4.5.8; Suet. *Galba* 12; Plut. *Galba* 12). Martial uses the term *auscaules*, a *hapax legomenon* for ‘bagpipes’, rather than the Latin *utricularius* (Suet.
Nero 54). As with clancularius, the obscurity of the term heightens the contemptuous tone towards this anonymous poet.

procul a libellis nigra sit meis fama,
quos rumor alba gemmeus vehit pinna:

Throughout the books, Martial displays a concern about the risk that he may be associated with the distribution of malicious verses (1 praef.; 7.12; 72). Whilst the literary renown he mentions in the previous poem brings great rewards, the destructive power of fame is always present (for the use of fama in terms of literary reputation cf. 1.29.1; 7.88.1; Greenwood 1998: 291). This is the first occasion in which fama and rumor are mentioned in the same poem, where fama represents the negative side to Martial's popularity and rumor the beneficial aspects (i.e. the reward of readership mentioned in 10.2 above). The personified fama is traditionally depicted with wings, flying over the land to spread her injurious reports (Verg. A. 4.173-88; Ov. Met. 12.39-63; Stat. Theb. 3.4.25). The destructive nature of fama is illustrated by its description as nigra, similar to the verses soaked in black venom of 7.72: si quisquam mea dixerit malignus/atro carmina quae madent veneno (7.72.12-13; 7.12.4 also et mihi de nullo fama rubore Hor. S. 1.4.85; 91; 100; Greenwood 1998: 307). Whilst fama occurs on many occasions throughout Martial's poems, rumor is mentioned on only six other occasions (2.72.6; 3.735; 80.2; 87.1; 4.16.2; 69.2). For the combination of fama and rumor, see Juv. 6.408; Plin. Pan. 59.3. The wings of gemmeus rumor are white in contrast with the black wings of the ill-omened fama (Verg. A. 7.408), in order to further distinguish between the negative and positive aspects of fame and reputation. rumor is described as gemmeus,
bejewelled', the only occasion in which it is given this epithet. Martial uses the adjective elsewhere to describe peacocks, an image perhaps deliberately evoked here as a continuation of the bird metaphor (3.15.13 gemmeique pavones; also Phaed. 3.18.8, Jenkins ad loc.). The colour motifs enhance the destructive effects of the \textit{fama}, and \textit{nigra fama} complements the language of the \textit{sordidum dentem} mentioned above (Greenwood 1998: 307).

\textit{cur ego laborem notus esse tam prave, constare gratis cum silentium possit?}

Authorship of such verses is emphatically denied in the resolve to favour silence at no cost, as opposed to the heavy price imposed by the charges of libel. Apart from 10.3 and 10.5, poems on the subject of poets passing scurrilous/libellous verses as Martial’s occur mainly in Book 1. For example, 1.66 concerns the individual who obtains fame through literary plagiarism; and Martial’s rejoinder is virtually identical: \textit{aliena quisquis recitat et petit Jamam,/ non emere librum, sed silentium debet} (1.66.13-14). In his preface to Book 1, he claims that his satire is aimed at fictitious persons, and he combines this with the notion that the price of ill-repute has no appeal: \textit{mihi fama vilia constet et probetur in me novissimum ingenium} (1 praef.). A shared feature of both books is that they form Martial’s first published approach to a new and hence uncertain political regime. It seems, then, that Martial was especially keen to protect himself against the laws of libel and \textit{maiestas}. 
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The literary theme of Book 10 continues with a rejection of the hackneyed mythological themes set forth in the more elevated literary genres in order to demonstrate, by contrast, the relevance of Martial's chosen genre. The refusal to present obscure literary subjects which have no relevance in contemporary Roman society, in preference for realistic depiction of life, has an extensive literary tradition, particularly in the satiric genre of the first century CE (Pers. 5.1; Petr. 1-3; 88; Juv. 1.1ff.; 1.162ff.). This idea is also found in other genres, such as elegy (Ov. Am. 1.1; 2.1; 2.18; Prop. 1.7; 2.34; 3.3) and didactic poetry (Verg. G. 3.3ff.; Manilius 3.5, Aetna 9ff, and Nemes Cyneg. 15ff). As such, it became the means of defence for the poet's chosen literary genre, as opposed to the more grandiose styles of epic and tragedy (Bramble 1974: 12-13, Spisak 1994: 291ff.).

In satire, this rejection developed as an element of the programmatic poems, mainly in the form of recusatio and apologia, where the poet is obliged to justify his choice of genre and its significance to topics of real life (Braund 1996: 110-21; on the relationship between satire and Martial, see Spisak 1997: 352ff.). As part of the recusatio, those genres regarded as inferior in the literary hierarchy were expected to belittle the more elevated literary genres. Persius objects to contemporary practitioners of these exalted genres, whose work he considers irrelevant and artificial and a reflection of the moral degeneracy in contemporary society (in particular Satire 1 and 5.14-20; cf. Spisak 1997: 356-7; Braund 1996: 111ff.). He frequently connects the irrelevance of genres such as epic and tragedy with the decline in morality and what is favoured by contemporary readership, and excludes from his audience all but a select few, in contrast with those who read these artificial and stale works:
The objection to stale, overworked themes is closely related to the observation of moral degeneracy in society, and is not just represented in satire. Seneca (Ep. 114) discusses the causal relationship between the decline in literature and society which is reiterated in Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (Williams 1978: 12ff.). In Petronius' *Satyricon* 1-4, Encolpius declaims against the decline in rhetoric where the preferred style is long-windedness, and stale and unreal themes, which Agamemnon in answer blames on the decline in morals and the decadence of the age. The decline in arts is raised again in *Satyricon*, and is ascribed to the value attached to money (88).

The attack on the pretensions of these elevated genres is even more pronounced in Juvenal. In a similar vein to 10.4, Satire 1 attacks the poets who adopt boring mythological themes that have no relevance to the present day, and presents a list of mythological topics to demonstrate their futility and to illustrate the benefits of the satiric genre (1.1-11; 52-4, 162ff; Braund 1996: 22-4, 110-21; Spisak 1994: 301). The rejection of the elevated genres is a *topos* for Roman Satire as a means of justifying to contemporary Roman society its moral values and realism.

Convention established the genres of epic and tragedy as the pinnacle of literary standards, as opposed to the genre of epigram, which was traditionally regarded as *πατρυω* (‘playthings’) and not in the same league as the more serious
poetry (Sullivan 1991: 60). Martial adheres to this tradition in labelling his verses as trivial and frivolous pieces, such as: *nugae* (cf. 1.113.6; 4.10.4; 6.64.7-8, 7.11.4; 7.26.7; 7.51.1; 9 praef. 5; 13.2.4), *ioici* (cf. 1 praef. 7; 1.35.13; 4.10.8; 5.15.1; 6.82.5; 6.85.10; 7.12.2; 7.28.8; 10.64.2), *lusus* (cf. 6.85.9; 11.6.3; 11.16.7), *levis versus* (cf. 7.8.9 *leves elegos*; 9.73.9; 12.94.8), *versus parum severi* (cf. 1.35.1; 10.20.1), *tricae* (cf. 14.1.7) and *apinae* (cf. 1.113.2; 14.1.7) (Sullivan 1991: 60; Spisak 1992: 46ff.). At 8.3.13-18 and 12.94.9, he acknowledges the conventional loftier status of genres such as epic and tragedy in contrast with his own modest genre, but this deprecation of his choice of genre becomes a device for confirming his own poetic artistry. The proof of this is provided by his selection of subjects pertinent to contemporary Roman life in his verses (4.49, 5.53, 9.50 and 8.3,10.4.10; 8.3.20 *agnoscat mores vita legatque suos*). At 4.49, Martial criticises those who regard epigram as a frivolous exercise (4.49.2 *lusus..iocosque*), in favour of the incomprehensible themes related in epic and drama (5.53.1-2; 9.50; 10.21; 33.5-7). Martial claims that the subjects of real life in epigrams are more significant than the mythological subject matter of tragedies or epics which are remote from ordinary living. Both the language and ideas in these epigrams are straightforward and direct, without the pomposities and pretentiousness of obscure mythological or historical references.

Martial frequently uses mythological themes in a conventional form to 'decorate, clarify, illustrate or emphasise his chosen subjects' (Allen 1970: 356), to highlight contemporary situations, or to use them to flatter Domitian (9.64; 65; 104; 5.65). Many of the subjects mentioned in 10.4 appear as mythological exempla in other epigrams and not just as a target of criticism (see further below). This usage suggests that it is not the actual learning which he despises but the artificial and
pedantic nature of these genres. Poems such as 4.49 and 10.4 serve to undermine indirectly ‘the whole hierarchy of literary genres, to establish a new set of poetic values and models in opposition to those already established in Greco-Roman literary theory’ (Sullivan 1988: 178). Martial’s protest is against poetry that has come to do more and more with fantastical and unreal characters and situations (Spisak 1994: 303). The adverse reaction to stale mythological themes is not unique but part of his dissatisfaction with the status of his own lowly genre within the hierarchy of literary genres. For example, Vergil in the *Georgics* rejects themes that are *omnia iam vulgata* (3.4); this refers to themes in the Alexandrian tradition but not necessarily the style (Thomas 1988: 36ff.).

Drama and epic are not the only targets under attack in this poem, but more specific jibes are aimed at writers and their works, such as Statius’ *Thebaid* (Parthenopaeus, Books 6; 7; 8), Theocritean pastoral, Propertian elegy (Hylas 1.20), Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (Hermaphroditus 4.383), Attis in Catullus (63) and Callimachus (*Aetia*) (Sullivan 1991: 74, 179). Included are poets for whom he has previously professed admiration, such as Catullus, Vergil (4.14.14; 11.48.1; 12.67.5; 12.3(4).1; 11.52.18), and Ovid (3.38.19; 1.61.1; 5.10.10; 8.73.9-10; 12.44.6) (Swann 1994: 45-6). Catullus’ influence on Martial is indisputable, and he is frequently acknowledged in the epigrams (e.g. 1 *praef.* 1; 1.7.3-4; 1.109.1; 2.71.3; 4.14.13; 5.5.6; 6.34.7; 7.14.3; 10.78.16; 11.6.16; 12.44.5; 59.3; Martial calls him *doctus* cf. 7.99.7; 8.73.6; 14.100.1; 152.1; Swann 1994: 34, Spisak 1992: 158-61). In fact, the addressee of 10.4, Mamurra, is intended to bring to mind the prominent individual of Catullan invective (see below). But Catullus, with his adoption of Callimachean aesthetics, is also recognised as the forerunner of the neoteric movement in poetry. Martial’s
attitudes towards Callimachus and Alexandrian principles are extremely complicated (Sullivan 1991: 74-5; see also Spisak 1994: 291ff.). In 4.23, Martial professes admiration for Callimachus as an epigrammatist, but he attacks the characteristics of Callimachean poetry exemplified by Catullus’ Attis (2.86), Cinna’s Zmyrna (10.21), and the Amazonis of Domitius Marsus (4.29). Martial is selective in his adoption of Alexandrian principles, clearly stating his preference for the short poem, the epigram and brevitas, but effectively discarding the mythology and other elements which do not relate to real life (Sullivan 1991: 75, Newman 1990: 92-6).

The Aetia represents the ultimate in poetry on Greek mythological themes that lack any relation to real life and are irrelevant to the poet of social resonance (Spisak 1994: 304). Martial is adapting the apologia and recusatio, and employing them against the very initiators of these forms, Callimachus and the Roman poets who adopted them (Catul. 1; Ov. Am. 1.1-3; cf. Spisak 1994: 300, Braund 1996: 110-11). This reveals an aspect of Martial’s ludus which unites the traditions of the neoteries and satirists by showing his opposition to Callimachean literary precepts (Spisak 1997: 360 n.22). He is quite willing to accept that he uses these writers as models for his own epigrams, yet also feels the need to distance himself from the literary traditions in order to represent a new style. Martial is continually trying to maintain his popularity with his reader, which does not conform to Callimachean traditions (cf. Callim. Epig. 28; Spisak 1994: 304), even in his apology for length which is left to the discretion of the reader (10.1). Martial comments that his readership favoured epigrams over other genres, however much the latter were praised: laudant illa (i.e. tragedies), sed ista (i.e. epigrammata) legunt (4.49.10). Martial’s primary concern is
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for the reader and not to accommodate a set theory of epigram (3.9, Braund 1996: 110).

As mentioned above, 10.2 and 10.4 are a separation of the ideas addressed in 8.3, which establishes his readership and fame and justifies the selection of the epigrammatic genre (cf. 10.2). Martial’s literary fame is a result of his choice of themes pertaining to real life in language and style, and which are readily comprehensible to his readership. In Martial’s terms, Callimachus' *Aetia* represents the epitome of obscure and arcane literature, and the poet challenges the contemporary value of such poetry against his own. In an interesting twist, the Callimachean legacy is evoked in the following poem which adapts the Alexandrian tradition of curse poetry.


*Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,*

The epigram opens with a list of mythological references compacted into a series of questions on the benefit of such subjects: *quid nisi* ... *quid tibi* ... *quid* ... *quid* ... *aut qui* ... *quid?* The first examples are arranged in pairs, one male, the other female, who have committed crimes against family, followed by two sets of three youths of effeminate character (Watson and Watson: 96). The vocabulary and structure is reminiscent of 5.53.1-2, where the target is the writer rather than the reader of such poetry:

*Colchida quid scribis, quid scribis, amice, Thyesten?*  
*quo tibi vel Nioben, Basse, vel Andromachen?*
Similarly Juvenal accompanies his programmatic statement with a series of indignant rhetorical questions (1.1-13; 87-97).

For his tirade against the regurgitation of lavish mythological tales, Martial selects examples well-established from Greek and Roman literature, in particular tragedy. Oedipus is a name closely associated with tragedy, and he is represented in both Greek and Latin drama by Sophocles and Seneca respectively. Although the subject is familiar, Martial chooses an unusual Greek accusative form for Oedipus rather than one of the more accepted forms where the accusative ending would be the usual form *Oedipum* (Quint. Inst. 9.3.8), a first declension form *Oedipodam* (Sen. Oed. 216; 943) or *Oedipodem* (Stat. Theb. 11.666; Suet. Nero 21.3). Statius uses this form on three occasions, cf. Theb. 2.436, 8.242, 11.491; also Ov. Tristia 1.1.114 in the accusative plural *Oedipodas*; also found at Mart. 9.25). Clearly, the motive for using this form is to convey contempt for the pedantic and obscure even in language, and perhaps as a personal jibe at Statius.

The account of Thyestes, the son of Pelops, appears in Aeschylus, Euripides and Seneca, and was a popular subject of tragedy (cf. Hor. Ars 91; Carm. 1.16.17; Quint. Inst. 10.1.98; Cic. Pis. 19; Pl. Rud. 2.6.25). In poems with a similar theme, Martial also uses Thyestes as the embodiment of material which is outdated and irrelevant to contemporary life (4.49.3-4 *ille magis ludit qui scribit prandia saevi/ Tereos aut cenam, crude Thysta, tuam;* 5.53.1 *Colchida quid scribis, quid scribis, amice, Thyesten*; cf. Pers. 5.5; 17ff., who also typecasts Thyestes as hackneyed material in the higher genres of poetry), but he is also mentioned at 3.45 as a comparison for the unpleasant dinner service of Ligurinus. In Book 10, Thyestes, along with Medea and Scylla in the following line, appears again at 10.35, where
themes of violence and bloodshed are also avoided by the contemporary poet Sulpicia in favour of risqué but virtuous verses.

Here Thyestes is *caligantem*, which is used ironically, possibly to refer to 'dim-sighted' (or 'dim-witted') Thyestes who is blindly eating his own sons (cf. *OLD* s.v. *caligo*). Perhaps it is also intended to evoke the image of the sun turning back in the sky at the sight of Atreus serving up his own sons to Thyestes, according to the Senecan version of the story (Sen. *Ag.* 36; Aesch. *Ag.* 1593; Eur. *El.* 737; cf. Jenkins on 10.4.1; Watson and Watson: 96.).

**Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?**

The two masculine figures are then contrasted with two feminine, Medea and Scylla (Sergi 1989: 56-7). The term *Colchis* is a common synonym for Medea (cf. *TLL* 2.530.3; Mart. 10.35.5 *non haec Colchidos asserit furorem*; 5.53.1; also Hor. *Epod.* 16.58; Prop. 2 (3) 21.11; 2 (3).34.8; Ov. *Met.* 7.301; 7.331; 7.348; *Rem.* 262; Juv. 6.643), who was a standard topic for tragedy and epic (e.g. Euripides; Seneca). Appropriately, Martial employs the unusual Greek plural accusatives, the use of which occurs only once and in epic poetry (Stat. *Theb.* 9.734). Not only does the plural form balance that used for Scylla, but it also reflects the disparaging attitude towards the endless repetition of such themes (cf. Juv. 1.52-3 *Herecleas aut Dimoedeas*; Braund 1996: 89).

There were two Scyllas, one who was originally human but turned into the sea monster with six heads in the Straits of Messina (Hom. *Od.* 12.73ff); the second, the daughter of king Nisus who cut off his purple or red lock of hair and killed him in order to deliver the city to king Minos, who drowned her for her deed (Ov. *Met.*
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8.1ff.). The two are frequently conflated in poetry (e.g. Verg. Ecl. 6.74ff.; Prop. 4.4.39ff.; Ov. Fast. 4.500; Ars 1.331ff.), which is most likely Martial's intention here, in order to illustrate the pretentious nature of such mythological themes. Watson and Watson, however, suggest, that the reference is specifically for Nisos' daughter, thus making all the mythological exempla of lines 1-2 characters who sin against family (Watson and Watson: 97).

Martial contrasts the subjects of *monstra* in these genres with that of *hominem* to demonstrate the advantages of epigrams. Although Shackleton Bailey proposes *mihi* the ethic dative instead of *nisi* ('what do you read except monstrosities?') for the reason that Martial does not mention mythological poetry solely dealing with the monstrous (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 142), this kind of question occurs elsewhere to introduce a series of examples (5.48.1; 7.24.1-2; Siedschlag 1977: 19).

*quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,*  
*quid tibi dormitor proderit Endymion,*

Martial progresses from murderous characters to those of an effeminate nature, such as Hylas, Attis and Endymion. Rather than the standard objections to epic and tragedy, references to these characters suggest Martial's objections to Hellenistic lyric and Roman elegy as demonstrated in the works of Theocritus, Propertius, Ovid and Catullus. Such characters are representative of all that is effeminate in these types of literature, and Martial cites them here not simply as examples of trite, irrelevant mythological themes but also as representatives of a kind of poetry that is morally degenerate. He also argues elsewhere that the readers of such effeminate, decadent
and affected literary genres are themselves sexually and morally abnormal (Kay on 11.90; also see Sergi 1989: 58ff.).

The myth of Hylas, who was carried off by Heracles on the expedition of the Argonauts and was enticed by the water nymphs into the spring, is a popular subject in Hellenistic poetry (Callimachus, Nicander, Apollonius, Theocritus Id. 13) and Roman literature (Verg. Ecl. 6.43; Prop. 1.20; Ov. Ars Amat. 2.110). This phrase is echoed by Juvenal to typify commonplace mythological exempla 1.163-4 aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus (Colton 1991: 66; also cf. Verg. G. 3.6; Stat. Silv. 1.2.199). Hylas is mentioned on many occasions in Martial, generally for the purposes of contemporary situations or in a satirical context (5.48.5 raptus Hylas; 6.68.8; 7.15.2; 50.8; 65.14; 11.43),

Parthenopaeus was one of the seven against Thebes, and is also mentioned at 6.77.1 (Aeschylus Theb. 547). Statius is never mentioned by name in Martial’s epigrams, but some scholars suggest that this reference indicates a covert attack on his contemporary, who devoted considerable time to the character of Parthenopaeus in his Thebaid (e.g. 4.248; Sullivan 1991: 73; Watson and Watson: 97). Also note Citroni’s argument that the attack is aimed at the Theban cycle in general and not specifically at Statius (Citroni 1968: 296 n.22).

Attis, the self-castrated consort of the Phrygian goddess Cybele, is best known as the subject of Catullus 63 (cf. also Lucr. 2.61, Ov. Fast. 4.170ff.; Apul. Met. 8.26ff.). At 2.86, Martial criticises the galliambic metre of Catullus’ poem, preferring to avoid such difficult metres in short poems, and citing the work as a symbol of the types of degenerate poems which he finds objectionable: nec dictat mihi luculentus Attis/ mollem debilitate galliambon (2.86.4-5). Persius also objects to the
mythological representation of Attis on the grounds that his self-emascula
tion is indicative of the decadent and effeminate morals of contemporary society (1.92-3 sed numeris decor est et iunctura addita crudis/ cludere sic versum didicit "Berecyntius Attis").

Another popular theme with Hellenistic poets and their Roman adherents is Endymion, famed for his eternal sleep at the hand of Selene, who fell in love with him (cf. Hes. frs. 245; 260; Sappho fr. 134, Prop. 2.15.15; Ov. Ep. 18.63; Ars 3.83). Note also the use of words ending in -tor as marking a person given to a particular vice (cf. Watson and Watson: 97). The hapax legomenon of dormitor is possibly invented to connote obscurity and pedantry, the elements to which Martial is objecting.

exutusve puer pinnis labentibus, aut qui
edit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?

The periphrastic phrase exutusve puer pinnis labentibus refers to the story of Icarus, who lost his wings flying too close to the sun (Ov. Ars 2.76; Met. 8.195; Tib. 3.7.10). A similar phrase is used at 4.49.5 as an example of a tired mythological theme (aut puero liquidas aptantem Daedalon alas); also cf. Juv. 1.54 where it is used in the rejection of epic themes in favour of satire: et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem (Colton 1991: 37-8). Colton also notes that the common noun puer is used disparagingly to describe a mythological hero (Colton 1991: 38).

The final and perhaps most negative example is Hermaphroditus, the youth who obtained both male and female characteristics from the gods at the request of Salmacis, the nymph of the fountain in which he bathed, to unite them in the one embrace (Plin. Ep. 7.33; Ov. Met. 4.285). This myth features largely in Ovid's
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Metamorphoses (4.274-85; 383; 15.319), which was most likely modelled on Hellenistic poetry (AP 2.102; 9.317; 783; Diodorus 4.6.5). This figure was also a popular feature of statuary, an example of which is mentioned by Martial at 14.174, and he is mentioned again at 6.68.9 where he is described as *femineum*, as a comparison with the youth Eutychos who recently drowned. His effeminate qualities are emphasised by the feminine adjectival form *amatrices* (see also 7.15.4; 69.9; cf. *circulatrix* of 10.3.2), which conveys contempt for the composition of such literature and also for the readership of such works.

*quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae? hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est'.*

These two lines define the advantages of the epigrammatic genre over other genres. This genre can state definitely that it possesses an understanding of real life, as opposed to those other frivolous literary forms. Martial emphasises the triviality of myth in contrast with the realistic depiction of life.

*chartae* is often used in Martial, as here, to mean papyrus roll (e.g. *vacuas chartas* 14.102, 6.64.2; 2.1.4; cf. Juv. 1.18), as opposed to a secondary meaning to denote that which is written upon the paper (10.19) (cf. 6.64.23 *scribere versiculos miserass et perdere chartas*; 2.1.4; also Juv. 1.18). The serious nature of such literature is mocked by its description as *vana ludibia*, to highlight its pretentiousness (cf. OLD s.v. *ludibrium* 4). This is the only appearance of *ludibrium* in Martial, though, ironically, he frequently uses *ludus* in reference to his verse (1 praef. 4; 3.99.4; 4.49.1-4; cf. Watson and Watson: 98).
For the syntax of *hoc lege...quod*, the relative pronoun would normally be governed by a verb in indirect speech (cf. Ov. Met. 5.414 *agnovitque deam nec longius ibitis*, inquit and Ep. 12.201-2 *aureus ille aries villo spectabilis alto/ dos mea, quam dicam si tibi "redde' neges*). For the anacoluthon created by the sudden switch into direct speech *'meum est'*, even though indirect speech would normally be expected after the relative pronoun, cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 142.

non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.

Martial returns to the theme of *monstra* from the opening lines with a selection of horrific mythological creatures, the sort that are not a feature of situations in real life. This line is a deliberate reminiscence of Verg. A. 6.289 *Gorgones, Harpyiaeque et forma tricorporis umbrae* combined with *Centauri in foribus stabulant, Scyllae biformes* (6.286). The spondaic hexameter with a Greek ending is an established feature of Alexandrian and Roman neoteric poets (Fordyce 1961: 277-8 on Catul. 64.3); here it attacks the initiators of such pedantry with their own forms (cf. *Appennino* of Pers. 1.93 as a parody of contemporary poetry; *Heracleas* of Juv. 1.52; Ferguson 1979: 115; cf. Braund 1996: 22-4 for Juvenal’s use of epic *topoi* and *tropes* re-presented in a satiric guise to demonstrate the benefits of the satiric genre). According to Quintilian, one word covering two metrical feet was considered effeminate even in verse (*Inst. 9.4.65*).

Martial mentions three examples of mythical creatures, typical of epic poetry, all half-beast, half-human, Centaurs, Gorgons and Harpies, which contrast with his own verse on the subject of *homines*. Martial declares the subject matter of his book
is real life, as possessing far more relevance for contemporary society, a justification typical of these lower genres (Phaed. 3 prol. 50; Mart. 8.3.20; Juv. 1.85-6 quidquid agunt homines; Colton 1991: 44).

Originally, the verb sapit, sapere and sapiens referred to taste in terms of food, but became incorporated into literary metaphor for verse which demonstrates all that is wise, tasty and tasteful (e.g. 11.90.8 dispeream ni scis mentula quid sapiat; 7.25.6; 6.64.18; Cic. Brut. 172; Petr. 3.1; Quint. Inst. 6.3.107; 12.10.10; Pers. 1.103; Gowers 1993: 39). These and the following lines directly recall 8.3.19ff., which also includes a food metaphor for literary style: at tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos:/ agnoscat mores vita legatque suos (8.3.19-20).

sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nece scire: legas Aetia Callimachi.

The expression cognoscere mores repeats agnoscat mores of 8.3.20 which is the basis for the ideas conveyed in this epigram and also 10.2. Similarly, the remainder of 8.3 demonstrates the benefits of the epigrammatic genre over tragedy and epic; in particular compare lines 19-20: at tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos/ agnoscat mores vita legatque suos. See also Persius 1.83-91, where the poet demonstrates that these artificial genres of poetry offer the wrong kind of stylistic ornament for the purposes of real life (Jenkinson 1980: 108). Although at 10.2, Martial expresses his regard for his readership, here he is rejecting a reader who reads such poetry, but who, ironically, is also reading Martial.

The address to Mamurra brings to mind the political ally of Julius Caesar and frequent target of the invectives of Catullus, as an example of immoral behaviour (e.g.
A Mamurra is also the subject of 9.59, a poor man who ogles the wealthy items on sale at the Saepta without purchasing anything (cf. 10.80; see Henriksen on 9.59.1). Martial's use of the name here asserts his affiliations with Catullus and his model in the epigrammatic genre. In the following line, however, he rejects the literary models for Catullus.

The *Aetia* of Callimachus is an elegiac poem which tells of the poet being transported in a dream to Mount Helicon, where he is instructed by the Muses in the origins of mythical lore connected with Greek history, customs and religious rites. Martial is challenging the outmoded subject matter of Callimachus, who in turn criticised pretentious mythology (*Aet. fr.* 1.3; *Iamb.* 2.12). This produces the paradox that Martial is employing the very principles of Callimachus against him. Such polemical style against Callimachean concepts is not unique to Martial but is already a feature of epigram during the late Republic and early Empire (e.g. Philip *AP* 11.321; 347; Antiph. *AP* 11.322; Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 11.20; 9.305; 11.31; 23; and Antig. *AP* 9.406; cf. Jenkins on 10.4.12). Elsewhere in Martial, Alexandrian poets are also condemned for their use of mythological subjects, for example Cinna's *Zmyrna* (10.21.4), the *Amazonis* of Domitius Marsus, and also the *Attis* poem of Catullus (2.86.4; Sullivan 1991: 74). Here, the *Aetia* represents the ultimate in obscure and pedantic mythological themes, which contradict the social character of Martial's epigrams.

Martial uses the quadrisyllabic ending of the pentameter as a specifically Greek type, a dactyl followed by a choriambus (cf. line 4). It is commonly found in the Alexandrian poets (such as Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, Hermesianax and Callimachus) and in the neoterics, Catullus and Propertius (cf. Jenkins on 10.4.12).
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Hence, its usage here is ironical, with the intention of attacking its practitioners with their own metrical affectations.

10.5

Martial invokes a curse against an unknown poet who is publishing defamatory material against Roman men and women of the upper class. Although 10.5 does not accuse the poet of publishing slanderous works in Martial’s name, his denouncement of those who do publish such material protects his own literary reputation. This poem demonstrates that he is capable of producing such malice, but attacks against real named individuals would be beneath him. Therefore Martial employs a well-established literary form as his mode of attack (Watson 1991: 148-9; Sullivan 1991: 46). For the laws of libel and imperial censorship, see 10.3.

The invocation of a curse to bring harm upon one’s enemy was an inherent aspect of Greek and Roman life, and shares similar features with religious prayers (Watson 1991: 2ff.). Such curses were of ancient origin, and make their appearance in the earliest Greek literature, with numerous examples in Homer (Od. 9.528-35; ll. 9.453-7; 566ff.; Watson 1991: 12-13), the tragedies of Sophocles (Oed. 744-5; 1381-2; Ant. 1304-5) and Aeschylus (Ag. 1565-6). Through the Hellenistic poets the literary curse was developed and established as a distinctive topos, known as Arae. The most famous is the Ibis of Callimachus, but Moero, Theocritus and Euphorian are also distinguished for their poetry in this genre (Watson 1991: 81-2). This topos was adapted and imitated by the Roman poets, such as Horace (Epod. 5.85-102), Vergil (A. 4.607-29; Dirae), and also incorporated into elegiac love poetry (Tib. 1.9.11-12; Prop. 2.16.43-46; Ov. Am. 1.8.113-14), even as an element of comedy (e.g. Pl. As.
The most significant example in Roman literature is the *Ibis* of Ovid, which seeks revenge against the betrayal of an exiled friend. It is an acknowledged imitation of Callimachus' work of the same name (of which only fragments remain), and as such provides the basis for analysis of the literary *arae*.

The rationale of the *Arae* is to wish upon the poet's enemy a range of physical suffering as a result of some provocation, and to demonstrate that retribution will take place in the end. Certain artificial patterns emerge in the structure of the *Arae*, in particular stereotyped formulae such as the employment of mythological and historical exempla. These invariably involve some form of horrific physical torment which is subsequently wished upon the poet’s antagonist with the desire that the enemy may suffer these fates anew (Watson 1991: 88). Alongside the traditional and celebrated mythological exempla, the Hellenistic tradition cultivated the obscure and the technique of referring to the mythological character in as oblique a form as possible (Watson 1991: 103ff.). Another feature of the *Arae* is the wish that the poet's enemy endure death in addition to physical suffering, and preferably in the form of horrific or extreme methods such as being devoured by wild animals.

Standard *topoi* in Greco-Roman imprecation literature which are covered in this epigram include exile (Verg. A. 4.616; Sen. *Med.* 20-1; Ov. *Ib.* 113; Polybius 3.25.8; Plutarch *Sull.* 10.4; Aesch. *Sept.* 637-8), beggary (Sen. *Ben.* 6.35.4-5; Tib. 1.5.53-4; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.113-4; *Ib.* 113-4), maltreatment of the corpse (Ov. *Ib.* 303-4; 427-36; 515-6; 299-300; Polybius 8.23) and mutilation of the offender's corpse by beasts or birds (Hor. *Epod.* 5.99-100; 10.21-2; Ov. *Ib.* 169-72; 515-6), loss of burial rites (Eur. *Hipp.* 1030-1; Soph. *Aj.* 1175ff.; V. Fl. 1.813-14; Aes. 3. fr. 77 Hercher; CIG
The traditional formulae are exhibited in this epigram but Martial offers the traditional punishments in an innovative fashion; for example, not only should the victim be exiled from Rome as a beggar, but also he should become an exile from the areas traditionally associated with beggars (Watson 1991: 148). The predominant theme is that the gravity of the punishments should outweigh the offence to a disproportionate degree, to atone for the outrage which Martial has suffered; namely, that the anonymous poet is publishing offensive material in Martial’s name.

The influence of Ovid’s *Ibis* on 10.5 is unmistakeable, and there are numerous parallels in language, formulae and exempla. These similarities include the wish for exile (113-14; 637-8), beggary (114, 417-24), loss of burial rites (163-4), maltreatment of the corpse (165-72, 331-8, 515-16), and as gruesome an end as possible (287-8; 381-3; 459-60; 543-4; 279-80; 477-80; 501-4; 533-4; 595-6; 599-600). Ovid’s work devolves into a prolonged list of obscure mythological torments to be suffered by the victims. In contrast, Martial selects only two mythological exempla, those of Tantalus and Sisyphus, and wishes upon his enemy the entire range of mythological punishments with a conciseness and brevity in one collective generic statement: *delasset omnis fabulas poetarum*.

Such is the number of Ovid’s mythological exempla that considerations of reality are discarded to the point that his enemy will be cast into the mythical framework and timescale of the exempla (Watson 1991: 86). In 10.5, greater emphasis is placed upon the torments of his enemy, which are real and substantial. Martial continues in the tradition of the *Arae* by wishing upon his enemy the
punishments after death, where his doom (perhaps even ironically) is to suffer the punishments of all the mythological characters, until he confesses authorship with *scripsi*.

Whilst 10.5 is clearly thematically associated with 10.3 on the publication of defamatory poetry (see 10.3 above), its relationship with 10.4 draws attention to the question of Martial’s literary motives. The juxtaposition of these two epigrams highlights Martial’s playful attitude towards the literary traditions, as he simultaneously attacks part of the Callimachean tradition in 10.4 and acknowledges his debt to it in 10.5, by using a literary form strongly linked with Callimachus. Like 10.3, the metre is choliambics, which was also closely associated with Callimachean verse. He adapts the *topos* to his own purposes by avoiding the abstract mythology and replacing it with realistic *exempla*.

This is the closing segment in this group of poems on literary matters, and the use of the perfect tense for the ultimate word *scripsi* offers a sense of finality. 10.6 begins a new sequence of ideas with two consecutive poems for the new emperor Trajan. Although 10.5 is part of a carefully arranged opening sequence of 10.1-5 and ends the sequence, it also links with the imperial theme of 10.6. This link is later repeated with the pairing of 10.33 and 34.

On this poem see Jenkins on 10.5; Watson 1991: 148-9; Watson and Watson: 99-105.

**Quisquis stolaeve purpuraeve contemptor**

Like much curse poetry, the target of the curse remains nameless and is identified only as *quisquis* (for which similarly cf. Ov. *lb.* 9 *quisquis is est nam nomen adhuc*
I tacebo; Ov. Tr. 3.11.56; Hor. Carm. 2.13.2; Mart. 1.55.13; 6.61(60); 3.82.1ff; 9.97.12; Verg. Ecl. 3.90). Instead the individual is described as contemptor, the only occasion where Martial uses this term, but the suffix -tor suggests that his activities are ongoing, and complements the rogatores of line 4. Unlike this poet, Martial refuses to attack specific individuals, and so even his enemies remain nameless (cf. 10.33.9-10 hunc servare modum nostri novere libelli,/ parere personis, dicere de vitis).

The Roman nobility is referred to by metonymy through the garments worn (stola) and their colour (purpura), which symbolises honour, dignity and respectability (for metonymy cf. Quint. Inst. 8.6.23ff.; Allen 1970: 356). The stola was the upper garment worn by the Roman matron, representing the female nobility (cf. Stat. Silv. 1.2.234; Plin. Nat. 33.40; Ulp. Dig. 47.15.15; Wilson 1938: 156; Croom 2000: 73-6) and distinguishing the matrona from slave, foreigner, freedwoman and prostitute (1.35.8-9). The colour purpura evokes the rich shade of garments worn by men of rank, such as the emperor, senators, magistrates, generals, and was traditionally the most expensive of dyes (cf. 8.8.4 purpura te felix, te colat omnis honos; 8.66.8; 10.10.12; Croom 2000: 25-7).

**quos colere debet laesit impio versu,**
**erret per urbem pontis exul et clivi,**

This poet commits the offence of slandering those unable to retaliate and where the slander is unwarranted, cf. Hor. Epod. 6.1-2 quid innerentis hospites vexas canis?/ ignavus adversum lupos? The targets of this slander are individuals worthy of respect and admiration, as indicated by colere which usually means 'to worship gods', but
here, as often in Martial, there is an added patronal sense of honouring one's superiors (cf. 1.55.5; 2.55.1; 3.38.11; 5.19.8; 6.50.1; 10.58.5; 96.13; 12.68.2).

The phrase *laedere versu* is a standard expression used to describe the harmful nature of verbal assaults in Roman literature (e.g. Hor. *S.* 2.1.21 *tristi laedere versu*, Ov. *Ib.* 5 *nec quemquam nostri nisi me laesere libelli*; Mart. 3.97.2; 5.15.2; 3.99.2; Fletcher, 1983: 411). Here, the destructiveness of such verse is emphasised by the addition of *impius* as it denotes those who are 'irreverent' or 'undutiful' towards those superiors who require respect. Martial uses the adjective *impius* on only six other occasions in different contexts, although there is the implication that the epithet increases the offence against Rome or the Roman people (3.58.16 *impiorum...Colchorum*; 4.11.3 *impia bella*; 30.8 *Libys impius*; 5.42.2 *impia flamma*; 69.5 *impius miles*; 6.85.3 *impia Cappadocum tellus*).

The *topos* of exclusion from society is a conventional element of curse poetry (cf. Ov. *Ib.* 113: *exul, inops erres, alienaque limina lustres;/ exiguumque petas ore tremente cibum*; Tib. 1.3.35-40; 2.11.1-6; Williams 1996: 56). Beggars were treated as social outcasts (2.19.3-4; 12.32; Juv. 4.1114-16 with Colton 1991: 162; 14.134; Pers. 6.56; Ov. *Ib.* 418), although there is little evidence of their treatment in Rome (cf. Juv. 3.13ff.; Mart. 12.57.12ff.; Kay on 11.32). This phrase alludes to one of the special places associated with beggars, the Hill of Aricia (2.19.3; 12.32.10). Martial offers a new angle to this *topos* by exiling the poet not only from the city, but even from the areas assigned to beggars as well.
interque raucos ultimus rogatores
oret caninas panis improbi buccas.

The term rogator normally denotes a proposer of laws, and there are only two occasions where it appears in the sense of mendicus, both in Martial (cf. 4.30.13 Baianos sedet ad lacus rogator in reference to the Libys impius). The prospect of extreme poverty is a very common motif in curse poetry (Ov. lb. 113-14; Watson 1991: 36 n.163). Not only will this poet become a beggar, but he will be the most wretched amongst beggars (Watson and Watson: 100).

In addition to the life of begging and poverty, this punishment ensures that he is the last in line to ask for these mouthfuls fit for a dog (cf. 4.53.6 cui dat latratos obvia turba cibos). A colloquial meaning of bucca is 'mouthfuls of bread' (cf. Mart. 7.20.8; Petr. 44.2 with Smith 1975: 107; Suet. Aug. 76.2), which suggests the inadequacy of the food which is improbi (Watson 1991: 148). Dogs were fed on the poorest scraps of bread, and this indicates the ultimate in poverty and degradation (Juv. 5.11 et tremere et sordes farris mordere canini? with Colton 1991. 168-9; also cf. Philostratus VA 1.19; Gellius 13.31.16 for prandium caninum; Watson and Watson: 101-2; for canis as a common term of abuse see Petr. 74.10 with Smith 1975: 204).

illi December longus et madens bruma
clususque fornix triste frigus extendat:

In winter, the poet is forced to take refuge under archways or arched ground-floor rooms for the poor and prostitutes (cf. 11.61.3-4). Such places were likely to be associated with beggars. December represents the coldest time of year, and so would have been especially harsh for beggars and the homeless (1.49.19-20 at cum
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December canus et bruma impotens/ Aquilone rauco mugiet; 7.95.1). For the curse of being forced to suffer in cold, cf. Hipponax fr. 115.9-12.

The term *fornix* occurs only four times in Martial, all of which suggest a disreputable location, such as a brothel (1.34.6; 11.61.4). At 12.61, Martial refers to it as a place to find a writer of bad poetry (12.61.8-10 *nigri fornicis ebrium poetam,/ qui carbone rudi putrique cretal scribit carmina quae legunt cacantes*).

*vocet beatos clamitetque felices*  
Orciviana qui feruntur in sponda.

A consequence of such punishment is that the culprit longs for death as an escape from his life of poverty and exile and, therefore, the torment is renewed each time he sees a corpse carried on a pauper’s bier. Because of his prolonged sufferings, the dead are ironically described as *beatos* and *felices* (cf. Hor. S. 1.9.28), perhaps because they shall receive a proper burial. The *sponda* generally means the frame of a bed or sofa, and here it represents the funeral bier or *sandapila* of the poor for cremation of burial (see 2.81.1; 8.75.10; Suet. Dom. 17.3; Toynbee 1971: 45).

Although Shackleton Bailey prefers *Orciviana* to denote the maker of the bier, it seems unlikely that a humble bier of a pauper would bear the maker’s name (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 143). Therefore, the emendation *Orciniana* seems preferable, in association with Orcus, god of the dead, and it is likely that irony or derision is intended in its application here (cf. Orcinus, a name conferred upon slaves after the death of their master; Suet. Aug. 35; Jenkins on 10.5.9).
at cum supremae fila venerint horae
diesque tardus, sentiat canum litem
abigatque moto noxias aves panno.

After a prolonged life of torment, the day of death arrives for the victim, although further torture awaits, which is the subject for the second half of the poem. The term *fila* denotes the thread of life spun by the fates, a common feature of Roman literature (see Hor. *Carm.* 2.3.16; Verg. *A.* 10.815; Ov. *Met.* 2.654; Tr. 5.10.45; Stat. *Silv.* 4.28).

Death, denoted by *dies* (cf. Verg. *A.* 10.467; Suet. *Aug.* 99 and *Tib.* 67), is described as *tardus*, which normally would offer relief, but here serves to increase the victim’s sufferings. Although premature death is the more usual motif in curse poetry, the prospect of a delayed death following a life of torment is also characteristic of such literature (Ov. *lb.* 123-4 *causaque non desit, desit tibi copia mortis:/ optatam fugiat vita coacta necem*; Hor. *Epod.* 17.62-4; V. Fl. 1.803ff.; Watson 1991: 35 n.158, 148).

The grim images, firstly of dogs quarrelling over the victim’s corpse, and secondly of birds, symbolic of ill omen, waiting to feed upon the flesh of an unburied body, are set formulae of *arae* poetry (cf. Ov. *lb.* 169-70 *unguibus et rostro crudus trahit ilia vultur/ et scindent avidi perfida corda canes*; 477-80; Tib. 1.5.53-6; Watson 1991: 36 n.161). As a variation on this *topos*, the victim is aware of these animals hovering around his still living body, and, as a grisly afterthought, he anticipates that mutilation of his body will probably commence before he dies (Watson 1991: 149).

*nec finiantur more simplici poenae,*
*sed modo severi sectus Aeaci loris*

The punishment does not cease with his agonising death, but the notion of prolonged sufferings after death is a common motif to this genre (Tertius *De Anim.* 4.5; Watson 76
1991: 36, 254). The following lines are an adaptation of the catalogue of mythological exempla in Ovid’s *Ibis* (cf. 174ff.). In accordance with the traditions of *arae*, Ovid makes frequent use of obscure mythological exempla, unusual versions of well-known myths and oblique references, to identify the character involved (Watson 1991: 106). In 10.5, however, this lengthy catalogue of mythological exempla is deliberately avoided even though it is implied that the whole range of punishments may be inflicted on his opponent.

Because it is uncertain whom the victim is supplicating, Shackleton Bailey proposes the replacement of *supplicis*, with either *supplici* in the context of *poenae* meaning *dolores*, or *simplici* as in *mors simplex* to connote ‘death without torture’ (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 285; contra Jenkins *Addenda*). The emendation of *simplici* seems to avoid the awkwardness of *supplicis*.

Aeacus refers to only one of the judges in the underworld (Plato *Apol*. 41a; *Gorg.* 534e ff.; Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.22; Ov. *Met.* 13.25; Prop. 4.11.19; Sen. *Apoc.* 14.15), but suggests that the judges imposed the punishments as well (cf. Ov. *Ib.* 188 *Aecaus in poenas ingeniosus erit*). It is uncommon for Aeacus to be represented as exacting punishment with a whip; this was normally administered by the Furies (Ov. *Ib.* 183 *hic tibi de Furiis scindet latus una flagello*; Verg. *A.* 6.570; 7.451; Sen. *Her. F.* 88; V. *Fl.* 8.20; Suet. *Nero* 34.4; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.117f.; Luc. 6.370ff.; Apul. *Met.* 9.36; also cf. Ar. *Ran.* 605ff.; cf. *RE* 7.311; 63ff.).

```
nunc inquieti monte Sisyphi pressus,
nunc inter undas garruli senis siccus
```
Two standard examples from mythology of punishment in the afterlife are employed, those of Tantalus and Sisyphus, both of whom appear in Ovid's *Ibis*. Their mention here seem disproportionate to the offence, but the hyperbole is intended for ironical effect, and is an endemic characteristic of Satire and satirical writing in general (Watson 1991: 148). The punishment of Sisyphus was to roll to the top of a hill a rock which perpetually rolled down (cf. Ov. *Ib.* 175-6 *Sisyphus est illic saxum volvensque petensque,* *qui* agitur rapidae vinctus ab orbe rotae; 191 *Sisypho, cui tradas revolubile pondus, habebis*; Sen. *Phaed.* 1231; Mart. 5.80.11; Hom. *Od.* 11.593ff). He was sometimes pictured as carrying the rock, and *pressus* here implies this (Watson and Watson: 104).

The second example refers to Tantalus, one of whose crimes was to divulge the secrets of the immortals. His punishment was to stand in a pool which drained away when he tried to drink, with fruit which moved out of reach (*Od.* 11.583ff), and, in some versions, with a rock hanging over him as if about to fall (Pindar *Ol.* 1). Such a periphrastic phrase is a common feature for identifying well known characters of myth (cf. *garrula linguae* in Ov. *Am.* 2.2.44; also *Met.* 4.457; 6.172; 10.41; Hor. *Epod.* 17.66; S.1.1.68; Tib. 1.3.77), and the oblique style of identifying a character was typical of *Arae* poetry (Watson 1991: 103). Tantalus' punishment is a common *exemplum* in Greco-Roman literary curses (cf. Ov. *Ib.* 193; Eur. *Or.* 5ff.; Sen. *Phaedr.* 1232), and his unrestrained tongue, which in many stories was the reason for his punishment (Apollod. *Ep.* 2.1; Ant. Sid. *AP* 16.131.9; Cic. *Tusc.* 4.16; Ov. *Met.* 6.213; P. Sorbonn. 2254), parallels Martial's own target, who is unable to keep check on his slanderous publications.
The verb *delasset* is unusual, and not only denotes the exhaustion of all the mythological punishment without providing a complete catalogue, but also asserts that these tales do not fulfil Martial’s concepts of punishment. A significant aspect of the *Ibis* is that the catalogue of mythological tortures to be inflicted upon the sufferer consequently results in the offender becoming the embodiment of a new myth, because the extent of his crime is such that he is placed in a class of his own (cf. *Ib.* 191-4, Williams 1996: 70). The term *fabulae* to denote these myths is possibly intended to contrast with the *vita* and *hominem* which fills Martial’s poetry, that is, it implies that these tales are pure fiction – as opposed to the “real life” situations that fill Martial’s poems.

The Furies were the spirits of punishment avenging without pity wrongdoers after death. The call to the Furies to avenge and punish crimes, a conventional literary element, occurs as part of Aeon’s curse in Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica* (4.13ff.), in Ariadne’s prayer to the Furies in Catullus (54.192), and in Dido’s call to the Furies to avenge her (Verg. *A.* 4.610).

The ultimate objective of the epigram is that justice will be served on the offender for the outrage committed. The consequence of punishing the offender with all the tortures in the mythological syllabus is that he is finally forced to confess in the Underworld that he is the author of these scurrilous works. The confession consists of one word *scripsi*, which is the ultimate penalty for the offender and constitutes the
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climax of the poem (cf. 7.72.16, where Martial calls upon his patron to shout *non scripsit meus ista Martialis*). This also could explain Martial's desire for retribution as an offence committed against him personally, and hence his desire for such revenge (Watson 1991: 148). Despite the fearful and dire punishments which Martial wishes upon his enemy, the disparity between the crime and the revenge demanded relieves the gravity of the epigram (cf. 7.24.7-8; for humour in Roman curse poetry, see Watson 1991: 145-9).

10.6

Trajan's long-awaited triumphant return to Rome is the subject of the first of two consecutive epigrams honouring the new emperor. This pair is undoubtedly part of the new set of poems written specifically for the second edition (cf. 10.2). The practice of placing two poems consecutively with the same theme is usually avoided, but exceptions are made for imperial poems, especially at the opening of a book (e.g. 5.1-3; 6.1-4; 7.1-2; 5-8; 8.1-2; 12.4-5).

The subject matter of 10.6 is the senatorial delegation sent to congratulate Trajan on his accession to the throne and the anticipation of his triumphant return to Rome from the Rhine in the spring of 98 (Sullivan 1991: 46). In 97, Trajan set out for the Rhine to restore frontiers and was there when proclaimed emperor in January of 98 on the death of Nerva. Instead of returning directly to Rome, he sent a letter of goodwill to the Senate with a pledge not to execute senators, following Nerva's principle (Dio 68.5; Bennett 1997: 50). He accepted the title of *pontifex maximus* unchallenged, but remained on the Rhine frontier despite apparent public demands that he return to Rome (Plin. *Pan.* 22).
Martial presents this epigram from the perspective of those at Rome eagerly anticipating the arrival of the newly proclaimed emperor, and extolling those fortunate enough to be selected by lot for the senatorial delegation to meet him on the Rhine. The word order of the first couplet is carefully arranged, with *felices* and *ducem* as the opening and concluding words respectively, which stresses the significance of the occasion. The anaphora of the following three couplets, each opening with *quando*, is typical of triumphal poetry (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.25-8), and it is as if the questions are those for the delegation to put to the emperor. This repetition emphasises Trajan’s absence from Rome where he belongs; both 10.6 and 7 focus on his long-awaited return (Fearnley 2003: 628). Trajan’s return is pre-empted at the poem’s conclusion with the anticipatory and triumphant *venit*.

Trajan’s triumphant return to Rome is envisioned with crowds of Romans lining the via Flaminia to celebrate his return, and with the cavalry and Moors marching in the triumph also. Martial does not emphasise *magnos triumphos* as with Domitian (7.6), but instead focuses on the anxiety of the crowds rapturously awaiting the emperor’s return. Such a feature is characteristic of panegyric literature, and these phrases coincide with Pliny’s account of Trajan’s actual procession into Rome (Plin. *Pan.* 22). Trajan’s return was quiet and modest, and he arrived on foot in preference to the extravagant chariots usually used by triumphators (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.214; Tib. 1.7-8; Prop. 4.1.32, where the triumphator rides in a *quadriga* drawn by four snow white horses). Trajan wished to emphasise foremost his identity as a private citizen (Bennett 1997: 53).

The language of this epigram echoes that of triumphal and panegyric literature, particularly in the tradition of Augustan poetry where the triumph was
regarded as the ultimate symbol of imperial greatness (Prop. 2.14; 3.1.9ff.; 3.4; Ov. Am. 1.2; 2, 12; Ars. Am. 1.213ff.; Tr. 4.2; Hor. Carm. 3.13; 4.2; Verg. A. 8.714ff., Williams 1968: 430ff., Galinsky 1969: 75ff., Cairns 1975: 23). Material typical of such literature is employed here, such as the triumphant return of the emperor from his military campaigns, the public celebrations of the audience, especially female, and the triumphal procession which is anticipated (Jenkins on 10.6.1-2). The content of imperial praise here is modified to the conventional iconography of the emperor and his military prowess. Trajan is identified with the sun and the stars, conventional symbols of the emperor's attributes (8.21; 36; 9.91; Scott 1936: 114ff.; Weinstock 1971: 370ff.).

Parallels can also be drawn with the opening epigrams of Book 7 (1; 2; 4; 5; 6; 7), which focus on Domitian’s military expedition against the Sarmatians in 92 and refer to Domitian's triumphant return to Rome (cf. also 8.15; and 11.4;5 for the emperor Nerva). In particular, 7.6 conveys a similar tone of anticipation at the imminent arrival of the triumphant Domitian (cf. Vioque on 7.6). The similarity in the tone and flattering language of these imperial epigrams suggests that attitudes to flattery did not alter under a new emperor (Waters, 1964: 51).

For this poem see Jenkins ad loc.

Felices, quibus urna dedit spectare coruscum

*felices* are those selected for the senatorial delegation to Trajan to congratulate him on his accession to the throne. Trajan was not the first to attain the throne outside Rome, and it became convention to send an embassy to a newly proclaimed emperor (cf. Tac. Hist. 1.4 evulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri; Millar
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1977: 352). For example, Galba refused imperial titles until the senatorial embassy conferred them on him at Narbo (Dio 63, 296; Plutarch Galba 11.1-2). Other examples of embassies being sent are those to Vitellius (Tac. Hist. 2.55.2; 69.1) and to Vespasian (Tac. Hist. 4.6ff.). The tradition continued with Hadrian and Septimius Severus (Herodian 11.12.6; HA Sept. Sev. 6.12). It was also customary to send an embassy into a province to hasten an emperor’s return to Rome (e.g. Hor. Carm. 4.5 to Augustus in Spain, Suet. Cal. 49.1, Millar, 1977: 353) or to greet him as he approached. The terms felix, felicitas and feliciter are frequently associated with triumphators, in connection with a prayer for victory or the description of victory (Versnel 1970: 361). Here, however, it refers to those fortunate enough to be selected to greet the triumphant emperor (cf. 7.2.5; 7.8.6; Hor. Carm. 4.2.46ff.). It would seem that the members of the delegation were selected by means of lots selected from an urn (cf. the selection of a delegation to meet Vespasian in Tac. Hist. 4.6-8: Priscus eligi nominatim a magistratibus iuratis, Marcellus urnam postulabat, quae consulis designati sententia fuerat...vicit pars quae sortiri legatos malebat, etiam mediis patrum adnentibus retinere morem; Plin. Pan. 36.4 sors et urna fisco iudicem adsignat; Clarke 1966: 49-50). The language is appropriately refined in the circumstances; for example, the use of coruscum is typical of epic poetry (Verg. A. 2.470; 9.163; Sil. 5.238; Stat. Theb. 1.216; TLL 4.1076.49ff.). The appearance of the ‘flashing’ or ‘gleaming’ emperor complements the astral imagery of the following line.
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solibus Arctois sideribusque ducem.

Associating the emperor with solar and astral iconography was not novel or limited to the emperors of Rome, but derived from ancient near eastern traditions as a means of elevating such rulers to divine status (Weinstock 1971: 37ff.). Since the reign of Augustus, symbols such as the sun, stars and thunderbolts were represented as relating to the imperial cult, and, as a result, the radiate crown was developed by Nero, later worn by Vespasian (Scott 1936: 1, 32-3). The presence of such imagery is also found in the literature of the period (Verg. Ecl. 9.47; Hor. Carm. 1.12.46; 3.5; 4.2; 4.5; Prop. 4.6.59; Suet. Div. Jul. 88; Stat. Silv. 4.1.3ff.; Mart. 7.1; Scott 1936: 67-71, 133ff.). The concept of imperial command over the heavens as well as the earth was an established aspect of Flavian rule, as recognition of their divine status (e.g. Stat. Silv. 3.3.138-9 in relation to Vespasian illum et qui nutu superas nunc temperat arces/progeniem claram terris partitus et astris; Scott 1936: 69). Martial refers to the deified Flavians being bestowed their own constellations through Domitian: templa deis, mores populis dedit, otia ferro/astra suis, caelo sidera, serta lovi (9.101.21-2). The literature and coinage for Trajan, who was at first reluctant to accept honours and additional titles, reflect the associations with divinity as conventional symbols of imperial authority and legitimacy (Dio Chrys. Or. 1.22, Plin. Pan. 21.1; Bennett 1997: 71). Pliny's Panegyricus identifies Trajan with Jupiter Optimus Maximus (4.4ff.; 11.3; 88.8) as well as the sun (Pan. 35.5), illustrating the typical language employed here in praise of the emperor, although Pliny stresses Trajan's human qualities (Braund 1998: 57-8). Martial refers to Trajan as dux, stressing his military achievements. It is possibly a conventional term in context as the same term is applied to Domitian also with respect to his military triumphs over
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the Sarmatians (7.2.8). In Book 12, Martial repeatedly stresses Trajan’s military achievements, for example 12.6.6 and 12.8.6 (tanto duce militem videret), where dux is used as an imperial title for Trajan. Pliny similarly refers to Trajan in terms of his military leadership: imperator tu titulis et imaginibus et signis, ceterum modestia labore vigilantia dux et legatus et miles (Pan. 10.3). The postponement of ducem until the end of the line following the alliteration and rhyme in solibus Arctois sideribusque emphasises its impact.

quando erit ille dies, quo campus et arbor et omnis lucebit Latia culta fenestra nuru?

This is the first in a series of questions which anticipate the emperor’s triumphant return. Martial’s description of Trajan’s arrival pre-empts Pliny’s description of Trajan’s actual entry into the capital, which reproduces rhetorical conventions of panegyric and triumphal literature (Plin. Pan. 22-3; cf. Claud. Cons. Stil. 3.1ff.; 3.63ff.; Hon. 546f.; Hor. Carm. 3.14.5ff; 4.5, Jenkins on 10.6.3-4). There are similarities in language such as ille dies and the images of streets and roofs packed with the welcoming public:

ac primum qui dies ille, quo exspectatus desideratusque urbem tuam ingressus es!... videres referata tecta laborantia, ac ne eum quidem vacantem locum qui non nisi suspensum et instabile vestigium caperet, oppletas undique vias angustumque tramitem relictum tibi, alacrem hinc atque inde populum, ubique par gaudium paremque clamorem (Plin. Pan. 22).

The formulaic phrase ille dies refers to a specified day for a particular event to take place (cf. ille dies 3.6.6, and illa dies 3.10.2; 5.34.6; 7.21.1; cf. Ov. Ars 1.213; Stat. Silv. 3.2.127-8; Verg. G. 1.493; Prop. 3.4.12; also Iliad 6.448; Theocritus 23.33; for
the differentiation between dies as a feminine and masculine noun cf. Jenkins). Here it refers to the triumphant arrival of Trajan into Rome. The streets, trees and windows are described as shining brightly, possibly from the presence of people in bright dress and lights decorating the trees (SB² 2: 331); it also implies that the presence of the emperor will generate this glittering splendour. This is an extension of the radiate iconography mentioned above (cf. Hor. Carm. 4.5.5). Although campus is used in a non-specific sense with arbor, here it probably also denotes its other sense as the Campus Martius along the route of the via Flaminia, which formed the path of the triumphal procession through Rome (cf. OLD s.v. campus). The windows are filled with admiring women, who formed a large section of spectators, an aspect also noted in Pliny, perhaps as part of the accepted tradition of triumphal procession (Pan. 22). Their nationality is emphasised in the epithet Latia, as a symbol of respectability and decency.

quando morae dulces longusque a Caesare pulvis
totaque Flaminia Roma videnda via?

The actual day of Trajan’s expected entry into Rome itself is fraught with anticipation and delays, with the crowd breathlessly awaiting his arrival. These delays are described as dulces, which heightens the atmosphere of expectancy and excitement pervading Roman citizens at the prospect of Trajan’s arrival. Following the agony of waiting, the first sight will be the dust stirred up in the distance by Trajan and his army as they make their way towards Rome. Finally, the Roman public will stand along the Flaminian way to watch Trajan’s triumphant procession through the capital. Entry to Rome was by the via Flaminia, built in 220 BCE by censor C. Flaminius,
which ran from Rome to Ariminum on the Umbrian Coast (Richardson: 415-16, Platner-Ashby: 562). It then proceeded through the Campus Martius to the gate of the Servian wall on the eastern slope of the Capitol. This was the usual approach to the city from the north-eastern provinces (Bennett 1997: 53 n.4).

quando eques et picti tunica Nilotide Mauri ibitis et populi vox erit una ‘venit’?

These last two lines represent the imagined procession through Rome accompanied by the cavalry and North African tribesmen. Although a direct address to the emperor is avoided as to the actual date of this procession, the poet petitions this army on behalf of the whole of Rome. Trajan’s actual entry into the capital was modest and by arriving on foot he promoted his status as a private citizen rather than as emperor (Bennett 1997: 53). Also cf. Pliny’s description of Trajan’s arrival:

\[ \textit{tam hoc ipsum, quod ingressus es, quam mirum}
\]
\[ \textit{laetumque! nam priores invehi et importari solet, non dico quadriiugo curru et albentibus equis sed}
\]
\[ \textit{umeris hominum, quod adrogantius erat} \]

\textit{(Plin. Pan. 22.1).}

The Moors, from North Africa, were involved in Trajan’s Dacian campaigns (Bennett 1997: 89; cf. 9.22.14; 10.13.2; 12.24.6; Verg. A. 4.132). They are described as dressed in their military uniform, the tunic fastened with a leather belt (Croom 2000: 32; Wilson 1938: 55ff.). Because of their service in Trajan’s campaigns, they are also represented in this costume on the column of Trajan (Jenkins \textit{ad loc.}).

The anticipation overwhelms the entire Roman people and in voice the utterance of a single word ‘\textit{venit}’ will herald Trajan’s arrival. This phrase similarly appears in Martial’s epigrams concerning Domitian’s triumph over the Sarmatians.
and his expected return to Rome (7.6.10 *Sarmatica laurus nuntius ipse veni*; 7.8.4
*i am licet ingenti dicere voce venit*; also cf. 12.8.10 *possum ostendere Caesarem; venite*).
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Here is a formal prayer to the river Rhine to return Trajan to Rome. This is the parallel poem to the previous epigram, continuing the theme of Trajan's return to Rome. As in 10.6, Martial avoids directly addressing the emperor, and instead the dialogue is between two impersonal concepts. The identity of the supplicant is delayed until the final line, then revealed to be the river Tiber as a symbol of Rome. While 10.6 concerns the anticipation at Rome for the return of the triumphant general, here the focus turns to the northern frontier, which naturally draws attention to Trajan's military prowess. Amidst the glorification of Trajan's military achievements is the hope that both the banks of the Rhine will henceforth be Roman and that conquest and stability rendered by the emperor's military leadership will return Trajan safe and sound back to Rome to celebrate his triumph. Whilst the reverent tone of the poem is in keeping with the prayer genre, upon the disclosure of the supplicant's identity the appeal becomes a demand for Trajan's return to Rome. This authority reflects the Tiber's supremacy over all other rivers, just as Rome commands the rest of the world.

The imagery and language is reminiscent of the opening group of poems in Book 7, which celebrates Domitian's triumph over the Sarmatians. In a parallel manner, 7.6 discusses the celebrations at Rome just like 10.6, and 7.7 switches to the conquered foreign territories (*7.7.7 illic et oculis et animis sumus, Caesar*). Similar
expressions of the successful defence and expansion of the empire are conveyed in both poems. Such a formulaic pattern sustains the idea that the language of panegyric changed little with the change of emperors.

Although the personified river is addressed on other occasions in Martial (e.g. the Nile at 6.80.10; 10.26), this is the only example of an instance where one river supplicates another. The dignified and formal nature of the poem, indicated by elevated epic language (e.g. Nympharum, Thybris), alliteration and assonance, is appropriate to the prayer style. This grandiose language is combined with the rural images of the plough and the barbarian farmer, which necessitates the involvement of Roman conquest and expansion as a civilising force. In addition, the value of Trajan's military achievements on the Rhine frontier is emphasised.

For this poem see Jenkins on 10.6; Merli 1996: 212-15.

Nympharum pater amniumque, Rhene,
The opening of this epigram is presented with the dignity and reverence typical of the conventional form of prayer or hymn addressing the god or goddess within their particular sphere of influence (cf. 7.74.1; Hor. Carm. 1.10.1; 1.35; 3.11; 3.18.1; 3.22.1; Saec. 1; Verg. A. 8.71; 9.405; 11.557; Petr. 133.1). The Rhine represents the established frontier between Germany and the Roman provinces (Tac. Germ. 1.1). Personification of the rivers is a standard characteristic of Roman literature (cf. 8.11; Ov. Pont. 3.4.88). Figures of the personified rivers were displayed in Triumphant processions as symbols of the conquered territories (Pers. 6.47; Ov.; Tr. 4.2.41-2; Pont. 3.4.107; Prop. 3.3.45).
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The title *pater* characterises the Rhine as the protector of the surrounding waters, represented by *Nympha rum anniumque* (cf. Verg. G. 4.382 *Oceanumque patrem rerum Nymphasque sorores*). Although it is frequently ascribed to the Tiber (Verg. A. 8.539; 10.421; also *genitor* 8.72; Enn. Ann. 54; *pater Tiberinus* Verg. G. 4.369; Stat. Silv. 1.6.100), its force is later reduced by the epithet *domin us* ascribed to the Tiber.

The Nymphs were traditionally affiliated with water (cf. 1.49.10; 4.57.8; 6.57.1; 7.15.6; 7.50; 9.58; 11.82.5), and frequently referred to in conjunction with river gods (e.g. Verg. A. 12.142; Jenkins *ad loc.*).

**quicumque Odrysias bibunt pruinas**

*Odrysias* is an example of metonymy to denote ‘Thracian’, from the Thracian tribe the Odrysaes. It seems to have been first used by Ovid (cf. *Met.* 6.490), and Martial uses this term on only three other occasions, all with reference to Domitian (cf. 7.8.2 *victor ab Odrysio redditur orbe deus*; 7.80.1; 9.93.8, on the literary tradition see Vioque on 7.8.2). Although Martial refers to the Rhine as father in connection with rivers whose source is Odryssian frosts, these are geographically more suited to the Danube. It seems that Martial is conflating the term to mean ‘northern’ in the sense of the whole of the northern frontier (cf. 9.93.8 with Henriksén *nomen ab Odrysio quod deus orbe tulit*). These northern frosts were renowned for their severity and this heightens the emphasis on the stamina and military prowess of the emperor (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 4.801 *sic tener Odrysia Mavors nive*).

The poetical expression *bibere*, which is often used to represent the origin or identity of people (Verg. *Ecl.* 1.62; 10.65; *A.* 7.715; Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.20; 3.10.1;
is adapted to denote the source of the rivers and streams. Here it is used in an unusual sense to describe the rivers receiving their waters from the melting Thracian frosts (cf. *Geticis pruinis* of 11.3.3; Juv. 5.50; Luc. 8.363; V. Fl. 2.177), and although the sense is awkward it is suitable for the elevated tone of the poem.

*sic semper liquidis fruaris undis*

The *sic* clauses, typical of the prayer poem, impose the restrictions or conditions on the outcome of the wish expressed, and are presented before the actual request. The sense is perhaps analogous to the English 'so help me God', and these clauses are a conventional formula in Roman literature (cf. Mart. 7.28.1 with Vioque; 9.42.5 to Apollo: *sic semper senibus fruare cycnis*; 12.62.15; Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.1 with N-H; Catul. 17.5 with Quinn 1970: 148; Verg. *Ecl.* 9.30-2).

The alliteration and rhyme echo the sound of the river flowing unfrozen and unscathed by frosts or northern barbarians. Herodian relates that horses were able to cross the frozen Rhine in wintertime (6.7.7, cf. Jones 1993: 146; Mart. 7.80.8); the threat of northern barbarian tribes crossing the frozen Rhine was of considerable concern. The most recent example of this had occurred in 88 during the revolt of Antonius Saturninus, which was hindered when a sudden thaw prevented the rebels from crossing the river (cf. Suet. *Dom.* 6.2). The various northern peoples and tribes are generalised in literature, as such descriptions are more frequently given to those on the Danube frontier such as the Getae (cf. 7.7.2; Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.9; Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.31; 3.12.27ff; *Pont.* 4.7.9; Verg. *G.* 3.349ff; cf. Dio's account of Trajan’s construction of a bridge over the Ister for fear that the Dacians might attack over the frozen river; Dio 68.13). For a comparison between the panegyric and similarities in
language of this passage and that of Ovid’s *Tristia* 3.2 and 3.12.27ff., see Merli 1996: 213-15.

*nec te barbara contumeliosi
calcatum rota conterat bubulci;*

The elevated language of the previous lines is downplayed by the image of the barbarian farmer trampling the area with his plough. The harsh sounding alliteration enhances the description. This is linked to the conquest and security of the frontiers under Roman control, as maintenance of this control will ensure Trajan’s return to Rome. Although Augustus began expansion in the north, the Flavians established a series of campaigns towards expansion of the northern frontiers (Jenkins *ad loc.*; on Flavian expansion in the north see Jones 1993: 126ff.). Trajan continued these campaigns over the Dacian tribes for security of the Rhine and Danube (Syme 1958: 46ff.). Appointed governor of upper Germany at the time of his succession with full pro-consular imperium, Trajan even on his accession remained to review and settle matters on the Rhine frontier instead of immediately returning to Rome, then at the end of 98 continued with a review of the Danube frontier.

The rustic *bubulci* deliberately interrupts the dignified language of the previous lines and is used as an expression of contempt towards the barbarian tribes (cf. Juv. 7.116 with Ferguson 1979: 224; also cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.30; *Pont.* 4.7.10).

*sic et cornibus aureis receptis
et Romanus eas utraque ripa:*

River gods were frequently represented in the form of a bull (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.80-1), hence their description as being two horned, an association which perhaps derives
from the sound made by rivers (cf. Verg. A. 8.77; 8.827; G. 4.371-2 with Thomas 1988: 214; Hor. Carm. 4.14.25; Hom. Il. 21.237; for further literary examples cf. Vioque on 7.7.3). More specifically, the Rhine is portrayed as possessing horns by Vergil (A. 8.727 Rhenus bicornis) and Martial (7.7.3; 9.101.17 cornua Sarmatici ter perfida contudit Histri). The shattering of these horns signified the defeat of the area (cf. 7.7.3 fractusque cornu ter improbum Rhenus; 9.101.17; Ov. Tr. 4.2.41; Claud. Const. Stil. 1.220ff.; see Vioque on 7.7.1-6). The onomatopoeic nature of the line conveys the image of the Rhine flowing freely as a result of Roman occupation (cf. liquidis fruaris undis). Golden horns are traditionally associated with divinity as an ancient symbol of power and authority (cf. Hor. Carm. 2.19.30 aureo cornu; Ov. Met. 10.112 cornua fulgebant auro; V. Fl. 6.71). Such figures were carried in the procession of triumphs (cf. Ov. Tr. 4.2.41ff.; Pont. 3.4.107ff.; Prop. 3.3.45), and it is possible that this image is intended to suggest Trajan’s success on the frontier and his returning to Rome in triumph.

Here, receptis refers to the restoration of the river and its territories, as the Rhine has regained not only its horns but also control of both its banks, as a result of Trajan’s successful campaigns of the northern frontiers. Although both banks of the Upper Rhine were secured under Roman control, the Lower Rhine was fortified only on its western bank (Tac. Ann. 13.55; RE 1A 741.17ff.; 13.583.32ff.). The continued security of these banks will return Trajan to Rome in triumph.

Traianum populis suis et urbi, Thybris te dominus rogat, remittas.
10.7

The subject of the request and the identity of the supplicant is delayed until the concluding lines. This is the first time Trajan’s name appears in Martial’s poetry, and occurs on only two other occasions in the corpus (10.34.1; 12.8.3). As in 10.6, he is not directly addressed, which is indicative of Martial’s hesitancy towards the new emperor. The device of the Tiber commanding the Rhine to return Trajan conveys the notion of a supernatural authority, rather than the requests of the poet or the Roman people.

Thybris is the poetical form of the river Tiber, and the Hellenized form of an Etruscan name, as opposed to the regular prose form Tiberis. Vergil uses Thybris eighteen times in the Aeneid in contrast with one instance of Tiberis (A. 7.715), while an alternative form is the substantive use of the adjective Tiberinus to denote the river god (A. 6.873; 7.797; 8.31), on another occasion he uses Tiberis (G. 1.499). It is possible that Thybris is a Vergilian innovation, since its use is not found before the Aeneid (Fordyce 1986: 61-2 on Verg. A. 7.30). Following Vergil’s example, Thybris is the form preferred by Ovid in the Metamorphoses (but he uses both forms in the Fasti), and also Lucan, Silius Italius, Valerius Flaccus, Claudian and Ausonius. Tiberis is found in Horace, Propertius and Juvenal (3.62; 14.202) and once in Statius (Silv. 4.3.112), who uses the form Thybris eight times. In Martial, the form Thybris occurs only here and at 10.85.4, but he also uses Tiberis (4.64.25), the adjectival Tiberinus (10.85.1) Transtiberinus (1.41.3; 108.2; 6.93.4), alternative titles Tusco amne (9.101.10) and the ancient name Albula (12.98.4). The literature indicates that it was not unusual to alternate between the two forms, but this instance of Thybris deliberately conjures up associations with epic poetry, which is in keeping with the
majestic tone of the epigram. The choice between *Thybris* and *Tiberis* may also be
due to metrical concerns.

The Tiber is entitled *dominus* in contrast with *pater Rhenus*, emphasising the
authority commanded by the Tiber over the other rivers. Hence the petition for the
Rhine to return Trajan shifts from polite supplication to a command (cf. Ennius *Ann.*
67V, *fluvius qui est omnibus princeps*, quoted by Fronto *Or.* 15.7 *Tiber annis
dominus et fluentium circa regnator annium*; Verg. *A.* 8.77; also *fluviorum rex
Eridanus* in Verg. *G.* 1.482; see Ov. *Met.* 2.259; *Fast.* 4.572). This title not only
ranks the Tiber as chief of all the rivers but reflects Rome’s supremacy, and is also
attributed to Roma by Martial (1.3.3; 3.1.5; 9.64.4; 12.21.9; Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.44; Ov.
*Fast.* 4.831; *Pont.* 4.5.7). The Tiber was a prominent emblem of Rome and can be
used to symbolise the city itself in literature (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.144-5; 1.5.23-4; 2.7.45;
cf. Roberts 2001: 551). The notion that the Tiber is *dominus* and representative of
Rome as the supreme entity is contrasted with the denomination of Trajan himself as
*non est hic dominus, sed imperator* (10.72.8, where it is designed to contrast with
Domitian’s titles). It is possible that the poet is suggesting that Trajan, even as
emperor, is obliged to obey the command from Rome that he return.

Up to this point, the poem adopts the form of a supplicatory prayer to the river
Rhine, which is maintained with *rogat*. The final word *remittas* however, is more
forceful in tone and more of a command, the fulfilment of which cannot be refused.
Unlike the hopeful expression of *venit* uttered by the Roman people, the demand
made by the river Tiber expresses the wish of the city itself as the ultimate authority.
A new sequence of ideas is introduced with a humorous observation towards legacy hunters. The practice of *captatio* or legacy hunting, the pursuit of the heirless rich by the obsequious attentions of the *captator*, became common practice in Rome from the time of the Republic (cf. Cic. *Off*. 3.74). Such practice was encouraged by the growing rate of childlessness among the wealthy (Plin. *Nat.* 14.1.5; Plin. *Ep.* 4.15.3; Sen. *Ep.* 19.2; Stat. *Silv.* 4.7.33; Tac. *Germ.* 20.17; *Hist.* 1.73), the frequent rewriting of wills caused by the fear of intestacy (Plin. *Ep.* 5.5.2; 8.18.5; Juv. 1.144-6; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 9.6; see Crook 1973: 38-44), and the obligations of *amicitia*, which ensured the right of benefiting in the will but complicated the distinction between *amicus* and *captator* (Cic. *Phil.* 2.40; *Fam.* 14.1.5; Plin. *Ep.* 7.20.6; 7.31.5). Although rarely addressed in Greek literature (cf. Parmenion *AP* 11.65), the growing social problem of *captatio* is frequently illustrated in Roman literature from a moral perspective (Plin. *Ep.* 5.1.3 with Sherwin-White’s note; also 2.20.7; 8.18; Tac. *Ann.* 13.52; 15.19), and became a popular *topos* for satiric literature from the Augustan period onwards (Hor. *S.* 2.5.44; Petr. 116ff.; Juv. 1.37-9; 2.58-9; 3.129; 4.15-21; 5.96-8; 137-40; 6.39-40; 12.93-7; 111-30; the only reference from the middle Republic is Pl. *Mil.* 709). The verbal form *captare* first appeared in Horace (S. 2.5.23).

This topic is a common target of Martial’s satire throughout the books and appears in a number of ways and perspectives (1.10; 49.34; 2.26; 32.6; 40; 65; 3.52; 4.5.6; 56; 5.18; 39; 6.27; 62; 63; 7.66; 8.27; 9.8(9); 48; 88; 92.11; 100.4; 10 (16(15); 43; 11.44; 55; 67; 83; 87; 12.40; 56; 73; 90). On this topic see Tracy 1980: 399-402; Kay on 11.44; Rudd 1966: 224ff.; Champlin 1991: 87-102, 201-2.
In addition to the topic of captatio, the hideousness of old age and the prospect of marriage to such a person are presented. The repulsiveness of old women is a standard stereotype of Roman satire, and typical features exaggerated are their age, drunkenness, sexual desires and offers of marriage in return for a dowry to the narrator who resists with disgust (e.g. Lucil. 282-3; Ov. Am. 1.8.3-4; 114; Hor. Epod. 8,12; Mart. 1.19; 2.33; 3.32; 3.93; 4.20; 7.75; 8.79; 9.29; 37; 10.39; 67; 90; 11.21; 29; Richlin 1983: 69-70). The old woman desires marriage with the poet, no doubt to assuage her sexual appetite, yet is rejected with revulsion by the narrator (cf. Mart. 10.90; Priap. 57.6; 12.5-7). The poet would be tempted only if she were older, because no matter how unattractive or unappealing the prospect, she will die sooner.

The persona of the captator is presented from the perspective of the ego narrator, a typical device in Martial (cf. 12.40). This does not necessarily represent the poet’s own views, but the first person perspective offers simplicity and a familiarity. This persona represents the stock satirical figure of the legacy hunter to reflect contemporary social attitudes.

This is the first poem in the book of only two lines, in contrast with the first seven, which are close to or at least ten lines in length. Its brevity and humorous tone herald a change in the book’s thematic direction. Its bipartite structure is a common device in Martial’s epigrams of this nature (cf. Sullivan 1991: 221-4 on Lessing’s approach to the structural analysis of such epigrams). The first half of the poem is known as the Erwartung, which introduces the theme and provides the ‘set-up’ to the poem’s outcome. It is resolved by the Aufschluss or explanation generally in the form of witty conclusion or the rhetorical figure of the surprise ending. In this situation, the reader would perhaps expect the speaker to state his preference for a younger bride.
rather than an older woman. As an ironic criticism of legacy seekers, the poem's outcome rests on the actuality that he is only prepared to marry her if she were older in the hope that she will die sooner and pass on her estate.

Nubere Paula cupit nobis, ego ducere Paulam
nolo: anus est. vellem, si magis esset anus.

The opening of the poem is based upon the theme of marriage, with the simple statement that Paula wishes to marry the speaker but the desire is not reciprocated (cf. 9.10; also 2.49). It is not until the concluding line that the true motive behind the epigram, that of captatio, is revealed.

Most of the literary sources do not refer to marriage between the captata and captator, so it would appear to be a fairly rare occurrence. Features most commonly attributed to the process of captatio are the giving of gifts (1.10.2; 4.56; 6.63.5; Plin. Ep. 9.30.2), words in the form of praise or flattery (11.87), deeds or officia such as attending the salutatio (9.100) (Champlin 1991: 90). Sexual services and marriage appear in a class of their own on the extreme side of captatio. That the old woman is eager for marriage and the so-called captator is unwilling (cf. 3.93.19) indicate that the roles of captator and would-be captata are reversed, with Paula the one eager to ensnare the ego persona of the poem.

Paula is a common praenomen and cognomen among Roman women (cf. Paul(l)a/Polla; Kajanto Cognomina: 244-5). This name appears in a disparaging context in several other epigrams all related to marriage, where she appears as an adulteress (1.74, 6.6; 11.7) or, as in 10.8, a woman desperate for marriage (9.10).
10.8

The relationship between 9.10 and 10.8 seems likely: *nubere vis Prisco: non miror, Paula; sapisti./ ducere te non vult Priscus: et ille sapit.* Both poems begin with *nubere* and both involve Paula. Both set up a situation in which the woman wants to marry a man who has no wish to marry her (cf. Henriksen on 9.10). In 10.8, however, a further irony is created with the suggestion that Paula’s repulsiveness would become an attraction if only she were even older. The term *anus* does not necessarily denote an ‘old woman’, but a woman who is no longer young (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.9 with N-H; 4.13.25). It is frequently used in a sexual context concerning women who are either too old or are physically repulsive (14.147; Prop. 3.25.16; Ov. *Ars* 3.69.7; Tib. 1.6.81). The repetition of *anus* stresses the contempt and ridicule by the speaker at the prospect of such a union (*anus* frequently appears at the end of a sentence not only for metrical purposes but for satirical emphasis, e.g. 4.13.2; 4.20.2; 11.23.14; 11.46.6; 12.70; 14.147, Leary on 14.147).

The pronouns *nos* and *ego* are used interchangeably in Martial and in Roman poetry (e.g. Juv. 1.15). The juxtaposition here makes the effect more striking (cf. 5.19.19; 7.93.3; 10.10.3).

10.9

Literary fame and Martial’s readership are the themes here, both of which are picked up from 10.2 as testament to the poet’s immortality based on his readership. The value of a poet’s renown was a long-established feature of Greek poetry (Alcman 148, Theognis 237ff.) and also became incorporated into Roman literary traditions (cf. 10.2; Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.14; *Ep.* 1.20.13; *Ars. Poet.* 345; Ov. *Tr.* 2.118; 4.10.128; *Am.* 1.3.25; 15.7ff.; Plin. *Ep.* 2.10.2; 9.11.2; Mart. 1.1.2; 5.13.3; 6.64.35; 8.61.3). Martial
frequently claims a wide readership, not only in Rome but throughout the Empire (cf. 1.1.2; 5.13.3; 16.3; 6.60(61); 82.6; 7.17.10; 8.3; 9.81.1; 9.97; 10.93; 103.3; 11.34; 12.16), for example at Vienne (7.88), Vindelicia (9.84.5), Getica and Britain (11.3). This seems borne out by a number of inscriptions with quotations from his epigrams in Germania Superior, (CIL XIII 5657), Spain (CLE 1392), France and Africa (cf. Citroni and Howell on 1.1). This poem can be compared with 1.1, which similarly addresses the renown awarded him by his dedicated readership:

\[
\textit{Hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris,}
\]
\[
\textit{toto notus in orbe Martialis}
\]
\[
\textit{argutis epigrammaton libellis:}
\]
\[
\textit{cui, lector studiose, quod dedisti}
\]
\[
\textit{viventi decus atque sentienti,}
\]
\[
\textit{rari post cineres habent poetae.}
\]

1.1 lacks this element of deprecation towards his own fame where Martial reduces it to the same level as a racehorse, whose fame is fleeting. In 10.9, the extent of the author's popularity is ironically diminished by the concluding line as a demonstration of the emptiness of fame and as a mocking observation on contemporary tastes. Usually Martial emphasises the value of his fame, as in 10.2, but here he admits its hollowness—it can be matched by a racehorse. Thus, this poem is distinguished from his other poems on this subject where he does not appear to deride or belittle his fame in this manner.

This topos is expanded to address the figure of invidia, one who begrudges others their success or happiness primarily incited by the author's literary fame (cf. Dickie 1981: 183-208). The threat of invidia from Martial's contemporaries due to his popularity and success appears as a common subject of Martial's epigrams (1.91; 2.71; 86; 6.64; 8.61; 9.97; 11.94). Elsewhere, he not only depicts himself as the
victim of invidia (1.40; 115; 4.27; 77; 8.61; 9.97; 11.94; 12 prae. 14ff.) but also presents himself in the persona of the invidiosus (4.37; 61).

The first four lines are presented in the form of an epitaph to glorify the author’s literary achievements and popularity. The use of the epitaph style was a popular device to demonstrate the author’s literary achievements and fame (Hor. Carm. 2.20). Such a treatment is similarly presented in an epigram of Callimachus in the form of an epitaph to his father (AP 7.525), which extends into literary polemic concerned with invidia. Ironically, later in Book 10, there is an epitaph mourning the loss of a charioteer (10.53), whose fame is renowned throughout Rome.

These motifs immediately recall Martial’s literary fame, as addressed in 10.2, but also suggest a variation on the themes in 3 and 5, the attacks on writers publishing slanderous material about others. Still, he stresses that his own fame is a result of his material being molto sale, non tamen protervo, without resorting to malice. Any expressions of invidia towards the poet are rendered futile and unwarranted by his own parallel with a racehorse. 10.8 provides the appropriate introduction to 10.9, both in metre (hendecasyllables) and theme (muito sale). Although the subject matter of the previous poem could be construed as malicious, its satire is directed towards a stock character rather than a real person.

Also see Jenkins ad loc.; Tränkle 1996: 142-3.

Undenis pedibusque syllabisque

Hendecasyllables and elegiacs are the metres most commonly favoured by Martial (see Introduction on metre). Appropriately, 10.9 is in hendecasyllables and the surrounding epigrams are in elegiac couplets (10.8 and 10). Although the term
10.9

sylla
a usually denotes 'verses' (cf. 9.11.12), its use in the plural here is meant to
mean hendecasyllables (cf. 1.61.1). Ovid makes a similar observation on the elegiac
metre of Am. 1.1.27: sex mihi surgat opus numeris in quinque residat and also line 30:
Musa, per undenos emodulanda pedes. Elsewhere, Martial refers to his metrical style
at 2.86, in his objection to sophisticated metres such as sotadics, galliambics and
palindromes, although he occasionally uses unusual metres as a satirical exercise (e.g.
3.29).

et multo sale nec tamen protervo

The reference to *sal* is a common literary metaphor in Roman literature to convey wit,
in the sense of biting wit or piquancy (cf. Catul. 13.5; 86.4; Hor. S. 1.10.3 *sale multo;*
Ep. 2.2.60 *sale nigro*; Cic. Orat. 87; de Orat. 1.159; Att. 1.13.1; Quint. Inst. 10.1.94;
*acerbitas et abunde salis*; Mart. 4.23.7; 6.44.2; 7.25.3 *nullaque mica salis*; 8.3.19;
12.95.3; Plin. Ep. 3.21.1; Spisak 1992: 88ff.; Gowers 1993: *passim*). The essentials of
*sal* or elegant wit incorporate all that is *lepidus, comis* and *urbanus*, as opposed to
crude or vulgar jocularity (cf. Hor. Ars 270; Cic. Off. 1.104; de Orat. 2.235ff.; Brink
1971: 308-9). Martial contrasts the writing of epigrams with vinegar at 7.25.5, and
compares his own work with that of a spicy olive at 9.26.5-6 (Bramble 1974: 54; also
cf. 1.1.3 *argutis epigrammaton libellis*). The sharpness of such wit is modified by
*non tamen proteruo*, in contrast with the description of malicious poetry being
published in 10.3 and 5 (e.g. 10.3.1-2: *vernaculorum dicta, sordidum dentem/ et*
*foeda linguae probra circulatricis*). This concurs with Martial's claim that his
epigrams are not aimed at specific or named individuals (1 praef.; 10.33.10).
The expression *notus gentibus...notus populis* refers to 'the whole world' or the peoples of the empire outside Rome (*TLL* 6.1850. 32ff.; cf. Mart. 12.6.5 *populi gentesque*; 12.8.1; *terrarium dea gentiumque Roma*; see Bowie on 12.6; also cf. Tac. *Dial.* 5.3). Martial frequently refers to his popularity and readership not only in Rome but in far flung places of the empire as well (cf. 1.1.2 *toto notus in orbe*; 8.3.3-4; 7.88.1-2; 8.61.5; 12.3.3). The claim to worldwide fame is not a new device but goes back to Alcman, and is also found in Horace and in Ovid (Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.14; Ov. *Tr.* 2.118; 4.10.128; *Am.* 1.3.25, 15.7ff.).

*ille Martialis* is a variation on the common *ille ego qui* formula (cf. 1.1.1; 9pr 11; 9.28.2; 10.53.1; Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.1; *Met.* 1.757; *Am.* 2.11.2; Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.8) which precedes autobiographical details. The pronoun *ille* denotes a reference to a well known person, place or thing (cf. 1.1.1ff.; 6.82.4 *ille Martialis*), and the expression creates a formal tone which contrasts with the language of the final line.

Martial refers to himself by his *cognomen*, possibly meant to stress the formal circumstances (cf. 1.1.2; 1.117.17; 7.72.16; 10.92.16 is the only instance of the *cognomen* not in hendecasyllables). His *praenomen* is more often used in poems of a more familiar kind, such as poems addressing friends (with the exception of 6.47.6, cf. SB¹: Index s.v. *Martialis*).

The formal tone of the poem is interrupted by an address to those who envy Martial's fame and popularity (note there is more than just one). Such parataxis is typical of colloquial speech and frequently occurs in the epigrams (4.36.2; 6.2.6; 7.89.4; 9.48.9; Petr. 63.6; 76.3; 77.1; Verg. *A.* 7.73).
invidia is the technical term to describe the envy of another’s success (the equivalent to the Greek φόνος), and Martial applies it on forty-three occasions in his poetry (see Dickie 1981: 182-208). It appears as a common device in Greek and Roman literature (Hes. Op. 2.26; Callim. Aet. fr. 1: 17; Iamb. 1; Hymn. Apoll. 105ff.; Verg. Ecl. 7.26; Hor. S. 1.10.78; Ep. 1.19; 35f.; Carm. 2.20.4; Ov. Am. 1.15.1), and especially as part of the poet’s justification for attacking or denouncing others (Hor. S. 1.4; Mart. 10.33, Dickie 1981: 185ff.). There are numerous examples in the epigrammatic genre (Callim. AP 7.525; Antiphanes AP 9.256, 11.322; Palladas AP 10.51; 90; 91; Lucilius AP 11.192; Leonidas AP 9.356.3ff.; Philip AP 11.321). Here his query about the motives of their invidia acts as a foil for the poem’s resolution.

non sum Andraemone notior caballo

Andraemon refers to a race horse, obviously well known at the time, and demonstrates the overwhelming popularity of horse racing (CIL 6.2.10052, Tränkle 1996: 142 n.40). Chariot racing was one of the most popular forms of entertainment for Romans of all social classes (cf. Ov. Am. 3.2; Ars 1.135ff.; Juv. 11.193ff.; Plin. Ep. 9.6; Mart. 3.63.12; 4.67; 5.25; 6.46; 7.7; 8.11; 10.48.23; 50; 53; 74; 76; 11.1; 33; Jenkins ad loc.). It appears that particular racehorses were popular and other race horses are named in Martial, such as Passerinus and Tigris (7.7.10) and Hirpinus (3.63.2; Juv. 8.63; cf. CIL 6.2.10053).

caballus is the vulgar word for horse, and is often used in classical Latin in a derogatory or contemptuous sense (Lucil. 4.163; Var. Men. 478.1; Hor. S. 1.6.59; 1.6.103; Ep. 1.7.88; 1.14.43; Pers. Pr. 1; Juv. 10.60; 11.195; Petr. 117.12; 134.2; Citroni on 1.41.20). The term is used only four times in Martial, and always with a
derogatory tone (1.41.20 non est Tettius ille, sed caballus; 5.25.9 quam non sensuro dare quadrigenta caballo; 12.24.6; also as a cognomen 1.41.17) as opposed to twenty-five occasions where equus occurs. A similar comparison is made at 5.25, where Martial complains of money placed on a horse instead of contributing towards the benefits of literature. The deflating effect of the word emphasises the contrast between the fame given to his works and that accorded to a horse.

The duties a client undertakes in obligation to his patron are described in this poem. The relationship between patron and client, known as amicitia, was a fundamental aspect of Roman society, and its absurdities and abuses are a popular subject in Martial and the Roman satirists (for this topic in Martial cf. SB3 3: Index s.v. Clients and Patrons; also see Juv. 1.95ff.; 3.122ff.; 4; 5; 7). In particular, these poems are presented from the perspective of the client, who acquired at least part of his income by paying court to another (White 1978: 81).

In the pyramid hierarchy of Roman society (Sen. Ben. 6.34.3; Juv. 1.101), with the emperor at the top, it was possible for individuals to be both patron and client simultaneously (Braund 1996: 32, Nauta 2002: 18-26). The set-up of this system is not clear cut and it is likely that overlaps occurred, where each party could be of the same social standing, which perhaps would alter treatment in individual cases (Spisak 1998: 245). Therefore, it was not considered degrading for men of higher social positions as well as the poor ordinary clients to attend upon patrons, although their purpose was to obtain political or social influence rather than financial rewards (e.g. Mart. 12.29(26); Juv. 7.90; Epict. Diss. 4.10.20; Man. 33.13; Lucian, De Merc. Con. 105
Those of a higher social standing would naturally receive preferential treatment. Different levels of amicitia can be distinguished; the clientes were the numbers on the outskirts of a man’s circle of acquaintance, often faceless to the patron, whilst men of a more personal relationship were identified as amici or sodales (White 1978: 76 n.5). Those of the lower social status, nameless and unable to offer the patron any more than their presence and deference, were often neglected by the patron in favour of those who might provide social, political or economic influence. This poem criticises the discriminations of clients based upon social status, where consuls push in ahead of others (cf. also 12.29(26)). Juvenal similarly complains about the absurdity of senators and other senior magistrates competing with and greedily pushing aside the ordinary clients for the rewards from the patron (Juv. 1.99; 101; 117-19; Colton 1976: 35).

The officia clientum began in the early hours of the morning with the salutatio or morning call upon the patron (cf. 1.70; 9.100; 10.82), followed by the client escorting his patron to the forum, and his continued presence throughout the day (Balsdon 1969: 21-4; Marquardt 1886: 259ff.). Further attention throughout the day included attending recitations (e.g. Juv. 1.4), household ceremonies and other duties. Clients were often paid to attend their patron’s dinners and suffer his abuse as entertainment (Mart. 4.68; Herodian 2.6.7; Saller 1982: 128). The relationship was based on the notion of exchange, where the poor offered humble gifts and deference. In return, the patron would hand out the sportula, ‘little basket’, or gift, originally in the form of a small sum of money (100 quadrantes; cf. 1.59; 3.7; 10.75) or food. Domitian changed this system by temporarily abolishing this dole (e.g. 3.7), but Martial observes its re-instatement in subsequent books (4.68). For further study on

Martial himself was an eques (5.13.1-2), for which the minimum census requirement was an income of 400,000 sesterces (White 1978: 88; Nauta 2002: 53). The rank of eques does not necessarily mean that Martial had ready access to substantial supplies of cash. It is extremely difficult to determine the actual circumstances of Martial’s economic status or the sincerity of his cries of personal poverty (see Nauta 2002: 53-8; Tennant 2000: 139-56 argues that Martial’s complaints of paupertas are genuine; also see Hardie 1983: 51, 54-6; Bramble 1974: 159). It would seem, though, that he relied on the contributions of patrons and performed the duties of a client much to his own personal displeasure. He indicates that he himself attended salutationes (1.70; 108; 5.20; 10.70; 74; 82; 11.24; 12.18; 68) and mentions tokens received from rich friends, fictitious or otherwise, such as money (6.20), a country home (12.31), a slave (8.73), and a variety of other gifts, often in exchange for a poem (7.53; 9.49; 6.82; 7.36; 11.79; 12.24; 8.50; 7.27; 9.72, White 1978: 86-7). Pliny in his obituary to the poet mentions a gift of money made to the poet though Martial himself never mentions it (Plin. Ep. 3.21). In addition to such tokens, attachments to wealthy and influential amici were advantageous to the poet, and their praise contributed to the wider circulation of the poet’s books (White 1978: 85). Martial even calls upon an amicus to defend him against the publication of slanderous material in his name (1.52; 7.12; 97; 5.80; 4.27.5; Quint. Inst. 7.2.24; Plin. Ep. 2.10.3; Saller 1983: 246-57).
The competitive nature and struggles of the client's life are frequently addressed throughout Martial's books (1.59; 70; 112; 2.68; 3.4; 7; 14; 36; 46; 60; 4.8; 26; 68; 57; 6.88; 9.100; 11.24; 68; 14.125). His dissatisfaction with the patronage system and the difficulties of living in Rome become more pronounced in Book 10. This is the first of a series of poems to address this subject throughout the volume (10.11; 15(14); 17(16); 18; 19; 34; 36; 49; 56; 57; 70; 74; 76; 82; 97). This topic often appears alongside poems which endorse country living and as such acts as justification for his return to Bilbilis (10.13; 37; 78; 96; 103; 104; cf. Spisak 2002: 127-41). This was in fact his last book published in Rome before his return to Spain.

Cum tu, laurigeris annum qui fascibus intras,

The epigram is addressed to an individual of consular status, as is indicated by the image of the triumphal procession of the new consul from his residence, accompanied by friends, relatives and clients to the Capitol (cf. Ov. Fast. 1.81 ianque novi praeunt fasces, nova purpura fulget). The fasces were carried by lictors in such a procession, and decorated with bay or laurel in the manner of a triumph (cf. 7.63.9; for the expression laurigeris...fascibus cf. 12.2.11 laurigeros habitat facundus Stella penatis in reference to the inauguration of a suffect consul; Claudian IV Cons. Hon 14-15 nec te laurigeras pudeat, Gradivi, secures pacata gestare manu). This triumphal ceremony however seemed to be customary of the following century (RE 4.1125.42; Jenkins on 10.10.1), but perhaps is described here to make Paulus' behaviour as a consul ordinarius seem more undignified.

During the empire, the position of consul ordinarius became a primarily honorary position, and as such no longer held office for the whole year but two pairs
of consuls held office for six months (cf. Jenkins on 10.10.1). After the reign of Nero, consuls held office for four then two months, and in 69, fifteen consuls held office (Syme 1958: 67). In the reign of Domitian the number of consuls ranged from six consuls in a normal year (89, 91, 94, 96), three pairs or the emperor and six others (87, 92, 95) to eight consuls in 86 (Syme 1958: 67). The consuls who began the year were given the honour of giving their names to the year, as Paulus does here (intras) (cf. Stat. Silv. 4.1.1-3).

*mane salutator limina mille teras,*

*mane salutator* refers to the ritual visits made by the *clientes* upon their patron in the early hours of the morning in order to offer a ritual greeting (cf. 1.55.6; 1.70; 3.58.33; 4.8.1; 78.4; 5.22.1; 8.44.3; 10.74.2; 12.29.1; Cic. *Fam.* 7.28.2; 9.20.3; Columella 1 *praef.* 9; Manilius 5.64ff., Sen. *Ep.* 95.48; 101.3; see Saller 1982: 128-9; Marquardt 1886: 259ff.; Balsdon 1969: 21-4). Such receptions were held in the atrium with benches set out for those to wait until they were announced by the *nomencurator.* The earliness of the hour, personal discomfort and the time wasted by such visits are reasons for complaint in Martial of this duty (cf. 1.70; 3.36; 4.8; 9.100; 10.82). Visitors were admitted according to status, a custom begun in the second century BCE by Gaius Gracchus and Livius Drusus (Sen. *Ben.* 6.34). Originally, the *salutatio* was a private occasion where members of the *familia* paid their respects to the *paterfamilias* (Suet. *Galba* 4.1; Front. *Amic.* 4.6). From the time of the republic, the *salutatio* was a way of the client showing respect to the patron, and the number and importance of callers emphasised the patron’s status and prestige (9.22.10; 10.14(13); Plut. *Pomp.* 23.3; Lucian *Nigrin.* 13; Sen. *Ep.* 76.15; 123.7; *Dial.* 8.1.8ff.; George on
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The hyperbole of *limina mille teras* suggests the client’s endless rush from *salutatio* to *salutatio* (cf. Sen. Dial. 10.14.3; Mart. 8.44.4 *sed omne limen conteris salutator*; 12.29(26).1 *sexagina teras cum limina mane senator*; cf. 2.11.2; Juv. 1.100 *vexant limen*).

hic ego quid faciam? quid nobis, Paule, relinquis, qui de plebe Numae densaque turba sumus?

The poet addresses the magistrate, Paulus with a series of rhetorical questions, which culminate in the climax of line 5 (for the literary background on the usage of rhetorical questions, see Siedschlag 1977: 22-3). For a parallel phrase cf. Juv. 3.41 *quid Romae faciam?* (cf. Mart. 2.93.2; 3.38.13; 6.51.4; 6.56.5). Effective contrast is made between *tu* of line 1 and *nobis* here, to distinguish the single man of high status from the masses (Post: 234).

Paulus is a common name (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 243), used ten times in Martial, once for a real friend or acquaintance (7.72), but other times fictitiously as a plagiarist (2.20), or as a mean patron (5.22; 9.85; 12.69 also 4.17; 5.4; 6.12; 8.33, Howell on 5.22). Martial may favour the name for its humorous connotations in its meaning ‘of small stature’ (Kay on 12.69). For similar structure compare Ov. *Ars* 1.211 (*qui fugis ut vincas, quid victo, Parthe, relinquis?*). Just two poems before,
Martial has used the feminine form, which perhaps is a method of interlinking between poems with different subjects.

The phrase *de plebe Numae densaque turba* refers to the masses, the innumerable lower classes who attend the *salutationes* in the hope of receiving the handout. The nameless nature of the masses is emphasised by the depreciatory and dismissive *densa turba* (cf. 1.20.1; Juv. 1.96; 120-1 *densissima centum/ quadrantes lectica petiti*; 4.63; 10.73; Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.7 *mobilium turba Quiritium*).

Martial uses Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, as an example of integrity and irreproachability (cf. 10.52.2; 11.5.2; 11.15.10; 11.104; 12.3.8; 62.8). The name is used by metonymy for *Roma* or *Romanus* (e.g. 10.44.3 *Numae colles*; 10.10.4; 76.4 *plebs Numae*; 12.62.8), as an image of antiquity or old age (10.39.2; 3.36.2), moral rectitude and frugality (9.27.6 with Henriksen; 11.104.2). Numa is mentioned only twice before Book 9, but then appears in eleven poems in Books 10 and 11, then twice in Book 12. It is significant that seven of those eleven occasions are from Book 10 (35.14; 39; 44; 76; also 52; 97; for Book 11 cf. 5; 15; 104.2 and 12 cf. 3; 62). Henriksen reasons that the frequency of these references in these later books reflects the establishment of peace, piety and morality under a new emperor (see Henriksen on 9.27.6). He states further that the satirical occasions on which the name occurs in Book 10 (52; 97) are perhaps poems retained from the first edition under the reign of Domitian.

*qui me respiciat, dominum regemque vocabo? hoc tu - sed quanto blandius! - ipse facis.*
The verb *respiciet* is used here in the sense of the patron looking condescendingly upon the lowly and humble *cliens* (similarly Juv. 3.184-5 *quid das ut Cossum aliquando salutes, ut te respiciat clauso Veiento labello?; Sen. Dial. 10.2.5; similarly 4.83.3 with *despicis*; Petr. 44.10). Although *respiciet* seems accepted by most textual critics (although *respicies* is also suggested), Shackleton Bailey substitutes the generic subjunctive *respiciat*, which offers more force in the context (SB1: 318).

The expression *dominium regemque* is intended to be used as a respectful title of a patron by a client, although the expression frequently assumes contemptuous tones in Martial (cf. 1.112; 2.68.2; 4.83.5; 12.60.14; Juv. 5.137; 8.161). The title *dominus* was initially associated with slavery (5.57), but under the empire remained in social use as a complimentary polite address between inferiors and superiors of free birth, as well as masters and slaves (Sherwin-White on Plin. *Ep.* 10.2.1). It is used courteously by the freedman at Trimalchio’s dinner (Petr. 57.2 with Smith 1975: 154), and Seneca addresses his brother with this title (*Ep.* 104.1; see Howell and Citroni on 1.81; 112). *rex* is used as an ingratiatory form of address by parasites to their patrons in Plautus (*Capt.* 92; 825) and Terence (*Phorm.* 70; 338; cf. White 1978: 81). In the first and second centuries it became popular as a form of address, despite its demeaning connotations for the client. It generally is used to illustrate obsequiousness or concealed satirical disparagement towards the patron by the client (e.g. 1.112.1; 2.18.5; 2.68.2; 3.7.5; 5.19.13; 5.22.4; 10.86.13; 12.60.14; Pers. 1.67; 3.17; Juv. 1.136; 5.114; 130; 137; 161; 7.45; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.92; also cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.37-8 *rexque paterque/ audisti coram; 1.17.43 in reference to Maecenas; White 1975: 285, Nauta 2002: 16-17). Note especially epigrams such as 2.68, where Martial contrasts the formal *rex dominusque* with the informal first name friendship (2.68.1-3
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*quod te nomine iam tuo saluto,/ quem regem et dominum prius vocabam,/ ne me dixeris esse contumacem*). Similar contrasts are made between the verbs *colere* and *amare*, which are meant to illustrate the disparities in such relationships (e.g. 2.55; White 1978: 81).

In contrast with *hic ego quid faciam?*, the poet admits that Paulus can perform the duties of the client in a manner far more deferential and ingratiating than the poet ever can. Such contemptuous comparisons occur frequently in epigrams dealing with the patron-client relationship, and emphasise Martial's condemnation of the abuses of such a system (2.18; 2.32; 3.60; 6.11; 9.2; 92; 10.96; AP 9.216; 253; 148). For the parenthesis see 10.9, also cf. Cic. *Att. 9.5.1; Mart. 7.39.8.*

*lecticam sellamve sequar? nee ferre recusas,
per medium pugnas et prior ire lutum.*

Martial lists the duties performed by the *clientes* for their patron throughout the day, a form of *Häufung von Gegensätzen* regularly used in epigrams on the patron-client relationship (2.18; 2.33; 3.60; 11.9; 9.2; 9.92; 10.96; see Siedschlag 1977: 53-5). After the *salutatio*, the clients escorted the patron, seated in a sedan chair carried by slaves to the forum, whilst he carried out his daily business (3.46; 11.98.11; 3.36.4). The *lectica* was the litter or couch in which the patron lay down or reclined while being carried by *lecticarii* or *sellarii*; the *sella* was the chair or sedan within which one sat (3.36.4; 3.46.4; 5.12; 9.22.9; 12.58; Catul. 10.14; Juv. 1.120-1; 3.245; 7.132; Suet. *Claud. 25; Domitian 2; Sen. Dial. 10.12.6*). Such modes of transport exhibit ostentation (Mart. 4.51; 6.77; 84; 9.2.11; Sen. *Ep. 31.10; Dial. 2.14.1; Lucian Cyn. 10; George on 3.36). Martial contrasts the ordinary behaviour of the *clientes* with that of
Paulus, who is eager even to carry the litter, a duty for slaves or *liberti*, but not a free man, especially a consul (3.46.4; Sen. *Dial.* 9.12.4). Martial again emphasises the undignified behaviour of Paulus a consul, who fights to be the first to walk in the mud (cf. 3.66.4-5 *per mediumque trahat me tua sella lutum*; 7.61.6 *nec praetor medio cogit ire luto* 12.29(26).8; Juv. 3.247; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.72; Sen. 3.6.4). The mud of central Rome is frequently described especially with reference to clients wearing white togas when accompanying the patron to the forum (cf. 5.22.6f; 7.33; 11.21.4; George on 3.36; cf. Lucil. *fr.*109, 1018 Marx; Juv. 3.247; Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 13.24; Sen. *Ep.* 107.2; *Dial.* 3.12.4; 5.6.4; 35.5; Tac. *Hist.* 3.82; Suet. *Vesp.* 5.3; Plutarch *Cic.* 30.5).

Friedlaender prefers the present infinitive *ire* to the textual variant *iste*, although Lindsay gives the perfect infinitive *isse*. Jenkins notes that from the time of the Augustans the perfect infinitive was used for metrical convenience (Verg. *A.* 6.79; *Tib.* 1.1.29-32; also Lucr. 3.683), and also in the manner of a Greek aorist infinitive (Platnauer 1951: 109-11). Martial uses the perfect infinitive only where the present is metrically impossible, but here there is no metrical difference between the two and the sense is more general, which suits the use of the present infinitive. Note the present infinitive with *pugno* in Ov. *Met.* 2.822 *illa quidem pugnat recto se attollere trunco*, which assumes the sense and construction of *conor* in prose, and *tempto* and *nitor* in poetry (Post: 235).

saepius assurgam recitanti carmina? tu stas
et pariter geminas tendis in ora manus.

Recitations of poetry were regular social events, either as private functions or part of formal social affairs (Juv. 1.4 with Braund 1996: 75). Another of the client’s duties
was to attend the patron's recitation of his poetry, with the expectation of praise in the form of enthusiastic applause and shouting (cf. 3.18 with George's note; Plin. Ep. 1.13 with Sherwin-White; 2.10.7; 5.3.9; 6.17.2; Mayor on Juv. 3.9). Martial elsewhere describes the irritation felt by a client or guest forced to listen to a patron reciting his own poems at dinner (3.50; 44.15; 78.25; Lucilius AP 11.10).

The sycophantic gestures of admiration for the patron's recitation are ironically emphasised. For example, *adsurgam* describes the complimentary way of showing approval by rising before another (Cic. *Cato* 18.64; *Amic.* 7.24; Att. 2.19.3; Plin. *Ep.* 6.17.2; 9.23.1; Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.9; 12; Pers. 1.82; Tac. *Dial.* 13; Phaedrus 5.7.28; Suet. *Aug.* 56).

The expression *geminas tendis in ora manus* may refer to the client holding his hands up to his face and devotedly blowing kisses to the patron in response to his recitations. Such a gesture is normally performed by the reciter as a bow in response to the applause (cf. 1.3.7 *dum basia iactas*; Phaedrus 5.7.28). A more likely explanation is that it is a gesture of admiration (cf. Juv. 3.104-6 *iactare manus*; Plin. *Ep.* 6.17.2; Dio 61.20.3). Such a motion 'to stretch out one's hands towards someone' is also used to show supplication (Caes. *Civ.* 2.5; Cic. *Catil.* 4.9.18; Verg. *A.* 1.93; 3.176; 6.314), and is also used in reference to actors (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.179; Braund 1996: 193). Jenkins suggests that Paulus is cupping his hand round his mouth and shouting his support (Plin. *Ep.* 2.14.5 with Sherwin-White), or holding his head in an expression of rapture, although *in ora* is always used in Martial of someone else's face (2.75.2; 3.19.4; 5.69.3). The sense is that Paulus is taking his enthusiasm for the recitation to the extreme in anticipation of the benefits from such flattery.
quid faciet pauper, cui non licet esse clienti?
dimisit nostras purpura vestra togas.

At 5.13, Martial also associates the equestrian rank with pauper, which does not necessarily suggest poverty, but somewhere between egenus and dives (cf. 2.90; 4.77; 5.15; 6.43; 7.46; Nauta 2002: 54). The poet is frustrated by the unfairness of this system which benefits clients because of their higher social status and their influence.

The term cliens is not commonly used as a polite term because of its blunt realistic tone and connotations of inferiority (Cic. Off. 2.69; Sen. Ben. 2.23.3; Nauta 2002: 15). Although cliens appears in satire (cf. Mart. 10.74.2; Petr. 30.11; Laus Pís. 119; 134; Juv. 5.64; 9.72), terms such as the more moderate cultor with its corresponding verb colere (Mart. 9.84.4; Juv. 9.49; Ov. Ars 1.722; Sen. Dial. 10.2.4; Laus Pisonis 109; 133;) or the most common amicus are preferred (for the use of these terms cf. White 1978: 80-1 and Nauta 2002: 15-18; note that amicus is used in 10.11).

The term dimitto is generally used in the sense of disbanding or discharging a person from a military or similar service (Hor. Carm. 2.2.49; Verg. A. 12.844; Tac. Hist. 3.57; Cic. Pís. 48; Sen. Ben. 5.17.2; cf. OLD s.v. dimitto). Here, its contemptuous tone denotes the difference in authority between senators and clients of lesser status. (The same verb appears two poems later at 10.12.3 in a farewell poem to Domitius Apollinaris, who is leaving the rigours of city life for a country holiday; where it seems as if the poet is granting leave to Domitius, his superior.)

Martial uses purpura as metonymy to refer to the garments worn by senators and other men of higher rank (cf. 10. 5.1). As a colour which naturally implies wealth, its use here ironically depicts the magistrate’s attendance at the salutatio.
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amongst the ‘real’ clients (cf. 12.29.5 sed tu, purpureis ut des nova nomina fastis). The chiastic arrangement heightens the ironic contrast.

Attention is drawn to the toga, the official uniform of the client when performing his duties towards his patron throughout the day (1.108.7; 2.74.1; 3.36.9; 46.1; 5.22.11; 9.100.1; 10.19(18).4; 74.3; 82.2; 11.24.11; 14.125.2; 12.18.5; Juv. 3.127; 7.142; Sen. Ep. 114.12). The toga was a heavy, uncomfortable garment which was easily soiled, especially by the client trampling in the mud after his patron (for the toga cf. Croom 2000: 40-4). This discomfort and the cost of its upkeep are a continual cause for complaint in the epigrams and, as such, the toga symbolises the hardships of the client in Rome (1.103.5; 3.4.6; 3.36; 5.22; 7.33.1; 9.49 with Henriksén’s note; 100; 12.18.5; Juv. 3.171ff.; Plin. Ep. 5.6.45; Sen. Ep. 18.2; cf. turba togata of 6.48.1). Martial often contrasts the wearing of the toga with more comfortable attire associated with country living (e.g. 1.49.31; 4.66; 12.18.17), and his dislike for the toga is especially apparent in Book 10 as the poet prepares to escape from Rome and all the toga represents (10.47; 51.6; 74; 82; 96.11-12).

Mistreatment within the system of amicitia continues with an address to Calliodorus, as one who misleadingly portrays himself as a generous gift-giver. amicitia encompassed a wide variety of relationships where social ranks often overlap. It seems that a significant factor was a reliance upon a reciprocal exchange of goods and services as symbols of friendship (Spisak 1998: 243-55; on gift exchange in general cf. Saller 1982: 13ff., Hands 1968: 26ff.). The notion of giving and receiving gifts occurs on a number of occasions in Martial, and the poet is especially aggravated by
those who abuse this aspect of the friendship, generally for personal benefit (cf. 5.59; 8.38.1-3; cf. Spisak 1998: 247; Kleijwegt 1998: 264-6). In 10.11, Calliodorus fails in his obligations of friendship by not bestowing such gifts or by giving gifts which are simply too meagre, despite his self-proclaimed generosity. A similar example occurs at 5.82, where Gaurus is criticised for not fulfilling his promises of bestowing gifts upon the poet:

Quid promittebas mihi milia, Gaure, ducenta,
si dare non poteras milia, Gaure, decem?
an potes et non vis? rogo, non est turpius istud?
i tibi, dispereas, Gaure: pusillus homo es.

The hypocritical amicus whose claims of generosity are grossly exaggerated is a common target in Martial’s poems (2.43; 3.37; 6.11; 9.2; 12.13; 36). Although it is a recurring subject throughout the books, it takes special prominence as a motif in Book 10, and following 10.11 there is a long sequence of poems which raise similar concerns (14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19). Most of these poems portray individuals who weaken the bonds of friendship in their reluctance to fulfil their obligations of friendship. These examples of bad friends are intentionally juxtaposed with Martial’s Spanish friend Manius of 10.13, who exemplifies the essence of true friendship. Mistreatment of friendship is commonplace in Roman society, in contrast with the apparent sincerity of country living (as conveyed by 10.12), and ultimately these notions become the motivation for Martial’s departure from Rome.

As the basis for his own pretensions to friendship, Calliodorus draws upon two proverbial examples of friendship from mythology and tragedy, those of Pirithous and Theseus, and Pylades and Orestes (compare 6.11 see Kleijwegt 1998: 265). These examples evoke the ideal models of friendship, but, as Martial points out, such
standards of friendship have been corrupted in contemporary Roman society because of individuals such as Calliodorus, whose actions do not match his words. A similar example occurs at 12.36, where Martial reproaches the patron Labullus who thinks himself generous and boasts of his generosity, but his meanness is revealed when compared to famous literary patrons of the past.

_Nil aliud loqueris, quam Thesea Pirithourque, teque putas Pyladi, Calliodore, parem._

Two mythological examples of unqualified friendship are introduced with the sole purpose of comparison with the subject's own ideas of friendship. The famed friendship of Theseus and the king of the Lapiths, Pirithous, is frequently used in Classical literature as an ideal example of heroic friendship from mythology (cf. 7.24.4; Hom. _Od._ 11.631; Plutarch _Theseus_ 30ff.; Ov. _Tr._ 1.5.19; _Pont._ 2.3.42; 2.6.26 _Aegidae Pirithoique fides_; _Ep._ 4.110; _Met._ 8.303; Stat. _Theb._ 1.475; 8.53-4; Sen. _Phaed._ 244; Verg. _A._ 6.393 _Thesea Pirithounque_; Ausonius _Ep._ 25.63; Apoll. Sidon. _Ep._ 3.13.10; Claudian 3.107ff.; Otto: 347). They are even referred to separately to denote friendship (Ov. _Tr._ 1.3.66; 1.9.31; 5.4.25; _Pont._ 4.10.78). Their names evoke constant and noble friendship, and demonstrate the meaning of exceptional and unqualified devotion. Calliodorus' boasts that his gifts are greater in comparison with such examples automatically reveal that he is not to be a true friend.

Martial refers to Pylades, the constant companion of Orestes, as their partnership, like that of Pirithous and Theseus, represents a proverbial symbol for deep friendship (cf. Grewing on 6.11.1; 7.24.3; Cic. _Amic._ 24; Ov. _Rem._ 589; _Tr._ 1.5.21; _Pont._ 3.2.69-70; Stat. _Theb._ 1.477; Otto: 258). Only one of the names needs to
be mentioned as an allusion to friendship (cf. Mart. 7.45.8-9; Cic. *Fin.* 2.84; Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.54). A similar example occurs at 6.11 where Martial refers to this pair as an illustration of equal friendship, in contrast with the host Marcus who serves his guests a meal different from his own. At 7.45, Ovidius, as an example of a true heroic friend, outdoes even Pylades in his courage (7.45.8-9 *miretur Pyladen suum vetustas;/ haesit qui comes exuli parentis*, see Kleijwegt 1998: 268). As symbols of friendship, both pairs sometimes appear together (e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 1.47ff.; Mart. 7.24).

The addressee of the poem is Calliodorus, presumably fictitious, who appears on several other occasions in the epigrams, in all of which he appears as a figure of mockery (5.38 as a knight who pretends to have a brother in order to halve the requirement for the equestrian qualification; 6.44 as a joker who makes fun of everyone; 9.21 as one who keeps his land and sells his catamite; and 10.31 where he sells a slave to buy a fish, thereby eating a man). This name rarely appears on inscriptions, as only two examples are found (cf. Fraser and Matthews vol. 1, s.v. *Καλλίδορος*; Hénriksen on 9.21). Although Howell suggests that the name of Calliodorus is selected for metrical convenience (Howell on 5.38), here it appears quite deliberately, since its meaning ('giving beautiful things') conveys an ironical contrast with his actions. The Greek provenance of the name suggests he is a wealthy freedman, a conventional target of Roman satire in relation not only to the wealth of such men but also the political power they exerted (Hor. *Epod.* 4; Juv. 1.109; Sen. *Ep.* 27.5; Mart. 5.13; 82; Petr. 26ff.; see Kay on 11.12; Grewing on 6.8.5).
dispeream, sit tu Pyladi praestare matellam
dignus es aut porcos pascere Pirithoi.

dispeream is a colloquial expression and commonly used in Martial (cf. 1.39.8; 2.69.2; 9.95b.2; 11.90) or in alternative forms (cf. 2.5.1 valeam; 10.12.3 ne vivam nisi; 5.82.4 pereas). The phrase connotes a conviction to guarantee the certainty of a particular statement to demonstrate 'may I die' or 'hang me if this is the case' (Quinn 1970: 429, on Catul. 92.2). Similar sentiments appear in Cicero's letters (Att. 5.20.6), and are especially prominent in the love elegy and satire (Catul. 92.2-4; Prop. 2.21.9; Ov. Am. 2.11.5; Ep. 16.184; Hor. S. 1.9.47; Suet. Tib. 59 in the form of a lampoon).

Two proverbial expressions, Pyladi praestare matellam and porcos pascere Piritio convey the poet's contempt for Callidorus' value as an amicus (cf. Otto: 215). The scornful tone is heightened by the alliteration. That Callidorus is not worthy of performing such menial tasks in the name of friendship is made all the more ironic by the use of praestare, a common term to express the fulfilment of duties in such a relationship (3.36.1-2 quod novus et nuper factus tibi praestat amicus, hoc praestare iubes me, Fabiane, tibi; 3.46.11; 1.108.7; 10.96.13; Juv. 3.188ff.).

matella refers to a narrow necked lagena type flagon for the purposes of urination (6.89.1 with Grewing; 12.32.13; 14.119 with Leary; cf. 3.82.15; Pl. Mos. 386; Petr. 58.9). Note also that holding a pot for someone to piss into is referred to as a slave's job in Petronius (27.4) The coarseness and vulgarity of the expressions are contrasted with the grand-sounding and dignified symbols of heroic friendship exemplified by Pylades and Pirithous, which belittles the aspirations of amicitia expressed by Callidorus. Note the alliteration of 'p' in lines 2-4, emphasising Martial's tone of exasperation.
10.11

‘donavi tamen’ inquis ‘amico milia quinque
et lotam, ut multum, tere quaterve togam.’

amicus is the term most favoured to refer to both participants in a patronage
relationship, rather than the terms patroni or clientes which are generally avoided out

Other terminology used by Martial includes amicitia, amor, amare, and sodalis,
although cliens is also used, particularly when emphasising the inferiority of one of
the partners in the relationship (cf. 10.10.11; Nauta 2002: 15, White 1978: 80).
donavi is commonly used in these circumstances to represent the bestowal of such a
‘gift’ in these types of relationships (e.g. 1.75.1; 2.30.2; other verbs used include do
and mitto in similar contexts).

Pecuniary gifts were a significant component in the relationship between a
patron and client, and Martial refers to specific amounts either received by him or
fictional addressees, which range from 6,000 sesterces at 4.76 and 6.30 to as much as
200,000 sesterces at 4.61 and 5.82 (for other amounts requested or borrowed by
Martial cf. 2.30 with Williams for 20,000 sesterces; 44 between 4, 7 and 11, 000
sesterces; 6.20 for 100,000 sesterces; Nauta 2002: 81). Because of these varying
amounts, it cannot be resolved whether 5,000 sesterces represents a reasonable sum
or a paltry figure.

Just as in the previous epigram, Martial refers to the wearing of the toga, the
standard form of dress for a client to pay attendance upon the patron at functions such
as the salutatio, or escorting the patron to the forum (cf. 10.10.12). Such a garment
was expensive to maintain and therefore was a welcome gift from the patron to the
poorer client. Martial makes frequent references to the toga as a gift to the cliens in
varying contexts, for example Parthenius' gift of a toga for Martial at 8.28 and 9.49 (cf. 10.73; 12.36). Here a toga washed only a number of times perhaps suggests that it is still rather new and unused, and as a result is a generous and valuable gift (cf. 1.103.5; 3.36.9; 7.33.1; 9.100.5). Alternatively it may suggest that what Calliodorus thinks is a fine gift is actually quite poor. In similar circumstances Petronius refers to the gift of garments to a client as *iam semel lota* (30.11 with Smith 1975: 64-5).

This is the first time the expression *ut multum*, 'at most', occurs in Latin literature, and it appears again in Juvenal (Juv. 7.186-7 *ut multum, duo sufficient*; see Colton 1991: 322-3; Jer. Ep. 133.13 *unum aut ut multum tres homunculus*; cf. Mart. 14.97.2 *ut minimum* with Leary on 14.97).

*quid, quod nil umquam Pylades donavit Orestae? qui donat quamvis plurima, plura negat.*

The speaker illustrates the contrast between the true ideals of friendship expressed by Orestes and Pylades and Calliodorus' own attitude towards friendship. Calliodorus is compelled to broadcast his so-called generosity as a cover for his meanness; however, the true ideal of friendship, such as that represented by Pylades and Orestes, implies that gifts are not exchanged; instead it is understood that common property is shared. Similarly, at 2.43, Candidus boasts of the importance of sharing amongst friends, but does not live up to his claims: 'Κοινὰ φιλῶν: haec sunt, haec sunt tua, Candide, κοινα, quae tu magnilocus nocte dieque sonas? (2.43.1-2; see Williams on 2.43). Such individuals wilfully abuse these traditional standards of friendship with their deceptive claims of generosity. The poem concludes with a generalising statement

123
that the entire notion of gift-giving makes a mockery of the principles of true friendship.

Martial sends a farewell message to Domitius, wishing him an enjoyable summer vacation away from Rome. The poem emphasises Domitius’ fortune in leaving Rome and describes his journey to the north of Italy for a late summer holiday. It was traditional for the wealthier classes to escape the heat and discomfort of Rome during summer and stay at their country residences in Italy (cf. 3.58; Hor. Ep. 1.7.5-9; Balsdon 1969: 193ff.).

The literary model for this poem is the *propemptikon*, a farewell poem to a person embarking upon a journey (see Cairns 1972: Index s.v. *propemptikon*; N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.3; Hardie 1983: 156-64 on Stat. *Silv.* 3.2; Bobrowski 1991: 203-15). This genre encompasses an extensive literary tradition and was adopted by the Hellenistic poets as a popular literary exercise, although there are only fragmentary remains of Callimachean *propempika* (fr. 400, *Iamb.* 6). The genre was also adopted by Roman poets, such as Horace (*Carm.* 1.3; *Epod.* 1), Ovid (*Am.* 2.11), Tibullus (1.3), Propertius (1.6; 8) and Statius (*Silv.* 3.2). Martial also uses this form for the concluding poem of this book where he sends the book on its journey to Spain.

Martial includes from the *propemptikon* traditional *topoi* such as formulaic language (*i precor, dimitto*), a description of the route that the traveller will take (lines 1-2), expressions of affection for the traveller and sorrow for his absence (line 4) (Cairns 1972: Index s.v. *propemptikon*). Menander Rhetor discusses the elements of the *propemptikon* and divides the genre into three categories according to the status of
speaker and traveller (Men. Rhet. 395.4-32; Cairns 1972: 8ff.). This poem represents
the poet as the inferior (perhaps client) addressing his superior (patron), and includes
the customary expressions of affection and respect (Prop. 1.6; 3.4; Hor. Carm. 1.20;
3.14; Cairns 1972: 240). The expressions of affection are developed into an imitation
of love elegy, with terms such as *formosus, ne vivam* and strong sexual language such
as *liveo, pallida and rapiet* (Hor. Carm. 3.25; Ov. Am. 2.11; Prop. 1.8). The
anticipation of Domitius' return to Rome in the concluding lines belongs to the
tradition of the *prosphonetikon*, and the models for this at the end of the *propemptikon*
are Ovid Am. 2.11 and Statius Silv. 3.2. Martial, however, avoids the conventional
themes of the feasts and celebrations for the return of the traveller and instead focuses
on the harmful effects which Rome will have on Domitius' return, thereby adapting
the genre to suit his own purposes.

The contrast between the benefits of leaving Rome and the disadvantages of
remaining are heightened by an extensive use of colour motifs. Terms such as *albis
amicis, pallida, and livebit* illustrate the unhealthy atmosphere created by lifestyle at
Rome, in contrast with the benefits which country living bestows (e.g. line 8: *o quam
formosus dum peregrinus eris!* and lines 11-12: *sed via quem dederit rapiet cito Roma
colorem,/ Niliaco redeas tu licet ore niger*). These features continue from the theme
on the hardships of living at Rome, and Martial focuses on the simple pleasure of
acquiring a healthy tan. The poet reminds Domitius that once he returns to Rome and
its taxing way of life he will quickly lose his healthy appearance. This is indicative of
the pastoral theme in Book 10, which compares rural and urban life (Spisak 2002:
127-41).
The *topos* of the contrast between urban and pastoral lifestyles originated in the Hellenistic bucolic poetry of Theocritus, and was developed for Roman writers by Vergil in particular; it was also used as a standard of Roman declamation (Verg. G. passim; Plin. Ep. 7.3; Cic. S. Rosc. 20.44.74-5; Quint. Inst. 2.4.24; Sen. Con. 2.1.11-12; see Braund 1989b: 23, Spisak 2002: 132 n.17). This *topos* promotes themes of simplicity and rusticity in contrast with the more complicated city life which is often, as here, portrayed as unhealthy and draining (further see Halperin 1983: 61-72). As such, it was especially popular in Roman satire, especially in the works of Horace and Juvenal, not only for comic exaggeration but also as symbolic of the moral values represented in country and city (Hor. S. 2.6; Epod. 2; Ep. 2.2; Juv. 3; 11; 14.180ff.; see Braund 1989b: 23ff., Spisak 2002: 132-4, Merli 2006: 259ff.). These ideas are reflected in Martial’s poetry in the contrast between city and country life, and 10.12 can be compared to themes presented in 1.49 which contrasts the quiet life of Spain with the discomforts of city life. 1.49 complains of aspects such as the *querulus cliens* and the *salutatio,* which are the topic of 10.10 and 11. In this way, 10.12 anticipates 10.13, which refers to Martial’s love for his homeland (see also 4.55). The concept of the simple life also complements Martial’s rejection of grandiose themes in literature in favour of the straightforward and realistic themes raised in the earlier poems of Book 10.

10.12 follows two poems on the theme of patronage, which are directed at the hardships of the client’s duties and hypocritical patrons. Martial refers to Domitius as a valuable patron with courtesy and respect, and perhaps his absence will leave Martial vulnerable to the type of patrons and situations addressed in 10.10 and 11. Language such as *amicis* and *turba* also suggests that used of patronage and the
unpleasant aspects of Rome (or those which Martial considers unpleasant), which Domitius is leaving behind.

The theme of Domitius’ absence from Rome recalls poems 6 and 7 which refer to Trajan, who is also absent from Rome; these earlier poems also focus on Trajan’s return to his position in Rome. This link is strengthened by such verbal echoes as *Nilotide* (6.7) with *Niliaco* (12.12) and *venit* (6.8) with *venies* (12.9); *solibus* of 6.2 and *totos...soles* of 12.7. The path that each man is taking also figures strongly in these poems; for Trajan will return in triumph along the via Flaminia, and Domitius is travelling along the via Aemilia. Yet the descriptions of both men’s return are treated from quite different perspectives. In the imperial poems to Trajan, Martial treats Rome as superior to the external world, and the emperor’s return will bring beneficial enrichment to the city. At 10.7.9 Martial addresses the Tiber as *dominus* of the Rhine, which further strengthens Rome’s superiority and domination. Rome’s greatness is challenged in 10.12 for here Rome is regarded as inferior to the outside world and Rome will cause harm to Domitius on his return. The message of slavery is also echoed in this poem, where it is the city-dwellers who are under the yoke of slavery compared with the beneficence of country living. Martial is using these poems to accommodate the requirements of each particular subject or recipient; hence, in part, the difference in the representation of Rome. In 10.6 and 7, the emperor Trajan is summoned home to celebrate his triumph over the German tribes and to demonstrate that Rome is the superior power. In 10.12, Domitius is voluntarily leaving the city for the benefits of country life, so Martial focuses on the detrimental aspects of the city, and its brutal power is expressed in language such as *rapiet* (10.12). It is also a standard feature of the *propemptikon* to refer to the location of the traveller’s
destination in complimentary language (Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.6; Mart. 10.20.10f.; 10.78.1; 104.4; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.49). Martial still recognises the value of Rome at 10.13(20).10, where he may create the ideal Rome in any part of the world, provided he is with his friend Manius.

The poem's addressee, Domitius, is possibly the same Domitius Apollinaris addressed in 4.86; 7.26; 89; 10.30; 11.15, also a friend of Pliny (Plin. *Ep.* 2.9; 5.6; 9.13.13; Syme *RP* 2: 715). Some critics do not consider that this epigram belongs to the same category of poems addressed to this Domitius Apollinaris particularly as he is not addressed elsewhere by Martial as Domitius (Sherwin-White on Plin. *Ep.* 9.13.13, White 1975: 295). It is possible that this epigram is addressed to this same man, though here Martial refers to him by his *praenomen* because of the use of *Apollineas* in connection to the town, Vercellae, which serves to anticipate and render the addressee by his *cognomen* as redundant and inelegant (Syme *RP* 7: 588; Nauta 2002: 159-60). These epigrams portray Apollinaris as a valued senatorial patron and literary benefactor of Martial, and illustrate aspects of friendship and literary patronage in Roman society (Syme *RP* 7: 598). If the addressee is Domitius Apollinaris, there is a link to 10.30 which is also addressed to him, and again on the theme of the attractions of the country compared to life in Rome. Domitius Apollinaris had returned to Rome after a governorship of Lycia-Pamphylia during 93-96, and fragments of the *Fasti Ostienses* confirm that he was *consul designatus* in 97 from July 1 to September 1 (also cf. Plin. *Ep.* 9.13.13 with Sherwin-White's note, which confirms that he was consul between May and August). Inscriptions found at Vercellae confirm the existence of the *patria* of Apollinaris there (*PIR* D 133, Syme *RP* 7: 588ff.). This is not the only occurrence of wordplay with the name Apollinaris,
which is used again at 11.15 as a witty contrast with *Saturnalia* (Kay on 11.15.12). It
seems likely, then, that this epigram was written in 97 following Domitius’
consulship, but instead of focussing on his consular activities or office Martial
presents as his theme the contrast between city and rural life (Nauta 2002: 160).

For this poem see Merli 2006: 259ff., Nauta 2002: 159-60.

*Aemiliae gentes et Apollineas Vercellas*
*et Phaethontei qui petis arva Padi,*

The poem begins with a poetic description of the locations which Domitius will pass
through on his journey to northern Italy. The description of the route and the land
which the traveller will journey through constitutes a principal *topos* of the
*propemptikon* (see 10.12). *Aemiliae gentes* refers to the peoples along the via Aemilia
which was named after its builder the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus in 187 BCE. It ran
from Ariminum to Placentia and was an important Italian trade route (Chevallier
1976: 136). These territories were not as historically established with a literary and
cultural background as some of the territories south of the Po, but were acquiring their
own identity (cf. Mart. 3.4; 6.85.6; Syme *RP* 2: 704).

Although it has been suggested that *Apollineas* is an indirect reference to
Domitius Apollinaris, this area of Italy was identified with the cult of Apollo in
inscriptions (*CIL* 5 P. 737, Friedlaender on 10.12.1; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.58.50 Vollmer
1898: 288-9). The reference is perhaps intended to have a twofold effect.

*Phaethon,* the son of Helios, was killed by one of Zeus’ thunderbolts whilst
driving his father’s chariot, and fell into the Eridanus river, which became associated
with the Padus (river Po) which rises in the Cottian Alps and flows east to Cisalpine
Gaul into the Adriatic (3.65.5; 5.53.4; Ov. *Met.* 1.750-2.400; Hyg. *Fab.* 154; Eurip. *Hipp.* 735ff.; Stat. *Theb.* 1.221; Sil. 7.149ff.).

**ne vivam, nisi te, Domiti, dimitto libenter,**  
**grata licet sine te sit mihi nulla dies:**

A typical feature of the *schetliastic propemptikon* is the complaint or reproaches by the speaker in an attempt to persuade the traveller to stay behind (Prop. 1.6), which Martial adopts here by saying each day that Domitius is absent will not give any pleasure (Cairns 1972: 7ff).

Expressions such as *ne vivam* are typical in love elegy (see 10.11.3 above; for example Ov. *Am.* 2.11.5-6 *o utinam ne* with McKeown 1998: 225-6). Such language is also in keeping with that of the *propemptikon* genre, which expresses similar sentiments expressed in love elegy (e.g. Prop. 1.6.12 *a pereat, si quis lentus amare potest*). These expressions, combined with the alliterative and assonantal wordplay in *Domiti, dimitto*, create a sense of intimacy between poet and addressee.

**sed desiderium tanti est, ut messe vel una urbano releves colla perusta iugo.**

The following lines describe Martial’s misery at Domitius’ absence from Rome, yet his return will remove any trace of the suntan gained in the country. The expression *desiderium tanti est* denotes *feram meum desiderium tui*, an expression of the *propemptikon* genre (Friedlaender on 10.12.5; also cf. 8.60.3-4; also see 1.12.11; 108.6; 117.18; 12.43.11; 59.11).

*messis* is used as an alternative for *aestas* or *annus*, frequently for metrical convenience, but its usage here suggests the pastoral image of rich harvests (more so
than aestas or annus) and the idyllic setting of harvest time (see Howell on 1.104.4; also 4.78.1; 6.80.10; 8.55.18; Petr. 89.1).

The term urbanus is meant to denote activities connected with Rome (3.58.29 exercet hilares facilis hortus urbanus; 1.55.14 vivat et urbanis albus in officiis). If this epigram is addressed to Domitius Apollinaris, this city yoke perhaps denotes the suffect consulship just recently held by Domitius in July of 97 (Nauta 2002: 160). The use of iugum as the yoke of city business wittily applies a rural term to describe the hardships of the urban lifestyle; it is frequently employed in Roman literature as a symbol of a life of bondage (cf. Catul. 63.33; Hor. Carm. 1.35.28; 2.5.1; S. 2.7.92; Ov. Tr. 5.2.40). The word implies that city life is akin to rural slavery while country life is one of freedom. The drudgery of work in the fields (at harvest) is transferred to the city.

i precor et totos avida cute combibes soles –
o quam formosus, dum peregrinus eris!

The use of the imperative i accompanied by expression of good wishes is a standard formula of the propemptikon genre (Ar. Eq. 498; Ov. Am. 2.11.37; Stat. Silv. 3.4.1,2,3; Hor. Epod. 1.1; Tib. 1.3.1; Mart. 10.104.1; Cairns 1972: 248 n. 28). Martial does not focus on the hardships and the pressures of Roman business, but instead on the healthy tan which the fortunate Domitius will acquire outside Rome. For a similar expression to conbibes soles, compare Juv. 11.203 nostra bibat vernum contracta cuticula solem/ effugiatque togam (see Colton 1991: 412).

The adjective formosus is used only once in Catullus (86.1), but subsequently became a popular term in the genre of love elegy and conveys warm affection (Var.
There are numerous examples in Roman literature of sunbathing or the practice of *apricatio* or *insolatio* as a pastime enjoyed by those at leisure (cf. 1.55.14 with Howell; Sen. *Dial.* 10.13.1; *Ep.* 86.8; Plin. *Ep.* 3.1.8; 3.5.10 *aestate si quid iacebat in sole*, Hor. *Carm.* 2.15.10; *Ep.* 1.20.24; also the elderly see Pers. 4.33; 5.179; Cic. *Sen.* 53; Juv. 11.203 with Mayor’s note). Not only does a suntan promote health and vitality, but Martial is using the benefits of a suntan to demonstrate the *otium* of country living in contrast with the city life (cf.1.55.14). Dark or suntanned skin is also associated with foreigners, and this corresponds with *peregrinus*. Martial uses *peregrinus* several times generally as an adjective, to emphasise the notion that anything outside Rome is foreign (cf. 3.55; 12.2 (3).2; 9.21). Here, with tanned skin, Domitius is a foreigner to Rome and to all the unpleasant elements that pervade the city.

*et venies albis non cognoscendus amicis*  
*livebitque tuis pallida turba genis.*

*agnoscendus* is found in the γ manuscript tradition, and denotes the sense ‘to recognise by sight, to know again or identify’ (cf. Verg. A. 3.173; Plin. *Ep.* 7.27.8; *OLD* s.v. *agnosco*); but Shackleton Bailey prefers the use of *cognoscendus* of the Β manuscript, which can also assume the meaning to ‘recognise a person or thing one already knows’, rather than its usual meaning of ‘get to know’ or ‘learn’ (Ov. *Met.* 7.723; see *OLD* s.v. *cognosco*; SB¹: 320).
The expression *albis amicis* suggests that the poet is amongst Domitius' *amicis*, those on a more intimate relationship with the patron. At 7.26.1 and 10 Martial refers to Domitius as *meus*, and *noster* at 7.89.2, which also indicates some kind of patronage relationship (Nauta 2002: 74 n.9). Martial refers to Domitius’ *amicis* as *albi*, which describes the sickly or unhealthy pallor especially of those living at Rome (cf. 3.58.24; Pers. 3.98; Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.15; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.51; André 1949: 28). This is just one in a series of colour motifs which are used to illustrate the contrast between urban and city lifestyles.

*livebit* is also a term which applies to the dull steely blue of bruises, and was originally associated with abscesses, tumours, and inauspicious entrails in sacrifices and prophecy (Celsus 2.6.5; 5.26.20; Sen. *Oed.* 377; André 1949: 172). In Roman poetry, it evokes the colour of poisons, the rivers of hell (Verg. *A.* 6.320; Stat. *Theb.* 4.522), and unpleasant emotions such as envy (Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.16; Sil. 6.290; André 1949: 254; Kay on 11.20). Martial frequently employs the term to denote jealousy (6.86.6; 8.61; 11.20.1; 11.94), generally in relation to other writers who are resentful of his success (1.40.2; 10.33.6; 11.33.3; 12 *praef.* 5; Sen. *Dial.* 5.8.4 *lividus malignitate*; Hor. *S.* 1.4.93; see Kay on 11.20.1; André 1949: 171-5). The noun *livor* is used by Propertius in reference to a lover’s jealousy, which further links the verb here to the image of love elegy (Prop. 1.8.29). Here the verb is used in a construction similar to *invidere* with the dative of the person envied (cf. 6.86.6; 9.23.5; 11.94.1; Tac. *Ann.* 13.42).

*Turba* is frequently used as a dismissive term to refer to the faceless masses of the lower classes which belong in the lowest level of the patronage relationship (Mart. 10.10; Juv. 1.20.1; 5.19-21). Here the phrase *pallida turba* emphasises the countless
masses of white faces in Rome, in contrast to the brown complexion with which Domitius will return to Rome (cf. 1.49.35).

sed via quam dederit, rapiet cito Roma colorem,
   Niliaco redeas tu licet ore niger.

The poem does not express the poet’s pleasure at the prospect of Domitius’ return to Rome, but instead focuses on the adversities of city living. The concluding lines reach the climax in the colour motif, in that Rome, the city itself, will eradicate any traces of the tan which Domitius has acquired whilst outside Rome. The emphasis appears to be on the fact that leaving Rome for a short time is not enough, and does not compare with the pleasures of country life. The vividness of rapiet, typical in elegiac poetry in terms of sexual assault (e.g. 12.52.13; Prop. 2.6.21), creates an image of violence inflicted upon Domitius by the city.

The adjective Niliacus is often used in a poetical context to mean ‘Egyptian’ and makes frequent appearances in Martial in this sense (1.86; 3.93.7; 4.42; 5.13; 65.14; 8.81; 10.15; 12.74; 13.1; 9; 57; 85; 122; 14.150; also cf. Ov. Ars 3.318; Lucr. 10.80; Juv. 1.26). niger in this sense connotes suntanned and brown like an Egyptian (cf. 7.13.4; André 1949: 55). These terms also reinforce the image of Domitius as a foreigner in Rome.

Themes from the previous two poems are combined in this poem which praises the idyllic country setting of Spain, Martial’s homeland, and provides an example of true friendship as represented by his childhood friend Manius. Somewhat surprisingly,
Spain and the poet's birthplace Bilbilis are referred to on very few occasions in the previous nine books (1.49; 61.12; 4.55). The most prominent of these poems is 1.49, which is addressed to Licinianus who is returning to Spain. Martial uses this as an opportunity to contrast the advantages of rural living in Spain with the stresses of city life (Howell on 1.49). 10.13 is the first instance of Book 10 in which Martial conveys his longing for his birthplace. This is the first in a series of poems throughout Book 10 which anticipates his actual departure from Rome to his homeland at the conclusion of this book (37; 78; 92; 96; 103; 104).

Martial's idyllic description of Bilbilis forms part of a larger thematic cycle on the contrasts between urban and rural life, and the illustration of the pastoral ideal (Spisak 2002: 127-41). Martial's resolution to return home is anticipated by the previous epigrams expressing complaints on the hardships of living in Rome. In this cycle of epigrams, Spain, and in particular Martial's home town Bilbilis, represents a moral sanctuary and life of simplicity far removed from the corrupting atmosphere and difficulties of Roman society where characters such as the stingy patron or greedy client prevail. Here the pastoral ideal is reflected in the ethical component based on the concept of the absence of all needs or the desire for possessions (Spisak 2002: 132-3; cf. 10.12).

The epigram is addressed to Manius, whom Martial acknowledges as an old childhood friend, although little is known of him and he is not mentioned anywhere else. The benefits of rural life are exemplified by Manius, the first example in Book 10 of the vir bonus type (as described by Spisak 2002: 133), a man of honesty and irreproachable character who enjoys simple living (e.g. Antonius Primus of 10.23; 32). His character contrasts with the satirical portraits in surrounding poems of the
hypocritical stingy patron and greedy client which overshadow Roman society. True friendship is also demonstrated here in contrast with the unbalanced relationship of amicitia typified by Calliodorus of 10.11. The proverbial tests of friendship are presented in the form of a travelogue of faraway places to which Martial is prepared to travel with Manius as evidence of his friendship (cf. Catul. 11; Hor. Carm. 2.6; 3.4.29-36 utcunque mecum vos eritis; Epod. 1.11-14). Unlike the travel poems of his models Catullus and Horace, where together the two may endure all barbaric lands, Martial’s poem takes this notion one step further in the expression that with Manius’ presence, any place, no matter how uncivilised, will appear as the ideal Rome. Despite expressing his desire for country living, Martial intentionally specifies Rome as the central focus, but Rome without unpleasantness or hardships. Here, an idealised Rome is depicted in terms of amicitia and true friendship rather than the alliance of patron and clients; true friendship is not to be found in the actual city of Rome but in Spain.

There are discrepancies in the manuscript traditions on the position of this poem within the book, which appears as number 13 according to manuscript T or as 20 in accordance with L and E (e.g. Friedlaender’s edition). Lindsay’s revised numbering of poems listing this poem as 13 is the more accepted in current editions (Lindsay 1903a: 13ff.).

Ducit ad auriferas quod me Salo Celtiber oras,
pendula quod patriae visere tecta libet,

The river Salo flows through northern Spain and meets up with its tributary, the Ribota, at Bilbilis (1.49.12; 4.55.15; 6.18.1; 10.78.1; 96.3; 103.2; 104.6; 12.2.3; 21.1;
Celtiber refers to the large area of the north-eastern part of Central Spain, Hispania Tauraconensis, which includes Bilbilis in the west (cf. 12.18.3, Bowie; also Valerius Maximus 5.1.5). The name derives from a combination of the Iberians (from Libya and the south) and the Celts, an Indo-Germanic tribe who entered the Spanish peninsula from south-western Gaul (cf. Mart. 4.55.8 *nos Celtis genitos et ex Hiberis*), used by Livy (24.49.8) for the Iberianised Celtic districts of the interior of Spain (Sullivan 1991: 172). Martial uses these poetic terms to describe his homeland rather than directly referring to Bilbilis; his hometown is not named until the final two epigrams in this book. In Book 10 references to Spain and Martial’s homeland are much more pronounced as his return becomes more of a reality (Sullivan 1991: 183).

References to life in Spain are infrequent in the earlier books, the most outstanding example is 1.49 (also 3.14; 4.55; cf. Tartessus of 9.61). Martial refers to his homeland in a number of ways such as Hispania (1.49.2; 3.14) and its peoples as Celtiber (1.49.1; 10.13; 12.18.11) Celtae (4.55.8; 7.52; 10.65; 78); Hiberi (4.55.8; 7.52; 10.65; 78; 12.9).

The gold-bearing nature of a river or its sands, denoted by *auriferas...oras*, is a common feature of Roman literature (Catul. 29.19; Tib. 3.3.29; Ov. Am. 1.15.34; Plin. Nat. 4.115; Mart. 10.96.3; 12.2.3; compare also 12.18.9 *auru Bilbilis et superba ferro*), and here indicates the preciousness of these lands to the writer.

*pendula ...tecta* refers to the sloping roofs on the hilltop and southern slope of Martial’s home town Bilbilis, above the river Salo (cf. 1.49.2; *altam...Bilbilin*; 1.61.11-12; 4.64.33; Paulinus of Nola 10.223 *acutis / pendentem scopulis*; 13.112.1). The entrance to the town was from the fortified north-west and west of the town, which presented a view of these roofs. The town was founded in the second century
BCE by the Galeria tribe and was an important strategic site. These first two lines are filled with nostalgia for Martial’s homeland, and indicate his motivation to leave Rome for Spain (compare Hor. *Carm.* 2.6.13-16).

tu mihi simplicibus, Mani, dilectus ab annis et prætextata cultus amicitia,

The addressee of this epigram, Manius, is revealed as a close childhood friend of Martial; this is the only epigram addressed to him (compare 11.20.5, where Manius is identified as an agent of Mark Antony). Martial addresses other friends from Spain, such as Flavus at 10.104 and his literary relative Valerius Unicus at 12.44. As a praenomen Manius occurs fairly commonly and also was used as a cognomen in the male form (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 40). Here the praenomen emphasises the intimate relationship between the poet and his friend from his youth. The adjective *dilectus* appears in only five other instances in Martial and mostly suggests a deep devotion towards their recipient, as here (1.12.3; 9.61.19; 10.85.2; 14.77 *delecta Catullo*; also 11.47). Other individuals addressed by their praenomen include Quintus Ovidius (7.93; 9.52; 53) and Julius Martialis (1.15; 107; 9.97; 12.34).

Manius embodies the *vir bonus* of rural life for the poet, and the phrase *simplicibus ...dilectus ab annis* recalls a happier time for the poet of simple provincial life (cf. 10.30; 37; 44; 47). Although the term *simplex* denotes the innocence of boyhood here (cf. 10.62.1), on other occasions it represents an esteemed quality of directness in certain individuals (1.39.4; 8.73.2; 10.33; 47), and at 10.47.7, *prudens simplicitas* is an element of the *vir bonus* who enjoys country living. It also reflects the nature of Martial’s own poetry in its straightforward and honest language and
subject matter (1 praef. 7; 11.20.10). simplex and its forms occur more frequently in
Book 10 than in any other book (10.33; 47; 62; 83), which perhaps suggests a
heightened interest in this attribute.

Manius and Martial spent their boyhood together, as specified by praetextatus,
which refers to the toga praetexta worn by boys up to the official age of manhood,
when it was set aside for the pure white toga virilis (Liv. 42.34-5; 1.78; 10.308;
Croom 2000: 41). It is possible that Martial calls the friendship praetextata (rather
than a term such as iuvenalis) as a reflection of the amicitia relationship, since putting
on the toga also represented not just adulthood but the assumption of client duties.
But their friendship lies outside patron/client roles and is an example of true amicitia
as opposed to those depicted in 10.10 and 11 (on amicitia see 10.11).

Hiberis is a synonym for the Spanish lands, employed frequently by Martial (4.55.8;
5.65.11; 6.18.1; 7.52.3; 8.28.5; 10.65.3; 10.78.9; 12.9.1). Other synonyms include
Hesperius and Hispania (cf. 12.18.11-12; Sullivan 1991: 175-9).

The repetition of tu...tu...tecum...tibi (lines 3, 5, 7, 9) especially towards the
opening of a line reinforces the personal tone of the poem and the intimate
relationship between Manius and the poet. This is reflected by the repeated
juxtaposition of tu mihi/ tecum ego. The language is effusive, with expressions such as
dulcior and dignus amore (compare 8.77.1-2 to Martial’s friend Liber Liber,
amicorum dulcissima cura tuorum,/ Liber, in aeterna vivere digne rosa).
Tecum ego vel sicci Gaetula mapalia Poeni
et poteram Scythicas hospes amare casas.

The epigram illustrates the proverbial test of friendship with the poet promising to go anywhere in the world with Manius, in particular, to places which would be considered distasteful to those accustomed to the luxury of Rome. But the presence of Manius on such travels would render such discomforts irrelevant to the poet. Martial selects non-specific areas in Africa and around the Black Sea to convey inhospitable peoples and remoteness, a conventional feature of this type of poem (Hor. Carm. 1.22.1-8; 17-33; 2.6.1ff.; Catul. 11.2ff.; cf. N-H on Hor. Carm. 1.22.5).

Gaetula is a term used frequently by poets to mean 'African' and especially connotes the wild interior of Africa (Verg. A. 5.351; Hor. Carm. 2.20; Stat. Theb. 9.739; Juv. 10.158). Mapalia refers to the reed covered huts in which the nomadic African tribes lived, more specifically the Libyan settlements according to Sallust (Sallust Bell. lug. 18.8; Verg. G. 3.340, also magalia at Verg. A. 1.421; 4.259; Mart. 8.53(55).3).

The Carthaginians were naturally traditional enemies of Rome (cf. 4.14.4; 8.53.3), and the land of Carthage is often noted for its barrenness, hence the adjective sicci (cf. Luc. 4.587-8 qua se/ Bagrada lentus agit siccae Sulcator harenae; Sil. 6.140-1 turbidus arentis lento pede sulcat harenas/ Bagrada). Scythicas...casas refers to the small humble dwellings of the Scythians, a nomadic tribe north and north-east of the Black Sea (cf. Hor. Carm. 3.24.9; Mart. 14.109 with Leary). Although Friedlaender prefers the emendation of hostis to agree with Scythicas, hospes is the form generally accepted by the textual critics and in this context produces a deliberate paradox (SB1: 320).
si tibi mens eadem, si nostri mutua cura est,  
in quocumque loco Roma duobus erit.

Martial concludes the epigram with the hope that Manius returns the friendship, and that such a friendship can exist in any place in the world. Such phrases demonstrating reciprocal claims to friendship are conventional in Latin literature (cf. 12.21.10 Romam tu mihi sola facis; Tib. 3.1.19 illa mihi referet, si nostri mutua cura est; Ov. Met. 7.800 mutua cura duos et amor socialis habebat; Fast. 2.64; 7.30 mutua cura).

It is perhaps surprising that Rome is presented as the poet's 'home' and focus after epigrams which have been so scathing (e.g. 10.12.8 o quam formosus, dum peregrinus eris). Here, Rome becomes not so much a place but a state of mind, which can be recreated anywhere in the bond between two old friends. This, an idealised Rome is depicted in terms of amicitia and true friendship rather than by the alliance of patrons and clients, yet for Martial true friendship is not to be found in the actual city of Rome but in Spain.

Wealth and extravagant luxuries do not overcome discontentment, but instead are perhaps contributing factors. Cotta enjoys the height of luxury with items such as a four-wheeled carriage accompanied by his retinue of Libyan slaves, coloured drapes lavishly surrounding his bath/Baian villa, perfumes which scent and colour the sea water, feather down for his pillows and expensive wines. These successfully convey the impression of decadence to the extreme; Martial uses similar examples in other poems criticising selfish rich patrons (2.16; 43; 3.60; 62; 82; 9.22; 12.17). As a result
of such wealth, Cotta creates unhappiness for himself by lying outside the locked door of his mistress, the clichéd image of the *exclusus amator* of Augustan love poetry.

This is the first of a series on Cotta as a selfish rich patron in Book 10 (10.49; [64]; 88). At 10.49, he serves cheap wine to his guests and keeps the expensive wines for himself. It is difficult to place 10.88 in the same category, however, as he seems to be a humble legal note taker who happily accepts worthless wax tablets as reward for his labour.

The presentation of the wealthy Cotta surrounded by luxury is closely related to themes in the previous epigrams on the contrast between rural and urban life. In 10.13, not only does Martial express the desire to move to the country away from the city but also he conveys the message that friendship with a childhood companion would overcome the absence of luxuries even in the most inhospitable of areas. This poem is deliberately placed. It is preceded by poems such as 10.10 on the miseries of life of a poor client, 10.11 on the stinginess of patrons, and it follows 10.13 on true friendship that needs no luxury. 10.14 gives us a super-rich patron who is totally self-absorbed, and subsequently leads into 10.15 on a stingy rich patron.

*Cum cathedrata litos portet tibi raeda ministros et Libys in longo pulvere sudet eques.*

cathedrata litos as offered by Heraeus now seems the more accepted emendation rather than *cathedralicios* or *cathedrtilios*, although the meaning is clearly designed to convey luxury and effeminacy (*cathedrata* is cited from καρπίων καθεδρωτών in a glossary and *litos* from 10.68.3; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 123.7 in Housman *CP* 3: 1101). The *cathedra* was an easy chair, often distinguished as an armchair, commonly used by
poets and rhetoricians. As a sedan chair, it was generally used by women, and Martial frequently uses it as a symbol of effeminacy (3.14.8; 3.63.7; 12.18.18; 12.38.1; Juv. 6.91; 9.52; Hor. S. 1.10.91; Prop. 4.5.37; Sen. Cl. 1.97; Plin. Nat. 16.174; Plin. Ep. 2.17.21; Bowie on 12.18; Marquardt 1886: 726). This is the only example of *cathedrata* meaning ‘filled with cushioned seats’.

*raeda* or *rheda* was a four-wheeled carriage drawn by more than two horses, like the *carruca* or *petorritum*, and was a common mode of transport for the family from Rome to the country or in the country. It was often ornamented in metal, and was adaptable as a sleeping compartment (Hor. S. 1.5.86; 2.6.42; Cic. Mil. 28ff.; 55; Balsdon 1969: 213). Such transport is typically symbolic of wealth and luxury (Sen. Ep. 87.2-4; 7; 123.7; Juv. 10.19-21; Hor. S. 1.6.107-9).

It was typical for the *raeda* when travelling into the country to be accompanied by a retinue of family slaves in case of robbers or highwaymen (3.47.14). *Libys* refers to the *Massylae* (see 9.22.14; 12.24.6), and conveys further an impression of luxury and extravagance. The phrase *in longo pulvere* refers to the dust raised by the large escort which he needs for his travels (cf. 10.6.5).

*strataque non unas tingant triclinia Baias et Thetis unguento palleat uncta tuo,*

The meaning of this line remains elusive. Baiæ was a fashionable holiday resort in the Bay of Naples, renowned not only for its health-giving springs and beaches, but as a place of disrepute and excessive proclivities. Wealthy Romans built large and extravagant villas there as holiday homes. Martial refers to Baiæ seventeen times as an example of splendour (see Howell on 1.59). The luxurious decoration of the villa
or bath is another feature of the extravagance of wealth. Either meaning connotes the proverbial dissolute lifestyle which Baiae advocated.

The specific meaning of *Baia* here is defined as ‘bathing beaches’, which denotes the baths or warm springs in Baiae (cf. *OLD* s.v.; Cic. *Cael.* 16; also cf. Sidonius Apollinaris *Ep.* 5.14.1, where it is used as a generic term for *thermae* by Sidonius Apollinaris; also *CIL* 8.25425; 25363; Yeglil 1992: 94). In this context, *triclinia* are the luxurious seats around the interior of the bath rooms or chambers opening out of the bath (Lucian *Hippias S.*; Stephenson: 377). Shackleton Bailey suggests that the term means Baian villa, where *unas* denotes the luxury of owning more than one such place (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 285-6 on Cic. *Att.* 11.6.6 *sibi et Caesaris hortos et Baia desponderat*; 12.40.3; *Cael.* 35; 38).

The meaning of this line is further complicated by the verb *cingant*, possibly to denote the enormity of the villa as to enclose Baiae on all sides. Shackleton Bailey suggests *tingant* in place of *cingant* to support his interpretation of *Baiae* as villa, as it emphasises the villas suffused with colour by the *strata* or draperies in the dining room supported by a statement by Pliny (*Nat.* 37.63 *longinquum amplificantur visu (sc. smaragdi) inficientes circa se repercussum aëra*; also Claudian *Prob. et Olybr.* 254-65 *tecta parant epulis ostroque infecta coruscus umida genniferis illuxit regia mensis*; Shackleton Bailey 1978: 285). This replacement enforces the hyperbole which balances the colours staining the sea water in the following line.

*Thetis* is used by metonymy for the sea-baths or *piscinae*, into which perfumes were poured for fragrance and altering the colour of the water. Such practices emphasise extravagance, effeminacy and luxury (cf. 10.30.11 where it is used by metonymy for the sea; 5.1.2; *Sp.* 121; see Allen 1970: 356).
candida Setini rumpant crystalla trientes,

Stephenson suggests that *rumpo* is used in the sense here ‘to fill to bursting’ (cf. Verg. G. 1.49), and a similar expression is also found at 9.73.5 *rumpis et ardentia madidus crystalla* to denote the hot wine cracking the delicate crystal (cf. also 12.74). *candida* is used in the sense of clear or transparent in respect to the crystal glasses (cf. also Mart. 6.42.19; Plin. *Nat.* 37.129; Tib. 1.5.124). Paley and Stone suggest that it is a poetical expression illustrating the delicacy of the glasses (Paley and Stone, 329).

Crystal vessels were extremely costly and sought after, therefore, they are frequently mentioned in Martial as symbolic of wealth (1.53.6; 3.82.25; 8.77.5; 9.22.7; 9.73.5; 10.66.5; 14.111; see Henriksen on 9.73.5; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 37.28, 129; Juv. 6.155; Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.3; *Ep.* 119.3; 123.7; Marquardt 1886: 743). The delicacy of crystal is expressed in a contrasting epigram in 8.33.10 (Sen. *Dial.* 5.40.2; Petr. 64.10; Plin. *Nat.* 33.5).

*rumpere* is used in an analogous context to *frangere*. Agosti argues that the delicate nature of the crystal is such that the action of pouring the wine would cause it to crack (Agosti 1995: 65-70). Martial exaggerates Cotta’s wealth to the point that the fact of pouring the wine is simply to render the crystal unusable a second time.

*trientes* refers to a common size of drinking vessels holding 1/3 of a *sextarius* or the contents of such a vessel (Howell on 1.106.8; Leary on 14.14.103; also 2.1.10).

*Setini* refers to the wine of Setia, which was 70 kilometres south-east of Rome. This location produced wine considered of a fine quality and consequently was costly (Plin. *Nat.* 14.59-61; Juv. 5.34; 10.27; Seltman 1957: 154ff.). Juvenal describes its taste as being fiery and potent: *et lato Setinum ardebit in auro* (Juv. 10.27; also 8.51). Setian wine is frequently used by Martial as an image of wealth and excessive luxury.
10.14 (13)

(4.69.1; 6.86.1; 8.50(51).19; 9.2.5; 13.112; 124; 14.103; also see Kay’s note on 11.29.6). Note that Martial refers to Cotta’s expensive tastes in wine again at 10.49.

dormiat in pluma nec meliore Venus:

pluma is a further example of opulence and comfort, of goose, swan or partridge feathers (Plin. Nat. 10.54) used for stuffing pillows and mattresses (Blümner 1911: 115ff.; Leary on 14.146). It appears in Martial and other Roman literature as a satirical example of sumptuousness (9.92.4; 12.17.8l; 14.146.2; 14.159; 14.161; Juv. 1.159; 6.88; 10.362; Lucil. 257K; 277; Sen. Dial. 1.3.10; see Bowie on 12.17.8; Leary on 14.159; Marquardt 1886: 724).

Martial emphasises Cotta’s decadence further by stating that not even the pillows which Venus sleeps on are as soft or luxurious. The mention of Venus also denotes sexual intercourse, which complements the subject matter of the following lines.

ad nocturna iaces fastosae limina moechae
et madet heu! lacrimis ianua surda tuis,

The epigram is directed away from the theme of luxury and decadence towards the theme of the exclusus amator popular in Augustan elegy. The theme of the weeping lover shut out by his unsympathetic mistress also appears in Greek epigrammatic tradition (cf. Meleager AP v.191). Martial illustrates the conventional portrait of the lover shut outside on the threshold of his mistress (cf. Prop. 1.16; Hor. Carm. 3.10.19). She is described as surda, which conveys the meaning ‘unresponsive’ in a poetical sense, typical of elegy (cf. Prop. 4.11.2; nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda
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The description of Cotta’s mistress as moecha, a term which conveys the meaning ‘adulteress’ (Mart. 7.10.13; Catul. 42.3; Hor. S. 1.4.113; Prop. 7.10.13; Juv. 6.278), deflates the impact of the elegiac clichés. Another unusual word is fastosae, which is rarely used, for other than in Martial only two other instances exist in the Latin corpus (13.102.2, Petr. 131 quid est, inquit, fastose; Laus Pis. 119).

**urere nec miserum cessant suspiria pectus. vis dicam male sit cur tibi Cotta? bene est.**

Martial again draws upon conventional language of love poetry in the use of *urere*, to connote the sense ‘to inflame with desire or passion’ (see Quinn 1970: 273 on Catul. 61.170; 83.6; Verg. A. 4.68; Hor. Carm. 1.13.9; Tib. 2.4.5; Prop. 2.3.44; see Quinn on Hor. Carm. 1.13.9). Martial employs conventional and clichéd phrases of Augustan love poetry to demonstrate the predictable behaviour of Cotta, which complements his exaggerated and ostentatious lifestyle (cf. Hor. Carm. 3.7.11 suspirare Chloen et miseram tuis/dicens ignibus uri; Ov. Met. 7.803 aequales urebant pectora flammae; Catul. 61.169-71 illi non minus ac tibi/pectore uritur in intimo/flamma).

The addressee of the epigram, Cotta, is a fictitious personality, and is frequently the target of Martial’s epigrams in a satirical context as an exemplar of decadence (1.9; 23; 10.49; 88; 12.87, note also 6.70, and 10.64). The name is Etruscan in origin but aristocratic in nature, but is not commonly found, with only five examples in inscriptions (Kajanto Cognomina: 106). The names of both Cotta and Crispus of the following poem are associated with distinguished patrons from a previous era. Marcus Aurelius Cotta Maximus Messalinus was the patron of Ovid,
who praises him highly in this role (Pont. 1.7.83; Juv. 5.109; 7.95). It is possible that Martial uses the name ironically to contrast patrons of old with current ones, who merely flaunt their own wealth (cf. 12.36).

The concluding line presents the paradox shown by Cotta that wealth does not alleviate miseries, even if his unhappiness is imagined (poems on this same theme conclude in a similar manner of question and witty response; cf. 2.16.6 vis fieri sanus? stragula sunea; 3.60.9-10; 62.7-8; 9.22.16 ergo quid? ut donem, Pastor et aedificem). This sentiment recalls a theme conventionally employed in Horace on the subject of quod satis est, that material wealth does not produce contentment (cf. Hor. S. 2.6.4; Ep. 1.1.89; Carm. 3.16.43-5 multa petentibus / desunt multa; bene est cui deus obtulit / parca quod satis est manu; also 3.1.25-32; Ep. 1.2.46). Horace also relates this theme closely to the contrast between urban and pastoral life and the happy life he has for himself at his Sabine villa (Epod. 1.31; S. 2.6.4).

10.15 (14)

The poet rebukes Crispus for his claims of friendship when his sole demonstration of friendship is not the giving of gifts but his breaking wind in the presence of the poet. Not only does Crispus refuse to loan Martial money or present him with substantial gifts of food, clothing and silver plate, but even the most minimal or insignificant of gifts. This theme immediately recalls Calliodorus of 10.11, whose claims to true friendship are artificial. Both men fail to fulfil the obligations and duties involved in the relationship of amicitia, especially through the giving of gifts and services (Spisak 1998: 252). Rather than a genuine request for money or gifts, this epigram is an illustration of the obligations of friendship and the expectations which arise from such
a relationship (cf. Spisak 1998: 252-3). This attitude towards friendship contrasts Martial's relationship with Manius of 10.13, which embodies genuine reciprocity of feelings between friends. As well as the notion of amicitia, the poem also shares motifs with Cotta from the previous poem; Crispus is just as rich as Cotta, and both men in different ways embody the selfishness of the rich. This theme will continue in 10.17 and 19.

The gifts mentioned are commonly referred to by Martial as gifts bestowed in the relationship of amicitia, particularly in terms of a festival such as the Saturnalia (4.88; 8.71; 10.57; 5.19; 7.53; 12.36, see 13 and 14 with Leary). Gifts of silver plate were given by rich and poor alike, normally in the form of spoons by the poorer people (8.33.3; 9.71.9) and dishes and goblets by the richer (Hor. Carm. 4.8.1; Mart. 7.72.4 with Vioque; also cf. 7.86.6; 10.57; 11.105; 12.36). Martial also mentions gifts of togas and food as gifts bestowed on clients by their patrons, an essential feature of the relationship of amicitia (7.36; 8.28; 10.73; 12.24; 36; Saller 1983: 252ff.). Martial emphasises Crispus' parsimonious behaviour, which contradicts the nature of amicitia, as he refuses to loan Martial money, despite his overflowing coffers. Moreover, the lack of gifts actually offered by Crispus to Martial is further highlighted by the list of gifts, however meagre or useless, that he is unwilling to provide.

Cedere de nostri nulli te dicis amicis.
   sed, sit ut hoc verum, quid, rogo, Crispe, facis?

The addressee is the fictional Crispus, who also appears at 5.32 as a miser who leaves his property to himself (cf. Howell on 5.32). It is a fairly common cognomen and,
like Cotta, denotes an individual of aristocracy (Kajanto Cognomina: 223). These examples should be distinguished from the real individuals C. Passienus Crispus (10.2) or Q. Vibius Crispus, who was known for his wealth (4.54). The latter is noted at 12.36 as a representative of ideal patrons from the past (12.36.8-10 Pisones Senecasque Memmiosque/ et Crispos mihi redde, seu priores), and it is possible that Martial deliberately selects the name here to remind readers of the contrast (cf. Cotta from the previous poem).

The term amicus here represents the notion of amicitia, and is emphasised repeatedly in these poems on the subject of good and bad friendships (cf. 10.11.5; 12.9; 13.4, 19.3).

mutua cum peterem sestertia quinque, negasti,  
non caperet nummos cum gravis arca tuos.

Martial requested 5,000 sesterces from Crispus, but even this amount was refused by Crispus, despite his overflowing money boxes (cf. 4.37; also the receipt of loans 4.76; 6.30; 9.102; 12.36). For such amounts, cf. 10.11.5. A similar request and refusal of a loan is presented at 2.30, but without the crude conclusion which this present epigram provides. arca was the strongbox in which Crispus kept not only his money, but also other valuables and records of loans (cf. 2.30.3-4; 5.13.6; Stat. Silv. 2.2.150-1; cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 132-3).

quando fabae nobis modium farrisve dedisti,  
cum tua Niliaicus rura colonus aret?

This is the first in the series of questions addressed to Crispus concerning his nonexistent gifts. Beans and barley are particularly plain fare and highlight the
stinginess of Crispus in not bestowing upon his clients food or a dinner (cf. 4.46.6; also cf. *conchis* 5.39.10; 7.78.2; 13.7.1; Juv. 3.293; 14.131). The paucity of the gift is contrasted with Crispus’ wealth, illustrated by his ownership of property. *Niliacus...colonus* suggests either land tended to by an Egyptian tenant farmer, or valuable property actually in Egypt (cf. 5.13.7; Sen. *Ep.* 77.3; cf. also 10.74.9 *spicifer...Nilus*).

*quando brevis gelidae missa est toga tempore brumae? argenti venit quando selibra mihi?*

Crispus does not even provide an ill-fitting toga in wintertime, or small amounts of silver at the Saturnalia, further demonstrations of his stinginess in the obligations of friendship. The expression *brevis toga* contradicts the nature of the toga, a garment known for its size and cumbersome form. It is again used at 11.56.6 to denote a toga that is too small, thereby making the gift insufficient and useless (cf. 1.92.8; 2.85; 4.53.5; 12.36; Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.128ff.; or the toga as a gift in the practice of *amicitia* cf. 10.11.6 on the gift of a cloak or garments in winter; also cf. 4.19.1, 3-4; 14.135 (137).2 with Leary; Juv. 9.28-31 with Colton 1991: 352-3).

Gifts of silver plate were often given by patrons at the Saturnalia (cf. 10.57; also 7.86.6; 11.105; 12.36; 13.48; 7.58; see Friedlaender, vol 4 278; also cf. Juv. 141-4 with Colton 1991: 366-7). Elsewhere the poet refers to acceptable amounts in such gifts as weighing something more like *quattor librae* (2.44.2; 8.71; 12.36; cf. 7.53.12 *argenti... pondera quinque*). Crispus does not even give the inadequate amount of half a pound of silver.
nil aliud video quo te credamus amicum
quam quod me coram pedere, Crispe, soles.

Martial concludes his attack on Crispus' attitudes to friendship with a coarse disclosure of his sole sign of friendship, that he breaks wind in front of the poet. The use of the term *pedere* is not generally used in polite circumstances (Catul. 54.3; Hor. S. 1.8.46; also cf. 1.9.70; Mart. 4.87; 7.18.9; 12.40; 12.77), and is considered the more vulgar term, as opposed to *crepare* (cf. 12.77 where both verbs are used; Adams 1982: 249; see also Bowie on 12.77.3). It cleverly recalls *cedere* in the opening line as a play on the theme of gift and exchange. The crudity of such an action reflects Crispus' complete disregard towards the concept of friendship, and conveys Martial's contempt for such a character.

Aper has pierced his wife's heart whilst involved in some unidentified sport. The true reason for this sporting accident is to obtain her inheritance, as emphasised by the placing of *dotatae* as the opening word. Under Roman law the husband had the use of the dowry only whilst the marriage continued, and, although divorce was possible, no financial gain would result from such action (Treggiari 1991: 329-31; Gardner 1986: 103). Therefore the murder of a rich spouse was an alternative means of obtaining financial rewards (cf. 2.65; 5.37.21-4; further see Treggiari 1991: 344-8; Gardner 1986: 10-17; Saller 1984: 195-204). Inheritance seekers obviously provided a wide range of entertaining material for Martial's readers (cf. 10.8). The murdering of one's spouse, whilst not perhaps as popular as the subject of *captatio*, still makes regular appearances in Martial's epigrams (2.65; 4.58; 5.37.21-4; 8.43; 9.15; 78; 10.43; also
10.16 (15)

cf. Juv. 6.136-41; 12.111-20). The frequency with which Martial seems to report such
behaviour is more likely to be for comical effect rather than actual likelihood (see

The themes presented here and in 10.8 depict the less pleasant sides to
marriage, with dowry hunting and murder for the sake of inheritance. These and
related themes on marriage, including adultery and divorce, form a cluster of poems
towards the centre of the Book (40; 41; 43), following several poems extolling the
virtues of marriage (33; 35; 38). They are then interspersed throughout the remainder
of the volume (63; 69; 91; 95; 102). This poem and 10.8 are linked by theme and by
shape. Both adopt the pithy format of Erwartung and Aufschluss, in contrast with the
surrounding poems which are between eight and ten lines in length. The Aufschluss
depends upon the play with the verb ludo. Its initial impression is intended to induce
the image of Aper shooting his wife, supposedly in a sporting accident; and its
repetition reveals Aper’s true purpose of his gamesmanship (see Watson and Watson:
292). The circumstances in which this is achieved is not clear, especially the kind of
hunting game the husband would be playing in the presence of his wife.

The term ludo is also common language of love poetry, and is often used to
denote sexual play in erotic poetry, as in Catullus. In this sense, the shooting of the
wife’s heart is inflicted not with the intention of murder, but with playful love in
mind. The manner in which this is achieved is through poetic composition. Martial
uses the term ludo constantly of his own poetry to describe its lack of weight and
seriousness, and this same meaning is possibly intended here to denote Aper’s
composition of love poetry as a means of gamesmanship. A similar application of
ludo appears at 12.94.8 where it is used to describe a competition between Martial and
Tucca in the writing of elegy (*ludo levis, elegos: tu quoque ludis idem*). Such an explanation is further supported by the choice of term for arrow, *harundo*, which generally denotes a pen for writing elegy. The ambiguity of the poem's meaning denotes Martial's own literary sport and must surely be deliberate (for example cf. 10.40; 81; 84).

For this poem see Watson and Watson: 291-2.

**Dotatae uxori cor harundine fixit acuta,**
*sed dum ludit Aper: ludere novit Aper.*

The term *dotata* denotes the dowry agreement which formed part of the marriage contract and was a formal legal document signed by witnesses or guests at the wedding (2.34.1; 2.65.5; 7.10.14; 69.2; 11.23.3; 12.75.8; 12.45.2; 997.5; see Treggiari 1991: 329-31; Balsdon 1969: 186-9). On the actual amount of the dowry, see Saller 1984: 195-205; Champlin 1991: 116-18.

The occasion for such an accident to occur is vague; possibilities include target-practice on Aper's estate or a hunting expedition (e.g. Sulpicia in [Tib.] 4.3; Watson and Watson: 291). The vague nature of Aper's sport suggests the need for alternative interpretations of the poem, beyond the standard element of inheritance seeking.

Elsewhere Martial uses *harundo* to mean a pen or reed used for writing, elegy in particular (1.3.10; 9.12.3; 14.209.2; 216.2; Pers. 3.11; as a reed for catching birds cf. Mart. 9.54.3; and for the manufacture of a musical pipe, 14.64.1), and this is the only occasion where it is used to mean arrow or shaft of an arrow (cf. Verg. A. 4.73; 5.544 *fixit harundine malum*; Ov. *Met.* 1.471; 10.526). Martial plays on the
traditional concept of Cupid's arrows piercing hearts to inspire love (Ov. Met. 10.525-8; Apul. Met. 5.24). Perhaps Martial is also playing with the meaning of harundo not only as an arrow but as a pen used in the composition of love poetry.

Aper appears as a common cognomen (Kajanto Cognomina: 325), and is used several times in Martial (7.59; 11.34; 12.30; 70). As on other occasions the name is used in satirical circumstances especially as a reflection of the ferocity and greed of his namesake, the boar (Aelius de Nat. Anim. 5.45; Kay on 11.34). This is suitable to his characterisation here as a legacy hunter who murders his wife for her money. The hunting theme is continued with the suggestion of comical role reversal, where the boar becomes the hunter (Vioque on 7.59; for the use of word play with names see McCartney 1919: 343-58).

The point of the epigram relies entirely on the use of ludo in the second line. Although the term can denote accidental death in keeping with the notion of Aper shooting his wife for the inheritance (Ov. Met. 10.200-1 nisi si lusisse vocari/ culpa potest; cf. Watson and Watson: 292), its use in other contexts brings a different perspective to the poem. ludo and lusus are also used as euphemisms for various kinds of sexual play in Roman literature, especially love poetry (Adams 1982: 162-3; cf. Mart. 2.60.3, Kay on 11.104.5; Catul. 68.17; Hor. Ep. 2.2.214; Ov. Ars 2.389). For Martial's use of ludo in reference to the frivolous nature of his own poetry cf. 1 praef. 4; 1.6.4; 3.99.3; 7.8.1; 12.9; 8.3.2; 9.84.3; 11.6.3; for the literary play by others cf. 4.49.3; 12.18.4. In this way, Aper's ability for gamesmanship with his poetry is sufficient to transfix the heart of his wife with love.
10.17 (16)

Martial continues the series of epigrams on the relationship of amicitia, especially the notion of gift exchange (cf. 11; 15; 19). Here the poet rebukes Gaius for promising gifts without actually giving any. In return for such poor treatment and as a way to outdo Gaius’ promises, the poet presents a list of extravagant gifts he is prepared to present to Gaius; these gifts are fantastic to the point of being virtually unattainable, and include items of celebrated fame and even mythological origin (the nest of the Phoenix). As a result, these unobtainable 'gifts' are equivalent to Gaius' gift of absolutely nothing. This selection of the exotic and valuable echoes and contrasts the list of stingy and worthless gifts typically expected from patrons in 10.15 (although Crispus does not even provide those).

In his list of items, Martial moves from the western to the eastern limits of the empire. The gifts themselves are not only expensive, but remote and exotic - and, because of their remoteness - hard to obtain. The movement from west to east is comparable to Catullus 11, though Catullus moves from east to west. This also perhaps recalls the motif in 10.13 of Manius travelling anywhere in the world for the sake of a friend, even to the remotest or most dangerous areas.

The satirical tone relies on the repetition of quidquid throughout the poem as the list of objects becomes more exotic and unrealistic. Such anaphora is a common device in Martial for satirical purposes as a build-up to the last line (e.g. 1.39; 1.41; 2.11; 53; 3.62; 63; 93; 9.57; 9.97), and is an elaboration of an effect favoured by Catullus (e.g. 43.1-4; 78; 87; 88; cf. Howell on 1.39).
It is immediately obvious that Gaius and the poet are engaged in some type of amicitia relationship already described in earlier poems (e.g. 10.15). Gaius shares the same notion of friendship as Crispus and Calliodorus; his idea of gift exchange is to make promises of gifts which are not realised. For this reason, the poet uses language akin to military strategy (for vincam cf. OLD s.v. vinco 9) as a means of ousting these ‘gifts’. As such, the pleonastic phrase donis muneribusque further suggests the inestimable number of gifts which Martial is offering in the following lines (cf. 4.88.1 nulla remisisti parvo pro munere dona). For similar sentiments towards unfulfilled promises, compare 2.25; 5.82.1-2; 12.12.

The name Gaius is common, and is used fictitiously twice further in Martial in similar contexts, once again as a stingy man who does not give gifts (2.30.6), as a comparison between wealth (Gaius) and poverty (Condylus) at 9.92 (the name is also employed in a generalising sense with Lucius 5.14.5; the Gaius of 11.35 and 1.70 is identified as Gaius Julius Proculus, a wealthy senator; see Kay’s note on 11.35).

accipe Callaicis quidquid fodit Astur in arvis,
aurea quidquid habet divitis unda Tagi,

accipe is the term most frequently used by Martial to denote the receipt of a gift, although sometimes sume is used (cf. 1.88; 7.1; 12.74; 13.9; 11; 45; 102; 14.27; 28; 87; 89; 96; 102; 159; 185; 218; Siedschlag 1977: 11).

Callaicia, the modern Galicia, is in the north-west of Spain, and was celebrated for its gold deposits (cf. 4.39.7; 14.95; also for Spanish gold in general 7.88.7; 10.96.3; 12.3.3; 18.9; 57.9; 14.199.2). Some texts offer gallaciis or gallaicis because
of the similarity in sound between ‘c’ and ‘g’, but most editors prefer Callaicis (cf. Leary on 14.95.2; also 4.39.7; Quint. Inst. 1.5.12; TLL 3.1.33ff.).

Astur refers to an inhabitant of Asturia in Hispania Tarraconensis in the north-west of Spain (Plin. Nat. 4.112; used adjectivally Mart. 14.199.2). The Asturian area was a major source of gold in Spain (Plin. Nat. 33.78; Sil. 1.231ff.).

The use of quidquid adds to the extensive range of the gifts offered, suggestive of plenty, and the anaphora from line 5 contributes to the build up to the last line (also cf. Luc.: 7.755 quidquid fodit Hiber, quidquid Tagus expulit auri; see Post: 237).

The Tagus (modern Tajo) was a river of the Iberian peninsula, and distinguished for its alluvial gold deposits (Schulten 1913: 469; Dolç 1953: 200-2). Martial frequently associates the river with gold, often with the epithets aurifer or aureus, and also it appears in other genres of Roman literature (Mart. 1.49.15; 7.88.7 with Vioque; 8.78.5; 10.96.3; 12.2.3; also Catul. 29.19 amnis aurifer Tagus; Liv. 35.22.7; Ov. Met. 2.251; Am. 1.15.34; Juv. 3.54; 14.298-9; Luc. 7.755; Sil. 1.155; Plin. Nat. 4.115 Tagus auriferis harenis celebratur).

quidquid Erythraea niger invenit Indus in alga,
quidquid et in nidis unica servat avis,

The poet offers pearls or gems which were found in the seaweed of the Mare Erythraeum, the Red or Arabian Seas, which surrounded the Arabian peninsula and shores of India (cf. 5.37.4; 5.11.1; Tib. 3.3.17; Plin. Nat. 12.70). They are often referred to in Martial as a symbol of extravagance or luxury, as here (cf. 8.28.14; Henriksén on 9.2).
Indus is a generic term referring to the inhabitants of India, classified as an ill-defined region of Asia from the subcontinent of India to the borders of China (cf. OLD s.v.). These terms are used to complement each other, as with Calaicus and Astur, and enhance the exotic and incomparable nature of Martial's gifts.

The phoenix was a renowned creature of Greek and Egyptian mythology, and it was believed to live for five hundred years or more (Herodotus 2.73; Tac. Ann. 6.28; Thompson 1895: 306-9). It is generally described as unica because there was only one in existence at any one time (Ov. Met. 5.395-402; Am. 2.6.54 et vivax phoenix unica semper avis). Martial refers to the spices such as cinnamon and casia from which the phoenix constructed its nest. These spices were highly desirable items of luxury, an aspect first noted by Manilius in the first century CE (Man. 4.115; Plin. Nat. 10.4; 12.85; Ov. Met. 15.392-407 with Bömer 1969: 86, 375ff.; Mart. 5.37.13; 6.55.2; 9.11.4; also 5.7 as a symbol of a newly dawning golden age; see Grewing on 6.55.1, also Miller 1969: 21-6, 42-7, 154-72).

quidquid Agenoreo Tyros improba cogit aheno:
quidquid habent omnes, accipe, quomodo das.

Tyrian purple produced by shellfish from the city on the Phoenician coast was introduced to Rome in the first century BCE and was highly sought after as a symbol of luxury and wealth (4.28.1; 5.23.5-6; 14.133.1; Ov. Met. 6.61; Med. 9; Ars 3.171-2; Sen. Her. O. 663; Plin. Nat. 9.125-42; Vitr. 7.13.3; Prop. 3.13.7; Tib. 3.8.16; Cic. Att. 9.9.2, further see Croom 2000: 25-7). Its epithet improba conveys contempt for items of such extravagance (cf. 10.36.1; on the many usages of this adjective in Martial cf. Howell on 1.48.7 and 104.2; TLL 7.1.691.28ff.).
ahenus refers to the cauldron in which dye was kept. The spelling varies between aeneus and ahenus in the orthographical evidence, but it does not affect the metre (cf. Leary on 14.133.1; Lindsay 1903b: 47).

Agenoreus refers to places connected with Agenor the King of Tyre and his descendants, such as Phoenicians (Mart. 2.43.7; Sil. 7.462), Thebans (Stat. Theb. 2.384) and Carthaginians (Sil. 1.15; 3.631; 15.341). These terms draw attention to the exotic and extraordinary nature of the gifts which Martial promises (cf. lines 3 and 5).

The climax of the epigram is the mention of indeterminable gifts which reach beyond the fantastic ones already mentioned, corresponding to the absence of gifts presented by Gaius. The repetition of language from the opening lines (das; accipe) emphasises the effect of Martial's offer of gifts. The repetition of das from the poem's opening stresses the significance of Gaius' disregard for the courtesies involved in friendship.

This poem concerns a collection of poems, or a poem, which Martial has intended for Macer as a gift for the Saturnalia. Macer has complained that he does not receive these poems from Martial as his customary Saturnalian gift, although, as curator for the via Appia, his time is taken up by the reports of road surveyors. Instead of the poem being addressed to Macer, it is addressed to Martial's muse, who is seemingly depriving Macer of Martial's poetry. In the concluding line, Martial addresses the via Appia, the subject of Macer's reports, which will suffer from neglect if Macer reads Martial's poems instead of his reports. The themes of this poem echo those of 11.1, written for Parthenius, where Martial expresses the idea that a business man such as
10.18 (17)

Parthenius has no time to read Martial’s poetry, but instead should be engaged in business affairs of considerably more importance (cf. also 4.82; 5.80; 7.26; 97; 11.106). In Book 10, this notion returns in greater detail two poems later, in Martial’s poem for Pliny, where the poet again addresses his muse, as he directs her to Pliny’s house with his epigrams at a time appropriate for frivolity. In both poems, Martial uses self-deprecating language to refer to his poems (e.g. 10.18 (17).4 *nugas*; 10.20 (19).1 *nec doctum satis et parum severum*) in contrast with the more important matters which concern his addressees (6.64.6-9; cf. Spisak 1992: 46ff.). Unlike 10.12, the attractions of leisure and relaxation are downplayed in contrast with the importance of Macer’s position.

The idea that Martial has failed to provide a gift of poems to Macer is an ironic twist on the theme from the previous poems 10, 11, 15 and also subsequently 10.19, where Martial complains of others not supplying gifts to him.

**Saturnalicio Macrum fraudare tributo**

The Saturnalia was celebrated in December and became the foremost holiday of the year. It lasted for a period of about five (4.88.2; 7.53.2; 14.79.2) to seven days (14.72.2). The main features of this festival were the exchange of gifts and *sigillaria* with friends, and general licence and celebration, even where the slaves reverse roles with their masters (Hor. *S.* 2.75; Sen. *Ep.* 47.14). Despite the free time associated with the holiday, the importance of Macer’s position means that he should not take time away from it to read Martial’s frivolous poetry (Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.4 and Sen. *Ep.* 18 both complain of the holiday taking them away from their work). Although many poems are distinguished as gifts for friends and patrons (e.g. 3.2; 4.10; 5.18; 7.17; 84;
9.58; 99), or sent as accompaniment to a gift (cf. 7.46), out of all the books, only Book 11 is intended as a Saturnalian gift (cf. 11.6; also see 5.30). Books 13 and 14 list the usual collection of gifts presented on this occasion and Martial humorously states that a poor man may be compelled to present the book as a gift rather than the actual items (13.3.5; 14.1.6). The material in the Saturnalian poems were light, humorous, even obscene, to reflect the festive atmosphere of the occasion (Lucian Sat. 15-16, on Saturnalian literature see Nauta 2002 184-9). Several poems throughout the books specifically refer to these poems as gifts during the Saturnalia (4.46; 88; 5.19; 30; 84; 7.53; 11.2; 6; 15; Books 13 and 14; cf. 14.71; 182).

The Macer of this poem would appear to be Q. Baebius Macer (cos. suff. 103), curator of the via Appia in around 95 (PIR² M12). Another Macer is also mentioned at 12.98.7 as proconsul of Baetica in 100/1 and as governor of Dalmatia in 10.78, and Syme identifies the man of those poems with the man of this present poem (see Syme 1958: 666; PIR² B 20; Eck 1982: 281-362). This poem clearly shows that Macer was a dedicated admirer of Martial's poetry, and this sentiment is repeated at 10.78 where the poet promises to send his poetry to Macer during his governorship in Dalmatia.

The term *tributum* in this context denotes a contribution or offering paid as though to a higher authority (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2). It conveys some level of obligation on Martial’s part to present Macer with a gift of his poems and indicates a difference in status in the relationship between the two men.

*A standard literary custom was to address the Muse or Muses as a source of poetic inspiration (Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.33; 2.1.37; Mart. 3.20; 8.3.2; 12.11.1; also in the plural*}

frustra, Musa, cupis: non licet; ipse petit;

*A standard literary custom was to address the Muse or Muses as a source of poetic inspiration (Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.33; 2.1.37; Mart. 3.20; 8.3.2; 12.11.1; also in the plural*}
Martial often names his muse as Thalia, the muse of comedy (4.8.12; 23.4; 7.17.4; 46.4; 9.26.8; 73.9; 10.20(19).3; 12.94.3; cf. Stat. Silv. 2.1.11; Ov. Ars 1.264; Fast. 5.54; Tr. 5.9.31; Hor. Carm. 4.6.25), but he also calls upon Terpsichore (3.68; 12.11). The muse is called upon again in 10.20 where the poem commands Thalia to take the poem or libellus as a gift to Pliny's house. Martial's address to the muse is not a request for inspiration, but the conversational form renders it deliberately incongruous and perhaps in keeping with the Saturnalian mood (on Saturnalian gifts cf. Harrison 2001: 295-312, Leary on 13 and 14, Nauta 2002: 187).

The specification that a poem is written at the particular request of a patron is clarified by petit and poscit, although such requests are not commonly presented in Martial's poems (see also 9.89 cogis; 11.42.1 poscas; and 12 praef. 18 tibi...exigenit, Nauta 2002: 87-90).

sollemnesque iocos nec tristia carmina poscit et queritur nugas obticuisse meas.

Martial uses self-deprecatory terms such as iocos and nugas for his poems, as part of the literary tradition established to create an appearance of mock-modesty offset by the terms sollemnes and tristia (Catul. 1.4; Hor. Ep. 1.19.42; Ars 322 with Brink 1971: 347ff.; Plin. Ep. 4.14.8; 7.2.2; for Martial's extensive use of nugae, see Henriksen on 9 praef.; Sullivan 1991: 60-1). Originally associated with religious ritual (e.g. 8.38.9), the term sollemnes here implies that such observances are customary to the Saturnalia (cf. 9.54.5; 11.65.5; 12.62.5). Macer demands poetry of a
light and frivolous subject matter suitable to the occasion, and the lines imply that he has not received such poetry from Martial for some time.

**mensorum longis sed nunc vacat ille libellis.**  
**Appia, quid facies, si legit ista Macer?**

A regular theme in epigrams of this type is that the recipient is too busy to read Martial’s epigrams, and the poet emphasises the greater importance of the patron’s business matters or affairs of state (4.92; 5.80; 7.26; 7.97; 11.1; 11.106; also Sen. Dial. 6.5-7.3). The verb *vaco* is frequently used as a conversational idiom to describe finding recreational time to read such poems; this phrase in particular echoes that of 11.1.5-6 (*libros non legit ille sed libellos;/ nec Musis vacat, aut suis vacaret*; also 5.80.1 *si vacabis*; 7.26.2; 7.97.6; 11.106; Juv. 1.21; Hor. Ep. 2.2.95; Plin. Ep. 3.18.4). Its context here is ironic, since Macer’s road reports are his actual job, not something for leisure time.

The expression *longis...libellis* is an oxymoron. Here *libellis* refers to formal communications or reports (*OLD* s.v. *libellus* 3a) sent by the road surveyors, but at 10.1.3 *libellus* denotes a short book. There is an implicit contrast between the road survey reports and Martial’s books. While both are *libelli*, Macer’s reports are *longis* and Martial’s are characterised as *brevem* (10.1.4).

Macer was *curator* of the via Appia, the principal connecting road between Rome and southern Italy (Chevallier 1976: 132-4; Richardson: 414). The Appian way is addressed in this way on one other occasion, at 9.101.1, in praise of Domitian’s achievements. Martial also refers to it as *Latia via* (9.62.2; 9.101.2). The shift in address from Martial’s muse to the Appian way, rather than to Macer himself,
highlights his esteem for the level of importance of Macer’s position, as a significant aspect of Rome will be neglected if he reads Martial’s trifling poems even on a holiday. A similar device occurs at 10.7 where the river Tiber addresses the Rhine to bring Trajan to Rome.

Martial revisits the subject of the patron-client relationship and the iniquities which arise from this system (10.10; 11; 13; 15; 17). The epigram is organised into two sets of elegiac couplets. The first two lines suggest the familiar subject of the stingy patron Marius who is reluctant to perform the obligations and duties of patronage towards his clients. The reason for such stinginess is explained in the concluding clause of this couplet *sed nec habet*, which provides an added twist to the subject of the stingy patron, as this patron has nothing to offer. The object of contempt is not so much Marius, but rather the clients.

The poem begins as if it is a continuation of 10.17 on stingy patrons, but then suddenly announces a change of direction – the ‘patron’ is penniless. The next lines, almost like a new epigram, attack the stupid clients for continuing to pursue a hopeless cause. The poem concludes with a vehement address to the city Rome lamenting the foolishness of her citizens who maintain this unworkable system. This is the first poem of the book where Roma is invoked and Martial directs the blame towards Rome herself as responsible for the hardships of the client. The address to the city Rome recalls a verbal echo from 10.12.11 and 10.13.10, which reflects the conflict between the ideal of Rome and its reality. In 10.19 the Roman crowd (*turba 19.3*) that continues to cultivate its barren patron (*sterilem...amicum*) is the same pale
crowd (*pallida turba*) that envied the healthy tan that country life had given Apollinaris in 10.12. In both cases, Rome drains life and colour from those who live under its rules and hardships. Moreover Martial’s reproof directed towards the city itself demonstrates once again Martial’s discontent with the urban lifestyle and anticipates his return to Spain (cf. 10.104).

Nec vocat ad cenam Marius, nec munera mittit, 
ne spondet, nec vult credere, sed nec habet.

Martial presents a list of the duties and obligations for a patron to perform for his clients, which Marius does not do. The common name Marius appears on three other occasions in the epigrams, all for the purposes of humorous anecdotes or circumstances, which suggests that each one is fictitious (1.85; 2.76; 3.28; the Marius of 7.87.5 is believed to be a real person, cf. Howell on 1.85.3).

The series of duties which Marius fails to provide is emphasised by the repetition of *nec* at the opening of each clause, which is only broken in the final sequence with *sed nec habet*. This final clause supplies the explanation for Marius’ failure to provide (cf. 10.15 with *quidquid*).

The *officia* of the patron towards his clients included invitations to dinner (5.44.2; 9.97-9-10; White 1978: 76) and the sending of gifts (cf. 10.11; 15(14). Martial often refers to the outrage and humiliation felt by a client at eating at home, which reflects neglect by the patrons (Kay on 11.25.15; 2.1; 14; 18; 27; 5.47; 7.20; 9.14; 12.19; 82, see also Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.60 *scitari libet ex ipso quodcumque referit; dic/ ad cenam veniat*). Such language is typical of the *amicitia* relationship. The verb *vocare* is conventional language used in the issuing of dinner invitations (e.g. 3.50.1;
60.1; 5.44.2; 47.2; 7.20.2; 9.91.1, 11.57.2), and Martial also mentions the slave entitled vocator who performed this function (7.86.11; Sen. Dial 5.37.4) in private households. The language also immediately echoes that of 10.17 in vocare (17.1) and manus (17.2).

The expression munera mittere is typical for the presentation of gifts in the amicitia relationship (also e.g. 6.62.2; 63.5; 9.88 1 and 3, cf. Verg. A. 4.623 in the sense of the dedication of offerings). The alliteration produces a contemptuous tone (cf. 6.53.5).

In return for the client’s duties towards his patrons, the patron was obliged to act as guarantor towards his clients (Mart. 12.25.1-2 with Bowie’s note: cum rogo te nummos sine pignore, ‘non habeo’ inquis; idem, si pro me spondet agellus, habes; Pers. 5.79 Marco spondente, recusas/ credere tu nummos; Juv. 7.134; Sen. Ben. 4.12.2; Cic. Att. 12.17). Another duty concerned the lending of money to clients (1.75.1; 8.37; Quint. Inst. 4.2.6; Cic. Flac. 46; see OLD s.v. credo). Martial makes frequent use of the theme of lending money generally with the suggestion that it will never be returned (Howell on 1.75; 2.3; 3.41; 4.76; 6.5; 8.10; 37; 9.102; 11.76). The use of vult evokes the image of the parsimonious patron unwilling to part with his money, until it is revealed that this patron does not even have any money to lend.

turba tamen non deest sterilem quae curet amicum.
eheu! quam fatuae sunt tibi, Roma, togae!

These final lines are directed towards the clients who prolong the demeaning activity of attaching themselves to patrons who are either unwilling or unable to provide service (1.76.14; Juv. 12.97 quis aegram et claudentem oculos gallinam impendat
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*amicus tam sterilis*, see Colton 1991: 422). The image of the faceless mass of clients approaching the patron is revived from 10.10.4. The term *curo* is typical language of the patron-client relationship, and evokes the sense of *colo*, 'to devote oneself to' or 'to cultivate' (6.50.3). The term *amicus*, often appearing with epithets such as *dives* (5.18.10); *felix* (3.37.1) and *magnus* (43.41.3), is used ironically here with the less than flattering *sterilem*, 'yielding no gift or reward', to denote the unfulfilling consequences of the patron-client relationship from both sides (see further on *amicus* on 10.11.5).

*toxae* is metonymy for *togati* to denote those who wear the toga for the purposes of *salutatio* to visit their patrons (1.108.7; 12.18.4; see also *urbanae togae* of 11.16.2, for the toga used as a symbol of the clients see 10.10.12). Martial concludes the poem by addressing the personified city herself in a lamentation of the city lifestyle and the patronage system. Roma is addressed again a number of times throughout the book (also at 10.53.2; 72.13; 74.1), but at 10.2 she reminds the poet of her role in the poet's own literary achievements (cf. 10.2). Here, her image is intended to contrast with the idealistic nature of the city at the end of 10.13.

10.20 (19)

Martial sends his book to Pliny with the intention that its contents should be read at the appropriate occasion of a drinking party, lest he should be disturbed from more important business matters. The poem describes the directions and the route taken to the destination and its anticipated reception. Here, however, he addresses not the book itself, but as often elsewhere, the muse of its inspiration, Thalia (cf. 12.11.1; also 3.20.1; 4.23.4; 5.6.2; 7.8.1; 8.3.2; 9.73.9; 99.1; 10.18.2; 12.11.1; 13.1.3). The
first section of the poem offers geographical directions for the book's journey to its recipient. Once the muse reaches its destination, the poet gives strict instructions that such poetry is suitable only to be presented during the late hours of the drinking party, when festive and non-serious matters are celebrated. Martial often presents poems which perform the role of commendation of the book towards the patron on the poet's behalf, and common features include the book waiting for an appropriate opportunity to approach the patron; a description of the book's itinerary through Rome; a playful profession of self-modesty towards the poem's literary merits; praise for the patron's literary accomplishments; and the association of the poem with late night drinking or Saturnalian festivities (e.g. 1.52; 1.70; 3.2; 5; 4.10; 82; 86; 5.5; 6; 80; 7.26; 97; 99; 8.72; 9.99; 10.93; 11.1; 12.1; 2; 5; 11; Roman 2002: 139). In poems with a similar theme, he sends the book in his place for reasons such as the earliness of the hour (1.70.18; 1.108.10; also 3.2.5) or to be presented for emendation (4.10; 5.80). Here Martial gives no reason for sending Thalia on his behalf, but perhaps represents the poet's deference and timidity towards his patron (see also 3.5; 7.26; 97), or emphasises that this is a book sent from one literary man to another (e.g. 3.20; 4.23).

The literary device of the topographical description of the book's journey towards its destination is common throughout Roman literature (Mart. 1.70; 10.104; 12.2(3); Catul. 35; Hor. Ep. 1.20; Stat. Silv. 4.4; cf. Geyssen 1999: 719 n.2), but the dispatch of the book and the description of the precise course to its destination are based primarily on themes from Ovid's exile poetry (Pont. 4.5; Tr. 1.1; 3.1; 3.7; Pitcher 1998: 60ff.). Another example in Martial's epigrams is 1.70, where Martial sends his book to the house of Proculus to attend the salutatio in his place. Geyssen argues that the topography and poetical allusions recounted in 1.70 are not purely
10.20 (19)

decorative but evoke images of the emperor Domitian (Geyssen 1999: 708-38),
though this epigram is not ostensibly directed towards the emperor. In 10.20 the
description of the book’s topographical journey towards the patron, from the lowly
Subura for Pliny’s villa and the sites mentioned along the route suggest Pliny’s social
superiority over Martial. Similarly, the implicit comparison between Martial’s rustic
little book and Pliny’s weighty forensic compositions suggests a literary gulf between
the two writers.

Although this epigram is not directly concerned with the urban/rural contrast
introduced earlier in the book (cf. 10.13), the vocabulary is reminiscent of this theme,
where the distinction is elaborated in terms of urbane and rustic. Martial describes his
little book as un-learned and un-serious (nece doctum satis et parum severum) though
not quite rustic (sed non rustipculum), but quite clearly in contrast with Pliny’s efforts
in service of ‘grim Minerva’ (10.20.14 tetricae... Minervae), that is, the weighty and
elloquent legal works that Martial compares to Cicero’s writings. For his muse is not
merely grim, but one to whom Pliny must devote his entire days (totos dat... dies
20.14). So, even Pliny, it seems, is dominated no less by the forensic demands of the
centumviral court than is Apollinaris in 10.12 by the city’s yoke.

Martial employs self-deprecating and mock-modest language towards the
work which he is offering to Pliny, and he lauds Pliny’s skills as an orator in the
centumviral courts which represent matters of a more important nature (e.g. the
epithet facundo at 10.20.3; also 20.13-14 disertam... ianuam). Martial associates
Pliny with Cicero, the exemplar of Republican oratorical skill, and such a connection
will determine Pliny’s fame and immortality. The final lines of the poem are devoted
to the appropriate occasion for the presentation of Martial’s poetry, the late dinner
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hour, when wine and relaxation offer the opportunity for less serious subjects. This is in contrast with Pliny’s literary pursuits, which are appropriate to the working hours of the day. The nature of Martial’s poetry, however, ensures that even characters such as Cato, an exemplar of moral uprightness and seriousness, would allow for the reading of such poetry during evenings of leisure and entertainment.

This poem is quoted by Pliny himself in his letter to Cornelius Priscus on the event of Martial’s death (Ep. 3.21; see Adamik 1976: 63-72, Henderson 2001: 56ff.). It appears that Pliny rewarded Martial with a gift of money to subsidise his journey to Spain, thus demonstrating his obligations as a patron:

\[
\text{meritone eum, qui haec de me scripsit, et tunc dimisi}
\]
\[
\text{amicissime et tunc ut amicissimum defunctum esse}
\]
\[
\text{doleo? dedit enim mihi, quantum maxime potuit,}
\]
\[
\text{daturus amplius, si potuisset. tametsi qui homini potest}
\]
\[
\text{dari maius, quam gloria et laus et aeternitas?}
\]

10.20 contains the only reference to Pliny in Martial’s epigrams, and although some doubt surrounds the identity of Caecilius Secundus mentioned at 5.80 and 7.84, it is generally considered that these examples refer to someone other than Pliny (Howell on 5.80, Jenkins ad loc.). The Caecilius Secundus of 7.84 is referred to as being on the Danube at the same time that Pliny was tribune of Rome in 92. Martial’s allusion to Pliny’s work in the centumviral courts suggests that 10.20 was written before January 98 when Pliny was appointed to the Prefecture of Saturn, which he held until August 100; in his letters, Pliny states that he did not practise in the courts upon his appointment (Sherwin-White on Plin. Ep. 2.14.1; 10.3).

Pitcher suggests that, given that Pliny is not mentioned previously by Martial, 10.20 may be interpreted as an opportunity for Martial to develop new friendships other than those cultivated during Domitian’s reign (cf. 10.58 to Sextus Julius 171
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Frontinus, see Pitcher 1999: 560). It is impossible to determine whether this poem belongs in the first edition or was part of the revised edition. The inclusion of expressions and themes previously employed in the poet’s approach to Domitian are a striking feature of this poem. A recurrent theme is Martial’s comparison of Domitian to Jupiter (4.1) and in particular his identification of Domitian as *noster Tonans* (6.10; 7.56; 99; 9.20; 28; 91; Pitcher 1998: 68-9, Scott 1936: 133-40). The purpose of these parallels is to illustrate the poet’s subordinate position to the emperor. The same idea is again applied in 10.20 in terms of Martial’s position to Pliny, from comparisons of their literary preferences to the difference in location of their dwellings. Another subject which is linked to the previous reign is achieved in Martial’s association of Pliny with Minerva, who was the divinity most closely identified with Domitian (Suet. *Dom* 15.3; Dio 67.1; Scott 1936: 166-88; Darwall-Smith 1996: 115-29). Notions such as the book’s journey from poet to patron, the implicit lowliness of poet and book compared to the patron, and the need to offer the book only in the relaxed period after dinner when the wine flows freely reflect the continuation of imperial panegyrics which are now associated with private individuals (for Martial’s flattery of Domitian combined with modesty towards his own poetry cf. 1.4; 6; 70; 2.91 with Williams; 6.1; 8 praeef.; 1; cf. also 10.6; 7).


*Nec doctum satis et parum severum,*
*sed non rusticulum tamen libellum*
10.20 (19)

The epigram begins with an apology in language of mock modesty for the standard of the poetry which Martial is presenting to his recipient. The term *doctus* is conventional of Roman poets such as Lucilius, Catullus, Horace, and Ovid where it is applied in a literary-critical context. Spisak defines its fundamental meaning as 'skilled', 'knowing' or learned', but it acquires the sense of 'educated' and 'cultured', 'possessing good taste', and, even more specifically, 'able to appreciate or write poetry' (for the literary tradition of *doctus* cf. Spisak 1992: 117-47; Newman 1990: 18-24). Martial's usage of *doctus* in terms of poets and poetry expresses a wide range of meanings in keeping with the literary tradition (e.g. *doctus Pedo* at 2.77.5-6; 5.80.13; *carmina docta* at 6.61 (60). 8; 7.29.5 *doctos libellos*; Spisak 1992: 127ff.). Here the meaning assumes the sense of 'sophisticated', 'cultured' and 'in accordance with professional literary standards' (Spisak 1992: 155). *doctus* also has Callimachean overtones, so it links with 10.4 and Martial's rejection of meaningless and unintelligible poetry in favour of poetry with valid subject matters (cf. Tzounakas 2006: 116ff.). It invokes comparison with material that is *rusticitas*, and Martial informs Pliny that his own poetry is not *doctus* to the standards of Callimachus; however, nor is it *rusticus*.

The phrase *parum severum* implies that the genre of Martial's poetry may not meet the moral standards of a solemn lawyer such as Pliny (cf. 1.35.1 *parum severos*; 4.14.6 *paulum seposita severitate*; 8 praef. 10 epigrammata a severissimis; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.3.2 *faco non numquam versiculos severos parum*; Catul. 16.8 *versiculi molliculi ac parum pudici*; Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.9 *Paulum severae musa tragoediae*). This expression also anticipates the poem's conclusion: *tunc me vel rigidi legant Catones,*
as Martial elsewhere associates this quality with Cato (1 praef. 21 Cato severe; 11.2.1-2 durique severa Catonis frons).

The antithetical expression nec...sed contrasts Martial’s limitations and his qualities (Siedschlag 1977: 30), and line 2 asserts the claim that his work is non rusticulum. The meaning of rusticus suggests a lack of sophistication and countrified simplicity as opposed to urbanitas, although this term is deliberately avoided here in reference to Martial’s poetry (cf. 10.12.6 on urbano). It is a common adjective in the epigrams but it appears more frequently in Book 10 than in any other (10.72.11 rustica Veritas; 101.4; 103.8). Although Martial is ostensibly deprecating his poetry in contrast with the writings of Pliny, it is still required to be of a literary calibre for men such as Pliny to enjoy. Here, Martial proves that his poetry is non rusticulum by the use of various literary effects, such as chiasmus and the deliberate variation in the construction of nec...satis et parum. For a discussion of literary rusticitas and urbanitas, see Tzounakas 2006: 111-28.

The diminutive rusticulus complements the diminutive of libellum and perhaps maintains Martial’s sense of mock modesty in presenting this poem. Such use of the diminutive may also contribute to the depiction of the book as a child or young slave encouraged to be witty or amusing (cf. 5.15.4 praeter libellos vernulas nihil misi; Petr. 24.2 vernacula urbanitas; Tac. Hist. 2.88). It is uncertain whether libellum in this context refers to the collection of poems or this poem alone (see further 10.1.2), especially as Pliny does not mention other poems in his letter. Compare the similar language of non...tamen with that of 10.9.2 multo sale, nec tamen protervo, a poem which also professes self modesty.
facundo mea Plinio Thalia

This phrase contrasts the identity of the recipient, Pliny, with the addressee of the poem, Martial’s muse, Thalia. C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus was an eminent lawyer of the day (see line 15 below), and was distinguished for his oratorical skills; hence his description as *facundus*, a term which Martial frequently employs to characterise senators and other distinguished personalities, for example Cicero (11.48.2), who is used as an example of comparison further in this poem (also 4.23.5; 5.5.1; 5.30.5; 7.45.1; 7.91.1; 9.26.1; 10.87.2; 12.24.3; 12.2 (3).11; 14.189.1). Such a description anticipates Martial’s subsequent praise of Pliny’s oratorical skill in the law courts (for Pliny’s life and career cf. Sherwin-White on Pliny, Introduction: 72ff.).

Thalia is the muse of comedy and festive or jocose poetry (Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.115f.; Hor. *Carm.* 4.6.25; Ov. *Ep.* 15.84; *Ars. Am.* 1.264; *Fast.* 5.541; *Tr.* 5.9.31). Martial frequently addresses her as his source of inspiration (9.26.7; 73.9) and associates her with his poetry, referring to it as *nostra (mea) Thalia* (4.8.12; 8.73.3; 12.94.3; see Henriksén on 9.26.7).

*i perfer: brevis est labor peractae altum vincere tramitem Suburae.*

The sentence concludes with a double imperative which reinforces Martial’s command to his muse. The use of the imperative *i* as an interjection or reinforcing imperative appears on 17 occasions in Martial (Kay on 11.1).

The phrase *brevis est labor* could be taken initially as a reference to Martial’s epigrams, until the next line makes it clear that it is referring to a journey across town. The path which his muse is to follow begins with the ascent of the Subura, the street
north-west from the forum which passed between the Oppian and Cispian Hills to the Esquiline Hill (cf. Howell on 5.22.5 *alta Suburani vincenda est semita clivi;* Juv. 5.76-9), where Pliny apparently owned a house. The area of the Subura was regarded as the busiest district in Rome, notorious not only for its shops and brothels but also for its noisy, dirty and criminal environment (for the numerous references to the Subura in Martial see Henriksén on 9.37; Juv. 3.5; 5.106; 10.156; see Richardson: 373). In contrast, the Esquiline Hill denotes a wealthier area of Rome, which combined urban and countryside pleasures (Juv. 5.75-9, with Braund 1996: 289; 11.50-1). As a result, the prospect of leaving the noise and unpleasantness of the Subura renders the strenuous effort of climbing the hill easier.

The process of climbing uphill described as *brevis labor* seems to be at odds with the strong use of the term *vincere,* which connotes a degree of conquest in arriving on top of the hill (5.22.5). Compare its use at 1.70.8 where it denotes the superiority of the Flavians over the wonders of the world (*quae Rhodium moles vincere gaudet opes;* cf. Howell on 1.70.8).

Martial describes a well-known route to reach Pliny’s house at the top of the hill. This could be interpreted as a deviation from Callimachean principles, which reject the well-trodden public highway in favour of the narrow untrodden path (Callim. *Epig.* 30.1; Antipater of Sidon *AP* 7.109; Pindar *O.* 6.23; *I.* 5.23; *Paean* 7b.11; Cameron 1995: 59ff.). This is in keeping with his proclamation of a wide contemporary readership at 10.2, and also his aversion to obscurity or the mysterious, as the directions of such a well-known path are in accordance with Martial’s emphasis on reality and the description of real life.
illic Orphea protinus videbis
udi vertice lubricum theatri
mirantisque feras avemque regem,
raptum quae Phryga pertulit Tonanti;

The next point of location refers to the *lacus Orphei*, at the top of the *Clivus Suburanus*, with a fountain shaped in a semi-circle, and on its steps was a representation of Orpheus surrounded by birds and beasts (Picard 1947: 80-5). The iconography of such a relief appears to be in accordance with examples of paintings, mosaics, and monumental reliefs from various periods and origins (Picard 1947: 81-4, Jenkins *ad loc*).

There were two public fountains in the Region V Esquiliae, the Nymphaeum Alexandri and the Lacus Orphei whose site is unknown. Its location was perhaps near the site of the churches S. Lucia and S. Martino which are situated *iuxta Orfeam*. Housman argues that *theatri* refers to Orpheus' audience of animals, comparing *Sp.* 24 (21).1 (quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse theatro), and *Ov.* *Met.* 11.21 (Housman *CP* 2: 726). A more plausible explanation is that it refers to the shape of the semi-circular pool itself with steps similar to the *gradus* of the theatre (*SB* 2: 342, Picard 1947: 80-5).

The statue is described as *udi...lubricum*, which implies that the figure is slimy with moisture or perhaps covered with moss in the pool (cf. Post: 238, Jenkins *ad loc*.). Although the fountain provides a prominent landmark, the selection of Orpheus compliments Pliny's literary and oratorical qualities, as it focuses on the element of the admiring audience. Martial's description of Orpheus as *vertece*, rising above the other figures, further enhances the impression of Pliny's metaphorical superiority over the poet (cf. lines 4-5).
avemque regem refers to the eagle, traditionally the bird of Jupiter who carried off Ganymede (Phryga by metonymy, cf. 2.43.13) to be his attendant. The eagle is also a traditional emblem in reliefs listening to Orpheus' playing (Pind. Pyth. 1.6ff; Picard 1947: 84) and represents a metaphor for poetry and poets (Pind. Nem. 5.20; Olymp. 2.87ff.; Bacchyl. 5.16ff.).

The manuscript reading of avemque regis produces an awkward meaning of the 'king's bird' as opposed to the supposed interpretation of 'king of the birds' (cf. Hor. Carm. 4.4.2-3; Plin. Nat. 10.203; Claudian Const. Hon. 3; Shackleton Bailey 1978: 286). Housman cites the reading of regi which complements Tonanti in the following line (Housman CP 2: 726). Shackleton Bailey proposes the alternative reading of regem used in the form of an adjective, citing the adjectival use of rex at Verg. A. 1.21 hinc populum late regem belloque superbum; regardless of the feminine avem (also Mart. 5.55.1 volucrum regina; Shackleton Bailey 1978: 286). The reference to the eagle creates a comparison between Pliny and his patronage and the beneficence of Zeus towards his subjects.

Martial uses grandiose epic language to recount the story of Ganymede carried off by the eagle to be Jupiter's cupbearer (9.36.2; 57.7; 12.18; Stat. Theb. 1.548; V. Fl. 5.694). The image parallels Thalia carrying the book to the great patron Pliny. It is also notable that the story of Ganymede features strongly in a cycle of poems in Book 9 which parallels Jupiter and Ganymede with Domitian and his eunuch attendant Earinus (9.11-13; 16-17; 36). The pertulit used to denote the eagle carrying Ganymede echoes the command perfer to Thalia to carry the little book to Pliny. As Jenkins notes, the sensuous little Ganymede being carried to Jupiter parallels the playful little book being carried to Pliny (Jenkins ad loc.).
illic parva tui domus Pedonis
caelata est aquilae minore pinna.

Pedo refers to Albinovanus Pedo, a contemporary of Ovid, who was a writer of epigrams and epic poems, one entitled the *Theseis*, the other on the campaign of Germanicus in Germany (Ov. *Pont.* 4.16.6; Tac. *Ann.* 1.60; Sen. *Suas.* 1.15; *Cont.* 2.2; Sen. *Ep.* 122). The other references to Pedo (with Catullus and Marsus) suggest that Pedo’s epigrams served as a model for Martial (1 praef.; 2.77.5; 5.5.6; see Williams on 2.77.5). Here, too, Martial associates Pedo with Thalia (*tui Pedonis*), which contrasts with Pliny’s relationship to Minerva. The motive for identifying Pedo’s house is unclear but could be interpreted as a guide for Thalia, who has already visited this house and so may help show the way to Pliny’s house. The description of the eagle, described as *minore pinna*, contrasts the more minor work of Pedo (and, by association, Martial) with that of Pliny who is compared to Jupiter’s eagle.

*sed ne tempore non tuo disertam*
pulses ebria ianuam videto:

Martial advises Thalia on the appropriate time for her to approach the house of Pliny lest the drunken muse arrive at an unsuitable time as an uninvited guest (cf. 4.8.11-12 *gressu timet ire licenti/ ad matutinum nostra Thalia Iovem*). The image is inverted because instead of the conventional belated drunken arrival, in the manner of Alcibiades in Plato’s *Symposium*, Habbinas in the *Satyricon* or Messala in Tacitus’ *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Thalia’s premature arrival may interrupt Pliny’s pursuit of more studious activities (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.13.4 *ne studio nostri pecces odiumque libellis*). Because of her associations with festive and comic poetry, Thalia must wait for a suitable moment to arrive at the house. The epithet *ebria* evokes associations
with drunken Bacchanal and the festive seasons of the Saturnalia (cf. 10.87.11 pugnorum reus ebriaeque noctis; 13.1.4 postulat ecce novos ebria bruma sales; also 5.30.5). The image of the unseemly muse disturbing Pliny’s study is further enhanced by the use of pulses, which either refers to the muse knocking at the door or to her banging on the door with her feet as a more overt demand for entry (cf. Ter. Eun. 284; Hor. Carm. 1.4.13-14 pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas/ regumque turris; S. 1.1.10).

The phrase disertam ianuam reflects the skills of its master, in the same way that the ianua of love poetry displays the unyielding character of its mistress (TLL 7.1.136.2ff; Jenkins ad loc). Martial frequently uses this adjective in terms of an inanimate object (4.55.3; 6.48.2).

totos dat tetricae dies Minervae,

The reason for the muse’s untimely arrival is that Pliny devotes his day to learning and the employment of tetricae Minervae. Minerva was traditionally the patroness of arts and eloquence, and here her application is to forensic oratory (Howell on 1.76.5; Juv. 10.114). The epithet tetrica, a stark contrast with the description ebria applied to Thalia, is a conventional quality attributed to Minerva (Claudian De. Cons.2.275; Sidonius Carm. 9.139; Avienus Orb. Terr. 992). Martial uses this term quite frequently and in similar contexts (4.82.4; 10.64.2; Pers. 6.2 iamne lyra et tetrico vivunt tibi pectine chordae; Ov. Fast. 5.351 non est de tetricis, non est de magna professis).
dum centum studet auribus virorum

The centumviral court was a civil court which mainly dealt with inheritance cases or affairs of real estate, and which acquired considerable oratorical prestige during the empire (see Grewing on 6.38; 7.63.7; for Pliny’s involvement in this court see Sherwin White on Plin. Ep. 2.14 and also 6.33; 1.18; 4.14; 4.24; 5.9; 6.12; 9.23; Nauta 2002: 145). In epigrams to his patrons, Martial frequently expresses the idea that these men are busily occupied with affairs more important than his poems (4.92; 5.80; 7.26; 97; 11.1; 106; 10.18).

hoc quod saecula posterique possint
Arpinis quoque comparare chartis.

Martial elevates Pliny’s oratory in these courts to immortal status alongside the famous speeches of Cicero. Pliny often mentions his regard for Cicero and desire to imitate his skill (cf. Plin. Ep. 1.5.12 ‘est enim’ inquam ‘mihi cum Cicerone aemulatio nec sum contentus eloquentia saeculi nostri’). Martial uses Arpinis to refer to Cicero, derived from Arpinum, which refers to Cicero’s native town (cf. 4.55.3 Arpis cedere non sinis disertis). The correct form of the adjective is Arpinatibus from Arpinas, -atis, as Arpinus is the adjectival form of the town of Arpi in Apulia. The term chartis refers to Cicero’s writings or works, as opposed to the alternative meaning of papyrus (cf. 10.4.7). The language relating to Pliny’s everlasting fame (hoc quod saecula posterique possint/Arpinis quoque comparare chartis 15-16) echoes Martial’s description of the immortality of his own literature in 10.2.11 (at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt).
seras tutior ibis ad lucernas:

The appropriate time for Thalia to present the book/poem to Pliny is during the final hours of the dinner or *comissatio*, with the opportunity for drunkenness, relaxation and conviviality (cf. 4.8.7ff. especially 11-12 *gressu timet ire licenti/ ad matutinum nostra Thalia Iovem;* 4.82.5; 11.15.3). *lucernae* refers to the lamplight indicating the occasion takes place at night (Juv. 10.339 with Colton 1991: 387; also Prop. 3.8.1; Sen. *Dial.* 3.18.4; TLL 7.2.1699ff.), a conventional feature of the ancient drinking party (Hor. *Carm.* 1.27.5). Jenkins suggests that the reference to Pliny holding a drinking party (popular in Rome) may create an ironic deflation of Pliny’s seriousness and elevation to immortality (Jenkins *ad loc.*). Alternatively, it may be a means to depict the balance in Pliny’s character.

*haec hora est tua, cum furit Lyaeus,*
*cum regnat rosa, cum madent capilli:*

There follows a tricolon of *cum* clauses, which builds up to the concluding statement. The idiom of *meus*/*tuus* in the sense of *faustus* or *proprius* is common and here emphasises the appropriate occasion for Thalia’s literary diversions (Jenkins *ad loc.*; cf. line 12). Martial evokes the familiar image of Dionysus *cum furit Lyaeus*, who bears associations with loss of control or raging in the phrase (Hom. *Il.* 6.132; Soph. *Ant.* 1152, Pausanius 2.7.5; Herodotus 4.79) and conventional illustrations of drunkenness (Hom. *Od.* 18.406; 21.298; Hor. *Carm.* 2.27.8; Lucr. 18.2).

The presence of roses, garlands and unguents was a conventional element of *symposia*, and roses in particular represented luxury (Hor. *Carm.* 2.11.4; Mart. 2.59.3; 3.68.5; 5.64.2; 7.89.1; 9.61.17; 9.93.5; 12.17.7; 13.51.1; Anacreon *AP* 11.47.7ff.).
10.20 (19)

The verb *madeo* is typical in this context and produces the atmosphere of merriment and drinking (11.15.5; *TLL* 8.34.18ff.). The soaked hair perhaps refers to the scented oil used to anoint the hair (*RE* IA 1854.1ff.), and enhances the portrait of dishevelled behaviour permitted on such occasions. This reference to wet or perfumed hair is perhaps associated with the *Orphea...lubricum* of the lines above.

*tunc me vel rigidi legant Catones.*

Cato Maior and Cato Uticensis appear frequently as symbolic examples of virtue and stern old fashioned morality in Roman literature (Sullivan 1991: 64 n.23; Nordh 1954: 224). In Martial this figure often becomes a model of ridiculous *gravitas* (1 præf. 16; 5.51.5; 9.28.3; 11.2.1-2; 11.28.3; 12.6.8; also 4.14.13-14; 7.68.4; Petr. 132.5; V. Max. 2.10.8; Nordh 1954: 224ff.; Otto: 78), and here it is possible that this is combined with the traditional fondness of both Catos for alcohol (Cato *De Agr.* 156.1; Cic. *Sen.* 46; Hor. *Carm.* 3.21.9ff.; Plut. *Cat. Min.* 6.1ff.; see Jenkins *ad loc*). This naturally contrasts with the serious character of Pliny presented in the above lines, but perhaps is meant in jest to convey the notion that even men such as Pliny, who are engaged in important and serious affairs, allow time for relaxation and entertainment.

10.21

Criticism of a poet who writes obscure and incomprehensible poetry recalls the literary themes at the beginning of the book. This poem echoes the theme of 10.4 in its defence of the epigram as a literary genre in contrast with the pretensions of stale mythological references in the more serious literary genres. Whereas 10.4 addresses Mamurra, the reader of obscure and erudite poetry, 10.21 directs the poet's criticism
towards the writers of such works, specifically towards Sextus, who is most likely fictional. The features of this poetry to which Martial is opposed include obscurity, long-windedness and learned displays of erudition, all of which are remote from ordinary living which Martial endeavours to represent in his own poetry. Such material is so incomprehensible that grammatici are necessary for its interpretation, in contrast with the clarity and subject matter more pertinent to Roman life in Martial’s verses.

As an extension of his argument, Martial criticises Sextus for preferring Cinna instead of Vergil as a literary model. Martial refers to Vergil with the utmost admiration and respect, as the leading writer of his genre and age (for Vergil and Callimachus see Cameron 1995: 454-83). This criticism of Cinna reflects Martial’s rejection at 10.4 of the Callimachean partiality to erudition and obscurity. Similar comparisons are made at 4.29 where Martial favours the Satires of Persius over Marsus’ epic on the Amazons, following the rationale that brevity and conciseness is better than length (cf. also 2.86). Cinna, a contemporary of Catullus, was a prominent adherent of the neoteric movement at Rome, and his epic poem, Zmyrna, was so distinguished for its obscurities and learned allusions that L. Crassicius Pansa wrote a commentary during the early Empire (Bonner 1977: 62, 217; Cameron 1995: 225). Catullus expresses admiration for Cinna’s poetry in its erudition and style (Carm. 95), and although Catullus is Martial’s foremost literary model he adapts this influence to suit his own purposes. As in 10.4, Martial’s complaints are directed towards poetry which is unreadable and irrelevant to Roman readers.

Martial emphasises that his genre requires no interpretation or explanation by grammatici, which is consistent with his rejection of the Alexandrian tradition.
Callimachus' *Aetia* was prominent in the canon of works taught by *grammatici*, and in turn the neoteric poets of the late Republic and Augustan periods were closely associated with Roman *grammatici* (Bonner 1977: 217). Similar attacks against the Alexandrian commentators and grammarians are made by other poets in the *Anthologia Palatina*, with particular emphasis against Callimachean interpreters (Antiphanes *AP* 11.322; Philip of Thess. *AP* 11.321; 347; see Cameron 1995: 475). The two prominent genres in the canon of the *grammatici* were epic and tragedy (Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.4-8), both genres from which Martial clearly distinguishes his own work (8.3.13-16; 10.4). Vergil is the Roman poet primarily associated with the teachings of the *grammatici*, and Martial associates Vergil with the *grammatici* in a previous epigram (5.56.3-5). His present objection, however, is to the use of obscure and pretentious material preferred by Sextus, as opposed to his own which requires no explanation. The irony is that not even commentators can make sense of Sextus' poetry.

The juxtaposition of 10.21 with 10.20 provides an interesting contrast of ideas, for in the first poem Martial describes his work as *nec doctum satis et parum severum* and admits its humble status in comparison with that of its recipient, Pliny; yet implies that even great men such as Pliny enjoy reading Martial's work (cf. 6.64). This poem, however, dismisses the poetry of a rival poet whose works are so out of touch with reality with its obscure themes that not even learned commentators enjoy reading it.

*Scribere te quae vix intellegat ipse Modestus
et vix Claranus, quid rogo, Sexte, iuvat?*
Martial addresses his epigram to the writer Sextus, whose work is so obscure and learned that not even the grammatici are able to interpret it. The name Sextus occurs a total of twelve times in Martial (2.3; 13; 44; 55; 87; 3.11; 38; 4.68; 5.38; 7.86; 8.17; 10.57; also Domitian's librarian whom Martial addresses at 5.5) Although the text of Friedlaender replaces the name Crispus from the β manuscript, Shackleton Bailey retains the title of the addressee as Sextus in accordance with the γ manuscript; but both are metrically interchangeable. Examples of both names are employed against stingy patrons or those who renege their obligations of friendship (e.g. 10.15), although in support of the name used here a naive Sextus imparts his aspirations to literature at 3.38. It is likely that the character of this poem is fictitious in accordance with Martial's claim that he does not attack real individuals (cf. 10.33). The commonness of the name perhaps contrasts the obscurity and learnedness of Sextus' literature.

Martial refers to two well-known professional grammarians as examples of those unable to interpret Sextus' writings. Modestus refers either to Julius Modestus, a freedman of C. Julius Hyginus who was a freedman of Augustus (Suet. Gram. 20), or Aufidius Modestus, a contemporary of Plutarch (Friedlaender on 10.21.1-2). Claranus was a grammarian under Domitian, connected with Scaurus and Asper (Aus. Ep. 18.26). Martial's readers would undoubtedly have recognised the names as distinguished grammarians (cf. Juv. 7.215 who refers to Palaemon, a teacher of the first century CE).

non lectore tuis opus est, sed Apolline libris:
10.21

The works of Sextus are so impenetrable to the ordinary reader that they require interpretation through divine intervention. Apollo is used by metonymy to refer to his temple where the interpreter of the Delphic oracle expounded the will of Zeus to men, and which was celebrated for its obscure messages (Aesch. Eum. 19; Verg. A. 3.275; Carm. 3.5.12). Hence, whilst the association with Apollo is flattering towards Sextus' literary erudition, it also places his verse beyond the level of the contemporary reader. This contrasts Martial’s relationship with his lector established in 10.2 whom he describes as opes nostrae and who is able to understand his poetry without the need of a divine interpreter.

_iudice te maior Cinna Marone fuit._

Sextus selects Cinna, writer of obscure albeit erudite poetry as his model in place of Vergil (although cf. Vergil’s own opinion of Cinna: Ecl. 9.35 nam neque adhuc videor nec dicere Cinna digna). Because of his adherence to neoteric principles, Catullus also praises the brevity of Cinna’s epic poem in contrast with the long-windedness of Volusius (Carm. 95). Given Martial’s attitudes towards length, it would perhaps seem surprising that Martial disapproves of Cinna, but it is the subject matter and style to which Martial objects, rather than the length in this instance.

The significant juxtaposition of _Cinna Marone_ emphasises the contrast between the two authors. Martial associates Vergil with epic just as he does Cicero with rhetoric, and Vergil is referred to as an exemplar of his literary genre but not one with associations to the pretentiousness of such genres (14.185-6). He is given epithets such as _magnus_ (4.14; 11.48.1; 12.67.5;) 5 5.10.5), _aeternus_ (11.52.28), _summus_ (12.3.1), _sacer_ (8.55.2), _facundus_ (14.185.1; also 5.5.7-8 _ad Capitolini_ 187
caelestia carmina belli/ grande cothurnati pone Maronis opus; cf. Vioque on 7.29.7-8). It is possible that Martial’s praise of Vergil derives from Vergil writing his epic based on events from Roman history, thus making it accessible to his readers (Cameron 1995: 483). For further discussion on Vergil and Martial see Spaeth 1930: 19-28; Citroni 1987: 396-400.

sic tua laudentur sane: mea carmina, Sexte, grammaticis placeant, ut sine grammaticis.

A similar sentiment occurs at 4.49 where Martial refers to the fact that other poets are praised but Martial is actually read (4.49.10 laudant illa sed ista legunt; for a comparison in structure between these two poems see Salanitro 1991: 21). In contrast, Martial elsewhere draws attention to his poetry being both read and praised (3.1; 6.60.1).

The grammatici (the Latin litterati) were experts on linguistic and literary aspects of Greek and Latin works. Favourite writers for their published commentaries included Homer, Vergil and Horace (Mart. 2.7.4; 5.56.3; 7.64.7; 9.73.8; 10.70.12; 14.120.2; Cic. de Orat. 1.42.187 in grammaticis poetarum pertractatio, historiarum, cognitio, verborum interpretatio, pronuntiandi quidam sonus; Hor. Ars 78; Sen. Ep. 95.65; Juv. 6.438; Quint. Inst. 1.2.14; Suet. Gram. 4; see Bonner 1977: 212ff.). The conciseness of the poem deliberately contrasts with the long-winded and unintelligible nature of Sextus’ poetry.
Martial's aversion to the social habit of kissing one's friends in greeting is treated in this poem. Martial feigns sickness by wearing bandages and covering his mouth with lead for medicinal purposes in his efforts to deter the persistent social kisser Philinus (cf. 7.95; 12.59; on this poem see Mans 1994: 106-7). In the early empire, kissing became a regular form of greeting between friends (Sen. Dial. 4.24.1) or as a sign of condescension towards lesser individuals, such as between emperors and his subjects (Plin. Pan. 23.1; Dio 59.27.1; Suet. Otho 6.2) or patrons and clients (Mart. 8.4.5; 12.29.4; see Kay on 11.98; Vioque on 7.95). In Roman satire, the mouth is often characterised as impure, mainly because of low standards of hygiene and the spread of diseases through physical aspects such as saliva (Catul. 99.10), bad breath (Mart. 1.87; 2.12; 11.30; 12.85; Petr. 9.6), and the tongue (2.61; 3.84; 9.27; 11.61; further see Adams 1982: 213 n.1; Sullivan 1991: 203). The poet's distaste for social kissing as a way of greeting one's friends appears throughout the books, especially as their attempts to kiss the poet are uninvited and unwelcome (1.94; 2.10; 12; 21-4; 33; 7.95; 11.98; 12.55; 59). This revulsion towards touching an unclean mouth is frequently implied as a consequence of either fellatio or cunnilingus (11.30; 12.59; 85; 7.95.14; Catul. 79.3-4; Juv. 6.51). For example, in Book 2 there is a series of poems where Martial expresses disgust towards Postumus and his kisses which are foul because of his predilection for fellatio (2.10, 12; 21 33).

The poem begins with a question to open the dialogue, a form commonly used in Greek epigram and by Catullus (30; 40; 88;104), and which anticipates a satirical or witty answer (Sullivan 1991: 221). This is the third poem of Book 10 in the scazonic or limping iambics metre, and adheres to the Catullan approach in its association with
satirical and abusive verse especially concerned with vice or moral standards (cf. 10.3). It is perhaps a deliberate ploy by Martial to use a metre so favoured by Catullus immediately following a poem where he questions an aspect of Catullus' literary style (cf. similarly 10.4 and 5).

Cur spleniato saepe prodeam mento
Martial mentions the wearing of face patches for medicinal purposes as here (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 29.126), for cosmetic enhancement (8.33.22; cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 6.2.2), and to conceal scars or marks (*et numerosa linunt stellantem splenia frontem*). A similar expression occurs in a poem on the same topic, which describes in detail all kinds of unpleasant facial diseases (11.98.5 *nec triste mentum sordidique lichenes*; see Kay’s note). Here the joke is that Martial does not need such plasters but applies them to avoid Philinus and his filthy kisses. The adjectival form *spleniatu*s is a *hapax legomenon* derived from *splenium* and refers to a patch or plaster.

*albave picta sana labra cerussa,*

*cerussa* refers to the white carbonate of lead which was used as a popular cosmetic in the ancient world (cf. Howell on 1.72.6; 2.43.12; 7.25.2; Ov. *Med.* 73; Pl. *Mos.* 258), and Pliny also refers to its use as a medical treatment for burns (Plin. *Nat.* 33.102; *Celsius* 3.10.2). Martial’s description of his lips as *sana* emphasises the redundancy of the bandages and white lead for medical treatment and the conclusion clarifies their use as a ploy to deter Philinus from greeting the poet with a kiss (cf. 11.98.6 *nec labra pingui delibuta cerato*).
Philine, quaeris? basiare te nolo.

The verb *quaeris* to initiate a question is a common device in Martial (e.g. 2.38; 5.56; 7.34; 11.19; 12.17, Catul. 7.1), and along with the identity of the poem’s addressee is delayed until the final line in anticipation of the witty rejoinder. It is implied that Martial’s reluctance to kiss is due to Philinus’ practices as a *fellator*, and a similar phrase is echoed in the conclusion to 11.98 (11.98.23 *facias amicum basiare quem nolis*; for similar reactions cf. 1.94; 6.66; 11.61.5; Antipater Thess. *AP* 11219; Catul. 79.3; Sen. *Ben.* 4.30.2; Suet. *Nero* 35.4; Kay on 11.98).

There is some confusion over whether the target of this poem is meant to be the female Philaenis from the β manuscript, or the male Philaenus/Philinus in accordance with the γ manuscript tradition. Martial uses the name Philaenis eight times for a physically repulsive courtesan (2.33; 4.65; 9.29; perhaps also 62;12.22) and also in poems which deal with the theme of women who engage in the most depraved forms of sexual vice (7.67; 7.70; 9.40). At 2.33, Martial expresses his reluctance to kiss Philaenis because she is a *fellatrix* and as such, bears similarities with 10.22 (both Williams on 2.33 and Henriksen on 9.29 assume that 10.22 is addressed to the female Philaenis). The language of this poem seems to fit the context of the reviled social custom, such as the verb *prodeam* which suggests the image of the poet appearing in public for the purpose of social exchanges (Kassel 1966: 6-7). Unlike Philaenis, the name Philinus appears on only one other occasion, but also in Book 10 and in a satirical context (102), and seems to be more appropriate given the surrounding poems which reflect Martial’s objections to other social functions and customs in Rome related to the process of *amicitia*. 

191
Martial congratulates Marcus Antonius Primus on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday (cf. also 10.32). Rather than express a desire for youth, the poem celebrates the attainment of advanced years and the tranquillity that it brings without regret or the fear of the onset of death. Martial praises Antonius for being able to look back over his life with pleasure, and his appreciation doubles the merit of the life he has lived. Complimentary sentiments such as the manner in which an individual has lived, and which has contributed to a long happy life, are expressed towards other patrons and friends throughout the books: for example, he urges Licinius Sura to live life to the full upon his recovery from a serious illness (7.47.12 *perdiderit nullum vita reversa diem*; also cf. 1.36; 3.6; 4.13; 5.20; 8.77). This notion is seen elsewhere in Martial (e.g. 1.15; 2.90; 5.58; 8.77.7-8 *qui sic vel medio finitus vixit in aevo,/ longior huic facta est quam data vita fuit*), where he reflects on the enjoyment of life and is a feature of Epicurean teaching (Howell on 1.15; 5.58). These ideas are particularly prevalent in Horace (e.g. *Carm.* 1.11.7-8 *dum loquimur, fugerit invidal aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero* with N-H) and Seneca:

```
id ago ut mihi instar totius vitae dies sit; nec mehercules tamquam ultimum rapio, sed sic illum aspicio tamquam esse vel ultimus possit... paratus exire sum et ideo fruar vita quia quam diu futurum hoc sit non nimis pendeo (Ep. 61.1-2).
```

The usual age for the onset of old age in Rome is generally given as sixty, when men were able to retire from civic obligations (Cameron 1995: 177). By these standards, Antonius has entered extreme old age at seventy-five.

This is the first in a short series of poems related to birthday celebrations and the onset of old age and eventual death (24; 26; 27). It complements the following
poem which refers to Martial's own birthday, where he hopes to reach the same age himself. There is also seemingly deliberate juxtaposition of 10.22 and 23 in terms of contrasting attitudes to patrons. Unlike the inexcusable behaviour of the kissier Philinus, Antonius Primus represents the *vir bonus* (cf. 1.39.4; 10.33; 47), a motif which is introduced at 10.13 with Martial's childhood friend Manius and developed throughout the Book (Spisak 2002: 133).

**Iam numerat placido felix Antonius ævo quindecies actas Primus Olympiadas**

The poem refers to Marcus Antonius Primus from Tolosa in Gallia Narbonensis (9.99; 10.32). He is generally taken to be the Antonius Primus who played a significant role during the civil wars of 69, which is supported by a corresponding origin of birth, name, and age (Suet. Vit. 18; Mart. 9.99.3 with Henriksen). Both Housman and Shackleton Bailey dispute this supposition, and cite Tacitus' rather vituperative description to illustrate the difference from the character presented in Martial: *strenuus manu, sermone promptus, serendae in alios invidiae artifex, discardiis et seditionibus potens, raptor, largitor, pace pessimus, bello non spernendus* (Hist. 2.86, Housman *CP* 3: 990; SB¹: 491; SB² 3: 340). He is first mentioned in Tacitus for his condemnation during Nero's reign for forgery of a will (*Ann.* 14.40), but then reappears at the beginning of the civil war when appointed commander of the seventh legion in Pannonia by Galba, before attaching himself to Vespasian (*PIR*² A 866, Syme 1958: Index s.v.). It is more plausible that Martial was acquainted with Primus in his retirement and thus associates him in these terms as patron rather than through his prior military activities.
He is first mentioned in Book 9, where he is described in laudatory terms: *Marcus Palladiæ non infitianda Tolosæ/ gloria, quem genuit Pacis alumna Quies* (9.99.3-4). Thus, the depiction complements that given where he is described as *felix* (line 1) and *bonus vir* (line 7). Martial addresses him again at 10.32, and possibly also at 10.73, giving thanks for the gift of a toga (see Henriksen on 9.99.2).

Martial refers to Primus’ advanced age in poetical terms, using the phrase *quindecies actas Olympiadas* which would normally estimate Primus’ age as sixty years. *Olympias* is often used to refer to a five year period as a synonym for *lustrum* (cf. 4.45.4; 7.40.6; Ov. *Pont.* 4.6.5), which therefore brings his age to seventy-five years. Antonius is fortunate for reaching such a significant age, and as such can enjoy these years in tranquillity, perhaps as opposed to the more turbulent years of his youth (Sullivan 1991: 43). Such a description is appropriate in the context of his characterisation as a *vir bonus*.

*papaeritosque dies et tutos respicit annos
nec metuit Lethes iam propioris aquas.*

Primus now has the leisure to review his life without regret and also to look to the future without fear of death. These years are safe because that they cannot be taken away from him (cf. Sen. *Ben.* 3.4.2 *quod praeterrit, inter tua sepositum est*). The river Lethe is a poetical metaphor for death (7.47.4; 96.7; cf. 10.2.7), and such elegant language suits the respectful tone towards Primus. Perhaps a secondary message is contained in expressions such as *placidum aevum* and *tutos respicit annos*, which suggest that a general period of safety and assurance has been established with the new regime under Trajan.
nulla recordanti lux est ingrata gravisque;
nulla fuit cuius non meminisse velit.

Each day of Primus' life has been spent in such a way that he can reminisce without
regret or shame over past events. Nor is there cause to forget any occasions, which is
an admirable achievement in seventy-five years. Such sentiments reflect the true
nature of the vir bonus.

The term lux is commonly employed as poetical metonymy for dies (3.6.2;
Catul. 107.6; Hor. S. 1.5.39) and with particular reference to a festive day, especially
the dies natalis cf. (Hor. Carm. 4.11.17-20; Ov. Ib. 217; see further Vioque on 7.22.1-
2). Such poetical phrases are in keeping with the dignified tone of the poem.

ampliat aetatis spatium sibi vir bonus: hoc est
vivere bis, vita posse priore frui.

For examples of similar Epicurean sententiae on the way one lives, cf. 1.15.12: sera
nimis vita est crastina: viva hodie; 6.70.5 non est vivere, sed valere vita est; 7.47.12
perdiderit nullum vita reversa diem; also cf. 1.25.8; 2.32.7; 10.62.15. Seneca
expresses similar sentiments on the enjoyment of life in old age:

conplectamur illam (senectutem) et amemus; plena est
voluptatis, si illa scias uti (Ep. 12.4)... deinde nemo tam
senex est, ut improbe unum diem speret. unus autem dies
gradus vitae est (12.6)... crastinum si adicerit deus,
laeti recipiamus. ille beatissimus est et securus sui
possessor, qui crastinum sine sollicitudine expectat.
quisquis dixit 'vixi' cotidie ad lucrum surgit (12.9).

Antonius exemplifies the characteristics of the vir bonus as one who increases the
amount of time for himself towards the enjoyment of life, a motif which is continued
throughout Book 10 (cf. 10.47). There are only a few occasions where Martial refers
to patrons in similar terms; 1.39.4 for Decianus artibus et vera simplicitate bonus; and
10.23

at 10.33 to Munatius Gallus. The generous praise bestowed on Antonius Primus and the high esteem the poet shows towards his character suggests a special bond between the two men, especially as it recurs at 10.32.

10.24

Martial announces the celebration of his own fifty-seventh birthday as a companion piece to the previous poem. Birthdays were traditionally celebrated in Rome with feasts (Cic. Phil. 2.15) and sacrifices to the person’s Genius, which included the offerings of food, wine and incense (Hor. Carm. 3.17.14; Tib. 1.7.50; 2.2.8; Ov. Tr. 5.5.12), the decoration of the altar (Hor. Ep. 2.1.144), and the giving of presents (Mart. 9.53; Marquardt 1886: 250ff.). Birthday greetings were incorporated into a literary form, the *genethliakon*, of which there are numerous examples in Roman literature, especially elegy (e.g. Tib. 1.7; 2.2; Prop. 3.10; Stat. Silv. 2.7; Ov. Tr. 3.13; for further literary examples see Cairns 1972: 113 n.14, 136-175; Argetsinger 1992: 93). Such poems in commemoration of the recipient’s birthday include a range of standard *topoi*, especially a description of the birthday customs mentioned above (Cairns 1972: 113, Hardie 1983: 115-17 on Stat. Silv. 2.7). Here, Martial incorporates standard *topoi* such as the giving of presents, the offering of incense and cakes to his *Genius* (Ov. Tr. 3.13.16-17; Tib. 2.2.7-8; 3.10.18).

Birthday poems to friends and patrons, including the emperor Domitian are common throughout Martial’s epigrams (3.6; 4.1; 7.21-3; 9.39; 53; 10.87). In this poem, however, the birthday celebrations are for the poet himself, which is a slight inversion of the notion of the *genethliakon* as encomium for the poem’s recipient. This is not unique to Martial but previously occurred in Ovid’s *Tristia*, where the
10.24

topoi of the birthday celebrations are inverted towards the poet himself (Tr. 3.13; Cairns 1972: 135-7). Martial refers to his own birthday celebrations on a number of occasions throughout his books (9.52; 10.25; 12.60).

The poem celebrates Martial reaching the age of fifty-seven years. In addition to the characteristic giving of presents and offerings of incense and cakes to the Genius, the poet expresses the desire to live another eighteen years upon which he would reach seventy-five. This detail deliberately recalls the previous poem to Antonius Primus in celebration of his seventy-fifth birthday, who is able to live without fear of death nor regrets for the past. Martial adds that reaching such an age is sufficient and does not wish to live beyond that point and suffer the infirmities of advanced old age.

Natales mihi Martiae Kalendae, lux formosior omnibus Kalendis,
Martial frequently gives his birthday as being on the Kalends of March (9.52; 12.60). Because of this and the mention of other birthdays which also fall on the Kalends (8.64; 9.52; 10.87), it was suggested that all Romans celebrated their birthdays on the Kalends because of its religious and commercial significance (Lucas 1938: 5-6). It seems more likely that Martial’s birthday on the Kalends of March was a mere coincidence and Henriksén offers epigraphical and literary evidence in support of this (see on 9.52; also SB² 2: 212 on 8.64). The month also has special significance as it echoes Martial’s own name. Natalis is often used without dies, and in this genre is regarded as a personified entity (Tib. 2.2.1; see also Cic. Att. 7.5.3; Verg. Ecl. 3.76; Plin. Ep. Tra. 10.17a.2; Mart. 9.53.1; 12.60.7).
qua mittunt mihi munus et puellae,
This day also has significance in that it was also the day of the Matronalia, the festival
sacred to Juno on which presents were given to women (Suet. Vespasian 19.1; Juv. 9.53; 9.90.15). Martial emphasises the double significance of this day by joking that
even women sent him presents on this day (cf. 5.84 where Martial promises to send
Galla at the Matronalia the equivalent present she sent him on his birthday - nothing).

quinquagimensima liba septimamque
vestris addimus hanc focis acerram.
The offering of cakes and incense to the person’s Genius was a traditional aspect of
the birthday festivities and conventional topoi of the genethliakon genre (cf. 9.90.15-
18; Ov. Tr. 3.13. 15-16; Cairns 1972: 135-7). As this is the fifty-seventh time these
offerings have been made on his behalf, this gives his age as fifty-seven. Although
Martial refers to his birthday in other epigrams, this is the first time Martial reveals
his actual age. His exact date of birth cannot be verified from this poem, because it is
not certain whether this poem was presented in the first edition of this book published
in 95 or simply part of the second, but it is surmised that he was born between the
years 38 to 41 (Sullivan 1991: 2).

his vos, si tamen expedit roganti,
annos addite bis, precor novenos,
ut nondum nimia piger senecta
sed vitae tribus arcubus peractis
Martial prays to his Genius that he hopes a further eighteen years are added to his life
so that he may reach seventy five but die before the onset of extreme old age,
described as nimia piger, a term which connotes the negative aspects of inertia or
inactivity (e.g. 4.4.4; 9.40.9; although Martial uses it to describe himself at 12.68.4 *sed piger et senior Pieridumque comes*; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.8.3 *iam subeunt anni fragiles et inertior aetas*; also Juv. 10.188ff. on the helplessness of the aged). The age of seventy-five was generally considered the point of advanced old age (see 10.23).

The full circle of life was 100 years and was divided into four segments (Manilius 2.844-5). Here Martial refers to the first three stages of life for a person, *pueritia*, *iuventus* and *senectus*, the last of which he would complete in eighteen years time and reach extreme old age. Seneca likens these stages of life to a series of circles as in the manner of a racecourse: *unus autem dies gradus vitae est. tota aetas partibus constat et orbes habet circumductos maiores minoribus* (Ep. 12.6). For support of Housman's emendation of *arcubus* for *areis* or *aureis* see Housman *CP* 3: 991-2.

*lucos Elysiae petam puellae.*
*post hunc Nestora nec diem rogabo.*

Upon reaching such a point, Martial, like Antonius Primus, will be able to meet death without fear (for the prospect of death in a birthday poem cf. Ov. *Tr.* 21-2). The groves of Elysia belonged to Proserpina and marked the entrance to the Underworld (Hom. *Od.* 10.). Such sentiments are common in epitaphs (Lattimore 1942: 41). Nestor who lived through three generations was proverbial for his longevity and often appears as the model of old age (Hom. *Il.* 1.250ff.; e.g. Mart. 2.64.5.58.5; 6.70.12; 8.6.9; 64.14; 10.67.1; 11.56.13; 13.117.1; Otto: 242). Although Martial wishes a long life for himself, he does not wish to live beyond this length of days (for a similar type of sentiment, cf. 7.96.7-8 *sic ad Lethaeas, nisi Nestore serior, undas/ non eat, optabis quem superesse tibi*; Juv. 12.128 *vivat Pacuvius quaeso vel Nestora totum*).
10.25

The subject of this epigram is the spectacle of the condemned criminal facing punishment in the arena. The punishment in this case is drawn from the historical tale of Mucius Scaevola who thrust his hand into the fire in defiance of King Porsenna (Liv. 2.12-13). The execution of criminals in the manner of historical exempla seems to have been a regular occurrence in the arena, and several examples of enactments of mythical executions in the amphitheatre are referred to in the Liber Spectaculorum, such as the execution of Laureolus in the manner of Prometheus (Sp. 7 with Friedlaender; also cf. 5-6; 8 and 21; Tertull. Apol. 15.4-5; Coleman 1990: 44-73). Scaevola is the only Roman example of such a spectacle (Coleman 1990: 62-4). The example of Mucius Scaevola was regarded as synonymous with bravery and courage and also appears at 1.21 and 8.30 (also from the perspective of the criminal in the amphitheatre; cf. Sen. Ep. 24.5-6; 66.51; Sen. Cont. 10.2.3; 5; for other examples of similar famous historical exempla cf. 1.13; 42, Nordh 1954: 224-38). It is possible that Martial witnessed such a spectacle in the amphitheatre.

10.25 adapts the story of Scaevola to represent the antithesis between appearance and reality by denigrating the convicted man's heroism, with a twist on the traditional concept of Scaevola's action as the epitome of bravery (Nordh 1954: 235). It seems that the criminal forced to enact the role of Mucius Scaevola is trying to escape a worse fate, and as a result the poet would consider him more heroic if he were to resist the sentence of plunging his hand into the flames and face the agonising alternative of the tunica molesta (see Coleman 1990: 61-2).

The language of this poem suggests that this is a recent poem (line 1 says nuper), though the punishment of Mucius in the arena is also mentioned in 1.21 (from
85-86 CE). If so, the punishment seems to be a favourite and repeated in the arena. It
is also possible that this is an older epigram added to pad out Book 10, especially as it
does not seem to have any parallel poems in the rest of the book.

In matutina nuper spectatus harena
Mucius, imposuit qui sua membra focis,

Literary sources explain the course of events at the amphitheatre, which began with
the beast hunts or *venationes* in the morning, followed by the execution of condemned
criminals during the *meridianum spectaculum* (Mart. 8.67.3; Sen. *Ep.* 7.3; Suet.
*Claud.* 34), and the gladiatorial combats in the afternoon (Friedlaender on 10.25;
Coleman 1990: 55ff.).

Criminals were used to re-enact punishments or trials from history or myth (cf.
*Sp.* 5-6; 7-8 on Laureolus, 21; 8.30; see Coleman 1990: 55). Mucius Scaevola was
captured and charged with conspiracy to murder the king Porsenna, and, in defiance
of the threats made against him, plunged his hand into the sacred flames (cf. Liv.
2.12-13, see Howell on 1.21 for the story as an etymological myth). The language
appears conventional on this subject (cf. 8.30.1 *qui nunc Caesareae lusus spectatur
harenae*; Sen. *Ep.* 70.20 *cum ad matutina spectacula pararetur*; *Dial.* 5.43.2 *videre
solemus inter matutina harenae spectacula tauri*; and for line 2 cf. Sen. *Ep.* 24.5
*Mucius ignibus manum imposuit. acerbum est uri: quanto acerbius si id te faciente
patiaris!*).
si patiens durusque tibi fortisque videtur,
Abderitanae pectora plebis habes.

Scaevola is traditionally identified as the exemplar of heroism and courage (e.g. 8.30.3-4 *aspicis ut teneat flammam poenamque fruatur/fortis et attonito regnet in igne manus*!), but Martial then proceeds to denigrate such admirable qualities in this situation. The spectator of this punishment who associates the criminal in the arena with these qualities is likened to the people of Abdera, a town in the south of Thrace whose citizens were proverbial in antiquity for their stupidity and foolishness (Cic. *Att.* 7.7; Ov. *lb.* 465; Juv. 10.47-50, further see Otto: 1). The adjectival form *Abderitanus* is a hapax legomenon. In this context, *pectora* represents *ingenium*, the soul, mind, or personality, which includes emotional, moral and rational aspects of the person rather than the usual meaning of the breast (cf. 11.53.2; *OLD s.v. pectus* 4).

*nam cum dicatur tunica praesente molesta*

*‘ure manum’, plus est dicere ‘non facio.’*

The *tunica molesta* was a robe covered in pitch and other flammable substances, which was worn by the condemned and then set alight. Tacitus describes this punishment carried out by Nero on the Christians in 64 CE (*Annales* 15.44) and it is frequently referred to as a standard punishment for convicted criminals (Sen. *Ep.* 14.5 *illam tunicam alimentis ignium et inlitam et textam*; Juv. 1.155; 8.235, with Colton 1991: 345-6; Tertullian *Mart.* 5; Coleman 1990: 60). Martial also refers to it as the paper wrapper used for frying fish at 4.86.8.
10.26

Martial commemorates the death of Varus, a centurion, who has perished in Egypt. As Martial is unable to carry out the burial rituals in person, this dedicatory epigram ensures the memory of Varus' name, even though his body has been laid to rest (similarly cf. Catul. 101 on the long journey to visit his brother's grave; also Ov. Pont. 1.9.47-8 funera non potui comitare nec ungere corpus/ atque tuis toto dividor orbe rogis). Memorial epitaphs and tomb inscriptions are some of the earliest forms of epigram and they became firmly established in Alexandrian literature; the earliest Latin epigrams extant are epitaphs (Sullivan 1991: 78-94). They form their own separate Book in the Anthologia Palatina (Book 7), as subdivided by Constantine Cephalas (Sullivan 1991: 81). This literary form was a fitting commemoration of the dead and emphasised the notion that whilst people, or even tombstones, are ephemeral, these words will be everlasting. Epigrams in the form of eulogies and epitaphs are prevalent throughout Martial's books, especially where he wishes to commemorate close friends, patrons and slaves (cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. Death; for Book 10 in particular see 50; 53; 61; 63). Although this poem is not strictly an epitaph, it contains features which are typical of the sepulchral epigram. Such features include the name of the deceased (who is also the recipient of the poem, cf. Catul. 101; Callimachus Epig. 2), the location of his homeland and ancestry, followed by praise for his profession and achievements which have been cut short by his untimely death (cf. 1.93; 6.28; 76; Bing 1988: 58; also Lattimore 1942: 184-99).

The finality of death is presented in stark contrast with the immortal survival of this poem. The theme of literature as surviving all the elements is a conventional topos of Greek and Roman literature, and this recalls the second poem of this volume.
with the reference *solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori* (10.2.12). This poem is a conscious acknowledgment of the enduring nature of literature, where the text becomes the literary monument that shall outlast even a tombstone. As such, it is Martial’s poem which will ensure commemoration of Varus’ name.

We can see a progression of poems on the themes of life and death beginning with 10.23 on Antonius Primus who has reached seventy-five, the pinnacle of old age, where the prospect of death holds no fear. This continues with 10.24 in celebration of Martial’s own birthday, when he expresses the wish to reach such an age. The full enjoyment of life and the attainment of old age contrast this poem with Varus’ untimely death and the transience of life. The theme will continue in 10.27.

As Varus has died in Egypt, not only is Martial denied the opportunity to carry out fully formal rites of a traditional funerary ceremony, but also it means that Varus, a Roman citizen, is unable to return to his homeland. This poem in some ways recalls 10.6 and 7 where Martial calls for the emperor’s return to Rome, whereas here we have a centurion whose return to Rome was anticipated but was prevented by his death in a far off land. Verbal echoes between these poems are emphasised in the address to the Nile, here described as *fallax*, and represent the authority or controller of events, just as at 10.7 the river Tiber commands the Rhine to return Trajan.

Vare, Paraetonias Latia modo vite per urbes nobilis et centum dux memorande viris,

Nothing is known of the identity of Varus, except from the information given in this poem, which is that he was a centurion in Egypt (*PIR*¹ V 201). He is not mentioned again in the epigrams, although another Varus, who is a prolific poet, is addressed at
8.20. The opening of the poem establishes certain features which are typical of sepulchral epitaphs, such as the disclosure of his name, profession and achievements (Lattimore 1942: 13ff.). The address to the dead man is typical of tombstones and of epigraphical literature; it establishes a connection between the living poet and the deceased (Catul. 101 with Quinn 1970: 439ff., also cf. Catul. 4; 96; Prop. 4.1; Verg. A. 6.214-35; 11.182-202).

Paraetonium, a town in the west of Alexandria with a large harbour, is here used as an example of poetical metonymy for Egypt as is suitable to the sombre tone of the poem, typical of epic (Stat. Theb. 5.10; Luc. 3.295; 10.9; Sil. 3.255; 5.356; 17.449). It is possible that Martial chose this particular town because it is the location of Varus' death.

Varus' rank as Roman centurion is indicated by Latia vite, the Latin vine rod, which was the symbol of office for the centurion (Juv. 8.247 and 14.193 with Mayor's note; Tac. Ann. 1.23). He is referred to as dux, which recalls the title attributed to Trajan at 10.6.2. Martial praises Varus' achievements as centurion, especially his command of a century of soldiers. Such compliments are characteristic of sepulchral literature.

at nunc Ausonio frustra promisse Quirino,
    hospita Lagei litoris umbra iaces.

The achievements in Varus' life are contrasted by these two lines revealing Varus' death in a far off land and the fact that he is not able to be returned to Roman soil.

Although it appears that Romans did not feel an overwhelming urge to be buried in Rome (with the exception of Ov. Tr. 3.3.45-6: sed sine funeribus caput hoc, sine
honore sepulcri/ indeploratum barbara terra tegit; Lattimore 1942: 201-2), the
intention is to create the contrast between Varus’ anticipated return to Rome and his
body now kept in a far off land.

Martial uses the poetical epithet Ausonius on sixteen occasions in his epigrams
as a synonym forItalicus. Its use extends back to Alexandrian poets such as
Callimachus (frg. 238.28) and was introduced into Latin poetry by Vergil (A. 10.267;
for further literary examples cf. Vioque on 7.6.2 and Henriksen on 9.7.6). It is
accompanied by the term Quirinus, which Martial uses on only three other occasions
in his poetry; it is notable that they mainly occur in this particular Book (10.51.15;
58.15; 11.1.9; cf. also Quirinalis of 1.84). Although the formal language heightens
the solemnity of the occasion, it also draws attention to the significance of Rome as a
motif throughout the Book (see Introduction). The present tense iaces heightens the
notion of the unchanging quality of death. For a similar expression cf. Verg. A. 5.871
nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena.

The use of hospita seems strange for it is a term which conveys the sense of
‘visitor’, ‘guest’ or ‘stranger’, despite the fact that his remains are resting permanently
in Egypt (cf. Mart. 9.61.7 hospitis invicti). As a Roman citizen, however, Varus’ real
home will always be Rome (cf. 10.12.8).

Poetical metonymy is used to denote Egypt, on this occasion with Lageus,
which refers to the father of Ptolemy (cf. Luc. 1.684; 8.692; 10.394; 414; 522; Sil.
1.196; 10.321). The reference here uses language to create imagery of the great
general Pompey lying on the Egyptian shore, as depicted by Lucan (8.692-822, cf.
Mayer 1981: 167ff.). The death of Pompey was a conventional exercise for
epigraphical literature and appears elsewhere in Martial’s poems (e.g. 5.74; AP 2.398;
9.402, Mayer 1981: 167-8). Here, this association between Varus and Pompey strengthens the event of Varus' demise as a significant loss to the Roman military and intensifies the sympathy felt for a Roman leader who must remain absent from Rome.

spargere non licuit frigentia fletibus ora,
    pungua nec maestis addere tura rogis.

The tears of the mourners are a standard feature of sepulchral literature, and these lines are reminiscent of the gifts and tears described by Catullus towards the death of his brother (Catul. 101.8-9 tradita sunt tristi munere ad inferias,/ accipe fraterno multum manantia fletu; Ov. Tr. 3.3.81-4; Lattimore 1942: 172ff.). Unlike Catullus' journey to his brother's grave, Martial is unable to make the journey to Egypt for this simple act, which heightens the pathos of this epigram. Nor is he able to carry out the traditional offerings for the deceased; these offerings included such items as flowers (Verg. A. 6.883-5), and incense and spices thrown on the rogus or funeral pyre (cf. Mart. 10.97; these spices were also rubbed on the body; see Kay on 11.54.2; also 6.85.12). These rituals are also a standard feature of sepulchral literature (Lattimore 1942: 128).

sed datur aeterno victurum carmine nomen:
    numquid et hoc, fallax Nile, negare potes?

The final sentiment is the gift of this poem which Martial is able to present in commemoration of his dead friend. The phrase aeterno carmine also evokes language of sepulchral epitaphs in sentiments such as aeterno somno (see Lattimore 1942: 82ff.). The strength of this gift is that this poem will provide an immortal memory of his name in literature, which not even the fallax Nile can destroy. Martial addresses
the Nile as fallax which is in keeping with the idea of the treachery of the Egyptians (Prop. 4.11.33; Theocritus 15.49), but also reproaches the river for its refusal to return his friend to him. The term fallax might also recall Pompey’s treacherous murder in Egypt (cf. Luc. 8.623-4 aevumque sequens speculatur ab omni/ orbe ratem Phariamque fidem; 8.827 quid tibi, saeva, precer pro tanto crimine, tellus?). Since Varus is a soldier, the echo may be used to rank him alongside Pompey in greatness and as a loss to Rome.

10.27

Pretensions to grandeur, and men affecting social positions which are above them, are commonly addressed in Martial and by satirists in general, such as Juvenal and Petronius (Juv. 3.153-9; Petr. 26ff.; Mart. 5.8; cf. Malnati 1988: 133-41, who argues that Martial’s primary objective in such epigrams is the exposure of such posturing; see also Sullivan 1991: 162). Despite Diodorus’ wealth, which enables him to invite men from the senatorial and equestrian orders to his birthday party, men from these upper classes still regard him from the perspective of his low birth. Diodorus represents a typical example of the individual who flaunts his wealth by the offering of extravagant gifts, and his wealth attracts clients from the upper classes (see 10.15). Criticism is directed towards social standards in Rome where respectable men from senatorial and equestrian rank seek rewards from a man born from humble stock. Freedmen are a regular target of Martial’s poems, particularly in the effect of their wealth in Roman society (see Kay on the Zoilus cycle in Book 11; cf. also 10.34; 80). Diodorus’ display of wealth in the presentation of excessive amounts of money in the sportula reflects the importance of wealth, but does not guarantee social esteem.
Diodorus is celebrating his birthday with a celebratory feast, as was common Roman practice. A feature of the party was the giving out of presents which Martial converts into the *sportula* which in the first century CE was a gift of money for the clients. Martial diminishes the effect of birthday celebrations by bringing the client/patronage relationship into the poem combined with the attitudes to wealthy freedmen of humble parentage.

The poem begins in exactly the same manner as that of 10.24 which celebrates Martial’s own birthday, although it is quite contrasting in tone. Note the transition from solemnity in 10.26 to humorous sarcasm in 10.27, while still retaining the continuity of theme on commemorations of death and birthdays on the whole.

**Natali, Diodore, tuo conviva senatus**
**accubat et rarus non adhibetur eques,**
**et tua tricenos largitur sportula nummos.**

Diodorus is most likely fictitious. His name appears in similar circumstances as a miserly rich man at 1.98 and as an Egyptian poet at 9.40 (see Henriksen’s note). Here the name suits the satirical nature of the poem, where Diodorus presents gifts to those of higher social status (cf. Calliodorus of 10.11; 31, who also incurs Martial’s contempt for the extravagance and flaunting of a patron’s wealth with disregard of more needy clients).

Invitations to dinner parties made up a substantial part of payment to clients in return for their attendance upon patrons throughout the day. Martial refers repeatedly to such invitations throughout his books (cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. *Dinners*). Here Martial specifically refers to the attendance of senators and equestrians at banquets (cf. 14.1.1 *synthesibus dum gaudet eques dominusque senator*). Such a notion occurs on several
other occasions to illustrate the boasts of an individual who mistakenly thinks he is held in high regard socially because he invites senators and the like (cf. 7.76.2; 9.48.7 *at tu continuo populumque patresque vocasti*; compare 8.49, where Martial praises Domitian for inviting people of all status to his feast).

Birthday feasts were a traditional feature of celebrations in Rome and were accompanied by the presentation of gifts (see 10.24; also cf. 7.86; 11.65 with Kay; Juv. 11.84). Instead of receiving gifts, the wealthy Diodorus is handing out gifts of money to his clients who are from a higher social status. The *sportula* was originally a basket of food presented as a gift to clients and it extended to the form of money during the empire (see Henriksén on 9.85.4). The usual amount was 100 quadrantes but Martial occasionally mentions the receipt of larger amounts from some extravagant patrons (8.42; see Henriksén on 9.100).

*nemo tamen natum te, Diodore, putat.*

The poem concludes with a colloquial expression which mocks Diodorus' humble background and which enforces the idea that despite his wealth those from the higher classes are there only for the money and still do not regard him as belonging to their rank. The ironic humour of the line relies upon the meaning of *natum non putare* as a colloquial expression which expresses the sense of 'to regard as a nonentity' (cf. Grewing 1998: 335-6; also see OLD s.v. *puto* 5c; see Kay on 11.65 and 11.12). As such, it suggests that Diodorus' supposed status is that of a wealthy freedman. For similar expressions cf. 4.83.4 *nec quisquam liber nec tibi natus homo est*; 8.64.18 *natum te, Clyte, nec semel putabo*; 11.65.6 *sescentis hodie, cras mihi natus eris*; Petr. 58.10 *ergo aut tace aut meliorem noli molestare, qui te natum non putat*; Sen. *Apoc.*
10.27

3.2 nemo enim unquam illum natum putavit; Tac. Ann. 11.21 Curtius Rufus videtur
mihi ex se natus (Otto: 238).

10.28

This is a prayer to the god Ianus culminating in a request for everlasting peace for Rome. The god is addressed in a manner typical of a prayer to a deity where the god’s attributes are invoked first, although the god is not formally addressed by name until line 6 and the poem concludes with the actual request (cf. 10.7; Cairns 1972: 218).

The description of Ianus follows the Augustan model given in Ovid’s Fasti 1.63-283, where he is presented as the god of beginnings and the deity invoked first in all prayers and official ceremonies. As the god of doors and gates (ianua), a special aspect of his cult was his involvement with the opening and closing of the gates of war, which were located near the Ianus Geminus shrine on the north side of the forum (Platner-Ashby: 278-9). These gates remained open during times of war and were closed on specific occasions to denote the declaration of peace at Rome (Ov. Fast. 1.279-81; Syme RP 3: 1182-3). The gates were closed only twice prior to Augustus, first by Numa Pompilius, and then a second time at the end of the First Punic War (Var. L. 5.165; Syme RP 3: 1179). Augustus himself proclaims that he brought about the closing of the gates three times during his reign (Res Gestae 13; Liv. 1.19.3).

The closing of the gates was a momentous occasion throughout Roman history, but became more significant during the empire. Their significance as a symbol of peace was a development of the Augustan age to represent the restoration of stability and the prospect of peace and prosperity to Rome under the new regime, and as such became closely associated with imperial panegyric in Horace, Vergil, and
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Ovid (Hor. *Carm.* 4.15; *Ep.* 1.1.54; 2.1.255-6; Verg. *A.* 1.294; 7.605-10; 8.357; Liv. 1.19.3; 1.32.9; 8.9; Ov. *Fast.* 1.63ff.). Following the precedent of Augustus, the closing of the gates was established as a significant achievement by emperors as a symbol of peace and prosperity under their reign (V. Fl. 2.620; Sen. *Apoc.* 9.2; Sil. 12.718; Luc. 1.62; Stat. *Silv.* 4.1; 3; for the occasions on which the gates were closed throughout the empire, see Syme *RP* 3: 1179-97).

The significance of Ianus as guardian of the gates gradually increased during the empire. His image first appears on imperial coinage during the reign of Nero (BMC 64-6, 111.113; 156; 198, 201-4, 225-6, 310, 372, see Darwall-Smith 1996: 40). The god achieved greatest prominence during Domitian's reign with the construction of the temple of Ianus Quadrifrons in the Forum Transitorium in about 95 (Mart. 8.2; Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.9-10; Nauta 2002: 353, see Platner-Ashby: 280; Syme *RP* 3: 1193-4; Darwall-Smith 1996: 121-2). Although construction commenced during Domitian's reign, the Forum Transitorium was officially dedicated by Nerva in 97 (Richardson: 167-9, Platner-Ashby: 227-9).

The first mention of Ianus in Martial occurs in Book 7 on the forthcoming return of Domitian to Rome (7.8.6) to denote the onset of the new year. Ianus also is addressed twice in Book 8 (2 and 8) to celebrate the return of Domitian from his campaign against the Sarmatians in January 93 (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.171; 4.1.39 with Coleman 1988: 78; Suet. *Dom.* 6.1; also Mart. 8.15.5-6; Jones 1993: 152-3). In these poems, Domitian's triumphant return to Rome will ensure the establishment of peace and prosperity to the empire. This is a deliberate recollection of the Augustan models, and more specifically of Horace's imperial poetry which proclaims Augustus as the restorer of peace and stability (*Carm.* 4 especially 4.15; for the associations of peace

Domitian's special relationship with Janus is reflected in both Martial's and Statius' poetry, and a fundamental theme for both is the god's bestowal of long life upon the emperor (Mart. 8.2.5-7 *et lingua pariter loquitus omni/ terrarum domino deoque rerum/ promisit Pyliam quater senectam*; Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.11 *ipse etiam immensi reparator maximus aevi*; also 17-18; 37; see Scott 1936: 106, 157). Statius *Silvae* 4.1 celebrates the inauguration of Domitian into the consulship, where the god Janus actually addresses Domitian and panegyric *topoi* include the hopes for peace in the new year along with the closing of Janus' gates (4.1.13; see Coleman 1988: 64ff.). The assurance of the emperor's long life as an aspect of the imperial panegyric *topoi* extends to the concept of the *aeternitas* of the empire (Scott 1936: 154).

Although the emperor is not identified in this poem, it is obvious that this poem was not written with Domitian in mind. Martial also associates Janus with the emperor Nerva at 11.4, which addresses Janus in his role to inaugurate the new year and therefore to celebrate the beginning of Nerva's consulship in January 97. Because of this link between Nerva and Janus, it seems most likely that 10.28 is associated with Nerva's reign and was composed at the end of 97 when Nerva opened the temple of Minerva in the Forum Transitorium (Friedlaender on 10.28.1; Nauta 2002: 353-4; contra Syme *RP* 3: 1193, and Coleman 1988: 69). Although the poem is intended for Nerva, it is included in the second edition of Book 10 published at the start of Trajan's reign. The request for ever-lasting peace at Rome seems appropriate
in the context of the proclamation of a new emperor, especially given Trajan's recent successful military campaigns in the north (10.6; 7).

Annorum nitidique sator pulcherrime mundi,  
publica quem primum vota precesque vocant,

The poem begins in conventional prayer form to the god Ianus appealing to his qualities (cf. 8.2.1 fastorum genitor paresque Ianus; Verg. G. 1.5-6 vos o clarissima mundi/ lumina, labentem caelo quae ducitis annum). These first lines introduce the god Ianus and his various functions. As the first month of the year was named after him, Ianus was concerned with ceremonies beginning the new year (Ov. Fast. 1.65 anni tacite labentis origo; Mart. 8.2.1; Luc. 5.5), especially the inauguration of the consules ordinarii which began in his month (cf. Stat. Silv. 4.1 which celebrates Domitian's seventeenth consulship on the first of January; Coleman 1988: 62-4; also Mart. 8.66.9; 11.4; Ov. Pont. 4.4.23-6). In addition to the new year, Ianus is associated with beginnings in general (Hor. S. 2.6.20-2 matutine pater, seu 'Jane', libentius audis/ unde homines operum primos vitaeque labores/ instituunt), and as the originator of everything (Ov. Fast. 1.63-112), hence Martial's designation of Ianus as sator. Ianus was associated with the granting of the people's wishes at the new year ceremonies and was the first god invoked in all prayers and ceremonies: max ego, cur, quamvis aliorum numina placem/ Jane, tibi primum tura merumque fero?/ ut possis aditum per me, qui limina seruo/ ad quoscumque voles' inquit 'habere deos' (Ov. Fast. 171-4; see also Sen. Apoc. 9; Liv. 8.9.6; Hor. Ep. 1.16.59). For more on Ianus see Syme RP 3: 1179-97.
"mundus" is commonly used by Martial to describe the Roman world (cf. Stat. Silv. 4.1.17 where Ianus himself addresses Domitian as "parens mundi"; also cf. Mart. 7.7.5 "te summe mundi rector, et, parens orbis; also 12.62.1 "antiqui rex magne poli mundique prioris"), as it covers not only the "orbis terrarum" (Hor. S. 1.3.112), but the heavens ("mundus caeli"; cf. N-H on Hor. Carm. 1.12.15; TLL 8.1635.13-84; see Vioque on 7.7.5; Verg. G. 1.5-6). Martial frequently associates the adjective "nitidus" with "astra" (8.36.7; 9.51.7; also 8.21.9 "tarda tamen nitidae non cedunt sidera luci; Stat. Silv. 1.2.147; 2.1.94; also to water 12.98.2), and its use here as an epithet to "mundus" reflects the divine radiance which Ianus as god of the new year will bestow on the world.

The adjective "publica" is used on only one other occasion in Martial, notably in an imperial panegyric on Domitian’s return to Rome (7.6.5). Martial favours "populus" to refer to the Roman people and "publica" is rarely used in Roman poetry except in Horace (Carm. 4.2.41-2; Vioque on 7.6.5). This perhaps suggests a further recollection of Augustan poetry and the incorporation of peace and stability under Augustus.

pervius exiguos habitabas ante penates,
plurima qua medium Roma terebat iter:

Martial here refers to the site dedicated to Janus Geminus in the north-eastern corner of the Forum; hence the crowds of passers by. It constituted a passageway of 'two arched gates with double doors, joined by lateral walls to form a rectangle' (Syne RP 3: 1179). Martial implies that Ianus, as god of peace and the conveyer of the new
year, deserves a more worthy temple, and the location of Ianus Geminus is contrasted with the splendour of the temple to which this poem refers in the following lines.

\[
\text{nunc tua Caesareis cinguntur limina donis}
\]
\[
\text{et fora tot numeras, Iane, quot ora geris.}
\]

These lines clearly refer to the temple of Ianus Quadrifrons which was built in the Transitorium or Forum Nervae and contained a four faced statue of Ianus which was brought to Rome from Falerii in 241 BCE (Servius A. 7.607; Macrobius 1.9.13; Syme RP 3: 1193). The idea that Ianus has as many statues as there are fora denotes the four faces of the statue observing the four fora: the Forum Romanum, Augustum, Pacis, and Transitorium (although its exact location and design is still disputed see Platner-Ashby: 280; Darwall-Smith 1996: 120-2; cf. also Mart. 8.2.3-4 tot vultus sibi non satis putavit optavitque oculos habere plures; 10.51.12 fora iuncta quater). The completion of this temple was celebrated in 95, as evidenced by Martial (cf. 8.2; also Stat. Silv. 4.1; Coleman 1988: 71, on Stat. Silv. 4.1.12), but the reference here clearly refers to gifts from Nerva, in all likelihood in the context of Nerva’s opening of the Forum Transitorium in 97, and does not bear any associations with Domitian.

Ovid’s Ianus is represented as biceps or biformis (Fast. 1.65; 89) for the two sides of every door: omnis habet geminas, hinc atque hinc, ianua frontes, e quibus haec populum spectat (Ov. Fast. 135-6). Ianus is traditionally looking out from the threshold with countenances in two directions (compare Stat. Silv. 4.1.12 utroque a limine; Verg. A. 7.610 nec custos abstiit limine Ianus; Luc. 1.61-2 pax missa per orbem/ferrea belligeri compescat limina Ian). The representation of the four sides of
Ianus appears to be a more recent formation (Syme RP 3: 1191), and is suggested by Shackleton Bailey as representing the four seasons (SB² 2: 160, on 8.2).

The gifts of Caesar refer perhaps to the ornamentations of the new temple (cf. 8.65.7 *grande loci meritum testuntur et altera dona*). The second line also suggests the association of Ianus with arches and doorways; it refers to the *Ianus Medius*, which was designated the place in the forum as a single archway (Cic. *Off.* 2.87; Hor. S. 2.3.18 further see Platner-Ashby: 275-6). The address to Ianus does not occur frequently in Latin literature, but was often used as an invocation (Liv. 1.32.9; 8.9; Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.59; S. 2.6.20; Juv. 6.394) or in connection with bringing in the new year (Ov. *Fast.* 5.424; *Pont.* 4.4.23; Pers. 1.58). The most obvious literary precedent for the address to Ianus occurs in Martial Book 8, where he is addressed in association with the coming of the new near and the return of Domitian to Rome following his recent victories on the Danube (cf. 8.2; 8).

*at tu, sancte pater, tanto pro munere gratus,*
*ferrea perpetua claustra tuere sera.*

The conclusion reveals the sole purpose for the poet’s appeal to the god, a prayer for peace and stability. The address to Ianus as *sancte pater* occurs frequently in literature and reflects his authority as the god of beginnings (Ov. *Fast.*1.279ff.; Juv. 6.394; Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.59; cf. also Mart. 8.2.1 *fastorum genitor parensque Ianus*); it is also typical in an address to a deity (cf. Mart. 10.7.1; 12.62.7). As a contrast, in Statius' *Silvae*, Ianus addresses Domitian as *magnus parens mundi* (4.1.17; cf. also *Silv.* 4.2.15; Mart. 7.7.5 *summe mundi rector et parens orbis*) which reflects Domitian's divine status (see Coleman 1988: 72, on 4.1.17).
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Ianus was regarded as god of doors and gates (*ianua*), which culminated in his public duty as official guardian who controlled the opening of the gates of war during wartime and the closing of the gates as a declaration of peace at Rome, as described by the god himself in the *Fasti*: *ut populo reditus pateat ad bello profecto/ tota patet dempta ianua nostra sera./ pace fores obdo, ne qua discedere possit; Caesareoque diu numini clauses ero*’ (Ov. *Fast.* 1.279-83). The language is typical of such themes and echoes earlier references to the closure of the gates, especially those which celebrate Augustus’ role as the instigator of peace and stability to Rome (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 4.15.9 *Ianum Quirini clausit*; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.253ff. *clastraque custodem/ pacis cohibentia Ianum*; Ov. *Fast.* 1.218-19).

10.29

Martial returns to the theme of gift exchange arising from the obligations of friendship (cf. 10. 11; 14; 17(18); 18; 19). Sextilianus is the typical example of the friend who neglects his duties of friendship towards the poet. Although he used to present or swap gifts with Martial, on occasions such as the Saturnalia and his birthday, now he presents them to girlfriends in return for sexual favours. The recurrence of this theme, good and bad friendship, which received considerable attention in the earlier part of the book, again changes the thematic direction, and reminds the reader of Martial’s discontentment with social behaviour at Rome. Although the application of this theme here lacks the same intensity with which it is earlier conveyed, 10.29 instigates a group of poems in a pattern similar to the earlier section of the book, but on a much smaller scale (30; 31). The desire to leave Rome is clarified in the following poem, 10.30, which is dedicated to Domitius Apollinaris, already addressed at 10.12 for his
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good fortune at being able to leave Rome for a holiday. 10.31 considers the greed of a man who sells his slave for the sake of one extravagant meal. It could perhaps seem ironic that 10.29 follows a poem glorifying everlasting peace at Rome, hence also portraying Rome as the superior power, but this again demonstrates Martial’s separation between Rome as the ideal entity and the actuality of living there for the poet.

The poet presents two typical occasions when gifts would have been expected, the Saturnalia and his birthday, the Kalends of March (10.24). He voices his outrage that Sextilianus gives his girlfriend a gift on the Saturnalia, when it is customary to give presents to men and children. And though the Kalends of March was the date of the Matronalia festival where it was traditional for women to receive gifts, the reader is aware that this day also coincides with Martial’s birthday, for already in 10.24 he joked that even women and girls give him presents on this day, despite its concurrence with the Matronalia. Not only does Sextilianus abuse the obligations of friendship by not giving anything to the poet, but the fact that he gives the presents to a girl on both these occasions intensifies the insult and outrage felt by the poet. Compare the more elaborate version of this situation at 9.2, where Martial criticises Lupus for mistreating his clients and friends and spending lavishly on his mistress.

Gifts of silver dishes and togas on such occasions are frequently mentioned in Martial (cf. the silver dishes at the Saturnalia 4.88; 7.54; and the gift of togas cf. 2.85; 8.28; 10.15 (14); 12.36). The gift of the green dinner gown for his girlfriend instead of the toga for Martial indicates Sextilianus’ preference for foreign extravagance and luxury over traditional Roman symbols, as emphasised by the use of the Greek terms *prasina synthesis*. The colour of the gown (leek-green) enhances the
image of frivolity and extravagance in contrast with the whiteness of the toga. Despite Martial's mention of the toga elsewhere as a source of complaint in association with the duties of the client and the hardships which they entail, here it reflects traditional Roman values (cf. André 1949: 295). Sextilianus ruins the principle of gift-exchange in the obligations of friendship, not only by not giving any gifts to the poet but also by presenting those gifts to a female companion.

The poem is arranged in three sets of couplets. Each of the first two pairs opens with *quam* with the examples of occasions where Martial does not receive gifts, a dish at the Saturnalia and clothing on the Kalends of March. There seems to be a formulaic pattern for these first two couplets intensified by significant contrast of tenses. The imperfect tense, which refers to the time when Sextilianus presented to the poet in the past (*mittebas, donebas*), is contrasted by the perfects *misisti* and *empta est* in the second line (this is a fairly common pattern in the epigrams cf. 9.88.1-2 *cum me captares, mittebas munera nobis* postquam cepisti, *das mihi, Rufē, nihil*). The final couplet provides the resolution of the poet with *iam*, and the heightened contrast is created by the use of the perfect and present tenses. The obscene *futuis* provides a dramatic finish to the poem and appropriately expresses Martial's contempt for Sextilianus in return for his insults (cf. 10.15.10 *quam quad me coram pedere, Crispe, soles*).

*Quam mihi mittebas Saturni tempore lancem,*
*misisti dominae, Sextiliane, tuae;*

Due to the nature of the epigram, it is most likely that Sextilianus is a fictitious character. He appears in only three other poems in Martial, where the themes bear no
relation to his character at 10.29, although on each occasion he is a target of criticism. At 1.11 and 26, he is mocked for his drunkenness following the distribution of tokens from the games which were exchanged for gifts. At 6.54 he is the subject of wordplay on his preference for homosexual practices. The name is rarely found outside Martial (eight times in CIL; cf. Kajanto Cognomina: 155).

Perhaps the diminutive derivative of this name conveys contempt, but other than for metrical effect (such names occur frequently in Martial for satirical purposes and are often fictional, e.g. Gargilianus, Caecilianus, Pontilianus, see Nauta 2002: 47 n.30; also on diminutives and the addition of suffixes to names, see Giegengack 1969: 24), there seems little special significance for the name.

Martial uses domina more frequently than amica to denote the title of mistress. Here the title is more appropriate to suggest the degree of power which the girlfriend has over Sextilianus. Also cf. 9.2 where a variety of different terms is used for Lupus’ mistress in a derogatory manner with adultera, domina, moecha and puella.

The Saturnalia was generally cause for licentious behaviour, freedom, and gift-giving (see 10.18 also Leary on 14.4). Its celebration is frequently mentioned in Martial’s poems in the context of gift-giving, particularly on the occasions where people give either no presents or presents small in value (cf. 2.85; 4.46; 88; 5.19; 84; 7.53; 12.81; see further Harrison 2001: 295ff.) The lanx, a serving dish often made of silver or other precious metals, seems to be a typical gift on the Saturnalia, and Martial refers to it on several occasions (7.72.4; 14.97; cf. Leary on 14.97.1; as a gift also cf. 4.54).
et quam donabas dictis a Marte Kalendis, 
de nostra prasina est synthesis empta toga.

Martial mentions his birthday a number of times in his epigrams, more specifically for the fact it occurred on the same day as the Matronalia where it was traditional for all women to receive gifts (cf. 10.24).

The garment which Sextilianus presents to his mistress is the synthesis, generally identified as dinner gown with matching tunic and pallium (Croom 2000: 39; Lindsay 2000: 325-6; Wilson 1938: 169ff.). This term is used rarely in Roman literature, mostly in Martial and Statius, and it was traditionally worn at the Saturnalia because of its loose-fitting nature as a symbol of freedom particularly in contrast with the uncomfortable toga which represents the formal elements of everyday life such as the salutatio (cf. 2.46.4; 4.66.4; 5.79.2; 14.1.1 with Leary’s note; 142; the term is also used for pottery at 4.46.15; Stat. Silv. 4.9.44). Women also changed into special garments when dining in company (Croom 2000: 87).

The colour of this dinner gown is described as prasina, a distinctive shade of green, which became accepted during the empire as one of the racehorse colours at the circus (Mart. 10.48.23; 11.48.23; Suet. Cal. 55.7; Nero 22.1). In other literary examples the term appears synonymous with images of extravagance and lavishness (Petr. 28.8, 27.2; 64.6; Mart. 3.82.11; see André 1949: 295; for the gifts of brightly coloured gowns for women cf. 2.39).

Note the complex word order of these two lines. The postponement of the antecedent toga until the end of the sentence perhaps reflects the long wait by the poet for his gift (which in fact never arrives).
iam constare tibi gratis coepere puellae:  
muneribus futuis, Sextilane, meis.

Sextilianus adds insult to injury by bestowing gifts not on one *domina*, but on several, indicated by *puellae*, the more general term for girlfriend (*OLD* s.v. *puella* 3b).

The expression *constare gratis* appears only once elsewhere in Book 10, at 10.3.12 in the context of Martial’s refusal to compose slanderous poetry about real individuals. This repetition may be coincidental, as there is no obvious connection between the two poems, except perhaps for the fact that Martial’s criticism is directed towards a fictitious individual. Also, both poems refer to an element of deprivation or treachery which has befallen the poet.

This is the first appearance of the term *futuo* in Book 10, and appears frequently throughout Martial’s corpus (forty-nine times, see Adams 1982: 118-22; cf. 10.81.1). In this context, not only is its literal meaning intended, but it also conveys Martial’s utter contempt for Sextilianus’ dismissive approach to the gift-exchange process. Such a strong word in contrast with the language of the rest of the poem effectively provides the ultimate insult.

10.30

The superiority of life at Apollinaris’ villa at Formiae continues the theme of the urban-rural contrast prevalent in the book (10.12; 13; see Spisak 2002: 134, Merli 2006: 260ff.). This theme is presented in terms of a lengthy description of nature’s abundance and never-ending supply of produce at the villa. The tour of the summer resorts south of Italy enjoyed as a respite from the heat of Rome and the depiction of indolent life enjoyed at the villa are abruptly contrasted in the final five lines,
reminding Apollinaris that his slaves are enjoying a carefree lifestyle while he is occupied with business in Rome. The reality of life at Rome represented in terms of slavery in contrast with the ideal free life enjoyed outside Rome culminates in the poet’s assessment that the roles of master and slave have been reversed.

Although we can not tell if this poem was included in the original edition of Book 10, Domitius Apollinaris was suffect consul between July 1 and September 1 of 97, which might suggest an occasion for the piece (for the dates of his office see Syme RP 7: 588ff.). Despite reluctance from some scholars to identify Domitius of 10.12 as Apollinaris (Jenkins on 10.30.7, White 1975: 295, Sherwin-White on Plin. Ep. 2.9, contra Nauta 2002: 161, Syme RP 7: 598), similar themes and motifs seem to suggest that the two poems are strongly connected to each other. It is significant that both epigrams depict journeys towards specific geographical locations around Italy. 10.12 presents a brief version of Apollinaris’ travels north along the Aemilian way for his summer holiday. In 10.30, the topographical description is far more detailed and the poet takes the reader on a tour of the summer resort locations south of Rome where Apollinaris owned villas, towards his allotted destination, his villa at Formiae. It is perhaps significant that his preferred destination is also that furthest away from Rome. In both poems, the difference in lifestyles within and outside Rome is heavily contrasted in accordance with the rural/urban motif (Spisak 2002: 127-41).

Unlike in 10.12 where Apollinaris has already left Rome for his vacation in northern Italy, in 10.30 the constraints of business in Rome prevent him from even leaving Rome to enjoy the pleasures which life at his haven in Formiae offer. The idea that even the most important men such as Apollinaris are slaves to life at Rome is reiterated (cf. 10.12.6 urbano releves colla perusta iugo) in the last five lines of the
the idea that these masters serve their own slaves who are enjoying the lifestyle at these country villas intended for their masters. The concept that the slave’s life is happier than the master’s is not uncommon in such poetry (cf. 9.92; Juv. 9.41-5), and is associated with the different lifestyles in the urban-rural contrast (e.g. Hor. S. 2.6, Merli 2006: 260ff.). The motif heightens Martial’s comment on the reality of Apollinaris’ lifestyle in Rome, that wealth and importance do not necessarily confer happiness. The description of the villa and his ownership of villas in other resort locations demonstrates the immense wealth and superior status of Apollinaris, yet Martial makes it clear that, in his opinion, such material possessions do not guarantee a free life at Rome.

Such poems in praise of a patron’s villa occur regularly in Martial’s books, and other examples intended for particular patrons include those to Faustinus (3.58; 10.51), Julius Martialis (4.64) and even the emperor (5.1; also see 12.51, cf. also the satirical 3.47; also cf. Stat. Silv. 1.3; 2.2). The respect and gratitude towards patrons and friends is expressed in the description of a villa and is a feature of poems by Martial (3.58; 4.64; 10.51; 12.50) and Statius (Silv. 1.3; 2.2; 4.2.18-67), although the manner of presentation by the two poets is extremely different. The poems of Statius on the topic of villas display erudition on a far more lavish scale with extensive use of mythological allusions and other poetical devices for a grand effect. There is perhaps a suggestion of parody or imitation of Statius in Martial’s poems in the use of such stylistic devices as metonymy (3.58.6; 10.30.6-10; Stat. Silv. 4.4.12ff.), epic or grandiose language (fessus 10.30.3, aequor; pictam), and similes (10.30.14). Even the length of these poems suggests some imitation of Statius or an attempt to imitate an elevated style. In Martial’s poems on villas, there is considerable focus on the
lifestyle which accompanies the ownership of such a place, and frequently his use of irony and uncomplicated imagery of 'real life' at the villa undercuts the grandiose style.

The style and content is typical of such poems intended for one of Martial's wealthy benefactors of considerably higher status, and contains sophisticated poetical language as befits the poem's general tone of praise and admiration. Several thematic sections can be distinguished in the poem. In the first section (1-10), Martial does not directly address the intended recipient of the poem, but refers to Apollinaris in the third person (other poems such as 3.58 and 4.64 do not directly address the subject either, which suggests that such a device is common practice in such poems). Instead, Domitius' villa at Formiae is formally addressed in a tone of praise and admiration for the pleasures which the villa offers in contrast with any other location as a respite from Rome. This device is more effective than a direct address to Apollinaris, and is complemented by the address to Roma, who in line 25 is preventing Apollinaris from visiting Formiae.

The middle section of the poem (11-24) depicts the idyllic activities which the villa has to offer, such as sailing, being kept cool by the gentle breeze from a fan, and fishing. In contrast, the final five lines express concern for his patron confined by business affairs in Rome, and who is unable to enjoy these simpler pleasures at his villa. The paradox is completed by the notion that his servants take advantage of the countryside in his place. Although the use of choliambic metre seems out of context for this poem, its satirical quality contributes to this irony (Jenkins ad loc.).

Although the praise of a villa appears a common enough subject dedicated to private individuals, it is significant that the motif of the fish controlled by its masters
(lines 21-4), which represents the subjugation of the forces of nature, occurs in 4.30 as an example of imperial panegyric. Martial’s motives for adapting language previously reserved for the emperor towards a private patron are unclear. The similarity of the language between the two poems suggests that the poet is either elevating his manner of praise to a worthy man such as Apollinaris or is possibly denigrating the language of imperial praise. Such a prominent imperial motif directed towards a private individual warrants attention, particularly as this is the only occasion on which this motif appears in a non-imperial context.

This poem bears certain similarities to 10.20, which purports to send the book to Pliny on the Esquiline. Both poems (which depict a journey of some kind) reflect the superiority of the recipient in status and his condescension in accepting Martial’s poetry despite his commitment to more important business affairs. The gentle irony emphasising the fact that important business prevents him from enjoyment and entertainment indicates an element of playfulness with the genre and lightens the tone of the poem.

This epigram has attracted considerable attention, especially concerning its literary antecedents and its influence on subsequent poetic panegyrics of grand villas and mansions (Jenkins ad loc.). Also see Jenkins ad loc.; Colton 1967: 41-4; Nauta 2002: 161, Merli 2006: 260ff.).

O temperatae dulce Formiae litus,  
vos, cum severi fugit oppidum Martis  
et inquietas fessus exuit curas,  
Apollinaris omnibus locis praefert.
The poem opens with an address to Formiae, which was a town on the coast of Latium, a popular location for holiday villas (RE 6.2857). Admiration for its surroundings is a typical feature of this style of poetry (e.g. Hor. Ep. 1.16.8; Stat. Silv. 1.3.5-8; 29-30; 2.2.13-16). The use of the apostrophe establishes the formal tone and reflects the gravity of the occasion (cf. 2.4; 4.56; 75; 9.23; 10.38; 12.24; 32, see also Colton 1967: 42 who compares it to Catul. 31.12-13, salve, o venusta Sirmio, atque ero gaude/ gaudente, vosque, o Lydiae lacus undae). Here the emphasis is on the actual location and the pleasures it offers Domitius Apollinaris.

In contrast, Rome is starkly described in language more suitable to poems which display Rome as a superior military power. This is particularly evident in the metonymy of oppidum...Martis for Rome, employed elsewhere in Martial only in a poem to celebrate Domitian’s return from his Sarmatian campaigns (8.65.12 hos aditus urbem Martis habere decet; cf. also Petr. 55.6.1 luxuriae rictu Martis marcent moenia). The epithet severus enhances the grim presentation of Rome in contrast with the appealing quality of Formiae (dulce). The use of oppidum for Rome as opposed to the more usual urbs is rare in Roman literature, and seems to be an archaic form which appears in Livy (42.20.3; 45.16.5; 42.36.1) and Varro (L. 6.14, cf. Jenkins ad loc.). Such an unusual and archaic term is intended to emphasise the derogatory attitude towards the city in accordance with the satirical play on the urban-rural contrast.

The notion of Apollinaris fleeing harsh Rome anticipates the images of slavery towards the end of the poem. Language such as inquietas curas reflects the noise and bustle of Rome in contrast with the tranquillity of the countryside (cf. Mart. 12.18.1-2 dum tu forsitan inquietus erras/ clamosa, Juvenalis, in Subura; compare Stat.
Silv.1.3.41-2 *qua tibi tota quies offensaque turbine nullo/ nox silet et nigros imitantia murmura somnos*?). A term such as *fessus* is rare in Martial (5 times, as opposed to his preferred use of *lassus*), but features in Statius’ poetry in a similar context (e.g. Silv. 2.2.48 on the villa of Pollius; 4.2).

non ille sanctae dulce Tibur uxoris,  
nec Tusculanos Algidosve secessus,  
Praeneste nec sic Antiumque miratur;

Martial distinguishes Formiae as Apollinaris’ preferred summer retreat with a geographical tour of popular summer resorts, where Apollinaris may have owned additional villas (Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.45 with Sherwin-White). The tour begins in the hills east of Rome and continues south along the coast of Latium towards its eventual destination at Formiae, perhaps selected for being furthest from Rome. The list of places on a geographical journey as signposts is a regular feature in Martial’s poems (1.70; 10.12; 20) and creates a vivid image for the reader of the journey taken to reach Formiae.

First mentioned is Tibur, which was located east of Rome in the Sabine hills (note the repetition of *dulce* from the opening line), and was popular for its cool climate as a respite from the heat of Rome (e.g. 1.12.1; 4.57.10; 4.60; 5.71). Apollinaris’ wife was either from Tibur or owned her own villa. She is described as *sancta*, which traditionally denotes female chastity and respectability, and is an admirable quality of Roman women (cf. 6.29.2; 11.53.5; further see Jenkins *ad loc.*). This perhaps foreshadows the series of poems on marriage and virtue in the coming poems (e.g. 10.33; 35; 38).
10.30

The journey takes the reader through the hills south of Rome, through districts which were fashionable for their more temperate climates, including Tusculum, fashionable for its more temperate climate (4.64.13-14); Algidus, a mountainous range; Praeneste (4.64.33); and Antium, on the coast of Latium (RE 1.2561.39).

non blanda Circe Dardanisve Caieta desiderantur, nec Marica nec Liris, nec in Lucrina lota Salmacis vena.

The journey continues along the coast of Latium with a list of popular holiday resorts, including Circei, noted for its association with Circe (5.1.5; 11.7.5), and Caieta, southeast of Circei, supposedly named after Aeneas' nurse who died there (for a similar use of metonymy cf. 5.1.5 seu placet Aeneae nutrix seu filia Solis). The river Liris ran south between Latium and Campania, and the nymph Marica possessed a grove through which the river flowed (cf. Leary on 13.83; further see Jenkins ad loc.). The final location is the Lucrine lake which adjoins the Gulf of Baiae, and was famous for its oysters (1.62; 4.57; 6.43; 13.82; 90; see Howell and Citroni on 1.62). Salmacis was the nymph associated with Hermaphroditus (cf. Ov. Met. 15.319, see Mart. 10.4.6), and although her spring was originally located in Halicarnassus in Asia Minor, Martial appears to have deliberately transferred her to the Lucrine lake (cf. 6.68.9). Perhaps it is the dubious moral lifestyle for which the area of Baiae was renowned (see Jenkins ad loc.).

Metonymy is used liberally throughout this passage in keeping with the elegant style of the poem. Circei (blanda Circe), Minturnae (Marica), and the Lucrine Lake (vena Salmacis) are deliberately metonymised into alluring females in
contrast with Apollinaris’ virtuous (sancta) wife, perhaps as a witty touch to entertain Apollinaris. It also parallels the erotic image of the girl with her purple fan at 14-15.

hic summa leni stringitur Thetis vento;
ne nec languet aequor, viva sed quies ponti
pictam phaselon aduvante fert aura,
The middle section of the poem focuses on the idyllic existence enjoyed at the villa in Formiae. Metonymy is employed again in the form of a beautiful mythical female, with Thetis, the famed sea-nymph, to denote the sea (cf. 5.1.2; 10.14; Allen et al., 1970: 356). The language is intentionally poetic (e.g. viva sed quies; stringitur - cf. Ov. Met. 4.136; 11.733; aequor - cf. Verg. A. 6.723) in Martial’s endeavour to set the tone of this poetry style. For example, pontus occurs only twice elsewhere in Martial (Sp. 24.6; 9.40.7) and is used elsewhere in satire for parody of the more elevated forms of poetry (Phaedrus 4.7.10; Jenkins ad loc.). This is the only occasion in which Martial uses the term phaselon; it denotes a boat used for pleasure sailing, and is frequently described as colourfully painted (Verg. G. 4.287; Juv. 15.127; also cf. Catul. 4.1 ille Phaselon; see Jenkins ad loc.).

sicut puellae non amantis aestatem
mota salubre purpura venit frigus.
The aesthetic pleasures of the holiday resort are enriched by the central simile of a girl keeping cool with a fan. Such use of a simile occurs rarely in Martial (cf. 5.48.5 talis raptus Hylas, talis depresso Achilles), and is most likely deliberately used in imitation of the grand poetic style. Not only does the image of the fan complement
the breeze on the lake to denote coolness as opposed to the stifling heat of Rome, but
the image reflects the luxury of such recreational pursuits.

*purpura* is interpreted as referring to a fan, or *flabella* which is the expected
term used in another poem to denote a fan in similar language (3.82.10-11 *et aestuanti
tenue ventilat frigus supina prasino concubina flabello*). In other usages in Book 10,
*purpura* is used twice by metonymy to denote senators of Rome (10.5.1; 10.10.12;
also 41 and 93), which makes the usage here all the more striking. Here it may simply
reflect the opulence of Apollinaris' estate.

*nec seta longo quaerit in mari praedam,
sed a cubili lectuloque factatam
spectatus alte lineam trahit piscis.*

Fishing was a favourite activity in the countryside, and is mentioned frequently in the
epigrams as such (e.g. Mart. 1.55.9 *et picsem tremula salientem ducere saeta*;
3.58.27; 4.66.7; 9.54.3; Plin. *Ep.* 9.7.4). The image of Apollinaris fishing from the
comfort of his own couch represents the pinnacle of relaxation and idleness.

*si quando Nereus sentit Aeoli regnum,
ridet procellas tuta de suo mensa:*  

*Nereus...Aeoli regnum* is metonymy for the sea (cf. Sp. 34) and continues the high
reference to the sea god Nereus complements Thetis, his daughter, in line 11 above.
The grandeur of the language also increases the ironic impact of the final lines.

Following the images of relaxation and comfort, the benefits of country living
are emphasised in the notion of self-sufficiency from the abundance of produce at the
villa, as is typical of such poems (cf. 3.58; Spisak 2002: 134). Such a motif is characteristic of urban/pastoral contrast, as a feature of the ideal way of life (e.g. 1.49.13ff. and 27ff.; 4.66.5ff.; Tib. 1.3.45; see Citroni on 1.49.13).

piscina rhombum pascit et lupos vernas,
natat ad magistrum delicata murena,
nomenclulator mugilem citat notum
et adesse iussi prodeunt senes mulli.

Such fishponds were typical of wealthy villas, either for personal use or as a profitable part of the estate (4.43; 11.21.11; Plin. Nat. 9.171; Var. R. 3.17.3; Col. 8.16.5; Stat. Silv. 2.2.29; D'Arms 1984: 45 on the location of fishponds; cf. Jenkins ad loc). Fish were commonly kept as pets by the wealthy as a symbol of prestige; there are numerous examples of ‘fish-fanciers’ throughout Roman history (for example Hortensius in Var. R. 3.17.5-8; also Plin. Nat. 9.17.2; Cic. Att. 2.17; Macr. 3.15.4; Toynbee 1973: 210; see Jenkins ad loc.). The duty of the nomenclulator was to announce the names of the clients on admission to the patron. Here the presence of the nomenclulator not only suggests that the fish have names, but also that they represent the clients of Appollinaris. The mugilem is notum; the mulli are senes, details which perhaps humorously reflect the usual list of clients at the patron’s door.

The image of the fish approaching on command represents the conquest over the forces of nature, where the fish approach on command (for Martial’s descriptions of sacred animals and fish, see Weinreich 1928: 143ff.). It is significant that the only other occurrence appears as an example of imperial panegyric for Domitian in almost identical language.
10.30

dum praedam calamo tremente ducit,
raptis luminibus repente caecus
captum non potuit videre piscem,
et nunc sacrilegos perosus hamos
Baianos sedet ad locus rogator.
at tu, dum potes, innocens recede
iactis simplicibus cibis in undas,
et pisces venerare delicatos. (4.30.9-16; cf. also Sp. 11(9); 20(17)).

The adoption of imperial language in 10.30 is possibly merely an expression of Martial’s respect and gratitude towards his patron, which complements the use of elevated language and poetic devices. This type of panegyric towards a private individual does not occur anywhere else in Martial, and perhaps suggests that Martial is deliberately subverting the use of panegyric formerly exclusive to imperial literature.

frui sed istis quando, Roma, permittis?
quot Formianos imputat dies annus
negotiosis rebus urbis haerenti?
o ianitores vilique felices!
dominis parantur ista, serviunt vobis.

The final lines contrast with the enjoyment of the villa’s delights from the previous lines. As with the opening of the poem, it is the location which is addressed. The complaint is made to Roma that she is obstructing Apollinaris’ departure for this idyllic existence. This is strengthened by the emendation to *permittis* rather than the third person *permittit*, and the address to Rome seems more appropriate in the context as an effective parallel to the address to Formiae. In contrast with the poetic language in the description of the villa, the poet employs language normally used in business activities (*imputat*; *negotiosis*), which reinforces the realities of living at Rome. The poem concludes with a pithy exclamation extolling the fortunes of the overseers and
stewards who live at the villa all year round. The gentle humour suggests that Apollinaris is a slave in the city of Rome, serving his own slaves who supposedly live the life of leisure in the country.

10.31

Calliodorus is not wealthy and has sold a slave for twelve hundred sesterces for one lavish meal in his efforts to impress others (cf. 6.77, where Martial berates Afer who simulates wealth despite his extreme poverty). This motif occurs in other poems in different contexts. For example at 3.48 it is employed to criticise Olus for his simulated poverty, and at 12.16 and 33 where Labienus sells land for items of lesser value. The primary objective in these poems is to illustrate the absurdity of such situations.

The subject matter turns abruptly from the idyllic life at Formiae to a depiction of greed and extravagance at Rome. Calliodorus is the same addressee of 10.11, which precedes the other poem for Domitius Apollinaris in this book and perhaps strengthens the link between 10.12 and 10.30. This chiastic arrangement of addressees/recipients of particular poems is not a unique occurrence in Martial’s books, and a similar example can be noted in poems to Gaurus and Parthenius, although the device is used across two separate books between (8.27 and 8.28; 9.49 and 50; Garthwaite 1998: 169). 10.30 and 31 are also linked by the discussion of the relative fate of slaves (serviunt 30.29; servum 31.1), from those who are felices in their existence in the first poem in contrast with those sold for a meal in the latter. In addition, the main course of the meal is a four pound mullet, which is meant to reflect
10.31

a truly extravagant meal. The difficulty of obtaining a single fish contrasts with the abundance of fish at Apollinaris’ country estate in the previous poem.

Addixti servum nummis here mille ducentis,
    ut bene cenas, Calliodore, semel.

Calliodorus appears as a fictitious character several times in Martial’s poems, most recently at 10.11. It appears evident that here, unlike 10.11, the subject is an impoverished Greek freedman who needs to auction a slave for the sake of one extravagant meal (semel). The meaning of the name (giver of fine gifts) perhaps humorously suggests the contrast between his previous (poor) dinners and the lavish meal on this occasion. The auction price of this slave seems relatively cheap, which perhaps confirms the poverty of the owner (although cf. 6.77.9 where a slave is bid for 600 sesterces; the normal price for a slave in Martial is around 100, 000 sesterces, cf. 1.88.1; 3.62.2; 8.13; 11.38; 11.70.1; for further information see Citroni on 1.58; Grewing on 6.66; Kay on 11.38).

The expression bene cenare suggests ostentatious display of wealth (4.68; 7.78; 9.14; 9.19.2), and in this context illustrates Calliodorus’ desire to impress others as a gourmand in a similar fashion (cf. Henriksen on 9.19.2).

nec benen cenasti: mullus tibi quattoremptus
    librarum cenas pompa caputque fuit.

Martial plays on the double meaning of bene to infer both a good meal and the sense of moral correctness (SB² 2: 353, on 10.31; OLD s.v. 4). The serving of mullet was considered a delicacy and often featured in lavish dinner parties as an example of wealth and extravagance (3.77; 11.49; 12.48 with Bowie’s note; Juv. 4.15; 21-5, see
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Colton 1991: 146-8; Petr. 93.2). The extravagance is emphasised by the grand procession (*pompa*) of the fish into the dining area (cf. 12.62.9-10; Petr. 60; Hor. S. 2.8.13-15).

exclamare libet: 'non est hic, improbe, non est piscis, homo est; hominem, Calliodore, comes.'

The vocative *improbe* conveys moral censure towards Calliodorus' actions and is used in other satirical contexts to express outrage at the shamelessness of others (cf. 3.61.1; 11.54.4; Juv. 9.93). The point of the poem is neatly conveyed in the conclusion that Calliodorus is consuming the price of a man, the slave sold at auction. The criticism is aimed at Calliodorus for selling a slave for one extravagant meal, presumably to impress others. The phrase *non est piscis homo est* is reminiscent of Seneca's moralising on the lot of slaves: 'servi sunt. immo homines. 'servi sunt.' immo contubernales. 'servi sunt.' immo humiles amici. 'servi sunt' (Ep. 47.2). The concern for the fate of slaves or humanity in general does not feature elsewhere in Martial's poems, and his outburst against Calliodorus' treatment of his slaves suggests an element of hypocrisy.

10.32

This is the second of a pair of poems in Book 10 in honour of Marcus Antonius Primus whose seventy-fifth birthday is celebrated at 10.23. Although addressed to Caedicianus, the poem is on the subject of a portrait of Antonius Primus. The portrait is praised for its realistic depiction of Primus' features which presents him in his middle age, to which Martial respectfully states that this seems young to Primus due
to his advanced years. Portraits which were realistic and lifelike were highly sought after and praised for these qualities, and their description in poetry reflect an extensive literary tradition (1.109; 3.40; 7.44; 84; 9.74; 76; 11.9; see Howell on 1.109.19 for further literary examples). A common criticism made in literature on the topic of portraits and other fine art is that they fail to capture the true essence of their subject. Hence Martial praises the picture for its fidelity to Primus' external features, but it does not show his true character *(mores animunque)* and the qualities which make him such a great man.

The poem represents some connection to the literary cycle of poems in Book 10 and Martial's motives for his own poetry. Literature and the fine arts are frequently compared to emphasise the superiority of literature over other arts, especially in relation to its everlasting nature (9.76; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.1-15; Hor. *Carm.* 3.30; see Vioque on 7.84). The subject of real life is in itself an important feature of Martial's poetry, which he stresses is designed to reveal the *mores* of men (10.4; cf. also Mart. 7.84.6-8 *certior in nostro carmine vultus erit*; Hor. *Carm.* 4.8.13-22), an aspect which a portrait cannot deliver.

*Haec mihi quae colitur violis pictura rosisque,*
*quos referat vultus, Caediciane, rogas?*

The poet is respectfully decorating the portrait with a garland of roses and violets, a popular combination for wreaths and garlands (cf.9.11.1; 60; Plin. *Nat.* 21.14; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.22; Ov. *Met.* 12.410), perhaps still in honour of Primus' birthday. This is the only occasion in which Martial speaks of 'honouring' a portrait in such a manner; however cf. 1.117.6 used in the context of honouring a book and 10.6.4. *colere* is also
conventional language in the context of honouring patrons (1.55.5; 2.55.; 5.19.8; 12.68.2). A similar example can be found at 9.24 where Martial speaks of worshipping the emperor’s effigy (9.24, it is also used in the imperial poems 5.3.6; 9.64.6; 101.12; 11.5.2). Caedicianus is addressed a number of times (1.118 with Howell; 8.52; 10.84), and it appears uncertain whether he was an actual friend of Martial or simply a convenient fictitious addressee (SB² 3: 344, also see Kajanto Cognomina: 132, 181). The fact that Caedicianus has to ask whose portrait it is suggests the artificiality and transitory nature of pictorial art.

talis erat Marcus mediis Antonius annis
   Primus: in hoc iuvenem se videt ore senex.

The portrait is of Marcus Antonius Primus of 10.23 (also 9.99) where it is revealed that he is seventy-five years of age (see further on Primus at 10.23). The portrait which is the subject of this poem is one of him in middle age. Primus is of such an age that this now seems young to him. These lines emphasise the realistic representation of the portrait. Although the portrait is of him in middle age, Martial uses the term *iuvenis* (OLD s.v., which classifies the term for a young man up to the age of 45) in contrast with *senex*, these being conventional terms to represent the divisions of life of which there were traditionally three (3.43; 4.78; 7.71; 88.3; 9.7.9 *iuvenesque senesque*; 11.44; 81; 14.47; Leary on 14.97 refers to Cic. Sen. 33: *infirmitas puerorum et ferocitas iuvenum et gravitas iam constantis aetatis*, see Vioque’s note on 7.88.1-4).
ars utinam mores animumque effingere posset!
pulchrior in terris nulla tabella foret.

These final lines counteract the attraction of the portrait because it does not reveal Antonius Primus’ most valuable qualities; hence the superiority perhaps of Martial’s poems. mores combined with animus denotes a person’s moral character in a two fold manner by describing his character as a state and in terms of conduct (cf. Bowie on 12.6.7). At 12.6 this term is used to describe the emperor Nerva, and its rare use signifies the special character of the individual (cf. also Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.22; Ov. *Met.* 4.767; also Tac. *Agr.* 46; Liv. 37.36.2; Quint. *Decl.* 278.6).

The use of the term tabella as opposed to pictura from line 1 suggests that they are used interchangeably, although tabella is perhaps more specific to a small painted panel (cf. 1.109.18; 7.84; 9.74; 76; see Vioque on 7.84.1-5). Martial also uses tabella for a notebook (14.3.1; 192) or the individual page of a notebook (14.196; see *OLD* s.v.).

10.33

The poet wishes for the continuation of the prosperous and happy marriage of Gallus’ daughter. In return Martial requests that Gallus support Martial in his defence against accusations that he has written slanderous poetry. 10.33 addresses Munatius Gallus in an appeal to his qualities of simplicitas and bonitas. His possession of such qualities, true Roman values, makes him the ideal contrast with those associated with invidia (cf. Dickie 1981: 193-5). He also can be compared with Antonius Primus of 10.32, who is presented as an exemplar of the vir bonus in 10.23 and more recently at 32.
The ideas presented in this poem belong to a long standing literary tradition in satire, and the structure of the poem resembles the second half of Horace's *Satires* 1.4. Martial firstly persuades the reader that those who are publishing slanderous poetry in his name do so out of invidia. This is followed by the declaration of his own literary and moral intentions in his poetry *parcere personis, dicere de vitii* (cf. Hor. S. 1.4.100ff.; Dickie 1981: 195). Although not peculiar to Book 10 (cf. 1 *praef.*; 7.12; 7.72), the prominence of this theme and its prevalence in this book make it all the more striking. Both 10.5 and 10.33 precede imperial panegyric, and, given the scarcity of imperial poems in Book 10, the twofold arrangement suggests a significant connection between the two themes. This poem reinforces his literary programme laid out in the opening poems of this book to remind the reader that, despite the satirical nature of his poems, they are not aimed at specific people (cf. 10.3). The poet who is distributing slanderous poetry in Martial's name is doing so out of invidia of Martial's skill and fame (see Dickie 1981: 183-5). A similar poem is 7.72, in which Martial expresses the wish that Paulus be granted success and happiness, in return for his pronouncement that *non scripsit meus ista Martialis* (7.72.16) (this also appears in two separate but juxtaposing poems 1.39-40, where 1.39 appeals to Decianus' *simplicitas* and 1.40 discusses the theme of invidia). This type of poem is also similar to 1.52, which asks for Quintianus, a man of high standing and reputation to come to his defence against plagiarists. The subject of slanderous poetry distributed in Martial's name reintroduces a theme from the beginning of Book 10 (cf. 10.3 and 5). Just as the theme of poets plagiarising Martial's work is prevalent in Book 1, the idea that poets are publishing slanderous works in Martial's name is particularly apparent in Book 10. The similarity between 1.52 and 10.33 reveals the
similarity between these two books. The striking similarity of thematic structure between Book 10 and Book 1 suggests Martial’s desire to re-establish his literary programme in Book 10 under a new emperor.

Simplicior priscis, Munati Galle, Sabinis, Cecropium superas qui bonitate senem,

The addressee of this poem is Munatius Gallus, who was legate of Numidia in 100-103 (PIR² M 724 – 725, Nauta 2002: 65 n.83; RE 538.20), and is possibly the same Gallus of 1.108 (cf. Howell on 1.108). Martial refers to a Gallus on other occasions throughout his volumes, but, due to the difference in subject matter, they are most likely fictitious characters (2.47; 56; 3.27; 92; 4.16; 7.55; 10.56; 82; 12.47).

Martial draws attention to Gallus’ traditional Roman moral values of simplicitas (cf. 10.13.3; 47.7) and bonitas, as qualities possessed by the vir bonus, a motif which is repeated throughout Book 10 (cf. 10.13; Spisak 2002: 136). Two proverbial examples of these traditional values are employed for comparison. The Sabine women were famed for their chastity, and are appropriate in the context of the virtue of Gallus’ daughter (cf. 1.62; 11.15.2; Juv. 10.298; Otto 1562). The expression Cecropium...senem is extremely vague and Martial often uses the adjective Cecropius in the epigrams (e.g. (1.25.3; 7.69.3). It is derived from Cecrops, the mythical king of Athens (cf. Leary on 13.24.1), and here it either refers to Epicurus, whose school of philosophy was located in Athens (cf. Vioque on 7.69.3, SB² 2: 355, cites Diogones Laertius 10.9 for Epicurus as an exemplar of goodness), or perhaps Socrates (Heilmann 1984: 48 n.4; Friedlaender on 10.33.2). Martial mentions Socrates on only one other occasion at 10.99 in the context of his ugly appearance. Because of the
similarities in expression at 7.96, it seems more likely that here Martial intends Epicurus.

The concept of simplitias is a significant theme in Book 10 reflecting the ideals of the happy life (10.13.3; 47.7). It first appears in the proemium to Book 1 in the context of Martial’s own poetry and the standards he wishes to convey: absit a iocorum nostrorum simplitate malignus interpres nec epigrammata mea inscribat: improbe facit qui in alieno libro ingenióus est (1 praef. 8-10; also cf. 11.20.9-10: absolvis lepidos nimirum, Auguste, libellos./ qui scis Romana simplitate loqui). It is also used as a quality to describe those who support the highest standards of poetry (1.39.3-4 si quis Cecropiae madidus Latiaeque Minervae/ artibus et vera simplitate bonus; 8.73.1-2 Istanti, quo nec sincerior alter habetur/ pectore nec nivea simplitate prior). For the idea that livor and invidia are absent from men who possess such qualities cf. Ov. Pont. 3.3.95-106 (Dickie 1981: 194).

sic tibi consoceri claros retinere penates
perpetua natae det face casta Venus,

The wish that Gallus’ ties with his daughter’s father-in-law remain permanent is an unusual way of phrasing the wish for his daughter’s happy marriage, which presumably occurred recently. Although his identity is unknown, Gallus’ daughter’s father-in-law is clearly someone of standing. Such an expression does not seem to occur elsewhere in Martial, but seems to denote that this is an epigram intended for a particular group rather than a wide readership.

The epithet casta ascribed to Venus occurs on three occasions in Martial (2.34.4; 6.45.2) and is appropriate in the context of women who are sexually faithful
to their husbands (cf. 1.13.3; 62.1; see Williams on 2.34.4). This term echoes sanctae uxoris of 10.30.2, and is repeated at 10.35.8, which extols the writings of Sulpicia as a paradigm of chastity for the Roman matrona.

**ut tu, si viridi tinctos aerugine versus**
**forte malus livor dixerit esse meos,**

There seems rather a sudden change of theme from what began as an encomium to one of self-defence and appeal for someone to defend his verse (cf. 7.69). Striking colour imagery is employed to denote the poetry produced through envy and malice (viridi tinctos aerugine; livor). aerugo refers to a shade of verdigris and is associated particularly with ideas of spite (cf. 2.61.5; Hor. S. 1.4.100-1: hie nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est / aerugo mera; see André 1949: 110; for the colour of livor see livebit at 10.12.10). Similar expressions appear at 7.12 where the poet uses weapons dipped in blood and snake venom: si qua Lycambeo sanguine tela madent (7.12.6) and 7.72 where such verses are soaked in black venom: si quisquam mea dixerit malignus/ atro carmina quae madent veneno (7.72.12-13).

**ut facis, a nobis abigas, nec scribere quemquam talia contendas carmina qui legitur.**

Martial requests that Gallus use his influence to drive away such malicious rumours that he is responsible for such material (ut facis). At 7.72, Martial calls upon Paulus to lend his voice on the poet’s behalf for the same reason: ut vocem mihi commodes patronam/ et quantum poteris, sed usque, clames: ‘non scripsit meus ista Martialis (7.72. 14-16). It is perhaps intentional that this same verb abigo appears at 10.5.12, where the anonymous author of such slanderous poetry is forced to chase away the
crows waiting to pick at his flesh upon his death. In addition to Martial’s dissociation from malicious poetry, the poet asks Gallus to assert that poets such as himself (cf. 10.2), who rely on fame and readership, do not produce these types of works.

hunc servare modum nostri novere libelli,
parcere personis, dicere de vitis.

Martial advocates poetry which speaks of real life (cf. 10.4) and depicts vices, yet does not aim his criticism at real people. The tradition of poets claiming not to be making personal attacks is a favourite topic in satire and became particularly manifest in the imperial period (e.g. Lucil. fr. 1008-38; Pers. 1.119, Juv. 1.150; cf. Bramble 1974: 190-204; Dickie 1981: 183-208). For example, such sentiments are also emphasised by Horace in the Satires, where he asserts that he attacks vices, not individuals:

...absentem qui rodit amicum,
qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos
qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacebre
qui nequit: hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto (Hor. S. 1.4.81-5, also 2.1.39-44).

In Martial, it first appears in his preface to Book 1, where he makes similar claims, contrasting his own literary intentions with those of his predecessors:

quae adeo antiquis auctoris defuit ut nominibus non tantum veris absit sint sed et magnis. mihi fana vilius constet et probetur in me novissimum ingenium. absit a iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpres nec epigrammata mea inscribat: improbat facit qui in alieno libro ingeniösus est.

For other poems on the same topic in Martial, see 5.12.2; 7.12; 72 (cf. Vioque on 7.12 for more examples in the literary tradition of personal invective, e.g. Catul. 11; 16; 36;
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Plin. Ep. 10.3.1). Also compare 1.4.7-8, where Martial appeals to the emperor to distinguish between context and author: innocuos censura potest permittere lusus:/ lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba.

10.34

This is the first and only poem in Martial which directly addresses Trajan. It refers to an edict approved by Trajan which prohibited freedmen from bringing accusations against their patrons and the restoration of rights to patrons in exile (cf. Plin. Pan. 42). Trajan is represented in his role as patron of the Roman people, and his beneficence will bring stability to Roman society. Praise of imperial legislation is a standard feature of imperial panegyric in Martial’s poems to Domitian (e.g. lex Julia and Roscia) and in those expressing his gratitude towards his award of the ius trium liberorum (cf. 2.91). The panegyric language is recycled from Martial’s poems to Domitian. The first two lines of 10.34 are a direct adaptation of 6.87; however, the language is modified to suit the circumstances of a new emperor. In the epigram for Domitian, the emperor is given divine status and as one of the gods wields heavenly powers. In this poem, Trajan is removed from associations with divinity but instead is perceived in his role as patronus over the Roman people. Although similar motifs are employed, the reluctance to elevate Trajan to divine status indicates the contrast between Martial’s handling of poems under the two regimes. Another difference between 6.87 and 10.34 is that Trajan is addressed by his personal name, unlike Domitian, who is never addressed directly as Domitiane, only as Caesar or one of his other titles such as Germanicus (further see below on lines 1-2). In 10.34, the emphasis on the emperor’s benevolence towards his subjects/clients conveys the
prospect of a new prosperous regime and the celebration of the end of a bad ruler (cf. 10.28).

This is the third poem in the imperial sequence of poems to the emperor Trajan (cf. 10.6; 7; 28). The deliberate arrangement of 10.5 (an attack on the author of slanderous poetry) and 10.6 (the first poem to Trajan) is repeated with 10.33 and 34, and the juxtaposition of Martial’s literary programme with imperial panegyric reinforces the significance of these two themes at the start of a new regime. The positioning of these two themes perhaps suggests Martial’s nervousness/hesitance in his approach to the new emperor. Amidst the praise of the emperor’s qualities, the tone is still tentative in nature, which is unusual as this is not a feature of Martial’s poems to Domitian or even Nerva (cf. Fearnley 2003: 628). This hesitant approach is continued in 10.72, the next and final imperial poem of the book, where the panegyric (but insincere) language of former days is dismissed in favour of a rather restrained form of Truth.

On this poem see Jenkins ad loc.; Fearnley 2003: 627ff.

Di tibi dent quidquid, Caesar Traiane, mereris et rata perpetuo quae tribuere velint:

The poem begins in a formal prayer style which expresses the hope for Trajan to receive his deserved rewards from the gods and that these rewards will be everlasting. This opening phrase is adapted from 6.87.1 to Domitian: di tibi dent et tu, Caesar, quaecumque mereris. The omission of et tu eliminates any association of the emperor with divine status (cf. Grewing on 6.87.1, who also notes the proffering of the god’s
beneficence on the emperor as a standard expression of panegyric, e.g. Plin. Pan. 28.6 *dent tibi, Caesar, aetatem di quam mereris*).

Unlike 6.87, Trajan is addressed by name, which is a rare occurrence in Roman literature. It is more usual for emperors to be addressed as *Caesar, princeps* and *Augustus* (cf. Vespasiane in Tacit. Hist. 2.76.8; 78). Trajan is addressed by name once in Pliny’s *Panegyricus* (89.2 *pater Traiane*; on other occasions he is addressed as *Caesar Auguste* 4.3; 5.2 or *imperator Auguste* 16.2; 56.1). Martial never addresses Domitian directly by name but employs the more formal terms of address, such as *Augustus; Germanicus, dominus, Caesar* (see SB 3: s.v. Index Domitian). It is striking that Martial uses this form of address in his only poem addressed to Trajan, however he does the same with Nerva at 11.2.6. This more informal style of address perhaps is intended to demonstrate Trajan’s (and Nerva’s) status as mortal in contrast with Domitian’s divine posturing, and, as such, also offers a greater sense of freedom under the new regime.

qui sua restituis spoliato iura patrono
- libertis exul non erit ille suis -,

Trajan set up an edict which restored legal rights and the obligations of patronage over freedman and slaves to patrons who had been exiled by Domitian (Plin. Pan. 42; cf. Tac. Hist. 2.92 which discusses a similar gesture made by Vitellius). The intention of the edict is to reassure patrons that freedman will no longer be used to bring charges (in addition to treason) against their patrons. Although the poem appears to praise Trajan for his beneficence towards the patrons in contrast with their mistreatment under the old regime, Fearnley suggests that the offer to restore rights to
patrons but not return them from exile reflects a 'hollow, even cynical political
gesture' (Fearnley 2003: 628). This interpretation casts a less flattering light on
Trajan in his role as patron of the Roman people. Patrons in Rome are however,
according to Martial, reassured by such an edict.

dignus es ut populum possis servare clientem,
   ut – liceat tantum vera probare – potes.
The cautious tone is exemplified by the awkward syntax of *dignus es ut...possis* and
the emphasis of Trajan as patron of the Roman people. The submissive manner of the
final line illustrates the worthiness of Trajan's power and his capacity to protect the
Roman people.

The element of Martial's hesitancy in his approach to the new emperor, seems
apparent in the language used in this final line; for example, the subjunctive *liceat* can
be compared with the more definite *licet* of his poetry to Nerva (e.g. 11.2.6; 12.5.4,
see Fearnley 2003: 628).

Housman's ingenious emendation of *populum* from *totum* (or even *tutum*) is
accepted by current scholarship in keeping with the general sense of the poem
(Housman CP 2: 727, SB² 2: 356, Fearnley 2003: 627, Jenkins ad loc.). The reading*totum* offers the rather weak statement that because Trajan has bestowed assistance to
patrons, he deserves to do the same to clients, which does not seem suitable reward
for him. *populum* presents the more suitable explanation that Trajan is worthy to be
quinto decimo kal. Oct., domine, provinciam intravi, quam in eo obsequio, in ea erga
tefide, quam de genere humano mereres, inveni, Housman CP 2: 727).
10.34

Despite this textual emendation, the difficulties of interpreting Martial’s meaning in these lines are not resolved, especially the central phrase *liceat tantum vera probare*, which rationalises the notion above which may be considered extravagant (cf. 5.19.1-2 *si qua fides veris, praeferrri, maxime Caesar/ temporibus possunt saecula nulla tuis*). It implies that only the truth shall be tolerated under this new emperor, which excludes any elements of deceptiveness or pretence. The same notion is picked up in 10.72.10-11 in the proclamation that dry-haired rustic Truth has returned to Rome (*per quem de Stygia domo reducta est/ siccis rustica Veritas capillis*), which signifies that freedom to speak the truth is unrestricted under the new regime.

10.35

This poem is an ecomium on the subject matter of the poetry of Sulpicia, a contemporary female writer whose poetry related the erotic relationship with her husband Calenus. Although her poetry discusses themes of a sexual nature, Martial defends it on the grounds that it is appropriate to those who respect the sanctity of marriage. The supposed sauciness exhibited in her poetry does not reflect her own moral decency. 10.35 forms a pair with 10.38, and these are the only occasions when Sulpicia is mentioned in Martial’s poems.

Because only two lines of Sulpicia’s poetry remain, biographical information and details of her writings depend on these. Her literary programme is praised by Martial for its lascivious nature on the subject of *amor*, which, however, is still *casta* or sexually pure and espouses the bonds of marriage appropriate to a Roman *univira*. Her poetry does not speak of unseemly love or unnatural acts within the context of
marriage or of the kind of crimes and scandals represented in myth by Medea, Thyestes, Scylla and Byblis. Martial identifies Sulpicia's sexual instructions with the counsel of Egeria towards Numa, which is playfully referred to as ioci in contrast with the mythological subject matter addressed in more serious literature. But not even Sappho, the traditional role model for women of literary skill (Catul. 35.16-17; Ov. Tr. 3.7.20), is able to surpass Sulpicia in terms of learning, behaviour and beauty.

7.69 adopts a similar approach in praise of Canius' bride Theophila for her learning. Here too Theophila is placed alongside Sappho: carmina fingentem Sappho laudarit amatrix:/ castior haec et non doctior illafuit (7.69.9-10). The sentiment in 10.35 presents Sulpicia as superior to Sappho not only for her erudition but also as one who is pudica. Martial elevates her beauty beyond that of Sappho, to the extent that Phaon would choose Sulpicia over Sappho. Sulpicia's status as univira is reinforced towards the conclusion of the poem in her imagined rejection of Jupiter, Bacchus and Apollo, even in the event of Calenus' death. Sulpicia is the true example of the Roman univira and Martial submits her poetry to be read by both husbands and wives who wish to abide by such respectable behaviour.

The defence of Sulpicia's literary programme reflects Martial's outline of his own literary aims set out at the opening of Book 10. He applies similar descriptions to her poetry (lusus cf. 6.85.9; 11.6.3; 16.7; delicias 2.16.3; 7.88.2; 8.82.6; 9.28.2) and defends hers as he does his own. Martial praises Sulpicia for the absence of mythological exempla in her poetry which in 10.4 he rejects as themes irrelevant to everyday life in contrast with those of his own poetry. This is strengthened by the use of identical mythological examples (Medea, Thyestes, Scylla) in both poems. Martial compliments Sulpicia on the risqué nature of her poetry yet commends her on her
conduct in real life, which is the same contrast he claims for himself (1.4.8). Martial manipulates his praise of Sulpicia towards his own literary programme, which rejects such Callimachean themes in favour of subjects relevant and constructive to readers. It is also perhaps intentional that the subject matter of this poem, 10.33 and 34 reflect those presented in 10.4, 5 and 6, although in different order.

Hallett provides a thorough analysis of the influences of Catullus and Propertius on these two poems, though she does not note that the links between Sulpicia and Catullus’ Lesbia are strengthened by 10.39, addressed to Lesbia immediately after the second Sulpicia epigram (10.38) (Hallett 1992-3: 99-123). Whilst Hallett acknowledges that there is a close link between Lesbia and Sulpicia in 10.35 and 38, she focuses more closely on the contrast between Propertius’ Cynthia and Sulpicia (especially Prop. 2.15), with the implication that Sulpicia surpasses Lesbia and Cynthia because of her conduct as univira. The link to Propertius is given further strength on the basis that Sulpicia’s own poetry echoes Propertius’ language, which would contribute to Martial’s choice of Propertius as a model for these poems (Hallett 1992-3: 122). The strong echoes of Catullus and Propertius strike a somewhat incongruous chord with Martial’s rejection of Callimachus in 10.4, incongruity at odds with the influence of Callimachus on these elegiac poets (Hallett 1992-3: 105 n.18). As with 10.4, Martial is using the literary devices of the Alexandrian traditions as weapons against them to demonstrate not only his own learning but also to defend the value of his own poetry.

Omnes Sulpiciam legant puellae
uni quae cupiunt viro placere;
omnes Sulpiciam legant mariti
uni qui cupiunt placere nuptae.

Martial focuses on the readership of Sulpicia’s poetry, mainly married men and women, because of the nature of her poetry, the genre of erotodidaxis where the poet acts as a teacher of love. This is evident in the remaining fragment of her poetry which is located in a scholium on Juvenal 6.537 (si me cadurci fasciis/ nudam Caleno concubantem proferat). Such poetry is part of an extensive tradition in both Greek and Latin literature (e.g. Callim. iamb. 5), and is naturally associated with erotic elegy (Cairns 1972: 72).

The opening lines make use of devices typical of elegiac poetry in terms of similar language, repetition and anaphora. The first two lines outline Sulpicia’s literature as a guide for women who want to be univirae (cf. 10.63.8). Emphasis is placed on the erotic word placere by its positioning at the end of the phrase (for the usage of placere in a similar context cf. 1.35.5; 7.29.4; Tib. 1.8.15 OLD s.v. placeo 1d). This emphasis is slightly reduced in its repetition at line 4 where the situation is reversed for husbands who wish to please their wives.

puella is a common term in elegiac poetry, but here is used in the double sense of wife (e.g. 7.88.3-4 me legit omnis ibi senior iuvenisque puerque/ et coram tetrico casta puella viro; 9.66.1 uxor cum tibi sit formosa, pudica, puella, OLD s.v. 2a; see Jenkins ad loc.). In order that no doubt is made of its meaning, in line 4 it is replaced by the more conventional nupta, which is significantly placed at the end of the phrase.
Anaphora of this kind is a conventional device in erotic poetry, especially that of Catullus (note the same device at lines 11-12). These opening lines seem reminiscent of Catullus in the dialogue between the two lovers Acme and Septimius:

unam Septimius misellus Acmen
mavult quam Syrias Britanniasque;
uno in Septimio fidelis Acme

For a similar example in Martial, compare 1.109.22-3 (also cf. Siedschlag 1977: 122 n.4).

non haec Colchidos asserit furorem,
diri prandia nec refert Thyestae;
Scyllam, Byblida nec fuisse credit:

The mythological exempla recall Martial's claims for his own poetry at 10.4, and explain his defence of Sulpicia's poetry in terms identical to his own, that she deals with subject matter appropriate to real life. With the exception of Byblis, the other examples of Medea and Thyestes appear in 10.4 as well-worn mythological tales to which Martial objects. Such themes differ from Sulpicia's poetry, not only in the difference in subject matter but also in the contrasting messages conveyed. All these examples are associated with mythological characters who violate the bonds of marriage or family. For example, Medea takes vengeance against Jason by killing her children (cf. 10.4), and Thyestes is served his own children as punishment for seducing his brother's wife (cf. 10.4). In contrast with Sulpicia's demonstration of fidelity within the marriage bed, unnatural lusts or passions are also emphasised (e.g. for Scylla’s betrayal of her city and father in her love for Minos cf. Ov. Met. 8.1ff.).

The myth of Byblis tells of her lust for her brother (some versions place this in
reverse), and as a consequence is turned into a hamadryad following attempted suicide (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.450ff.). These myths also represented the aspects of Hellenistic poetry which were outdated for contemporary Roman society and were not appropriate in the verse of either Sulpicia or Martial (cf. 10.4).

"sed castos docet et pios amores, lusus, delicias facetiasque.

Compare Prop. 1.1.4-6 *et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus/ donec me docuit castas odisse puellas/ improbus* (cf. Hallett 1992-3:118). Martial deliberately inverts the Propertian phrase both to highlight Sulpicia's own debt to Propertius and to separate Sulpicia from these other poets in terms of the decency of her poetry. Her role as teacher on the subject of *Amor* is defined here as one which is sexually pure as opposed to those presented in the mythological examples in the previous lines. The sexual purity is qualified in the following line with the double play on *lusus, delicias* and *facetias*, which have sexual connotations but in a positive sense (for *deliciae* cf. Mart. 7.14.2 *amisit lusus deliciasque suas*; Catul. 45.24; Prop. 2.15.2; further Adams 1982: 196-7). The tricolon of words progresses from sexual and sensual pleasures to *facetias*, its single appearance in Martial, which connotes more intellectual cleverness or wittiness (cf. Catul. 12.9 in a similar sense). Therefore, these terms relate not only to her sexual behaviour, but also to the nature of her poetry. The levity of her subject matter deliberately contrasts with the mythological themes rejected by Martial. Martial also uses these terms to refer to his own poetry, for example 1.14.1 *delicias, Caesar, lususque iocosque leonum*; 35.13 *parcas lusibus et iocis rogamus* (also for..."
similar expressions cf. Plin. Ep. 4.14.1ff.; see Jenkins ad loc.; for the literary tradition also see Spisak 1992: 146ff.).

Shackleton Bailey replaces probos amores with pios amores, and gives the literary precedence of Seneca to support this emendation (Phaed. 165 compesce amoris impii flammas, precor; SB1: 329, on 10.35). This is an attractive proposition in the context of the mythological themes presented above; however, pios does not seem to convey a comprehensive sense required here of castos and 'morally unexceptionable' (cf. Jenkins ad loc.). In addition, Martial uses the term probus far more frequently in the sense of morally acceptable, especially in the context of his own poetry (cf. 1 praef. 6-8; 1.4.8 lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba).

cuius carmina qui bene aestimarit,
nullam dixerit esse nequiorum,
nullam dixerit esse sanctiorem.

Martial refers to the literary critic, who will approve the literary value of Sulpicia's work (in terms of Martial's own critics cf. 12 praef. 25 tu velim ista, quae tantum apud te non periclitantur, diligenter aestimare et excutere non graveris; also 4.82; 86.1 si vis auribus Atticis probari; 5.80; 7.26). The use of such comparatives is a conventional device for erotic poetry (cf. 1.109.1-2 Issa est passere nequior Catulli / Issa est purior osculo columbae; see Howell on 1.109.1).

nequior assumes the sense of a playful naughtiness, as opposed to actual impropriety, and is a common term in love elegy (cf. 1.109.1; 2.4.4; 3.69.5; 7.14.4; 11.15.4; see Howell on 1.109.1 and Vioque on 7.14.4 for examples in elegy, especially Propertius and Ovid). Here it is paralleled with sanctiorem, which reinforces the castos et probos amores reflected in both her behaviour in real life and
in her poetry. This perhaps also extends by implication to Martial's own poetical motives and the representation of extremes in behaviour, which are not a reflection of his own ideals (Spisak 1992: 162).

*tales Egeriae iocos fuisse*
*udo crediderim Numae sub antro.*

Sulpicia's literature and style is compared to that of the nymph Egeria recognised in legend as the wife and religious adviser of king Numa Pompilius (Livy. 1.21; however also cf. Juv. 3.10-20). The term *iocos* not only implies verbal jests but is also used in a sexual sense as with line 9 (see Adams 1982: 161-2). A feature of pastoral erotic poetry is employed here in the location of the grotto as a meeting place (Theocritus 3.6; Verg *Ecl.* 9.41ff., Jenkins *ad loc.*). This comparison also offers a moral basis for Sulpicia's poetry as appropriate to Roman tradition.

The legend of Numa and Egeria represents the epitome of true *Romanitas*, and their devotion to purity and ancient Roman values contrast with the themes conveyed in the Greek mythological types listed above. Juvenal parodies Livy's narrative of their encounters by making suggestive remarks about the relationship between Numa and Egeria (Juv. 3.12-20; Liv. 1.19-21). Although Livy describes her as *coniunx* (1.21; cf. Mart. 6.47.3; Ov. *Fast.* 3.262ff.), Juvenal names her ironically as Numa's *amica* (*hic, ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae* 3.12), which effectively extinguishes themes of purity conveyed by their relationship (for linguistic influences of 10.35.13-14 on Juvenal see Colton 1991: 89-92). For further references to Numa in Martial see 10.10.4.
hac condiscipula vel hac magistra
esses doctior et pudica, Sappho:
shed tecum pariter simulque visam
durus Sulpiciam Phaon amaret.

The motif of instruction is continued, in both a sexual and a literary sense, where
Sappho is conjectured as either schoolmate or pupil to Sulpicia. The feminine form
condiscipula first appears in Martial and occurs elsewhere only at Apuleius (Met.
9.17). Note that the term magistra is used on only one other occasion in Martial,
where it appears in the context of the prostitute who will prepare the inexperienced
husband for his wedding night (11.78.11 ergo Suburanae tironem trade magistrae).

Sappho was the traditional role model for learned women (AP 7.16; Ov. Tr.
3.7.20) which even awarded her muse-like status (AP 7.407; 718; 9.506). The
designation of Caecilius’ girlfriend as Sapphica puella/ Musa doctior in Catul. 35.16-
17 is adapted here (also cf. 7.69) and extended to include Sulpicia’s pudicitia (cf.
Catul. 76.28 aut quod non potis est, esse pudica velit). The OLD defines both pudica
and casta as those who are chaste or sexually pure (cf. OLD s.v. castus 4), and in this
sense they appear to be interchangeable. Martial even uses them together at 4.6.1
credi virgine castior pudica. The adjective pudicus occurs only 7 times in Martial
(4.6.1; 6.4.5 plus debet tibi Roma quod pudica est; 8.54.4 formosam minus aut minus
pudicam; 9. 5(6).2 pudice princeps; 9.66.1 uxor cum tibi sit formosa, pudica, puella;
11.104.15; also pudiciorem 2.54.2), which perhaps suggests a more specific meaning
than the more frequently used castus. Pudicitia is a technical term for the requirement
for future brides and also as a test in marriage, and it is possible that Martial applies
pudica in this sense to married women rather than simply in terms of casta (e.g.
9.66.1; 11.104.15; on Pudicitia cf. Treggiari 1991: 105-7). At 6.4.5 and 9.5(6).2, the
term is used in the context of Domitian's moral legislation and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* (see Grewing on 6.7.2 and Henriksen on 9.5(6)).

For the associations of Sappho with Catullus' Lesbia and a detailed analysis of the echoes of Catullus 35 in this poem, cf. Hallett 1992-3: 107-8. *doctus* belongs to an extensive literary tradition, and here implies more than technical ability but a privileged divine knowledge which Sulpicia is able to pass on to her readers (for the use of *doctus* in a literary-critical context in Roman literature and in Martial cf. Spisak 1992: 117-65, especially 161-3).

Phaon was originally the ferryman of Lesbos upon whom Aphrodite bestowed youth and good looks. He became associated with Sappho as the lover for whom Sappho killed herself by hurling herself from the Leucadian rock (Sappho fr. 211 L.P., see Jenkins *ad loc.*). This relationship was firmly established in Roman literature (Ov. *Ep.* 15), and Martial uses language conventional of love elegy by presenting him in the character of the cruel lover towards Sappho, but not for Sulpicia (cf. *OLD* s.v. *durus* 5b).

*frustra: namque ea nec Tonantis uxor nec Bacchi nec Apollinis puella erepto sibi viveret Caleno.*

Martial's claim that Sulpicia would refuse the advances of Jupiter or other gods echoes Catullus 70.1-2: *nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle/ quam mihi non si Iuppiter ipse petat*; which itself is modelled on Callimachus *Epig.* 25 (Catul. 70.1-2 with Quinn 1970: 398-9, Newman 1990: 249). Martial extends the passage to include Bacchus and Apollo, who are possibly mentioned because of their associations with literary inspiration rather than for their matrimonial activities (e.g. for Bacchus cf.
Hor. *Carm.* 2.19). Their addition reinforces the extent of Sulpicia’s devotion to her husband.

The significance of the marital relationship is awarded further emphasis by the arrangement of Sulpicia’s name at the beginning and Calenus’ at the end (Richlin 1992-3: 128). The poem is skilfully balanced by a return to the idea expressed in the opening lines of a *puella* and her husband. Of Calenus, nothing is known except the information presented here and at 10.38 as husband of Sulpicia, and in the *scholium*. Martial also uses it for a fictitious character at 1.99, but it is not a common *cognomen*, with only ten inscriptional examples (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 191; cf. also *PIR* 2 2.220).

Munna is sending poor quality wines to his friends back in Rome from his vineyard estate in Massilia. If this was not sufficiently insulting, he is making them pay for it at the same price as very fine wines such as Falernian or Setian. Munna does not visit Rome for fear that he may actually taste some of his own wines which he is distributing to his friends. The offer of poor quality food and wine to guests and friends is a common complaint in Martial’s poems and it recurs at 10.49 where Cotta is serving cheap wine in expensive glasses, which, however, does not improve the wine. A similar example is 1.18, which criticises Tucca for mixing bad wines with good and serving them to his guests. Martial frequently draws attention to the quality of wines served where the host serves poorer wines to the guests while he drinks expensive fine wines (3.82; 4.85; 6.92; 10.49; Juv. 5.30 ff.; similarly with food products cf. 1.20; 2.43; 3.60; 4.68). This theme is complemented by the next poem which contrasts the availability and quality of food in Rome and in Spain.
Improba Massiliae quidquid fumaria cogunt,
accipit aetatem quisquis ab igne cadus,
Massilian wine is criticised at 3.82.23 and 13.123 although it seems to have been otherwise regarded as wine of good quality (Leary on 13.123; cf. SB² 2: 358 cites Plin. Nat. 14.68 for the commendation of this wine and suggests that other wines of the Narbonensis were ruined by the smoking process). The wine was placed in a room known as the apotheca where it was exposed to smoke in order to artificially age it (Hor. Carm. 3.8.11-12; Mart. 3.82.23; Juv. 5.35). Leary suggests that such oversmoked wines were appropriate to the inferior service of dinner guests of lower status (Leary on 13.123.1). Here the point of the complaint is that Munna is sending bad wines at the cost of fine quality wines. For information on wine in Rome see Seltman 1957: 156ff. and Younger 1966: passim.

a te, Munna, venit: miseris tu mittis amicis
per freta, per longas toxica saeva vias;
The name Munna is used only three times in Martial (9.82 and 10.60) and this is its only occurrence in Roman literature, although its Spanish origin is suggested (see Henriksén on 9.82). On all three occasions it is used in a satirical context; 9.82 mocks Munna for consulting an astrologer and Munna’s fear of losing his patrimony and 10.60 parodies the ius trium liberorum. The expression toxica saeva appears on two other occasions in Martial in the same context (cf. 1.18.6 et dare Campano toxica saeva mero; 5.76 toxica ne possent saeva nocere sibi). A vivid image is presented of the wine travelling all this way to Rome with the elevated phrase per freta somewhat incongruous to the tone of the rest of the poem (cf. 2.24.4; 8.50.16; 12.98.4; see Bowie on 12.98.4 for its use in Roman poetry).
Wines of differing qualities are contrasted also at 1.18 (Vatican with Falernian) and 1.26 (Opinion and Massic with Laletanian), and complaints of a host providing a bad wine for his guests are a cause for complaint in Martial's poems (cf. 3.49) similar to his discontent at the different qualities of food. Falernian (13.111) and Setine (14.103) wines were considered some of the finest wines and amongst the costliest wines because of their quality (see Leary on 13.111 and 14.103). Falernian was also praised for being one of the few wines which excelled with age. This passage perhaps suggests that Munna is trying to sell or present his own wines either as the same quality as Falernian or Setine or at the same price (cf. Plin. Ep. 2.6, on the host who serves different classes of wine to different people).

Martial asks his friend and compatriot Maternus for a message as the poet prepares to make his way from Laurentum to Spain. The poem continues with a comparison of the availability and quality of food and wine between these two locations. At Laurentum, the local seafood and meats are bland and meagre, and the villa primarily relies on products brought in from the Roman markets (cf. 3.47; 58), unlike the abundance of high-quality produce found in Spain. The poem contains an extensive list of comparisons between food hunted and caught at Laurentum and in Spain, which encompasses all varieties on land and at sea, further highlighting the abundance and variety of food in Spain. The list of foods identified as luxury dishes - mullets,
10.37

Oysters and hares - are conventional and frequently occur in Martial on similar occasions (together cf. 7.78). The notion of self-sufficiency constitutes a significant part of the urban-rural contrast, which is a prominent thematic motif of Book 10 (cf. 10.30, Spisak 2002: 134). Here, Martial conveys this idea in a more personal tone by contrasting commodities associated with Rome and those of his homeland, which at this point illustrates the ideal way of life away from the hardships of Rome (cf. 10.13). Like 10.13, where Martial first mentions his return to Spain in his address to his Spanish friend Manius, the reiteration of this intention is addressed to another fellow-citizen from Spain, Maternus.

This is a companion piece to the previous poem on wine, where Munna does not visit Rome in case he should taste his own inferior wines. Both poems relate to the quality of produce, wine in particular, especially in relation to Rome, although they are quite different in tone. The juxtaposition of thematically related poems in this way is a common device in the books (e.g. again on the subject of food and wine cf. 7.78 and 79).

In addition to the topos of the urban-rural contrast, the theme of friendship is also raised, particularly by way of contrast with the previous poem (again for the juxtaposition of poems on good and bad examples of friendship cf. 10.13(20) and 14; 18(17) and 19 (18) and 20 (19); 29, 30 and 31). Munna abuses the obligations of friendship by making his friends pay exorbitant amounts for substandard wine. Martial venerates Maternus municeps vetusque sodalis, which emphasises both his status as fellow compatriot from Rome, but also as a true and long-standing friend. His emphasis on Maternus’ position as a jurisconsult in Rome demonstrates similarities to poems to men engaged in important business affairs at Rome, such as
Macer (10.18(17)); Pliny (10.20); and in particular Domitius Apollinaris (10.30), who are not able to enjoy idle pleasures due to their official positions at Rome.

**Iuris et aequarum cultor sanctissime legum,**

**veridico Latium qui regis ore forum,**

Before identifying the addressee, Martial acknowledges the gravity of his subject's position and responsibilities at Rome, which is a common feature of poems to patrons (cf. 10.12; 18; 20). Maternus was one of the *iurisconsulti* who held *ius publice respondendi*, the authority granted by the emperor (established by Augustus) to publish answers or opinions on legal matters (cf. Pomponius 1-2.2.48-50; Crook 1984: 26). Martial employs language which is formal in nature and imparts a legal character appropriate in the circumstances. He demonstrates his esteem for Maternus by appealing to his role as legal *cultur*, a familiar expression in poems of praise and admiration especially in the opening line (cf. 5.5.1 Sexte, *Palatinae cultor facunde Minervae*; 10.92 Marri, *quietae cultor et comes vitae*). His authority over the law courts is proclaimed in the expression *regis ore forum* (cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.1.13 *et illud suum regnum iudiciale opposuit* in reference to his opponent Aquilius).

*Veridicus* is not a common term, and is generally used in the context of divinities or extremely distinguished personages (5.5.1 *seu tua veridicae discunt responsa sorores*; Sen. *Ag.* 255 *veridici dei*; Catul. 64.306; Lucr. 6.6 for Epicurus *omnia veridico qui quondam ex ore profudit*).
municipl, Materni, tuo veterique sodali
Callaicum mandas si quid ad Oceanum –

After the esteem paid to Maternus’ office, Martial introduces the nature of his friendship with Maternus. Maternus is mentioned in two other epigrams both humorous in character (1.96, 2.74), but the only personal information is presented in this poem. As well as noting his position as jurisconsult, the poem reveals that Maternus was a native of Bilbilis and an old friend of Martial (PIR¹ M 362). He appears in the early volumes of Martial’s epigrams, and so it is perhaps significant that Martial calls upon Maternus as one of his long-standing friends, also a Spaniard in Rome, as he is about to leave for Spain.

The term municeps is used to denote his shared citizenship with Martial as belonging to the same municipium (for its usage in terms of Bilbilis cf. 10.103.1 Augusta mihi quos Bilbilis acer; 12.21.1). It occurs on seven occasions in Martial, four of which occur in Book 10 (65; 87.10; 103.1 municipes also 7.97.3; 12.21.1; 14.114.2). It is not commonly found in poetry (e.g. Catul. 17.8; Juv. 4.33; 14.271; see Vioque on 7.97.3), and it is possible that it is employed here as part of the legal vocabulary to suit the context.

The close friendship between Maternus and Martial is presented in the expression vetus sodalis, and is frequently used by Martial (cf. 1.54.7; 99.14; 2.43.15; 2.44.4; 5.19.9; 7.86.5 10.104.8; 12.25.3; also Ov. Pont. 2.4.33; see Howell and Citroni on 1.54.7). This phrase conveys a personal element to the relationship and reflects the ideal of good friendship which is a prominent theme in Book 10 (cf. 10.13).

The first section of the epigram concludes with its main objectives: Martial’s intentions to leave for Spain (for Callaicum used to represent Spain, cf. 10.17); and
the contrast between the lifestyles of Rome and Spain. Legal vocabulary is perhaps
semi-parodied in the use of *mandas*, a verb which is generally used in the context of
testaments and wills (cf. Howell on 1.88.1; Vioque on 7.99.8, *TLL* 8.263.64-71).

an Laurentino turpis in litore ranas
et satius tenues ducere credis aco
ad sua captivum quam saxa remittere mullum,
visus erit libris qui minor esse tribus?

The first set of contrasts is made between the quality of food found at Laurentum and
in Spain, especially the types of seafood in both locations. Laurentum was twelve
miles outside Rome on the coast of Latium (9.48; 10.45). It was acknowledged for its
marshes, hence the availability of unsavoury catches such as frogs and needle fish (cf.
Cic. *Fam.* 7.18 describes the residents there as *ranunculi*). It seems that Maternus
owned a villa there, which Martial was visiting on his way to Spain (SB² 2: 360, on
10.37). The poet reminds him of the quality of produce available in Spain in
comparison (for other derogatory comments made on villas just outside Rome which
require food to be sent in from Rome, cf. 3.47; 58.45-51).

This modest fare is no comparison for the mullets caught in Spain, which are
thrown back if they weigh less than three pounds. This conveys the image of
abundance and superiority of such a luxury item, as just at 10.31 Martial rebukes
Calliodorus for selling a slave to buy a four pound mullet (10.31.3; also 10.30.24).

et fatuam summa cenare pelorida mensa
quosque tegit levi cortice concha brevis
ostrea Baianis quam non liventia testis,
quae domino pueri non prohibente vorent?
Seafood remains the object of comparison for the *summa mensa*, which suggests the *pièce de résistance* of the meal rather than that at the top of the table (Plin. *Nat.* 9.63 *proxima est mensa iecori dumtaxat mustelarum*; SB² 2: 361). The pathetic items caught at Laurentum are presented first. The *peloris* was a type of shellfish, not renowned for flavour, especially in comparison with oysters (cf. 6.11.5 *tu Lucrina voras, me pascit aquosa peloris*). Martial appears to be the only Roman poet to use the adjective *fatua* in the sense of ‘insipid’ or ‘tasteless’ (7.25.7; 11.31.8; 13.13.1; *TLL* 6.372.33). In this context it seems to imply a lack of salt or seasoning (Servius *ap. Verg. G.* 3.395; Kay on 11.31; Leary on 13.13.1), hence its meaning elsewhere for foolishness or lack of wit (3.72.8; 10.19.4). The second item is generally identified as the mussel, referring to the membrane which lines its internal shell, and was also a common item found on the Roman table (cf. 3.60.4).

By contrast, in Spain, oysters, a true delicacy, are so plentiful that they are eaten by masters and slaves alike, which conveys an extravagant depiction of self-sufficiency. The notion of slaves enjoying such pleasures also recalls the reversed ideas of slavery from 10.30, where the slaves enjoy the luxuries intended for their masters who are detained in Rome (cf. 10.30.25-30). Like mullets, oysters were a luxury item, and these from Spain are just as good as those from Baiae, which produced the finest oysters (cf. 13.82; also 3.45.6 7.78.3 where they are placed alongside mullet as a delicacy; Leary on 13.82; on oysters in Rome see Andrews 1948: 299-303).
hic olidam clamosus ages in retia vulpem
mordebitque tuos sordida praeda canes:
illic piscoso modo vix educta profundo
impedient lepores umida lina meos.

The poem switches to catches on land, where the only source of hunting at Laurentum
is a vixen that injures the hunting dogs. At 4.4.11, Martial refers to the distinctive
stench of the hunted fox as being a most unpleasant smell and one to avoid (SB² 1:
281 on 4.4). Although the adjective *sordida* is often used in a positive image of rustic
dirt (e.g. 1.49.28; 1.96.4; 98.8), here it represents a creature bedraggled by dirt and
neglect (13.1.2; 14.83.2 of a flea *vel si quid pulice sordidius*; cf. Leary on 14.83).

In contrast, the fishing nets which emerge dripping from the sea (no doubt
with an abundance of mullets and oysters) are now used on land to catch hares. Hares
were considered a delicacy, and a fashionable dinner course (cf. 7.78.3; 13.92; see
Leary on 13.92; also 7.78.3; Petr. 3.62 ; Juv. 5.124; 11.138; Hor. S. 2.8.89), but were
also a popular hunting subject (1.49.25; 3.47.11; Hor. S. 2.2.9). The imagery of the
nets hampered by the weight of the catch emphasises the generous quantity of produce
available in Spain as part of the ideal way of country living.

dum loquor, ecce redit sporta piscator inani,
venator capta maele superbus adest:
omnis ab urbano venit ad mare cena macello.
Callaicum mandas si quid ad Oceanum -.

The phrase *dum loquor* conveys the immediacy of the poem, that Martial is currently
in Laurentum. At the moment of composition he is witnessing the fisherman
returning with an empty basket and the hunter who is mistakenly proud of his inedible
item, a badger (cf. 4.35.3-4 *stupuitque superbus/ venator cultro nil superesse suo*).
*maele* meaning badger or marten is the only occurrence in Martial, and is used rarely
in literature (Gratius *Cynegetica* 340). Such an unusual term perhaps reflects the scarcity of adequate produce available at Laurentum.

The availability of any food at Laurentum is now dismissed by the pronouncement that all food for this villa by the sea is bought from Rome at the *macellum* or fish and meat market (cf. 3.47 and 3.58). There were three such markets at Rome, one north of the forum, the *macellum Liviae* on the Esquiline, and the *macellum magnum* on the Caelian (cf. 10.59.3; 96.9; 12.62.9; Juv. 11.10.64; Leary on 13.85; Bowie on 12.62.9; on the location of these markets see Richardson: 240-2).

Although the poem concludes with the same words as at line 4, its tone is quite different from the opening lines which praise the important business Maternus undertakes in his profession. After the contrast between the lifestyle at a holiday villa near Rome and the idyllic nature of Spain, the repetition of this line conveys an appeal to Maternus to accompany the poet to Spain.

**10.38**

The companion piece to 10.35 would appear to be a *consolatio* addressed to Calenus on the apparent death of his wife Sulpicia. The poem contains very few expressions of mourning or explicit mention of her death in the style of other consolatory poems (e.g. Catul. 3; 96; Prop. 4.7) or sepulchral epigrams, but instead focuses on the pleasure enjoyed by Calenus and Sulpicia throughout their marriage. Their marriage lasted fifteen years, which were of such a loving nature that Calenus regarded them as the entire duration of his life. Such references to the actual length of marriage and its lasting nature are characteristic of funereal epitaphs on the death of one’s spouse, especially wives who have been chaste and faithful to one man (cf. 10.63; *AP* 7 and 8;
Richlin 1992-3: 128). These features are already established as part of Sulpicia’s character, and 10.38 is rendered all the more poignant in relation to the final lines of 10.35 where Sulpicia refuses any other life if Calenus were taken away from her. Richlin suggests that the poem is written on the occasion of their divorce rather than Sulpicia’s death, supporting her argument by interpreting the extant fragment of Sulpicia’s work as the breaking up of the marriage bed and the fact that the erotic imagery of proelia and pugnae in 10.38.6-7 seems inappropriate to a funerary epitaph (cf. 10.35; Richlin 1992-3: 128-32, also Mattiacci 1999: 215ff.). Whilst this is an ingenious proposal, this language might not be so out of place as a touching tribute to the devotion shared between Sulpicia and Calenus here and in 10.35. As with 10.35, vocabulary and expressions are obviously influenced by love elegy, and are modelled closely on Catullus (5; 7) and Propertius (2.15) (see Hallett 1992-3: 100ff.).

Martial’s commendation to Calenus for regarding the fifteen years of marriage as an enduring bond continues the contrast with Catullus’ love affair with Lesbia which was short lived and unhappy, unlike the love shared by Calenus and Sulpicia. The language of reckoning their love in a fixed temporal unit (quindecim; computatur numeras, unam nox omnis, quater, tribus lustris), which reflects the lasting nature of their marriage, is a striking divergence from Catullus’ unrealistic and impetuous estimation of the unquantifiable length of time for the love between him and Lesbia reckoned by the number of kisses (e.g. Catul. 5.10-11 dein, cum milia multa fecerimus/ conturbabimus illa; and 7.1-2 quaeris, quot mihi basitationes/ tuae, Lesbia/ sint satis superque....11-12 quae nec pumerare curiosi/ possint nec mala fascinare lingua). The frequent mention of the time Calenus and Sulpicia spent together is marked by the counting of Indian pearls, which emphasises the throwing
into confusion of keeping count of days or kisses (cf. Catul. 5). The emphasis which Calenus places on the importance of their time as a lifetime, rather than the brevis lux of Catullus demonstrates his respect for their relationship and its lasting nature.

The elegiac vocabulary contributes to the representation of the poem in an elevated poetical style in keeping with the nature of the poem, yet maintains a simple and consolatory tone in its reflection on the marriage between Calenus and Sulpicia (also see 10.35).

For more detailed examination of the allusions to Catullus and Propertius in this poem and the ways in which Martial deliberately inverts these themes, see Hallett 1992-3: 106ff. For further reading on this poem see 10.35 and Jenkins ad loc.

O molles tibi quindecim, Calene,
quos cum Sulpicia tua iugales
indulsit deus et peregit annos!

The first half of this poem opens in the same way as the opening to Propertius 2.15 with the emotional impact of three apostrophes to denote the relationship between Sulpicia and Calenus cf. O me felicem! nox o mihi candida! et o tu/lectule deliciis
facte beate meis! (Prop. 2.15.1-2; Williams 1968: 723ff.). The use of molles immediately establishes the tone of the poem and is a popular term in elegy (cf. OLD s.v. mollis; also cf. Ov. Tr. 3.4.43 mollesque inglorius annos).

Calenus is revealed as the poem’s addressee in the opening line, which parallels the use of Caleno as the final word of 10.35. The continual repetition of their names increases the personal tone of the poem (10.35.1, 3, 18, 21; 10.38.1, 2, 9). These opening lines confirm the devotion of their fifteen year marriage. Although this is the only occurrence of the term iugales in Martial, it is common in poetry and
appropriate to the tone of the poem (cf. *TLL* 7.2.624.1; *OLD* s.v. *iugalis*). On the funerary inscriptions for their wives it was common for husbands to record details such as the age of their spouse, the length of their marriage, and features such as a wife's virtue, fidelity and devotion enjoyed in a happy marriage (for examples on funerary inscriptions see Lattimore 1942: 275-80). The average length of Roman marriages seems to have been between sixteen and twenty years (cf. Jenkins *ad loc.*, Hopkins 1965: 322ff.). The distinguishing feature of this marriage is, of course, the devotion and love which has endured its entire span of fifteen years.

The time which Calenus and Sulpicia shared together was granted to them by a god (denoted by the generic *deus*; cf. 1.99.5; 2.24.7), who also has the power to separate them. The completion of these fifteen years is defined by *peregit*, which Martial frequently uses to denote the close of one's life (cf. 1.78.7; 4.18.5; 5.37.16; 10.61.2). Such an expression in this context seems to lend support to the notion that Sulpicia has in fact recently died.

{o nox omnis et hora, quae notata est caris litoris Indici lapillis!}

The second apostrophe reflects the constant nature of their devotion and happiness, and each day and hour is carefully treasured and reckoned by a traditional Thracian story of placing a white pebble in an urn for every happy day spent (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 7.131; in Martial cf. 8.45.2; 9.52.4; 11.36.2; 12.34.5; also Catul. 107.6; Pers. 2.1; Otto: 64).

For the expression *caris...Indici lapillis* cf. 1.109.4 *carior Indicis lapillis*, which also happens to evoke Catullan imagery, see Howell and Citroni on 1.109.4.
The reckoning of time in the circumstances of a love affair is evocative of Catullan elegy, for example Catullus 5.5-6, which discusses the brevity of life: nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux/ nox est perpetua una dormienda. Unlike this present poem, where each night and day is reckoned to the hour, Catullus prefers to focus on the unquantifiable nature of his affair, which proves to be unstable unlike the relationship between Calenus and Sulpicia: quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenæ/ lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis/ oraclum Iovis inter aestuosæ/ et Batti veteris sacrum sepulcrum (7.3-6). The allusion to the Indian shore has strong Catullan overtones, particularly as an aspect of the neoteric poetry of exotic imagery and far away places (cf. Catul. 7.3 magnus numerae Libyssae harenæ).

o quae proelia, quas utrimque pugnas
felix lectulus et lucerna vidit
nimbis ebria Nicerotianis!

Martial refers to two images which are typical elements of elegy and erotic poetry. The first is the description of lovemaking in terms of battles and sparring, conveyed by proelia (Hor. Carm. 1.6.17 with N-H; Ov. Am. 1.5.14) and pugnas (Ov. Am. 1.8.96). The second is the presence of the lectulus et lucerna in the erotic situation, and is sensualised further by the description of the perfumed oil poured into the lamp, common in Greek erotic epigram (AP 5.4; 5.128; 180; Mart. 11.104.5; 14.39). This image is enhanced by the adjective ebria to denote the meaning ‘full of’ (TLL 5.2.15.36ff.; Jenkins ad loc.). It generally describes drunkenness, and here perhaps its use evokes intoxication through the fumes emitted by the incense (see OLD s.v. ebrius 1b).
Niceros was a well known perfumer of the time, and Martial mentions his name on two other occasions (cf. 6.55.3; 12.65.4; Sidonius, Carm. 9.323; PIR¹ N 59, cf. similarly AP 5.181; for ancient perfumes see RE 1A 1851.48).

vixisti tribus, o Calene, lustris: aetas haec tibi tota computatur et solos numeras dies mariti.

The repetition of the address to Calenus with the exclamation reflects the elevated poetical style in imitation of the elegiac poets. Calenus considers the period of marriage which he has enjoyed as his life, a popular notion in antiquity (cf. 1.15.4 et numerat paucos vix tua vita dies; 6.70.15 non est vivere, sed valere vita est; for further examples see Friedlaender, Howell, and Citroni on 1.15.4). Such expressions were also common in funeral inscriptions (Lattimore 1942: 236-7).

For similar expressions of reckoning time, cf. 6.70.7: at nostri bene computentur anni; 12.8.3; Juv. 6.199; 10.349. These lines are closely modelled on Propertius 2.15.37-40: quod mihi si interdum tales concedere noctes/ illa velit, vitae longus et annus erit./ si dabit et multas, fiam immortalis in illis:/ nocte una quivis vel deus esse potest (Richlin 1992-3: 128-40).

ex illis tibi si diu rogatam lucem redderet Atropos vel unam, malles quam Pyliam quater senectam.

Calenus appeals to Atropos to grant him one day which would be preferable to a lifetime of extreme old age without Sulpicia. Atropos was one of the three Fates, and she represented the unchangeable and inflexible nature of life and death (RE
2.2150.55. The Fates were also in charge of the return of the dead from Hades (Ov. Met. 5.532).

The sense of these lines is extremely awkward, and Jenkins suggests that rogata might be more meaningful for vel unam to receive proper emphasis, that Atropos would grant one day despite his pleas for all or part of the fifteen years. There is no precedent for this in the textual tradition, and despite its awkward syntax the sense is still clear and produces effective rhyme with rogatam... unam... senectam. The expression vel unam complements ex illis of line 12.

The adjective Pylius is metonymy for Nestor, from his kingdom Pylos on the west coast of the Peloponnese (cf. 8.2.7 promisit Pyliam quater senectam; similarly 4.1.3; Stat. Theb. 5.751; 9.29.1). Nestor was renowned for his longevity, and is often used in literature to denote extreme old age (cf. 10.24.11). That Calenus would rather spend one night with Sulpicia than live four times Nestor’s age heightens the significance of the time which they have spent together. This notion of old age foreshadows the satire on exaggerated old age presented in the following poem.

10.39

The poet confronts Lesbia for her claim that she was born in the year of Brutus’ consulship, the first consul of the Republic, then refutes her response that she was born during the reign of Numa by declaring she is even older and moulded from Promethean clay, thus as old as creation itself. Invective against old women is a conventional feature of Satire (see 10.8), and is also a regular subject in the poems of Lucilius and the Greek epigram (cf. AP 11.66-74; 256; 297; 298; 327; 417). Such women are primarily targeted for their physical repulsiveness or sexual lust (Richlin 275)
Old women feature frequently in Martial for humorous or satiric purposes (cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. Crones: 1.19; 100; 3.32; 67; 93; 4.20; 7.75; 8.79; 9.29; 37; 80; 11.87) and appear in three other poems of Book 10 in similar situations (10.8; 67; 90).

Although Lesbia is a fictional character on this occasion, the name automatically evokes Catullus' Lesbia, and the satirical nature of the poem deliberately offsets the previous poem 10.38 (and its pair of 10.35) which contains strong reminiscences of Catullus' poems to Lesbia. The measurement of time also links these poems. In 10.38, Calenus regards his fifteen year relationship with Sulpicia as equal to his entire lifetime. His preference for the brevity of those years as opposed to extreme old age contrasts with the present poem. Lesbia boasts of her extreme old age, and, in addition, the poet declares her age as being inestimable. 10.39 does not just look back to 35 and 38, but also introduces a series of epigrams disparaging of women (40; 41).

Consule te Bruto quod iuras, Lesbia, natam, mentiris. nata es, Lesbia, rege Numa?

Martial addresses Lesbia in a tone of mock solemnity in response to her oath, as defined by iuras (cf. similarly cf. 11.62 Lesbia se iurat gratis numquam esse fututam:/ verum est. cum futui vult, numerare solet; also 5.47.1; 6.12.1; 8.81.12; 11.8.14; 73.1) and the heavy use of spondees in the first line. Her sworn statement is immediately dismissed by mentiris.

The historical and mythological comparisons are employed to convey an exaggerated estimation of Lesbia's age. They are typical in Martial's satire on old
women and are standard devices in such invective (10.67.1-4; also 3.32; 93; 9.29; 
_Priap._ 57.3-5; Richlin 1983: 69 n. 14; also _AP_ 11.71). Brutus was the first consul of 
Rome in 509 BCE, hence the absurdity of the example (cf. 11.44.1 _orbis es et 
locuples et Bruto consule natus_; 8.30; 11.16). Numa, second King of Rome, dates 
back even further to 715-673 BCE. Numa is also used but in a different context in 
10.35.13-14, providing another link between 10.35, 38 and this poem. Not only is 
Lesbia older than these two, but their great reputations, Brutus as liberator of the 
Roman Republic (Liv. 1.56.8; Ov. _Fast._ 7.217 he is given the epithet _sapiens_) and 
Numa’s religious devotion contradict the connotations which Lesbia’s name produces. 

Lesbia is used as a fictional name on six other occasions in Martial, frequently 
in the context of sexual degeneracy (1.34; 2.50; 11.62), or in other derogatory 
circumstances such as playing on physical deformity (11.99) or attempts to mask old 
age (5.68; see Kay on 11.62; _RE_ 12.2100). As an ironic touch on Martial’s part, her 
name naturally recalls that of Catullus’ Lesbia, a symbol of youthful beauty (also cf. 
_Hor._ _Epod._ 12.17).

sic quoque mentiris. namque, ut tua saecula narrant, 
ficta Prometheo diceris esse luto.

Martial draws the epigram to its conclusion with an extreme example of age, the 
mythological legend of Prometheus moulding humans from clay (Hes. _Theog_ 424). 
Callimachus refers to this aetiological legend twice in corresponding language (fr. 493 
ei σε Προμηθεως/ ἐπλασε, καὶ πηλοῦ μὴ ἥ ἐτέρου γέγονας, and _Iamb._ 2.23 
καὶ τοῦν θαλάσσα και τὸ τετράπουν αὐτως/ ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡς ὃ πηλὸς ὃ 
Προμήθειος). Martial’s allusion here is perhaps significant, given his open rejection
of mythological subject matter. The reckoning of Lesbia’s age as old as creation itself is double-edged. In addition to the obvious point of age, she is not able to estimate her age from a Roman example, but from the Greek model of Prometheus, a story popular amongst Hellenistic writers and subsequently with the Roman devotees to Alexandrian traditions (Callim. fr. 493; Iamb. 2.3; Prop. 3.5.9; Ov. Met. 1.80-8; further examples see Mayor on Juv. 14.35). For similar expressions on the Promethean myth in Martial, cf. 9.45.3; 11.84.9; 14.80.2; 14.182: *ebrius haec fecit terris puto, monstra Prometheus;/ Saturnalicio lusit et ipse luto*; and also cf. Juv. 6.11-13; 14.35 *et meiiore luto finxit praeordia Titan*; Hor. Carm. 1.16.13-15. 10.35 and 38 reinforce Martial’s rejection of hackneyed mythological subject matter in 10.4; therefore, by using this aetiological myth, Martial heightens the effect of the insult.

10.40

This is the first of a group of poems in Book 10 on the theme of marriage which mention Polla (10.69; 91), although 10.69 is the only poem which actually addresses Polla. Unlike here, where she is Martial’s Polla (*mea Polla*), 10.91 identifies her husband as Almo whose household of eunuchs is the reason for Polla’s childlessness. 10.33; 35; 38 and 41 are linked by the theme of marriage which is addressed in quite differing contexts. Sulpicia epitomises the behaviour appropriate to a *univira*, and in contrast Polla is censured for her companionship with effeminate men (*cinaedus*) and for committing adultery. Women who spend time with effeminate men is a conventional theme for Martial’s anti-feminist outbursts (cf. Sullivan 1991: 185-207), but the prevailing cause for the poet’s outburst is the discovery of Polla’s adultery.
This poem emphasises sexual deviation outside the boundaries of proper conduct for married women, in contrast with the behaviour displayed by Sulpicia.

Semper cum mihi diceretur esse
secreto mea Polla cum cinaedo,
irrupi, Lupe. non erat cinaedus.

Polla (also spelt Paula and Paulla) is an extremely common name, and there are numerous examples of it in inscriptions as a popular praenomen and cognomen (Kajanto Cognomina: 243-4; for Paula in Martial cf. 10.8). This is the first of three poems which mention Polla, and are all related to the subject of marriage (69; 91). Unlike the other two, this Polla is associated with Martial, although she is still most likely a fictitious character. Perhaps to set this poem apart from the other two, this is the only one of the three poems on Polla in the hendecasyllabic metre. She appears twice more in other books, one poem ridiculing her appearance (3.42) and the other with an erotic motif (11.89).

Lupus is used a number of times in Martial frequently in the fictitious character of a miser (5.56; 6.79; 7.10; 7.55; 9.2; 11.18; 55; 88; 108), but the Lupus addressed at 10.48 is a poet friend of Martial. Kay suggests that poems such as 11.88; 6.79 and 10.40 are addressed to a real person because the addressee is not the target of the satire (see Kay on 11.7.1 and 11.88). Polla and Lupus appear together again in two separate but juxtaposing poems, Lupus at 11.88 and Polla at 11.89.

cinaedus was applied in terms of the passive role in a homosexual relationship (see Adams 1982: Williams 1999: 175-8). The term is rarely applied in poetry and generally only in satire (cf. Catul. 10.24; 16.2; 25.1; 29.5; 33.2; 57.1; Phaedrus Fab.
Elsewhere, Martial comments on the preference by women for effeminate men (cf. 7.58; also 6.39.12-13 quartus cinaeda fronte, candido vultu ex concubino natus est tibi Lygdo; in a similar sense see 6.67: cur tantum eunuchos habeat tua Caelia quaeris/ Pannyche, vult futui Caelia nec parere?). The exact nature of this sexual relationship is unclear, and Shackleton Bailey perhaps rightfully rejects the suggestions of cunnilingus or fellatio in preference for straight sex (cf. Juv. 6 Ox 3 invenies omnis turpes similesque cinaedis; SB² 2: 363; also see Richlin 1992: 266 n.36 who lists this poem amongst those on oral intercourse). Adultery is a common subject in Martial’s epigrams, and contributes to the motif in Book 10 of marriage and virtuous women (e.g. 33; 35; 38; 41; 42; on adultery in Martial cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. Adultery; also cf. Sullivan 1991: 198; for adultery in Roman literature see Richlin 1992: 215-9).

This epigram continues the theme of marriage, although on this occasion divorce is the issue. Here Proculeia unexpectedly divorces her long-term husband at the beginning of the new year and seemingly without explanation. Martial reveals that greed is her motive, and she is afraid that all his money will be spent on the games towards which he has to contribute in his office as praetor. Therefore she divorces him to preserve her share of their property. Such a frivolous reason for her divorce reflects the degeneration of the sanctity of marriage during this period, and was a conventional target for satirists (Sen. Ben.’ 3.16.2; Grewing on Mart. 6.7; Juv. 6.224-
Although Martial frequently discusses subjects such as adultery and other types of misconduct associated with marriage, divorce is rarely mentioned and even then appears only cursorily (11.2.4; 104.1). Both Proculeia and the adulteress Polla from the previous poem contrast with the model of the univira Sulpicia, whose fifteen years of marriage were equivalent to a lifetime together. 10.41 also looks ahead to 10.43 in which Phileros benefits from the deaths of his multiple wives through their inheritances. In addition, this attitude of greed and monetary gain complements characters such as Calliodorus (10.11) and similar examples of miserliness depicted earlier in the book (e.g. 10. 10; 14; 15; 27).

Mense novo Iani veterem, Proculeia, maritum deseris atque iubes res sibi habere suas.

The skilful arrangement of words in the first line highlights the balance between the divorce, and the new year and the previous year, when Proculeia was married. Although Ianus is often mentioned in the context of beginnings in general, here he denotes the beginning of the year (cf. 12.31.4 *quodque viret Iani mense nec alget holus*; for the many functions of Ianus cf. 10.28).

This the only occasion on which Proculeia is mentioned or addressed in Martial; it does not occur elsewhere in Roman literature (cf. Proculeianus CIL 25, Kajanto *Cognomina:* 153). One suggestion is that it is related to *procul*, the sense of which could be determined as appropriate in this poem, where Proculeia intends to be at a distance from her husband (Giegengack 1969: 63).

Although *veterem* can denote the sense of aged or ancient, Martial appears to use this sense more in the context of objects, such as wine (e.g. 4.64.15; 5.7.3; 5.10.5;
7.79.2; 9.73.2; 100.2). It implies that he is Proculeia’s husband of many years, and it is further revealed that he is a praetor, which makes him roughly 39 years of age. This is more appropriate given the irony of Proculeia divorcing her husband for such a hollow reason (for the sense of *vetus* as ‘long-standing’ cf. 10.37.3). In particular, it contrasts the blissful fifteen year marriage between Calenus and Sulpicia commemorated in 10.38, cut short by the death of Sulpicia.

*res sibi habere suas* was the formal legal expression for divorce, which was one of the prescriptions set out in the Twelve Tables; although the original language is unknown (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.69 *illam suam suas res sibi habere iussit*). In literature it appears in Plautus (*Am.* 928; *Trin.* 266), Seneca (*Suas.* 1.6) and Apuleius (*Met.* 5.26) (for variations see Treggiari 1991: 446-7); and *res suas* presumably refers to personal belongings rather than the dowry (Treggiari 1991: 447). This technical language conveys Martial’s contempt for Proculeia’s treatment of her marriage and the triviality with which she treats the formal proceedings of divorce.

Women were able to initiate divorce proceedings against their husbands (Pl. *Mil.* 1164ff. *Am.* 928; cf. Treggiari 1991: 444). All divorce cases required a cause, and the usual grounds were offences such as adultery or sexual misconduct (Treggiari 1991: 461ff.). The reader should expect a serious misdemeanour on the part of the husband to show due cause for the divorce.

*quid, rogo, quid factum est? subiti quae causa doloris? nil mihi respondes? dicam ego, praetor erat:*

Martial interrogates Proculeia as to the reason for her actions. The expression *causa doloris* suggests some grievance in terms of sexual behaviour in keeping with the
reasons for divorce given above. *dolor* is a term common in love poetry to denote grief or love-sickness, especially at the deprivation of a loved one (cf. 6.52.2; 14.173; Prop. 1.14.18; Catul. 96.1-2; for further examples see Vioque on 7.96.1). Her grounds for divorcing her husband are that her husband is a praetor. This is hardly good cause for divorce, and Martial proceeds to explain the situation in the following lines.

constatura fuit Megalensis purpura centum milibus, ut nimium munera parca dares, et populare sacrum bis milia dena tulisset.

One of the duties of the praetor was to organise the exhibition of games and festivals, which were subsidised by the state (Balsdon 1969: 263ff.). The praetor was obliged to contribute to the cost from his own pocket so as not to appear mean (cf. 4.67.5-6). At these main festivals, the praetor led the procession, and presided over their proceedings (12.28.9-12; Juv. 10.36). He would be dressed in the *toga picta*, which was purple embroidered with gold, an expensive garment normally reserved for triumphing generals (cf. 7.2.8).

The Megalesian festival was held on April 4 to 10 to celebrate the Magna Mater Idaea (for a description of the festival and the massive expenses supplied by the praetor cf. Juv. 11.191-5; Balsdon 1969: 246). The privilege of wearing the purple robes at this festival will cost the praetor 100,000 sesterces (cf. 5.23) towards the general cost of the games, despite economical measures he may take (similarly cf. 4.67.5-6 praetor ait ‘scis me Scorpo Thalloque daturum,/ atque utinam centum milia sola darem’). The 20,000 sesterces refers to the amount he contributes for the
10.41

*populare sacrum*, which perhaps denotes the *ludi plebeii* held in November in the Circus Flaminius (Balsdon 1969: 246).

*discidium non est hoc, Proculeia: lucrum est.*

*discidium* literally means 'cleaving asunder'. It is a common synonym for *divortium* and frequently used in literature of all periods as a term for divorce (Tib. 1.5.1; Sen. *Con.* 8.6; cf. Treggiari 1991: 441; *RE* 5.124). This is its only appearance in Martial, for elsewhere his expressions for divorce are *ite foras* (11.2.4) and *vade foras* (11.104.1 with Kay).

Proculeia's schemes are purely financially motivated, as conveyed by the concluding statement *lucrum est*. The term *lucrum* is generally used to convey the sense of profit or gain (cf. 8.9.3; 13.1.8i 3.4; *OLD* s.v. 2a). In matters of divorce, when the wife initiated the proceedings, the dowry was returned to her (Treggiari 1991: 466ff.; Kaser 1968: 247ff.). For similar money-making schemes associated with marriage, cf. 10.8; 43.

10.42

Martial praises the attractiveness of the youth Dindymus, as is represented by his lack of beard. The relationship between an older man and a younger man, particularly a handsome young slave or former slave, seems to be an acceptable part of Roman society (e.g. 1.58; 4.42; 5.83; 11.43; 14.205; Richlin 1992: 221-3; Williams 1999: 72-7; for Martial's sexual tastes cf. Sullivan 1991: 207-10). The tenderness of the relationship between poet and youth is represented by the kisses which the poet enjoys in the youth's beardless state and the language and imagery are typical of erotic
poetry. The model for such kissing poems is Catullus, poems 5 and 7, which reckon the total number of kisses between the poet and Lesbia as infinite (also cf. 48; see Grewing on 6.34). Martial adopts the *basia* motif elsewhere in a similar erotic context between two men (6.34), though in 10.42 the number of kisses is reckoned only at five. Martial demonstrates admiration for Catullus in his adaptation of the Catullan motif, yet his divergence from Catullus' original idea exhibits a certain degree of irony or parody, so that Martial may prove his knowledge of the literary traditions and insert his own innovations (Sullivan 1991: 96). The influence of Catullus is further enhanced by the use of the name Dindymus, which has connotations with poem 63 and the castration of Attis on the mountain of that name. This continues Martial's play with Catullus' language and vocabulary from 10.39, where he addresses the ancient Lesbia (also cf. 10.4; 35 and 38).

The subject matter of this poem, with affection demonstrated between two men, contrasts the themes of marriage, adultery and divorce expressed in the previous series of poems and is resumed in the following poem. The only other poem in Book 10 to consider the attractiveness of youths is 10.66, and, interestingly, this poem precedes another series of epigrams on the shameless behaviour of women.

Tam dubia est lanugo tibi, tam mollis ut illam halitus et soles et levis aura terat.

The poet admires the young man's smooth cheeks, which contribute significantly to his attraction (1.31.5-6; 2.48.4; 4.7.3; 9.56.11; 11.22.5; 43.10; 63; 12.18.24-6; 14.205). The growth of the beard symbolised the development from childhood to puberty, which is marked by the first ceremonial shave and cutting of long hair (1.31,
with Howell and Citroni; Catul. 61.130-2; AP 6.279). Martial frequently comments upon the attractiveness of beardless youths and laments their maturing to manhood (4.7; 5.48; 7.29.3; 9.16; 56.10-11; AP 12.191). The adjective *mollis* is a conventional metaphor for effeminacy, and is commonly associated with pathics and *cinaedi* (2.84; 3.73; 5.41.2; 12.75; Catul. 25; Richlin 1992: 258 n.3, Williams 1999: 127-32; 211-5, also Index s.v. *mollitia*).

celantur simili ventura Cydonea lana,
pollice virgineo quae spoliata nitent.

Dindymus’ lack of beard prolongs his attractiveness despite his development into manhood. The poet praises the lightness of Dindymus’ beard in a vivid comparison to a girl plucking a quince (*cydonea* cf. Leary on 13.27; also Prop. 3.13.27). References to fruit are typical of erotic imagery, and a similar image can be compared at 3.65 in relation to the scent of Diadumenus’ kisses (3.65.1 *quod spirat tenera malum mordente puella*; also Catul. 65.19-23). The term *lana* offers a variety of meanings, but here suggests the fine hair covering the outside of the fruit (cf. 13.57; on the different uses of this word see Coleman 1994: 149; *TLL* 7 (2). 914.41-50). The analogy of the virgin girl conveys an impression of youth and sexual purity appropriate to the poem, but the depiction of the girl stripping the tree of its fruit adds a hint of sexual aggressiveness in the sense of ‘deflowering’, which enhances the erotic tone of the poem. This is conveyed by the use of *spoliata*, which here assumes the meaning ‘to strip of a natural covering’ (cf. *spoliatrix* of 4.29.5; Ov. *Ars* 3.449 *redde meum!* clamant *spoliatae saepe puellae*; *OLD* s.v. *spolio* 1b).
fortius impressi quotiens tibi basia quinque,
barbatus labris, Dindyme, fio tuis.

Poems on kissing are characteristic of erotic poetry, and the calculation of their number is naturally reminiscent of Catullus 5; 7 to Lesbia, and also 48 to Juventius:

\[ Mellitos oculos tuos, Juventi, 
si quis me sinat usque basiare, 
usque ad milia basiem trecenta 
nec numquam videar satur futurus, 
non si densior aridis aristis 
sit nostrae seges osculationis. \]

Also cf. Mart. 6.34.7-8 nolo quot arguto dedit exorata Catullo/ Lesbia: pauca cupit qui numerare potest (see Grewing’s note). The theme of kissing is a frequent subject in Martial’s poems dealing with boy-love, and the poet describes the sensual pleasure received from kisses in the context of their scent (3.65; 11.8), given begrudgingly (5.46), or continuously (6.34; also 11.26).

Dindymus was the mountain in Phrygia famously associated with the worship of Cybele by the eunuch priests known as Galli. The name evokes Catullus 63 on the castration of Attis on this mountain, and is therefore appropriate in this context as a puer delicatus. It only appears as the name of a person in Martial, and always in poems with homoerotic contexts, for example 5.83 and 12.75.4; as a young slave boy 11.6.11; and as a eunuch at 6.39.21 and 11.81 (see Kay on 11.6.11; cf. Dindyma CIL 4.4101).

Phileros has buried seven wives, and the implication is that he has murdered them. Their burial on his land increases the value of his estate by virtue of their inheritance. This resumes the thematic series of poems on marriage, which have ranged from best
wishes on the wedding in 33, to the description of the univira in 35 and 38, adultery in 40, and divorce in 41; however, between them is a poem on homosexual love (42). This poem addresses the prospect of multiple marriages (seven) together with the suggestion of murder for the sake of inheritance. The concept of an individual of either sex marrying many times is a regular subject in Martial’s poems (7.58; 8.43; 9.15; 78; on the actuality of serial remarriage especially after the death of a spouse cf. Treggiari 1991: 499-502), and like this present poem it is often combined with the murder, particularly by poison, of the spouse in order to receive the inheritance (4.69; 8.43; 9.15; 78; cf. Juv. 14.220-2 elatam iam crede nurum, si limina vestra/ mortifera cum dote subit: quibus illa premetur/ per somnum digitis!). The frequency with which serial marriage occurs in Martial suggests that it was a popular satirical topic as a variant on the theme of captatio (cf. 10.8; Henriksen on 9.15).

Septima iam, Phileros, tibi conditur uxor in agro.  
plus nulli, Phileros, quam tibi reddit ager.

The name Phileros, ‘fond of love’, is not directly necessary to the point of the poem, which is the recovery of inheritance from his wives. It adds to the humour of the poem and belongs to the category of names which Martial uses appropriate to the activities of the person involved, in so far as Phileros has married seven times (Giegengack 1969: 82). Phileros also occurs at 2.34 in an appropriate context, and is apparently a typical name in satirical language (Petr. 44.1; Aed. poet. fr. 2.1; Gel. 19.9.12, also Cic. Fam. 9.15.1).

Phileros has married and buried seven wives, a favourite number used by Martial to denote the large number of husbands or wives a person may have (cf. 288)
7.58.1 *iam sex aut septem nupsisti, Galla, cinaedis*; 9.15.1 *inscripsit tumulis septem scelerata virorum;* 78.1 *funera post septem nupsit tibi Galla virorum;* cf. 4.69.4; Juv. 10.229).

*condere* is language typical of funerary epitaphs and equivalent to *sepelitur,* although this is the only occasion in which Martial uses it in a satirical context (cf. 1.114.3; 7.96.1; 10.71.3; 11.13.7; also Pers. 2.14 *Nerio iam tertia conditur; TLL 3.150.83-151.57;* Martial seems to prefer *extuli* in satirical poems, cf. 2.65.2; 4.24.2; 5.37.21)

*ager* in this context refers to a privately owned estate (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2), and although all burials took place outside the city according to the Twelve Tables, rich landowners established tombs for themselves and their households on their own estates (cf. 10.61; Toynbee 1971: 48-9). The expression *reddit ager* refers to the yield from his estate, which is produced (rather gruesomely) from the death of his wives, and hence from the inheritance he gains from them (cf. 2.38 *quod mihi reddat ager quaeris, Line, Nomentanus?* / *hoc mihi reddit ager: te, Line, non video; 5.42.4 non reddet sterilis semina iacta seges*).

### 10.44

Quintus Ovidius demonstrates the ideal of true friendship in his decision to travel to Britain for the sake of his friend without consideration for his own age and health. The pledge to travel anywhere in the world on behalf of a friend is a common proof of friendship, with numerous literary precedents. For example cf. Seneca's statement:

*in quid amicum paras? ut habeam pro quo morti possim, ut habeam quem in exilium sequar, cuius me morti et opponam et inpendam* (Ep. 9.10).
Also cf. Catul. 11; Hor. *Carm.* 2.6.1-4; 2.17.10-13; 3.4.29-36; *Epod.* 1.11-14; Prop. 1.6.104; Tib. 1.3.1-3; Ov. *Pont.* 2.10.21-42; Petr. 94.2. This theme is treated earlier in the book at 10.13 (20) where Martial declares his friendship for his childhood friend Manius. The bond of friendship is a significant theme in Book 10, and Martial calls upon a number of his old friends and patrons, perhaps because of his impending departure from Rome (Sullivan 1991: 49). Friendship and the comforts of country living in this poem create a link to 10.47 and 48 on the essentials for a happy life.

It is difficult to determine the actual relationship between Ovidius and Martial, although the language in this poem seems to suggest a close personal friendship due to their neighbouring estates in Nomentum (cf. 1.05; 13.119; 9.98). Sullivan’s argument that Ovidius was not Martial’s patron for the reason that Ovidius was a client of Caesonius Maximus fails to take into account the hierarchical system of *amicitia* (Sullivan 1991: 20; cf. Saller 1989: 49-62 on the role of multiple clientships). Kleijwegt suggests that Ovidius was a patron of the poet whom Martial reproaches at 9.52 and 53 for Ovidius’ refusal to accept a birthday gift, though with the proposal that he should give the poet a gift (Kleijwegt 1998: 270-2, however cf. Henriksén on 9.53 who suggests that such playful humour may simply indicate the familiarity of their relationship). He argues further that 10.44, like 7.93 where the poet complains that Narnia prevents Quintus from remaining at Nomentum and close to Martial, hints also at a rejection of the poet’s friendship and mocks Ovidius for his display of friendship towards another (Kleijwegt 1998: 272). The language and tone of 10.44 seems to convey admiration for Ovidius’ demonstration of friendship, and any reproachful language is contained in the wish for Ovidius to consider himself amongst his friends and return to his villa in Nomentum. Such praise for Ovidius’ behaviour
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reflects Martial’s attitudes to good friendship throughout the book and balances the
tone of the next poem, where Martial defends his inclusion of poems complimentary
or appreciative in nature towards individuals in his books in addition to the satirical
and the contemptuous.

For further reading, see Kleijwegt 1998: 270-2.

Quinte Caledonios Ovidi visure Britannos
et viridem Tethyn Oceanunque patrem,

The poem begins in a manner similar to the propemptikon, as it describes the journey
which Ovidius is set to undertake (cf. 10.12; Stat. Silv. 5.2.1 rura meus Tyrrhena petit
saltusque Tagetis/ Crispinus; nec longa mora est aut avia tellus). The language and
expressions are sophisticated in nature, which is appropriate to the degree of respect
and praise towards Ovidius, and is reminiscent of Lucan (cf. 6.67-8 aut, vaga cum
Tethys Rutupinaque litora fervent / unda Caledonios fallit turbata Britannos).

Ovidius is preparing to journey to Britain, the north-west limit of the empire
(TLL 2.2196.68ff.). Such a journey to the farthestmost ends of the empire recalls the
notion of accompanying one’s friend even to the most barbarous of places (cf. 10.13).
Metonymy is applied to denote the trip over the sea in the form of the sea gods Tethys
and Oceanus (cf. Sp. 3.6 et quem supremae Tethyos unda ferit).

Quintus Ovidius appears in eight other poems spread throughout the corpus,
especially in relation to his estate and the production of wine at Nomentum (13.119,
1.105 with Howell and Citroni; 7.44 with Vioque; 45; 93; 9.52 with Henriksén; 53;
98). Nothing else is known of him other than from the epigrams, and he is not
mentioned again after this poem. Here and at 9.52 are the only two occasions where
Ovidius is addressed by both his praenomen and cognomen. Elsewhere he is called Quintus (7.93; 9.53; 13.119) or Ovidius (1.105; 7.44; 45; 9.98). The context indicates that these all refer to the same person.

He is also addressed at 7.44 and 45, a pair of poems composed to accompany a portrait of Caesonius Maximus being given to Quintus Ovidius. Caesonius Maximus was a friend/patron whom Ovidius voluntarily followed to Sicily on his being exiled by Nero, possibly following the Pisonian conspiracy (Tac. Ann. 15.71.5; Nauta 2002: 71). Like this epigram, which expresses admiration for Ovidius’ strength of character and attitudes towards friendship, 7.44 and 45 praise Ovidius with similar language for his friendship in following Caesonius Maximus into exile: e.g. aequora per Scyliae magni comes exulis isti,/ qui modo nolueras consulis ire comes (7.44.5-6) and again hunc tu per Siculas secutus undas (7.45.5). Similarly at 7.93, the poet reproaches the city of Narnia for keeping Ovidius away from Nomentum and hence from Martial.

ergo Numae colles et Nomentana relinquis
otia nec retinet rusque focusque senem?

Nomentum was a town thirteen miles north of Rome, where Ovidius owned a farm and vineyard (1.105 with Citroni and Howell; 7.93; 9.98 with Henriksen; 13.119 with Leary). This estate was near to Martial’s own property, and Ovidius’ presence is presented as the reason for the poet’s residence there: quid Nomentani causam mihi perdis agelli,/ propter vicinum qui pretiosus erat? (7.93.5-6).

In the opening lines, elevated language and metonymy reflect the mood of sincerity and esteem for his friend. The phrase Numae colles is used to denote Rome, which evokes the notion of ancient moral standards in keeping with the tone of the
poem (on Numa see 10.10.4; for a similar expression cf. 4.57.9 *Herculeos colles*, 7.13.3). In his attempt to persuade Ovidius to return to Nomentum, Martial appeals to aspects of retired life which might attract a man of Ovidius' age, such as *otia, rusque focusque*. The term *otia* denotes leisure to devote one's time, and Martial uses this term for the pleasure he receives from his own estate at Nomentum (6.43.3 *me Nomentani confirmant otia ruris* also cf. 1.55.4; 107.3 with Howell; 12.68.5; for scholarship on this term in Martial see Vioque on 7.28.7). The prospect of the *focus* is repeated in Martial's image of the ideal life in 10.47, and typifies the image of contentment in pastoral living (cf. 10.47. 1.49.27; 1.55.8; 2.90.7; 4.66.10).

gaudia tu differs, at non et stamina differt
Atropos atque omnis scribitur hora tibi.

A similar sentiment on the brevity of the pleasures in life is expressed at 1.15 to Martial's closest friend Julius Martialis: *non bene distuleris videas quae posse negari/ et solum hoc ducas, quod fuit, esse tuum./ exspectant curaeque catenatique labores,/ gaudia non remanent sed fugitiva volant* (1.15.5-8). The reminder of Ovidius' increasing age and the importance of reckoning every hour are perhaps reflective of the close relationship between the two. The language of reckoning the hours is also reminiscent of 10.38: cf. *o nox omnis et hora, quae notata est/ cara litoris Indici lapillus*! (10.38.4-5). As in 10.38, Martial again refers to Atropos, one of the Fates, as the ultimate controller of life and death, and who appears only on these two occasions in Martial's books. Similarly, just as 10.38 praises the bond of marriage, so this poem commends the bond of friendship.
praestiteris caro – quis non hoc laudet? – amico
ut potior vita sit tibi sancta fides;

The *amicus* for whom Quintus is travelling to Britain is unknown. One possibility is that he was accompanying him in exile (Kleijwegt 1998: 272), but the more probable suggestion is that he was assuming a post as governor or legionary legate (Nauta 2002: 71 n.113). Unlike 7.44 and 45, which clearly confirm Ovidius’ departure for Sicily for the sake of his friendship with the exiled Caesonius Maximus, there is no indication in the poem that Ovidius is again following someone into exile, although he is still demonstrating the full extent of his friendship.

The expression *fides sancta* is used on only one other occasion in Martial, and that is concerned with loyalty towards the emperor Domitian in 9.84.2 (see Henriksen: cf. Catul. 76.3; Verg. A. 7.365; Phaedr. 4.14.5; Sil. 13.749). Given that it is used only on this one other occasion and is directed towards the emperor, this present usage may be an example of the transfer of imperial panegyric to ordinary individuals.

*sed reddare tuis tandem mansure Sabinis*
*teque tuas numeres inter amicitias.*

Because this is the only occasion where *Sabini* is used to denote Nomentum in Martial, Citroni refers to this as a separate estate from that at Nomenum (Citroni on 1.105). Nomentum was also considered Sabine territory and the name most likely refers to the same estate (cf. Verg. A. 7.712; Strabo 5.3.1; Plin. *Nat.* 3.107; Nauta 2002: 71 n.112; Howell on 1.105). 10.33 refers to ancient moral integrity, and this notion is perhaps retained in this present poem with the reference to Numa as a reminder of the benefits in Nomentum.
These last lines do not suggest Martial’s disappointment with Ovidius for not returning to Nomentum as a rejection of the poet’s friendship, but rather gently to remind Ovidius to treat himself as he would one of his own friends. Martial’s urging that Ovidius focus on himself is reinforced by the repetition of tuis...teque tuas (also tibi of line 6). The effect of the final word of the poem amicitias confirms the value of friendship over everything else (cf. 10.13.4).

The poet defends his poems, which are not suited to the readers who favour the satirical ones (for Martial’s defence of his poems against critics cf. 1.91; 2.8; 71; 7.81). Martial reproaches his reader for selecting the satirical poems and dismissing any which are lene, dulce, blanda and honorificum on the grounds that they are pinguis. For this reason, his reader prefers a single rib in contrast with the ilia Laurentis apri offered by Martial. The metaphor of food to represent different styles of literature is a familiar topic in Greek and Roman literature, where each literary genre is classified according to taste, such as sweet, acidic, or bitter (see Bramble 1972: 42-59; Gowers 1993: passim). For example, at 9.81, when a poet criticises his poetry for not being exacti, Martial compares his poetry to the courses of a meal. In response, he expresses the wish that his poetry pleases the diners and not the cooks.

The sharp-tasting ingredients of sal and acetum are appropriate to the genres of epigram and satire, and any items which are sweet and complimentary, contradict the purpose of such genres. One reading of this poem is that it is intended to criticise the poet’s own poems which are lene and dulce, even to the point of conspiring with his readers exclusively in favour of his satirical epigrams (Gowers 1993: 248).
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elements are not appropriate to the satirical genre, and elsewhere Martial criticises a poet for writing epigrams which are *dulcia ...et cerussata candidiora*, whereas his own poetry contains *mica salis* and *acetum: infanti melimela dato fatuasque mariscas:/ nam mihi, quae novit pungere, Chia sapit.* (7.25.7-8). But Martial's poetry is not limited to the topics of satire and humour, and it would seem that Martial is defending poems such as the one immediately preceding for Quintus Ovidius in praise of the bond of friendship, as it exhibits these very qualities such as *lene* and *dulcis* in nature. Variety is the key ingredient of his work, not only in quality, but also in subject matter. This is exhibited in the following poem where he requests Matho to say something bad from time to time.

10.45 also forms a pair with 10.59, where the anonymous reader is reproached for his/her selectiveness in reading only Martial's shorter epigrams. Like 10.45, the necessity of variety is presented in the form of a culinary metaphor. The defence of his subject matter is an extension of the literary programme established at the beginning of the book (10.1-5). His complimentary poems for genuine friends and patrons are contrasted with those satirical in nature, which, he claims, are directed towards fictitious persons (cf. 10.33.9-10).


*Si quid lene mei dicunt et dulce libelli,*
*si quid honorificum pagina blanda sonat,*

Terms such as *lene* and *dulce* belong to the gastronomical language representative of literary genres which are contrary to satirical poetry (cf. Hor. S. 2.4.25-7 *quoniam vacui committere venis/ nil nisi lene decet; leni praecordia mulso/ prolueris melius;*
Gowers 1993: 248 n.122). At 7.25, Martial criticises another poet for always writing in this fashion: *dulcia cum tantum scribas epigrammata semper/ et cerussata candidiora cute* (7.25.1-2), unlike his own: *nam mihi, quae novit pungere, Chia sapit* (7.25.7-8; for other examples of *dulcis* as a term of literary criticism cf. 7.84.5; Catul. 68.7, *TLL* 5.1.2192.15-30; see Vioque on 7.25.1). The difference here is that Martial is referring to a selection of his poetry, that which is complimentary in tone, in his criticism of the reader who wishes to read only his humorous poems.

Martial responds to the reader's complaints that his poetry is *blanda* and *honorificum*. The term *blanda* generally denotes the sense of 'flattering' or 'ingratiating' in a less than desirable context (cf. 7.88.9 with Vioque; also Catul. 64.139-40, *TLL* 2.2039.10). It is striking that at 10.72 Martial dismisses the language of *Blanditiae* from his poetry. This is the only occasion in which *honorificum* appears in Martial, and its use in Roman literature incorporates senatorial or imperial praise (Plin. *Ep.* 1.5.12; 3.4.3; *Cic. Att.* 1.16.4; *Ver.* 2.122; *Sen. Dial.* 4.34.1). As such, the reader's complaints about poetry that is *blanda* and *honorificum* are directed towards the complimentary pieces for Martial's friends, and perhaps more especially for his patrons of a high social status.

**hoc tu pingue putas et costam rodere mavis,**

**ilia Laurentis cum tibi demus apri.**

The unnamed critic of this epigram rejects such poetry as *pinguis*, the fat of the meat, which is a conventional metaphor for literature that is flabby, greasy and turgid (cf. 1.107.8; *Hor. S.* 2.2.21; *OLD* s.v. 1b). The loin denotes the best part of the meat (cf. Juv. 5.133-6 with Colton 1991: 198). The description of the reader preferring a bone...
to gnaw on, just like a dog, is an image which Martial frequently presents of his literary critics (5.28.7; 5.60.10; 6.64.32; 13.2.6).

In Horace, the Laurentian boar, fat on sedge and reeds, represents poetry that is tasteless and indigestible (S. 2.4.40-2 umber et iligna nutritus glande rotundas/ curvat aper lances carnum vitantis inertem;/ nam Laurens malus est, ulvis et harundine pinguis; see Gowers 1993: 147-148, 248). Boar at the dining table is a luxury item in Martial’s poems (9.48.5 inter quae rari Laurentem ponderis aprum; also 7.78.9; 9.14.3; 12.17.4), and perhaps is intended here to represent the richness of his poetical style as opposed to the mean bone preferred by the reader (cf. Gowers 1993: 248 n.122, who argues that Laurentian boar evokes an image of turgid and indigestible poetry).

Vaticana bibas, si delectaris aceto: 
non facit ad stomachum nostra lagona tuum.

The poet rejects this reader’s criticisms by exposing his/her cheap tastes in poetry. Martial’s poetry is totally unsuitable for such a reader (similarly cf. 2.86.12 me raris iuvat auribus placere). Although Vatican wine is not mentioned elsewhere, Martial frequently reviles it for its cheapness and nasty vinegary taste (1.18.2 with Howell; also 6.92.3 Vaticana bibis: bibis venenum; 12.48.13-14 imputet ipse deus nectar mihi, fiet acetum/ et Vaticani perfida vappa cadi, Younger 1966: 156). acetum is the term for vinegar, and its tangy flavour represents the ideal metaphor for satirical literature especially in terms of malice or racy wit (7.25.5 with Vioque; Hor. S. 1.7.32-3; 2.3.117, Pers. 5.86, TLL 1.381.49-61).
stomachum represents the general literary taste of his reader unable to digest the complete range of Martial's poetry (13.3.8 si quid non facit ad stomachum; OLD s.v. 3a; see 12 praef. 17 for its sense of ill-temper and vexation). The colloquial and prosaic term lagana, a vessel commonly used to contain wine, represents Martial's poetry (4.69.3; 6.89.4 with Grewing, 9.87.7; 12.82.11; 13.120; 14.116; TLL 7.2.894.11-13). Here it is used in a general sense to contrast with the nasty tasting Vatican wine mentioned above. The chiastic phrase stomachum nostra lagana tuum heightens the force of his statement.

In direct contrast with the previous poem, which justifies Martial's inclusion of complimentary or puff poems to friends and patrons along with his satirical epigrams, Matho is criticised for his lack of variety by trying to say everything prettily. Its humour is an appropriate contrast with the subject matter of the previous two poems, one which is a complimentary piece and the other which defends such poems.

This poem is also a response to 7.90, also addressed to Matho, who criticises the unevenness of Martial's own book of poems:

Iactat inaequalem Matho me fecisse libellum:
si verum est, laudat carmina nostra Matho. 
eaequales scribit libros Calvinus et Umber:
eaequalis liber est, Cretice, qui malus est.

Martial is very conscious of variety in his volumes, as is demonstrated by the arrangement of themes. Throughout his books he defends himself against accusations of inaequalitas in his poetry, even the difference in quality from poem to poem (1.16; 7.81; 85; 90; also Plin. Ep. 3.5.10; cf. Sullivan 1991: 70; Vioque on 7.81). For
example, at 1.16 Martial claims that some of his poetry is *bona*, some is *mediocria* and others *mala plura*, which is the normal composition for a book. Unlike Martial, Matho aims to say everything in the same way without any attempt at variety.

Martial’s justification for his book’s variety of subject matter is that it reflects the changeability of everyday life (Citroni on 1.16). Therefore this poem is indirectly related to the literary cycle in Book 10, especially with the disclosure of his literary programme in 10.4 that his poems are concerned with real life.

**Omnia vis belle, Matho, dicere. dic aliquando et bene; dic neutrum; dic aliquando male.**

The fictitious Matho is addressed a number of times in Martial in a variety of humorous contexts: at 4.79 as a guest who outstays his welcome; at 6.33 on the sodomite Sabellus; as one who engages in sexual practices at 7.10.3; at 7.90 as a critic of Martial’s poems (see above); at 8.42 as a client; and in a humorous poem at 11.68. In Juvenal he is characterised as both a lawyer and a bankrupt (1.32-3; 7.105-49; cf. 11.34 where he is also characterised as a windbag, see Colton 1991: 389; Cic. *Fam.* 9.25.4). The popular *cognomen* belongs to the *gens Pomponia* and the *gens Naevia* (*PIR*² N 364). Grewing suggests that its usage here and 11.68 represents its associations with the Greek μονοθάνειν as an observation on criticism and instruction (see Grewing on 6.33.1; possibly also 7.90).

The humour of the poem is dependent upon the repetition of *dicere* and the contrasting levels of *belle, bene* and *male*. Such repetition is characteristic in Martial’s epigrams of this kind (cf. 3.90; 6.44; 7.20; 11.67; 68; 92; 12.39; Sullivan 1991: 249). Terms such as *bonus* and *malus* are conventional terms used in literary
criticism to denote the quality of a literary work (e.g. 1.16 sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plural/ quae legis hic: aliter non fit, A vite, liber; 2.86.6 matus poeta; 6.82.10; 7.81.1; 90.4). The adverb belle is used frequently in Martial instead of bene (cf. the etymological world play between bene and belle at 2.7.7 with Williams nil bene cum facias, facias tamen omnia belle; 6.44.5 at si ego non bene, sed vere dixero quidam; 7.85.2 with Vioque). bellus is commonly associated with urbanity and elegance of style, which is extended to its use as a term of literary sophistication and criticism (e.g. Catul. 12.1; 22.9; Cic. Att. 13.20.2; de Div. 2.66; de Orat. 3.101; Var. Men. Fr. 335; Persius 1.48-53; Petr. 64.2; Ross 1969: 110-11, Krostenko 2001: 51-59, 111-14)

At the heart of Book 10 is Martial’s formula for true happiness in life, and its simplicity of style and conciseness of expression perhaps make it one of the best known and most imitated poem of Martial (Sullivan 1986: 112). It is addressed to Julius Martialis, Martial’s most intimate friend in Rome, for whom he formulates poems on a similar theme in other books (1.15; 5.20; 4.63). For example, at 5.20 he lists the elements of the contented lifestyle which the two can share in Rome, whereas here the setting for true contentment is country living. Although the poem does not directly express a desire to leave Rome, the longing for country living corresponds to Martial’s dissatisfaction with aspects of life in Rome, such as the relationship of amicitia in earlier poems in Book 10, it thus anticipates his eventual departure from Rome at the end of the book. Spisak regards this poem with respect to its position at the centre of this book, and demonstrates its significance as the collation of major
themes and motifs introduced already (Spisak 2002: 134-5). The poem is a continuation of the cycle of poems on the urban/rural contrast (13; 23; 30; 37; 44), with a greater emphasis on pastoral living as the ideal and less focus on complaints of life in Rome expressed in earlier poems. Other themes include the expression of true friendship (13; 44) and the moral fortitude of one’s spouse (cf. 10.35).

These ideas are expressed in other books, and the obvious model for 10.47 is 2.90, addressed to Quintilian, and which also lists the simple pleasures in life:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me focus et nigros non indignantia fumos} \\
\text{tecta iuvant et fons vivus et herba rudis.} \\
\text{sit mihi vema satur, sit non doctissima coniunx,} \\
\text{sit nox cum somno, sit sine lite dies. (2.90.7-10).}
\end{align*}
\]

10.47 expresses notions based on Epicurean doctrines on \textit{vita beatior} and although it does not express any profound philosophical thoughts the ideas are placed in a framework which would appeal to the Roman reader, with elements such as inherited land, the importance of friendship, and the virtuous matrona (Sullivan 1991: 215-17, Adamik 1975: 55-64, Watson and Watson: 139-40). The description of the ideal way of life is a standard in Roman literature, especially in Augustan poetry and is particularly associated with country living combined with sufficient but not excessive quantities of food, drink and sex, the absence of political concerns, the importance of friendships on an equal basis, and living life without fear of death (e.g. Verg. G. 2.458-540; Hor. \textit{Epod.} 2; Tib. 1.1; see Sullivan 1991: 217, Watson and Watson: 139). The primary difference between these passages and this of Martial is that country life represents a lifestyle of leisure and idleness rather than the farmer’s life of labour and toil (cf. Hor. S. 2.6; Watson and Watson: 139-40).
The poem is divided into several sections. The first part introduces the subject matter (*vita beatiior*) and reveals the addressee (1-2). The elements of the contented lifestyle are then listed in three groups which contribute to the contented lifestyle: work, money and land; human attributes and characteristics; then the basic necessities, food, drink, sex and sleep (3-11). The fundamental guideline for happy living is presented in the final idea which presents the philosophical outlook on how to approach the prospect of death (12-13). These themes are continued in the following poem, which presents the ideal dinner party as requiring elements such as pleasant company of friends and moderate but sufficient quantities of food. In addition, the complimentary nature of this poem exemplifies the type of poems which he defends in 10.45 as part of the variety in his poetry's subject matter.


Vitam quae faciant beatiorem,  
lucundissimé Martialis, haec sunt:

Martial outlines his intention to reveal the ingredients for *vita beatiior*, as *vita beata* is the standard phrase to express happiness and is especially part of the philosophical doctrine of Epicurus (Hor. S. 2.4.95 *vitae praecepta beatae*; Epicurus *Ep. Men.* 128-9; Sen. *Dial.* 7.1.1; cf. *TLL* s.v.*beo* 1.2.1912ff.).

Julius Martialis was Martial’s most intimate friend during his time in Rome (cf. 12.34.1-2 *triginta mihi quattuorque messes/ tecum, si memini, fuere, Iuli*). He is addressed or mentioned in all the books but Books 2 and 8, and Book 6 is dedicated to him (cf. 1.15; 3.5; 4.64; 5.20; 6.1; 7.17; 9.97; 11.80; 12.34; 1.107 is also possibly
addressed to Martialis, see Nauta 2002: 73 n.73, although Howell suggests otherwise).

It is unclear whether he was Martial’s patron and social superior (Citroni on 1.15, Grewing on 6.1, Shäfer 1983: 74-95) or simply a close friend (Kleijwegt 1998: 273-5). From the information given in the epigrams it seems that he was a lawyer (e.g. 5.20.6), but like Martial participated in the tedious duties of a client (e.g. 5.20.5-7; for his status as a lawyer and a client see Howell on 5.20; cf. Citroni on 1.15, Grewing on 6.1, Sullivan 1991: 17 as a lawyer but not a client, see Nauta 2002: 73 n.119).

Regardless of what roles Julius Martialis undertook in Rome, a close personal relationship is certainly evident in the manner of address to him in the various poems, which is mirrored here by the superlative *iucundissime* (possibly 1.107.1 *Luci carissime Iuli*; 3.5.4 *Iulius, adsiduum nomen in ore meo*; 5.20.1 *care Martialis*; 6.1.2 *in primis mihi care Martialis*; 9.97.1 *carissime Iuli*).

*res non parta labore, sed relicta;*
*non ingratus ager, focus perennis;*
*lis numquam, toga rara, mens quieta;*

The means of supporting oneself is the first element for discussion. The concept of land not being worked for but inherited is regarded by Sullivan as an inherently Roman element to the poem, but reflects the Epicurean doctrine on the acquisition of property (Adamik 1975: 62). Features such as *ager* and *focus perennis* are typical attractions of country living, and suggest self-sufficiency and the plentiful quantities available (on *focus* see 10.44.4; 2.90.7 *me focus et nigros non indignantia*; Watson and Watson: 141).

Self-sufficiency is idealised by country living which does not involve the worries of lawsuits and the cumbersome toga. Elsewhere, Martial displays his
10.47
displeasure at lawsuits as an aspect of city life which is contrary to the happy life (2.90.10 *sit sine lite dies;* 5.20.6 *nec litis tetricas forumque triste*). Mention of lawsuits may also refer to Julius Martialis as a practising lawyer at Rome. The toga is a symbol of the hardships of the patron/client relationships at Rome and is a frequent cause for complaint particularly in Book 10 (see 10.10.12; cf. 3.46.1 *exigis a nobis operam sine fine togam;* 1.49.31; 12.18.17; Juv. 11.205 *effugiatque togam* with Colton 1991: 412-13). The beneficial outcome of the absence of such political and city activities in country life is *mens quieta* (10.92.1; cf. Verg. *G.* 2.467). This implies freedom from the duties undertaken by the client in the city.

**vires ingenuae, salubre corpus;**
**prudens simplicitas, pares amici;**

In addition to the material items, Martial presents the essential physical attributes which are conducive to the happy life. The term *ingenuus* refers to the strength appropriate to a free-born Roman, rather than the excessive strength necessary for slaves (3.36.6, 6.11.6; Ov. *Tr.* 1.5.72). Again this evokes the notion raised in 10.30 that city work is akin to slavery. Here the body is described as *salubre,* as good health was a sign of country living (Sen. *Ep.* 10.4; Petr. 61; for a similar expression cf. Juv. 10.356 *mens sana in corpore sano*).

**prudens simplicitas** refers to the individual who combines candour with praise, and *simplicitas* is a characteristic of the *vir bonus* illustrated by men such as Manius (10.13.3) and Munatius Gallus (10.33). It is now revealed as a fundamental aspect of country living and accompanies the following notion of friendship, which is an important element in the Epicurean philosophy of happiness (e.g. Epicurus
Friendship exists between two individuals provided that they are *pares* or equal in status, as this eliminates the hardships and injustices of the patron/client relationship (cf. 5.20.4 *et verae pariter vacare vitae*, Ov. *Tr.* 3.4.44 *amicitias et tibi iunge pares*). This expression may also suggest the nature of the relationship between Martial and Julius Martialis as being of equal in status (see above). For the notion of good and bad friendship as a significant motif throughout Book 10, cf. 10.13.

*convictus facilis, sine arte mensa; nox non ebria, sed soluta curis;*

The atmosphere of the pastoral dinner table is *facilis*, a notable characteristic of country living (e.g. Hor. *S.* 2.2.118-20, 2.6.59-76). This is perhaps also due to the company invited who possess the characteristics mentioned above. The food is plain and in sufficient amounts, but not lavish or extravagant, as is conventional for such meals (Hor. *S.* 1.6.114-15, 2.2.70-1, 2.6.63-5, further see Hudson 1989: 72ff.). Alcohol offered in sufficient but moderate quantities will provide a convivial atmosphere but not one of excessive drunkenness (cf. 10.87.11 *pugnorum reus ebriaque noctis*).

*torus* refers to the marriage bed and described as *non tristis et pudicus* which reflects a happy but morally pure sexual life (cf. the description of the Roman *matrona* Sulpicia at 10.35; also 10.68.7). For the association of *pudicitia* with country living see Hor.
Epod. 2.39-40 quodsi pudica mulier in partem iuvet/ domum atque dulcis liberos
(Watson and Watson: 142).

The happiness of country living offers sleep uninterrupted by concerns of business and legal troubles in Rome (cf. 2.90.11 sit nox cum somno; also cf. 1.49.35; 5.20.6; 12.68.5-6, also for sleep as a topos in the pastoral lifestyle see Hor. S. 2.6.61; Tib. 1.10.9-10; Verg. G. 2.470). Elsewhere Martial complains about the difficulties of a good night’s sleep in Rome, for reasons such as noise and the wearisome prospect of the early morning salutatio undertaken by clients (12.18.14; 57.2).

quod sis esse velis nihilque mals;
summum nec metuas diem nec optes.

This form of ending is the most famous example of the reconciliation between two opposites or contrasting extremes which represents a compromise or middle way known as μεσότης (2.36; 9.132; 11.100; Sullivan 1991: 226, especially n.19). The ultimate requirement for a life of complete happiness is that death is neither feared nor wished for (cf. 5.20.11-14 nunc vivit necuter sibi, bonosque soles effugere atque abire sentit;/ qui nobis pereunt et imputantur:/ quisquam, vivere cum sciat, moratur?; 10.23; 38). Both these notions reflect the Epicurean principles regarding life and death (for the first see Epicurus Ep. Men. 126; Lucr. 3.830-1094, especially 861-9; 970-7; 1076-94; for the second concept see Diog. Laert. 10.119; Watson and Watson: 143).
Here is a dinner invitation to some of Martial’s literary friends/patrons and fellow poets. The poet gives a detailed description of the layout of this party, which consists of pleasant company of equal friends, a convivial atmosphere, with unpretentious yet sufficient food and wine, plus liberal and enjoyable conversation without fear of reprisals. The invitation poem is a part of the literary tradition, with examples found as far back as Bacchylides (fr. 21) and Philodemus (AP 11.44; also Nicaenetus 2703ff.). It became a popular form in Roman literature, and was especially favoured by Horace (Carm. 1.20; 4.12; Ep. 1.5; also Carm. 1.27; 3.28; there is also the famous parody of this genre in Catul. 13; for examples in prose see Cic. Fam. 7.26.2; 9.16.7; 9.20.1; Att. 6.1.3; Plin. Ep. 1.15; for more on the literary traditions see Williams 1968: 125-9, Jenkins ad loc.). Standard topoi of this genre include the promise of good company, conversation and entertainment, and plentiful food and wine.

Martial uses the invitation poem on two other occasions, at 5.78 to Toranius, and at 11.52 to Julius Cerialis (perhaps the same Cerialis of this poem), although the tone is more humorous. Unlike these two other poems, there is not one guest invited but six: Stella, Nepos, Canius, Cerialis, Flaccus and Lupus, which is unusual for such a poem. Each poem provides a detailed list of the items on the menu, and the conclusion focuses on the entertainment and conversation offered, which will be entertaining and witty. The pleasant mood arises from the ability to speak without fear of harmful consequences for the speaker (cf. 1.27.5-6 et non sobria verba subnotasti/ exemplo nimium periculosos). The conversation is open (cf. simplicitas 10.47.7), and free of malevolence towards others, which also reflects Martial’s approach in his own poetry (cf. 10.33). Awkward subjects are avoided by his
recommendation that his guests discuss the more trivial subject of chariot racing, as appropriate to such an occasion.

Such invitations are typically presented to the poet's social superiors, and accordingly the menu is generally presented from a self-deprecating and humble perspective. Nauta comments on the seemingly asymmetrical relationship of the invited guests in this particular poem (Nauta 2002: 59-61). Whilst the patrician Stella and the wealthy Flaccus are superior to Martial in status, the rest appear to be social equals. The common interest of the guests is poetry, and it is clear that the key component of the evening is poetry and witty conversation appropriate to the convivial atmosphere (cf. 10.19 (20) where Martial sends his poem to Pliny for a similar occasion). Even the description of the items on the menu with expressions such as *herba salax* (line 10) and *madidum...de sale* (line 12) reflect the literary tone appropriate to the convivial conversation and are for the benefit of the literary guests (Gowers 1993: 257ff.). The food ranges from simple coarse fare, such as mallows and lettuce to luxury items such as sow's udder, and such a mixture of food reflects the variety which Martial claims for his books of poems (cf. 10.45). This also represents perhaps a contrast between literary genres, with a comparison made between the large and extravagant and the modest/impromptu style which best reflects Martial's own poems.

The convivial mood of this dinner party is produced by the pleasant company, food and wine that is plentiful but not excessive or extravagant, and good-humoured and congenial conversation; all of which comprise the ideal way of the happier lifestyle in the previous poem (especially 10.47.7-9). In this way, the two poems form a thematic pair, where 10.48 acts upon the doctrines defined in 10.47 with one vital
difference. Whereas 10.47 obviously idealises country living as the key to happiness, the opening to 10.48 indicates that this particular dinner party is to take place in Rome with food most likely sent from Martial's estate in Nomentum (cf. *vilica* 10.48.7; for Martial's estate see 10.44). Regardless of this fact, the food is considered satisfactory for the occasion (cf. also 10.37 which contrasts country food in Spain with food bought in and around Spain). More importantly, the quality of the invited guests provides a genial atmosphere and amusing conversation. These themes of generosity and good friendship also provide an antithesis to 10.49, where the ungenerous host Cotta serves cheap wines to his guests in expensive glassware, while he himself drinks superior wines.

The poem is arranged into several sections and employs motifs and themes which are standard to invitation poems. First, Martial arranges the hour of the dinner party and names the recipients of his invitation. The contents of the dinner are catalogued from first course, main to dessert and the addition of wine. The final four lines address the appropriate types of conversation to be raised at such a meal, in order to produce a relaxed and convivial mood.

For further reading on this poem see Jenkins *ad loc.*; Gowers 1993: 255-64; Nauta 2002: 58-61.

*Nuntiat octavam Phariae sua turba iuvenae,*
*et pilata redit iamque subitque cohors.*

The hour of the dinner is determined by the cry of the worshippers of Isis at their service which was conducted at the temple of Isis located in the Campus Martius. This was near Martial's home in the Quirinal (9.18.2). Although the worship of Isis
had become an established feature in Rome by the Flavians (Tac. Hist. 4.81; Suet. Vesp. 7; Dom. 1), disdain is detected in the expression *Phariae sua turba iuvenae* (cf. 2.14.8 *maesta iuvenca* and 8.81.2 *nec per Niliacae bovem iuvenae*, where Isis is equated with Io who was transformed into a heifer; contempt is expressed for other foreign cults at 5.41.3; 11.84.2; 12.28.19; 57.11; 13.63; 14.204; further see Jenkins *ad loc.*).

The exact meaning of line 2 is unclear because of the clauses *pilata ...cohors* and the application of *iamque* in the sentence. The most commonly accepted reading is that the cohort refers to the changing of the Praetorian guard who have been relieved of duty (cf. Friedlaender on 10.48.2, and Jenkins *ad loc.*; also SB² 2: 368). The word *iamque* has contributed considerably towards the difficulties of this line. The most sensible suggestion is that it involves a hyperbaton and an *á̄pó κονοῦ* construction, and thus is paraphrased as *et pilata cohors iam et rediit et subiit* (e.g. 6.10.8 *et Capitolinas itque reditque vias*; for a fuller discussion see Jenkins *ad loc.*).

*temerat haec thermas, nimios prior hora vaporens*
*halat, et immodico sexta Nerone calet.*

Because of the difficulty in determining the time of day in Rome, religious services held at particular times of the day provided a convenient method of doing so, and there are numerous literary examples of similar practices regarding the Jewish Sabbath (e.g. Ov. *Ars* 1.75; Hor. S. 1.9.67; Jenkins *ad loc.*). The specific hour for the invitation is given, which provides a degree of legitimacy to the invitation. The eighth hour is reckoned as being between 2.31 and 3.46 (mid-summer) and between
1.29 and 2.13 (mid-winter), as the length of an hour ranged between forty-five minutes during winter and an hour and a quarter during summer (Balsdon 1969: 16-18; Marquardt 1886: 257ff.). The eighth hour was usually reserved for bathing, and dining normally took place during the ninth hour (4.8.5; 11.52.3 octavam poteris servare; lavabinur una; Balsdon 1969: 33).

Here Martial refers to the typical routine of bathing before the main meal (cf. 6.53.1; 11.52.3; Plin. Ep. 3.1.8). The ideal time for bathing before the meal is reckoned by a comparison to the baths of Nero, where the temperature varies from hour to hour with a reflection on the different temperatures which these times denote (3.20.15-16 Titine thermis an lavatur Agrippae/ an impudici balneo Tigillini; 12.82.1). The baths of Nero were also located in the Campus Martius, confining the locations to the area surrounding Martial’s own home (cf. 2.48.8; 3.25.4; 7.34; 12.83, Platner-Ashby: 531-2; Richardson: 393-5).

Stella, Nepos, Cani, Cerialis, Flacce, venitis?
septem sigma capit, sex sumus, adde Lupum.

The poem has not one but several addressees, all of whom are friends and amateur poets. Stella refers to L. Arruntius Stella a friend and amateur poet, praetor in 93 and consul suffect in 101, and is also included in a list of poets by Sidonius Apollinaris Carm. 9.267 (cf. 1.7; 1.61; 7.36.6; Howell on 1.7; Syme 1958: Index s.v.; PIR A1151; White 1975: 267-72). He was friends with both Martial and Statius, and Kay notes that he is the third most mentioned individual behind Domitian and Flaccus (Kay on 11.52.15). It seems that Stella is the most socially superior of all the friends whom Martial invites to his dinner (White 1975: 271). Nepos is addressed as an old friend.
and neighbour at 6.27 and also at 13.124 (cf. Grewing on 6.27), but little else is known about him, although it is possible that he is Varisidius Nepos (Plin. Ep. 4.4) or Maecilius Nepos (Plin. Ep. 2.3; 3.16; 4.26; 6.19, see White 1975: 297 n.46). Canius Rufus was a close friend and poet also from Spain (cf. 1.61; 69 3.20; 21; 7.69; 87), who wrote a history of Claudius' reign, poetry, and a work called Pantaenis (7.69). Julius Cerialis is the addressee of another invitation poem at 11.52 where Martial declares that he is prepared to listen to Cerialis' recitations of his tedious Gigantomachy poem in return for his company.

The name Flaccus occurs 21 times in Martial's poems, but it is uncertain whether each poem refers to the same person (see PIR² F 170). Some of these poems are concerned with his literary tastes (1.61; 4.49; 8.55), his wealth and position as patron (8.55; 9.55; 12.74; 11.80), even his sexual interests (1.57; 4.421; 11.27; 100; 101) and various miscellaneous subjects which seem to show some links with the other poems (1.98; 7.82; 87; 9.33; 11.95; 98; see Pitcher 1983: 414-23). Although his identity remains unknown, one suggestion is that he is Calpurnius Flaccus mentioned in Pliny who was suffect consul in 96 (Ep. 5.2 with Sherwin-White; also White 1975: 297 n.46). Two poems refer to his residence in Cyprus, which would suggest he was there in a position such as proconsul, legatus or quaestor, possibly in 94 (Mart. 8.45; 9.90; White 1970: 113-18; see Henriksén on 9.90.10). From this and the allusions to his wealth, such as a villa at Baiae (11.80), it seems likely that he was of senatorial rank (Howell on 1.57). He is mentioned together with Stella on two other occasions which link their background and age, and also illustrates Martial's literary associations with both these men (1.61; 9.55, Pitcher 1983: 414-15).
The final addition to the dinner is Lupus, whom Martial elsewhere uses fictitiously; White suggests that he is also a fictitious character here as he receives a backhanded invitation (White 1975: 271 n.14).

Instead of the three couches summus lectus, medius and imus, with three people seated on each, here Martial refers to the sigma, a large semi-circular couch shaped in the form of the Greek capital sigma, which seated between six and eight people (Balsdon: 1969: 35; cf. 14.87 accipe lunata scriptum testudine sigma./ octo capit; veniat quisquis amicus erit).

exoneraturas ventrem mihi vilica malvas
attulit et varias quas habet hortus opes,

Martial returns to the idea of the simple life from the previous poem with the emphasis on the food provided by the vilica, which evokes the idea of home produced food rather than exotic or luxurious foods (1.55.1; 3.58.20; 9.60.3). The list of the food items on the menu is a typical feature of invitation poems, and indeed these same types of food which Martial offers are repeated in his other invitation poems (5.78 and 11.52).

The first item offered is mallows, which were generally taken to provide relief from constipation (cf. 3.89 utere lactucis et mollibus utere malvis;/ nam faciem durum, Phoebe, cacaentis habes, see Jenkins ad loc.). Reference to laxatives at the beginning of the meal reflects the convivial atmosphere of this particular occasion (Gowers 1993: 257-8).
in quibus est lactuca sedens et tonsile porrum,  
nece deest ructatrix mentha nec herba salax;  
secta coronabunt rutatos ova lacertos  
et madidum thynnii de sale sumen erit

The *gustus* or hors d'oeuvre consists of lettuce, leeks, mint, eggs on mackerel and a  
sow's udder steeped in brine. Each item is presented with a vivid adjective,  
appropriate to the convivial atmosphere of the meal. Gowers argues that these  
adjectives personify each dish to represent a particular type of dinner guest, ranging  
from the crude to the salacious to the drunk (Gowers 1993: 257ff.). The *lactuca sessilis* is presented as *sedens*, and its laxative qualities remain in keeping with the  
suggestion of bowel motions mentioned above (cf. 11.52.5-6; for *sedere* as a  
euphemism of *cacare* see 11.77.2; Gowers 1993: 258 n.175).

Next is the *porrum sectile*, although *sectile* is replaced with *tonsile* in order to  
maintain the personification of these vegetables, as a part of the bathing ritual before the meal (Gowers 1993: 258; for leeks cf. 3.57.8; 11.52.6). Mint is also used for medicinal purposes to assist digestion by causing belching (Galen *In Hipp. Epid. 6 Comm.* 2.34; further see Jenkins *ad loc.*). Belching is expressed by *ructatrix*, a *hapax legomenon*, which perhaps is meant to demonstrate the witty conversation at the dinner party (for this *ix* ending see 10.3.2). It is balanced by *herba salax*, which refers to *eruca* or rocket, which was noted for its aphrodisiac properties (3.75; Ov. *Ars* 2.422; Gowers 1993: 258 n.179). This is enhanced by the adjective *salax*, which commonly denotes excessive degrees of sexual behaviour (e.g. it is associated with the diminutive *mentula* at 11.25 *illa salax nimium nec paucis nota pullis/ stare Lino desit mentula, lingua cave*).
Next is the dish of cheap mackerel garnished with chopped eggs. *lacertus* denotes different types of fish, and is generally used in Martial to denote a cheap fish as part of a humble man’s meal (7.78.1; 11.27.3; 52.8; 12.19.1, see Kay on 11.27.3; D’Arcy Thompson 1947, 120). Gowers notes that *lacertus* is also a reflection of the diners, with a pun on its meaning as ‘arm’ (Gowers 1993: 259). She adds that the sense of *rutatos*, which generally denotes bitterness, is perhaps intended to contrast with the rejection of ill-tempered conversation towards the conclusion of the poem (Gowers 1993: 259).

The final dish refers to the sow’s udder, which is an expensive delicacy in contrast with the simpler fare described above (2.37.2; 7.78.3; 9.14.3; 11.52.13; 12.48.9; *AP* 11.44.4; also Leary on 13.44; Gowers 1993: 260 n.188). The sauce denotes some type of fish sauce, and *madidus* denotes the usual meaning of ‘drenched’, but combined with *sal*, the common metaphor for wit, it also assumes the literary sense of ‘steeped in learning’ as a joke for his guests (cf 6.44.2 *et solum multo permaduisse sale*; Gowers 1993: 261).

*gustus in his; una ponetur cenula mensa:*
*haedus inhumani raptus ab ore lupi,*
et quae non egeant ferro structoris ofellae
*et faba fabrorum prototomique rudes;*

The term *gustus* refers to the list of the hors d’oeuvres mentioned above and also represents the foretaste of the dinner itself (Gowers 1993: 261 n.201, for a similar expression cf. 11.52.12 *haec satis in gustu*). The diminutive *cenula* used to describe the meal reflects the self-effacing tone to the meal Martial offers his guests and parallels diminutives and deprecatory terms used to characterise the books
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themselves, such as *libelli* and *nugae* (cf. 5.78. 22 and.31; 7.51.12). Here *mensa* refers to the main course of the meal, which comprises a goat kid, meatballs, beans, chicken and ham.

The dish of a kid just rescued from the wolf continues the play between foodstuffs and humans (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.60 *haedus ereptus lupo*; Prop. 4.4.54 *inhumanae...lupae*; see Gowers 1993: 262). For a kid from the poet's farm at Tibur as the main course of the dinner also cf. Juv. 11.64-8 (with Colton 1991: 391-2). The expression *inhumani lupi* is a witty joke for the inclusion of the last invited guest, Lupus, mentioned above.

The *structor* was the slave who arranged the dishes on the table and also carved the meat, and who was generally owned by the wealthy (Juv. 5.120ff.; Petr. 36; Sen. *Ep.* 47.6). The fact that Martial's meal has no need for such a slave illustrates the lack of pretension not only in his literature but also at his table (cf. *struere* used in a literary sense 4.10.5; 10.59.3).

More literary wordplay is used with *ferrum*, a term familiar to military epic, and Martial's rejection of it at his table parallels his objection to such literary genres (Gowers 1993: 262 n.206). Rather, he describes his party with the diminutive *cenula* which not only suggests modesty at the table but perhaps also reflects his own literary genre. The bean was a common food item, and the wordplay *faba fabrorum* confirms Martial's preference for simplicity and allegiance with humble craftsmen, rather than with the elaborate pretensions of epic (Gowers 1993: 262).
pullus ad haec cenisse tribus iam perna superstes
addetur. saturis mitia poma dabo,
de Nomentana vinum sine faece lagona,
quae bis Frontino consule trima fuit.

Although pullus can refer to the young of any kind, here it refers to chicken, which was a common ingredient of the Roman meal (2.37.5; 3.13.1; 58.50; 13.45 with Leary). Added to this is the ham which has already lasted three dinners (cf. Petr. 66.7; for this image as a parody of the kid saved from the wolf, see Gowers 1993: 263). Although the serving of leftovers was regarded as mean (e.g. 1.103.6; 3.58.42) it is possible that here it simply reflects the poet’s modesty and self sufficiency.

Dessert is provided by wine and apples from Martial’s own estate (cf. 10.94). The sweetness of the apples is perhaps meant to overcome the bitterness of the salt and rue from the appetisers (this phrase appears to be a conflation of two lines of Verg. Ecl. 1.80 mitia poma and 10.77 ite saturae...capellae, see Gowers 1993: 263). The bittersweet mixture not only represents the nature of the conversation at the dinner party, but also reflects the diverse quality of poems in Martial’s volume (cf. 10.45).

It is possible that the wine also comes from Martial’s own estate (cf. 13.119; 10.44). Nomentan wine, although not of the highest quality, was still considered quite drinkable (see Leary on 13.119). Identifying the age of a wine by referring to a recent consulship was a common literary method (Petr. 34.6 with Smith 1975: 73, Hor. Carm. 1.20.3). Frontinus refers to Sextus Julius Frontinus, consul for the second time in 98 (cf. 10.58; PIR² F 322; Syme 1958: 642, 657, 790). This indicates that this poem belongs to the second edition of Book 10 (Jenkins ad loc.). As trima is now the accepted reading in place of the confusing prima, it would seem that the wine is
sufficiently aged after six years (Housman CP 2: 728; Jenkins ad loc.; Seltman 1957: 207-8). White distinguishes this Frontinus from the patron of Martial mentioned at 10.58 on the grounds that the mention of his name as a consular date does not necessarily assume that he should be included among Martial’s patrons (White 1975: 295 n.41). The description of the wine as sine faece parallels the following reference to the conversation as sine felle (Gowers 1993: 263).

10.48

accident sine felle loci nec mane timenda
libertas et nil quod tacuisse velis:
de prasino conviva meus Scorpoque loquatur,
neque faciant quemquam pocula nostra reum.

Martial moves from the contents of the meal to the accompanying conversation, which is also an element of invitation poems (Catul. 13.1, Philodemus AP 11.44.5, Hor. Ep. 1.5.24; also Cic. Off. 1.136 on the suitable subjects at dinner; cf. Sen. Ben. 3.26.1 excipiebatus ebriorum sermo, simplicitas iocantium; nihil erat tutum; omnis saeviendi placebat occasio, nec iam reorum expectabantur eventus, cum esset unus; Hammer 1929: 200). Similar descriptions of the entertainment during the meal are presented at 5.78.25-32 and 11.52.16-18 where Martial promises music and says that he will not bore his guests with recitations of his poetry.

Although the term fel is used in the context of epigrammatic poetry at 7.25.3 to denote a literary bite or sting that wounds (see Plin. Ep. 3.21.1 on Martial; Ov. Tr. 2.565), here such sentiments are intentionally avoided (cf. 10.45). His guests may speak without fear of their words being repeated outside the dinner. Although the guests are given libertas (licentia linguae, cf. TLL 7.2.1314.28), the commissatio is not a suitable occasion for any serious or controversial topics, but instead should be
limited to jocularity and pleasure (cf. 10.20). Hence Martial recommends the topic of chariot racing for his dinner party. This perhaps indicates his rejection of elitist snobbish attitudes in the same manner as his dismissal of pretentious genres of poetry. The type of conversation on offer also characterises the salacious and unconformist style of Martial’s books (Gowers 1993: 263-4).

The reading *venetoque* is retained here, although Shackleton Bailey suggests *Scorpoque* on the basis that Scorpus was a charioteer of the Greens (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 143; cf. 10.50). Jenkins favours the expression *venetoque* on the grounds that *Scorpoque* disrupts the polar emphasis in the line, and uses 14.131.1 as his model: *si veneto prasinove faves, quid coccina sumes?*. He also notes that 10.48 comes probably from the second edition (cf. 48.20 *Frontino consule* above) in 98, that is, after Scorpus’ death (cf. 10.50; 53) and so the guests would hardly be speaking of him as living, as they clearly would be doing in 10.48. The term represents the Blue Faction of charioteers in the circus, and here perhaps suggests the rivalry between the supporters of the different factions (cf. Leary on 14.131.1; also 6.46.1; Juv. 3.170; Colton 1971: 56).

10.49

In this epigram, Martial criticises Cotta for serving cheap wines in expensive glasses to his guests, while he himself drinks good wine. Contrasts between good and bad wines occur frequently in Martial’s epigrams, especially as an observation of the stingy host who serves his guests cheap wines (cf. 1.18; 3.49; 82.22-5; 4.85; 10.36; 12.27; Juv. 5.24-37 with Colton 1991: 172-4; Lucil. AP 11.137; 295). The same complaint is made at 4.85 where Ponticus serves wine in two different types of glass
10.49

to disguise the fact he is serving two different types of wine. Here the humour of 10.49 is dependant upon the word play of *plumbea* to describe the quality of the wine, in contrast with the offering of the wine in gold cups.

This poem recalls 10.36, which criticises Munna for sending bad wines to his friends. The depiction of the hypocritical host immediately contrasts with the pleasant atmosphere of the dinner party in the previous poem, where host and guest are treated alike. Cotta’s presentation of the terrible wine in amethyst and gold cups connotes luxury and extravagance combined with stinginess, in contrast with the simplicity of the dinner in the previous poem (cf. 11.11; note also 12.74, where Martial justifies his gift of cheap glassware to Flaccus and argues its usefulness over expensive crystal).

*Cum potes amethystinos trientes et nigro madeas Opimiano, propinas modo conditum Sabinum*

Extravagance and wealth are conveyed by the presentation of wine in valuable wine vessels encrusted with amethysts (for similar types of vessels cf. 11.11.5 with Kay, 14.108 with Leary, also 14.94.2 ). The colour amethyst is also associated with opulence and wealth, and the adjective is frequently used in the context of expensive clothing in Martial (1.96.7; 2.57.2; 13.154; Juv. 7.136).

Opimian wine was produced in the consulship of Opimius in 121 BCE, and because of the fame of its quality, Martial’s time is virtually proverbial for the finest vintage (1.26.7; 2.40; 3.26; 3.82.24; 9.8; Petr. 34.6; see Leary on 13.113). The term *niger* reflects the darkness of the wine’s colour, and is commonly associated with Falernian (8.55.14; 77.5; 9.22.8; 90.5; 11.8.7; 49.7). This wine is contrasted with Sabine wine which came from the district of Reate and Amiternum, north-east of
Rome. It is not mentioned elsewhere in Martial, but it was known for its cheapness (but cf. *vile Sabinum* in Hor. *Carm.* 1.20.1 with N-H).

The term *propino* denotes the practice of drinking to a person by proposing a toast, taking a sup and then handing the glass over to the person honoured (cf. *OLD* s.v. *propino* 1; Howell on 1.68; 3.82.25; 8.6.13; 12.74.9; Juv. 5.127; 6.05). The poet is naturally insulted to be toasted with cheap wine.

*et dicis mihi, Cotta, *vis in auro?*
*quisquam plumbea vina vult in auro?*

The name Cotta appears a number of times in Martial and is frequently applied to those with pretensions to grandeur as in this poem like the Cotta of 10.14 who surrounds himself with luxury items (on the origins of the name, cf. 10.14).

The whole point of the poem relies on the play with *plumbea* and *auro*, where *plumbea* combines its meaning of 'leaden' (e.g. 1.99.15 with Howell; 6.55.3) with 'inferior' or 'worthless' in reference to the quality of the wine (cf. 10.94 *plumbea mala*; Otto: 282).

This is the first of a pair of poems (the other 10.53) commemorating the death of the celebrated charioteer Scorpus. These two poems can be definitely regarded as belonging to the revised edition of Book 10 because Scorpus is mentioned at 11.1, allowing Friedlaender to calculate his death between December 96 and early 98 before the publication of the second edition of Book 10 (cf. Friedlaender on 10.50, Watson and Watson: 185). This poem is in the style of the *epicedion* (Stat. *Silv.* 5.1),
which is a consolatory and encomiastic poem on the dead person, with features such as the celebration of Scorpus' activities in life, the idea that he will continue his profession in the Underworld, and the exhortation to deities or appropriate persons. The tone is appropriately sombre and respectful towards Scorpus as appropriate to a poem mourning the death of a famous character for the Roman people.

Discussion of horseracing is a popular subject in Martial’s poems, and it is fitting that this poem mourning Scorpus’ death appears soon after 10.48 where Martial recommends the subject of horseracing as appropriate for a relaxed dinner party (cf. 3.63.12). Martial frequently derides horse racing and complains about the amount of money which charioteers earn and the vast quantity of money spent on racing (e.g. 4.67; 5.25; 10.74; 76), and also the fame which such a profession incurs (10.9). Other poems glorify similar professions, including 5.24 in hymn style to the gladiator Hermes; 9.28, which is also another epitaph or on his retirement to the mime actor Latinus; and 11.13, an epitaph to the mime actor Paris. It is common practice for Martial to place sepulchral poems in pairs and in close succession (1.114; 116; 5.34; 37; 6.28; 29; 9.74; 76; 11.48; 50; also 10.35 and 38).

The funerary epigram is one of the fundamental types of the epigrammatic genre (cf. 10.26; AP Book 7). Ornate language and metaphors are applied, in keeping with the funerary style of the poem, and Martial employs language, expressions and terminology which are characteristic of epitaphs (Vioque on 7.40: on the language of epitaphs cf. Lattimore 1942: passim). In keeping with the profession of Scorpus, Martial employs racing metaphors to describe his death, and praise of his winning achievements has the wreaths of victory replaced by those of mourning. The concept of Scorpus reaching the finishing post too quickly conveys the idea of his untimely
death or *mors immatura*, a common feature of funerary epigrams and epitaphs (as a *topos* in Roman literature cf. Lucr. 5.221; Plin. *Ep.* 2.110; 5.5.4; 4.21.2; 5.21.4; 6.6.7; 8.16.1; *AP* 7.166; 177; 185; 632; further see Lattimore 1942: 184-99; Ciappi 2001: 587ff.). The poem focuses on combining the success of Scorpus’ career as a professional charioteer and grief at his death, and how he will continue this activity in the underworld (cf. 5.34).

For other commentaries on this poem (and 10.53) see Jenkins *ad loc.*; Ciappi 2001: 587-610; Watson and Watson: 184-8; also see Johnson 1954: 264-72 on sepulchral poems in Martial.

*Frangat Idumaes tristis Victoria palmas,*
*plange, Favor, saeva pectora nuda manu;*

The first half of the poem does not identify the poem’s subject, but instead depicts images typical of mourning in a manner appropriate for the deceased charioteer (cf. 5.37; 7.40; 11.13). Scenes of mourning are set amidst the atmosphere of the arena, the place of Scorpus’ fame. The mourners are personified as *Victoria, Favor, Honor* and *Gloria*, who represent the controlling elements of the circus.

Celebration of personified *Victoria* was a firmly established feature of the circus and her figure led the procession of deities into the arena (Ov. *Am.* 3.2.44-5; *RE* 2.8.2528; Watson and Watson: 186). In consideration of Scorpus’ death, Victory is shown breaking the Idumaean palm, the traditional symbol of victory presented to race winners (cf. Juv. 8.57-9, Ov. *Am.* 3.2.82, Cameron 1973: 17). Such palms are commonly identified as Idumaean in Roman poetry because of their associations with
Idumaea (Judaea), which was celebrated for its palms (Verg. G. 3.12; Hor. Ep. 2.2.184).

Favor represents the technical term for applause or approval of the audience towards a particular charioteer (14.131.2; Plin. Ep. 9.6.2 nunc favent panno; Ov. Tr. 2.506; RE 6.2.1909 2078 9; see Jenkins ad loc.). Here the personified Favor is described beating his breast in the traditional gesture of mourning, effectively conveyed by means of onomatopoeia and assonance (cf. 2.11.5; 5.37.19; Verg. A. 1.481; 4.673; Ov. Met. 6.248-9; Toynbee 1971: 45).

mutet Honor cultus, et iniquis munera flammis
mitte coronatas, Gloria maesta, comas.

The cult of Honor was more generally associated with Virtus rather than the circus (Ov. Pont. 2.11.21 ad palmae per se cursurus honores; Ciappi 2001: 595). In place of celebratory and festive costume, the traditional garments of mourning, traditionally dark or black, are donned (Prop. 4.7.28; Ov. Met. 11.699; RE. 13.1698. 49ff.; for the expression mutet cultus cf. Ov. Met. 8.447-8 quae plangore dato maestis clamoribus urbem/ inplet et auratis mutavit vestibus atras; OLD s. v. muto 4).

Gloria is the consequence of victory, and crowns were a conventional garment to represent triumph (AP 16.336; 340; for Gloria in terms of racing cf. Verg. G. 3.102; Cameron 1973: Index s.v. crowns). Here, however, the crowned tresses are cut off or torn out and offered to the funeral pyre. The tearing of hair was a conventional gesture of grief at Greek and Roman funerals (Hom. Il. 18.25; Ov. Am. 2.6.5), but it is possible that the cutting of a lock of hair and presenting it in tribute to the deceased was also a genuine custom and not just a literary motif (cf. Prop. 1.7.19-21 AP 7.593;
see Watson and Watson: 186 also Lattimore 1942: 202ff.). Gifts (munera) to the deceased were part of the traditional procedure at funerals and generally comprised items such as wine and perfume (cf. 10.26).

Although iniquus is commonly employed to describe the unjust nature of death (cf. for gods TLL 7.1.1640.43; funerals TLL 1641.16), its application to the funeral pyre is unusual and appears rarely in Roman literature (cf. Stat. Silv. 2.1.170 lucem...iniquam; see Jenkins ad loc., Watson and Watson: 186). Cremation was at this time the favoured method to dispose of the dead (see 10.71; Tac. Ann. 16.6; Toynbee 1971: 40).

heu facinus! prima fraudatus, Scorpe, iuventa
occidis et nigros tam cito iungis equos.

The second section of the poem begins with the apostrophe, a common device in funeral poems to convey the injustice of the individual’s inopportune demise (cf. 3.19.8 o facinus, falsa quod ursa fuit; 6.62.3; 11.91.3 a scelus, a facinus with Kay; 11.93.3; 6.85.7 heu qualis pietas, heu quam brevis occidit aetas!; Lattimore 1942: 183-4).

This is continued with the term fraudatus, which represents the sense to deprive someone of what is his by right (cf. OLD s.v. fraudo 1a; TLL 6.11.1262.78-1263.89), and is frequently employed in literature to express the misfortune of early or untimely death (7.40.5; Ov. Met. 10.196; Tib. 3.5.19; Verg. A. 4.355). Expressions such as prima iuventa are typical of epigraphical language for mors immatura (e.g. CLE 1260.1; Lattimore 1942: 184ff.). Scorpus was twenty-seven at the time of his death (cf. 10.53.3). Jenkins also points out that the secondary meaning of terms such
as *facinus* ('foul'), *fraudatus* ('cheated') and *occidis* ('crash') maintain the analogy between death and horse racing (see Jenkins *ad loc.*, Harris, 1972: 209).

*nigros equos* refers to the horses of Pluto which Scorpus now drives in the Underworld (Ov. *Met.* 5.359-61), suitably in black in contrast with the racing colours green and blue which represent the charioteers. The idea that the deceased continued his occupation in the Underworld is a motif typical of sepulchral inscriptions to evoke the immortality of the spirit (Mart. 5.34.7-8; *AP* 7.25; 30; 31; 69; 70; 189; 670; Ciappi 2001: 600; Lattimore 1942: 44-65).

Scorpus the charioteer is mentioned in six of Martial's epigrams, beginning with 4.65 where the poet discusses a praetor giving the charioteer 100,000 sesterces; the mention of gilt statues in his honour (5.25); the pair with this present poem 10.53; also winning fifteen bags of gold in a single hour in 10.74; and then again at 11.1.15-16. Although Scorpus was a common name for charioteers there is plenty of epigraphical evidence to suggest that he was an actual renowned charioteer of the time; for example, one inscription celebrates the number of his victories as 2048 (*CIL* 6.10048.19; also *CIL* 6.8628; *PIR*² S 359; Syme *RP* 3: 1062-9).

Because he is mentioned as being alive at 11.1, it is estimated that he died sometime between December 96 and before the publication of this second edition in 98. Although the cause of his death is unknown, some scholarship suggests that he died in a racing accident, suggested by the terms such as *facinus* and *fraudatus* mentioned above (Harris, 1972: 205-7, although Watson and Watson: 187, suggest that Martial would have clearly stated such a fact).
curribus illa tuis semper properata brevisque
cur fuit et vitae tam prope meta tuae?

The final lines illustrate the parallel between the rapidity of the course in the racetrack and the short duration of life (cf. 6.29.7-8 *immodicis brevis est aetas et rara senectus/quidquid ames, cupias non placuisse nimis*). The sentiment of a hastily reached death expressed by *properatus* is a common theme in this context (7.40.7; 9.86.1; 10.61.1; 11.91.11; Jenkins *ad loc.*, Watson and Watson: 188). *meta* represents the end post at the end of the race track, but is also a common metaphor in Roman literature for the end goal in life (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.1; Verg. *A.* 10.471-2; 12.546; *TLL* 8.864.25ff.). Its description as *brevis* refers to the rapidity with which the professional charioteer arrived at this goal post combined with the sense of a shortened life span (for *brevis* in this context cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.13.22-3; *OLD* s.v. 4; Jenkins *ad loc.*; Watson and Watson: 188).

The grammar of these lines is awkwardly expressed, especially the syntax of *curribus* which could be taken as either a dative of the agent after *properata* with an unusual transitive use of the verb (Watson and Watson: 188), or as an ablative, which is perhaps more preferable (*SB* 2: 372, on 10.50). The sense is that Scorpus has reached the end of his life as quickly as his chariot always reached the winning post.

10.51

This epigram continues the contrast between pastoral and urban living from 10.47 (cf. Spisak 2002: 137). In the midst of spring and with the onset of summer Martial encourages Faustinus to leave Rome and spend summer in tranquillity and idleness at his villa in Anxur/Terracina (cf. 3.58 on Faustinus’ villa at Baiae). The emphasis of
the first half of the poem is on the pleasures which can be obtained from country living. The mood of the poem is established by a four line depiction of the arrival of spring by the use of mythological metaphors in the epic style, which seems almost out of place and ironically contrasts with 10.4, where Martial rejects the value of such mythological exempla. The graphic image of the land covered in greenery and the song of the nightingale reflect the idyllic existence of country life. In the second half of the poem the tone switches from the attractions of country living to a guide to the prominent amusements at Rome, such as the theatre, baths, fora and temples which are not available in the country. There is some dispute over the name of the addressee of this poem. Damon argues that the line is so distorted by the confusion at the end in the manuscript tradition that Faustinus is in error for Frontinus, and that this poem forms a pair with 10.58 (Damon 1997: 162 n.98). Both poems are similar in language and tone, and both complain of the negotia in Rome which prevent the recipient from enjoying the pleasures of Anxur (cf. 5.1). Faustinus is generally linked to villas in Baiae and Tibur (3.58; 4.57; 5.71), but not at Anxur. Further, Faustinus is not addressed after Book 8 although he was a frequent addressee in the first eight books (it is not uncommon for addressees from the first few books to appear in a single poem in later books cf. Maternus 1.96; 2.74; 10.37.4, and Canius Rufus 1.61.9; 3.20; 7.69; 86; 10.48.5). This is an attractive proposal but there is no textual precedent to support such an alteration. Just because Faustinus’ villa at Anxur is not mentioned elsewhere does not automatically exclude his possession of one in that location. Nauta keeps the question of the poem’s addressee open, although he queries Damon’s suggestion on the grounds that this poem is not written on the occasion of Sextus Julius Frontinus’ consulate in 98 which fell in January (Plin. Pan. 61.6), while this
poem is dated May. It is possible that the reference to the Temple of the Flavian gens in line 14 dates this poem to the first edition of Book 10 before Domitian's death in 96 (Nauta 2002: 68 n. 98). In other poems of Book 10, Martial does not refrain from mentioning public monuments erected and dedicated by Domitian (cf. 10.28), which does not necessarily indicate that they belong to the first edition.

Although the identity of Faustinus is uncertain, from other poems in Martial it appears that Faustinus was extremely wealthy and owned a number of villas throughout Italy, such as at Baiae and Tibur (3.58; 4.57) and at Tivoli (4.57; 5.71; 7.80). Regardless of his identity and his career, the poems to Faustinus on his villas are similar in style to those of Domitius Apollinaris, where Martial complains that work in Rome consumes all of his time which could be spent in leisure and inactivity at the country villa (cf. 10.12 and 30; see Nauta 2002: 161-2). Little mention is made of their careers and the focus remains on their roles as owners of villas and literary patrons. Both 10.30 and 51 use mythological exempla, formal language and apostrophes to create an elevated style appropriate to the solemnity of the poem. A motif common to both poems is the idea that Roma herself is the impediment to the pleasures of country living, such as sunny summer days and the wearing of the more comfortable tunic; and that she confines the person to the burdens of business and political activities. Country life represents a respite from all activities, even those which are not draining. No denigration of Rome is suggested; merely that country life removes the cares and worries which Rome provides. This poem reflects the duality in Martial's attitude towards Rome, where, on the one hand, Rome is the cause of hardships and burdens, but, on the other hand, there is the implication that Rome has attractions which the country does not offer. Perhaps there needs to be a balance.
made between the two (cf. 5.20). Martial frequently complains of Rome snatching
days which could be spent in leisure but are occupied with its business affairs (cf.
10.30.25-30; 58). Each time Roma is identified as the culprit, and this is a primary
feature of Martial’s contrast between urban and pastoral life.

The arrival of spring and summer in the country means the onset of sunny
days, which at 10.12 Martial distinguishes in terms of the healthy tanned face of
Apollinaris returning to his white-faced friends in the city. Also part of rustic leisure
is the removal of the uncomfortable toga intended for the hardships of city life (cf.
10.11 etc) in favour of more comfortable country tunics.

For this poem see Nauta 2002: 68.

Sidera iam Tyrius Phrixei respicit agni
taurus et alternum Castora fugit hiems;

The first section of the poem is a series of pastoral metaphors and images to announce
the end of winter and the arrival of spring (cf. Verg. G. 2.315-45). The constellation
of Aries is unusually represented by Phrixei agni, which refers to the golden-fleeced
lamb which rescued Phrixus and Helle from Ino (cf. 14.211 with Leary; Ov. Ep.
6.104; Met. 7.8). Following Aries is Taurus, denoted by Tyrius in reference to the
bull who carried Tyrian Europa (Ov. Fast. 4.715; 5.603-20; Verg. G. 1.217-18). This
constellation approaches in April and rises fully in May, and represents the passing
from winter into spring. The image of Castor fleeing winter refers to the sun entering
the constellation Gemini on the twentieth of May (Ov. Fast. 5.694) as a sign of the
middle of spring and the onset of summer months (cf. 9.51.7-8 et si iam nitidis
alternum venit ab astris/ pro Polluce mones Castora ne redeat).
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ridet ager, vestitur humus, vestitur et arbor,
Ismarium paelex Attica plorat Ityn.

A pleasant pastoral image is presented by the rejoicing of the earth at the arrival of spring (Verg. G. 1.102 *laetus ager*; Stat. Silv. 1.3.56; 2.2.58 *gaudet humus*; Petr. 120.1.72) and the covering of the ground and trees in vegetation (cf. for the use of *vestio* in this sense cf. Verg. G. 2.38; 2.219; Ov. Fast. 4.707). The abundance of greenery on the ground and in the fields recalls from earlier poems in Book 10 the *topos* of self-sufficiency and the abundant quantities of food in rural life (e.g. 30.20-4; 37; 47).

An indication of spring is the song of the nightingale (Verg. G. 2.328 *avia tum resonant avibus virgulta canoris*), represented by *paelex Attica* or Philomela who was turned into a nightingale after being raped by her brother-in-law Tereus (cf. 1.53.9; 14.75 with Leary; in Greek literature Procne was turned into the nightingale and Philomela the swallow, see D’Arcy Thompson 1895: 22). As punishment for this act, Tereus’ wife Procne caused him to kill and consume his own son Itys (Ov. Met. 6.658; Tr. 2.390). According to Homer, Philomela killed her son in a fit of madness and her lament becomes the mournful song of the nightingale (Od. 19.518-23; cf. Mart. 14.75; Verg. G. 511-15). Martial appears to be conflating the two stories here, as suggested by the epithet *paelex* (cf. *Thracia paelex* in Sen. Herc. F. 149).

quos, Faustine, dies, quales tibi Roma †Ravennam†
abstulit! o soles, o tunicata quies!

Little is known of the identity of Faustinus, which was a common *cognomen* (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 272). He is mentioned 19 times in Martial’s books, and this is the final occasion in which he appears, with the exception of the disputed nominee of 10.58
(1.25 with Howell and Citroni; 114; 3.2; 25; 39; 47.5; 58.1; 4.10; 57.3; 5.32; 36; 71; 6.7 with Grewing; 53; 61; 7.12; 80; 8.41). As well as his ownership of villas (3.58; 4.57; 5.71; 7.80), Martial refers to the literary interest he takes in Martial’s poetry and the fact that he was a poet himself (1.25; 3.2 offers the book as a present to him; 4.10; 5.36; 6.7; 61; 7.12; 80; for the possibility that Faustinus is the author of a marble inscription found at Sperlonga cf. Howell and Citroni on 1.25). Although the poems do not specify whether he was engaged in senatorial or commercial business at Rome, one possible identification may be Cn. Minicius Faustinus who was consul suffect in 91 (PIR² M 609; cf. Nauta 2002: 68). Another suggestion is that Martial’s Faustinus is connected with the Faustinus addressed by Antonius Diogenes in his Wonders beyond Thule (Nauta 2002: 67 n. 96).

In line 5 there is a break in the manuscript which renders the meaning ambiguous, and proposed emendations are Ravennam (manuscript β), Ravennae (γ) or recessus (ed. Rom.). Ravenna is a naval base in Gallia Cispadana, which does not offer any enlightenment as to its present meaning (3.56; 57; 13.21.1). Some commentators suggest that Ravenna is the name of Faustinus’ villa, although such a title does not seem to be commonly used in this context (cf. SB¹: 336). The suggestion of recessus neatly ties in with 10.58.1 on a similar subject (Anxuris aequorei placidos, Frontine, recessus; see Friedlaender, on 10.51.8). Despite the missing word, the sense remains that Roma has stolen time more suited to leisure and relaxation in the country (for Roma cf. 10.2.5).
The repetition of the apostrophes heightens the intensity of the poem in praise of the repose of country living, especially its surrounding environment, such as the groves, fountains, sands and waters (cf. 10.30.1 o temperatae dulce Formiae litus; 7.15.3). Woodlands and springs are typical motifs of locus amoenus, and are frequently associated with villas (cf. 12.31.1 hoc nemus, hi fontes, haec textilis umbra supini with Bowie; on groves cf. 10.58.4; 12.50.1; Stat. Silv. 1.3.17; for fontes Mart. 2.90.8; 6.47.1; 7.50.1; 12.2.12; Plin. Ep. 2.17.25).

Anxur is the old fashioned name for Tarracina used by both Martial and Horace on the coast of Latium between Circeii and Caieta (Mart. 5.1.6; 6.42.6; 10.58.1; Hor. S. 1.5.26). It was a popular summer resort renowned for its health-giving waters (e.g. 5.1.6 sive salutiferis candidus Anxur aquis; 6.42.6 with Grewing). Also cf. the similarity with 10.58.1 Anxuris aequorei placidos, Frontine, recessus.

This passage is reminiscent of the description of Apollinaris' villa at Formiae in 10.30.12-18, where the villa is so close to the water he is able to fish from his couch. Such a picturesque image evokes the inactivity and idleness of country living which such wealthy men as Faustinus are able to enjoy.

The poetical language continues in the use of puppis which is metonymy for ship or boat and is used only in poetry (cf. Verg. A. 3.277; Catul. 64.6; OLD s.v. 2).
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sed nec Marcelli Pompeianumque nec illic
sunt triplices thermae nec fora iuncta quater
nec Capitolini summum penetrare Tonantis
quaeque nitent caelo proxima templa suo.

In contrast with the attractions of country living mentioned above (sun, woods, sea, relaxation), Martial sets the poem back in Rome with a list of the most famous landmarks there which the country cannot offer, such as the theatre, baths, the fora and splendid temples. First is the theatre, exemplified by the theatre of Pompey which was the first theatre built in Rome in 55 BCE (cf. 11.21.6; Platner-Ashby: 515; Richardson: 383-4) and that of Marcellus dedicated in 13 BCE (2.29.5, Richardson: 382-3). The triplices thermae denote the three famous Baths in Rome dedicated by Agrippa, Nero and Titus respectively (3.36.6; 10.48.4; Richardson: 386ff.). The fora iuncta quater refers to the four Roman fora, the Romanum, Julium, Augustum and Transitorium (cf. 10.28.4; Richardson: 164ff.).

The first temple refers to that of Iuppiter Tonans located on the Capitoline which was dedicated by Augustus (Suet. Aug. 29.4), although it is often confused in literary sources with Iuppiter Capitolinus (Mart. 7.60.1-2; see Platner-Ashby 305-6, Richardson: 226-7).

The final monument is identified as the temple of the Gens Flavia on the Quirinal south of the Alta Semita (Jones 1993: 87; Richardson: 181). The language is cognate with that used to describe the temple in a cycle of poems in Book 9 (e.g. 9.1.8 manebit altum Flaviae decus gentis/ cum sole et astris curnque luce Romana; also cf. 9.3; 20; 34; 98; also Stat. Silv. 4.3.19-23: stupet hoc vicina Tonantis/ regia, teque pari laetantur sede locatum/ numina. nec magnun properes exedere caelum; 5.1.240-1). The location of the shrine was the place of Domitian’s birth and it appears that the
temple became a mausoleum for the ashes of the Flavian family, including those of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian (Suet. Dom. 1.1.5; 15.2; 17.2 with Jones 1996: 12). The comparison of the emperor’s palace with the heavens is regular practice in imperial language e.g. 8.36.11-12: *haec, Auguste, tamen, quae vertice sidera pulsat/par domus est caelo, sed minor est dominus* (Verg. A. 8.97-100; Stat. Silv. 4.2.18-19; 30-1). Nor is it so unusual to find the mention of public monuments whose construction were begun by Domitian and completed by Nerva (cf. 10.28).

dicere te lassum quotiens ego credo Quirino:
‘quae tua sunt, tibi habe: quae mea, redde mihi.’

Like Domitius Appollinaris who is *fessus* at 10.30.4, Faustinus is also weary of life in the city, and he appeals to Rome to allow him time for leisure. The poem concludes with an address to Quirinus, as a synonym for Rome, a term which Martial uses on four occasions, three of which occur in Book 10 (10.26.3; 58.10; also 11.1; cf. Quirinalis 1.84). It is possible that Faustinus’ house in Rome was near the temple of Quirinus, which was also near to Martial’s own house (10.58.10, see SB² 2: 375). The appeal to Quirinus could also be a further justification for Damon to pair this poem with 10.58, which also addresses Quirinus towards its end. Faustinus is imagined as repeatedly requesting Rome to restore the time taken away from him. Such sentiments continue the motif from 10.47 on the idea of a happier way of life which discards *negotia* such as lawsuits and the toga, thereby excluding the requirements of life in the city.
10.52

Here, Martial ridicules the eunuch Thelys, who, because of his effeminate appearance, is branded a convicted adulteress. One rather convoluted reading is that Numa’s wife was corrupted by Thelys, which thus makes him an adulterer (*moechus*), and with his womanish name and appearance in his toga he assumes the image of a convicted adulteress (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 266). A simpler interpretation is that the poem depends on the play on Thelys’ name (woman) and his effeminate appearance.

Effeminate men are a regular target in Martial especially for their style and mannerisms, and this is expanded at 10.65, where the poet compares his own appearance with that of the Greek Charmenion. Martial often seems to associate eunuchs with sex and adultery for its ironic effect (cf. 10.40; 91; also 6.2 with Grewing; 67). This type of character should be contrasted with the *mollis* appearance at 10.42 of Dindymus, whose youthful demeanour is appealing (also 10.66; 98; on effeminacy cf. Williams 1999: 128-9). This short humorous epigram provides an interval from the series of long poems which are complimentary in tone (47; 48; 51). With the sombre epitaph for Scorpus in between (10.53), this poem begins a short selection of poems of a more satirical nature (54-7).

*Thelyn viderat in toga spadonem.*
*damnatam Numa dixit esse moecham.*

This is the only occasion in which the name Thelys, which means ‘Woman’, occurs in Martial and contributes towards the joke of the epigram. There is inscriptional evidence such as a freedman at Herculaneum of the same name (*CIL* 1403 f J5; 4.3340.34.7; see Fraser and Matthews, vol. 3b, s.v. *Θηλυς*). Numa sees the eunuch
Thelys in a toga, and calls him a *moecha damnata* in mockery of the effeminacy of his name and appearance, rather than his legal status (Giegengack 1969: 42-3).

Numa is referred to on numerous occasions in Martial, and here is used to denote a fictitious person in a satirical context (cf. also 10.97). The name evokes the image of Numa as the model of ancient Roman moral virtue in contrast with the effeminate appearance of the Greek Thelys (on Numa cf. 10.10).

Technically, the term *spado* denotes one who is impotent since birth, as opposed to *eunuchus* as one 'artificially castrated' (see Williams on 2.54.4). There is frequently little distinction made between the two (cf. 6.2.5-6 *nec spado iam nec moechus erit te praseside quisquam:* at prius – *o mores- et spado moechus erat;* see Grewing on 6.2.5; also see 2.54.4; 5.41.1; 6.39.21; 11.75.6; 81.1).

Although *adulter/a* is the formal term for adulterers, the Greek equivalent *moechus/a* is often used in satire, comedy and colloquial language (Hor. S. 1.2.38; 1.4.4; Juv. 6.11; Ter. Eun. 960; see Treggiari 1991: 232-3). Martial frequently uses *moechus/as* (see 10.14.7); the Roman form *adulter/a* appears on only a handful of occasions (*adulter* 1.34.4; 10.95.1; *adultera* 6.7.5; 9.2.3). The term generally evokes contempt and derision, and its use here complements the Greek name Thelys (cf. 6.2).

Women convicted of adultery were made to wear the toga like prostitutes (cf. 2.39.2 with Williams; 6.24 with Grewing; 64.5; Juv. 2.70; Hor. S. 1.2.1; 63; 61; 82). A parallel can perhaps be made with 1.35.9-10, where a prostitute dons a *stola* in an attempt at respectability. This crude use for the toga perhaps expresses Martial’s contempt for the garment as a symbol of the wearisome life in Rome. In 10.51.6, country living allows the wearing of the more comfortable tunic (for a similar observation cf. 10.73; 74).
The second poem on the death of the charioteer Scorpus is presented in the style of an epitaph, with the deceased as the speaker (cf. 10.50). There are many such types of poems throughout Martial's corpus for different types of individuals and they include epitaphs to men of distinction as well as slaves (1.116 for a friend's daughter; 5.34; 37 and 10.61 for Martial's slave girl Erotion; 6.28 Melior's slave boy; 52 Pantagathus; 7.96 for a slave of Bassus; 11.13 the mime Paris; 6.76 the praetorian Fuscus; 7.40 Etruscus' father; 10.71; 11.69 for a dog).

Formulae typical of sepulchral poems are employed, such as his profession, the premature onset of death, and the disclosure of his age at the time of his demise (cf. Lattimore 1942: 184-7, 266ff.; for similar epitaphs of charioteers see AP 16.335; 336; 339; 341; 342; 343.). There are numerous verbal and thematic connections between 10.50 and 53, such as the concept of a short life and untimely death (e.g. the repetition of brevis at 50.7 and breves at 53.2), the adoration of the public (Favor of 50.2, and plausus of 53.2) and the glory of victory (e.g. 50.3-4; Gloria recurs at 53.2; palmas 50.1; 53.4). It is possible that this poem was originally intended as a genuine epitaph or even that 10.50 and 53 formed part of a series of poems on Scorpus' tomb or monument (Weinreich 1940/1, cited in Jenkins ad loc.; see also White's note that this type of poem must have been written for a specific occasion, rather than for the book alone; he also includes 10.26; 50 and 71, White 1974: 40 n.3). In the literary context of Book 10, however, 10.50 and 53 belong to a group of funereal and epigraphical poems dispersed throughout the volume (26; 50; 53; 61; 63; 67; 71; possibly also 38 on Sulpicia). These poems clearly demonstrate Martial's display of variety in the epigrammatic genre, as some like this present poem are presented with
appropriate formality and solemnity (cf. 26; 50; 61; 71), but others are lighter and even deliberately humorous in tone (63; 67). The melancholy mood created by 53 is downplayed by the couplets surrounding it, and this is also true of the following series of poems (54-7).

For this poem, see Jenkins *ad loc.*, and Ciappi 2001: 601-9.

Ille ego sum Scorpus, clamosi gloria Circi, plausus, Roma, tui deliciaeque breves,

The poem opens with a phrase commonly used on epitaphs and sepulchral epigrams, and emphasises the fame of the deceased (cf. 6.28.1 libertus Melioris ille notus; 6.68.4; 76.1; 7.40.1; 9 praeft. 5 with Henriksén; 28.2 Latinus ille ego sum; 12.52.4; CLE 892 ille ego sum Proculus totus qui natus honor; Ov. Am. 3.9.5; for ille cf. 10.9.3; also Pl. Aul. 704 ego sum ille rex Philippus; see Jenkins *ad loc.*; Ciappi 2001: 602). Here Scorpus is the speaker of the poem rather than the addressee as in 10.50. He reminds the passer-by of his many victories in the circus as a symbol of his profession as charioteer. His self-title of clamosi gloria Circi recalls the exhortation to personified Gloria in 10.50 who mourns the death of Scorpus. The noise and hubbub of the circus is evoked by the reference to Scorpus’ great victories in the races (cf. Juv. 8.57-63; 11.197).

The expression deliciae brevesque conveys the sentiment that Scorpus’ life is only too brief (cf. 50.7 semper properata brevisque). Although deliciae is often used in contexts other than sepulchral poems (cf. 1.109.5; 4.87.2; 8.82.6), Martial employs it in a similar manner in poems on the death of other popular favourites such as Paris and Latinus (cf. 9.28.2 ille ego sum, plausus deliciaeque tuae; 11.13.3 urbis deliciae
salesque Nili; also 5.34.2 to Erotion and 6.28.3 to the freedman Melior cari deliciae breves patroni; cf. Ciappi 2001: 604-5).

invida quem Lachesis raptum trieteride nona, dum numerat palmas, credidit esse senem.

Lachesis, one of the three Fates in charge of assigning people’s lots in life, appears in three other funerary poems in Martial (1.88.9; 4.54.9; 9.86.8). The Fates who can shape the destiny of one’s life for good and bad are a conventional feature on epitaphs, and Lachesis’ feeling envy towards the deceased is commonly expressed in funerary epigrams and is especially associated with an untimely death (9.86.8 ausa nefas Lachesis; CLE 422.10; 1122.7;1222.5, see Jenkins ad loc. for further examples; on the Fates in funerary inscriptions see Lattimore 1942: 148-58).

The force of raptum emphasises the injustice of Scorpus’ life snatched away from him prematurely. This term is common in sepulchral epigrams of mors immatura (cf. 10.50.6 cito and properata meta; on raptum cf. 1.88.2; 116.2 with Citroni; 6.52.1; 68.3; 9.29.1; 10.71.2; 11.69.11; see Jenkins ad loc. and Ciappi 2001: 606).

It is especially common in Roman inscriptions to give the precise age of the deceased by periphrasis rather than ordinal numbers (cf. 6.28.8–9 with Grewing; 7.40.6 with Vioque, ter senas...Olympiadas; 7.96.3; also see 5.34.5-6; 37.16; 10.71.5; 11.91.2). The Greek term trieteride represents either a triennial festival or a period of three years, and is first used in Latin by Cicero (Nat. Deor. 3.58). It subsequently appears only in Silver Latin where its predominant meaning is the former (Sil. 4.776; Stat. Theb. 4.729; 7.93; 9.480). Martial uses the term on four occasions in the sense
of a period of three years, primarily to denote the age of a person (6.38.1 with Grewing; 7.96.3 with Vioque; also see 9.84.9 with Henriksen; Stat. Silv.2.6.72 for the age of a deceased favourite). From this we can deduce that Scorpus was only twenty-seven when he died.

Due to the numerous victories earned by Scorpus on the racetrack (2048 according to one inscription, see 10.50), the Fates reckon that he has realised the success of an old man regardless of his age. Such expressions are commonly employed in funereal literature, and heighten the pathos of his early death (cf. 4.73.8 seque mori post hoc credidit ille senem; CLE 1057.12; Ciappi 2001: 606-7). The poem concludes with the expression numerat palmas, which is reminiscent of the opening line of 10.50, describing Victory breaking these palms. This verbal echo reflects the strong literary connection between the poems, and also conveys a sense of finality.

10.54

Contempt for feigned extravagance contrasts with the mournful and solemn tone of the previous poem. Olus covers his tables with cloths and attempts to display his prosperity by claiming that the tables beneath them are expensive and splendid. Martial exposes Olus' deception, because if he covers good tables with cloths then the poet too can have such tables. The poem does not reflect the decadence of the rich, but is similar to Calliodorus of 10.31, who professes wealth by a single act of extravagance (Sullivan 1991: 48).
Mensas, Ole, bonas ponis, sed ponis opertas,
ridiculum est: possum sic ego habere bonas.

The name Olus is used on four other occasions in Martial, all in different satirical contexts, such as the patron/client relationship (2.68); feigned poverty (3.48); cosmetic appearance of hair and beard (4.36); and someone over-concerned with other people’s affairs (7.10). It is a form of the praenomen Aulus (cf. CIL 1.1210.4; Kajanto Cognomina: 40), and appears as Martial’s friend Aulus Pudens (5.28.2; 6.54.2; 6.58.1; 7.14.1; 9.81.1; 11.38.1; 12.51.2; cf. also Hor. S. 2.3.171). Here it is used fictitiously, and, because of its aristocratic associations, the name facetiously contrasts with this individual’s attempt at extravagance and luxury.

Ownership of a large number of tables was a symbol of wealth (cf. 7.48.1 with Vioque; 9.22.1-5; Seneca allegedly owned five hundred, cf. Dio Cass. 61.103). Expensive tables were often made of high quality wood such as citrus (cf. 14.3; 89; 91; 9.22.5 with Henriksén; 10.80), and for protection were covered with a tablecloth (9.59.7 inde satur mensas et opertos exuit orbes; 12.28.12; 14.139). Although bonas implies that the tables are not only of a good quality but also costly (cf. 4.69.2), the tables are covered as Olus is affecting wealth.

The adjective ridiculus is used only four times in Martial (2 praef. 8; 2.41.5; 4.20.4), and here it refers to a situation which is silly or absurd (cf. 4.20.4 altera ridicula est; OLD s.v. 2a). For this use of ponere see Citroni on 1.43.14, where it assumes the sense of exponere.

If Olus can feign wealth in such a manner, then so too can Martial. Martial claims poverty on several occasions throughout his volume, although it is much debated how genuine these declarations are (cf. 2.90.3; 4.77; 5.13). In this poem,
such a statement is more concerned with the artificial display of wealth and extravagance.

Marulla takes a special interest in the size of the *mentula* both before and after intercourse, and so Martial compares her hand to a weighing machine. There are other occasions where Martial ridicules women for taking an interest in the size of the sexual organ (e.g. 3.73; 7.14; 35; 11.63; Priapus 8.4-5 Williams 1999: 86-91; also for the size of penises in general cf. 1.58; 96; 2.51; 11.72). Note also the fresco of Priapus weighing his enormous phallus, which is at the front door to the House of the Vettii in Pompeii. This evokes fertility, marks the boundaries and reflects phallic authority, as the balance with a sack of coins signifies that the penis is worth its weight in gold (Plate 10 in Williams 1999: 92-3).

Excessive sexuality in women, regardless of age or status, is generally treated with disdain in Martial (cf. 4.12; Sullivan 1991: 197ff.). There are only four poems in Book 10 which directly deal with sexual behaviour in women (75; 81; 95; also 40 on adultery); on this occasion the tone is less insulting and more humorous with Marulla’s fascination with the length/weight of the penis. Although the abusive nature of this poem is fairly mild, it continues the thread of poems which are directed at women in a variety of satirical themes, such as adultery (40); age (39) and divorce for the purposes of monetary gain (41). Women such as Marulla who engage in such sexual practices are a primary target in Martial’s epigrams, especially where connections are made between money, power and sexual gratification (cf. 6.23; 12.97; Sullivan 1991: 204-5). The character of Marulla suggests sexual desire in contrast
with the women who are sexually threatening and set out to destroy male sexual
potency and demonstrate aggressive behaviour (Sullivan 1991: 205). Such overt
sexual behaviour contrasts with that of women such as Sulpicia, who are chaste but
lascivious in their sexuality (10.35).

Arrectum quotiens Marulla penem
pensavit digitis diuque mensa est,
libras, scripula sextulasque dicit;

The name Marulla is used on only one other occasion in Martial at 6.39.1, for an
adulteress who produces children from different men. It is attested in inscriptions as
an aristocratic name, which suggests that she is a matrona as opposed to a common
prostitute (cf. 6.39.1 with Grewing; CIL 6.16707; 6.21789; also cf. Marullus at 5.77.1
and Marullinus at 4.70.3; PIR M 221; see also Watson and Watson: 234).

In keeping with the more moderate tone of the poem, the milder term penis
replaces the more commonly used mentula, which was the archetypal obscenity.
Martial uses this term only a handful of times (cf. 2.51.4; 6.16.1; 3.82.17; 6.23.1;
7.82.1; 9.27.12; 11.74.1; also see Colton 1991: 505 n.51 for its use in Roman poetry
e.g. Catul. 15.9; 25.3; Hor. Epod. 12.8; Pers. 4.35; 48; Juv. 6.337 on the weight of the
testicles with Colton 1991: 244; also 9.43), in contrast with mentula which occurs
forty-eight times (cf. Adams 1982: 35). Marulla weighs the penis with her fingers in
the manner of a banker/moneychanger weighing his money (9.59.19).

idem post opus et suas palaestras
loro cum similis iacet remisso,
quanto sit levior Marulla dicit.
non ergo est manus ista, sed statera.
Wrestling or military imagery for sexual activity is a common element in Greek and Latin love elegy and literature (Apul. *Met.* 2.15-17; Prop. 2.1.13; 2.15.5; Suet. *Tib.* further see Adams 1982: 157-9). This is the only occasion in which Martial applies *palaestra* in this context, as he generally uses it in its original sense of physical exercise (4.55.7; 5.65.3; 7.67.7; 82.5). The sexual act is referred to by *opus,* denoting strenuous activity, and the term can be used even if there is no suggestion that the sexual act takes place in exchange for payment. *opus* is generally used to denote the male role in the sexual act (cf. 7.18.5 with Vioque; 11.60.7 with Kay; Ov. *Am.* 2.10.36; also Adams 1982: 157).

The metaphor for describing the flaccidness of the unerect penis is presented in the image of a limp thong (cf. 11.60 *alutam* as a metaphor for a limp penis with Kay; 7.58.3 *madidoque simillima loro*; Petr. 134.9; 57.8). Unlike 7.58, which treats impotence with contempt and ridicule (commonplace in Latin literature and erotic poetry cf. Vioque on 7.58.3), here the contrast is made merely to compare the weight of the erect penis before sex with its limp state after sex.

Marulla weights the organ with meticulous estimations of its heaviness. A *scripulum* was the twenty-fourth part of an *uncia* (ounce; cf. 4.88.3; 5.19.12) and the *sextula* was the sixth part. This is the only occasion in which the term *statera* is used in this way to qualify the rather weak joke, Marulla’s hand likened to a weighing machine (*OLD* s.v.).

Martial criticises Gallus for expecting him to be on hand at all times of the day, in addition to his attendance at the morning *salutatio* held by patrons for clients.
Objections to the distance that a client must travel to visit a patron are treated in a number of poems (1.70 with Howell; 1.108; 2.5; 5.22; 10.82), and this poem is closely related to 1.108 where the poet complains to an individual of the same name of the distance he must travel to make the morning visit (for the identity of this Gallus see below). Martial does not directly describe the wearying activities enforced on clients, but uses the analogy of various physical ailments which well-known contemporary physicians are able to cure. No skilled doctor can alleviate the sheer exhaustion caused by incessant attendance upon a patron. The fact that each of the conditions is extremely painful complements the pain suffered in these frequent visits to patrons such as Gallus.

Doctors in Martial are generally the target of ridicule, particularly for their tendency more to cause harm than to cure (cf. 10.77). Here, the object of mockery is not the incompetence of physicians, but the ignorance and selfishness of the patron in expecting Martial to be at hand throughout the day. He selects doctors who are possibly the most eminent in their field, but are unable to mend the poet's ailment. Martial displays proficient knowledge of medical terminology in specialist fields, which contributes to the contrasting images. After a considerable gap, this poem resumes the complaint on the patron/client relationship which was such a predominant theme in the opening section of the book (10.10ff.). The poem forms a pair with 10.82, which is also addressed to Gallus on the same theme of complaints about the hypocrisy of patrons and the hardships of clients. The following poem 57 also continues the theme of Martial's frustration with the patron/client relationship and the meanness of patrons towards clients.
Gallus is a common name in Martial and occurs in a variety of different contexts, such as in reference to the castrated priests of the mother Goddess (2.45; 47; 3.92), and for classifying an inhabitant of Gaul (2.56; 11.74; see Giegengack 1969: 27-9; PIR² G 58 equates the identity of this Gallus with that at 1.108 and 82; also 53ff. for its common occurrence in inscriptions). The name is also used in poems with complaints about the patron/client relationship: 1.108 on the distance the poet has to travel to visit Gallus; 3.27 on Gallus' lack of reciprocal invitations to dinner; 7.55 on his failure in the exchange of gifts; 10.82; and as a poet in 12.47. Howell suggests the possibility that both 10.56 and 82 are addressed to the same Munatius Gallus of 10.33, although the themes and tone of the poems are quite different. 1.108 refers to Gallus living far from Martial who lived on the Quirinal. Here, Gallus lives on the Aventine Hill which was the southernmost hill of Rome, overlooking the Tiber (cf. 1.108.2 verum transtiberina domus) and separated by the Murca Valley.

The term servire conjures up negative connotations of the patron/client relationship as an equivalent to that between master and slave (cf. 2.18.7 esse sat est servum; 32; 68; 9.9; Sullivan 1991: 126-7). Such sententiae are not exclusive to Martial's poems, but appear to be a conventional language in Roman literature (cf. Sen. Dial. 10.2.1; Ep. 47; Hor. S. 2.7; see Williams on 2.18.7 who examines the language of slavery in the context of the free Roman man as reflective of Stoic thought). The term servire sometimes has a sexual connotation in terms of an individual who is a slave to lust (cf. 9.41.2). The notion of someone enslaved by his
own desires perhaps links this poem to the previous poem about Marulla, who is obsessed with the weight of the penis.

Martial refers to the *salutatio* as part of the *officia* of the client on behalf of his patron (cf. 10.11). Gallus, however, expects such an attendance not once but several times a day.

*eximit aut reficit dentem Cascellius aegrum,*
*infestos oculis uris, Hygine, pilos;*

Cascellius is a dentist, and the name also occurs as a *causidicus* at 7.9 (PIR¹ C 458). Martial makes numerous references to individuals with bad or few teeth for the purposes of derision and revulsion (1.19 with Howell; 2.41.6; 3.93.2; 8.57; on dental care see Leary on 14.22; also Jackson 1988: 118-21). False teeth were made of ivory, pine or boxwood, and are generally treated with the same mockery as bad teeth (1.72.4; 2.41.6-7; 5.43 *emptos haec habet illa usos*; 9.37.3 *nec dentes aliter quam Serica nocte reponas* with Henriksen; 12.23.1 *dentibus atqae comis – nec te pudet – uteris emptis*; also 14.56.1 with Leary).

The very name Hyginus evokes the medical profession, and there are numerous examples of doctors with this name found in inscriptions (cf. Hygia at 11.60 with Kay; PIR H 238). For another occasion where Martial mocks eye doctors cf. 8.74 (Jackson 1988: 82-3, 121-3). The exact ailment mentioned here, whose remedy requires hairs burnt off the eyes, seems rather peculiar and is not readily identifiable.
The name Fannius also occurs at 2.80, there sometimes identified as Fannius Caepio, but the poems are not obviously related (see Williams on 2.80.1). Here he is simply a contemporary physician, but it also seems a common name (PIR F 115, also 112-17).

This is the only occasion in which Martial uses *uva* to refer to the medical term *uvula*, the small conical fleshy appendage suspended from the centre of the palate (as a medical term cf. OLD s.v. *uva* 3; also see Plin. *Nat.* 20.149; also 34.109 *sedat uvas oris...tollit et tonsillas*). Fannius' methods for removing the *uvula* without cutting it is unclear, although one suggestion is the use of *insecat*, 'cuts into', or *consecat*, 'cuts off' (Ker 1949: 21).

Eros is used on one other occasion in Martial as a real name, but in a more meaningful context at 7.10, here it refers to a physician who removes the brands of slaves (for epigraphical evidence of the name see PIR² E 86-90).

*stigmata* were the marks branded on runaway slaves (Petr. 45.9; 89.1 cf. Mart. 6.64.26 *stigmata nec vafra delebit Cinnamus arte*). In support of this interpretation, although Shackleton Bailey retains *saxorum* in his text (he uses *servorum* in his translation), most texts prefer the more sensible emendation by Scriverius of *servorum* (see Eden 2001: 585, who suggests that the origin of the textual problems derives from *fassorum* as 'the repulsive brands of those who confessed').

*enterocelarum fertur Podalirius Hermes:*
*qui sanet ruptos dic mihi, Galle, quis est?*

*enterocele* is a medical term referring to a strangulated hernia of the intestines, and occurs on two other occasions in Martial (11.84.5 with Kay *mitior implicitas Alcon*...
secat enterocelas; enterocelicius 12.70.3; AP 11.342; 6.166; cf. Celsus 7.18.3; Plin. Nat. 27.112; also see 12.83). The obscurity of the word as a technical medical term, and the painful nature of such a deformity, heighten the similarity between the task and skill of the physician and Martial’s dutiful but excruciating obligations as a client. Six-syllable words appear on numerous occasions throughout the epigrams, but it is unusual to find one in the same line as a five-syllable word (eg 3.7.2 anteambulonis congiarium; 4.46.18 Saturnalia fructuosiora; 11.15.12 Saturnalicos, Apollinaris). The ponderous nature of the line perhaps reflects the use of convoluted terms by the medical profession.

The name Hermes for a physician is often used in a mock-satirical context because of his role as the bringer of death who escorted souls to the underworld (cf. Hermocrates of 6.53, Giegengack 1969: 65 n.9). Here, however, he is praised for his skills and is entitled Podalirius, who was the physician son of Aesculapius in the Iliad (cf. 2.16.5 dimitte Machaonas omnis with Williams’ note).

The purpose of this list of medical practitioners is made clear in the final line, which is dependent upon the double meaning of ruptos as both ruptured physically and figuratively from the strain of all the travelling (cf. 12.14.11-12 saepius illis, Prisce, datum est equitem rumpere quam leporem with Bowie’s note).

10.57

Martial protests that a patron’s gift has been reduced from half a pound of silver to half a pound of pepper. Such gifts are typical of those exchanged on the occasion of the Saturnalia between patron and client. Complaints about the patron’s poor treatment of clients in the patron/client relationship is a well-established theme in
satire and is treated in all of Martial's books (already in Book 10 at 11; 15; 17; 19; 29). This is a contracted version of 8.71 which complains of the gradual decline of the value of gifts which Postumianus has presented to the poet, from four pounds of silver to nothing. The point of the *paraprosdokian* is that the gift of silver is not even enough to buy half a pound of pepper in the first place. Such poems are related to the hypocrisy of patrons and the lack of appreciation towards clients who traipse around Rome to attend them and receive very little in return, as in the previous poem (similarly cf. 10.70; also 4.26; 9.100 with Henriksen). 10.57 also echoes the theme of the previous poem on unequal services or exchange. It is followed by a more complimentary poem to a patron on the advantages of life outside Rome.

*Argenti libram mittebas; facta selibra est,*
*sed piperis. tanti non emo, Sexte, piper.*

Silver seems to be a common gift, and its weight was valued more than the beauty of a particular object (cf. 10.15, also 4.88; 5.59; 7.53 with Vioque; 86.7; 8.71; 11.105; 12.36.1 on the average quantities given which vary between the meagre amount of six scruples at 4.88 and five pounds at 7.53).

Pepper was imported from India. It was first used in medical treatments then came to be a popular cooking condiment (11.18.9 with Kay; Leary on 11.18.9; on its uses in Rome see Miller 1969: 24; 80ff.). It was an expensive product (cf. 7.27.7 with Vioque) and Martial also refers to it as a Saturnalian gift (cf. 4.46.7; 13.5; also Pers. 3.75). The contrast between silver and pepper is intended to emphasise the inequality in value of the gifts offered by Sextus.
Sextus, a common Roman praenomen, is also mentioned at 10.21, as a poet who writes obscure poetry. But the name is used commonly in Martial as an object of mockery or ridicule often in the context of money (2.3; 13; 44) and also in themes related to the patron/client relationship (2.55; 4.68; 7.86; 8.17; for other poems cf. 2.87; 3.11).

Martial recalls a visit he made to Frontinus' villa at Anxur/Terracina one summer, where the time was spent in literary discussion and composition/performance. This occasion is contrasted with the present in Rome where the poet has not time for poetry and is not even able to visit Frontinus because he is occupied with his duties as a client. The poem is a contrast between the blissful lifestyle of serenity and literary discussions held at Anxur, and the unrewarding visits to thankless patrons and the unproductiveness of the poet's farm at Nomentum.

It begins as a typical poem on the urban-rural theme to Frontinus, where the reader expects the poet to plead with Frontinus to leave his busy life at Rome for a life of leisure in Anxur. The peaceful serenity and leisure of the country are highlighted against the stark relentlessness of Rome. The idyllic life of Anxur evokes the ideal of the happy life expressed at 10.47 (Spisak 2002: 138). The theme of the happy life is developed further by the inclusion of the Muses and poetic inspiration as fundamental to the ideal lifestyle. The desire for otium in the country free from obligations is a typical theme in Martial and in Roman literature. Such a carefree rustic existence gives poets the leisure to devote their time to composition and leads to poetic inspiration (cf. 12.68 with Watson and Watson: 173-4). Martial frequently...
complains of the difficulties city life offers poets; for example at 1.70 he sends his book to the salutatio in his place because of the time wasted in such endeavours (1.76; 1.107; 3.38; 5.16; 56; 8.55 cf. Spisak 2002: 139 n. 24; also see 2.90 where he justifies his poetic pursuits to Quintilian in contrast with more important occupations).

Halfway through, the poem takes an unexpected turn and focuses on the personal struggles of the poet at Rome. Life at Rome is presented as endless obligations in the patron/client relationship with unproductive proceeds from the poet's estate. The complaints are that the toils of the salutatio and constant pandering to such patrons prevent him from his poetic inspiration. And because of his struggles as a client visiting others, he is unable to perform his duties to Frontinus. The final lines demonstrate his ultimate devotion to Frontinus with whom he enjoyed such poetic inspiration at the country villa, despite his inability to be officiosus by pledging his love through the gods and the Muses. Martial dislikes the obligations which a client must carry out, and he expresses this to Frontinus, stating that he would rather write poetry than perform the duties of a client yet he presents his utmost admiration and reverence to Frontinus.

In Martial's books only this poem and 10.51 refer to villas at Anxur. The two poems are strikingly similar in structure, tone and content, although addressed to different personages (cf. 51). For these reasons, their parallels have induced some commentators to suggest that they are directed towards the same recipient (cf. 10.51). Both begin with a vivid portrait of country living in summer and evoke images of peace and serenity. Grandiose language and expressions are employed as appropriate
to the tone of the poem and as befitting the status of the addressee, Sextus Julius Frontinus, consul of 98 (see below).

Unlike preceding poems on the urban/rural contrast, which call upon the addressees to discard their oppressive businesses of the city for country living, the focus is directed towards the poet’s own duties as a client in Rome. Martial complains of the exhausting duties of a client towards patrons. Duties such as the extensive trekking over Rome for the daily *salutatio* and day long attendance upon thoughtless patrons is complemented by the two previous poems which deliver these messages. Although the language indicates that Frontinus was a patron of Martial, the poet expresses the idea that mutual esteem and affection (*amare*) outweigh his failure to perform these *officia* towards Frontinus. This perhaps evokes the importance of friendship which Martial emphasises in Book 10 (13; 44).

This poem represents an integration of many of the major thematic ideas prevalent throughout Book 10 with perhaps a more personal perspective. Nauta identifies it as the first of a group of three dispersed throughout the latter stages of the book and one which explains Martial’s decision to leave Rome due to his odium for his duties as a client (10.70; 96; Nauta 2002: 55-6). The necessity of these *officia* hinders his poetical pursuits, and perhaps he reminds Frontinus of the literary inspiration they shared in the country as justification for his absence at the daily *officia* (2.90). Although the poem is an expression of the poet’s dissatisfaction with the urban lifestyle, Martial refuses to denigrate the city itself, describing Roma as *maxima* (cf.10.13.14). The poet is careful in his wording because of the difference in the work ethic of the pastoral *otium* and that required of Romans (Spisak 2002: 138-
9). Indeed, Martial does not persuade Frontinus to leave the city, but reminds him of the poetic inspiration which they enjoyed in the country.


Anxuris aequorei placidos, Frontine, recessus et proprius Baias litoreamque domum,

The opening lines of this poem set the tone with grandiose and appreciative language towards the pleasant environs offered by Anxur and Baiae as a compliment to the status of the poem’s recipient (similarly cf. 10.30.1; 51.1). This is intended to contrast with the images of Roman life in the latter stages of the poem.

For the location of Anxur or Terracina cf. 10.51, and especially note the similarity in expression with line 8 (litus et aequoreis splendidus Anxur aquis). The language placidos recessus evokes the contentment and serenity offered by such a villa, in contrast with lines 7-8 which describe the hardships and struggles created at Rome (cf. secessus 10.104.14; also Juv. 3.4-5 ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni/ secessus). Baiae was a resort in the Bay of Naples and renowned for its pleasures as a seaside resort (cf. 10.14). Anxur has its advantages because it represents all the benefits and pleasures of Baiae as a seaside villa, but its proximity to Rome (proprius) is even more valuable for businessmen such as Frontinus. It is still far enough away to be regarded as a retreat from the life of Rome.

Book 10 contains the only references to Frontinus, who is believed to be Sextus Julius Frontinus, the consul of 98 for the second time (Nauta 2002: 55-6; cf. 10.48.20; for details on his full career see Sherwin-White on Plin. Ep. 4.8.3; also for the confusion between Faustinus and Frontinus see also 10. 48. and 51). In addition,
he was the author of technical works on aqueducts (*de aquis*) and the *Strategemata* on military science and strategy (Syme 1958: 790). It seems that he was extremely wealthy, and there is evidence he also owned a villa at Formiae (*PIR*² F 322, Syme 1958: 176). White denies that Frontinus was a patron of Martial, on the grounds that mention of his name as a consular date in 10.48 does not necessarily establish him as a patron (White 1975: 295-6 n. 41). He continues by rejecting Sextus Julius Frontinus as the identity of the addressee in 10.58, for the reasons that this cognomen is so common that any particular individual cannot be identified and that the absence of the mention of his literary publications in this poem suggests that they are not the same person (White 1975: 296 n. 41). If this poem were published as a new poem in the second edition in 98, it would be quite likely that the addressee would be the consul of the same name, especially with reflections on past relaxation in contrast with the current wearisome duties (Nauta 2002: 55). There is perhaps also a literary link between the two authors in their description of Rome. Martial at 12.8.2 (*cui par est nihil et nihil secundum*) might be seen as a literary complement of Frontinus’ publication of 97 (*Aquis* 88.1 *cui par nihil et nihil secundum*; Nauta 2002: 55 n. 51). The contents of this poem suggest that Frontinus invited the poet to his home perhaps on only one occasion for the purpose of literary performance and companionship (Nauta 2002: 75). Although Frontinus is addressed only once, the duration of their relationship is unknown and there are numerous examples throughout the epigrams of an individual addressed or presented with Martial’s poems on only one occasion, for example Martial’s gift of poetry at 10.20 (cf. also 9.43 and 44 in Nauta 2002: 75-6).
et quod inhumanæ cancro fervente cicadae
don non novere nemus, flumineosque lacus

Martial visited Frontinus’ villa when the sun enters the Constellation of Cancer at the solstice during the heat of summer (cf. the similarity to 10.51.1-2 sidera iam Tyrius Phrixei respicit agni/ taurus et alternum Castora fugit hiems). The peaceful nature of the location is contrasted with the buzz and noise of the cicadas, representative of the stifling heat (cf. Ov. Met. 10.126-7 aesutus erat mediusque dies, solisque vapore/concava litorei fervebant bracchia cancri; Verg. Ecl. 2.13 sola sub ardentì resonant arbusta cicadis; Plin. Nat. 11.95; for a similar image of summer represented by the cry of the nightingale cf. 10.51.10). The epithet inhumanæ to describe the cicadas suggests their relentless humming but also may be a reference to the ancient notion that cicadas were once human beings (Plato Phaed. 259b, Post: 259). This same epithet is also used of amici at 5.22.12 (semper inhumanos habet officiosus amicos?) in the context of the patron/client relationship, and perhaps this image is meant to parallel the never-ending drone of clients trudging around Rome.

dum colui, doctas tecum celebrare vacabat
Pieridas; nunc nos maxima Roma terit.

The reason for Martial’s stay is delayed until the final part of the sentence. The language is typical of that used in the patron/client relationship, such as colui in contrast with amo at the end of the poem, and signifies cultivation or courting of a patron, for personal gain (Spisak 1998: 246). The term vaco denotes the time and otium devoted to literary pursuits, especially when concerned with individuals occupied with important business activities (10.18.5; OLD s.v. vaco 7a; Vioque on
7.26.1). Here the literary pastimes are denoted by doctae Pieridae, a poetical expression for the Muses, the harbingers of literary inspiration (68; also see 10.20).

The pleasantry of this occasion is contrasted with the current situation of the two men in Rome, abruptly conveyed by nunc. Roma is referred to as maxima which denotes the city’s imperial superiority and sway over the rest of the world (cf. 10.2; 30; 51; 103.9; also 1.3.3; 3.1.5; 7.96.2; 9.59.2). Martial combines the meaning of tero to convey the idea of Rome wearing a person out in fruitless activity (OLD s.v. 6) with its other sense of treading or traversing ground repeatedly (OLD s.v. 5b; Williams on 2.11.2), in keeping with the image of the client Martial endlessly wandering around Rome (cf. 10.10.2 mane salutator limina mille teras).

hic mihi quando dies meus est? iactamur in alto
urbis, et in sterili vita labore perit,
dura suburbani dum iugera pascimus agri
vicinosque tibi, sancte Quirine, lares.

For the sentiment that Rome prevents time for relaxation or enjoyable pursuits cf.
10.30.25-7 frui sed istis quando Roma permittit?/ quot Formianos inputat dies annus /
egotiosis rebus urbis haerenti?; 10.51.5-6 quos, Faustine, dies, qualem tibi Roma
Ravennam/ abstulit! Unlike these examples which are intended for the addressee, the complaint is personal in that Rome prevents the poet from his own literary creations.

The demanding existence in the city is presented by a vivid poetic metaphor of being tossed about in the sea, an image which evokes the sea of faces or turba frequenting the morning salutationes at the houses of patrons (cf. 10.10.4). The notion of the fruitless toil of ploughing barren land as a metaphor for Martial’s life at Rome is also a proverbial expression for wasting one’s time (cf. 1.107.7 in steriles
nolunt campos iuga ferre iuvenci with Howell; Ov. Ep. 5.115; Sen. Ben. 4.9.2; Otto: 159). This image leads to a complaint about Martial’s home in Rome and the productivity of his estate. Martial’s home in Rome was on the Quirinal Hill, near the temple of Quirinus (for Martial’s home cf. 10.51.15). In addition, he complains that his villa at Nomentum is not viable and consumes more than it provides (although cf. 10.48).

As with 10.51, the poet transfers his address from Frontinus to sancte Quirine, appropriate as the proximity to Martial’s own home (cf. 10.51; as a form of address cf. Juv. 3.76; Liv. 1.32.9; 5.52.7; 8.9.6; Ov. Met. 15.862; Fast.; 4.910; 6.796; Tac. Hist. 4.58).

sed non solus amat qui nocte dieque frequentat limina nec vatem talia damna decent.

Martial’s time is spent paying attendance on patrons in Rome. For the client’s duties towards the patron such as the early morning salutatio and accompanying him around the forum cf. 10.11. The term damna is more commonly used in elegiac poetry to denote the punishment suffered by a lover, but it also perhaps expresses the loss of something most precious, in this situation loss of time for poetry (e.g. 1.70.17-18 sic licet excuses: ‘qualia qualicaunque leguntur/ ista, salutator scribere non potuit; on damna cf. 7.14.8 with Vioque, 9.5.5; 12.57.15 numerare pigri damna quis potest somni?; Ov. Ars. 2.677).

The use of such vocabulary appropriate to elegiac poetry is in keeping with the image of the clients frequenting the patron’s threshold day and night in much the same way as does the lover, shut out by his mistress (cf. 10.14.7-8). Martial
emphasises the point that he is not alone in such an expression of 'love', and that such a task is pointless. Those who pay constant attendance do not prove their love for their patrons, but act only out of necessity.

The term *vates* is described as the closest Roman equivalent to the use of the Pindaric *opōs*, which combines learning, craft and natural gift. It is presented as a divine inspiration and offers special knowledge of the subject matter (cf. also 10.64.4; 8.63.3; 82.5; 9 *praef.* 5; Spisak 1994: 294). This term is used by Vergil towards himself and Horace in the sense of divinely inspired teacher, but it subsequently lost any religious connotations in Roman poetry. Martial uses it frequently as a grand term for *poeta* (cf. Verg. *A.* 7.41; Hor. *Carm.* 1.31.2; 3.19.15; Spisak 1994: 300; see Newman 1967).

per veneranda mihi Musarum sacra, per omnes iura deos: et non officiosus amo.

The poem concludes with a solemn oath, not only to the Muses but also to all the gods, of his faithfulness to Frontinus despite his inability to attend upon him so assiduously (7.12). The adjective *officiosus* occurs four times in Martial (1.70.2; 5.22.13; 12 *praef.* 40), and denotes one who performs the duties of a client and is ready to fulfil the obligations due to a friend or superior (also Petr. 74.12; 92.6-11; 105.9; see Salanitro 1988: 92-3).

The language is designed to express the distinction between the patron/client relationship and *amici*. This is the only occasion on which Martial declares his devotion towards a patron in such a manner, as *amo* is the ultimate expression of affection and esteem in contrast with the expression *colui* mentioned above (cf. 2.55.1)
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vis te Sexte, coli; volebam amare; Spisak 1998: 246; OLD s.v. *amo*). Martial’s point is that he too loves his patron, but he is not as *officiosus* as others are. This ironically attests to his own commitment as a client.

10.59

In this epigram, Martial reprimands his reader for selecting only the daintiest treats from the rich feast of poems which he offers in his book. The reader overlooks all the long poems which occupy a whole page in preference for the shorter poems. This theme is a variation on 10.45 in which Martial criticises a reader who prefers only the satirical poems and disregards any poems that are lyrical or laudatory. Like 10.45, culinary metaphors for the reader’s literary tastes are presented to rebuke the reader for selecting the daintier shorter poems and disregarding the longer and sometimes better poems. As with 45, the preceding poem is over ten lines long and this seems to represent the type of poem his reader does not like. Martial makes similar observations on his poetry throughout his books. For example, at 2.77 he responds to the criticism of Cosconius that his poems are too long with comparisons to great works of sculpture and architecture (also see 1.110; 3.83; 6.65). The length of 10.58 is contrasted with the two lines of 10.60. The reader is reminded that the dainty tidbits do not necessarily represent the better quality poems. Martial again asserts that variety of style and subject matter constitutes the essence of his books.

10.59 continues the literary programme from the first five poems, where he informs the reader that the content of his poems addresses real life (cf. 10.4). Martial’s disapproval of the reader selecting only the short poems contrasts with 10.1, where he gives the reader the choice of reading only part of the book and which the
reader can make as short as he/she wants. Here he specifies his preferred reader as one who can fill up on the solid plainer poetry as well as the delicacies offered in his books. Self-deprecating expressions (breviora ... non meliora) are combined with an elevated opinion of his material (dives), which conveys a sense of ironic dignity (Gowers 1993: 247). Martial is clearly playing with the Callimachean principles of brevitas in this poem, as he rejects the idea that all his poems are short, an ironic statement given the length of his poetry (Newman 1990: 95).

For further reading on this poem see Newman 1990: 95; Gowers 1993: 247-8.

Consumpta est uno si lemmate pagina, transis, et breviora tibi, non meliora placent.

The verb consumo introduces the poem's culinary flavour with the image of the page being devoured by a single subject or poem, denoted by lemmata. lemmata conveys three meanings, the subject of an epigram (cf. 11.42.2; Plin. Ep. 4.27.3), thus also the epigram as a whole, and the title of an epigram written above it (cf. 14.2.3; also 13.3.7-8; see Kay on 11.42.3). Here the secondary meaning is intended where the subject represents the entire epigram. The reader of this book can be contrasted with that of 14.2.3, where he/she is permitted to read these lemmata as the headings (cf. 14.2.3-4 lemmata si quaeris cur sint ascripta, docebo;/ ut si malueris, lemmata sola legas).

As at 10.45, he claims that the shorter poems preferred by the reader are not necessarily the better poems, thus exhibiting self-deprecating irony towards the satirical poems and promoting the literary quality of his longer ones (see 2.77 above; cf. also 8.29.2 quid prodest brevitas, dic mihi, si liber est?)
dives et ex omni posita est instructa macello
cena tibi, sed te mattea sola iuvat.

The epicentre of the poem evokes the imagery of Martial’s book as a sumptuous banquet (cena cf. 2.18) with a variety of courses selected from the market (cf. 10.45). Despite the notion of the epigram as an impromptu piece, instructa suggests that the arrangement of his book is carefully planned with the same craftsmanship as the chef who creates a good dinner (cf. 11.31.9 multiplices struit tabellas; 14.222.1-2 mille tibi dulces operum manus ista figuras extruet; Gowers 1993: 247 n.117; see also cf. 10.48.15 with structoris). The poet’s attempts are in vain as this fussy reader selects only the shortest poems as a delicacy or tidbit, figuratively denoted by mattea (Mart. 13.92.2 inter quadrupedes mattea prima lepus with Leary; Petr. 65.1; Suet. Cal. 3.8).

non opus est nobis nimium lectore guloso;
hunc volo, non fiat qui sine pane satur.

Martial now gives himself the opportunity to select his own reader for his books. The adjective gulosus here refers to a reader who prefers delicacies like a gourmand (cf. 3.22.5; 7.20.1 and 22; 8.23.1; 9.9(10).4; 11.61.13; 12.41.1; 64.2; 13.71.1; Juv. 11.19; TLL 6.2.2357.77-2358.53). Martial’s ideal reader is one who can be sated on plain bread, and substantial food. The final pun is provided with satur which commonly denotes well-fed or replete (2.90.9; 3.58.43), and here connotes literary satisfaction (4.23.6 qui si Cecropio satur lepore; 11.108.1 quamvis tam longo possis satur esse libello; 13.2.6 carne opus est, si satur esse velis). The inclusion of plain dishes such as bread in his banquet reflects Martial’s display of variety and is also indicative of the simplicity and directness of his poetry.
10.60

This is a parody of the *ius trium liberorum* which bestowed privileges on fathers of three children under the lex Papia-Poppaea of 9 CE. These rights were conferred upon childless or unmarried persons, and Martial mentions several times in his epigrams his own successful requests from both Titus and Domitian (2.91.6; 2.92; 3.95.6; 9.97.6; cf. Williams on 2.91 and Henriksén on 9.97). Martial transfers this idea to the schoolteacher who seeks this right because he has just increased the number of his pupils to three. The schoolteacher in Martial is depicted as stern and harsh, and is a rare subject in his epigrams (9.68; 10.62; also 5.84.2; 9.29.7; 12.57.4). Here the implication is that the quality of Munna's teaching is so dreadful that he has only two pupils in his classroom (for a similar sentiment cf. Diogenes Laertius 6.69; Athenaeus 8.41; on the number of pupils in Roman classrooms cf. Bonner 1977: 131-2). This poem is an example of the trivial delicacies with no substance which his reader prefers in the previous poem. It also anticipates 10.62 which entreats a schoolmaster to permit his pupils to enjoy their summer holidays.

*Iura trium petiiit a Caesare discipulorum
assuetus semper Munna docere duos.*

Elsewhere Martial refers to his own petition for the *ius trium liberorum* which was bestowed upon him by Titus and renewed by Domitian (cf. 2.91.6 *natorum genitor credar ut esse trium*; 2.92.1 *natorum mihi ius trium roganti*; 3.95.5-6; 9.97.6 with Henriksén). This privilege was awarded by the emperor to unmarried, childless men such as Martial, but also to Vestal Virgins, thereby enabling them to receive inheritances from which they would otherwise have been prohibited (cf. Wallace-
10.60

Hadrill 1981: 51-60, *RE* s.v. *ius liberorum*. The emperor referred to here remains appropriately anonymous as the generic term *Caesar* is employed. This term occurs on 126 occasions in his poetry (cf. 10.6; 34 and 101 in reference to Trajan).

This is the second occasion in which Munna is addressed in Book 10. He appears here as a fictitious schoolmaster, but is addressed at 10.36, also in a humorous context, as an individual who sends toxic wines to Rome (cf. 10.36).

10.61

Here is a request that the subsequent owners of Erotion's tomb bestow upon it the proper care and respect, and in return Martial offers the wish that no one else in the household suffer the same loss through death. It is surprising that Book 10 features the third poem mourning the death of Martial's slave-girl Erotion at the age of six, so long after the two other poems which appear in Book 5, indicating she died in around 89 or 90 (5.34; 37). This poem is comparable to 5.34 which expresses similar sentiments in the epitaphic tradition, whereas 5.37 reminisces on Erotion's charms and endearing ways. The number of poems to a particular slave is somewhat unusual and shows a special attachment by Martial towards this little girl (it is even suggested that she was his daughter, see below). The period of time between the first two poems and this present one is even more remarkable. One suggestion is that this poem was written at the same time as the others of Book 5 and only included as an afterthought in the second edition of Book 10. But it seems more likely that this poem is related to Martial's departure from Rome to his homeland in Bilbilis, and is a final farewell to his beloved slave-girl, coupled with the hope that her tomb is cared for in
10.61


The poem is characteristic of the epitaphic genre with funereal motifs and language such as the mention of the deceased's exact age, tears for the deceased and the wish for benefits on those who treat the tomb with the proper respect, with the expression of poignant sentiments of mors immatura (Lattimore 1942: 172ff.; cf. 10.50). Although many of Martial's sepulchral poems are for the death of slaves or freedmen (1.88 on the death of Alcimus; 101 on Demetrius; 6.28 and 29 with Grewing on Glaucias; 6.52 on the slave boy Pantagathus; 11.91 on Canace), this is partly due to the nature of the epigraphic tradition whereby masters and patrons displayed genuine affection in inscriptions for their slaves and freedmen in gratitude for their duties carried out for their masters (see Kay on 11.91). An irony is that similar sentiments are also expressed in epigrams on the death of pets (e.g. 1.09; 11.69 with Kay).

The poignant expressions typical of sepulchral epigrams belong to a series of epigraphical poems in Book 10, but differ considerably in their humorous tone and are dedicated to fictional females both significantly older than Erotion (10.63; 67; also cf. 10.50). The slave girl's name evokes erotic associations and it is perhaps not unintentional that the following poems all contain material highly erotic or sexual in nature (10.62; 63; 64; Watson 1992: 256ff.).

Following 10.61, there is a series of poems which are much lighter in tone (10.62-9; also 10.60), and all contain erotic overtones. Schoolteachers (60; 62), faithful wives (63; 64), effeminate men (65; 66), promiscuous women, both young
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and old (67; 68; 69), provide the subject matter and all are connected by themes of a sexual nature.


Hic festinata requiescit Erotion umbra,
crimine quam fati sexta peremit hiems.

Erotion, Martial’s slave-girl, died around 89 or 90, as is revealed by the two poems mourning her death in Book 5 (34; 37). There has been much discussion on the relationship between Martial and his slave girl (see above) with the suggestion that Erotion was Martial’s daughter by one of his slaves (e.g. Bell 1984: 21-4). Erotion is generally assumed to be her real name although it is not found as a slave name in Latin inscriptions, only one example of Erotio as a man (CIL 6.17801.10). Alternative forms include Erotianus, Erotice, Erotilus, Erotinis, and Erotulus. The name Erotium is used for a meretrix in Plautus’ Menaechmi; the Greek form Ἐρῶτιος is also found as an example of a Greek prostitute (cf. Watson 1992: 262). Watson also suggests that the name may not be the girl’s actual name but a nickname or pseudonym for its erotic associations and as a diminutive form of Eros.

The mention of age at death and its description as festinata is a common feature of sepulchral inscriptions, particularly those of the mors immatura (cf. 10.50 e.g. 11.91). Her death at the age of six is also referred to in both the other poems with similar sentiments (5.34.5-6 impletura fuit sextae modo frigora brumae;/ vixisset totidem ni minus illa dies; 5.37.15-16 quam pessimorum lex amara fatorum/ sexta peregit hieme, nec tamen tota; cf. Watson and Watson: 344-5). The lament that her
death is a crime is conventional in sepulchral poetry, especially when the individual has died so young (e.g. 11.93.3-4 o seelus o magnum facinus crimenque deorum/ non arsit pariter quod domus et dominus see Kay; cf. 10.50.5; also 2.65.3; 4.63.2; Stat. Silv. 1.4.17; AP 7.643; Lattimore 1942: 183). Martial uses the standard vocabulary of funereal inscriptions: festinata (10.50.7; 7.40.7; 9.76.7; 9.86.1); umbra (1.88.5; 5.34.3; parvula ne nigras horrescat Erotion umbras; 6.18.2; 6.76.6; Ov. Met. 14.330); requiescit (1.93.1; 6.18.10); peremit (similarly cf. peregit 5.37.16; 7.47.6; 11.91.2).

quisquis eris nostri post me regnator agelli, manibus exiguis annua iusta dato:

The language suggests that Erotion's tomb is most likely located on Martial's property at Nomentum (10.48.19). It was extremely important that the tomb was protected and treated with due respect and reverence, and it is common for such a request to be inscribed as a reminder to the subsequent owners (Lattimore 1942: 120ff.). A traditional request was that the tomb remained within the family to ensure its continued upkeep (hoc monumentum heredem non sequitur; cf. 1.116.5-6 with Howell; Toynbee 1971: 74ff.). This, however, was not always possible and Martial appeals to the subsequent owners of his estate to carry out the appropriate services to ensure that the tomb is properly maintained. The notion of the epitaph surviving the poet reflects the immortality of literature over life itself (cf. 10.2). It also ties in with the poet's impending departure and sale/transfer of his estate, for which reason he will be unable to attend personally to the tomb's upkeep (cf. 10.92). This exhortation, followed by the benedictory wish that no one else in the household die, is common in sepulchral epitaphs (CLE 385.6; 492.20ff.; Lattimore 1942: 120ff.; Jenkins ad loc.).
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*regnator* is a common epithet for gods in epic poetry (e.g. 14.175.1; 7.47.7 with Vioque; 11.6.2; Verg. A. 2.779; *OLD* s.v. 1b). It denotes the master of a *regnum* with the sense of *possessor* or *dominus* (cf. *regnata* 57.19; for its use in a humbler sense, cf. 12.31.8; Verg. Ecl. 1.69 *post aliquot, mea regnum, videns mirabor aristas?*; G. 1.124; see Jenkins *ad loc.*). Its grandiose tone is deflated by the diminutive *agellus* to represent his property but this is also in keeping with Martial’s depreciative attitude towards his property and possessions (cf. 10.92.13; for *agellus* cf. 1.116.5 *si cupit hunc aliquis moneo, ne speret agellum* with Citroni; *CIL* 6.262593).

The *Di Manes* represent the divine powers of the underworld in control of life and death, but also refer to the soul or spirit of the deceased in sepulchral literature (Lattimore 1942: 90ff.). As gods, it was necessary to provide them with offerings and rites.

*iusta annua* refers to the sepulchral offerings which were celebrated on the anniversary of the death/birthday of the deceased or during the official commemoration of the dead, the Parentalia in February 13-21 (Toynbee 1971: 50 ff.; 61ff.). Offerings of food, drink, incense and flowers were made on these occasions, and the laying of flowers was especially associated with the Rosalia, held between May and June (Lattimore 1942: 132ff.). Because no specific birth or death date is mentioned, it is possible that the wish is more in keeping with the general appeal for care and reverence (Jenkins *ad loc.*).

*sic lare perpetuo, sic turba sospite solus flebilis in terra sit lapis iste tua.*
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The poem concludes with the benedictory wish that no one else in the household die, in return for the subsequent owner’s annual dues to her departed spirit (cf. 6.28.10; 7.96.6-8; CLE 215; 429.1; for further examples see Jenkins ad loc.). Sentiments such as the wish for a long life or life longer than that incurred by the deceased or that there be no deaths thereafter in the household are typical endings in funereal inscriptions (cf. Lattimore 1942: 120-1, 235-7). In gratitude for the continued upkeep of the tomb, the poet expresses the wish that the owner’s house, here denoted by lare (TLL 7.2.966.7; OLD s.v. Lares 2), and household are everlasting. turba appears elsewhere in the sense of the entire household (12.97.3; cf. Juv. 14.166-7; Hor. Carm. 1.24.9). The request for tears from the passer-by or offer of tears for the deceased is a frequent motif in epitaphs especially in situations of mors immatura (1.88.6; 7.96.6; Lattimore 1942: 234; for the term flebilis in funerary poems cf. Hor. Carm. 1.24.9; CLE 555.6, Jenkins ad loc.).

10.62

The sad commemoration of Erotion is followed by an appeal to the stern schoolmaster that he allow his students to enjoy the summer heat without the exertion of studies. The exaggerated depiction of the schoolmaster is emphasised by the intimation that this particular teacher is giving lessons during the summer holidays. There were traditionally three main holidays for schoolchildren: the Saturnalia (17-23 December cf. 5.84); the Quinquatrus (19-23 March); and the summer of which the length is uncertain, between June or July and ending in October (Bonner 1977: 139). Schoolmasters in Martial are typically portrayed as wicked, threatening and cruel to
their pupils, and as those who spend their time shouting and punishing their students (9.68 with Henriksen; 12.57.4).

The language of this poem is similar to 9.68, and employ vivid imagery of the classroom and the summer heat (cf. 10.51.1-4; 58.3-4). This is one of the eight poems of Book 10 in the choliambic metre and retains some of the satirical nature of such a metre in the exaggerated description of the wicked schoolmaster. Although the homoerotic nature of the poem is not emphasised on its own, both this poem and its companion 9.68 are surrounded by poems with sexual contexts (e.g. 9.67; 69-70 and 10.63; 64), which heightens and reveals another side to the teacher-pupil relationship. Indeed, the language is heavy with homoerotic innuendo, and the notion of teachers preying sexually on pupils is a common comic motif in satire (Petr. 85.3, Juv. 7.238-41; 10.224; on sexual relationships between teacher and pupil see Williams 1999: 75-6).

Ludi magister, parce simplici turbae:

The Ludi Magister was the teacher of the Roman elementary school which set the groundwork for reading, writing, grammar and mathematics (Bonner 1977: 34ff.). simplex turba refers to his group of students, and Martial frequently uses this and similar expressions in the same context (cf. 12.49.1 with Bowie: crinitae Line paedagoge turbae; also cf. 12.28(29).19; 57.11; also cf. 2.57.5 grex capillatus; for turba cf. 10.10.5). The use of turba provides a verbal link with the previous poem where it is applied in a completely different context (cf. 10.61.5). The epithet simplex perhaps reflects their innocence and youth (cf. 10.13.3 in the context of Martial’s friend from childhood, Manius).
The schoolboys are referred to in erotic language normally attributed to young boys as sexually desirable objects, which perhaps suggests an additional reason to keep the boys in class. Although Martial uses the term *capillati* on only two other occasions (2.57.5; 3.58.30), there are numerous references to the attractiveness of long-haired boys before they reached manhood. Their maturity was symbolised by the cutting of the hair and the donning of the *toga virilis* (cf. 10.42; for a similar expression cf. 9.29.7 *ne matutini cirrata caterva magistri* with Henriksen). The epithet *delicatae* is often used to express the beauty of an object or place as synonymous with *elegans* or even *molle* (cf. 10.30.22; 74.10; 92.11; also cf. 1.49.7; 1.104.1 with Howell; 7.17.1 with Vioque 9.11.10 with Henriksen; *TLL* 444.80ff.; cf. also 3.58.32 *delicatus eunuchus*). By transferring it from the pupils to the table or desk, the erotic atmosphere of the classroom is heightened.

*nec calculator nec notarius velox
maiore quisquam circulo coronetur.*

The *calculator* was a teacher of arithmetic, who used counters on the abacus to reckon figures (Bonner 1977: 184). The *notarius* refers to the teacher of stenography; shorthand was a popular skill and secretaries were regarded as a valuable commodity (cf. 5.51.2; 14.208 with Leary, especially note the similarity of language at 208.1 *currant verba licet, manus est velocior illis*; also see Sen. *Ep.* 90.25; *RE* 11.2217ff.).

The arrangement of the pupils seems to be in a circle around the teacher arranged in the manner of an audience (cf. line 3 *chorus*; 2.86.11-12 with Williams
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scribat carmina circulis Palaemon/ me raris iuvat auribus placere; also cf. Petr. 27.3, Hor. S. 1.6.82; OLD s.v. *circulus*; Bonner 1977: 126).

albae leone flammeo calent luces
tostamque fervens Iulius coquit messem.

A vivid image of the summer heat under the blazing sun where the earth is roasted for the harvest refers to the constellation Leo, upon which the sun entered in July and remained until the end of August (cf. 4.57.5 *horrida sed fervent Nemeaei pectora coquit*; also see 9.90.11-12 *messes area cum teret crepantis/ et fervens iuba saeviet leonis*; for similar epithets see Henriksen’s notes; cf. also Pers. 3.5-6 *siccas insana canicula messes/ iam dudum coquit*). The imagery evokes the occasion as one of idleness and leisure. Martial seems to be plotting a course through the year in this section of Book 10, as this is the third constellation mentioned in order. In 10.51 he mentions Gemini, which signifies the middle of spring (51.1-2), then at 10.58 Cancer represents the onset of summer (58.3). In this poem we have the heat of mid-summer, then autumn arrives in the final section of Book 10 at 10.94 where he presents apples from his Nomentan estate.

cirrata loris horridis Scythae pellis,
qua vapulavit Marsyas Celaenaeus,
ferulaeque tristes, sceptrum paedagogorum,

Corporal punishment was an accepted component in Roman schools, of which a famous example is *plagosus Orbilius* in Horace (*Ep.* 2.1.70; see Bonner 1977: 143-4). The *scutica* was a leather strap with thongs at the end, and leather imported from Scythia apparently was used for more serious offences. Martial adds the mythological
element of the satyr Marsyas who contended with Apollo at Phrygia and was flayed alive. The irony of this parallel emphasises the so-called cruelty of the schoolmaster.

The *ferula* was a rod or stick made from giant fennel and was used for less serious offences to strike boys on the hands (cf. Leary on 14.80; cf. Juv. 1.15 *et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus* with Colton 1991: 20; also see Sen. *Cl.* 1.16.3; Quint. *Inst.* 1.3.14; Bonner 1977: 142-3). This whip is described as the *sceptra* of the *paedagogi*, and conveys an image of authority and power (cf. Ausonius *Ep.* 14.1 Ausonius, *cuius ferulam nunc sceptra verentur*, *Post*: 262). It also continues the sexual tone of the poem as it can also symbolise the phallus in erotic literature, and it thus suggests some form of sexual violation (cf. *Priap.* 25.3 which associates Priapus’ *mentula* with the sceptre of the Greeks at Troy, see Richlin 1992: 122; also cf. *OLD s.v. mentula* 2).

The *paedagus* was the guardian or *custos* of the boy until he reached manhood at seventeen (3.58.30; 9.27.3 with Henriksén; 12.49.1). He was generally a Greek slave, and his duties included escorting his charges from home to school, teaching the Greek language, and instilling proper behaviour with the authority to mete out punishment (cf. Bonner 1977: 37-46).

cessent et Idus dormiant in Octobres: aestate pueri si valent, satis discunt.

The exact dates of the summer holidays are unknown, and it is unlikely that they extended until October, but it is possible that the poet is requesting a longer period of rest than usual, which exacerbates the cruelty of the schoolmaster (see also 5.84; Bonner 1977: 139-40).
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The poem does not end with a satirical twist but a contemplative *sententia* on the welfare of pupils during summer (similarly cf. 10.23.8; 1.25.8; Sullivan 1991: 225). Elsewhere in Book 10, Martial describes the summer heat as draining, particularly in Rome with its stifling environment; for example his pleas to Apollinaris to take shelter in his comfortable country villas (e.g. 10.12.5-6; 30.10-15).

10.63

This sepulchral epigram is an epitaph for a Roman *matrona*; this complements the sepulchral epigram for Martial’s slave-girl Erotion (26; 50; 53; 62; 71). Although it contains language characteristic of the epigraphic tradition, the surprise obscenity in the final line suggests that this poem is a satiric parody of an epitaph, rather than a genuine epitaph exemplifying the *laudatio matronae* (Prop. 4.11; AP 7.224; 324; 331; 484; 743; *C.I.L.* 52). This seems to be the only occasion in which the sepulchral epigram is parodied in Martial’s epigrams in this way. The satiric/mocking nature of the poem is expressed in the form of hyperbole.

Firstly, the smallness of the tomb in comparison to the significance of the individual within is traditionally limited to renowned and eminent persons. The inscription continues in its inflated manner with the claim that the tomb will outlast two of the most renowned majestic monuments of the ancient world, the Mausoleum and the Pyramids. Although Weinreich suggests that such a comparison is typical of funerary epigrams, it is not used elsewhere in Martial’s epigrams other than in comparisons with monuments of the emperor (*Sp.* 1; 8.36; Weinreich 1940/1: 12ff. cited in Jenkins *ad loc*.). This perhaps is another occurrence of imperial panegyric in poetry for normal individuals even if under satirical circumstances.
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The poem then changes from description of the tomb to the qualities of the matrona herself, as expected in a funerary inscription. The reader is subjected to an exaggerated display of the matronal ideals such as chastity and fecundity. This matrona was accepted for the Secular Games not merely once but twice, which demonstrates an exceptional degree of respectability and virtue. Mention of her children is typical of sepulchral epitaphs, and although it is possible for her to have ten children, that they all survive her may seem unlikely (Watson and Watson: 353). The concluding lines confirm her status as univira, exemplifying the ideal Roman matrona. The use of the obscene mentula challenges her role as the virtuous univira, as a term inappropriate to the Roman matrona: 'by characterising the woman's univiratus in explicitly sexual terms, Martial hints that even one as virtuous as she enjoyed sex at least with her husband, thus ridiculing the notion that the ideal matron could really exist' (Watson and Watson: 351).

This poem picks up a theme from an earlier section of the book on the theme of marriage (35; 38; 39; 40; 41). The model of the univira is represented by Sulpicia of 10.35 and 38; who is depicted as chaste, but as one who takes pleasure in sex with her husband. Perhaps the purpose of her exaggerated self-presentation as the chaste and respectable Roman matrona is to prove that she is not really the ideal Roman matrona because of her use of this particular term.

Fowler considers the dual nature of this poem as both epigraphic inscription and as a literary document which will outlast objects made from stone (Fowler 1995: 53-4). This expression resembles in 10.2 with the claim to immortality for Martial’s poetry, and thus the underlying notion is that the matron will be commemorated in Martial’s poem and will outlast these monuments.
For this poem also see Jenkins *ad loc.*; Watson and Watson: 350-3.

**Marmora parva quidem sed non cessura, viator**

**Mausoli saxis pyramidumque legis.**

The assertion of the tomb which is small but not insignificant is commonly used as a motif on epitaphs for the famous (*Ap* 7.2b for Homer; 7.84 for Thales; 7.73; 337; 345; 380; see Jenkins *ad loc.*; Watson and Watson: 352). This provides the first suggestion of ironic hyperbole (cf. *Ap* 7.198 for the locust of Philaenius). The language of *non cessura* can be compared with Martial's description of his own poetry as outlasting celebrated monuments of marble and stone (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.30). Note also this poem in terms of its appearance as a marble inscription, and therefore the suggestion that the poem will survive these material objects (cf. 10.2; Fowler 1992: 53-4).

The address or appeal to the passer-by is a common feature of funerary inscriptions and occurs a number of times in Martial's funerary epigrams (6.28.10; 11.13.1; 91.3; also *Ap* 7.2b; 197; 198; Lattimore 1942: 230ff.).

The modesty of this tomb is contrasted ironically with two celebrated architectural monuments, the Mausoleum and the pyramids. The first refers to King Mausolus of Caria, whose wife Artemisia built a tomb famous for its grandeur and magnificence (*Spect* 1.5-6 *aëre nec vacuo pendentia Mausolea laudibus immodicis Cares in astra ferant*). The second is the pyramids, renowned for size and splendour (cf. *Sp.* 1.1 *barbara pyramidum sileat miracula Memphis*; 8.36.1 *regia pyramidum, Caesar, miracula ride*). These monuments are both mentioned in the first poem of the *Spectacula* amongst monuments listed as inferior to the Amphitheatre of the emperor Titus (*Sp.* 1). Although Martial uses both these examples in referring to the
superiority of the emperor’s constructions, it is possible that such comparisons were commonplace in funerary epigrams (Weinreich 1940/1 12ff. cited in Jenkins ad loc.). This is the first occasion in which they are used in this manner in Martial’s poems.

\textit{bis mea Romano spectata est vita Tarento et nihil extremos perdidit ante rogos:}

Providing the length of a marriage is a common formula on such epitaphs for \textit{matronae} (Lattimore 1942: 278ff.; Jenkins \textit{ad loc.}; also cf. 10.35 and 38). The woman indicates the length of her marriage by boasting of her participation in two Secular Games, ceremonies which took place at the Campus Martius in an area called Tarentum or Tarentus (1.69.8; 4.1.8; cf. Ov. \textit{Fast.} 2.191-8; Hor. \textit{Saec.} 13.20; 57-9, further see Jenkins \textit{ad loc.}, Watson and Watson: 352). The attendance of \textit{matronae} at these ceremonies was an official acknowledgment of their qualities, in particular chastity and fertility, and prayers were offered to Juno and Diana (Hor. \textit{Saec.} 13-20; 57-9). These Games originally marked the beginning of a new \textit{saeculum} or period of 110 years, and to attend two of these suggests an extremely long marriage. These games were held by Augustus in 17 BCE, and subsequently by Claudius in 47 CE and Domitian in 88. Therefore, her twofold attendance at these games is for hyperbolic effect to make the duration of her marriage seem longer than its actuality, which is 41 years rather than a period of 110 years (Jenkins \textit{ad loc.}).

At this time, cremation was more common in Rome than burial, hence the expression \textit{extremos...rogos} (cf. 10.43; for the use of such a poetical expression \textit{extremos...rogos} cf. Ov. \textit{Ars} 2.120; Prop. 1.19.2; Watson and Watson: 352).
quinqe dedit pueros, totidem mihi Iuno puellas,
cluserunt omnes lumina nostra manus.

Fecundity was a symbol of the respectable Roman matrona and the number of children a woman has borne is a regular motif on female funerary epitaphs (AP 7.224; 331; for a similar hyperbolic sentiment cf. 7.743). It was common to boast that all the children had survived, although such a large number seems unlikely (CLE 52.5 see Jenkins ad loc. for more examples cf. Liv. 42.34.4; Plin. Nat. 7.34, 158).

Therefore Juno is invoked in her role as Iuno Lucina, goddess of childbirth (Catul. 34.13-14; Watson and Watson: 353).

The closest relatives customarily closed the eyes of the deceased (Toynbee 1971: 44). In this case, her ten children perform this service. Such an image contributes to the ironical hyperbole prevalent throughout the poem.

contigit et thalami mihi gloria rara fuitque
una pudicitae mentula nota meae.

Chastity was an essential element of the Roman matrona and also is a common expression in funeral epitaphs (AP 7.324; 331; cf. Mart. 10.35). It was a common device on epitaphs to emphasise the fact that the deceased woman was married to one husband for life (Lattimore 1942: 296 n.251; also cf. Kay on 11.53.7 ut coniuge gaudeat uno; although not itself a funerary epigram, the poem expresses the wish that Claudia Rufina will always remain married to her husband). Although remarriage was common, her exceptional quality of univira is described as gloria rara, praise common to funerary inscriptions (CLE 2053; CLE 1508.1-3 et quae rara fides toris habetur,/ multos cum caperet superba forma,/ blandu iuncta viro pudica mansit; Catul. 111.1-2; Stat. Silv. 2 praef. 25; CIL 13.5383 obsequio raro, solo contenta
marito; on the subject of remarriage see 10.43; Treggiari 1991: 499-502; Watson and Watson: 353).

Note the similarity in language with 10.35 and 38 for the univira Sulpicia (10.35.1-2 omnes Sulpiciam legant puellae/ uni quae cupiunt viro placere). Sulpicia is also described as pudica (35.16), the same term applied to the woman of this epitaph.

This is the first of two occasions in Book 10 in which mentula is used, a term commonly used by Martial throughout his epigrams (cf. 10.90.8; compare penis of 10.55.1; Martial uses mentula on forty-eight occasions in his poems, cf. Adams 1982: 10 n.3; TLL 8.782.38-783.21). Here the term appears totally inappropriate for language supposedly spoken by a dead Roman matrona on her own tomb (Adams 1982: 217).

The juxtaposition of pudicitia and mentula intensifies the shock value of the obscenity and clarifies the humorous nature of the poem given the circumstances. Martial applies a similar device at 7.14 on the lament of the death of a pet belonging to his beloved Stella. The final line reveals that the girl is mourning the loss of the not yet developed mentula of a boy which showed greater promise (7.14.10 mentula cui nondum sesquipedalis erat). Here the expression of her status as univira in such a playful manner reduces any suggestion of solemnity in the poem.

10.64

Martial presents a book of his poems to Argentaria Polla, the widow of the epic poet Lucan, and excuses obscene material contained within by quoting a line from Lucan as precedent. It is not known whether Polla was actually a patron of Martial (see
below on *regina*), or an acquaintance to whom he presented a complimentary copy of his work (White 1975: 282-6). In Book 7, a cycle of three poems commemorates Lucan's birthday (7.21; 22; 23; it is also celebrated in Statius' *Silvae* 2.7), and it is possible that these were commissioned by Polla. There are several poems praising women in Martial's books (4.75; 9.30; 11.53; 12.31; 52), but very few are actually presented or dedicated to a woman such as Polla (White 1975: 284).

In comparison with some of Martial's other books, obscenities occur relatively infrequently in Book 10, so the juxtaposition of two poems ending with overtly obscene terms makes the effect all the more striking. The two poems complement each other for this very reason. 10.63 is an ironic parody of an epitaph for a chaste Roman matron, who declares her fidelity to one husband, and the expression *una pudicitiae mentula nota meae* in the final line is unexpected in the circumstances. Martial responds to this in the following poem by an apology for the obscene content of the book which he is presenting to Lucan's widow Polla, and in order that she should not be shocked by such material he ends the poem with a line from Lucan's poetry in the style of an epigram with a similar obscenity. He appeals to Polla not to be outraged by his material and reminds her of the contents of her husband's own poetry. In other poems, Martial informs the reader that even his most provocative material can be tolerated by decent Roman women (5.2.7-8; 7.88; 8.1-4; 11.16.9-10; 12.95; cf. also 3.68; 86). This is perhaps comparable with 10.35 and 38, and the relationship between Sulpicia and Calenus. Sulpicia, despite her status as *univira*, is still described as sexually equal to her husband, and is lascivious in her poetry for this reason.
Martial provides an imitation of Lucan’s epic poetry as a form of respect towards the poet. Lucan is mentioned a number of times throughout the epigrams and his poetic style is praised on several occasions (cf. 1.61.7-8; 7.23.1-2; for echoes and allusions to the *Bellum Civile* in Martial cf. 6.76.3; 7.63.9; Sullivan 1991: 102; Steele 1924: 314). Lucan is also mentioned at 14.194 (*sunt quidam qui me dicant non esse poetam:/ sed qui me vendit bybliopola putat*), and Leary suggests that this couplet is humorously sarcastic about Lucan’s abilities (Leary on 14.194). It is possible that in 10.64 Martial’s imitation of grandiose epic language is not so much deferential as an ironic representation of Lucan’s chosen genre of epic. Martial avoids any direct criticism of the epic poet by including a humorous line from one of Lucan’s epigrams which is more in keeping with his own style. Martial quotes Lucan not only as a mark of respect, but also as a precedent for obscenity, a technique developed by Ovid (*Tr.* 2.361ff.; also *Plin. Ep.* 5.3.3ff.; see Kay on 11.20). By combining the two, Martial demonstrates his capabilities for different styles of poetry also (cf. 10.45; 59).

Also see Watson and Watson: 131-4.

Contigeris, regina, meos si, Polla, libellos, non tetrica nostros excipe fronte iocos.

This opening identifies the addressee in a manner which finds its only parallel in an address to the emperor Domitian in Book 1 (1.4.1). The same phrase occurs at 1.4.1-2 to the emperor Caesar as an apology for the obscene content of his book: *contigeris nostros, Caesar, si forte libellos, / terrarum dominum pone supercilium.* These are the only occasions in which this expression occurs, and, as on many occasions in Book 10, this is is indicative of the transfer of imperial language to private
individuals. Such an introduction is designed to introduce a book of poems sent to Polla, and self-deprecating expression is a common motif in poems or books presented to patrons and friends (cf. 1.4; 4.14.11-12; 4.82.4 non tetrica nugas exigat aure meas; 5.30; 80; 7.97; 11.15; 106; 12.1; White 1975: 285). White suggests that the apologetic tone implies that the poet is uncertain of the reaction from this reader, and for this reason he concludes that she is not a familiar friend or patron but someone he is trying to impress (White 1975: 285).

The term regina can be used to refer to a woman pre-eminent in her class or group and here denotes a title of respect (cf. Petr. 128.2; OLD s.v. 3b). The masculine equivalent rex is used as a form of address in the patron/client relationship either with the sense of obsequiousness or with overtones of resentment (cf. Hor. Ep. 1.7.27 to Maecenas; Mart. 1.112; 2.68; 10.10; Nauta 2002: 16 n.51; White 1975: 285 n.32, 33; Damon 1997: 16-17, 135, 173, 181; also cf. Kleijwegt 1999: 106 n.6, who construes regina as evidence that Polla was a patron of the arts, but not necessarily Martial’s patron).

Polla refers to Argentaria Polla, the widow of the poet Lucan, who is generally identified as the daughter or granddaughter of the Greek rhetorician Argentarius, celebrated for his Latin declamations (PIR² A 756; Sullivan 1991: 40; Vioque on 7.21; for the suggestion that Lucan’s widow was Polla Felicis, a follower of Epicurean philosophies cf. Nisbet 1978: 10; also van Dam 1984: 454). Martial’s respect and appreciation for Lucan is directly expressed in a cycle of poems in Book 7 commemorating Lucan’s birthday, two of which are also addressed to Polla (7.21; 22; 23). Lucan’s birthday is also celebrated in Statius Silvae 2.7 also dedicated to Polla. She is described in the praefatio as rarissima uxorum (2 praef. 24-6) and the poem
also explains that it was commissioned by Polla (White 1975: 280-6; cf. also van Dam 1984: 454-5). It seems likely that Polla was a patron of Martial and Statius, despite the gap between Books 7 and 10.

*ioci* is a term which Martial frequently uses in a self-deprecating manner towards his own poetry, especially to ensure that his poems not offend (1 praef. 8; 1.35.10-14; 1.4.3 *consuere iocos vestri quoque ferre triumphi*; in Book 10 cf. 10.18.3; 35.13; 48.21; 87.7; Watson and Watson: 133).

Martial introduces the poet Lucan by describing him in language from his own genre, epic. *Vates* is traditionally associated with epic language to denote the poet (cf. 7.22.1 *Vatis Apollinei magno memorabilis ortu*; also 7.63.12 in reference to Silius: *proque suo celebrat nunc Helicona foro*; on the term *vatis* see 10.58.12). Mount Helicon was the residence of the Muses, the source of poetic inspiration, and here it denotes poetry itself (cf. Ov. Tr. 4.10.23-4; Prop. 3.5.19; Watson and Watson: 133).

Martial uses conventional formulae to denote the composition of epic poetry, especially to emphasise its military subjects (cf. 11.3.8 with Kay *quantaque Pieria proelia flare tuba*; 8.55 (56).4 *nec quemquam tanta bella sonare tuba*; Watson and Watson: 134).

non tamen erubuit lascivo dicere versu
‘si nec pedicor, Cotta, quid hic facio?’
Martial modestly excuses the lascivious nature of his poetry for Polla (cf. 1.4.8 *lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*), by quoting a line from Lucan’s own
epigrammatic poetry. The epic poem *Bellum Civile* is the only extant work of Lucan, and this is one of two examples of his epigrammatic poetry (cf. *FPL* 324). Suetonius distinguishes Lucan for his rude jokes (Suet. *Poet.* 47.16-20: *adeo ut quondam in latrinis publicis clariore cum crepitu ventris emisso hemistichium Neronis magna consessorum fuga pronuntiarit 'sub terris tonuisse putes'; Watson and Watson: 131-2). A similar example is found at 11.20, where Martial quotes obscene epigrams of the emperor Augustus (11.20 with Kay; also 1.4.8).

Martial ends with an obscenity intended for shock value and to contrast with the dignified style of the rest of the poem. Just like the previous poem, this language is intended for a Roman *matrona* for whom such terms would normally be deemed inappropriate. One difference is that in 10.63 the *matrona* herself uses the obscenity for her own epitaph, but here the obscenity is composed by Polla's husband. For this reason the use of such a term is meant to demonstrate Polla's appreciation of her husband's styles of poetry (Watson and Watson: 134).

The term *pedico* and its forms are a common obscenity in invective poetry and occurs 16 times in Martial (see Adams 1982: 123-5). The original context of the phrase remains unclear, particularly due to the passive *pedicor* (cf. Watson and Watson: 134). It was not usual for Roman males to place themselves in the passive role else they risked condemnation as *cinaedi* (cf. 3.95.13; 7.62.5-6; cf. Edwards 1993: 70-1, Williams 1999: 160ff.). Watson and Watson propose two meanings, firstly that Lucan's sentiments were unparalleled and the epigram was infamous; or that the original poem contained lines to imply that the individual who is not a *cinaedus* should not be there (Watson and Watson: 134). It would seem that Martial
is deliberately quoting such a line for the purposes of mock astonishment from such a sophisticated female literary patron, whereas it is her husband's own poetry.

In this epigram, Martial criticises the effeminate appearance of the Greek Charmenion by comparing him with the poet's own Spanish features, represented by his hairiness and unkempt appearance. Specific objections are that Charmenion uses oil on his curled hair, depilates the hair from his face and body and speaks with a lisp, all of which are signs of effeminacy, and stereotypically represent the *cinaedus* and homosexual behaviour (Richlin 1992: 137). Invective on the topic of effeminate characteristics is common in Martial's epigrams, and hair depilation is a prevalent motif in these poems and in satire (cf. 2.29 with Williams; 62; 3.63; 74; 5.41; 6.56 with Grewing; 7.58; 9.27; 47; 12.38; AP 11.190, 11.368; 8.113-16; 114-15; 9.12-15; Pers. 4.35-6; on the subject of effeminacy see Williams 1999: 127-32).

In addition, there is the contrast in nationalities. Charmenion is Greek, and the east was typically associated with un-masculine behaviour in style of dress, manners of walking and talking, and excessive care of bodily appearance (cf. Sen. Ep. 114.9, see Williams 1999: 129). This naturally evokes images of luxury and over-indulgence, which Martial is concerned with in this book especially in contrast with the notion of the simple lifestyle (e.g. 10.14). Martial the Spaniard represents the polar opposite to Charmenion and with his shaggy hair and rough style epitomises the essence of masculinity (cf. 2.36 where too much hair represents too much manliness). Juvenal makes the same comparison between Corinthians and Spanish for the same reasons:
Although the poet's appearance may not suit the desired ideal required at Rome, it is appropriate in the environment of country living for which he is headed at the end of this book. Martial writes that Spain is *equis et armis nobilum* (1.49.4) and therefore personal appearance is not a priority. This is the first occasion throughout the corpus where Martial provides detailed information about his personal appearance. Similarly at 10.103 he mentions that the years living in Rome have changed the colour of his hair to grey.

The sexual tone of the poem is intensified by the comparisons of the two men to different animals, Martial to the strongest of beasts, the lion and the eagle, and Charmenion the doe and the dove, reflecting the virility of one and the effeminacy of the other. The poem concludes with a play on the use of *frater* and *soror* which also denotes a type of sexual relationship. The comparison between the poet portrayed as masculine and an enemy as effeminate is a device employed by Catullus in his invective (e.g. 16; 25; 33); however Richlin notes that the real difference between the two poets is that Martial aims his attack against a fictitious 'stereotype' rather than a real person (Richlin 1992: 137).

This subject of masculine appearance and attractiveness deliberately complements the final line of the previous poem with the homosexual obscenity *pedicare*. The theme continues in the following poem, which laments the good-looking youth Theopompus whose profession is wasted as a cook.
Cum te municipem Corinthiorum tactes, Charmenion, negante nullo,

The poem is addressed to Charmenion (meaning 'one of delights or joys'), a name appropriate to his effeminate behaviour and appearance. The Greek name is not used elsewhere in Martial and there are no other attested examples of this form (cf. Fraser and Matthews, vol. 3a, s.v. Χαρμηνίου). Charmenion is a citizen of Corinth (for municeps cf. 10.37.3), which at this time was a colonia established by Julius Caesar. The old city, which was destroyed by L. Mummius in 146 BCE, became a by-word of luxury and effeminacy (cf. Juv. 8.112 unctamque Corinthon with Ferguson 1979: 238).

cur frater tibi dicit, ex Hiberis et Celtis genitus Tagique civis?

Martial refers to his Spanish heritage with a common expression to denote his homeland, by mentioning the Celts and Iberians together (cf. 10.17; also see 1.61.11-12; 4.55.8 nos Celtis genitos et ex Hiberis; 7.52.8). The contrast is striking, as while Corinth and Greece represent the epitome of culture and sophistication Martial associates Spain with the simplicity of country living (cf. 10.13; for Martial's racial heritage see Sullivan 1991: 172). Martial's homeland is associated with manly pursuits such as arms, horses, cavalry and gold mines (12.18.9 auro Bilbilis et superba ferro in Sullivan 1991: 179). Each man's appearance reflects his nationality.
Martial highlights the differences of their origins by continuing with a series of comparisons in their appearance. The first point of consideration is the maintenance of their hair styles. Charmenion has hair carefully styled in curls, which was achieved by the use of a *calamistrum* (curling tongs) and which is the source of numerous opportunities for mockery (for *flectere* in the context of styling the hair cf. 2.36.1 with Williams; 3.63.3-4; 5.61; also Pl. As. 627). The application of perfumed oil on the hair was also common, especially for banquets and dinner parties (cf. 2.29.5 *olet toto pinguis coma* with Williams' note; 3.63.3-4; 5.64; 11.39.11 with Kay; for *nitidus* to denote oiled hair cf. 14.50.1 *ne lutet immundum nitidos ceroma capillos*). In contrast, Martial describes his own hair as *contumax*, in so far as his thick hair refuses to submit to such treatments. This adjective appears on only three other occasions in Martial, and although it is used in different contexts each occurrence conveys a sense of stubbornness and defiance (2.68.3; 9.11.12; 12 praeef. 1).

Charmenion demonstrates his effeminate ways by using a *dropax* to depilate the hairs from his body (cf. 3.74.1 *Psilothro faciem levas et dropace calvam*). Body hairs were removed by plucking, shaving or even other methods are recorded such as singeing them with hot nutshells (2.29; 36; 62 also cf. Suet. Aug. 68.1; for a list of interesting types of depilation see Plin. Nat. 30.132, Williams 1999: 26, Gleason 1995: 67-70).
Martial is proud of his hairy body, and elsewhere he associates hairiness with traditional masculine austerity (e.g. 9.27.6-9; 47.1 Williams 1999: 130). *crura* generally denotes only the shins as perhaps here, but can refer to the legs as a whole (2.36.5 *nunc sunt crura pilis*; see Williams’ note; *OLD s.v. crus*). As the shins were the only part of the leg on display when wearing a tunic, the term evokes the image of hairy shins sticking out from a tunic. Although *hirsutus* denotes cheeks (cf. 6.52.2 with Grewing; 9.47.2) it also denotes austerity of character (Vioque on 7.58 with Vioque; Verg. *Ecl.* 8.34; Ov. *Ars* 1.108, Sil. 13.812). Martial uses this double meaning to his advantage to illustrate their differences in appearance and character.

*os blaesum tibi debilisque lingua est,*
*nobis filia forteius loquetur:*

The final physical comparison made between Charmenion and the poet is the manner of speech of each man. Charmenion speaks with a lisp, denoted by *blaesum*. It is a common term for such speech defects and is also used at 5.34.8 to refer to the charming lisping of the little slave girl Erotion, and also of the drunken speech at 9.87.2. This mannerism is emphasised by his *debilis lingua*, and is a typical indication of effeminate behaviour (cf. Pers. 1.17-18; 35; for the use of *debilis* in similar contexts see Mart. 2.86.5 Petr. 134.2). Richlin notes that the criticism of Charmenion’s manner of speech suggests a threat of irrumation (Richlin 1992: 137).

There is a textual problem with line 11 with the syntactical use of *filia*. One suggestion is that *nobis* is a dative of possession to provide the sense that Martial’s daughter (if he should have one) would speak louder and manlier than Charmenion (Post: 263). Other emendations include *fistula* and *ilia*; however, these do not make
much sense (for a translation with *ilia* see Richlin 1992: 137). Shackleton Bailey suggests that *filia* refers to the name of a loud-mouthed lady such as Pilia or Silia (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 143). Although the text is indeterminate, the sense is clear that Martial intends to distinguish between his own masculine voice and that of Charmenion.

*tam dispar aquilae columba non est*
*nec dorcas rigido fugax leoni.*
*quare desine me vocare fratrem,*
*ne te, Charmenion, vocem sororem.*

Richlin examines these animal similes in the context of reinforcing the threat of violent physical abuse as well as the idea of a male/female contrast between the two men – *columba/dorcas/soror* versus *aquila/leo/frater* (Richlin 1992: 136-7). Martial makes a comparison between the strongest and the weakest of animals, eagle and dove, lion and doe (see Otto: 88; Ov. *Ars. Am* 1.117 ut fugiunt aquilas, timidissima *turba, columbae;* Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.31; Mart. 10.100.4). Such similes are commonly used for women, and here the effeminate Charmenion is associated with animals such as the dove, the bird of Venus typifying romantic love (for other similes cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12.25-6; Richlin 1992: 137). The dove is also a common epithet/symbol in love elegy because of its associations with kissing (Kay on 11.104.9; also 1.7 with Howell; 1.109). Martial is the *rigidus leo,* and such an epithet is intended to convey his rough manners in contrast with the effete behaviour of Charmenion (*OLD* s.v. *rigidus* 4). Elsewhere, like *hirsutus* above, Martial uses this term to express moral austerity (cf. 10.20.21; also 6.64.1; 7.71; 92.3). It contains homo-erotic undertones as
this adjective is also used to describe the erect penis (cf. 9.47.6 with Henriksen; *OLD s.v. rigidus 5a*).

Both the lion and eagle symbolise magnificence and royalty in the animal kingdom, and hence are usually associated with exalted figures such as deities (e.g. the eagle as the bird of Jupiter) and consequently emperors (cf. Howell on 1.6; Weinreich 1928: 102ff.; Taylor 1931: 165). The lion as a symbol of imperial panegyric is prevalent in Martial's first Book of epigrams in his cycle on the lion and hare (1.6; 14; 22; 48; 51; 60; 104; cf. 10.100). Here, the grandeur of these animals is transferred to the poet himself, and represents another example in Book 10 of imperial panegyric used for private individuals (cf. 10.30).

The titles *frater* and *soror* are generally defined as terms for one's boyfriend or girlfriend, either for same sex couples or those of the opposite sex (cf. 2.4 with Williams; Petr. 127.1-2; Tib. 3.1.23-8; *OLD s.v. frater 3b; soror 1d; TLL 6.1256.22-69; Williams 1999: 223-4, also n.354). Their use here does not necessarily suggest a sexual relationship between the two men, as *frater* also appears as a term of endearment among male friends to denote brotherly love and friendship (e.g. 2.11.6 with Williams). Charmenion's womanly behaviour results in his receiving the scornful title *soror* in contrast with the poet's manliness (cf. 10.52, where the effeminate Greek Thelys is mocked as an adulteress in a toga due to his feminine appearance).

The poet appeals to the attractive slave boy Theopompus who is employed by his unnamed and hard-hearted master as a cook in the kitchen rather than as an attendant
at the dinner table. Cooks are associated with the filth and grease of the kitchens, hence the youth’s looks are wasted in such an environment. The image of the obdurate lover is evoked in the contrast between Jupiter succumbing to the appeals of Ganymede and this master who considers himself superior to Jupiter in his resistance to the charms of Theopompus. Martial uses this same idea in a couplet in Book 12 which combines gluttony with erotic themes:

Vincentem rosenos facieque conaque ministros
Cinna cocum fecit. Cinna gulosus homo est (12.64).

The irony of the poem is twofold in nature. Firstly it satirises the vain wealthy master who is so extravagant that he even has attractive cooks. This master is portrayed as the unyielding lover typical of love elegy. Theopompus’ physical beauty is such that he is compared to Ganymede, the archetype of the young attractive slave boy. The image of rich men served by young handsome men who are comparable to Ganymede is commonplace in poets such as Martial, Juvenal and Statius (Mart. 1.6; 3.39; 5.55; 9.11; 22; 36; 73; 103; 10.98; 12.15; 13.108; Petr. 92.3; Juv. 5.59; 9.46-7; 13.42-5; Stat. Silv. 1.6.28-34; 3.1.25-7; 4.2.10-12; Hor. Carm. 3.20.15-16; Williams 1999: 287 n.235). Such slave boys or ministri were employed for their sexual desirability in addition to duties of serving wine and food (cf. 11.11.3 with Kay; Williams 1999: 30-8; 49-51; 79-81). Sexually desirable slave boys are a common subject in Martial’s epigrams; for example Domitian’s own Earinos is also likened to Ganymede in a series throughout Book 9 (9.11; 16; 36).

The poem continues homo-erotic themes from the preceding poems although in a contrasting tone. Whilst the previous poem criticises Charmenion for his effeminacy, here Martial shows desire for the attractive cook Theopompus.
Quis, rogo, tam durus, quis tam fuit ille superbus
qui iussit fieri te, Theopompe, cocom?

The anonymous master is criticised for his hard-hearted and conceited nature in placing Theopompus in the kitchens as a cook. *durus* immediately sets a sexual tone as it plays upon an image typical in love elegy of the lover shut out by the pitiless mistress, a role here performed by the master (cf. 10.35.18; also 4.7.2; 8.46.6). The sense of *superbus* suggests that this master is so wealthy and vain he parades his extravagance by owning attractive cooks such as Theopompus (cf. 12.64; for *superbus* in this context cf. 3.7.5 *regis superbi sportulae recesserunt*).

This is the only occasion in which the name Theopompus occurs in Martial, and although it is probably a real name, its meaning ‘sent from the gods’ is appropriate to the sense of the poem, particularly in the comparisons to Ganymede and the description of Theopompus as *sidereus* (Giegengack 1969: 93-4).

Cooks are mentioned on a number of occasions especially for their culinary abilities or lack thereof (cf. 3.13; 94; 5.50; 8.23; 12.64; 14.220 *non satis est ars sola coco: servire palatum/ nolo: cocus domini debet habere gulam*; see Leary’s note; also 1.50).

*hanc aliquis faciem nigra violare culina sustinet, has uncto pollut igne comas?*

The image of the cook is presented as one who is dirty and greasy, and as such this is not an appropriate profession for one such as Theopompus. Elsewhere Martial associates kitchens with smut and dirt, denoted by the epithet *nigra* (1.92.9 *pasceris et nigrae solo nidore culinae*; 3.2.3 *ne nigram cito raptus in culinam*; Juv. 5.162; for *culina* see Vioque on 7.27.6). Instead of a fragrant perfume or unguent adorning his
hair, Theopompus' locks are decked with the soot of the kitchen fire (cf. 7.27.6; 8.67.8 alget adhuc nudo clusa culina foco).

Homoerotic symbolism is continued in the terms violare and polluo which suggest an act of defilement upon the youth and his appearance (e.g. 12.84.1 with Bowie nolueram, Polytyme, tuos violare capillos; also 5.61.6 crura gerit nullo qui violata pilo; 8.50.11 hunc nec Cinyphius tonsor violaverit; Adams 1982: 199, 223).

quis potius cyathos aut quis crystalla tenebit?
qua sapient melius mixta Falerna manu?

The primary duty of the ministri was serving their masters at the dinner table, although they were generally kept for their physical attractions rather than their ability to serve drinks (cf. 11.11 with Kay; 11.26.3-4 basia da nobis vetulo, puer, uda Falerno,/ pocula da labris facta minora tuis; 56.12). Therefore, there would seem little point in keeping one greasy and dirty, hidden and confined in the kitchens.

Wine glasses made of rock crystal were fragile and very valuable; hence this demonstrates the extravagance and wealth of this man (see 10.14.5; Leary on 14.111; 3.82.25; 9.22.7). Falernian wine, one of the most expensive and prized vintages, is served in these vessels, another example of luxury (for Falernian wine see 10.36.5; cf. 8.77.5 candida nigrescant vetulo crystalla Falerno; 9.22.7-8; nec labris nisi magna meis crystalla terantur/ et faciant nigras nostra Falerna nives; 9.73.5 rumpis et ardenti madidus crystalla Falerno).
si tam sidereos manet exitus iste ministros,
    Iuppiter utatur iam Ganymede coco.

If Theopompus is treated in such a way, then rightfully Ganymede should become Jupiter’s cook. Ganymede, the cupbearer to Jupiter, is generally presented as the archetype of the sexually desirable male slave (Williams 1999: 56-60; for the numerous literary examples see above). *sidereos* often assumes the sense of radiant or almost divine beauty and here is used appropriately to denote the comparison with Ganymede (cf. 9.36.10 *tantaque sidereos vix capit aula mares* with Henriksen; also Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.21-2; *OLD* s.v.). Double meanings and euphemisms are perhaps continued with the verb *utatur*, which can be compared to *fruor* and used in a sexual sense (Adams 1982: 222).

Here Plutia is of such a very great age that she is older than the oldest women of mythology, presented in a list of hyperbolic examples which appear to be typical of such invective, especially Greek epigram (e.g. 3.32.3-4; 76; 9.29; 10. 39; 90; *Priap.* 57.3-5; *AP* 11.67; 71; 72; Richlin 1983: 69). A common theme in such cataloguing is that the women are defined in some kind of family relationship, such as daughter, stepmother, grandmother, mother-in-law, sister, nurse (Richlin 1983: 70). The poem follows some type of sequential order from daughter, to stepdaughter, to grandmother, nurse and then mother-in-law. Most of the mythological examples are typically associated with old age and longevity, and begin with Plutia as the daughter of the first woman in time after the Great Flood, followed by familial relationships to those such as Nestor, Priam, Laertes and Niobe, who are all before the Trojan war.
Thyestes is not usually linked to old age, although it is possible that the myth predating the Trojan war like the other examples is sufficient reason for its inclusion (Watson and Watson: 355). Earlier in Book 10, Martial exemplifies Thyestes as an unsuitable subject for contemporary Roman society (cf. 10.4).

The primary thrust of the invective is that the old women are preoccupied with sexual desire which is presented as a repulsive notion on many occasions in Martial (cf. 10.39; 90). As well as Plutia’s comparisons to old women of mythology, the idea that she outlives crows, who were renowned for their longevity, conveys the bestial ugliness of old women (Richlin 1983: 70). Her hideous behaviour is intensified by the notion that her lust is unrelenting in the tomb in her desire for Melanthio, whose baldness suggests that he too is old and ugly (as well as dead). This renders her desire all the more repugnant. Similarly, at 3.93, Martial mocks Vetustilla for her lascivious behaviour which extends into extreme old age and beyond death, although the language is significantly more explicit.

This poem not only resumes invective against old women but also continues the criticism of women’s sexual conduct unbecoming to Roman women, and which is engaged in even after death (cf. 10.39). These themes are particularly prevalent in this section of the book and the topics of promiscuity and adultery are also continued in the following two poems (10.68; 69). In addition, 10.67 parodies sepulchral themes and topoi, which link the poem to other sepulchral poems for women in this book (10.61; 63). A sequential pattern emerges from these three poems in the respective ages of each subject. 10.61 commemorates the death of the little slave-girl Erotion, which is closely followed by the 10.63 with the anonymous ‘chaste matrona’, who is advanced in age, but not so much as Plutia. As with 10.63, the notion of behaviour
and language appropriate to a *matrona* becomes the predominant theme. Chastity is an ideal quality in the Roman woman and praise of her conduct is a typical *topos* of women's epitaphs (cf. 10.63). This notion is mischievously subverted by the image of Plutia itching with desire even in the tomb. In addition, the lust of Plutia's corpse sullies the notion of being buried in the same tomb as a marital ideal (Eur. *Alc.* 365-8; *CLE* 367.8, Watson and Watson: 354).

On 10.67, see also Watson and Watson: 353-6.

Pyrrhae filia, Nestoris noverca, quam vidit Niobe puella canam,

The poem begins with a catalogue of filial relationships to define Plutia's extreme age in a sequential order. Pyrrha represents one of the earliest figures of mythology, who along with her husband Deucalion, is the survivors of the Great Flood, and symbols of the origins of mankind (cf. Juv. 15.30; Ov. *Met.* 1.313-415). As Pyrrha's daughter, Plutia is not only old, but her age is incalculable (cf. 10.39.4). The example of Deucalion and Pyrrha appears in Greek epigrams for similar purposes as representative of old age (cf. *AP* 11.67.3; 11.71; Watson and Watson: 354).

As stepmother of Nestor, she is older than Nestor, whose name was proverbial for longevity (cf. 10.24; also 2.64; 5.38; 9.29.1 *saecula Nestorea permensa,* *Philiaeni, senectae* with Henriksen). By referring to Plutia as older than Nestor, Priam and Laertes, this dates her before Homer and the Trojan war, and the earliest heroes, which places her age in a remote past. Niobe was Nestor's grandmother (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.6), which further establishes Plutia's advanced age. Niobe is also associated elsewhere with sexually desirous old or even dead women, especially
concerning the myth that she was turned to stone, which perhaps complements the
image of the corpse of Plutia itching with lust in her tomb (cf. 3.32.3-4 *possum
Hecubam, possum Niobam, Matrinia, sed si nondum erit illa canis, nondum erit illa
lapis*).

Laertes aviam senex vocavit,
nutricem Priamus, socrum Thyestes,

Like Nestor, both Laertes and Priam are traditional symbols of extreme old age and
are depicted as old men in literature, beginning with Homer (Laertes in Ov. *Ep.* 1.97-
8; Sen. *Tro.* 698-700; for Priam cf. Mart. 2.64.3 *Peleos et Priami transit et Nestoris
aetas*; 5.58.5 *iam cras istud habet Priami vel Nestoris annos*; Hom. *Il.* 22.37-76;
Watson and Watson: 355). The filial relationships are continued with Plutia described
as grandmother of one, wetnurse of the other. Wetnurses formed a close bond akin to
family and were traditionally represented as old women in literature (for similar
examples cf. *AP* 11.67.3; Priap. 57.3-5 *quae forsan potuisset esse nutrix/ Tithoni
Priamique Nestorisque, illis ni pueris anus fuisset*; also see Watson and Watson: 355).

*iam cornicibus omnibus superstes,*

Crows were acknowledged for their longevity, and were supposed to live nine times
the age of a man (cf. Lucr. 5.108; Hor. *Carm.* 3.17.3; 4.13.25; Ov. *Met.* 7.274). This
being so, crows are targeted for comparison with the elderly in satire, particularly old
women, where they complement the notion of sexual unattractiveness (Priap. 57.1; *AP*
5.298.1; 11.67.2; 69.1; Plin. *Nat.* 7.153; Watson and Watson: 355).
hoc tandem sita prurit in sepulchro
calvo Plutia cum Melanthione.

As with 10.63, sexual language is delayed until the last few lines. The matrona of 10.63 uses lascivious language to express her chastity, but here Plutia continues her sexual desires in the tomb. The verb prurio evokes the sense that Plutia 'itches with lust' as a euphemism for having sex with Melanthio (cf. 3.93.20-1 prurire quid si Sattiae velit saxum?; 5.78.20; 9.90.8; 14.203 with Leary; Catul. 88.1, cf. Adams 1982: 188; OLD s.v. prurio 2a; Watson and Watson: 355-6). Plutia's behaviour parodies the poignant notion that a couple shared their tomb as they shared their marriage bed in life (cf. CLE 1142.25-6; Prop. 4.7.94; Treggiari 1991: 246, Watson and Watson: 356). Not only is her sexual behaviour unbecoming to a Roman woman, but her advanced age and burial make her all the more repulsive.

Plutia is preferred over the alternative Plotia (s) because of inscriptional evidence, although the name does not appear elsewhere in Martial, and it is possible that Plutia is chosen for its connections with Pluto and the Underworld (Watson and Watson: 356.). Therefore, her social status cannot be determined.

This is also the only occurrence of the name Melanthio in Martial, although it is attested by inscriptional evidence (CIL 3.4256; for derivations Melanthus cf. 6. 24212.7; 8.919; 9.4670; ILS 5644). The name's associations with servile status perhaps further disparage Plutia's behaviour. Baldness (calvus) is typically associated with age and ugliness of both sexes and is a common subject in Martial (cf. 10.83; also 2.41.10; 3.93.1-2; 5.49; 6.12; 57 with Grewing; 74; 9.37.2-3; 12.23; 45; 89; Watson and Watson: 356). As such it would seem that both parties are too old and ugly (not to mention dead) to engage in sexual activities.
Here the subject is Laelia, portrayed as a Roman *matrona* of pure Italian heritage, who attempts to adopt mannerisms and language that are Greek, especially of the kind typically restricted to Greek prostitutes. Despite Laelia’s attempts to present herself as fully Greek with her Greek blandishments towards her lover(s), these are deflated in the denouement in that her Italian heritage and upbringing prevent her from fulfilling her aspirations. Laelia’s language reflects more that of a Greek prostitute than a Roman lady, and a further objection is that she speaks in such a fashion to everybody and on all occasions. A similar sentiment is conveyed at 7.30 where Martial reprimands Caelia, also a Roman girl, for having sex with men of all different nationalities except Roman.

This is the second of three poems in succession which satirises women. This type of poem belongs to the category of women who display sexually aggressive or promiscuous behaviour (e.g. 2.34; 3.26; 4.12; 6.45; 67; 7.30; Richlin 1992: 246 n.41; also 53; and for a full list of Martial’s epigrams on wanton women cf. Richlin 1992: 235 n.33). The poem also complements 10.65 which compares the effeminacy of the Greek Charmenion with the Spanish poet by means of their appearance and demeanour. Here the parallel is between the language of Greek *hetairae* and that appropriate for a Roman *matrona*. Such conduct contradicts that demonstrated by the *univira* Sulpicia of 10.35 and 38, who uses playful but pure language in an appropriate setting with her husband. The use of inappropriate language more immediately recalls the use of the obscenity *mentula* in the epitaph of the unnamed woman at 10.63.

For this poem also see Watson and Watson: 226-9.
Martial selects three famous Greek cities, Ephesus, Rhodes and Mitylene, designed to evoke images of culture and luxury. Rhodes was celebrated for numerous things, renowned as the birthplace of the Sun, but was identified also with education, rhetoric and the Colossus (cf. 9.20.6 with Henriksen; 14.70.2 with Leary). Mytilene was the leading city on the island of Lesbos (cf. 7.80 with Vioque; Cic. Agr. 2.40) and Ephesus, a city on the west coast of Anatolia was famous for the Mysteries (cf. 4.55.4-6 Argivas generatus inter urbes/ Thebas carmine cantet aut Mycenas;/ aut claram Rhodon aut libidinosae/ Ledaeas Lacedaemnos palaestras). This line is reminiscent of the opening of Horace Carm. 1.7 (1.7.1-2 laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mitylenen/ aut Epheson bimarise Corinthis). In reality, however, Laelia lives on the Patricius vicus in Rome, the street north from the Subura towards the Viminal gate (cf. 7.73 with Vioque; Platner-Ashby: 576-7).

Laelia represents a noble Roman matrona, and the name is deliberately chosen for its similarity with Lais, a name synonymous with Greek hetairae (Giegengack 1969: 117-18). The name appears on two other occasions in the Epigrams, both for satirical purposes; once in the context of adultery (5.75 with Howell), and the second mocking her appearance (12.23; cf. PIR² L 59; Laelia also appears as a Vestal Virgin in Tac. Ann. 14.22).

dece coloratis numquam lita mater Etruscis
durus Aricina de regione pater;

Martial establishes Laelia to be of pure Italian stock from her parentage, her mother of Etruscan descent and her father from Aricia. Such a heritage reflects an old-fashioned
morality and virtue in contrast with the Greek lifestyle which Laelia is adopting. The epithet *coloratis* denotes tanned by the sun (cf. Quint. *Inst*. 5.10.81 *sol colorat*; *non utique qui est coloratus, a sole est*; Ov. *Am.* 1.14.6), which evokes the Roman ideal of hard but honest labour (Verg. *G.* 2.533, Watson and Watson: 227).

The description of Laelia’s mother as *numquam lita* ‘free of make up’ reflects ancient moral virtues appropriate to Roman women. Usage of cosmetics is frequently derided in Martial’s epigrams especially in the context of making women more sexually attractive (cf. 2.41.10-12 with Williams). Ovid in his handbook for women describes how the Sabine women who were praised for their chastity took little interest in their own appearance (1.62.1 with Citroni; Ov. *Med.* 11-12 *forsitan antiquae Tatio sub rege Sabinae* maluerint, quam se rura paterna coli; Watson and Watson: 227). Heavily made up women also denote *hetairae* in comedy (Ar. *Eccl.* 877-929; Lys. 42-8; Pl. *Mos.* 157-293; Dalby 2002: 114-15). Here it represents the contrast between the chaste Roman *matrona* devoid of cosmetics and the licentious nature of Greek women.

Her father is from the ancient town of Aricia 16 miles outside Rome on the Appian way, also famous for the grove sacred to Diana (13.19.1; 2.19.3; 12.32.10; Verg. *A.* 7.763) which denotes austerity and virtue (Cic. *Phil.* 3.15). The epithet *durus* is recalled from 10.66, there used in the context of the pitiless lover, while here it denotes moral fortitude (cf. 10.25.3; also see Watson and Watson: 227).

κύριε μου, μέλι μου, χαχή μου congeris usque,
pro pudor! Hersiliae civis et Egeriae.
Laelia expresses sweet nothings in Greek, and the fact that she uses them on all occasions raises the notion of promiscuity unbecoming to a Roman lady (cf. 10.63; 67). Such phrases are common expressions of love (Heliod. Aeth. 8.6.4; Plaut Bacch, 17-18; Juv. 6.195; Lucr. 4.1160-9; Watson and Watson: 227). These lines in particular are the obvious model for Juvenal in his attack on the woman who is fond of speaking Greek:

...non est hic sermo pudicus
in vetula. quotiens lascium intervenit illud
ζωή ναί να φήσει, modo sub lódice relicris
uteris in turba. quod enim non excitet inguen

Pudicitia is the ideal behaviour for the Roman matrona, and the exclamation intensifies Laelia's inappropriate conduct (on pudor cf. 10.35; for such apostrophes cf. 8.78.4 o pudor! o pietas; also 1.109.6 pro facinus; 2.346.8 pro scelus). Martial calls upon two ancient examples which symbolise Roman morality and virtue, Hersilia the wife of Romulus (Sil. 13.812; Ov. Met. 14.829-48) and Egeria the wife of Numa. The mention of Egeria recalls the behaviour of Sulpicia at 10.35, which suggests gentle mockery of sexual propriety but within the limits of marriage. These examples contrast with the lasciviousness and licentiousness of Greek behaviour.

Lectulus has voces, nec lectulus audiat omnis,
sed quem lascivo stravit amica viro.

The language here vividly recalls the poems to the univira Sulpicia, who is sexually interested in only one man (for similar expressions cf. Prop. 1.6.10; 3.21.34; Ov. Am. 2.5.56). The language used by Laelia is appropriate for the bedroom, and intended for conversation between an amica and her lascivus vir (cf. 10.64.5). Lascivus is a
conventional epithet in erotic poetry especially for its connotations with sexual shamelessness. It is a very common term in Martial (cf. 5.78.28; 6.45.1; 7.17.3 with Vioque; 9.26.1; 9.67.1 with Henriksen; 10.64.5; TLL 985.73ff.; Ov. Ep. 17.77). Not only is such language not appropriate to a Roman matrona, but its use in the bedroom promotes promiscuity and debauched behaviour. amica is the term for ‘girlfriend’ or sexual partner used in relation to a man but can assume characteristics of a prostitute (1.71.3; 2.34.5 with William’s note; 62.3; 3.69.6; 4.29.5; 9.2.1; 11.27.3 with Kay; 100.1; 14.9.1; 156.1). This naturally distinguishes this relationship from that between husband and wife, such as Calenus and Sulpicia.

scire cupis quo casta modo matrona loquaris? numquid, quae crisat, blandior esse potest?

Martial reprimands Laelia for her manner of speech because she is a casta matrona, which implies that she has sex only with her husband (cf. 10.33.4; 1.13.3; 62.1; 2.34.4 with Williams). It is not appropriate for her as a Roman matrona to use language more fitting to a Greek prostitute. This obviously contrasts with Sulpicia whose language is lascivious but chaste in the appropriate setting with her husband. At 10.64, the obscene language is not uttered by the lady Polla herself, but by her husband.

criso is an explicit sexual term for the motions of a woman during sex (cf. 14.203.1 tam tremulum crisat, tam blandum prurit with Leary; Lucil. fr. 361; Juv. 6.322 ipsa Medullinae fluctum crisantis adorat; Priap. 19.4 crisabit tibi fluctuante lumbo; Adams 1982: 136). Shackleton Bailey has emended the text of numquid, cum crisas, blandior esse potes, which implies that Laelia speaks in this way during
Intercourse, to the more preferable *crisat...potest*. This is appropriate to the sense that Laelia talks like a Greek prostitute despite the fact that she is a Roman *matrona* (cf. 11.104.11 *nec moto dignaris opus nec voce iuvare*; also see Watson and Watson: 228-9).

\[\text{tu licet ediscas totam referasque Corinthon,} \\
\text{non tamen omnino, Laelia, Lais eris.}\]

Corinth was a city famed for its luxury and wealth. The lines recall 10.65 which contrasts between Greek effeminacy and Spanish virility. The mention of Corinth also anticipates the reference to Lais, the famed Corinthian prostitute, although Lais was by now synonymous with prostitutes (11.104.22 with Kay; *AP* 7.218-20; *Ov. Am.* 1.5.12; Prop. 1.6.1-4). Thus, despite Laelia’s attempts to assume Greek habits and language, her Italian stock prohibits a complete transformation (cf. Sullivan 1991: 225 n.18 as a dialectical resolution of paradox or contradictions; see Watson and Watson: 229).

10.69

Martial continues his tirade against women in a short couplet which contrasts with the length of the previous poem. Here the subject of marriage and adultery is raised, a theme already prominent throughout the book. The point of the epigram is to mock Polla for her control over her husband by deliberate wordplay on the technical terms for marriage, *ducere uxorem* (Sullivan 1991: 248). Here the roles of husband and wife are reversed for comical effect to depict the jealous Polla, who suspects that her husband is committing adultery. The subject of adultery is very frequent in Martial’s
Custodes das, Polla, viro, non accipis ipsa. 
hoc est uxorem, ducere, Polla, virum.

This is the second of three times in Book 10 the name Polla is used. All three poems are concerned with the subject of marriage in some way (cf. 10.40). It was common practice in Rome for husbands to engage persons to watch their wives, but instead Polla exhibits her dominance in the marriage by employing watchers over her husband (1.73.3 with Howell sed nunc custodibus ingens; Tac. Ann. 11.35; cf. also Juv. 6.347-8 quis custodiet ipsos/custodes?).

The point of the epigram relies on the switching of the technical terms for marriage, where a husband is understood ducere uxorem and the wife nubere viro (8.12; Treggiari 1991: 349). Martial also reverses this idiom for a similar effect when referring to homosexual marriages (1.24.4; 12.42; Juv. 2.117ff.).

Martial laments to Potitus of the time wasted in trekking around Rome in obligations to his patrons all day from the early morning salutatio to the late night bath where he awaits the sportula of a hundred quadrantes. Because these duties generally occupy the entire day, the poet justifies his failure to publish more than one book of his epigrams in one year. This idea was most recently raised in 10.58, which is addressed to Frontinus, where the poet recalls their time together spent in literary composition at the villa in Anxur, in contrast with the exhausting and relentless life of work at Rome.
which prevents either from enjoying such pursuits. This notion is not exclusive to
Book 10 and appears throughout the corpus (for a literary precedent cf. Hor. S. 2.3).
It first occurs in Book 1 where Martial tells his book to perform his morning salutatio
for him in order that he may write his poetry:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{si dicet ‘quare non tamen ipse venit?’} \\
\text{sic licet excuses: ‘quia qualiacumque leguntur} \\
\text{ista, salutator scribere non potuit’ (1.70.16-18 with} \\
\text{Howell; cf. 3.36).}
\end{align*}
\]

At 11.24 Martial complains to Labullus that his attendance upon him prevents the
poet from spending time on literary productions:

\[
\begin{align*}
dum te prosequor et domum reduco, \\
aurem dum tibi praesto garrienti, \\
et quidquid loqueris facisque laudo, \\
quod versus poterant, Labulle, nasce!
\end{align*}
\]

10.70 brings an interruption to the long series of poems on the conduct
(e specially sexual) of men and women (62-9). The subject of client duties is a
prominent motif in the contrast between city living and the tranquillity of pastoral life
in Book 10, and 10.70 provides the impetus towards Martial’s eventual departure
from the city. This is supported by 12.68 where he explains that the onerous duties of
the morning client were the motivation for his departure from Rome. Although Nauta
refers to this as the second of three poems justifying Martial’s return to Spain with 58
and 96, it is supported by other epigrams, which complain of the client lifestyle
recurring at 10.74, 76 and 82 these being placed alongside poems concerned with his
return to Spain (78; 93; 96; see Nauta 2002: 56-7).
Quod mihi vix unus toto liber exeat anno
desidiae tibi sum, docte Potite, reus.

Martial presents Potitus’ accusation of laziness against him for being unable to publish more than one book a year. *reus* is a technical term to denote the individual being prosecuted (cf. 7.72 with Vioque; Cic. *de Orat.* 2.183; *OLD s.v.* 1). The charge is *desidiae*, a term which Martial frequently uses to represent literary ‘laziness’ (cf. 1.107.2 with Citroni; 8.3.1ff.; 8.3.12 *dic mihi, quid melius desidiosus ages?*; 12 *praef.* 2; 12.29.2 with Bowie; Plin. *Ep.* 1.8.2; 3.5.19; Suet. *Gram.* 8). The remainder of the poem constitutes the poet’s defence against this charge.

This is the only occasion in Martial where Potitus is addressed, but he appears to be a real person from the use of the epithet *docte* (Nauta 2002: 56n.52). Such an epithet is generally applied to erudite writers and poets, for example Catullus (7.99.7), Pedo (2.77.5), Seneca (4.40.2) and other literary friends such as Severus (11.75.20), Secundus (5.80) and Apollinaris (4.86.2). Although Spisak argues that Potitus is most likely fictitious, when the epithet *doctus* is used along with a person’s name it is always with reference to a real person (cf. Nauta 2002: 56n.52; *contra* Spisak 1992: 152). There are also numerous examples of Martial’s complaints of the client’s duties directed towards real persons (5.20; 10.58). Tacitus refers to a Valerius Potitus as one of the first quaestors elected after the expulsion of the Tarquins in 447 B.C (*Ann.* 11.22). It is evidently an aristocratic name, although nothing is known of this particular person. This Potitus is possibly related to the family of Valerius Messalla consul in 29 BCE (cf. also *PIR*² P 677-9, especially 678, also Kajanto *Cognomina*: 95).
Martial rarely produced more than one book of epigrams in one year (cf. Sullivan 1991: 15ff.; Fowler 1991: 33). Martial does not often comment on the length of time taken to publish a book of epigrams except in the contrast with the client’s duties (cf. 11.24.13-14 *triginta prope iam diebus una est* / *nobis pagina vix peracta*; also 1.70.16-18; also in the preface to Book 12 he sends Terentius Priscus poems written *paucissimus diebus* when he is in Spain at leisure). This is followed by a list of the duties he is required to perform daily to explain why he cannot produce more poetry.

The *salutatio* generally took place very early in the morning when it was probably quite often still dark; hence the use of *nocturnus* for hyperbolic effect (for the time in the morning, see below; for the *salutatio* cf. 10.10). Deprivation of sleep due to the earliness of the hour is a frequent source of complaint in the epigrams (cf. 10.82.2; also on sleeplessness 12.68.5-6 *otia me somnusque iuvant, quae magna negavit* / *Roma mihi: redeo, si vigilatur et hic*). Martial also refers to instances of patrons who are not even home to receive their clients at the *salutatio* (cf. 2.18.3-4 with Williams; 4.26; 5.22).

The term *gratulor* denotes the congratulatory messages the client offered his patron on the occasion of an important event (cf. OLD s.v.; TLL 2253.2.1). It only appears in Martial here and at 10.74 in the form *gratulatori*. Elsewhere Martial complains of friends who do not return his greeting as a form of courtesy (cf. 2.32; 4.83.3; 5.21.3; 57.2; 6.50; Juv. 3.87ff.; Petr. 44.10; Nauta 2002: 16).
nunc ad luciferam signat mea gemma Dianam,  
nunc me prima sibi, nunc sibi quinta rapit.

Formal documents were witnessed and sealed in temples such as the temple of Diana,  
and were stored there for safekeeping. Clients were called upon as witnesses to legal  
documents such as wills, marriage contracts and manumission of slaves, along with  
any other legal business (cf. 3.46 with George; 4.8; 44.6; 9.100; 11.24, White 1978:  
76; Juv. 8.142-5 quo mihi te, solitum falsas signare tabellas,/ in templis quae fecit  
avus statuamque parentis/ ante triumphalem; cf. Colton 1991: 335; also Juv. 1.128ff.  
with Morton Braund 1996: 103, and Colton 1991: 56-7; also cf. 9.87 where a drunken  
Martial is called upon as a witness to a will; Bridge and Lake: 77).

signo represents the technical term for the sealing of such documents, here  
sealed by a ring (cf. 5.39.2; 9.16.4; for the use of seal rings cf. 9.87.7 with Henriksén  
nunc signat meus anulus lagomam). Although Martial generally applies gemma to a  
gemstone or jewel (e.g. 9.12.6; 11.36), the term can also suggest a signet ring or seal  
(cf. Cic. Ver. 4.57; Stat. Silv. 1.3.49; Juv. 1.68, OLD s.v. 4; for rings as the symbol of  
a knight cf. 8.5.2; 14.122).

The temple of Diana was located on the Aventine and was one of the oldest  
and most important in Rome, as it promoted community, arbitration and asylum (cf.  
12.18.3 with Bowie; Platner-Ashby: 149ff., Richardson: 108-9). The epithet lucifera  
is a common title for the goddess Diana and for deities in general (e.g. 11.69.6  
luciferae pariter venit ad astra deae; cf. Cic. N. D. 2.68; V. Fl. 7.179; Ov. Ep.  
19.192). It is perhaps intentional that this particular temple was far from Martial’s  
home on the Quirinal and in close proximity to very wealthy houses, which further
exacerbates his complaint (6.64.13). The anaphora of nunc emphasises the never-ending trekking all over Rome in attendance upon his patron.

The first hour of the day varied between 4.27-5.42 a.m. in mid-summer and 7.33-8.17 a.m. in mid-winter (Balsdon 1969: 16). This was the time for the salutatio (see above). The officia of the client continued into the fifth hour, ranging between between 9.29-10.44 a.m. in mid-summer, and 10.31-11.15 a.m. in mid-winter. This was a time when activities in the forum were at their busiest, with courtcases and other legal business such as the signing of documents (cf. 4.8.3 in quintam varios extendit Roma labores; 8.44.8; cf. Balsdon 1969: 24). The negative connotations of rapit enforces the sense of this time, which could be spent in pursuing more pleasurable activities, being forcibly snatched away from the poet (cf. 10.12.11 sed via quem dederit rapiet cito Roma colorem).

nunc consul praetorve tenet redudesque choreae,
auditur futo saepe poeta die.

Clients were expected to escort their patrons such as consuls and praetors around Rome as they conducted their daily business activities, and then to continue to their homes (cf. 11.24.1-4; see Kay's note; also 2.18.5 with Williams; 2.74.2 quanta reduci Regulus solet turba; Marquardt 1884: 148 n.2.; RE s.v. anteambulo). Martial associates the procession of clients escorting their patrons around Rome with a troop of dancers, a notion which conveys contempt and scorn for such a spectacle (for choreae cf. 1.104.9 in the context of elephants).

Martial frequently complains of being obliged to listen to the recitations of other poets, especially bad poets. This is a common theme in satire (1.63; 2.88; 4.41;
6.48; 8.20; 9.83.4 with Henriksen; Hor. S. 1.4.23; 1.4.73; Pers. 1; Juv. 1.3-14; 39; 7.40). These clients were usually expected to listen to the verses written by their patrons and recitations (cf. 10.10.9; 12.40.1 with Bowie). Such recitations were extremely common during dinner and often seemed never-ending to the audience (cf. 3.45; 50; 5.78.25; 6.48; 11.52.16-19; 12.63; Juv. 1.4; Plin. Ep. 3.18.4 with Sherwin White).

sed nec causidico possis impune negare,  
ne si te rhetor grammaticusve rogent:

Martial refers to barristers and teachers who occupy his time in the same way. A causidicus is a colloquial term to denote a lawyer who pleads his cases in the courtroom. It frequently evokes contempt because it often applied to individuals who took payment for an officium (1.97.2 with Howell; 2.64.1 with Williams; 5.33; 14.219.1 with Leary; cf. 11.24.5ff.; Juv. 7.105-77). It seems that such a profession was highly remunerative, although limits were set during the Empire (cf. Petr. 46.7 with Smith 1975: 124; Juv. 7.106; Plin. Ep. 5.9.4; cf. Mart. 14.219 on the poor causidicus because he writes poetry instead of pleading cases). Martial then refers to the two stages following the elementary school, the rhetor who taught the art of rhetoric (2.64.7) and the grammaticus who taught secondary education (5.56.3 omnes grammaticosque rhetorasque; 7.64.7 with Vioque non rhetor, non grammaticus ludive magister; 9.73.8 quid cum grammaticis rhetoribusque mihi?; Bonner 1977: 150ff.). Teachers were not highly paid or regarded, although the profession of rhetor was slightly more lucrative because it dealt with a more specialist art (cf. Juv. 7.215-42; 7.157; 205; for rhetores cf. Juv. 7.186-8). Martial’s point is that the poet is
required to attend even those of the humblest professions on demand. This illustrates the miserable value of the poet’s occupation in Rome.

balnea post decimam lasso centumque petuntur quadrantes. fiet quando, Potite, liber?

Martial awaits the distribution of the hundred quadrantes (sportula) at the baths as the degrading symbol of his dependence. This was the usual sum for distribution (1.59.1; 3.7.1; 4.68.1; 6.88.4 with Grewing; 8.42.3; 10.75.1; Juv. 1.120ff.), although it was temporarily replaced by the provision of food, which Martial found even more degrading than the money dole (cf. 3.7.1-3: centum miselli iam valete quadrantes;/ anteambulonis congiarum lassi,/ quos dividebat balneator elixus; 3.30; 60; 9.85.4 with Henriksén). Martial’s attitude of weariness for this process is repeatedly expressed throughout these types of epigrams (cf. 10.74.2 lasso clienti; also 3.7.2; 36.5; also with fessus 10.82.7; 12.57.7 Juv. 1.120-1, Colton 1991: 52). Martial mentions that this gratuity was handed out during the evening at the bath or dinner (cf. 1.80; 3.7.1-3; 4.68; although Juvenal at 1.27 refers to the presentation of the sportula at the salutatio, this may be merely a convenient distortion for humourous purposes, see Cloud 1989: 205-18).

The eighth hour was the usual hour for bathing and the tenth for dinner (for these times cf. 10.48; also 1.108 with Citroni who suggests that this was based on a proverbial expression given in Publilius D28 decima hora amicos plures quam prima reperies; also see 3.36.5-6 lassus ut in thermas decima vel serius hora/ te sequar Agrippae).
10.70

The conclusion recalls Martial’s complaints about the distractions which prevent the poet from composition at 10.58 (10.58.7 *hic mihi quando dies meus est?*; also 10.30; for *fit* as a term of literary creation, cf. 1.16 *alter non fit, Avite, liber; 11.42.2 qui fieri potest*).

10.71

Martial commemorates the death of Rabirius’ parents, whose marriage lasted sixty years and who were fortunate enough to die together. The opening lines acknowledge the grief and sympathy appropriate to the death of the couple, and language typical of the epigraphic tradition is applied. A common motif in epitaphs, particularly with the elderly, was gratitude for a life well lived and satisfaction with its conclusion, (Lattimore 1942: 211-12). The closing *paraprosdokian* reveals that Rabirius’ sorrow is out of proportion to the prolonged life of his parents and is more suitable in the context of *mors immatura*. That the couple died after sixty years of marriage indicates that they were both of an advanced age upon their deaths, exposing Rabirius’ unreasonable manner of mourning. Martial uses this same sentiment at 7.40, where Claudius Etruscus laments the loss of his father in a similar way, as if his father were snatched away from him too soon (Gamberale 1993: 49-51).

This is the final poem in the series of epigraphical epigrams in Book 10 and there are close links between these poems, especially with 10.61 and 63. This poem resumes the motif of *mors immatura*, most recently conveyed by the death of six year old Erotion at 10.61. There are verbal echoes between 61 and 71 (e.g. 61. 3 *quisquis* and 71.1 *quisquis*; 61.2 *fati* and 71.3 *fata*; 61.1 *umbra* and 71.3 *umbros*; 61.6 *flebilis* and 71.8 *fletibus*), and also contrasts between the tender age of Erotion (61.1
festinata...umbra) and the advanced years of Rabirius’ parents. In addition, the ‘sting in the tail’ or paraprosdokian, is similar to the unexpected ending of 10.63.

The theme of marriage is one recurring from earlier poems. The idea that Rabirius’ parents enjoyed a lasting and loving marriage is reminiscent of Sulpicia and Calenus (10.35; 38), and in contrast with the adulterous relationships or those ending in divorce (10.40. 69). This theme in turn recalls the epitaph of the chaste matrona of 10.63 who remained married to one man. The union of this couple in life and death, denoted by their shared tomb, symbolises their everlasting devotion. It deliberately contrasts with 10.67, which describes the aged Plutia whose lascivious behaviour continues in the grave next to Melanthio, where it is not strictly clear that he is her husband.

On this poem also see Gamberale 1993: 42-54.

Quisquis laeta tuis et sera parentibus optas
fata, brevem titulum marmoris huius ama.

The poem begins in a manner typical of funerary epitaphs. It addresses the anonymous passer-by to look kindly on the tomb, and indicates that the tomb is constructed in memory of a child’s parents. The use of quisquis to address the unknown traveller is a typical feature of epigraphical literature (quisquis 7.40.8; 11.13.1; Lattimore 1942: 230ff., Gamberale 1993: 43-4; also cf. 10.61.3). It is also common to have the tomb itself refer to the inscription written on the epitaph (cf. 1.93 with Citroni).

The brevity of the title indicates the modesty of the tomb (cf. 1.93.4 with Citroni plus tamen est, titulo breviore legis; Ov. Ep. 14.28 sculptaque sint titulo
10.71

nostra sepulcra brevi; Prop. 2.1.72 et breve in exiguo marmore nomen ero). The fact that the inscription is so brief perhaps contrasts with the length of time that the couple were married in life.

condidit hac caras tellure Rabirius umbras;
nulli sorte iacent candidiore senes:
The identity of the tomb's dedicator is revealed as Rabirius, even though his parents, the recipients are not actually named. Little is known of Rabirius, as he appears only in the epigrams of Martial. He is referred to again at 7.56 as the architect of the Domus Domitiana, although some scholarship suggests a possible friendship between him and the poet (RE 2.1.23-4; cf. Gamberale 1993: 43 n.5, Vioque on 7.56). The language is typical of sepulchral poetry, where the deceased are referred to as caras umbras (cf. 10.26.4; also 10.61.1; also see Gamberale 1993: 45-6).

bis sex lustra tori nox mitis et ultima clusit,
arserunt uno funera bina rogo.
It was customary for couples to be buried together and to share the same tomb, just as they shared their lives together (cf. 7.40.3-4 natorum pietas sanctis quem coniugis umbris / miscuit: Elysium possidet ambo nemus; AP 7.378; 9.422; Lattimore 1942: 247-9; Treggiari 1991: 246). This perhaps deliberately recalls the lascivious Plutia of 10.67, who defiles this touching tribute to the bonds of marriage after death.

Death is often associated with notions such as the removal of light and everlasting sleep, hence the phrase nox mitis (Lattimore 1942: 161ff.). The adjective mitis denotes 'gentle' or 'mild', and is often applied to the very young (e.g. 4.7.2; 5.55.3; 14.47.2 with Leary) or the aged, which is perhaps reflected here. mitis is also
used in a funerary context at 6.68 on the death of Castricus, where the poet appeals to the leniency of the earth and sea towards the youth’s body (6.68.12 *sit, precor, et tellus mitis et unda tibi*; also see *TLL* s.v. *mitis* 1555, 78-80; for the expression *nox mitis* also cf. V. Fl. 7.3 *nox...soli veniens non mitis amanti*; Stat. *Theb.* 3.415-17; Gamberale 1993: 46n.20). It is affixed to items such as wine (13.109), and because of its association with deities Martial also uses it to describe the emperor Nerva on two occasions (12.5.3 with Bowie; 12.9). Here, it contrasts with the conventional gloominess of night and the Underworld, as evoked by epithets such as *atra* and *nigra* (cf. 5.34.3 *nigras...umbras*; Verg. *A.* 6.268 *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram*; 6.462; 435-6; Lattimore 1942: 162 n.25). Such an expression conjures images of a peaceful and timely death in contrast with the injustice generated by the deaths of Scorpio and Erotion.

Indicating the length of marriage is a conventional *topos* on epitaphs, and sixty years suggests that this marriage was of an exceptional nature, although there is inscriptional evidence of marriages lasting as long as fifty years (*CLE* 5.1880; 11.4483; 13.2000; 3.14524; Treggiari 1991: 234; also cf. 10.38). *rogus* refers to the funeral pyre, as cremation was the more common form of funeral at this period in the empire (cf. 10.63.4; 11.54; Toynbee 1971: 49-50).

**hos tamen ut primis raptos sibi quae rit in annis.**
**improbius nihil his fletibus esse potest.**

Tears are typical expression of grief in these circumstances (cf. 10.61.6; for further examples cf. Gamberale 1993: 53-4). The sympathetic tone of the poem conveys a sting in the conclusion, where Rabirius is reprimanded for excessively mourning the
death of his parents, which is inappropriate (*improbius*) in the circumstance. Parents who passed away before their children were traditionally regarded as fortunate (Ov. *Met.* 13.521-2; *CLE* 164-78, 1148.9, Vioque on 7.40.7-8), and Rabirius’ behaviour is more appropriate to the sorrow produced by *mors immatura* (cf. 10.50; 61). A similar sentiment appears at the conclusion of 7.40, which is addressed to Etruscus on the death of his father (cf. 7.40.7-9 with Vioque *sed festinatis raptum tibi credidit annis, / aspepit lacrimas quisquis, Etruscus, tuas*; also Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.17-21).

Martial rejects the language of flattery that he has formerly used for Domitian, and welcomes the return of Truth to Rome along with the new emperor, Trajan. The emperor is never directly named in the poem, and most scholarship associates it with the commencement of Trajan’s rule, although Sullivan assumes that the poem refers to Nerva (for Trajan see Nauta 2002: 282 n.14; Fearmley 2003: 613; Spisak 1999: 69; Jenkins *ad loc.*; for Nerva cf. Sullivan 1991: 77). It seems more likely that Trajan is the emperor of this poem and that it belongs to the revised edition of Book 10. As further support, the language is consistent with subsequent panegyrics to Trajan in propagandist literature, such as Pliny’s *Panegyricus*.

In the first half, the poet addresses *Blanditiae* and dispatches them off to the land of the Parthians, perhaps in an attempt to dissociate himself from language favoured in Domitian’s reign. The phrase to which Martial refers is primarily *dominus deusque*, which seems to have been officially adopted by Domitian and also occurs in Martial’s imperial poems (e.g. 5.8.1; 7.34.8; 8.2.6; Suet. *Dom.* 13.2). Martial announces that he will no longer use such language and banishes it to the
farthermost Parthians, where such phrases are best suited to the servile behaviour towards tyrannical kings. Such rejection of panegyric language is typically designed to establish the founding of a better reign under the new emperor, in contrast with the false flatteries garnered under the tyranny of the former ruler. Under Trajan, the praise is claimed to be genuine as Truth has been brought back from the dead; an unusual image, which demonstrates that sincerity and openness is prevalent. This language is prevalent in the propaganda for Trajan’s rule and appears prominently in the Panegyricus of Pliny, which displays the contrast between the false flattery under Domitian’s reign and the genuine praise intended for Trajan (for a discussion of genuine and false flattery in the context of Pliny’s Panegyricus, cf. Bartsch 1994: 148-87).

The second half of the poem is devoted to the titles bestowed upon the new emperor, which are designed to emphasise his status as a Roman citizen and to draw attention to his military leadership. The final lines issue a warning to Roma herself not to continue with the same language.

The cryptic language in this poem poses further questions as to its meaning. Martial makes it clear in other poems such as 10.20 that his poetry is meant for the Saturnalia and other festive occasions, times when the mantle of serious business is discarded. Here there is the tiniest hint that with the arrival of rustic Truth, there will be no occasion for such joviality. This could be regarded as a slight against the new regime, where every word spoken is taken seriously, and hence Martial’s mockery of such language is out of place.

Martial excludes his language from Rome because it is not suitable to the new regime, but at the same time perhaps signals his own departure at the conclusion of
the book. Martial does not define the new language he will use, and instead presents
the warning to Rome, perhaps further distancing himself as he prepares to leave the
city. In a book where arrivals and departures are given such unparalleled attention, it
seems possible that the two departures are connected.


**Frustra, Blanditiae, venitis ad me
attritis miserabiles labellis:**

The term *blanditiae* is associated with elegiac poetry, although elsewhere it is
personified only by Ovid, where it is used in an erotic context (Ov. Am. 1.2.35; also
2.19(20).17; 3.7(6).11). Martial uses the word on only two other occasions, both
times in Book 11, and in the context of erotic blandishments (11.29.5; 70.3 with Kay).
Here the term denotes the words of flattery and their personification in the plural is a
device through which Martial is able to separate himself from them, as an attempt to
dissociate the poet from his former language (Jenkins ad loc.). Such rejection of
flattery also became an integral feature of Trajan’s propaganda (Dio Chys. Or. 3.2;
Plin. Pan. 54.5). Martial is perhaps referring to the former language which he applied
to Domitian, and now here is a formal opportunity to recant any associations with the
old regime. Already the grovelling nature of these flattering words is emphasised by
their depiction as *miserabiles*, which displays the poet’s contempt for their
shamelessness.

One interpretation of *attritus* is that it refers to mouths ‘worn down by use’, as
a result of excessive use of obsequious language (*OLD* s.v. 1a). A more appealing
suggestion is that it conveys the sense of 'shameless' or 'brazen', generally used to describe the forehead rather than lips (e.g. 8.59.2 lippa sub attrita fronte lacuna patet; Juv. 13.241; OLD s.v. 3a; TLL 6.1.1357.83ff.; cf. 11.27.7 aut cum perfricuit frontem posuitque pudorem, Jenkins ad loc.). Its use here perhaps represents a facial expression made when uttering such blatant language.

dicturus dominum deumque non sum.
iam non est locus hac in urbe vobis;

The formulae of blanditiae to which Martial refers is now revealed in language which he himself used in reference to Domitian. Phrases such as dominus deusque were derived from the orient, which perhaps indicates the reason for Martial's dispatch of them back there (Scott 1936: 102-12). Just as there is no place for his language in Rome, the poet will also depart from Rome at the conclusion of the book. Martial's epigrams remain the only contemporary evidence that Domitian assumed the title dominus deusque. It is first used at 5.8.1 (cf. 5.5.2), and appears on several occasions in later books (7.34.8 with Vioque; 8.2.6; 9.66.3 with Henriksen; cf. 7.1; 2; 8.82; 9.28.7-8; also Suet. Dom. 13.2; Dio Cassius 67.4.7). As Henriksen points out, this does not verify the fact that Domitian formally adopted the title or that he decreed that everyone use it, especially as it appears neither in Statius or in anti-Domitianic writers such as Tacitus, Pliny and Juvenal (Henriksen on 9.66.3, also Jones 1993: 109). It seems more likely that Martial is simply referring to the language he used of Domitian by way of contrast with his approach to the new regime. Such language is also contrasted with that of Trajan's reign, as outlined by Pliny: nusquam ut deo, nusquam
ut numini blandiamur: non enim de tyranno sed de cive, non de domino sed de parente loquimur (Pan. 2.3 with Bartsch 1994: 163).

ad Parthos procul ite pilleatos et turpes humilesque supplicesque pictorum sola basiate regum.

Martial banishes these Blanditiæ to the Parthians, a race poetically associated with the furthermost edges of the world. They reflect a barbarian and foreign society which is the antithesis to the civilised atmosphere of Rome (cf. 5.58.4; Catul. 11.6-7). The Parthians represented one of the main enemies of the Roman empire, and their threatening and warlike character is frequently depicted (7.30.1 with Vioque, 9.35.3; 12.8.8, cf. Verg. G. 3.31; Ov. Ars 1.179; 1.201; 1.211-12; RE 18.4.2021.14ff.; Jenkins ad loc.). Their monarchical system of government conveys the image of a despotic ruler who held sway over all others, a structure disdained by Romans (on the Parthians see Dalby 2000: 186-91). This is reflected in an expression used by Martial which connotes a negative outlook towards Parthian kings (2.53.10 with Williams liberior Partho vivere rege potes).

The adjective pilleata refers to the pilleus which is generally understood to refer to the type of turban worn by the Parthians (Dalby 2000: 187, Jenkins ad loc.), but it is also the term for the freedom cap worn by the manumitted slave and also on occasions to celebrate the licentiousness of the Saturnalia. This adjective is used on only two occasions in Martial, here where it refers to the Parthians and at 11.6.8 for pilleata Roma on the celebration of the Saturnalia. It is striking that Martial should use the same term in books of such close proximity but in such different ways. Although the poet’s motives for the use of this epithet in this manner are unclear, its
ironical force on this occasion becomes apparent. The alliteration of 'p' contributes to the contempt directed towards the Parthians and their submissive society.

The Persians typify eastern degeneracy, both in their colourful attire and in their demeaning slavish behaviour when they prostrated themselves before their kings and kissing their feet (cf. Hor. Carm. 2.7.12 with N-H). The performance of such an act is also often intended to reflect the ruler's divine status, and possibly was introduced into Roman customs by Gaius (Sen. Ben. 2.12.1; Suet. Vit. 2.5; Dio Cassius 59.27.5; Taylor 1931: 247ff., 256ff., Jenkins ad loc.). There is the suggestion that such types of supplication were enforced by Domitian (Sp. 20 (17).1; 30.3-4; 8 praef; 9.66.2). The image of degeneracy is completed by the colourful and ostentatious garments worn by these rulers (for picti also cf. 10.6.7).

non est hic dominus sed imperator,
sed iustissimus omnium senator,

The term dominus bears implications of a master of slaves or a tyrant, as opposed to the term princeps as head of a free state (Scott 1975: 102). Such a title carries connotations of adulation reviled by Trajan, and Pliny makes similar claims against the title dominus in his address to the emperor in the Panegyricus (Plin. Pan. 2.3 quoted above, also 45.3 ita non aliis esse principem gratiorem, quam qui maxime dominum graventur; 52.7; 55.7). The title dominus was still retained, and indeed Pliny addresses Trajan in this manner in all but three of his letters.

The emperor's prowess as military commander is reflected in the use of imperator, and due to Trajan's reputation as a general this further supports the view that this poem refers to Trajan rather than Nerva (on Trajan's military campaigns cf.
10.72

10.6). It is also a term frequently associated with Trajan’s reign in other literary sources and appears throughout the *Panegyricus* (Plin. *Ep.* 10.1.1 *imperator sanctissime*, 10.4.1; *Pan.* 5.2.1; 5.4; 24.2). Elsewhere Martial refers to Trajan’s military leadership with the title *dux* (cf. 10.6.2; 12.8.5-6 *et fortem iuvenemque Martiumque/ in tanto duce militem videret*).

*senator* emphasises Trajan’s government at Rome for Roman citizens, in contrast with *imperator*, which implies military campaigns and expansion outside Rome. As such, it conveys the notion of Trajan’s mortality and status as ordinary citizen in contrast with the divine adulation supposedly demanded by Domitian, a concept frequently used to differentiate the two rulers in Trajanic propaganda (Plin. *Pan* 2.7 *iam quid tam civile tam senatorium, quam illud additum a nobis Optimi cognomen?*; also 2.4 *unum ille se ex nobis – et hoc magis excellit atque eminet, quod unum ex nobis putat, nec minus hominem se quam hominibus praeesse meminit;* 63.6 *haec persuasio superbissimis dominis erat, ut sibi viderentur principes esse desinere, si quid facerent tamquam senatores;* Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.22; Dio Cassius 68.5ff. 7.3; Jenkins *ad loc.*).

*per quem de Stygia domo reducta est siccis rustica Veritas capillis.*

Truth is described as having returned to Rome from her exile in the Underworld on account of Trajan. This perhaps deliberately echoes the reference to truth at 10.34, in the only poem addressed directly to Trajan in this book (cf. 10.34.6 *liceat tantum vera probare*). The presence of *Veritas* suggests a lack of restriction in the language used and the freedom to speak with sincerity rather than with feigned admiration (cf. 1
praef. lascivam verborum veritatem in reference to the language Martial uses in his own epigrams; Plin. Pan. 1.6.5; 54.5; 55.3; 67.1; 73.4; 84.1).

This is the only occasion where the deified Veritas appears in Martial and the term occurs very rarely in Roman literature in this form (cf. Hor. Carm. 1.24.7 incorrupta Fides nudaque Veritas with N-H; Var. Men. 141 ad nos accedit cana Veritas, Attices philosophiae alunna, Pind. Ol. 10.3, Gell 12.11.7; Jenkins ad loc.). The description of the flights of the gods is a common feature in the Greek and Roman literary tradition, as most famously exemplified by the flight of Justice (Verg. Ecl. 4.6; G. 2.473; Ov. Met. 1.149; also Hes. Op. 200; Jenkins ad loc.). The idea of an individual returning from the Underworld is not a common image in Martial, but it is perhaps significant that it is also used at 10.103 in reference to the jester Gabba, whose rustic language does not suit the present age, unlike that of Truth. The imagery of significant individuals from the past returning to life is a noted feature of imperial praise and Martial expresses a similar sentiment at 11.5 in complimenting the reign of Nerva, by saying that the staunchest republicans of all time would be happy under his reign (11.5.13-14 ipse quoque infernis revocatis Ditis ab umbris/ si Cato reddatur, Caesarianus erit with Kay; Luc. 7.358; Stat. Silvae 1.1.27ff.).

Truth is described as rustica, which generally assumes the sense of 'lacking the townsman's sophisticated outlook', 'provincial' and 'old fashioned' (usually in a disparaging manner, cf. OLD s.v. rusticus 7), and represents the opposite of all that is urbanus and sophisticated, thus placing it at odds with the idea of the imperial urbs (cf. 10.101; Fearnley 2003: 626-7). Its inclusion is perhaps intended to suggest a simplicity and sincerity as opposed to the falsities conjured up by the adulations of eastern kings. This word is used on three other occasions in Book 10: at 10.19 (20)
the poet describes his own poems as *non rusticulum* to prove that they are refined enough for Pliny; at 10.101.3 it is used to describe the jester Gabba whose wit is too coarse for contemporary Roman society; and finally at 10.103.8 it describes the rustic libations for Ceres, which were performed in the poet’s absence in his Spanish homeland.

The image of Truth approaching with *siccis capillis* can be contrasted with the *madidi capilli* characteristic of the Saturnalia and the atmosphere in which Martial prefers his poetry to be read (cf. 10.20.20 *cum madent capilli*). Other than the initial meaning of ‘dry’, *siccus* also can assume the sense of sober (Petr. 111.13) and, by extension, sober habits (Mart. 12.30.1 with Bowie; Petr. 37.7 with Smith 1975: 81; Hor. *Carm.* 1.18.3, *OLD* s.v.). As such, the prospect of a society where sombre truth and sobriety are expected does not suit the playful language to which Martial is accustomed.

*hoc sub principe, si sapis, caveto verbis, Roma, prioribus loquaris.*

The poet concludes the poem with an address to Rome, warning her not to speak in the same language of the former regime (for the address to Roma cf. 10.2). Trajan will not stand for the false flatteries of Domitian’s reign. This statement is substantiated by the *Panegyricus*, which similarly justifies praise for Trajan as genuine (Plin. *Pan.* 1.6 *utque omnibus quae dicentur a me, libertas fides veritas constet, tantumque a specie adulationis absit gratiarum actio mea quantum abest a necessitate*; see further Bartsch 1994: 178ff., Spisak 1999: 69-83). There could also
be the inference that despite the onset of Truth, the former language of mockery and jokes, Martial’s own, will not be accepted.

Martial expresses his gratitude for the gift of a toga which is rendered all the more special because the accompanying letter is prefaced with his own praenomen, Marcus. The toga was a common gift in the patron/client relationship because of its use as the requisite uniform of the cliens, and Martial often refers to it in poems concerning stingy patrons who do not send a toga as a gift (cf. 10.11.6; 15 (14).7; also cf. 2.39; 7.36; 86). In 10.73, the tone of the poem is one of admiration and gratitude for the welcome gift, and conveys a respectful attitude towards Primus in the language of amicitia (Kleijwegt 1998: 260). This poem can be compared to 8.28, where the poet expresses his gratitude for the receipt of a toga from the imperial chamberlain Parthenius by describing the distinguished superiority of the wool. Praise of the toga is condensed in 10.73, where Martial measures its quality as good enough for one belonging to Apicius or Maecenas, both exemplars of extravagance and luxury, as opposed to Fabricius, the model of austerity and simplicity. But it is the thought that accompanies the toga, rather than the toga itself, for which the poet conveys his utmost appreciation, especially as it is prefaced with their shared praenomen, Marcus, which symbolises their close relationship.

The question of identity of the poem’s addressee remains unresolved; however, most scholarship supports the conjecture that the donor of the toga is Marcus Antonius Primus, already mentioned at 10.23 and 32 in this book (Nauta 2002: 80, 82, Kleijwegt 1998: 260, Henriksen on 9.99). This certainly seems more
likely than Shackleton Bailey's suggestion that the poem is intended for a certain Marcus Severus, perhaps the same man of 5.80 and 11.57, where he is seen to be a close friend of Martial (cf. SB1: 343). Severus is a cognomen which occurs on many occasions in Martial, although it does not necessarily refer to the same person and the identity of these individuals remains even less certain (cf. Williams on 2.6 and Kay on 11.57). It is possible that the toga was a gift in appreciation for a book of poems which the poet presented to Primus at 9.99. And, in fact, this poem appears to contain verbal reminiscences of that poem, such as absentis pignus amicitiae (9.99.6) with pignus amici of 73.1, which strengthens the view that 9.99 and 10.73 share the same addressee (cf. Henriksen on 9.99, especially n. 2). 9.99 also reveals that letters were exchanged between the two men (9.99.2 charta salutatrix si modo vera refert).

Emphasis is placed on the concept that acknowledgment of their friendship is more gratefully received by the poet. When read on its own, this poem is a pleasant expression of gratitude for the gifts of letter and toga. The idea that the actual gift of the toga is less welcome than the consideration behind the gift is perhaps demonstrated in the arrangement of this poem with the following poem, which laments the tiresome duties of the client towards his patron, when the wearing of the uncomfortable toga was expected. This juxtaposition completely alters the initial reading of the poem and conveys the incessant struggles of the client between gratitude for gifts and the effort involved for their receipt. Martial is also deliberately playing with the arrangement by placing this poem, which contains such complimentary expressions towards a patron, after a poem where he sends flatteries as far away as possible from himself and Rome. Even though 10.72 is primarily
concerned with imperial praise, the effect of the contrast should still be taken into account.

For this poem see Nauta 2002: 64-5, 80, 82, Kleiwejgt, 1998: 260.

Littera facundi gratum mihi pignus amici
pertulit, Ausoniae dona, Severe, togae,

The opening of the poem is almost a word for word replication of Martial’s expression of thanks to Parthenius for the gift of a toga at 8.28 (8.28.1-2 *die, toga, facundi gratum mihi munus amicil esse velis cuius Jama decusque gregis?*). The language also echoes that of 9.99 where he calls his book *absentis pignus amicitiae* (9.99.5). Here the toga is *facundi...pignus amici* (Henriksen on 9.99 especially n.2). The toga described as *pignus* represents a ‘token’ of friendship between the two men (cf. Henriksen on 9.99.5, for the phrase *pignus amicitiae* cf. V. Max. 4.7.3; 7.6.2; Liv. 32.38.3; Tac. Ann. 14.25). *Ausonia* is a poetic epithet for Italy adopted from Hellenistic poetry (Apollonius of Rhodes 4.553; 4.660, Callim. fr. 238.28) and established in Latin poetry by Vergil (A. 10.268, *TLL* 1537.32ff., cf. Vioque on 7.8.2 and Henriksen on 9.7.6). Here the toga represents an object that is purely Roman, perhaps in contrast with eastern degeneracy such as that reflected in the colourful garb of the Parthians in the previous poem.

In line 2, Shackleton Bailey emends *severa* to *Severus* to show that the toga is a gift from a certain Marcus Severus, who is also a literary friend and critic of 5.80 and 11.57, and supported by the epithets *facundi* and *docti* (1.10), which do not appear in any other poem to Marcus Antonius Primus (SB² 2: 391). It could be that these adjectives refer to Primus’ support of literature as patron rather than as a poet (e.g.
9.99.1 Marcus amat nostras Antonius, Attice, Musas), and as someone described by Tacitus as sermone promptus (Hist. 2.86; see Henriksen on 9.99 especially note 2 who gives the example of Statius' description of Argentaria Polla as docta at Silv. 2.7.83, despite not writing poetry herself). Elsewhere, however, Martial never refers to Severus by his praenomen, and it is unprecedented for Martial to change the nomenclature within a poem when he calls him Marcus in line 8 (Nauta 2002: 82 n.157). Although Primus is never addressed just as Marcus in any of the other poems, his praenomen is emphasised at 9.99.1 and 3 (Marcus amat nostras Antonius, Attice, Musas;/ charta salutatrix si modo vera refert;/ Marcus Palladiae non infitianda Tolosae; also 10.32.3). The standard reading of severa remains unsatisfactory as its rather negative sense does not fit the context, where this particular toga is meant to be one of great magnificence. Although it has less textual support, the conjecture superba by Heinsius suits the meaning far better as it illustrates the superiority of the toga.

qua non Fabricius, sed vellet Apicius uti,
vellet Maecenas, Caesarianus eques.

The censor Fabricius of 275 BCE is a renowned model of simplicity and virtue (cf. 7.68; 11.5.8; 16; Juv. 1.154; 9.142; 11.91) and here illustrates the extreme opposite to the extravagant tastes of the other two examples. Apicius, the wealthy gourmet, is best known for committing suicide at the realisation that his remaining wealth could not sustain his extravagant lifestyle (cf. 2.89.5 quod luxuriaris, Apici; 3.22; Tac. Ann. 4.1). The description of Maecenas as Caesarianus eques perhaps echoes Hor. Carm. 1.20.1 clare Maecenas eques, as he never sought a position beyond this status. His
extravagant tastes are also expressed in Juvenal (12.39 *purpurae tenere quoque Maecenatibus aptus*, Colton 1991: 415). Maecenas is generally referred to in Martial as the ideal literary patron to Horace and Vergil in former days, and here the reference perhaps hints at a relationship of *amicitia* between Primus and Martial, as opposed to a friendship based on equal status (1.107; 7.29; 8.55; 11.3; 12.3; Kleijwegt 1998: 260).

vilior haec nobis alio mittente fuisset;
non quacumque manu victima caesa litat:
a te missa venit: possem nisi munus amare,
Maree, tuum, poteram nomen amare meum.

The idea that such a gift would be less valuable from someone else contains close verbal parallels with 9.99, where Martial guarantees Primus that he himself is sending an original copy of his work rather than one from a buyer, especially with *vilior* and *mittente* in line 5, and *munus* line 7 (9.99.7-10 *vilis eras, fateor, si te nunc mitteret emptor;/ grande tui pretium munus auctor erit:/ multum, crede mihi, refert a fonte bibatur/ quae fluit an pigro quae stupet unda lacu*). Similarly, he uses an elegant expression for the idea that not every gift is thankfully received, in the same way that not every sacrifice appeases the gods.

The term *munus* is a technical term for a gift in the *amicitia* relationship, which again suggests that the addressee is a patron such as Antonius Primus rather than a close personal friend (for *munus* cf. 10.17.2; 19.1; 24.3; 29.6). The repetition of *amare* is intended to convey the personal attachment between the men and their understanding of the nature of true friendship (cf. 10.58.14 *et non officiosus amo*). This is illustrated not only in the gift of a toga, but also in the connection the pair have...
in sharing the same praenomen. There is the suggestion that the name Marcus is embroidered on the toga, but it seems more likely that the reference here is to the heading of the letter (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 287).

munere sed plus est et nomine gratius ipso officium docti iudiciumque viri.

In addition to his gratitude for the gift of the toga and its accompanying letter, Martial formally expresses gratitude to Primus for his literary appreciation and patronage of Martial’s poetry (cf. 10.28.7 at tu, sancte pater, tanto pro munere gratus; for similar language to express gratitude to Trajan cf. 12.9.3 ergo agimus laeti tanto pro munere grates). He is described as doctus as tribute to his literary knowledge, and Severus is given the same epithet at 5.80.13 and throughout 11.57, although Martial seems to use doctus to describe literary patrons on other occasions (cf. 4.86.3 docto Apollinari; 10.70.2 docte Potite). iudicium represents literary judgement and discernment, and is a term which Martial often uses in the context of literary criticism (Nauta 2002: 82; for similar use cf. 1.53.11; 2.41.22; 9.26.8; 10.21.4).

10.74

Here the poet addresses Roma herself in his request to release the client from this wearisome occupation. We find a reprisal of Martial’s protestations of the tedious duties which the client has to perform in order to receive some contribution from patrons. This contribution is naturally unworthy of the lengths to which the client goes to obtain it. The paltry sum of one hundred quadrantes earned over the whole day is compared to the winnings of Scorpus the charioteer in a single hour. In return
for his books, Martial claims not to want rewards of gold or gifts of expensive wools, honey, grain, or wine. The poet requests sleep as reward instead of the early morning salutatio (cf. 12.18; 12.68), which implies the elimination of such tiresome duties. Sleep is one of the elements which Martial requires as an essential element for a lifestyle of contentment and satisfaction in 10.47 (cf. 2.90.10). Therefore it is not surprising that the poem contributes to the urban/pastoral contrast, where country living permits a full night of sleep; but the duties of the client prevent such a pleasure in Rome (Spisak 2002: 139).

The poem seems intended as a striking contrast with the preceding one, where the poet expresses such courteous gratitude for the gift of a toga, which so frequently symbolises the inconveniences endured by the client (cf. line 3 togatulos). It continues thematically from 10.70, and, as in that poem, the tone is much more personal in nature than in previous poems on this subject. At 10.70 the poet laments that the time consumed in performing the duties of the client leaves him little time to write and publish his poetry. In this poem, he complains that the rewards earned from attendance on these patrons do not match the extent of the duties.

The rewards of literary production are again brought under scrutiny, a theme from the earlier section of the book (cf. 10.2). Martial compares the income earned through his poetry to the profitable occupation of chariot racing, a profession which brought considerable fame and popularity to victorious racers such as Scorpus (cf. 10.50 and 53). Similarly, at 10.9 Martial ironically compares his own contemporary fame to that of a racehorse, as an observation on the hollowness of his popularity and literary immortality. Here Martial is equally deprecating towards his poetry and the rewards he deserves as a poet in Rome. As a result, the biggest rewards are to
abandon fame and popularity for a lifetime of relaxation and tranquillity away from Rome.

Unlike his other poems on this topic, 10.74 addresses his complaints not to an individual patron but to Roma herself for the obligations and duties brought upon the client (cf. 10.19.4). This recalls other poems throughout the Book where restrictive measures are imposed upon her citizens, but here, for the first time, it is the inferior client, and not just the wealthy such as Apollinaris, who is confined within the city limits (12; 30; 51; 58). The address to Roma herself and his expression of dissatisfaction for this lifestyle demonstrates Martial’s own conflicted relationship with the city, as Roma in 10.2 is the source of his literary fame but now is an oppressive force on the poet. This justifies his departure for Spain.

Iam parce lasso, Roma, gratulatori, lasso clienti. quam diu salutator

The term gratulator appears rarely in Roman literature, and this is the only occasion it appears with the sense of offering congratulations to patrons (Pl. Trin. 579, Cic. Fin. 2.108, TLL 2253.2.1). These opening lines contain clear verbal echoes of 10.70, and act as a direct continuation of the complaints uttered in that poem (cf. gratulatori with gratulor at 10.70.6, salutator with resalutantis at 70.5, lasso clienti with lasso at 10.70.13; also see Juv. 1.132 veteres lassique clientes with Colton 1991: 58-9). The subject of this epigram is made clear from these opening two lines, with numerous terms which refer to the client and the duties of client (cf. 10.10.11). The rhyme of gratulatori and salutator and the repetition of lassus perhaps reflect the poet’s own weariness and his contempt for this situation.
anteambulones et togatulos inter
centum merebor plumbeos die toto,

The language used here is clearly contemptuous of the entire process of the client’s obligations towards the patron. It was part of the client’s duties to escort the patron around Rome as he carried out his business activities, and, of course, the toga was worn throughout (2.57.5; 2.64.1; 46.1; 6.48.1). The term *anteambulo* suggests the image of slaves who walked in front of their masters, and it thus emphasises the debasement of the client (2.18.5 *sum comes ipse tuus tumidique anteambulo regis* with Williams; 3.7.2 *anteambulonis congiarium lassi*; Suet. *Vesp.* 2.2.).

The client was required to wear the toga in his duties for the patron, and Martial continually complains about its discomfort and expensive maintenance (cf. 10.10.12; 47.5; 1.49.31; 4.66.1; 11.16.2 with Kay). The diminutive *togatulus* seems to be an invention of Martial’s and occurs only here and at 11.24.11, where, on both occasions, the effect is clearly contemptuous (11.24.11 with Kay). The point is that *togatulos* ironically undercut Martial’s expression of thanks in 10.73 for the gift.

As with 10.70, the poet reminds the reader that the client receives only a hundred *quadrantes* as reward for his obligations (cf. 10.70.13). The *plumbeus* contemptuously refers to the worthlessness of such a contribution and ironically contrasts with the gleaming gold of Scorpus’ prize winnings in the next few lines (cf. 10.49 where Martial puns on the use of *plumbea* for the leaden quality of bad wines; 6.55.3; Petr. 43)
Martial compares his own meagre salary from a day’s work as a client to the earnings won by the charioteer Scorpus in a single hour (for Scorpus cf. 10.50). The number of bags given at quindecim is meant to convey an indeterminate number in comparison perhaps to the 100 quadrantes earned by the client (cf. 11.6.13 with Kay). The large winnings of charioteers are a common feature in Roman satire (Juv. 7.113-14; 243; 8.59), and on several occasions Martial differentiates between the income of a client or a poet and money spent on horse races as a far more lucrative occupation (4.67.5-8 praetor ait ‘scis me Scorpo Thallope daturum,/ atque utinam centum milia sola darem./ ah pudet ingratae, pudet ah male diviitis arcae./ quod non vis equiti, vis dare, praetor, equo?; 5.25 especially 9-12 quam non sensuro dare quadrigenta caballo,/ aureus ut Scorpi nasus ubique micet/ o frustra locuples, o dissimulator amici,/ haec legis et laudas? quae tibi fama perit!’).

non ego meorum praemium libellorum
- quid enim merentur? – Apulos velim campos;
non Hybla, non me spicifer capit Nilus,
nec quae paludes delicata Pomptinas
ex arce clivi spectat uva Setini.

Here Martial claims his books are not worthy of rewards of gold or expensive materials, such as wool, honey, grain, and wine. The list of products is referred to by a catalogue of places, each proverbial for the quality of their goods (for similar expressions cf. Juv. 9.54-7 with Colton 1991: 358-60).

Apulian fields were famous for raising sheep and renowned for supplying fine quality wool products (cf. 2.46.6 Apula non uno quae grege terra tulit; 2.43 with
Williams). Elsewhere Martial associates this wool with the creation of fine quality togas (cf. 8.28.3 Apula Ledaei tibi floruit herba Phalanthi). This suggestion appears to denigrate slightly the gift of the toga in the previous poem.

The second example refers to Hybla, a town in north-east Sicily famous for its aromatic flowers and bees, which produced fine and sweet honey, considered inferior only to the Attic variety (2.46.1-2 *floruit* ut *pingitur* Hybla *colores/* cum *breve* Sicaniae *ver* *populantur* apes with Williams; 7.88.7-8 with Vioque; 9.11.3 with Henriksen; 13.105 with Leary, Plin. *Nat*. 11.32; Otto: 168).

Although a staple food, Egyptian grain was an essential source of grain supply for Rome and was thus highly valued (8.33.13; 9.35.7 with Henriksen, Leary on 13.6-9; Plin. *Pan*. 30). This is the only time Martial uses the epithet *spicifer* and the rare occasions it appears are primarily in reference to Ceres and supply of grain (Sil. 3.403 *spiciferisque* *gravis* bellator Auaricus oris; Sen. *Herc*. O. 598; Man. 2.442 *spificera* est Virgo Cereris; Claudius Caesar Germanicus *fr*. *Aratea* 4 (3+4). 152; cf. OLD s.v.).

The final example refers to the Pontine Marshes south of Rome (13.112), where Setian wine of a high quality was produced (cf. 10.36; 13.112 with Leary).

*quid concupiscam quaeris ergo? dormire.*

Martial refers to peaceful sleep as one of the essential qualities of a contented life, and this naturally anticipates his desire to return to Spain (cf. 10.47.11). He frequently refers to being able to sleep when he is in Spain, untroubled by the obligations of the client (cf. 12.18.13-14 where he seems to be making up for the sleep lost in waking early for the *salutatio*: *ingenti fruor improboque somno/ quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora*). Again in Book 12, he gives lack of sleep as the reason he left Rome (12.68.5-6


10.74

*otia me somnusque iuvant, quae magna negavit* Roma mihi: redeo, si vigilatur et hic). The enjoyment of sleep is a common theme in Martial's epigrams, and sleeping into the morning appears to reflect country living, as opposed to the early morning bustle at Rome (cf. to Licinianus 1.49.35-6 *non rumpet altum pallidus somnum reus,/ sed mane totum dormies;* 12.57.27-8 *taedio fessis/ dormire quotiens libuit, inus ad villam*). Loss of sleep because of the patron/client obligations is a well-worn theme of Roman satire (e.g. Juv. 3.232-8).

10.75

In this epigram Martial mocks the demands made by Galla in return for her services. Her first request of 20,000 sesterces for her services seemed reasonable to the poet at the time. Yet the following year, although it is expected that she should request double that, instead the sum is halved and still appears excessive to the poet. So each time Martial refuses and the amount gradually is reduced over the years, even when she is demanding the dismal sum of the *sportula*. But she reaches the point where she not only offers herself for nothing; she offers the poet money.

This theme fits a pattern of poems addressed to Galla, where the language is also associated with willingness, demands and rejections. All the previous poems are two lines in length, so this seems an extended version of this type, coupled with the theme of 9.4, which is concerned with the high price for sexual services. Galla first appears in Book 2, and the fifteen poems in which the name occurs are spread quite evenly over the volumes up to Book 11. Poems which deal with sexual services for money are fairly common in Martial, and usually concern women who demand exaggerated prices, either ridiculously costly or too cheap (Richlin 1992: 235 n.35).
It is interesting that the language of demands, giving and refusal in exchange for services in this poem is also applied to the language of patron/client poems. This poem has much in common with others that deal with patrons who give too little. Indeed, the structure can be compared to 8.71, where Martial complains that Postumianus initially sent four pounds of silver, which in ten years evaporates into nothing (cf. 4.76; 11.68; 12.12). There is a reversal at the end of the poem, where the poet requests that Postumianus send a gift of the original amount.

It is perhaps deliberate, then, that this poem is sandwiched between poems decrying the injustices of the system of amicitia, especially the meagre rewards for clients. The poem also recalls the previous series of poems on the sexual behaviour of women (62-9).

Milia viginti quondam me Galla poposcit
et, fateor, magno non erat illa nimis.
annus abit: 'bis quina dabis sestertia', dixit.
poscere plus visa est quam prius illa mihi.

Galla is an extremely common female name in Martial and occurs in fifteen epigrams, mostly in Books 2 to 5, generally in poems which portray female sexual practices or marriage in a negative light (2.25 with Williams; 2.34; 3.51; 3.54; 3.90; 4.38; 4.58; 7.18 with Vioque; 7.58; 9.4; 9.37; 78; 10.95; 11.19; also in Juv. 1.125). Henriksén identifies two persons of the same name in the poems and distinguishes between poems which appear to refer to a genuine concubine of Martial, who complains that she does not keep her promises (2.25; 3.51; 3.54; 3.90; 4.38), and those, including this poem, which clearly refer to prostitutes (2.34; 4.58; 7.18; 7.58; 9.37; 9.78; 10.95; 11.19). It is difficult to make this distinction, as the language in many of these poems
is similar, particularly in the erotic play with terms such as dare, promittere, rogare and negare (2.25 with Williams; 3.54; 3.90; 4.38; 9.4).

First Galla demands 20,000 sesterces, and it is implied that the poet pays her. After a year she demands 10,000 sesterces, which the poet refuses to pay. If Galla is a prostitute, 20,000 sesterces is an extremely high price and would mean that she is at the top of her profession (cf. 2.63 with Williams where Milichus pays the excessive amount of 100,000 sesterces for Leda as a sexual partner).

**iam duo poscenti post sextum milia mensem**
* mille dabam nummos. noluit accipere.
* transierant binae forsan trinaeve Kalendae,
* aureolus ultro quattuor ipsa petit.

A series of offers is exchanged in the poem, met by rejection on both sides, and the language of posco and peto deliberately echoes the language of amicitia (10.18.3; 8.64.1). After six months the poet offers 1,000 sesterces instead of the 2,000 demanded by Galla, and both offers are rejected. After a few months the demand is lowered to four gold pieces, which equals 400 sesterces.

*aureolus* only appears in Martial as the diminutive of *aureus*, a gold coin worth 25 denarii (5.19.14; 9.4.11 27.12; 12.36.2). Although the diminutive does not affect the value, it is perhaps applied to illustrate humorously the high price requested by Galla. Similarly, in 9.4 it is used to emphasise the excessive price of a prostitute (*aureolis futui cum possit Galla duobus/ et plus quam futui, si totidem addideris,/ aureolos a te cur accipit, Aeschyle, denos?/ non fellat tanti Galla. quid ergo? tacet;* see Henriksen’s note). The point of the poem is that she asks for an exaggeratedly high price, which gradually is lowered until it is derisive.
non dedimus, centum iussit me mittere nummos;
   sed visa est nobis haec quoque summa gravis.
sportula nos iunxit quadrantibus arida centum;
   hanc voluit: puero diximus esse datam.

Galla demands one hundred sesterces which Martial again declines until she is reduced to requesting one hundred *quadrantes*, the equivalent of the *sportula*, the dole handed out following attendance upon a patron (cf. 10.70). Here this amount is described as *arida*, which conveys the sense of frugal or harsh as appropriate in the context of this amount, and it occurs again in the context of the patron/client relationship at 10.87 (cf. *sportula... parva* of Juv. 1.95-6, Colton 1991: 47). This echoes the theme of the previous two poems on the patron/client relationship.

do inferius numquid potuit descendere? fecit.
   dat gratis, ultro dat mihi Galla: nego.

Galla is offering herself for smaller and smaller sums of money, until eventually she offers herself for free. Just as the costliness of girls is a common cause for complaint made not only by Martial but also by the elegiac poets, so too the reverse is true (Hor. S. 1.2.55; Mart. 4.29.5, see Kay on 11.27). At 12.55 Martial makes the point that girls should not give sexual favours for free either (cf. 12.55.1 *gratis qui dare vos iubet*; also cf. 1.73.2; 7.85.1; 11.52.1; 12.55.1; 14.175.2).

Shackleton Bailey distinguishes two different meanings of *ultro* in the poem: at line 8, where the meaning is ‘of one’s own accord’; and line 14 where Shackleton Bailey adopts its meaning as ‘conversely’, i.e. referring to a situation which is the reverse of what it was originally (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 287-8). This is an attractive interpretation, as it increases the humour of the poem to the point that she even offers to pay the poet, who refuses. The humorous effect is created by the
unexpected use of the sexual meaning of *dare* in the final line in contrast with *datam* of line 14 (on the double entendre created by *dare* cf. 2.9.1 with Williams; 4.7.1; 7.30.1 with Vioque; 7.75.2 *vis dare nec dare vis* 14.175; *OLD s.v. do 4d*; *TLL* 5.1.1673.35-42).

*negare* is a common erotic term for the denial of sexual favours, although here the situation is reversed and it is the poet who is making the refusal, rather than Galla denying the poet sexual favours (cf. Williams on 2.25.4). A number of the Galla poems end in a similar fashion, with *negare* as the final or penultimate word in the epigram (cf. 2.25 *das numquam, semper promittis, Galla, roganti/ si semper fallis, iam rogo, Galla, nega*; 3.54 *Cum dare non possim quod poscis, Galla, rogantem/multo simplicius, Galla, negare potes*; 4.38 *Galla, nega, satiatur amor nisi gaudia torquent:/ sed noli nimium, Galla, negare diu*; 10.95.2; similarly cf. 4.12.2; 11.49 (50).12; 12.71.2 also where *negare* is used in rejection of financial help cf. 2.44.11-12 with Williams; 6.20.4; 7.43; 12.60).

10.76

Martial laments the poverty of the poet, a continuation of the theme from 10.74, and contrasts the fortunes of client/poet with those of the charioteer/muledriver. Mevius is Roman born and educated but is poor. He is a poet whilst the foreign Incitatus whose profession is mule driver shows off his wealth by wearing an expensive scarlet cloak. Contrasts between Romans and foreigners are typical of satire, and the image of the poor Roman and the wealthy foreigner is part and parcel of such comparison, which often includes other aspects such as appearance and moral values (cf. 10.68). Martial combines this theme with another motif common to Roman satire, the image of the
poor destitute poet, which appears very frequently in the epigrams. Although such complaints cannot be taken completely at face value, there is an element of personal involvement for Martial (cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. *Epigram*, especially 3.38, 5.25; 12.36; e.g. Juv. 7 especially 3-16). For example at 1.76, he encourages Flaccus to abandon poetry in favour of the more financially rewarding profession of oratory.

Chariot racers are mentioned more often in this book than in any other, and the contrast is made between the rewards earned by a poet (cf. 3.38; 10.70; 74) and those of a charioteer, who earns considerably more in fame and fortune (cf. 10.74). Such contrasts are not unique to this poem, and elsewhere Martial compares his own fame and fortune in a similar manner (10.9; 10.74). Therefore, this complaint may not merely be a reflection on Mevius himself but a general criticism directed at these professions in Rome. Mevius is extremely educated, can read both Greek and Latin, and most importantly is born and bred in Rome, his only fault being that he writes poetry. The address to the goddess Fortuna emphasises the inequity of the occasion between the circumstances of the poor freezing Roman and the well-off Incitatus. Although the poem does not directly mention Martial himself, the complaints reflect circumstances similar to those he himself faced in Rome, particularly if the name Mevius is taken as a form of word play on Martial's own name Marcus Valerius (Sullivan 1991: 206 n.34).

Not only does the poem illustrate the hardships of poets in Rome as one of the poorer professions, but also contrasts the prosperity of foreigners with that of native Roman citizens. This perhaps is linked to an ongoing idea in the book that those outside Rome are better off than those in Rome where there is hardship and slavery. Martial clearly distinguishes Mevius as a Roman citizen, and not from Syria or
Parthia, whose mention recalls 10.72, as the place to where Martial banishes the flattering language of his previous poems. Parthians are presented in 10.72 as humble subjects, and despite the presence of truth and freedom, it emphasises even further the inequalities suffered by Roman citizens in Rome.

**Hoc, Fortuna, tibi videtur aequum?**

The addressee of the poem is Fortuna in her role as the goddess of luck and bringer of good fortune (for a discussion of personified Fortuna in Roman history and literature, see Kajanto 1981: 502-58). The apostrophe to Fortuna here fits in with her characterisation as fickle and her tendency to change a person’s situation without regard for merit (Kajanto 1981: 530-1). She is often awarded the epithet *iniqua* (Ov. *Pont.* 4.6.39; Sen. *Con.* 7.3.1; Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.2; V. *Max.* 4.6.2; cf. also *inusta*). Although apparently popular in imperial literature, she is addressed only on a few occasions in Martial, mostly on similar subjects such as the injustices of patronage and with similar expressions (cf. 4.40 *hoc, Fortuna, placet*?; on the loss of a patron; 6.76.3 *licit hoc, Fortuna, fateri*; 6.79.1 *sciat hoc Fortuna caveto*; cf. Hor. *S.* 2.8.61-2 *heu Fortuna, quis est crudelior in nos/ te deus*?). Similarly, in *Satire* 10, Juvenal elevates *Fortuna* as the supreme goddess of Rome (10.365-6 *nos te/ nos facimus, Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus*).

civis non Syriaeae Parthiaeae,
nec de Cappadociis eques catastis,
sed de plebe Remi Numaeque verna,

Comparison is made between inhabitants of far-off areas notable for their barbarian lifestyle and the civilising atmosphere of Rome. The subservient life of the Parthian
is most recently described at 10.72. Whilst Parthians and Syrians were peoples renowned for their warlike character (cf. 10.72), Cappadocians were distinguished for their stupidity, incompetence and shabby appearance, and Cappadocia itself, located in the east of Asia Minor is generally emphasised in Martial for its unpleasantness (Vioque on 7.30; AP 11.237; 238.1; also cf. Juv. 7.15 quamquam et Cappadoces faciant equitesque Bithyni with Colton 1991: 287).

Both Syrians and Cappadocians (6.85.3; 9.30) were a source of slaves for Romans, and Martial singles them out as qualified for tasks involving menial labour such as carrying litters (cf. 6.77; 7.539.2.11; 22; 91; Juv. 6.351, Marquardt 1886: 175-6). As a Roman citizen Mevius should be at an advantage by living in the civilised society of Rome, the world power. Similar contrasts are made in 10.68, where Laelia attempts to pass herself off as Greek (cf. 10.65; 7.30).

Many foreigners arrived in Rome as slaves and often rose to the status of *eques* or became wealthy freedmen (cf. Juv. 3.62; 7.14 faciant equites Asiani/quamquam et Cappadoces faciant equitesque Bithyni/altera quos nudò traducit gallica talò; Colton 1991: 287-8). The fact that Martial himself was an *eques* (5.13.2; 9.49.4; 12.29.2; Allen 1970: 345) supports the connection between him and Mevius.

Mevius is of pure Roman stock, the idiomatic phrasing emphasising the ancestral tradition of Roman citizens (cf. 10.10.4). The term *verna* is here intended not to mean slave-born as it often does in Martial, but assumes its meaning of homebred (cf. 10.30.21; also 3.1.6; cf. Juv. 9.10 vernam equitem with Colton 1991: 348).
iucundus, probus, innocens amicus, lingua doctus utraque, cuius unum est, sed magnum vitium, quod est poeta,

Mevius is described with words of high praise, of the kind frequently offered to literary men of outstanding merit and education: *iucundus* (9.97.9; 10.47.2); *probus* (cf. of *vita* 1.4.8); *vir iustus, probus, innocens* (3.44.18). Knowledge of both Greek and Latin further emphasises his learnedness (9.44.4 ‘*Graece numquid*, ait, ‘*poeta nescis*’?; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.8.5 *docte sermones utriusque linguae*?; Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.90 *gemina plangat Facundia lingua*). His one downfall is that he is a poet, and these qualities which Martial himself possesses reflect his own position at Rome (cf. 3.44.5-5 *nimis poeta es*/*hoc valde vitium periculosum est*). Unlike Mevius, Martial was not a native-born Roman, but this does not necessarily detract from the correlation between the two as the purpose of the poem is to contrast wealthy foreigners with the natives of Rome.

*pullo Mevius alget in cucullo,*
cocco mulio fulget Incitatus.

The balanced symmetry of these two lines provides further contrast. For the image of the destitute poet freezing in a flimsy cowl cf. 3.38.9-10 *insanis; omnes gelidis quicumque lacernis sunt ibi, Nasones Vergiliosque vides; 12.36.2 algentemque togam brevemque laenam* given to the poet by Labullus.

It is most likely that Mevius is a fictitious personage, a satiric representative of the literary profession of the time, rather than a specific person. The name appears on only one other occasion in Martial, where he is mocked for his age and sexual hideousness, so there is not necessarily a connection between the two poems. He also
appears as an enemy to Horace and Vergil by whom he is treated with contempt (Hor. _Epod._ 10.2; _Verg. Ecl._ 3.90; cf. _PIR M_ 409; Giegengack 1969: 121-2).

Incitatus (‘swift’) also appears as a charioteer with Scorpus at 11.1, and it is possible that this refers to the same person here. Here he is described as a muleteer, who drove Roman carriages. It was traditionally a profession held in low esteem (Kay on 11.38), and the term used here is clearly derogatory. The comparison between the earnings of poets and money spent on chariot racing is again made at 5.25 (5.25.9-10 _quam non sensuro dare quadrigenta caballo, / aureus ut Scorpo nasus ubique micet?_; cf. 4.67, where Gaurus asks for money from a patron who spends it on Scorpus and Thallus).

The _cucullus_ was a woollen hood of dark colour, generally worn in the country, which suggests a cheaper dress than the toga (cf. Mart. 1.53.3; Croom 2000: 53-4). This poem echoes 10.73 in defining a poet’s status by means of clothing.

The progression of poems on money and patronage is interrupted by a complete change in subject, with a brief reflection aimed at the inefficacy of doctors even in the most trivial of ailments. The worst thing that Carus has done is to die from fever; the fever is actually one of a serious and fast-acting nature rather than the minor quartan. If it had been the lesser fever, he would have lived and his doctor would have prolonged his life so that he might suffer instead a slow painful death from his treatment (cf. SB² 2: 397; Mans 1994: 113; cf. Friedlaender on 10.77). For a similar sentiment see 5.9, where Martial complains that he felt worse after a visit from his physician:
10.77

_Languebam: sed tu comitatus protinus ad me venisti centum, Symmache, discipulis._

_centum me tetigere manus Aquilone gelatae: non habui febrem, Symmache, nunc habeo._

Doctors are unsurprisingly a common target in satire, typically for their conduct and lack of proficiency, regardless of actual skill or effectiveness (SB² 3: index s.v. _Doctors_; also cf. Howell on 1.30 for the literary tradition of mocking physicians; for doctors in Martial see Mans 1994: 105-20, also in general see Scarborough 1970: 296-306.). Martial frequently implies that doctors cause the deaths of their patients rather than restore them to health (1.30; 47; 8.74). Their low status, often that of slaves or freedmen, also contributes to a general distrust in their methods and also the tremendous bills charged for their services (Scarborough 1970: 301).

_Nequisius a Caro nihil umquam, Maxime, factum est quam quod febre perit: fecit et illa nefas._

Carus is most likely a fictitious character on this occasion, although the name appears elsewhere in Martial with regard to real persons: at 9.23 and 24 a Carus is a poet winner in Domitian’s Alban contest (also cf. 12.25 with Carus Mettius, a _delator_ under Domitian; for inscriptive evidence of the name, cf. _PIR_ C 456, Kajanto _Cognomina_ : 284).

The addressee Maximus is mentioned a number of times in Martial but does not necessarily refer to the same person. For this reason, Friedlaender distinguishes poems referring to a fictional Maximus (2.18 with Williams; 53; 3.18), and those concerning a real individual, of which the latter includes this poem (1.7 with Howell’s note; 69; 5.70; 7.30; see Friedlaender on 1.7). In the first category, the addressee
Maximus is the subject of mockery, whereas in the second group of poems the topics are either more general in nature or the mockery is directed elsewhere. Howell suggests that if the recipient of these poems is a real person, it is possible that his identity is Vibius Maximus of 11.106, an equestrian and governor of Egypt in 103-107 (PIR M 389; further see Kay on 11.106.1).

saeva nocens febris, saltem quartana fuisse!
   servari medico debuit ille suo.

The quartan was a malarial fever and its attacks occurred every four days; hence its name. Because of its mildness in nature it was generally greeted with relief by its sufferers and was considered preferable to more serious ailments (cf. Juv. 4.57 iam quartanam superantibus aegris; Cic. Fam. 16.11.1; Celsus 3.15).

The explanation of the epigram depends upon the reading of ille or illa in the final line. Some earlier commentators read illa which assumes that Carus is a physician whose speciality is the quartan fever. Because he died of this fatal fever, he was unable to prolong his suffering by treating himself for his own specialist ailment. This conclusion is rather weak, and the favoured reading is ille. This produces a progression of ideas, the quartan, being only mild, would have saved his life, until he received treatment from his doctor. Other examples on the incompetence of doctors can be found at 5.9, where to call for a doctor is equivalent to getting a disease where none had existed before, or 6.33, where even dreaming of a doctor can be fatal (Sullivan 1991: 167-8).
In a poem in the style of the *propemptikon*, Martial farewells his friend/patron Macer who is leaving Rome to serve as governor of Dalmatia (for the identity of this Macer see below). The poet does not express the more conventional inclinations to accompany Macer on his travels or await his return, but announces his own departure from Rome for his homeland Spain. The complimentary language is appropriate towards one of superior social position, and also suggests that Macer is a literary patron who is appreciative of his poems. This language places this poem in the third category of *propemptikon* defined by Menander, where the inferior addresses his superior, and encomium is a characteristic feature (Men. Rhet. 395 4-32, Prop. 1.6; Stat. Silv. 5.2; cf. Cairns 1972: 7-10; cf. 10.12). This genre is a recurrent feature throughout the book, and first occurs at 10.12, for Domitius Appollinaris’ departure from Rome, although that poem is distinguished in so far as Martial anticipates his greeting Appollinaris upon his return. Also, unlike 10.12, where the subject is leaving Rome for a vacation from the busy lifestyle of Rome, here Macer is setting off in an official capacity. And because Martial himself is leaving Rome he focuses on their separation, rather than an anticipated reunion at Rome. As the book has progressed, it has become evident that the *propemptikon* motif is closely related to Martial’s own imminent departure and it is significant that the final poem of the book is presented in the same style. At 10.104 the poet sends the book itself on its journey over the waves. Although there are frequent intimations, 10.78 is the first occasion in the book where the poet definitely announces his intention to leave Rome. A thematic motif in the poems immediately preceding this one is that of the hardships of the client in the city,
combined with the financial struggles caused by the profession of poet (10.70; 74; 76).

Despite their geographical separation, Martial promises to continue to compose poems for Macer. Although Martial will not be present in Rome for Macer's return, sorrow felt by their separation will be relieved through the composition of poetry, again apparently a feature of propemptic poetry (cf. Men. Rhet. 398.26-399.3 with Russell and Wilson 1981: 300ff.). In return, Martial requests that Macer consider the poet second only to Catullus. In the praefatio to Book 1 Martial declares his models to be Catullus, Marsus Pedo and Gaetulicus, and frequently throughout the books he invites comparisons between himself and these poets (2.71; 5.5; 7.99; cf. on the influence of Catullus on Martial cf. Newman 1990 75-103; Swann 1992; passim). Martial is asserting his own position in the literary hierarchy and is proclaiming his own literary immortality, just as at the opening of this book in 10.2.


Ibis litoreas, Macer, Salonas.
ibit rara fides amorque recti
et quae, cum comitem trahit pudorem,
semper pauperior redit potestas.

The opening of the poem clearly conforms to the language of the propemptikon, particularly with the use of eo ire, (cf. 10.12.7; 104.1; 7.84; 12.2; Prop. 1.6.34 ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii; Tib. 1.3.1; Hor. Epod. 1.1).

Salonae was the capital city of Dalmatia on the east coast of the Adriatic, where the imperial legates of consular rank resided (cf. Wilkes, 1969: 78-87). This is its only mention in Martial. It is not certain whether this is the same Macer addressed
at 10.18, who is curator of the Appian Way in around 95 CE, and generally identified as Quintus Baebius Macer (Nauta 2002: 65 n.83). This Macer was proconsul of Baetica in 100/101 (cf. 12.98) and consul suffect in 103, but it is not known if or when he assumed the legateship of Dalmatia (see further Syme *RP* 7: 613; also Eck 1982: 331 n.199; *PIR* 3 M 12-14, Nauta 2002: 65 n.83). It is possible that, if the references are to the same person, 10.18 was included in the first edition, and this poem is a new addition, which is logical considering Martial’s announcement of his own departure. Both poems recognise Macer as a literary patron who greatly appreciated reading Martial’s poems. Macer at 10.18 asks for Martial’s poems for the Saturnalia despite his being busily occupied with his position as curator of the Appian way. The language concerning Macer’s role as governor is similar to that in 12.98, which also relates the merits of a Macer as governor of Baetica.

Macer has the ideal qualities required as governor, *potestas* mixed with *pudor*. Compare the description of Nerva in 8.70.2 *sed cohibet vires ingeniumque pudor*; which is elaborated at 12.5.5 *recta Fides, hilaris Clementia, cauta Potestas*; also 7.52.2 to Celer governor of Spain especially line 3 *nee fuit in nostro certior orbe fides* (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.2 to Crispinus especially lines 71-2 *at tibi Pieriae tenero sub pectore curae/ et pudor et docti legem sibi dicere mores*). Here the *fides* is *rara* because of the reputation of greedy governors who abused their position of power (Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.21; Plin. *Ep.* 6.10.5 *tam rara in amicitias fides*).

A handful of poems is addressed to governors of provinces in Martial’s epigrams. For the most part such poems refer to the individual’s absence from Rome in such an official position and the beneficence under their control (1.86.6-7 on Terentianus governor of Syene; 7.52, Celer governor of Spain; 12.9 to Nerva; 12.98
for Instantius who will succeed Macer as governor of Baetica; compare 2.56, which mocks the wife of a governor and her reputation). Such types of poems for the arrival of new governors are outlined by Menander in the category of *epibaterion* (Men. Rhet. 378.4-16 with Russell and Wilson 1981: 281; also see Bowie on 12.98), where their location of governorship is praised in gracious terms such as those in the following passage.

felix auriferae colone terrae,  
rectorem vacuo sinu remittes  
optabisque moras, et exeuntem  
udo Dalmata gaudio sequeris.

Because of his outstanding qualities, Macer will not abuse his position and pilfer the province for his own gain. Gold mining was a lucrative source of the wealth for which the province was renowned, hence the epithet *auriferae* (cf. Stat. Silv. 1.2.153 *robora Dalmatico lucent satiata metallo*; 3.3.89-90 *quicquid ab auriferis eiectat Hiberia fossis,/Dalmatico quod monte nitet*; 4.7.14-16; Coleman 1988: 195-6, Wilkes 1969: 272-4). This adjective is used only on four other occasions in Martial, and three of those refer to the gold-bearing shores of Spain (10.13.1; 10.96.3; 12.2.3). Martial’s destination of Spain is described as *truces* in contrast with Dalmatia for Macer. This is a clear example of the poet manipulating his language for the benefit of the poem’s recipient.

There are many similarities in language with Statius’ farewell poem to Crispinus, who is also leaving Rome for his appointment as a legionary tribune (5.2; Nauta 2002: 216-17). The idea of tears mingled with joy is a fairly common
expression in the *propemptikon* genre (cf. Stat. *Silvae* 5.2.10 *quanto manarent gaudia fletu*; also 5.2.152 *felix qui viridi fidens*).

Although *rector* is commonly associated with the emperor (e.g. 7.7.5; 9.36.4), it also became a term associated with provincial governors (12.98.3; Juv. 8.87-8 *expectata diu tandem provincia cum te/ rectorem accipiet*; Tac. *Hist.* 1.59; *Ann.* 12.54; *CIL* 2.6378.42). Its use here, which echoes *recti* above, not only refers to Macer as governor, but also draws attention to his trustworthiness. *sinus* refers to the hanging fold or pocket of the toga which was used to hold money, and as such is also associated with pecuniary resources (*OLD* s.v. 4; Hor. *S.* 2.3.172; Tac. *Hist.* 3.19 *opes Cremonensium in sinu praefectorum legatorumque fore*). Macer will complete his governorship and return to Rome without plundering the wealth of his province.

*nos Celtas, Macer, et truces Hiberos
cum desiderio tuo petemus.
sed quaecumque tamen feretur illinc
piscosi calamo Tagi notata,*

The second half of the poem becomes concerned with the poet's own circumstances and his intended departure from Rome for his homeland in Spain. The term *desiderium* expresses emotion normally felt for someone or something once possessed and is a sentiment typical of this genre (Hor. *Carm.* 1.14.17; Prop. 3.22.6; Cairns 1972: 220). In his absence, Martial promises the composition of verses for Macer (similarly cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.99-100; especially 129ff. on the literature which Statius will write).

Unlike other occasions in Book 10 where Spain is designated as the ideal place to live (10.13), here Martial refers to it as *truces* in order to elevate his patron Macer's
destination above his own. Moreover, the river Tagus was known as the gold-bearing river (cf. 10.17(16).4), but here it is demoted to *piscosus* in order to paint a picture of Spain that is less kind than Dalmatia. The adjective *piscosus* still suggests the notion of abundance and self-sufficiency that he desires (cf. 10.37; 47).

The expression *Celtas et Hiberos* was most recently applied to describe Martial’s own heritage at 10.65, and this depiction of Spain is in keeping with Martial’s physical description of himself as a Spaniard, which also conveys the image of Spain and its inhabitants as one of unrefined simplicity (cf. 10.65, also cf. 7.52.3 *ille meas gentes, Celtas et rexit Hiberos* with Vioque).

Martial continually refers to Catullus as his literary model, beginning with the *praefatio* to Book 1 where he announces his intention to write in the same fashion. These sentiments continue throughout his books; at 5.5 he places his poems at the same standard at Pedo, Marsus and Catullus; 7.99 requests Crispinus as a reader to say: (6.7) ‘temporibus praestat non nihil iste tuis,/ nec Marso nimium minor est doctoque Catullo’ (see also 2.71; 4.14; 5.5; 30; 6.34; 7.99; 8.73 *docte Catulle*; 14.195; further see Offerman 1980: 107ff.; Swann 1998: 48-59). Also cf. Caecilianus in 2.71, who recites Catullus after Martial recites his own poems: 4-5 *hoc mihi das, tamquam deteriora legas,/ ut collata magis placeant mea?* This idea is repeated at the very end of this book with the assertion that the citizens of Verona
would wish to claim Martial for themselves just as they do Catullus (10.103.5-6), the only other occasion in this book when Catullus is mentioned.

Here is another observation on the decadence of the rich and the emulation of wealth caused by envy. The point of this poem relies on the play of the meaning of *rumpet* as bursting with envy and literally bursting. Otacilius and Torquatus appear only in this epigram. Torquatus even bests him in the epigram by being mentioned twice more than Otacilius, and his name always appears first. The motif of someone outdoing another particularly through envy is a common device in Martial’s epigrams, generally with ironic and humorous consequences. Torquatus has a palace at the fourth milestone outside Rome, so Otacilius acquires a *breve rus* at the same location; Torquatus has elaborate baths, Otacilius has a cooking pot; Torquatus has laurel plantation, Otacilius has chestnuts; Torquatus was consul, Otacilius was wardmaster elected by the people. Therefore Otacilius’ feigned attempts at wealth are poor imitations and ridiculous in the extreme. Those who emulate the extravagance of the wealthy are the intended target of this epigram. Otacilius is not even living beyond his means, but pretending that his possessions are worth far more than their real value (cf. also 10.54, where Olus covers his tables in order to pretend that they are of a far better quality). The joke of Otacilius emulating Torquatus’ wealth, but within his own means, is repeated throughout the poem, and this results in Otacilius appearing all the more foolish and absurd.

This naturally contradicts the poet’s own pronouncement for a happy life. This is conveyed in 10.47, which promotes satisfaction with what one has in life (cf. 458)
It is unsurprising that this poem follows Martial’s announcement of his intention to return to Spain, where he has already expressed desire for country living and the simple life.

Ad lapidem Torquatus habet praetoria quartum;
ad quartum breve rus emit Otabilius.

Of every item which Torquatus possesses, Otabilius is envious and desires the same. The poem is structured in couplets, where the first line describes Torquatus’ ownership, and the second describes Otabilius’ absurd attempt at imitation. The first is the elaborate palace or country mansion which Torquatus owns at the fourth milestone (for this location cf. Howell on 1.12.4 *signat vicina quartus ab urbe lapis* for this location reckoned from the gates in the Servian Wall; also Juv. 1.75; Suet. Cal. 37).

*praetoria* was originally a military term for its headquarters, and became associated with the emperor’s palace; but then was used for any large private house (Juv. 1.75 with Ferguson 1979: 117; 10.161; Stat. Silv. 1.3.25; 2.2.49; *OLD* s.v. 3). Otabilius buys the *breve rus* or small farm (cf. 1.114.2), which will not measure up to the luxury of a country villa, but the very language suggests a small, perhaps humble property.

Both characters appear only on this occasion in Martial’s epigrams and the nature of the poem suggests that they are fictitious individuals (SB: Index s.v. *Otabilius; Torquatus*). Torquatus is an aristocratic name (e.g. Torquatus was a consul in 65 BCE, cf. Hor. Carm. 5.7.23; Epod. 13.6; Ep. 1.5.6), and it means ‘adorned with a necklace’ (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 91, 346). It has been suggested that Torquatus here
refers to L. Nonius Calpurnius Torquatus Asprenas, consul in 94 and 128 (PIR T 133).

There is no known Otacilius, but the name is also aristocratic (cf. he is a praetor in Livy), and so it seems that he is of equal status. There seems to be no significance to his name beyond the possibility that he is a contemporary to Torquatus (PIR O 170).

Torquatus nitidas vario de marmore thermas extruxit; cucumam f ecit Otacilius.

Torquatus owns extravagant decorated baths which gleam with marble. Martial applies the term *thermae* to lavish and extravagantly decorated buildings, including private baths (on baths cf. 9.75; Fagan 1999: 16). The ownership of private baths is obviously a symbol of excessive wealth and luxury, and a similar but more elaborate description is given in Statius *Silvae* 1.5, which praises the baths of Claudius Etruscus (l.5.12-13 *dum nitidis canimus gemmantia saxis/ balnea dumque procax vittis hederisque soluta*). Otacilius’ pathetic attempt is a *cucuma*, which is generally described as a kettle or cooking pot (cf. Petr. 135.4). Each couplet with the exception of lines 5 and 6 finishes with the name Otacilius, giving the impression that he is second best in all his endeavours to outdo Torquatus.

disposuit daphnona suo Torquatus in agro; castaneas centum sevit Otacilius.

The next item is a plantation of laurel trees, a luxurious and expensive commodity, which indicates that Torquatus has a large estate with valuable produce (cf. 3.19.2; 12.50). The term *daphnon* refers to the plantation of laurels and appears only twice
in Martial (also at 12.50.1, which similarly emphasises a luxurious environment) and once in Petronius (126.12). Although Otacilius owns property, instead he plants one hundred chestnut trees which obviously do not match the opulence of owning laurel trees (cf. 5.78.15 *lento castaneae vapore tostae*). Chestnuts were apparently a cheap dish and were easily accessible (Plin. *Nat.* 15.53).

*consule Torquato vici fuit ille magister,*  
*non minor in tanto visus honore sibi.*

Torquatus becomes consul, and at the same time Otacilius is made *magister* of a *vicus* at Rome. Augustus divided Rome into 265 of these quarters and for each of these four magistrates were elected (Juv. 10.103; Hor. *S.* 4.34-6). The attainment of this office appears to Otacilius as great an honour as Torquatus becoming consul.

*grandis ut exiguam bos ranam ruperat olim,*  
sic, puto, *Torquatus rumpet Otacilium.*

The conclusion of the poem is based on 1.24 of Phaedrus’ *Fabulae Aesopiae*:

\[
\textit{Rana rupta et bos,}  
\textit{inops, potentem dum vult imitari, perit.}  
\textit{in prato quondam rana conspexit bovem}  
\textit{et tacta invidia tantae magnitudinis}  
\textit{rugosam inflavit pellem: tum natos suos}  
\textit{interrogavit, an hove esset latior.}  
\textit{illi negarunt. rursus intendit cutem}  
\textit{maiore nisu et simili quaesivit modo,}  
\textit{quis maior esset. illi dixerunt bovem.}  
\textit{novissime indignata dum vult validius}  
\textit{inflare sese, rupto iacuit corpore.}
\]

It is common practice for Martial to include proverbial expressions or familiar sayings in his epigrams as a means of strengthening the humour of his endings, and such a technique is common in Roman satirists such as Horace, Petronius and 461
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Lucilius (cf. Sullivan 1991: 225; 249-50). The joke relies on the play of *rumpo*, and Martial employs the double meaning of ‘to burst’ and ‘to envy’ in many of his epigrams (cf. Henriksen on 9.97; cf. Hor. S. 1.1; also S. 2.3.314-20).

10.80

The theme of wealth or the lack of wealth is continued in this next poem. Eros is a poor man and social climber, who in vain examines costly luxury items such as murrine cups, slave boys or citrus table tops; and openly weeps because he is unable to buy them. The humour of the poem depends not just upon Eros’ poverty but his open display of emotion over his poverty. Martial makes the point that there are plenty of people in Eros’ financial position who cannot afford these valuable possessions, but they bear this with greater staunchness. They mock Eros’ tears even as they conceal their own grief, because they are unable to make such purchases.

Similar sentiments are commonly expressed in Martial over the distinction between the extremely wealthy and the poor who remain poor (cf. 5.81 *semper pauper eris, si pauper es, Aemiliane/dantur opes nullis nunc nisi divitibus*; also 8.19 where Cinna is actually as poor as he pretends). Eros is unusual in his behaviour because he publicly exhibits his poverty rather than feign wealth. Perhaps for this very reason these people laugh at Eros yet in their pretence of wealth privately mourn their poverty. A corresponding poem occurs at 9.59 where Mamurra walks through the Saepta market place and declines all these expensive objects not because they are not good enough but because he is not able to afford them. The same objects are mentioned in both poems. This theme corresponds with the previous poem, which refers to the emulation of wealth.
Martial also uses the name Eros at 10.56 for a doctor, its Greek origin suggesting that he is a freedman. This is a traditional target of Roman satire, particularly of one who is attempting to reach beyond his social status.

These items on sale are frequently used together as symbols of excessive wealth; for example in 9.59 where Mamurra looks over such expensive items and disdains them in his disguise of wealth (line 3 *inspexit molles pueros oculisque comedit; 10 ingemuit citro non satis esse suo; 14 murrina signavit seposuit decem; cf. also 10.70).

Murrine glass is described as a lustrous material displaying a variety of colours, and was possibly akin to porcelain. It was originally imported from Parthia, and because of its fragility was highly prized and expensive. Martial frequently applies it as a symbol of opulence in his poems (cf. 3.26.2; 9.59.14; 11.70.8 with Kay; 13.110.1 with Leary; 14.113).

Citrus wood tables were also extremely expensive. They were often made with ivory inlay and thus represent luxury and wealth (2.43.9-10 with Williams; 14.89.2 with Leary; 10.98; 14.3; Petr. 119.2; Dio 61.10.3; Juv. 1.75; 137; 11.120). Compare 10.54, where Martial mocks Olus for pretending to own valuable tables by covering them up.

Young and beautiful slave boys were also a highly prized commodity and are often employed in Martial as a symbol of wealth (cf. 10.66). Such youths were also expensive and could cost up to 100, 000 sesterces (Howell on 1.58.1; 9.59.6 with Henriksén; 11.70.1 with Kay).
et gemitus ino ducit de pectore quod non
tota miser coemat Saepta feratque domum.

The Saepta or Saepta Iulia was a market place located on the Campus Martius, completed in 23 BCE by Agrippa. In this poem and 9.59 it is suggested that exclusive and valuable objects such as costly slave boys, high quality furniture, utensils and jewellery were sold here, perhaps only to those of higher social position (cf. Henriksén on 9.59; also 2.57; Richardson: 340, Platner-Ashby: 460ff.). It was also a socially significant location, and is described in 2.57, where the subject makes his way through this area in an effort to be seen by as many people as possible (Williams on 2.57; cf. also 2.14).

quam multi faciunt quod Eros, sed lumine sicco!
pars maior lacrimas ridet et intus habet.

The interpretation is that the majority of people laugh at the tears of Eros and keep their own tears concealed. Housman interprets this to mean that most people have not heard of Eros, and are not mocking Eros’ tears but openly laughing (Housman CP 2: 729). Shackleton Bailey suggests that Eros’ behaviour is well-known to a lot of people and their reaction is to mock his actions to disguise their inability to afford these luxuries (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 144). Those who are poor like Eros do not react by openly weeping but prefer to conceal their poverty and their sorrow, yet mock Eros for his stupidity in such behaviour.

Phyllis is most likely a prostitute who seems to have double-booked two clients, both of whom wish to enjoy her sexual favours first; and she willingly obliges them both.
The way in which she services the men is open to interpretation. Because the poem never clarifies whose tunic is raised, it is possible that one lover raises her legs, and the other lover lifts or raises his own tunic for the purposes of sexual pleasure of another form. On first reading the poem it seems apparent that the joke rests on the simultaneous penetration of both orifices (Richlin 1992: 131, Klug 1995: 76). Another explanation depends more upon Martial’s play with words and erotic double meanings so that she gives herself to one lover and her tunic to the other (SB² 2: 399). Either way, the poem conveys sexual perversion in a negative light.

This returns to the motif of women who behave in a manner regarded as inappropriate for Roman women, especially concerning their sexual behaviour. This is also one of the racier poems of the book, and the sexual subject matter creates an unexpected shift in emphasis from the preceding set of poems which deal with wealth and poverty, combined with the hardships of the client. The protagonist’s name of the preceding poem, Eros, perhaps anticipates the erotic nature of this poem. There are relatively few poems which are openly sexual in the book, and they are distributed randomly throughout the book; the next occurs at 10.90 (the last at 10.64).


*Cum duo venissent ad Phyllida mane fututum*
*et nudam cuperet sumere uterque prior,*
*promisit pariter se Phyllis utrique daturam,*
*et dedit: ille pedem sustulit, hic tunicam.*

This is the first of four occasions in which the name Phyllis appears in Martial, and, as on all subsequent occasions, the name is used in a sexual context. On the other three
occasions she is presented as the poet's lover or prostitute, sometimes as an old woman (11.29 with Kay), or as the traditionally greedy girlfriend to whom the poet considers offering gifts in return for sexual favours/services (11.49 (50); 12.65). It is a common name for courtesans or prostitutes (cf. 11.49 (50) with Kay; Prop. 4.8. 29ff.; Hor. Carm. 4.11; CIL 6 index s.v.).

Martial uses standard terms such as futuere and dare to refer to sexual intercourse (cf. 10.29.6, 10.75). sumere is generally used in an erotic context to refer to the cleansing of the body following sex (cf. 2.50.2 with Williams; 7.35.8 with Vioque; OLD s.v. sumo 5).

The point of the poem rests on the fact that Phyllis is able to accommodate both men at the same time, as succinctly explained in the final line (Klug, 1995: 77). It is commonly presumed that this implies she allowed both vaginal and anal intercourse to take place simultaneously by the two partners (cf. Mart. 9.32.4 hanc volo quae pariter sufficit una tribus; Galen 5.49; Richlin 1992: 131). The expression tollere pedes refers to the lifting of the legs for the purposes of sexual intercourse, although how the legs are lifted for the purposes of double penetration is still not absolutely clear (cf. 10.71.8 with Kay tollunturque pedes; Petr. 55.6 tollat pedes indomita in strata extraneo?; Cic. Att. 2.1.5 'at ego' inquit 'novus patronus instituam. sed soror, quae tantum habeat consularis loci, unum mihi solum pedem dat. 'noli' inquam 'de uno pede sororis queri; licet etiam alterum tollas' Ov. Ars 3.775 Milanion umenis Atalantes crura ferebat; cf. Adams 1982: 192n.3). Shackleton Bailey circumvents the problem by explaining that the second lover did not meet Phyllis for this purpose (i.e. paedicatum), but that the joke relies on the double meaning of dare and tollere, that she 'gave' to both men; the first 'raises' her feet, and
10.81

the second ‘lifts’ or steals her tunic (1978: 288). He adds further that that because of the position caused by *pedem sustulit*, her tunic does not need to be raised; and in the second place Phyllis is naked (*nudam*) (SB2 3: Appendix A 319). This interpretation detracts from the sexual humour intended by the act of double penetration.

10.82

In this epigram Martial continues his complaints about the duties imposed on the client in the patron/client relationship. Here, not only is the situation unrewarding to the client, but Martial indicates that the patron does not receive any special benefits either. He informs Gallus that he could tolerate snow and wind in carrying out these wearisome obligations if they offered an advantage, especially financial, to the patron. The truth is that the patron gains nothing from such an arrangement, but the client suffers. Martial begs Gallus to give up such a relationship because, although it does not cause inconvenience to him, he gains nothing from it, and, for this reason, there is little point to the client’s attendance upon the patron. These duties are exaggeratedly conveyed as torturous, akin to the crucifixions normally reserved for slaves, but inflicted on the poet who is supposedly free. These images reflect Martial’s depiction of life at Rome as a form of slavery, an image which features so strongly in Book 10 (cf. 10.74).

Martial’s criticisms on this unsatisfactory relationship between the patron and client is continued from 10.74, and the language of the final lines in particular echoes the opening of 10.74, where he exhorts Rome to dispense with the formalities of the patron/client relationship. In 10.74, the focus remains on the client, but here the theme is that the patron does not profit from the relationship. The prevalence of this
motif in this section of the book, especially its effect on the poet, leads to his preparations for departure towards the end of Book 10 (cf. 10.78).

There still seems to be a parallel between the course of the seasons and that of Book 10. Most recently, 10.62 refers to the middle of summer with its blazing heat, and here at 10.82 Martial describes the bad weather that arrives with autumn and winter. This is resumed at 10.87, where Martial refers to the celebration of Restitutus' birthday in October.

Si quid nostra tuis adicit vexatio rebus,
mane vel a media nocte togatus ero
stridentesque feram flatus Aquilonis iniqui
et patiar nimbos excipiamque nives.

Martial refers to his duties as a client as the source of his hardship, as denoted by vexatio. His role as client is symbolised by togatus, the cumbersome outfit about which Martial complains most recently at 10.74 (togatulus). These duties lasted all day, as they began very early in the morning with the salutatio, often whilst it was still dark, and ended with bathing and dinner which might last well into the night (similarly cf. 10.70).

Martial describes the client wandering around Rome in all types of terrible weather such as rain, wind and snow for the thankless obligations towards the patron (cf. 3.36; 12.29 (26).7-10 at mihi quem cogis medios abrumpere somnos/ et matutinum ferre patique lutum,/ quid petitur? rupta cum pes vagus exit aluta/et subitus crassae decidit imber aquae; Juv. 5.75-9: scilicet hoc fuerat, propter quod saepe relicta/ coniuge per montem adversum gelidasque cucurri/ Esquillas, fremeret saeva cum grandine vernus/ Iuppiter et multo stillaret paenula nimbo; see Colton 468
The Aquila wind blew in the middle of December, and was regarded as one of the most vicious and coldest of winds (1.49.20 with Howell).

10.82

1991: 187-8). The Aquila wind blew in the middle of December, and was regarded as one of the most vicious and coldest of winds (1.49.20 with Howell).

sed si non fias quadrante beatior uno
per gemitus nostros ingenuasque cruces,
parce, precor, fesso vanosque remitte labores,
qui tibi non prosunt et mihi, Galle, nocent.

Unlike most of the earlier poems on this subject, where the poet normally complains of the client earning the pittance of one hundred quadrans in one day from his patron, here the situation is reversed, as the patron does not even profit from one quadrans. The benefit is described as beatior, which recalls 10.47 on the vita beatior. Here it conveys a double meaning of ‘richer’ or ‘wealthier’ (cf. 10.87.8; 12.15.8 with Bowie). The phrase ingenuasque cruces recalls the same poem, but here such free men are punished in a manner fit for slaves (cf. 1.15.7 with Howell catenatique labores).

The term gemitus is used only twice in Martial, on both occasions in Book 10. At 10.80 it was used in the context of the groans of Eros who aspires to great wealth and luxury despite his poverty. Here it denotes the grief of the client in his agony over the officia clientum.

For the identity of Gallus, cf. 10.56, where he is addressed in a similar context, also as a patron, for whom Martial as client is expected to be in attendance at all times of the day, however inconvenient.

The language of lines 7-8 echoes 10.74.1-2 iam parce lasso, Roma gratulatori,/ lasso clienti. Here Martial presents the toils of the client as futile for patron and client alike (vanos); but elsewhere he uses the epithet vanus to refer to the worthlessness of gifts presented by clients to the patron (cf. 10.87.6; also 7.72.2 with
Vioque; also cf. *vanum munus* at 9.102.3 with Henriksen). For the comparison between *prosunt* and *nocent* cf. 10.2.11 *at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt*. Although this relationship may not benefit the patron, the client actually suffers torture. The emphasis on the client's pain as opposed to the patron's is enforced by use of the negative *nocent* as the final word.

10.83

Martial mocks Marinus for his attempts to hide his bald pate by combing the hair over from either side of his head. Physical deformities and diseases are a popular source of humour in Roman satire, and poets even target disabilities which might seem particularly shocking to a modern reader (for a range of subjects in the epigrams cf. Sullivan 1991: 168). In addition, personal appearance is often a subject for Martial's ridicule, and is often related to a person's sexual appeal (cf. 1.83; 2.33; 42; 53; 74; Richlin 1992: 133). Several epigrams denigrate those who are bald, and this poem expresses sentiments similar to 5.49, where Labienus' appearance of baldness on the top of his head and hair on either side gives the poet the impression that he is three men and not one, and so might receive three meals at the Saturnalian feast (5.49; 6.12; 75 cf. also 2.33.1 and 10.67). The treatment of hair is frequently associated with old age, as Marinus assumes he will look younger if he covers his head with the hair from the sides (cf. 6.57). Elsewhere Martial ridicules those who dye their white hair black in an effort to appear more youthful (3.44; 4.36), or who buy wigs to wear (6.12; 9.37; 12.23).

Marinus' old age continues the motif from earlier poems in the book concerning the elderly (cf. 10.39; 63; 67; 71). This is continued in the following
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poems such as 85 and 86, which mention retirement and the end of youth; and then 90 which scorns the aged woman Ligeia who also treats her hair (although in a different manner) to appear young. This is also the first in a set of poems which are lighter in tone than Martial’s complaints on the patron/client relationship.


Raros colligis hinc et hinc capillos et latum nitidae, Marine, calvae campum temporibus tegis comatis;

Martial provides a vivid description for the image of the comb-over on Marinus’ head with scanty hairs draped over his bald pate. For a similar expression, cf. 5.49.4 sunt illinc tibi, sunt et hinc capilli. In 5.49, calvae is also the term applied to denote a bald head (cf. 5.49.3 with Howell; 10.67.7; 6.57.2). The epithet nitidae is usually used to denote the application of hair oil on lustrous locks of hair, which heightens the scorn for Marinus’ gleaming bald pate (cf. 10.65.6).

This is the only occasion in which the name Marinus occurs in Martial, and though it seems a reasonably common cognomen it is most likely used fictitiously here (Kajanto Cognomina: 308).

sed moti redeunt iubente vento reddunturque sibi caputque nudum cirris grandibus hinc et inde cingunt:

The wind messes up Marinus’ careful arrangement of his hair and returns it to its natural state (cf. 2.41.10 quam ventum Spanius...timet) to reveal his baldness, denoted by nudum caput. The term cirrus is a technical term which denotes ‘hair in ringlets’
inter Spendophorum Telesphorumque
Cydae stare putabis Hermerotem.

The most likely possibilities for this image are that Spendophorus and Telesphorus are two beautiful *capillati* standing either side of Hermeros, the son or slave of Cydas; or that the description refers to a set of statues sculpted by Cydas (Eden 1989: 123; also cf. 5.49 where Martial compares Labienus’ hairstyle to Geryon the triple-bodied monster).

The exact identity of Spendophorus, Telesphorus and Hermeros of Cydas remains unclear. Spendophorus and Telesphorus are named elsewhere in Martial as *pueri delicati* (9.56; 11.26; 58); the identity of Hermeros or Cydas is not mentioned anywhere else and remains otherwise unknown. Martial only occasionally introduces obscure names into his epigrams, and it is uncertain whether they are meant to be based on real individuals (SB² 3: 325-6).

Spendophorus is mentioned as a *delicatus* at 9.56, a beautiful youth in the prime of life, possibly with some link to the name’s meaning as ‘carrier of libations’. The name only occurs in Martial in Roman literature, and its Greek equivalent at *AP* 2.306.1 (cf. Henriksén on 9.56).

Telesphorus (‘bringer of fulfilment’ Giegengack 1969: 62) appears on two more occasions in Martial in similar circumstances as a *capillatus* at 11.26 and 58 and the name is also extremely common (cf. Kay’s notes). It is possible that these two
lines refer to a group of statues sculpted by Cydas (cf. Plin. Nat. 36.33 Hermerotes Taurisces).

Eden bases his suggestion that Hermeros is a gladiator on the inscription of a gladiator’s name on a contemporaneous lamp from Puteoli. The same Hermeros is possibly engraved on Trimalchio’s wine cups (Petr. 52.3 nam Hermerotis pugnas et Petraitis in poculis habeo; Eden 1989: 123). He was perhaps renowned for his baldness because he fought without headgear (Eden 1989: 123-4).

vis tu simplicius senem fateri,
ut tandem videaris unus esse?
calvo turpius est nihil comato.

Although Friedlaender reads line 9 as quin tu simplicius senem fateris, the text above seems the more popular reading. There are numerous examples of vis and the infinitive to express an urgent command or exhortation (Friedlaender on 10.83.9; cf. Hor. S. 2.6.92; Juv. 5.74-5; Cic. Fam. 4.5.4).

Martial plays on the meaning of simplex with the intention of his appearance being more natural, but he is also more honest about his appearance. It becomes clear that Marinus is an older man trying to look younger in this way. The poet urges Marinus to be more direct in looking his own age. There is deliberate word play with comatus which not only ridicules Marinus’ attempts at hair arrangement but also implies that Marinus may next attempt a full head of hair by wearing a wig, another target for mockery (cf. 1.72.8 calvus cum fueris, eris comatus with Howell).
Afer either does not want to go to bed because the woman's attractiveness compels
him to stay, or because the woman, possibly his wife, is unattractive, and will insist on
going to bed with him (SB² 2: 401). Richlin places this poem in the second category
that implies that the woman is too ugly for sex (1992: 246 n. 41). Salanitro points out
that it is not stated that the woman is his wife and the context suggests that Afer is so
mesmerised by the beautiful stranger reclining next to him he prefers to remain
(Salanitro 1991: 8).

This is the first couplet since 10.69, and resumes the subject of epigrams that
are more satirical and salacious in nature, these interrupting the long series of poems
concerned with poverty and the hardships of the client at Rome.

For further reading, see Salanitro 1991: 7-9.

Miraris, quare dormitum non eat Afer?
accumbat cum qua, Caediciane, vides.

The poem is addressed to Caedicianus (on whose identity cf. 10.32, which is also
directed to him). The verb *miror* denotes the sense of amazement expressed by
Caedicianus at Afer’s behaviour, that he does not go to bed; his reason for which is
revealed in the following line (for similar expressions cf. 1.23.3 *mirabar, quare
numquam me, Cotta vocasses*; 10.96.1; 11.35.2; Salanitro 1991: 8).

The name Afer occurs a number of times in Martial, and is most likely a
fictitious individual. He appears in different satirical contexts throughout the books:
at 4.37 on the subject of money; as a nosy old man at 4.78; at 6.77 where ridiculed for
his poverty; at 9.6 as a patron who has recently returned from Africa; at 9.25 as the
host with young beautiful boys; and finally at 12.42 as the husband in a homosexual wedding (cf. 6.77 with Grewing). It was a common cognomen, a famous example being the name of Terence, Publius Terentius Afer (Kajanto Cognomina: 205; PIR A 436).

*accumbó* is the common term for reclining at dinner (cf. 2.37.9). One reading suggests that Afer is perhaps promiscuous in nature and that Caedicianus is astonished that he stays at the dinner table instead of leaving with the woman, but she is so ugly that on this occasion he is reluctant to leave. The verb *dormíre* is used on three other occasions in Martial where its meaning clearly denotes an individual sleeping with someone else (3.73.1; 8.44.17; 11.56.11). Here it is not obvious that this meaning is intended, and therefore it may suggest that the woman next to whom he is reclining is so beautiful that he does not want to go to bed on his own (Salanitro 1991: 8). Each interpretation suggests a sexual theme, either arousal or rejection. The ambiguity of the epigram is perhaps deliberate.

**10.85**

In this poem, the overflowing of the Tiber is presented humorously. Ladon is a retired sailor who buys a farm property on the banks of the Tiber in order to be close to his beloved river. The result is that the Tiber floods his fields; so he fills his own ship with stones in his effort to avert the deluge, which produces the irony that the sailor sinks his own ship in order to save his own life. A similar situation occurs in Juvenal 12, where the ship’s captain strengthens his ship in severe winds by chopping down the mast to make the ship smaller and thereby saves the life of his crew (Juv. 12.51-2). The subject of this particular poem is unique, although such incidents (especially
disasters or accidents which involve escape from danger) are common in Greek epigram and Martial; the setting is usually imaginary or improbable (Mart. 2.75; 3.19; 4.18; 60; 11.41 with Kay; AP Book 9, e.g. 9.233; 252; 276; Siedschlag 1977: 101). In Martial, there are several occasions which seem to involve real life situations, such as Regulus nearly crushed by a portico (1.12; 82). Some are treated with humour, such as the huge Gaul who falls down and breaks his ankle at 8.75 (also cf. 11.82 with Kay).

This is the third in a succession of humorous poems intended to interrupt the series of poems concerned with Martial’s complaints of poverty and patronage. Although the subject matter reveals no obvious connection with other poems in the book, the retirement of Ladon perhaps parallels the following poem concerning Laurus, who has also retired from an activity he enjoyed in his youth.

iam senior Ladon Tiberinae nauta carinae
proxima dilectis rura paravit aquis.

Sailors are not a regular source of humour in Martial, and are mentioned on only one other occasion at 3.67, which ridicules their laziness. Ladon is most likely a fictitious character, and the name is appropriate in the context as Ladon was a river god of Arcadia (Hes. Theog. 344; Schol. ad Pind. Ol. 6.143; Diod. 4.72; Paus. 8.20.1; Ov. Met. 1.702; Giegengack 1969: 113-14). Ladon’s use of his ship to control the Tiber in full flow perhaps complements this divine allusion.

Although the adjectival form of the river Tiber is very common in Roman literature, this is its only appearance in Martial (cf. Transiberinus 1.41.3; 108.2; 6.93.4), for terms such as Tiberis and Thyber are normally used (cf. 10.7). The river
Tiber appears at 10.7, personified as the representative of Rome who bids the Rhine release the emperor Trajan and return him to Rome. As such, it is a significant symbol of Rome and Roman life. Here it is conquered by a retired sailor.

Sailing on the Tiber was a common and necessary occurrence. Compare 4.64 on Julius Martialis' villa, which is also near the river and is not too troubled by the passing by of ships on the Tiber (4.64.21-4 *quam nec rumpere nauticum celeuma/ nec clamor valet helciariorum,/ cum sit tam prope Mulvius sacrumque/ lapsae per Tiberim volent carinae*). *dilecta* denotes a personal attachment to the river Tiber (cf. 10.13). For this reason Ladon buys property next to the river Tiber upon his retirement.

*quae cum saepe vagus premeret torrentibus undis
Thybris et hiberno rumperet arva lacu,
emeritam puppem, ripa quae stabat in alta,
implevit saxis opposuitque vadis.*

Because the Apennines were exposed to torrential outbursts of rain, the Tiber did overflow on occasion. This must have caused problems for those who lived near its banks, and here Martial describes the river flooding into the nearby fields (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2 with N-H; Tac. *Ann.* 1.76). He refers to this occurring during the winter months, and so continues the timeframe from 10.82 where he refers to the duties of the client in the same time of year. For Martial's use of the term *Thybris*, cf. 10.7.9.

Because of Ladon's retirement from sailing, so too his ship is retired, and thus given the epithet *emerita*, which originally described soldiers who had been discharged, then extended to anyone discharged from service (cf. cf. 1.61.10; 7.63.11
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with Vioque; Pers. 5.73-4; for the metonymy of *puppis* cf. 10.51.10). Despite this, Ladon uses the tools of his former occupation to assist his present lifestyle.

*sic nimias avertit aquas. quis credere posset? auxilium domino mersa carina tulit.*

The humour lies in Ladon using his ship not to sail on the water but to obstruct its course. Similar poems in Martial end in a like manner of displaying incredulity at such an occurrence (e.g. 1.82.10-11 *quis curam neget esse te deorum,/ propter quem fuit innocens ruina?*; 4.18.7 *quid non saeva sibi voluit Fortuna licere?*). Here Martial comments on the absurdity of Ladon sinking his own ship (for a similar expression cf. 4.66.14 *nec mersa est pelago nec fuit ulla ratis*).

10.86

In this epigram, Martial describes how Laurus used to love playing with the ball, but has grown too old to play. The matter is treated in the same way that a lover feels about his new mistress, and to emphasise this comparison the poet uses language appropriate to love elegy but which is heavily erotic (*caluit, inflammatus, flagravit, amore, lusor ludere*). Just as the lover grows old and is unable to be aroused, so Laurus loses his potency with the ball. This picks up the theme of mockery towards the ageing or elderly prevalent in this section of the book, most recently in 10.83, which ridicules the balding Marinus.
Nemo nova caluit sic inflammatus amica
flagravit quanto Laurus amore pilae.
 sed qui primus erat lusor dum floruit aetas,
nunc postquam desit ludere, prima pila est.

The playing of ball was a popular pursuit in Rome, and Martial refers to several different types of ball games in Book 14, with technical expressions for each and their different levels of strenuousness (14.45-8 with Leary; also 4.19.7; 7.32.7 with Vioque; Petr. 27.3 with Smith 1975: 55; for the different variety of ball sports see Balsdon 1969: 165, Harris, 1972: 75-111, Marquardt 1886: 842). Games involving such exertion are appropriate for energetic youths, but therefore exclude the weak or infirm (e.g. the image of the capillati playing ball at Petr. 27.3; cf. Cic. Sen. 33, on the elder Cato who thought that no ball games were suitable for the elderly). For this reason, at 14.47, Martial mockingly refers to a soft air-filled ball as the only ball suitable for children and the elderly for whom arduous exercise is not required (ite procul, iuvenes; mitis mihi convenit aetas:/ folle decet pueros ludere, folle senes).

Here is a play on two meanings of pila as ball and also its meaning as the dummy which is first thrown into the arena to provoke the bull (Sp. 9.4; 14.52.2 with Leary; 2.43.5-6 at me, quae passa est furias et cornua tauri,/ noluerit dici quam pila prima suam with Williams). Like this dilapidated dummy, Laurus is broken and decrepit through age. Thus the prima pila, the first ball given to the bull was the most damaged, just as Martial describes Laurus as the prima pila, worn down on account of his age and so unable to play.

The name Laurus occurs on only two occasions in Martial, here and at 2.64, where he is criticised because he is unable to choose between the professions of teacher of rhetoric and courtroom lawyer. As a result his indecision means that he is
too old for either (2.64.3-4 Peleos et Priami transit et Nestoris aetas/ et fuerat serum
iam tibi desinere with Williams). The meaning of the name victory or triumph
perhaps adds to the irony of infirmity in his old age. It appears twenty-seven times as
a real name in inscriptions also (Kajanto Cognomina: 334).

Erotic language is considerable in this poem, and evokes the notion of age
transforming the ardent youth into the impotent old man (cf. 3.43; 4.78; 11.44; 81).
Language such as inflammatus, flagravit and play on the terms ludo and lusor are
common expressions of erotic poetry, but are here transferred to Laurus’ love for the
ball (for ludo see 10.16, Adams 1982: 162, 223, 225; for flagro cf. 7.26.8 with
Vioque; 7.87.3; 12.52.4; Hor. Carm. 1.33.6 with N-H; OLD s.v. 3b; TLL 6.1.847.24).

10.87

Martial presents a poem to the lawyer Restitutus in honour of his birthday, in the style
of the genethliakon (cf. Cairns 1972: 136-7; cf. 10.25). He calls upon the lawyer’s
clients, represented as pia Roma, to show their respects to their patron by the offering
of valuable presents instead of the common and worthless articles typically given at
the Saturnalia, such as wax tapers, three-leaved notebooks and napkins. Contributors
include tradesmen, defendants charged with drunkenness and brawling, defamed
wives cleared of their misconduct by Restitutus, antique dealers, farmers, hunters and
fishermen. Each one offers a gift representing his or her occupation. The trader
offers costly cloaks dyed in Tyrian scarlet, the defendant dinner suits perhaps as
souvenir of the occasion which got him in to this circumstance, and the wife cleared
of misconduct offers jewellery. The list of contributors continues with the antique
dealer who sends engraved dinner plates, the hunter who brings a hare, the farmer a kid, and the fisherman seafood. Lastly, Martial sends poetry as his gift.

For this reason Nauta discusses three possibilities of what Martial’s gift entails (Nauta 2002: 106). The first is that the poem represents the gift itself (cf. AP 6.329), an unpublished collection of epigrams (AP 9.93), or a published book, perhaps Book 10 itself (Nauta 2002: 106-7). Some poems are clearly presented as individual poems or in a group for a patron or friend on a special date or occasion (e.g. 7.21-3, 9.11-13, 16-17, 36 with Henriksen), whereas others accompany gifts of poetry (e.g. 4.10; 14; 5.18; 30; 7.28; 10.18 (17); 11.15; further see Nauta 2002:108ff.; also White 1974: 40ff.).

Explanations or justification for sending poetry as a gift is a conventional literary device (cf. 1.11 with Howell, 7.42 with Vioque; 8.82, 9.26; 11.57; AP 6.321; 322; 328). Martial’s inclusion of his own poetry amongst such luxury items confirms that it is a valuable commodity, rather than the kind of gift expected of clients of the Saturnalia, although elsewhere he claims that this is the correct occasion for his epigrams (cf. 10.18 (17); also 5.18; 7.46; 11.1; also cf. Nauta 2002: 167).

This poem follows a collection of shorter, humorous epigrams and demonstrates Martial’s versatility in his subject matter. This, combined with its dignified tone, are elements to which he aspires (cf. 10.45; 59). It is complemented by the following poem, a short couplet which apparently mocks one of the least important legal professions. There is also a connection with 10.89 which compares a statue by Polyclitus to the work of Phidias, one of whose creations is presented to Restitutus.
Martial discusses birthday presents elsewhere, generally in the context of gifts which are either worthless or inadequate (cf. 10.24 and 29 on Martial's own birthday). Other examples include 7.86 where he complains at being invited to a birthday celebration because he sent no presents; 8.64 on Clytus, who celebrates several birthdays in a year to obtain presents; 9.53 to Quintus Ovidius, who would not accept Martial's gift (for poems celebrating birthdays also see 3.6 to Marcellinus; Domitian 4.1 and 9.39; 7.21-3 for Lucan; 12.60; Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.17 on the birthday of Maecenas; Plin. *Ep.* 6.30; Censorinus 3.5; also cf. 10.25; Argetsinger 1992: 175ff.).


Octobres age sentiat Kalendas facundi pia Roma Restituti:

This is the only occasion in which Restitutus is mentioned in Martial's poems, and is presumed to be a new patron of Martial. He is possibly Claudius Restitutus, a recipient of Pliny's correspondence, and a lawyer who defended Caecilius Classicus in 101 against Pliny (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 3.9.16; 6.17 with Sherwin-White; *PIR*² C 995; *CIL* 8.7039). His appreciation of Martial's poetry is emphasised by the epithet *facundus* which Martial uses elsewhere to his literary patrons (cf. 10.73; also 5.5.1 to Sextus; 8.28.1 to Parthenius; 9.26.1 to Nerva). Restitutus' birthday is celebrated on the Kalends of October, although some dispute whether this was the actual date of birth (this is fully discussed at 10.24.1-2).

The poem begins as an exhortation to *pia Roma* to commemorate Restitutus' birthday, but it should be noted it concludes with an address to Restitutus himself. Roma denotes the clients of Restitutus who are obliged to celebrate his birthday (for
Roma in similar contexts of patron/client subjects cf. 10.19 (18).4; 74; also Damon 1995: 164). The epithet *pia* is used on only two occasions for Roma in Martial, here and at 12.5.7, where it conveys the city's dutiful conduct towards the emperor (cf. 12.5.7 with Bowie). The alliteration with *Roma Restituti* conveys the gravity of the occasion.

*linguis omnibus et favete votis;*  
*natalem colimus, tacete lites.*  

The significance of the occasion is such that Martial requests that the celebrants commemorate it as if it were a religious event, and he uses formulaic language akin to a priest asking for silence during the performance of holy rites (cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1.71-3 *linguis animisque favete...lite vacant aures*; Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.2 *favete linguis*). Conventional material of the *genethliakon* genre includes the offering of gifts as part of the celebration, with the expectation that the friends and clients of Restitutus will honour the day by performance of some sacred activities (e.g. Tib. 4.5.9 *cape tura libens votisque favete*; also 2.2; 4.8; 4.9; Ov. *Tr.* 3.13; 5.5 Argetsinger 1992: 182-3). The request for silence perhaps conveys the silence of the courtroom, in respect for Restitutus' occupation as lawyer.

*absit cereus aridi clientis,*  
*et vani triplices brevesque mappae*  
*expectent gelidi locos Decembris.*  
*certent muneribus beatiores:*  

In honour of Restitutus, Martial dismisses the gifts of meagre value, normally presented by clients to patrons at the Saturnalia. His description of the client as
aridus conveys his contempt for this relationship and recalls his description of the sportula at 10.75.11.

cereus denotes a wax taper. This was a customary gift offered by client to patron, and, along with candles, was one of the oldest type of presents traditionally given at the Saturnalia, as it represented the return of the sun after mid-winter (cf. 13.3-9 and 14.42 with Leary, also cf. his discussion on Saturnalian gifts, Intro. section (i) D; also 5.18.2; Stat. Silv. 4.9.40 with Coleman 1988: 236; AP 6.249.1).

Line 6 is replicated from 7.72 where the poet wishes prosperity to Paulus, even in his receipt of presents, more valuable than those mentioned, at the Saturnalia; and in return Paulus will defend Martial against those who publish defamatory material in his name. triplices were three-leaved tablets bound together and were used to send messages or short poems to friends (cf. 7.72.2 with Vioque; 14.6 with Leary). That such items were not considered valuable gifts is denoted by the epithet vani, another term which Martial has previously used in this book to describe the worthless labours of the client (cf. 10.82.7). Gifts of mappae, table-napkins, were commonplace at the Saturnalia, and mentioned on numerous occasions in the epigrams (cf. 4.46.17; 5.18.1-2 quo volant mappae/ gracilesque ligulae cerique chartaeque; 7.72.2 with Vioque; 14.139; Catul. 12.15; Stat. Silv. 4.9.25, with Coleman 1988: 231).

The festive nature of the Saturnalia is denoted by its characterisation as ioci Decembris, a term which elsewhere Martial uses of his own poetry (cf. 10.18 (17).3; also see above). The term beatior generally refers to those who are 'blessed' or 'happier' (cf. 10.47.1), but here suggests economic wealth (cf. 10.82.5; also 12.15.8 with Bowie; OLD s.v. beo 3; TLL s.v. beo 2.1.1917).
Agrippae tumidus negotiator
Cadmi municipes ferat lacernas;

The negotiator refers to the small trader or merchant, perhaps one from the Saepta Iulia (2.14.5; 9.59.1) near the porticus Agrippae, a market which sold more expensive and valuable items of jewellery, slaves, furniture and clothing (cf. 10.80). The epithet tumidus ('puffed up') reflects the derogatory tone typical towards such a profession (cf. 11.66.2 with Kay).

He produces a costly cloak for Restitutus. The mythical figure, Cadmus, is a metonymy for Tyre, which was renowned for its purple dyes produced by shellfish (2.43.7 misit Agenoreas Cadmi tibi terra lacernas with Williams). The colour purple was traditionally a symbol of wealth and superior social status (2.29.3 with Williams; Howell on 1.53.5 Tyrias; André 1949: 90-102). The lacerna was a cloak fastened at the shoulder and worn over clothing as protection against rain (cf. Mart. 7.86.8 with Vioque; 14.131; 133; 135; especially with Leary; Marquardt 1886: 568-9, Croom 2002: 51).

pugnorum reus ebriaeque noctis
cenatoria mittat advocato;

One of Restitutus' clients is a defendant charged with assault and drunkeness at night (cf. Juv. 3.278, see Colton 1991: 136-7). In gratitude, he ironically sends a garment meant for comfort and relaxation in the evening, which reflects the consequences of his own situation. The cenatoria was a garment worn at meal-times and at the Saturnalia (14.135 with Leary; Petr. 21.5). Martial uses this term on only two occasions, and more frequently refers to the synthesis, although the difference between the two is unknown (cf. Leary on 14.135; for the synthesis cf. 10.29). It was
also customary to wear elegant clothes on celebratory occasions such as a birthday (cf. Cairns 1972: 136-7).

infamata virum puella vicit,
veros sardonychas, sed ipsa tradat;

Restitutus defends a woman falsely charged with misconduct by her husband. The term *infamata* denotes one who is falsely charged with adultery (*OLD* s.v. *infamo* 2b; Treggiari 1991: 283-4). *puella* denotes a married woman, but connotes one who is virginal (i.e. just married) or chaste in conduct (cf. 10.35.1; 7.88.4; also *nuptafemina* cf. Catul. 17.14; Ov. *Ep.* 8.20; Prop. 3.13.23).

In appreciation for Restitutus winning her case, she personally presents him with genuine sardonyxes, a popular stone for rings and extremely valuable (2.29.2 with Williams; 4.28.4; 61.6; 5.11.1; 11.27.10; 37.2; Pers. 1.16; cf. Juv. 7.143-4 on the lawyer who wears rented sardonyx for this very reason). Elsewhere, Martial refers to such gems copied to emulate wealth, and therefore here their authenticity is emphasised (cf. 4.61.6 *sardonycha verum*; 9.59.17 *sardonychas veros* with Henriksén).

mirator veterum senex avorum
donet Phidiaci toreuma caeli;

The collection of art and other valuable objects seems to have been popular in Rome at this time, as such possessions reflected the wealth and accomplishments of their owner (cf. 7.72.4 *se lances ferat et scyphos avorum* with Vioque; also see 4.39; 8.6; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6 with Coleman 1988: 175). Therefore the antique dealer presents the lawyer with an engraved work by the famed sculptor Phidias, an artist held in the
highest esteem. He created statues in gold, ivory, and bronze, and his works were greatly acclaimed and prized in antiquity, his most famous statue being that of Zeus constructed for the temple of Zeus at Olympia (cf. 9.24.2 with Henriksen). His creations are mentioned on nine occasions in Martial, most pertinently at 10.89 (also cf. 3.35.1 Phidiceae toreuma clarum 4.39.1 solus Phidicai toreuma caeli; 6.13.1 with Grewing; 73; 7.56.3 with Vioque; 9.24.2 with Henriksen; 44.6; for the adjectival form Phidiacus which is first used by Prop. at 3.9.15; cf. Mart. 3.35.1; 4.39.4; 6.13.1; 73.8 7.56.3 with Vioque; 9.25.4; 10.89.2; also Ov. Pont 4.1.32; Stat. Silv. 2.2.66; 5.1.15; Juv. 8.103).

venator leporem, colonus haedum,
piscator ferat aequorum rapinas.

The list of gifts continues with food items. Firstly, the hunter presents a hare, a popular dish and frequently regarded as a delicacy (cf. 10.37.16; 7.78.3; 13.92 with Leary; Petr. 36.2; Juv. 11.138). Secondly, the farmer presents a kid, which, although not necessarily a luxury item, is common fare at the Roman table (cf. 10.48.14 where it is the main course of a modern meal; Leary on 13.39; also 3.58.37). Finally, the fisherman brings seafood, although its nature is unspecified (cf. 10.37.5-11; on seafood also see 13.79-91 with Leary).

si mittit sua quisque, quid poetam
missurum tibi, Restitute, credis?

If each individual sends a gift symbolising his or her occupation, then the point of Martial’s gift becomes apparent. These final lines reveal that the poem itself is the
poet's own gift to Restitutus (see above). Thus, Martial ends by addressing the poem's intended recipient, although it begins with the address to Roma.

10.88

The meaning of this poem is unclear. It seems to mock Cotta, as a *pragmaticus* or legal note taker, whose task is to copy out all the documents of the praetors. In return he receives *cerae* or wax tablets or notebooks, which are a poor exchange for his extensive labour (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 288). An alternative interpretation is given by Salanitro, who places *accipis et ceras* as a continuation of the first sentence to suggest the meaning that not only does Cotta take down all the notes but he also takes the waxed tablets as extenuation of his rigorous duties as legal note taker and adviser (Salanitro 1994: 92-3). The joke depends upon *officiosus*, which refers to his excessive zealousness towards the performance of his duties. This produces a weaker punchline, and Shackleton Bailey's reading, which associates the poem with the receiving of humble presents in contrast with the previous poem, seems preferable (SB2 2: 405).

The *pragmaticus* represents the humblest positions in the legal profession (cf. Bowie on 12.72.5). Therefore it is perhaps appropriate that this couplet follows a lengthy poem celebrating Restitutus, who is clearly a renowned and respected lawyer. The mischievous juxtaposition is perhaps emphasised in the presentation of wax tablets as Cotta's reward, which echoes the Saturnalian gift of wax tapers mentioned in the previous poem, derided as a worthless present.

Omnes persequeris praetorum, Cotta, libellos; accipis et ceras. officiosus homo es.

Cotta is a *pragmaticus* whose duties were to give legal advice to advocates and perhaps copy down legal documents at dictation (cf. 12.72.5 *frumentum, milium tisanamaque fabamque solebas* / *vendere pragmaticus, nunc emis agricola* with Bowie; Juv. 7.122ff. with Mayor; *Digesta* 2.13.1.1 *edere est etiam copiam describendi facere: vel in libello complecti et dare: vel dictare*). The phrase *omnes ...praetorum...libellos* perhaps denotes the public notices of trials held before the praetors.

This is the final appearance of the fictional Cotta in Book 10, although it does not mean that each poem refers to the same individual (cf. 10.14 and 49; also 1.9 for a similar type of poem: *bellus homo et magnus vis idem, Cotta, videri:/ sed qui bellus homo est, Cotta, pusillus homo est*; see Howell; 1.23; 12.87).


If Shackleton Bailey’s interpretation is correct then it would appear that despite all the painstaking work that Cotta performs in taking down the documents for the praetors, all he receives in return are wax tablets (*cera* as writing tablets coated with wax cf. 14.4.2).

*officiosus* contemptuously conveys the sense of one who is always prepared to fulfil the obligations of a friend, or one who is dutiful or attentive in the duties of a client (cf. 10.58.14; also 1.70.2; 5.22.13; 12 *praef.* 4; Salanitro 1994: 92-3).
10.89

Martial praises a statue of Juno by the sculptor Polyclitus, which is so beautiful and lifelike that the king of the gods, Jupiter, would have fallen in love with it even more than the original Juno, to whom he was not only married but also related as her brother. The poem draws upon the famous mythological account of the judgement of Paris, selected to present the golden apple to the fairest of the goddesses, Minerva, Venus and Juno, of whom he selects Venus. This statue surpasses not only Minerva and Venus in looks and beauty, but also the real Juno. Such sentiments describing statues and portraits as more lifelike than the genuine article are common (cf. 3.35 and 40 on the representation of fishes and lizards; 8.50.10; see also Salanitro 2000: 271ff.). Similarly, people and statues are often compared to deities or immortals and described as superior to them (cf. 10.66 with Theopompus whose beauty is comparable with Ganymede; also 6.13 which reverses this idea that Julia is like a statue of Phidias or a painting by Pallas).

The poem is addressed to Polyclitus, a famous engraver and sculptor of the 5th century BCE who appears on two other occasions in Martial (8.50.2; 9.59.12 with Henriksen). Other sculptors mentioned in Martial include Phidias, Myron, Mentor, Praxiteles and Scopas (4.39; 8.50). Here the statue of Juno is elevated to one of which Phidias himself would be proud to claim ownership, a mark of high praise, as Phidias is continually represented in Martial as the apex of sculpting artistry (cf. 9.59).

Although there are no apparent thematic connections with the previous poems, there is still a verbal link with 10.87 in the reference to the craftsman Phidias. The beauty of this statue which will continue for as long as the statue remains, and it
contrasts with the following poem, which attacks an old woman in her attempts at youthful beauty.

Also see Salanitro 2000: 271-3.

_Iuno labor, Polyclite, tuus et gloria felix,
Phidiciacae c覆erent quam meruisse manus,_

*labour* is common metonymy to denote a work of art by metonymy (cf. 9.44.2 with Henriksén _opus laborque felix_ cf. 8.53.13 _gloria felix_; also 4.39.5; 8.50.1; Ov. _Pont._ 4.1.29; _TLL_ 2.794.31ff.). *felix* here conveys the notion of something beautiful to look at (cf. 9.17.6 with Henriksén; Hor. _Carm._ 4.13.21; Stat. _Silv._ 5.1.54). Here it refers to the statue of Juno sculpted by Phidias.

The engraver, Polyclitus, was a sculptor of the 5th Century, whose most famous works were the Doryphoros and Diadumenos. He is also addressed at 8.50 in praise of a bowl, to the effect that it should have been one of his creations (8.50.2 _Mentoris haec manus est an, Polyclite, tua_?). At 9.59.12, his works appear again on sale at the Saepta Iulia, implying that his works were highly sought after and valuable (cf. 9.59 with Henriksén). Here, his statue is reckoned to be as good as one by Phidias (cf. 9.44.6; 6.13 with Grewing). The pair again appear in Juv. 8.103-4 _Phidiacum vivebat ebur, nec non Polycliti/ multus ubique labor_ (see Colton 1991: 332-3).

_ore nitet tanto quanto superasset in Ide
divce coniunctas non dubitante deas._

A similar sentiment is conveyed at 6.13 where Martial describes the shining beauty of Julia's sculpture as lifelike in appearance (cf. 6.13.4 _et placido fulget vivus in ore decor_).
The beauty of Juno’s statue is such that had it been among the goddesses in the Judgement of Paris on Mount Ida (Verg. A. 1.27), it would have been deemed as more attractive than even the real Juno (cf. Ov. Ars 1.248 vincis utramque, Venus). Paris’ description as iudex is a commonplace (cf. Hom. Il. 24.27-30; Verg. A. 1.27 iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae; Ov. Ars 1.248; Petr. 138.6.3 ipse Paris, dearum litigantium iudex).

The term convictas seems a strong term in this context, as it suggests that the goddesses are ‘convicted of a vice or fault’ or ‘refuted’ thus of their claims to beauty, as the actual statue would have surpassed all (cf. OLD s.v. convinco; Post: 269). In Homer’s account of the Judgement of Paris the term νείκεος is applied, which similarly denotes the sense of ‘find fault with’ (Il. 24.27-30). Shackleton Bailey amends the usual rendering of convictas deas to coniunctas from the s text, to convey the idea of goddesses akin to or closely associated with Juno, with the reasoning that the goddesses are convicted of no actual crime (SB1: 350).

Iunonem, Polyclite, suam nisi frater amaret,
Iunonem poterat frater amare tuam.

Here the joke rests on the relationship between Jupiter as husband and wife and also as brother and sister. This is emphasised by the repetition of Iunonem, frater, and amare (Verg. A. 1.46 regina iouisque et soror et coniunx). This plays on the idea of there being two Junos, each the sister of Jupiter; one is the goddess, the other the statue. If Jupiter as Juno’s brother did not love Juno as his wife, then he would have loved the statue even more, as it is more beautiful than the real goddess (cf. 10.35 where Sulpicia is preferred in comparison with Juno; for comparisons between a work...
of art to the real life person or object cf. 109.18-23 with Howell; 3.40; 7.84; 11.9; AP 11.212-15; 233; 250). This reference to Jupiter may also suggest the famed statue by Phidias of Zeus at Olympia, as a pair for Juno's statue.

In this epigram, Martial ridicules the elderly Ligeia for her efforts to appear sexually attractive by depilating her genitalia in anticipation of sexual fulfilment. Her sexual desires are repellent and such practices should be confined to young wives. For this reason, she is told to behave more like the mother of Hector rather than his wife, Andromache.

Invective against old women is a conventional theme in Roman satire, especially the prospect of their sexual desires. It recurs throughout Martial (cf. 1.19; 64; 72.3-6; 2.34; 3.32; 76; 93; 4.20; 5.43; 6.12; 93; 7.35; 58; 75; 11.97; cf. 10.39; 67; Richlin 1983: 67ff.; 1992: 109-16). Here, the repulsiveness of the old woman, Ligeia, extends to her depilated genitalia. Female genitalia are generally presented with negative connotations in Roman satire, especially of those related to old age (Mart. 2.34; 3.93; Priap. 12; 46; 57; Richlin 1992: 233 n.11). Elsewhere in Martial, they are criticised for being bony (3.93.13; 11.100.4), white haired (2.34.3; 9.37.7) and noisy (7.18). Although animal invective is not common in Latin literature, it is generally used for invective against women, especially where it is concerned with a specific part of a woman's body (Mart. 3.93; 11.21; Hor. Ep. 8.5-6; 12; Priap. 46.10; Richlin 1983: 70-1). A milder form can be found at 10.67, which refers to Plutia having outlived crows, which are proverbially long-lived. Here Ligeia's crotch is viciously likened to the beard of a dead lion.
Hair, its abundance or lack of, is a recurring motif in this section of Book 10, and frequently establishes the age of the subject. For example, 10.83 mocks the baldness of Marinus who also attempts to appear younger by combing over the hair on the sides to hide his bald pate (cf. also the bald Melanthio at 10.67). Martial refers to himself at 10.65 as a hairy Spaniard, in contrast with the effeminate Charmenion who depilates his cheeks daily.

The theme of lascivious old women resumes from 10.67, where Plutia itches with sexual desire in the tomb (cf. also 10.39). The vivid description of her ugliness and age, despite her attempts, contrasts with the description of Juno's statue in the previous poem, whose looks surpass even the goddess herself. Such a statue also will remain ageless. The practice of depilation for sexual allure should be confined to young wives for sex with their husbands, an extension of the notion of univira conveyed in earlier epigrams (e.g. 10.35). This motif is complemented by the 10.91 on the subject of Polla's adultery with eunuchs. O'Connor notes that the motif of the mentula unwilling to become erect for Ligeia's cunnus is echoed in the following two poems, 10.91 which reveals the impotent Almo, then, by way of contrast, the garden statue of the virile Priapus in Martial's Nomentan estate in 10.92 (O'Connor 1998: 199).


Quid vellis vetulum, Ligeia, cunnun?

Ligeia is not a common name and does not appear elsewhere in literature other than another of Martial's epigrams (12.7). This epigram also makes fun of her age, which is ironically denoted by the lack of hair on her head (12.7 toto vertice quot gerit
capillos/ annos si tot habet Ligeia, trima est). It is perhaps derived from Ligea ('clear-voiced'), who is one of the wood nymphs mentioned by Vergil (G. 4.336 with Thomas 1988: 208; cf. Lycophron Alex. 726 where she appears as a siren). It is likely that the name is used for its association with Greek or servile origins (cf. Bowie on 12.7.2).

Depilation is generally regarded with contempt in Martial as a practice appropriate for effeminates (2.62; 6.56; 3.74; 12.32.21-2; cf. 10.65). The depilation of the cunnus was practised by prostitutes, and in 9.29 Martial refers to its counterpart for male prostitutes (9.27.3 et prostitutis levius caput culis; Henderson 1975: 220; also Kilmer 1982: 104-12).

cunnus is the common term for the female genitalia, the equivalent to mentula (Priap. 29, Adams 1982: 80-1; TLL 4.1410.5-31). Labelled offensive by Cicero (Fam. 9.22; Orat. 145), it is not common in Catullus (once) or Horace (three times), but is commonplace in graffiti and epigrams. It occurs on thirty-one occasions throughout Martial with the exceptions of Books 5, 8, 13 and 14. Its prominence in the opening line seems intended for shock value (cf. 10.63.8 where Martial uses mentula in a similar manner). The hideous appearance of an old woman's cunnus is mentioned on numerous occasions in Martial especially in the context of her sexual desire (cf. 2.34.3 praestatur cano tanta indulgentia cunno; 3.93.27 intrare in istum sola fax potest cunnun; 9.37.7-8 et te nulla movet cani reverentia cunni, /quem potes inter avos iam numerare tuos).
quid busti cines tui lacessis?
tales munditiae decent puellas;
at tu iam nec anus potes videri.

The old woman is likened to a corpse, a common comparison in invective against old women. They are sometimes depicted as relics or tombs (cf. 10.67; also 3.32.1; Hor. Epod. 8; Priap. 57.1 also Richlin 1983: 71; 1992: 114). Although this is its only appearance in Martial, munditia is a common term in Roman literature and one used to denote feminine grooming and immaculate appearance (cf. N-H on Hor. Carm.1.5.5 for further examples). In line 4, Shackleton Bailey amends nam to the more sensible rendering at (Shackleton Bailey 1989: 144).

istud, crede mihi, Ligeia, belle non mater facit Hectoris, sed uxor.

Mythological figures are frequently used in these kinds of poems to convey extreme old age (cf. 10.39; 67). Here Ligeia is told that such behaviour is appropriate to Hector's wife Andromache, and not his mother Hecuba (for contrasts in behaviour between old women or mothers and young wives cf. 11.23.14 nec quasi nupta dabis sed quasi mater anus; also 8.79; Priapus 57.7-8). Similarly, at 3.32, Hecuba appears as the archetype of the old woman who is sexually unappealing, and is again contrasted with Andromache at 3.67 (cf. 3.76.4 cum possis Hecaben, non potes Andromachen). Williams notes that Andromache is frequently presented in Roman literature as the paradigm of the anti-erotic (cf. Ov. Ars 3.109-12; 577; 522; Rem. 383-6; Williams on 2.41.14).
erras si tibi cunnus hic videtur,
ad quern mentula pertinere desit.

Despite her efforts and sexual lust, the *mentula* remains at a distance because of her age and ugliness, and thus Martial rebukes her for her care of her genitalia (also cf. 3.93.27 *intrare in istum sola fax potest cunnum*). Female genitalia do not receive favourable treatment in Roman literature and are frequently presented as an area repulsive and threatening to the phallus (e.g. *Priap.* 26-37; further see Richlin 1982: 72-4, 1992: 115-16). For the term *mentula* cf. 10.63.8.

quare, si pudor est, Ligeia, noli,
barbam vellere mortuo leoni.

Ligeia's genitalia are likened to a dead lion, which again demonstrates the link between old age and death (10.67; also see above). The image of the dead lion also conveys the idea that her genitalia once ferocious and powerful, which devour its prey with gaping jaws (1.6.4; 22.1; 60.1), are now lifeless and so are foul, stinking and decaying (cf. 6.93.3 where Thais is described as smelling worse than the jaws of a lion; also 4.20.4; *Hor. Epod.* 8.1.7; *Priap.* 57.2; Richlin 1982: 71).

Such behaviour demonstrates a lack of *pudor*, a characteristic admired in women and illustrated by various examples of *matronae* such as Sulpicia (e.g. 10.35; 38; also 33). Ligeia's conduct corresponds with that exhibited by a number of women throughout this volume in contrast with such modesty and virtue (e.g. 10.67; 68; 75; 81; 91). The poet demands that Ligeia exhibit *pudor* and not continue with such shameful behaviour, but act in a manner appropriate to an old woman. The expression *si pudor est* is a common means in Latin literature of stirring someone into
10.90

action (2.37.10 with Williams; 2.93.2; 3.74.5; 87.4; 7.95.16 with Vioque; Juv. 3.153-4; Stat. Theb. 10.710; Verg. Ecl. 7.44; Ov. Am. 3.2.24).

10.91

In this epigram, there are two reasons Polla fails to produce children: her husband Almo keeps a household full of eunuchs; and he himself is impotent. This is the final poem of three mentioning Polla, all of which are concerned with the subject of marriage and sexual misconduct (cf. 10.40; 69).

Impotence is a stock literary theme and is generally associated with old age, but sometimes, as in this situation, it extends to the inability to produce children (cf. 9.66; on impotence in general see 2.45; 3.70; 73; 75; 11.46 with Kay; 12.86; Sullivan 1991: 167). This motif is combined with the subjects of adultery and women who associate with eunuchs, themes which relate this poem to the other two poems on Polla in Book 10. Throughout the epigrams, Martial refers humorously to women who desire the company of eunuchs for sexual purposes (cf. 10.40). For example, Marulla of 6.39 has children from several adulterous relationships, and would have had more but for the following reason: *si spado Coresus Dindymusque non esset* (6.39.21). A similar sentiment occurs at 6.67 with Caelia, who wants sex without the risk of pregnancy:

*Cur tantum eunuchos habeat tua Caelia quaeris,*  
*Pannyche? vult futui Caelia non parere.*

Although it may not necessarily refer to the same woman, 10.91 echoes Polla’s penchant for *cinaedi* at 10.40. These themes recur at 10.95 where the paternity of Galla’s baby is disputed by both her husband and lover; then at 10.102, where
Philinus produces children without having sex because they are fathered by someone else. O'Connor suggests that this poem may be a final dig at Domitian's moral legislation which banned the castration of eunuchs (O'Connor 1998: 199; on Domitian and eunuchs cf. 6.2 with Grewing; Sullivan 1991: 39-40).

*Omnes eunuchos habet Almo nec arrigit ipse: et queritur pariat quod sua Polla nihil.*

Martial uses the term *eunuchus* on only four other occasions (3.58.32; 82.15; 6.67.1 with Grewing; 8.44.15), and on the whole prefers the term *cinaedus* (cf. 10.40; also *spado* 10.52.1). This is the only occasion in which Almo appears as a person's name in Martial, but the river Almo in the Roman Campagna was where the priests of Cybele (eunuchs) washed the statue of the goddess and her sacred implements (cf. 3.47.2 with George; also cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.339, SB\(^2\) 1: 233). This association is perhaps reflected in Almo's household of eunuchs. Almo's impotence is referred to by the verb *arrigo*, commonly used to denote erection or the inability to become erect (cf. 3.70.4; 75;76; 4.5.6; 6.26; 6.36.2; 9.66.2; 11.46.1).

10.92

The poet entrusts his Nomentum estate to a certain Marrius or Marius, an action which symbolises his imminent departure from Rome. Martial requests that Marrius maintain the rituals and sacrifices due to the deities whose shrines are on his estate. The body of the poem lists the shrines belonging to the specific gods, which are mainly typical of rural and agricultural areas and include Diana, Silvanus, Faunus, Flora, and Priapus but also Jupiter in his role as Thunderer. Although he himself will
be absent, Martial expresses the wish that these rites were maintained as if he were present, with the result that the gods grant to both of them their wishes.

Although Martial has mentioned his Nomentum farm on a number of occasions in his book, this is the most detailed description of its landscape (2.38, 6.43, 7.93, 10.44). At 10.78 he formally announces his intention to leave Rome for his homeland Spain and this is again reiterated in 10.93. At this point of this book, his preparation for his departure includes the disposal of possessions tying him to Rome. This subject returns again at 10.96, which contrasts his life at Rome with the prospect of country living in Spain, and which builds up to the final two poems of the book describing his departure. In Book 12 Martial reminisces over his Nomentum farm, which acted as a retreat from Rome (12.57).

Although it is not established whether Marrius has actually bought the farm or Martial has simply entrusted it to his care, the poet treats Marrius as a close personal friend, upon whom he entrusts the performance of religious duties as if he himself were still present. This sentiment is similarly conveyed at 10.61, where the poet requests that the subsequent owner care for the upkeep of the slave-girl Erotion’s tomb and in return will live a long prosperous life. Here the upkeep is elaborated to include that to the shrines of gods on the estate, but both specify the continuation of duties on the farm, despite Martial’s permanent absence. The nostalgic tone of the poem, appropriate in the context of the poet’s departure, appears in contrast with the humorous subject matter of the previous group of poems on a sexual theme, and begins the progression towards the Book’s conclusion. There is a connection between the previous poem on the subject of infertility, and this poem which refers to Priapus, the fertility god, whose attribute was an enormous phallus.
Additionally, the pleasant rustic themes are combined with images of bloodshed and violence (Lines 4, 7, 12, and 14), such as altars painted with the blood of sacrificial animals and the god Priapus in pursuit of Flora. These serve to undercut the sentimental tone of the poem, thereby producing a 'wry, parodic, and unsettling' effect, which is heightened by its placement after 10.90 and 91 (O'Connor, 1998: 199). Martial’s pride in his Nomentan estate is undermined by his complaint at 10.58 that the property consumes more than it yields. This idea is continued in 10.94 where the poet declares that the apples from his orchard at Nomentum are of such low quality that he sends fruits bought from the Subura.


*Marri, quietae cultor et comes vitae,*  
*quo cive prisca gloriatur Atina,*

The poem begins with a tone of praise and reverence towards Marrius which suggests a close personal friendship between the two (for a similar opening line cf. 10.37.1; 104.1). Although *comes* is sometimes used in the context of *amicitia*, it is not usually used as a synonym for *amicus*. It is more frequently applied to someone accompanying someone in his travels (e.g. 10.104.1; 2.24.4; 7.2.7; 44.5; White 1978: 80 n.20). Here it conveys the sense of an intimate and continuous companionship which will continue in essence if not in actuality after Martial’s departure, a sentiment expressed in the final lines of the poem. Marrius, like Martial, is able to appreciate the quiet manner of living which the estate at Nomentum offers. This is in keeping with the contrast between city and rural living; for example in 10.30.3 the city life of
Rome produces inquieta curas (10.30.3) in contrast with the mens quieta of country life (10.47.5).

The name Marrius is not mentioned anywhere else in Martial, and is not common in literature (Sil. 8.505). In the textual tradition, the form Marrius is favoured in manuscripts $\beta$ and $\gamma$ (cf. SB$: 351), although some texts follow manuscript Q and replace it with the more common form Marius (e.g. Friedlaender on 10.92). Both forms appear in Spanish inscriptions (cf. SB$: 351). Nothing is known of this particular person except in this present poem. Although the form Marius appears on other occasions in Martial, the context is generally for satirical or comical situations, and apparently depicts a fictitious character (cf. 10.18(19); 1.85; 2.76; 3.28; 7.87; see Jenkins ad loc.).

The only information given about Marrius is that he comes from Atina, an ancient Volscian city in the south-east of Latium (Verg. A. 7.630; Sil. 8.396; RE 2.2104.49ff.; see Jenkins ad loc.). He is praised for his achievements at Rome, which cause him to be famous in his own hometown, a common characteristic of small communities (e.g. 1.61.11 te, Licinane, gloriabitur nostro/ nec me tacebit Bilbilis with Citroni and Howell; also cf. 10.103 on the poet’s own fame in Bilbilis).

has tibi gemellas barbari decus luci
commendo pinus ilicesque Faunorum

The poem now lists the deities for whom Marrius is obliged to perform the duties of rites and sacrifices, and maintenance of their shrines on the estate, combined with a depiction of the rustic Italian landscape of pines and holm-oaks (on pinus cf. Verg. Ecl. 7.65; RE 20.2.1708.48ff.; for ilices see Ov. Fast. 2.165; RE 5.2042.22; Jenkins ad
10.92

loc.). Each shrine is introduced by a vivid description before its owner is identified (see Jenkins ad loc.).

Faunus is a god of Italian lineage, and one of the foremost rustic deities associated with the countryside, woods and flocks. The plural form is commonly used in poetry possibly because of the Greek use of plural with respect to such figures (cf. 8.49.4; 9.61.11; cf; Verg. Ecl. 6.27; Stat. Silv. 1.3.99; RE 6.2060; cf. Mart. 9.61.11 with Henriksen; Hor. Carm. 1.17.2 with N-H; Jenkins ad loc.).

et semidocta vilici manu structas
Tonantis aras horridique Silvani,
quas pinxit agni saepe sanguis aut haedi,

The next shrines are built by the overseer of the estate, who is described as semidocta, a term which occurs on only seven other occasions in Roman literature (Pl. As. 227; Cicero de Orat. 2.178; Front. Amic. 4.3.1; 4.3.3; Gel. 1.7.17; 15.9.6; 16.7.14; cf. Prop. 5.1.6 nec fuit opprobrio facta sino arte casa). Here it enhances the image of rustic simplicity (cf. 6.73.1 non rudis indocta fecit me falce colonus; for doctus cf. 10.20 (19.1)).

The first is a shrine of Jupiter in his form as Tonans, which Jenkins notes is appropriate to a rural setting in his poems (also cf. 10.20 (19). Silvanus is another rural deity frequently associated with Faunus, who wore a crown of pine cones and was traditionally depicted with shaggy hair and beard; hence the epithet horridi (cf. Hor. Carm. 3.29.23 with Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 354; Verg. A. 8.348).

Care for these shrines involved the sacrificial offering of sheep or kids in return for the god's protection over the estate (cf. Hor. Carm. 3.18.5 si tener pleno cadit haedus anno with Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 223; also cf. Ov. Fast. 3.300). This
vivid image of the altar painted with blood contrasts with the normal tranquillity of the countryside and adds a touch of reality to the poem (also see above).

dominamque sancti virginem deam templi,
et quem sororis hospitem vides castae Martem, mearum principem Kalendarum,

The next shrine belongs to Diana, whose role as mistress of hunting ensures her a shrine on a country estate. She is here identified by her status as virgin goddess. Her shrine, referred to by the grandiose term tempium, is shared by Mars, honoured for his association with Martial’s birth month, March (cf. 10.24).

et delicatae laureum nemus Florae,
in quod Priapo persequente confugit.

Flora was an ancient Italian rural goddess of flowers and all growing things, and hence associated with fertility. Her Festival, the Floralia, was celebrated between April 28 until May 3 (1 praef. 15 with Howell; Ov. Fast. 4.943ff.; RE 6.2759ff.). Priapus was a fertility deity distinguished for his exceptionally large phallus. His statue was a popular figure in gardens both as guardian and scarecrow (cf. 3.58.47; also see Williams 1999: Index s.v. Priapus). The depiction of Flora fleeing the figure of Priapus recalls the description of Priapus’ attempt to assault Lotis in Ovid (Fast. 1.391-440; Met. 9.347 Lotis in hanc nympha, fugiens obscena Priapi; also Theoc. Epig. 31; Ov. Met. 14.673-6; also see Richlin 1992: 121-2). This rather disturbing scene of attempted rape, depicted even in statues supplements the notions of violence and bloodshed brought about in rural life.
hoc omne agelli mite parvuli numen
seu tu cruore sive ture placabis;

Martial frequently refers to his farm in the diminutive, which here evokes his affection for the modest dwelling (7.31.8 with Vioque; 91.1; 93.5; 12.25; also cf. 10.61.3 on *agelli*). Marrius is expected to perform rituals for all these deities on the property. As well as the sacrifice of animals (see above), these rites also included the burning of incense, employed even in the simplest of sacrifices to placate the gods (cf. 9.1.6 *dum voce supplex dumque ture placabit* and 9.90.16 *et cum ture meroque victimaque* with Henriksen’s notes; also Hor. *Carm.* 3.18.7-8 with Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 223-4).

‘ubicumque vester Martialis est’, dices,
‘hac ecce mecum dextera litat vobis
absens sacerdos; vos putate praeuentem
et date duobus quidquid alter optabit.’

Despite his absence, Martial requests continued protection from these deities as if he were present (*absens sacerdos*) in the sacrifices performed by Marrius as the new proprietor in charge of the estate. Such sacrifices were performed with the right hand in keeping with the notion of the right side as the conveyer of good omens, as opposed to the left (cf. *TLL* 5.1.919.68ff.; also Mart. 9.61.7 *dextera felix*). Martial bids Marrius to request that if these sacrifices are duly performed then the gods shall grant the wishes of both men (for similar sentiments cf. 10.61.3; also 7.96.7-8 *sic ad Lethaeas, nisi Nestore serior, undas/ non eat, optabis quem superesse tibi*).
Martial refers to a collection of poems not yet published but which he is sending with Clemens to bring to his wife Sabina in Ateste, near Patavium in the north-east of Italy. This accompanying poem emphasises the compliment implicit in his sending these poems in advance of their publication. It is most likely that the collection of poems which Martial is presenting to Sabina is Book 10, or at least a selection of poems which are on the verge of public distribution, a fact denoted by the recent addition of the purple covering that accompanies a published book. Similarly, at 4.10, Martial sends his book newly published to Faustinus even while the pages are still damp. Sending an advance copy to a friend who is leaving Rome reduced the risk of circulation in Rome prior to publication and other writers copying his poems (Nauta 2002: 130; for plagiarism of Martial’s unpublished works cf. 1.29 with Howell; also 1.66; 117). Similarly, at 8.72, Martial sends with Arcanus en route to Narbo a collection of poems not yet prepared for publication, as it is still without the purple cover or polished with dry pumice. There are many other occasions where the poet sends a book of poems to patrons in another town (for example at 3.5 to Iulius Martialis where his wife will receive the book for her husband; at 4.10 the poet sends a boy with a newly published book to Faustinus; at 7.80 the book is carried by Faustinus for Marcellinus in Dacia; at 12.2, Martial sends the book to Rome; cf. Nauta 2002: 130-1).

Sabina is one of several friends or patrons who receive gifts of Martial’s poetry in Book 10 (cf. 10.18 (17) for Macer; 20 (19) for Pliny; 64 to Argentaria Polla; 87 to Restitutus). The motif of Martial’s material being sent on a journey to its intended recipient accompanied by an intermediary who is also the poem’s addressee
10.93

is a familiar idea in Martial, most recently presented at 10.20 (19) where Martial sends his muse Thalia with a collection of poems for Pliny. In 10.93, however, the description of the route taken and its reception is considerably abridged.

Martial specifically indicates that the selection he is presenting for Sabina has not yet been distributed for public consumption, which perhaps suggests that this poem either comes from the first edition of Book 10 or from new poems which were inserted into the newer edition. If the latter is the case, then it is possible that Martial is unable to present the poems to Sabina in person because of his journey to Spain. The donation of this collection of poems, as yet not published, and their departure with Clemens from Rome, symbolise the imminent finishing point of Book 10 itself and Martial’s departure from Rome (cf. 10.96). Clemens is leaving Rome before the poet, and the notion of sending the book not yet published before the poet’s departure foreshadows the final poem 10.104, where Martial sends his book (presumably now published) with Flavus to Spain.

For this poem see Nauta 2002: 130-1.

Si prior Euganeas, Clemens, Helicaonis oras
pictaque pampineis videris arva iugis,

Clemens is not mentioned elsewhere in Martial and nothing further is known of his identity except that his wife was named Sabina and they resided in Ateste, north-east of Italy (cf. PIR C 1135). The cognomen Clemens is very common, and is attested by over five hundred inscriptions of individuals bearing this name (Kajanto Cognomina: 263). Both names are presented at the beginning of the poem, which renders the dedication clear for the recipients, although in this case it is not useful in the
identification of either character. White notes around forty poems which employ this informal mode of presentation (White 1972: 56). The adjective *Euganeae* refers to the hills surrounding several cities in Venetia, such as Patavium, Verona and Altinum (cf. 4.25.4; 13.88 with Leary; Liv. 1.1.3; cf. Mayor on Juv. 8.15). Helicaon is metonymy for Patavium (modern Padua) in the north-east of Italy, the city founded by Antenor, Helicaeon’s father (cf. 14.152 *lodices mittet docti dibi terra Catulli/ nos Helicaonia de regione sumus* with Leary’s note on line 2; also Verg. A. 1.247; also metonymy for Patavium cf. Mart. 1.76.2 *Antenorei spes et alumne laris*).

Housman finds some difficulty with the expression of line 2, which he paraphrases as *agros pictos pampineis collibus; iugum* here refers to the crosspiece along which the vines were trained in a *vinea iugata* (Var. R. 1.8; Columella 4.17; 19; Plin. Nat. 17.164ff.; Housman CP 2: 730).

*perfer Atestinae nondum vulgata Sabinae carmina, purpurea sed modo culta toga.*

Sabina was presumably a prospective patron for Martial, although nothing else is known about her (*PIR S 7*). She is one from a group of women with literary interests mentioned in this book, such as Sulpicia and Argentaria Polla, widow of Lucan (cf. 10.35 and 38; 64). As with Clemens, there is no mention of Sabina on any other occasion in the epigrams. The name Sabina is one of the most popular names with geographical associations, and there is considerable epigraphical evidence of the *cognomen* in both male and female forms (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 186). Ateste is 18 miles south-west of Patavium (4.25.4; 1.67.2; Verg. A. 1.242; Liv. 1.1).
The *purpura culta toga* refers to the parchment case or *membrana* which enclosed the published roll ready for selling, and its purple covering suggests a luxury copy for the wealthier purchasers (*1.117.16 purpuraque cultum; 3.2.10 et te purpura delicata velet; 5.6.19 ullo purpureum petet libellum*). This purple wrapper has just been added as a compliment to the poet’s patron and can be contrasted with 8.72, where the wrapper has not yet been fitted (*8.72.1-2 nondum murice cultus asperoque/morsu pumicis aridi politus*).

*ut rosa delectat metitur quae pollice primo,\n   sic nova nec mento sordida charta iuvat.*

This new roll of papyrus as yet unopened is compared to an unplucked rose unsullied by human hands (*Verg. A. 11.68 qualem virgineo demessum pollice florem*). Once a work was read, it was rolled up again, with its beginning held under the chin and the rod to which the end was fixed in both hands so it rolled up evenly (cf. *1.66.8 quae trita duro non inhorruit mento* with Howell’s note; *AP 12.208*). Frequent reading of the work would therefore cause the material to become soiled through continual contact with the chin. The pristine condition of the newly published book as yet untouched enhances its value as a gift, and a similar sentiment occurs at 4.10 about a new book sent to Faustinus (*4.10.1-2 dum novus est nec adhuc rara mihi fronte libellus, / pagina dum tangi non bene sicca timet*). Shackleton Bailey notes that the literal meaning of *pollice primo*, ‘plucked by the first thumb’, is a careless expression to describe the freshly picked flower (*SB² 2: 411*). This poetic turn of phrase does not appear elsewhere and most likely is chosen for metrical purposes.
In this epigram, Martial sends an unidentified friend a gift of apples. They do not come from his Nomentum estate, whose apples are so terrible that there is no threat of thieves. Instead, they are sent from his greengrocer's on the Subura. The irony of buying produce from the city markets rather than one's own farm is not an uncommon motif in Martial. For example, 3.47 depicts the reversed image of Bassus en route from Rome to his country estate accompanied by provisions normally produced on a farm (cf. 3.58.45-51; 13.12). Martial complains on several occasions in his poetry of produce from his estate at Nomentum that is unsatisfactory and of low quality (cf. 7.31; 9.54; 11.18; cf. 10.58.8-9).

The positioning of this poem is deliberately provocative, as it soon follows the sentimental picture of his estate at 10.92, where it is entrusted to Marrius. It reflects the poet's attitudes towards city and rural life, and criticism of his estate near Rome with its pitiful harvest complements 10.96 where he announces that he is heading for Spain where the land produces crops in abundance.

Non mea Massylus servat pomaria serpens,
regius Alcinoi nec mihi servit ager,
sed Nomentana securus germinat hortus
arbore, nec furem plumbea mala timent

Martial contrasts his farm with two mythological gardens to emphasise its pathetic output which has no need for a guard. The *Massylus serpens* refers to the dragon which guarded the apples of Hesperides (cf.13.37.2 aut haec Massyli poma draconis erant with Leary). The adjective *Massylus* refers to the people from Massyli in Numidia, but also can be used poetically to mean 'African' (cf. 8.53.1; 13.37.2 with
Leary; *OLD* s.v.). Secondly, Martial refers to Alcinous, king of the Phaeacians, proverbial for his wealth, hospitality, and bountiful orchard which never ran out of produce (4.64.29; 7.42.6 with Vioque; 8.68.1 *qui Corcyraei vidit pomaria regis*; 13.37.1 with Leary; also cf. Hom. *Od.* 7.117; Verg. *G.* 2.87; Prop. 1.14.24; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.56; Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.82; cf. Otto: 12; *RE* 1.1544-47). Note that the order of these two mythological examples parallels the description of his estate; firstly that it requires no guard, and, secondly, that the yield is meagre. His apples are described as *plumbea*, an adjective used to denote the leaden taste of bad wine at 10.49.5. For Martial’s estate at Nomentum cf. 10.44.

**haec igitur media quae sunt modo nata Subura**

**mittimus autumni cerea poma mei.**

The poet still sends apples, but from the market on the Subura (cf. 10.20.5). Similarly, cf. 7.31, where Martial reveals that he buys his produce from the Subura because his own estate yields little (7.31.12 *id tota mihi nascitur Subura*).

**10.95**

In this poem, not only does Galla’s husband deny that he is the father of her child, but her adulterous lover also denies paternity. The reason given is that neither had vaginal intercourse with her, the suggestion being that some other form of sexual contact took place, most likely *fellatio*. This could be interpreted in two ways, one being that she performs other forms of sexual intercourse with both her husband and lover, and hence they refute the child as theirs. Alternatively, this could be interpreted as saying that she and her husband have no sex because she has a lover, but her lover...
10.95

also sends the child back because they engage in other types of sex. Shackleton Bailey notes the similarity between this poem and 12.26 (27), which also refers to the denial of sexual intercourse:

\[
A \text{ latronibus esse te fututam} \\
\text{dicis, Saenia: sed negant latrones} \\
(\text{also cf. 3.96.1 lingis, non futuis meam puellam; SB}^2 \text{ 2: 411}).
\]

This poem continues themes from 10.91 where Polla does not produce children from the household of eunuchs and an impotent husband (also cf. 10.102.1-2).

\textbf{Infantem tibi vir, tibi, Galla, remisit adulter.} \\
\text{hi, puto, non dubie se futuisse negant.}

This is the second appearance of the name Galla in this book, again in the context of indecorous sexual behaviour as she offers her sexual services for free (cf. 10.75). Here both her husband and her lover deny paternity of the child (for poems on illegitimate children cf. 1.84; 6.39; 8.31; 10.102). The term \textit{negare} is frequently used in the context of sexual activity, and is commonly used in poems with Galla (cf. 10.75).

10.96

Martial informs Avitus he is leaving Rome for his hometown Bilbilis in Spain. He justifies his departure by a series of contrasts between Rome and Spain. The little Rome has to offer includes land which consumes more costs than it bestows, a small fire for warmth, inadequate supplies of food, poverty and the hardships endured by the client such as the upkeep of the uncomfortable toga that continually is made
10.96

threadbare. In contrast, Bilbilis provides fertile land, a blazing hearth, plentiful provisions, and comfortable and durable clothing.

This poem recalls the description given in 10.47 of the *vita beatior* symbolised by a life of tranquillity with sufficient amounts of food, a roaring fire, comfortable clothing; the essence, in fact, of pastoral living. Not only are there close verbal echoes between the two poems, but also the order of features of country living in Spain emulates that of 10.47. As such, in 10.96, Bilbilis epitomises the idyllic lifestyle to which Martial aspires at 10.47, and the poem wistfully represents the decisive factor in his retirement from Rome (Spisak 2002: 140). Although Martial has announced his intention to leave Rome in 10.78, 10.96 represents an integration of the parallel themes connected with the pastoral/urban contrasts throughout Book 10 (44; 47; 58; 70; 74; 78), such as his longing for Spain (13; 37; 78), and the hardships of the client in Rome (10; 11; 15; 17; 19; 29; 49; 57; 58; 70; 74; 76; 82; cf. Nauta 2002: 57, who identifies this as the third of a group of three poems in Book 10 where he explains or justifies his decision to leave for Spain, also 10.58; 70).

His eagerness for the abundant supplies of food in Spain and fertile land can also be contrasted with the description of the meagre produce yielded from his Nomentum estate (cf. 10.58.8-9; 94). 10.92 represents his farewell to this estate closely followed by his complaints in 94 of its poor quality produce.

In addition, Martial focuses on the wearing of the hated toga which represents the client in attendance upon his patron. Unlike in Rome, a comfortable tunic is all that is needed for daily use in Spain, and as such the expensive toga will last much longer as the wearisome duties of the client are not required. Martial’s contempt for the patron/client relationship is prominent throughout the book, and towards the latter
stages this theme reflects his own personal situation as a client in Rome, which leaves him little time for his composition (cf. 70; 74; 82). This contempt is ironically conveyed in the following poem which refers to the wealthy Numa recovering from his fatal illness because he had bequeathed his estate to the poet.


Saepe loquar nimium gentes quod, A vite, remotas
miraris, Latia factus in urbe senex,

An Avitus is addressed or mentioned in six epigrams throughout the corpus; however, it cannot be verified that they all refer to the same man (1.16; 6.84; 9 praeef.; 10.102; 12.24.9; 75). The Avitus of 1.16 is usually identified as Stertinius Avitus, consul suffect in 92 (cf. Syme 1958: 597 n.4; PIR 659). Although Citroni argues that all the poems refer to the same man (cf. Citroni on 1.16), others identify different characters based on the varying nature of their tone and context (White 1972: 56-7.; also Howell on 1.16; 9 praeef.; also cf. Nauta 2002: 41). White explains that Avitus in 10.96 is a fellow-client and that the tone is inconsistent with an address to a consular such as Stertinius (cf. also the ‘flippant tone’ of 6.84 and 12.24). Although Avitus is also mentioned at 10.102 in a poem of a sexual nature, his identity cannot be confirmed either way (also 12.25).

Martial mentions that he has become an old man in Rome, hence his retirement to his homeland. He conveyed a similar sentiment roughly ten years earlier in Book 1 (1.108.4 factus in hac ego sum iam regione senex with Howell’s note). Although at 1.108 his self-description as senex seems exaggerated, here Martial is now fifty-seven years of age and approaching the age of sixty when he can be
classified now as *senex* (cf. 1.108.4 with Howell’s note; also 10.23). This is echoed in 10.103 where he refers to his thirty-four years of life in Rome having changed the colour of his hair to grey.

auriferumque Tagum sitiam patriumque Salonem
  et repetam saturnae sordida rura casae.

Martial ironically refers to his thirst to see the rivers of his native homeland, the Tagus and the Salo. Formulaic vocabulary is employed to denote the prosperity of these Spanish rivers; the epithet *auriferus* here used for the Tagus, but is also applied to the Salo elsewhere (cf. 10.13.1 *ducit ad auriferas quod me Salo Celtiber oras*; 10.78.5). Here the Salo, as the river of Bilbilis, his birthplace, is more appropriately given the epithet *patrium* (cf. 10.13.2; compare 12.2.3-4 *auriferi de gente Tagi tetricique Salonis,/ dat patrios amnes quos mihi terra potens*).

To Martial, Spain represents the ideal of pastoral life depicted in the phrase *saturae sordida rura casae* (note the chiasmus). The term *sordida* is frequently used in a rustic context to denote ‘good clean dirt’ (cf. 1.49.28 with Howell; 55.4; 3.58.12; 98.8; 12.57.2; also Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.28; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.28 *sordida rura*). Additionally, the adjective *satura* is applied to the cottage to suggest it is stocked with substantial amounts of food (for *satur* cf. 10.48.18; 59.16). The term *casa* denotes the house of a humble man, and is often applied as a contrast with *aedes* (cf. 6.43.4; 11.34.2 with Kay; 12.66.4; 72.2; also cf. 10.13.8).
illa placet tellus in qua res parva beatum
me facit et tenues luxuriantur opes:

This section is strongly reminiscent of the poet’s depiction of the ideal lifestyle presented in 10.47. There are numerous verbal echoes, for example beatum with 10.47.1 vitam beatiorem. The expression res parva suggests rustic simplicity (cf. Hor. Carm. 2.17.37 parva rura with N-H), and parva is balanced by the use of tenuis to denote modest sufficiency (cf. 7.42.3 with Vioque; Hor. Carm. 2.17.38 with N-H). The juxtaposition of parva beatum and tenues luxuriantur opes conveys the notion that wealth and luxury can be fulfilled by a small but sufficient amount in accordance with the ideal way of life (cf. 10.57.3 res non parta labore, sed relicta).

pascitur hic, ibi pascit ager, tepet igne maligno
hic focus, ingenti lumine Iucet ibi;

The comparisons between Rome and Spain are denoted by hic and ibi respectively, emphasising Martial’s presence in Rome and his longing for Spain. In Spain, provisions are produced on one’s own farm, and thus the farm yields greater harvests; but land in Rome costs more to run than it actually produces. This is clearly intended to contrast with Martial’s Nomentum farm (cf. 10.58.9 dura suburbani dum iugera pascimus agri; 94).

In Rome, even the fire is malicious in its meagreness, as suggested by its description as malignus (for malignus, cf. 5.28.8; Verg. A. 6.270 per incertam lunam sub luce maligna; cf. Post: 271). In contrast, country living provides an abundance of firewood to produce a substantial fire (cf. 1.49.27 vicina in ipsum silva descendet focum with Howell’s note). These lines recall verbally 10.47.4 non ingratus ager, focus perennis.
hic pretiosa fama conturbatorque macellus,
mensa ibi divitiis ruris operta sui;

Martial refers to the high cost of living in Rome, where even a small but costly amount of food does not satisfy hunger (on the high cost of feeding one's slaves cf. Juv. 3.166-7 magno hospitium miserabile, magno/ servorum ventres, et frugi cenula magno; Colton 1991: 121). This image is completed by conturbatorque macellus, which suggests that the food markets make one bankrupt (similarly cf. Juv. 6.40 captatore macello with Colton 1991: 210). The term conturbator is an invention of Martial, and used again at 7.27 to describe a boar too large for his kitchen (7.27.10 conturbator aper). It is derived from the verb conturbare, which is not common in poetry and only used once in Martial (9.3.5; see Vioque on 7.27.10; TLL 4.807.28-30). The formation of such nouns from verbs is a common occurrence in Martial (e.g. 10.4.4 dormitor; 10.74.1 gratulatror).

The abundance of produce in Spain is expressed in terms of wealth, but prosperity in terms of modest sufficiency (cf. 10.47.6 convictus facilis, sine arte mensa).

quattor hic aestate togae pluresve teruntur,
autumnis ibi me quattor una tegit.

The toga symbolises the client's daily obligations to patrons. It was essential to keep it clean, but being white was easily soiled and hence required frequent washing; as a result it became shabby very quickly (cf. 9.49 with Henriksen's note on the toga given by Parthenius at 8.28; also cf. 10.10; 11;74; 82).

In Spain, because the toga is not appropriate for daily use, one will last four years; in Rome, the poet wears out four in a single summer. Similarly at 4.66 Martial
envies Linus his provincial life where his expensive garments last ten years (4.66.3-4
Idibus et raris togula est excussa Kalendis /duxit et aestates synthesis una decem). The toga rara is also represents the notion of ideal living in 10.47 (cf. 10.47.5).

In contrast with the poet's departure for this pleasant lifestyle, Avitus is sent on his way to perform the unrewarding duties of a client. The very soil of Spain provides all that a single friend does not in this relationship between patron and client, recalling perhaps the contrasts between genuine friendships such as that with Martial's Spanish friend Manius (10.13(20)) and relationships based on unequal terms (amicus cf. 10.11.5; cf. the language of amicitia in praestare at 10.11.3, and colo at 10.58.5). Avitus' patrons are scornfully referred to as reges, a common term in this context (cf. 10.10.5, Nauta 2002: 16-17). This term also suggests Rome as a source of oppression and slavery for her citizens, a theme that is prominent in this book (cf. 10.12; also 82.6-7).

In expectation of Numa's death, his wife tearfully makes the preparations for his impending funeral. These arrangements include the building of the funeral pyre, the purchase of perfumes to be burnt with the body, the grave in which the ashes were placed, and appointing the undertaker. The final stage involves the writing of Numa's will in which the poet is named as his heir. This has the consequence that Numa
10.97


The practice of captatio is a common subject for Roman satire, especially in terms of greed and ways in which the prospective heir will ingratiate himself in order to benefit from the inheritance (Hor. S. 2.5; Pers. 5.73; Juv. 1.37-41; 6.40; 12.2-3; 12.93; Tracy 1980: 399ff.; Champlin 1991: 87ff.). The subject of wills or inheritance is reasonably common in Martial, particularly in the context of legacy-hunting or captatio (SB 3: Index s.v. Money; cf. 3.10; 4.70; 5.32 quadrantem Crispus tabulis, Faustine, supremis/ non dedit uxori. 'cui dedit ergo?' sibi; 7.66 with Vioque; 9.8 with Henriksén). This poem is similar to those in which the targets of captatores encourage the attention of legacy hunters without any intention of including them in their wills (2.40; 5.39; 9.48; 12.40; 73). As such, they feign illness to ensure that these legacy hunters shower them with gifts and attention (2.40 on Tongilius; 5.39; 12.90; Juv. 12.93-8; Pers. 2.8-9; Plin. Nat. 20.57; similarly Lucian Dial. Mort. 354 (16.6), where Thucritus pretends to be near death; Tracy 1980: 401-2; Mans 1994: 108-9). Here Martial himself is represented as the captator who has been named Numa's heir, and this device occurs on other occasions when a wealthier individual promises to leave the speaker a fortune in his will (cf. 9.48.1-2 heredem cum me partis tibi, Garrice, quartae /per tua iurares sacra capitque tuum; 12.73 heredem tibi me, Catulle, dicis. /non credo nisi legero, Catulle).

Dum levis arsura struitur Libitina papyro, 
dum murrum et casias flebilis uxor emit, 
iam scrobe, iam lecto, iam pollinctore parato, 
heredem scripsit me Numa: convaluit.

This passage refers to the various stages of preparation for the corpse’s cremation or burial (also see Toynbee 1971: 43ff.). Libitina was the goddess of funerals, and kept a register of deaths for which she received a tax. Her grove at Rome was the location for the undertakers (Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.6-7 with Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 371). Here her name is used by metonymy to refer to the funeral pyre (cf. 8.43.4 *una duos ut Libitina ferat*).

Papyrus was used as fuel to light the fire so that the coffin would catch alight (cf. 8.44.14 *fartus papyro dum tibi torus crescit*). From the context it seems that perfumes *murrum* and *casia* are to be used to anoint the body prior to cremation, and also cast on the pyre to overcome the smell (cf. 11.54.1 *unguenta et casias et olentem funera murrum* with Kay’s note; also cf. 10.26.6).

There were different types of *murrum* from plants such as the *Commiphora myrrha* or *Balsamodendron myrrha*. These plants produced an aromatic substance popular in perfumes, cosmetics and medicines (cf. 2.12 with Williams; 11.54.1 with Kay; Plin. *Nat.* 12.35; 66ff.; Miller 1969: 104ff.). *Casia* was a type of cinnamon taken from the bark of forest trees, and, although of a lower quality, it was an expensive commodity (see Kay’s note on 11.54.1; also Plin. *Nat.* 12.85; Miller 1969: 21ff.; 42ff.).

The tomb, funeral bier and undertaker await to receive the deceased, although this is the reverse order of the process. The *pollinctor* refers to the mortician who applied embalming lotions and oils to the corpse and dressed it in a toga (cf. 9.57.8
toga mortui tribulis with Henriksén’s note; Toynbee 1971: 44). The body was then laid in state on the lectus funebris and carried out for its disposal by cremation or burial (Pers. 3.103-5 hinc tuba, candelae, tandemque beatulus alto /conpositus lecto crassisque lutatus amomis /in portam rigidas calces extendit; for cremation as the standard method at this time cf. Mart. 10.42). The ashes were then placed in an urn for internment in the grave (for scrobis used to mean ‘grave’ cf. Tac. Ann. 1.61; Suet. Nero 49.1; OLD s.v. b).

This is the second of only two occasions in all of Martial’s Books in which Numa is treated as a fictitious character, both times in Book 10 (cf. 10.52). On both occasions the name is used in satirical circumstances to contrast with the ancient king famed for his establishment of religious observance and morality at Rome (Giegengack 1969: 109).

10.98

Martial defends himself for gazing at the attractive serving boys around the table of his jealous host Publius, rather than spending the evening staring at the lamps or expensive antique furniture. The solution to this is that he replace the boys with uncultured and scruffy sons of goatherds. This same theme is also conveyed at 9.25, where the poet expresses his annoyance at the host, Afer, who dislikes his guests staring at his slave boy Hyllus; as a result, Martial suggests that he replace the guests with those who are blind (see Henriksén’s note; also cf. 9.22.10-11 aestuet ut nostro madidus conviva ministro,/ quern permutatum nec Ganymede velis; AP 12.175).

The idea of replacing these attractive capillati with short-haired ordinary country boys elsewhere represents a contrast between displays of modern decadence
and the ancient morals (11.11.3 with Kay). A similar comparison is made by Juvenal, describing his own Italian slave boys in contrast with the effeminate appearance and decadence of capillati of eastern origins:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{plebeios calices et paucis assibus emptos} \\
\text{porriget incultus puer atque a frigore tutus,} \\
\text{non Phryx aut Lycius, non a mangone petitus} \\
\text{quisquam erit et magno: cum posces, posce Latine.} \\
\text{idem habitus cunctis, tonsi rectique capilli} \\
\text{atque hodie tantum propter convivia pexi (11.145-51).}
\end{align*}
\]

10.98 perhaps also reflects the differences between city and rural life, as it follows soon after a poem on the pastoral/urban contrast, which concludes with a jab at the selfishness of patrons (cf. 10.96). There is the slightest hint of the injustices of patron/client relations in this present poem, where Martial is a dinner guest of Publius who wishes to flaunt his wealth with beautiful slaves, valuable wine and furniture, but covetously watches over his possessions. The suggestion that these capillati are replaced with plain farm boys as opposed to replacing the dinner guests with blind men at 9.25 seems in keeping with the replacement of the urban lifestyle with simple rural ways.

On other occasions in Book 10 Martial describes the attractiveness of capillati (10.42; 66) and here it complements the following poem on the ugliness of Socrates whose countenance is likened to that of a Satyr.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Addat cum mihi Caecubum minister} \\
\text{Idaeo resolutior cinaedo,} \\
\text{quo nec filia cultior nec uxor} \\
\text{nec mater tua nec soror recumbit,}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{ministri} were servers employed for tasks such as pouring wine, although it seems they were selected more for their looks and sexual appeal. Likening such attendants to
Ganymede or implying they surpass him in looks is a well established literary motif (cf. 10.66). Here, however, Ganymede is referred to as *cinaedus*, which suggests sexual services in addition to the pouring of wine. Such a phrase appears on one other occasion in Martial in connection with Ganymede, and it seems to be an epithet unique to his poetry as it is attested nowhere else (cf. 2.43.13 *grex tuus Iliaco poterat certare cinaedo* with Williams note; also Williams 1999: 176 n.90; elsewhere Ganymede is described as *minister*, e.g. 11.104.9; 12.15.7). Here, this youth is not only more attractive than Ganymede, but also better adorned than the female guests present, who happen to be the host’s daughter, wife, mother and sister (for *cultior* cf. 14.26.2 *captivis poteris cultior esse comis*; also 5.30.4).

Caecuban wine, considered one of the finest Italian wines, was produced in the marshy ground in the Bay of Amyclase north of Gaeta, and is often mentioned in Martial for its quality (3.26; 6.27; 11.56; 12.17.6; 13.115 with Leary; cf. Seltman 1957: 153; Younger 1966: 203).

*vis spectem potius tuas lucernas aut citrum vetus Indicosque dentes?*

Martial’s only option is to gaze at the lamps or expensive antique tables in his attempt not to gaze at the attractive slave boy (cf. 9.25.5-6 *avertam vultus, tamquam mihi pocula Gorgon/ porrigat, atque oculos oraque nostra tegam?*; also cf. 11.23.9 where such youths encourage such attention). Lamps symbolise the festive atmosphere of a dinner party and were suspended over tables; they were often elaborate and expensive to burn (cf. Leary on 14.41; also see 10.20.18). The tables are made from citrus wood imported from northern Africa, with legs made from Indian ivory (cf. Williams on
2.43.9 *tu Libycos Indis suspendis dentibus orbus*; also 1.72.4; 5.37.5; 14.91.2 with Leary; for the expression *Indos dentes* see Catul. 64.48; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.94; also *Libycus dens* at Mart. 14.3.2 with Leary). In Martial, such furniture represents symbols of luxury and reflects the host flaunting his wealth (cf. 10.54).

suspectus tibi ne tamen recumbam,
p Praestea de grege sordidaque villa
ponsos, horridulos, rudes, pusillos
hircosi mihi filios subulci.

Martial requests that the host replace this attendant with unkempt and boorish youths from his country estate. Note also the verbal echo of this poem with 10.96 in the description of the villa as *sordida* (cf. 96.4), although here perhaps the term is intended to convey disdain. The verb *praesto* is also applied in 10.96.12-13 as a typical feature of the patron/client relationship. In contrast with the attractive long-haired catamite, these youths are short haired *tonsi*, which perhaps also removes any sexual appeal (cf. 11.11.3 *tonsa pura ministro* with Kay; also 9.36.10; 12.18.25; Juv. 11.150 with Colton 1991: 405). These boys are described with a list of epithets which conveys rusticity, intended to illustrate their lack of sophistication and incompatibility with metropolitan life.

The use of the diminutive *horriduli* suggests disdain for their appearance, although such a term is familiar in rural settings (cf. 10.92 *horridus Silvanus*; 1.49.33). *rudis* denotes the sense of ‘uncouth, unlettered, inexperienced’ simplicity which typically represents the country farmer or other features concerned with the country (3.24.4 *dixerat agresti forte rudique viro*; 6.73.1 *non rudis indocta fecit me falce colonus*; also cf. 1.12.5; 2.48.4; 90.9; 10.48.14 cf. *OLD* s.v. 4).
The diminutive *pusillos* is colloquial in tone, uncommon in poetry, and is always used in expressions of scorn or disdain, not merely towards the size of the individual, but also his intellectual capacities (e.g. 1.9.2 with Howell and Citroni; 3.42.3; 47.4; 62.8; 4.43.9; 5.82.4; 9.50.1 with Henriksen; cf. Catul. 37.16; 54.1; Hor. S. 1.4.17-19). The father of this tribe is described as *hircosus*, which suggests that his body odour resembles that of a goat (cf. *OLD* s.v.; Pers. 3.77 *aliquis de gente hircosa centurionum*). This adjective occurs only six times in Classical literature, three of those in Martial; and such a distasteful term conveys revulsion and condescension (cf. 9.47.5 with Henriksen's note; 12.59.5; also Pl. *Mer.* 575; Pers. 3.77; Gellius 12.2.11).

*perdet te dolor hic: habere, Publi, mores nos potes hos et hos ministros.*

*pudor* (B) instead of *dolor* is possible in the sense that the reason for Publius’ anger towards Martial gazing at his slave boys is false modesty; thereby his attempts at moral virtue conflict with his possession of such symbols of decadence. Shackleton Bailey emends *pudor* with *dolor* (γ), in the sense of Publius displaying pangs of jealousy towards the poet (cf. 10.41.3; *OLD* s.v. *dolor* 2; *TLL* 5.1843.44; SB¹: 353). In this context, *mores* denotes Publius’ jealous character or disposition, which he must contain if he intends to show off such beautiful attendants (cf. *OLD* s.v. *mos* 5).

The name Publius is a popular *praenomen* and appears in four other poems ranging from Book 1 to Book 10, although it cannot be established that they all refer to the same person. This is the only occasion in which he is actually addressed (1.109; 2.57; 7.72.7; 87; *PIR P* 789; Kajanto *Cognomina*: 174). He is always referred to by his *praenomen*, which suggests familiarity. Other poems seem to reflect a
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similar character of wealth and extravagance: 1.109 on a portrait of his pet dog; 2.57 on his ownership of expensive lacernae; 7.72 on his skill at board games; and 7.87, again refers to his dog in a list of pets (cf. Howell on 1.109; 2.57.3 with Williams; however, Vioque on 7.72.7 suggests that Publius of 1.109; 2.57 and 7.87 refers to a friend of the poet, whilst at 10.98 he is possibly fictitious).

10.99

A statue or bust of Socrates is the subject of this next poem. The face of Socrates was said to resemble that of a Satyr, and had Socrates been Roman born this bust would be included among the Satyr statues in the Portico of Octavia, where there is also one which resembles Julius Rufus. As Julius Rufus is not known elsewhere, the full purpose of the poem is relevant only to those acquainted with the individual.

Appearance and looks receive considerable treatment in Martial, and ugliness is a common target in satire (10.83; (84); 90; also cf. SB² 3: Index s.v. old, ugly). The poem also contrasts with the previous one, which praises the beauty of a youthful slave boy.

Also see Shackleton Bailey 1978: 288-9.

Si Romana forent haec Socratis ora, fuissent
Iulius in Satyris qualia Rufus habet.

Although Friedlaender suggests that the poem is based on his portrait on the cover of a book of Satires by Rufus (Friedlaender on 10.99.2), Shackleton Bailey’s suggested meaning seems far more plausible: in Satyris fuissent, qualia Satyris habet Iulius Rufus (Shackleton Bailey 1978: 289). It was well known from Plato’s description that
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the appearance of Socrates resembled the looks of a Satyr (Plato *Sympos.* 216d). Here, this description is placed in a Roman context, by referring to the statues of the Satyrs located in the Portico of Octavia, which contained a large collection of famous works of art (Plin. *Nat.* 36.29; Richardson: 317-18, Nash: 2.254-8).

Julius Rufus is not mentioned anywhere else in Martial and his identity remains unknown. One option is that he is the father of L. Julius Rufus, consul ordinarius in 67 (*PIR* I 529). Rufus is one of the most common cognomina, as attested by well over one thousand examples (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 26-7, 30, 64-5, 121, 134, 229).

10.100

Martial attacks a poet who is combining his own poetry with that of Martial and claiming authorship for both. The difference in quality manifestly exposes the penmanship of both, as it is impossible to combine lions with foxes or eagles with owls. Similarly, Martial likens his skill to a swift runner like Ladas in contrast with his competitor who metaphorically possesses a wooden leg. This reworks 1.53, where Fidentinus has inserted a page of his own poetry into a book of Martial; however, the quality is such as to identify the difference in the two authors (see Howell on 1.53; also cf. 1.29; 38; 52; 72; 11.94).

Although this is the first occasion that plagiarism of Martial’s work is directly addressed in Book 10, the theme recalls the opening poems of the book, particularly 10.3 on the threat of publishing defamatory material and publishing it in Martial’s name (also cf. 10.5). The connection between these three poems is established further by its scazonic metre. 10.100 introduces the final section of the book, which creates
an element of ring composition in its correspondence with the literary themes of the opening poems. The following poem on the comparison between the jokes of Gabba which are outdated and those of the current jester Capitolinus seems to reflect Martial’s attitude to his own poetry as no longer appropriate in the atmosphere of Rome. Plagiarism is again mentioned at 10.102, although not in connection with Martial’s own work.

Quid, stulte, nostris versibus tuos misces?
cum litigante quid tibi, miser, libro?

As with 10.3 and 5, the addressee of this poem is anonymous, and here refers to an unnamed poet who is placing Martial’s poems amongst his own and claiming authorship to Martial’s poems. He is addressed three times in the poem with different epithets which denote his stupidity and lack of intellectual abilities (stultus, miser and ineptus).

Friedlaender suggests that litigans denotes the book itself contending the poet’s claim to authorship and bringing a legal action against him (Friedlaender on 10.100.2). Housman interprets litigans in the sense of secum discordante, in that the very contents of the book are in strife because of their mingling of poetry by Martial and this other poet (cf. Ov. Met. 1.21 hanc deus et melior litem natura diremit; Fast. 1.107-8 ut semel haec rerum secessit lite suarum/ inque novas abit mass soluta domos. See Housman CP 2: 730; also SB2 2: 415). Because of language such as nostris versibus tuos misces in line 1, this interpretation seems more probable.
Martial compares the difference in quality between his own poetry and that of the other in terms of different beasts, lions with foxes, eagles and owls respectively. Comparisons of animals, especially birds, to denote poetical rivalry is commonplace in Martial (cf. 1.7; 53.7-10 with Howell; 10.5.7-8). Lions and eagles represent the highest creatures in the animal kingdom, and although these are not used elsewhere for the purposes of literary comparison, Martial uses the same two creatures in a comparison between his appearance and that of the effeminate Charmenion (cf. 10.65.11-12). His rival is compared with the nature of a fox and an owl, both nocturnal creatures, which perhaps reflects the obscurity and gloom of his composition. Neither creature is held in high regard, and the owl in particular is associated with death and ill-omen (cf. 11.34 with Kay; D'Arcy Thompson 1895: 66; 76; on the nastiness of the fox cf. 10.37.13 o lidam...vulpem).

The final comparison likens Martial to Ladas, a Spartan runner famed for his swiftness and triumphs at the Olympic Games (AP 16.54; cf. Mayor on Juv. 13.97). He is mentioned on one other occasion in Martial, again in terms of literary composition (2.86.7-8 quid si per gracilis vias petauri/ invitum iubeas subire Ladan?). The swiftness of feet reflects the dexterity of Martial’s verse in contrast with the clunking style of the other poet (cf. 10.9). The latter’s material is compared to a runner, who, with a wooden leg, will never win a race.
The adjective *inepte* is simply used in the sense of contempt for this poet's stupidity (cf. 7.33.3 with Vioque), although Martial also uses the noun *ineptia* as a self-referential term to denote the lighter or more trivial genres such as epigram (cf. 2.86.10 *et stultus labor est ineptiarum* with Williams; 11.1.14 with Kay).

This is the final poem of the book to be associated with the emperor Trajan. Martial praises Capitolinus, Trajan's court jester, whose wit and humour exceeds that of Gabba, a renowned jester during the reign of Augustus, whose comedy seems unsophisticated and simple in comparison. The device of someone or something in the present surpassing a mythical or historical paradigm is common in epigram (cf. 10.35.15 with Jenkins; also 7.50; 8.50.1ff.; 9.65.3; 103; 11.5). The wit of jesters is also comparable to the nature and style of Martial's own poetic genre, and Fearnley suggests that this dismissal of Gabba's boorish language reflects the sophisticated values associated with Trajanic Rome (Fearnley 2003: 627).

Gabba is imagined as returning from the dead and in consequence is silenced because of his rustic wit. A corresponding image is presented at 10.72, where Martial silences his former language of flattery, and so Truth, also described as *rustica*, is described as returning from the dead due to the beneficence of the new regime. Although Truth has returned at 10.72, the silencing of rustic Gabba seems to suggest the reality of this kind of truth being incompatible with Trajanic Rome (Fearnley 2003: 626-7).

There is also a thematic link between 10.100 and 101. Both involve comparisons, 101 between the jesters Gabba and Capitolinus, 100 between the boorish
unnamed poet and the much more elegant and sophisticated Martial. For this reason, it is possible that an implicit comparison is set up between Martial and Capitolinus. Further cf. Jenkins *ad loc.*; Fearnley 2003: 626-7.

**Elysio redeat si forte remissus ab agro**  
**ille suo felix Caesare Gabba vetus,**

Martial describes Gabba as returning from the dead, an unusual notion which also occurs at 10.72.10-11 on the return of rustic Truth from the dead at the prospect of the new regime under Trajan (a similar notion appears at 11.5 published before the second edition of Book 10 where Martial refers to the return from the Underworld of great Roman leaders from the past who would rejoice at the reign of Nerva). Although the usual phrase is *campi Elysii* (e.g. 12.52.5), Martial ironically uses the unpoetic *ager* which matches Gabba's description as *rusticus* in line 4 (cf. 9.51.5; 1.91.2 *Elysias domos*; 6.58.4 *Elysiae...plagae*; 7.40.4; 11.5.6 (*Elysium nemus*); 10.25.10 *lucos Elysiae...puellae*; see Jenkins *ad loc.*).

Gabba was the *scurra* or court jester of Augustus and was famed for his wit (cf. 1.41.16 *qui Gabbam salibus tuis* with Howell and Citroni; *PIR* G 1; *RE* 8.418ff.; also as jester under Tiberius cf. *scholia* on Juv. 5.4). Quintilian describes his humour as *lascivum et hilare* (*Inst.* 6.3.27) and provides various examples of his wit (*Inst.* 6.3.62; 64; 66; 80; 90).

Just as Gabba was favoured in his own time, so too Capitolinus is *felix* under the emperor Trajan. This notion of *felix* thereby extends to these emperors (cf. Jenkins *ad loc.*).
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qui Capitolinus pariter Gabbamque iocantes
audierit, dicet: 'rustice Gabba, tace.'

Capitolinus is not mentioned in any other source, but it is clear from the context that he was the court jester of Trajan (cf. PIR² C 414; RE 3.1530.20ff.). It is not surprising that he is not mentioned thereafter in Martial as this is the last book before Martial left for Spain.

Although Gabba is presented at 1.41 as the exemplar of *urbanitas*, here he is given the epithet *rusticus*, which encompasses not only the sense of ‘simple’ and ‘countrified’, but also ‘clownish’ and ‘unsophisticated’ (Fearnley 2003: 626; cf. 10.72.11 *rustica Veritas*). In contrast, the *urbanitas* of Capitolinus is welcomed in Trajan’s Rome (cf. 10.3).

10.102

In this epigram, two paradoxes on contrasting subjects are presented. Philinus claims the children his wife bears as his own, despite never having sex. In a similar manner, Gaditanus claims the poetry he publishes as his own, despite never composing. This poem combines two themes already raised in this book. The first is the subject of adultery and wives who indulge in adultery, which in this case produces illegitimate children (cf. 10.91; 95). Secondly, it continues the theme of plagiarism introduced at 10.100 on the subject of Martial’s own poetry. Production of a child is equated with literary production. This analogy is revealed by the word order, where *qui numquam futuit* is ironically juxtaposed to *pater* just as *qui scribit nihil* is to *poeta*, and the parallel arrangement of *poeta* and *pater*, *scribere* and *futuere* (Williams 2002a: 168). The correspondence between book and child is similarly reflected elsewhere in
Martial’s personification of his book throughout his works (cf. 10.104; Williams 2002a: 168 n. 29).

A similar comparative device is used at 1.72 where Martial likens Fidentinus’ plagiarism to the efforts of an old woman to appear young by wearing dentures and applying white lead to her face (see Howell’s note; for similar analogistic twists cf. 6.17; also see Sullivan 1991: 243-4). The parallel arrangement of 10.100 and 102 complements the arrangement of themes presented in 10.3 and 5 of the opening group of poems, which concern the related subject of the publication of scurrilous material.

On this poem see Williams 2002a: 150ff.

Qua factus ratione sit requiris,
qui numquam futuit, pater Philinus?

For a similar expression cf. 1.72.7-8 hac et tu ratione qua poeta es, calvus cum fueris, eris comatus.

Philinus is a father without having performed sexual intercourse (on the production of illegitimate children, cf. 10.91; 95). This is the only occasion that the name Philinus appears in Martial and he is clearly a fictitious character (although cf. Philine of 10.22). The erotic connotations of the name ironically contrast with his nonexistent sex life.

Gaditanus, A vite, dicat istud,
qui scribit nihil et tamen poeta est.

This is the only occasion that Gaditanus appears as a real name in Martial. Elsewhere, it is used as an adjective to refer to a native of Gades (modern Cadiz), a place
renowned for its female dancers and a generally dissolute atmosphere (cf. 14.203 with Leary; also 3.63; 6.71). Like Philinus, he is a fictitious character.

On the identity of Avitus, cf. 10.96, where an individual of the same name is addressed as a fellow-client. It is possible that the Avitus addressed here is a real person, such as at 1.16, where Martial discusses the varying quality of his poems (this accords with Kay’s criterion that an addressee mentioned in a skeptic epigram generally refers to a real individual; see Kay on 11.7.1).

The final pair of poems in the book represents Martial’s farewell to Rome and his return to his hometown Bilbilis. In this poem his longing for return to Spain finally becomes a reality as the poet reflects upon the thirty-four years lived in Rome. In acknowledgment of his fame and achievements in Rome, he addresses the citizens of Bilbilis in imagined anticipation of the glorious reception which awaits him upon his return as the celebrity of his hometown. As such, Martial expresses his hope for a reception similar to the way in which Verona glorifies the poet Catullus, one of his most influential literary models. He compares himself to Catullus in terms of literary ability and also the fame that their poetry has generated for both of them, and as such their glory is reflected in their birthplace (Swann 1998: 51). This echoes Martial’s request to Macer in 10.78 to rank Martial’s poetry as second only to Catullus, but here they are on a par in terms of the fame they give to their respective native towns.

Whereas the final poem of the book represents Martial’s final farewell to Rome with the Book’s journey to Spain, 10.103 focuses on the poet’s glorious arrival and reception in Bilbilis. The motif of triumphant arrival recalls the joyful and long-
awaited entrance of Trajan into Rome upon his proclamation as emperor, as described at the very beginning of the book (10.6). In contrast with the jubilant welcome imagined for Trajan, Martial's return to his homeland is expressed in less confident terms.

The poem concludes in a tone which seems almost hesitant and anxious at the prospect of his reception in Bilbilis; if he is not made welcome, he may return to Rome. It appears that this uncertainty was justified because his discontentment with Bilbilis is expressed in the epistle of Book 12 to Priscus, where he complains of these very municiipes addressed in 10.103, described as municipium robigo dentium (Howell 1998: 181-2). Further, in Book 12 he describes his longing for Rome (12.21.9-10 tu desiderium dominae mihi mitius urbis/ esse iubes: Romam tu mihi sola facis), and the patron/client relationship, which he is so desperate to leave behind in Rome, remains a source of complaint in Spain where the clients wake him for the detested salutatio (12.68).


Municipes Augusta mihi quos Bilbilis acri
    monte creat rapidis quem Salo cingit aquis,

The use of his homeland's official title, Augusta Bilbilis, in Martial's address to his fellow citizens establishes a formal and respectful tone. Bilbilis held the status of municipium of the Roman Empire and its full title which appears on coins was municipium Augusta Bilbilis (Howell on 1.49.3; Sullivan 1991: 174). Bilbilis was situated on the top of a hill (hence monte) above the river Salo (also cf. 10.13 (20); 1.49.3 with Howell; Sullivan 1991: 179ff.) which encircled the town (cf. 4.55.14-15
quam fluctu tenui sed inquieto/ armorum Salo temperator ambit). Here the waters of
the river are denoted as rapidae; but elsewhere Salo is described as brevi (1.49.12),
temperator (4.55.15), gelidae (14.33.2; also 1.49.13), terricus (12.2.3), Celtiber
(10.13.1), and patrius (10.96).

ejquid laeta iuvat vestri vos gloria vatis?
nam decus et nomen famaque vestra sumus,
 nec sua plus debet tenui Verona Catullo
 meque velit dici non minus illa suum.

This motif is given more extensive treatment at 1.61 where he lists the birthplaces of
famous poets, beginning with Catullus (1. 61.1 Verona docta syllabas amat vatis) and
concluding with the addition of himself and Bilbilis amongst them: te, Liciniane,
gloriabitur nostrat nec me tacebit Bilbilis (1.61.11-12). Note that the prediction of
fame in Book 1 has become a reality in Book 10.

The notion of a writer being celebrated in one's native town is a well
established poetic tradition (1.61.11-12; 14.195.1 tantum magna suo debet Verona
Catullo also cf. Hor. Carm. 3.30.10 with Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 374; Prop. 4.1.63-64;
Ov. Am. 3.15.8, cf. Fraenkel 1957: 304-5). At the beginning of the book, Martial
acknowledges Rome as the source of the fame and popularity which will provide him
with literary immortality (10.2; 9). Here he promises that as a result of his fame his
homeland will be glorified, just as Verona is celebrated for producing Catullus (cf.
10.78). For the poetic title of vatis cf. 10.58.12.

Catullus is given the epithet tenuis, which here reflects his literary refinement
and subtlety (cf. OLD s.v. 11; also see 6.64.17). Its application here is twofold, as
elsewhere in Latin poetry; tenuis is a translation of the Callimachean term λεπτός
which implies simplicity or modesty (Callim. fr. 1.24; Catul. 51.9; see Newman 1990: 7n.16; Mart. 7.42.3 with Vioque; 10.96.6).

quattuor accessit tricesima messibus aetas,
ut sine me Cereri rustica liba datis,
moenia dum colimus dominæ pulcherrima Romæ:
mutavere meas Itala regna comas.

Martial reveals that he has been in Rome for thirty four years, and so arrived in Rome in approximately 64 (cf. 10.96.2 Latia factus in urbe senex; 12.31.7; 12.34.1 trigintia mihi quattorquè messes; Sullivan 1991: 3). The number of years is described by the number of times the citizens have presented offerings to Ceres, the goddess of agriculture, which suggests the rural environment of his home town (cf. 10.94; 96).

Despite his yearning for the rural lifestyle, Martial acknowledges the superiority and magnificence of Rome in her description as domina, her moenia pulcherrima, and her kingdom, Itala regna (cf. 12.9.1 terrarum dea gentiumque Roma). In contrast with the description of Ceres as rustica, Roma is presented as domina, which conveys the difference between rural life and the more inhospitable atmosphere of Rome. The use of the epithet domina to denote Rome occurs elsewhere in Martial and suggests influence by Horace (cf. Carm. 4.14.43-4 o tutela praesens/ Italiae dominæque Romæ; in Martial cf. 1.3.3 with Howell; urbs domina; 3.1.5; also cf. maxima Roma 7.96.2; 10.58.6). domina is also a term characteristic of love poetry, especially in the representation of servitium amoris (cf. Vioque on 7.14.8; TLL 5.1.1938.1-27). Roma as domina reflects the notion presented in earlier poems in Book 10 of the city as an oppressive mistress (cf. 10.12). Along with dominæ, colimus also denotes the system of patronage (cf. 10.87.4; also cf. 2.55.1 with
Williams). Martial portrays himself as a client of Rome, but the language is simultaneously that of erotic poetry (elegy), with Martial as the suitor of a beautiful mistress.

The years have changed the colour of the poet’s hair, and the prospect of approaching old age represents the opportunity for his retirement to his homeland (10.96; Martial is fifty-seven, cf. 10.24). The reference to Rome (or, rather, Italy) taking his colour recalls the notion of Rome sapping the healthy colour of Domitius Apollinaris in 10.12.

```
excipitis placida reducem si mente, venimus;
aspera si geritis corda, redire licet.
```

The repetition of *si* reflects the apprehension felt by the poet on his reception in his hometown. He implies that he may return to Rome if his arrival proves to be less than welcome. Unlike the rejoicing which accompanies Trajan’s imagined arrival in Rome, Martial merely hopes for a reception that is *placida* (i.e. *sine cura* and *laxatus*; cf. 7.99.1 *placidum Tonantem* with Vioque; for Domitian 5.6.10; 5.23.3; 6.10.6). In contrast, the adjective *aspera* suggests an unfriendly or unwelcoming response to his return.

10.104

The poet sends his book on its journey to Spain accompanied by Flavus to greet some of the poet’s friends in his hometown. The poem takes the form of the *propemptikon*, which describes the route and the intended destination, followed by a prayer for the book’s safe journey. As such, the description of his book’s journey represents the
forthcoming journey of Martial himself. The appeal for good weather and calm waters for the book’s journey reflects Martial’s hope that his own relocation to Spain will be just as easy. The reminder that the captain will not wait for a single passenger urges the book not to delay longer in Rome and reflects Martial’s own desire to leave forthwith. Although there are similar poems where Martial declares that he is sending his book or collection of poems to a particular individual (e.g. 10.20 (13); 1.70), here the book is being sent ahead of him as a sophisticated form of greeting (cf. 10.93).

His Spanish friends, the intended recipients of the book, are identified as sodales, a term as far removed from the language of amicitia as possible in order to convey the idea of equal friendship free from obligations. Similarly, at 10.13, another Spanish friend from childhood, Manius, represents the epitome of true friendship. This reinforces the image of Spain as the ideal lifestyle in contrast with the wearisome life of Rome (cf. 10.96).

Not only does Martial farewell his book on its journey, but the expression of farewell also concludes the book itself. In other volumes, he refers to some other aspect of the book to mark its conclusion, such as the number of poems (1.188; 4.89), the number of books of poetry (2.93 with Williams’ note), or the reader who demands more poems (cf. 11.108.4 tacis dissimulasque? vale). Other books are concluded with imperial poems or epigrams where the conclusion is less clearly defined (although cf. Fowler 1989: 75ff.)

This is the first occasion in which Martial addresses the book in this particular volume. Its personification recalls the very opening of Book 10 where it is the book speaking independently of its author, and urging the reader to read as many poems as he or she likes. Although elsewhere he refers to his book in deprecating terms when
10.104

sending it as a gift (e.g. 10.20 (19).1 nec doctum satis et parum severum), here the book is described as comes to denote equality in status (Fearnley 2003: 633). Further, Martial identifies himself as parens, the first occasion where he assumes such a title over his books. He continues this role in Book 12 where he refers to the other volumes as its fratres (12.2 (3).6). The paternal association is reminiscent of Ovid’s exile poetry, where he refers to the separation of himself from his poetry in similar terms (Tr. 1.7.35-6; 3.14.11-14; 3.1.65-6; Fearnley 2003: 633 n.49). The two can be distinguished in that Ovid’s exile was forced upon him whereas Martial’s departure is voluntary. 10.104 also foreshadows one of the opening poems of Book 12, which is chronologically the next volume in the corpus, where in a similar fashion he sends his book back to Rome (12.2.(3).1-2 ad populos mitti qui nuper ab urbe solebas, /ibis io Romam, nunc perefrine liber; also cf. 3.4).


I nostro comes, i, libelle, Flavo
longum per mare, sed faventis undae,
et cursu facili tuisque ventis
Hispanae pete Tarraconis arces:

The language and expressions are typical of the propemptikon genre in the command to send the book on its way (cf. 10.78). The notion of the book as comes is a common expression to convey companionship in the context of travel (cf. 1.2.2 where the book is a companion for travellers on a long journey; also 2.24.4; 7.2.7; 44.5 with Vioque, cf. Catul. 11.1; Stat. Silv. 5.2.152; White 1970: 80 n.20; TLL 3.1772.43). The outline of the journey to Spain commences on the sea (10.78.1), and the prayer for a safe journey with smooth waters and good winds is a traditional feature of this genre as
most *propemptika* are addressed to those departing by sea (Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.8; 42; Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.2; Prop. 1.8.18, Cairns 1972: 130; 237).

Although the book is addressed on numerous occasions throughout the corpus, the diminutive is less frequent in this context (3.2.1; 4.86.2; 89; 7.97.1; 8.72.3 in contrast with *liber* 1.3.2; 70.1; 2.1; 3.4; 5; 7.84.3; 8.1; 9.99.6; 11.1; 12.2). Martial uses the term *liber* on only one occasion in Book 10 (10.70); on all other occasions, it is referred to as *libellus*, in keeping with the book’s request in 10.1.

The poet imagines the arrival at Tarraco, one of the larger towns on the north-east coast of Spain (1.49. 21; 13.118). The favourable winds and smooth waters are apparently designed to reflect Martial’s own re-establishment in Spain, though it is interesting that he uses this sea metaphor for his toils and struggles of life in Rome at 10.58 7-8: *iactamur in alto urbis* (Fearney 1998: 104).

This is the only occasion Flavus is mentioned in the books, and it is generally assumed that he was a fellow Spanish friend of Martial. There is considerable epigraphical evidence for the name, and 96 of the 102 examples extant are Spanish in origin (Kajanto *Cognomina*: 37; 227).

```
illinc te rota tollet et citatus
altam Bilbilin et tuum Salonem
quinto forsitam essedo videbis.
```

The final stages of the journey are presented by the land journey of five days on a two-wheeled vehicle known as an *essedum* (4.64.19; Ov. *Am.* 2.16.49). Because there is ambiguity over whether Martial intends a single car prepared five times or a new *essedum* each day, the accepted translation is ‘at the fifth stage’ (SB² 2: 417, Post: 272).
For the topography of Bilbilis, cf. 10.13; 103. The image of \textit{tuum Salonem} emphasises Spain as not only the poet's homeland but also that of the book (cf. 12.2 (3).1).

\textit{quid mandem tibi quaeris? ut sodales paucos, sed veteres et ante brumas triginta mihi quattuorque visos ipsa protinus a via salutes,}

Martial responds to his book's query as to its intended hosts, a common device in his address to his volumes (3.2.1 \textit{cuius vis fieri, libelle, munus?} 11.1.1-2). His friends from Spain are described as \textit{veteres sodales}, which suggests an intimate relationship. This is a common expression in Martial on the theme of friendship (1.54.7 with Howell; 99.14; 2.30.3; 43.15; 5.19.9; 7.86.5; 10.37.3; 12.25.3; Ov. \textit{Pont.} 2.4.33). Other than Manius at 10.13, and his uncle Valerius Unicus at 12.44, Martial rarely mentions other friends from Spain (although cf. 1.49).

Martial refers to the time he has spent apart from his friends in terms of the number of winters. This contrasts with the image of the previous poem, where the time is represented in terms of summer. Winter reflects a time of bitter hardship to reflect the sorrow of separation.

\textit{et nostrum admoneas subinde Flavum iucundos mihi nee laboriosos secessus pretio paret salubri, qui pigrum faciant tuum parentem.}

The true reason for sending the book in advance is now revealed, which is the request that Flavus find the poet a pleasant dwelling for his retirement. Here \textit{secessus} denotes a place of retirement, although elsewhere it simply denotes a retreat from the rigours
of city life (10.30.6; cf. Juv. 3.4.5; Plin. Ep. 1.3.3; Ov. Tr. 1.1.41). Martial requests that the residence require little renovation in order that he may become lazy as opposed to the endless toil he endured in Rome (compare 6.43.9-10 *nunc urbis vicina iuvant facilesque recessus/* et *satis est pigro si licet esse mihi* with Grewing's note; 12.18.10ff.; also cf. Juv. 12.18.10ff.) As such, this life of leisure in the absence of his client duties implies that Martial will have time to produce more poetry (cf. 10.70). In reality, his next book was not published until three years later, the reasons for which he presents in the opening epistle to Book 12:

```latex
scio me patrocinium debere contumacissimae trienni desidiae; quo absolvenda non esset inter 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 (12 praef. 1).
```

In addition, in keeping with his assertions of his modest financial status, the property must also be bought at a reasonable price (for the expression *pretio salubri* cf. Plin. Ep. 1.24 *si praedolum istud tam salubriter emerit ut poenitentiae locum non relinquit*; 6.30.3 *attentimus ergo ut quam saluberrime reficiantur*).

```latex
haec sunt. iam tumidus vocat magister
castigatque moras, et aura portum
laxavit melior. vale, libelle:
navem, scis, putor non moratur unus.
```

Martial urges his book not to miss the ship, and the possibility of the book missing the boat which will not wait for one tardy passenger adds a touch of drama to the finale (Sullivan 1991: 218). *Magister* is a common poetical term used to denote the captain of a ship (cf. Verg. Aen 5.176; Stat. Silv. 3.2.56; OLD s.v.), and here he is described as
tumidus to describe his pride and self-importance (cf. 10.87.3; also 2.18.5 with Williams; 5.19.3; 8.3.15). He is impatient to leave as soon as possible in order to remain with the favourable weather, especially while the gates of the harbour are open for ships to depart (cf. Juv. 8.261 prodita laxant portarum claustra tyrannis). The wish for fair weather whilst at sea is not uncommon in the propemptikon genre (cf. Hardie 1983: 156ff. on Stat. Silv. 3.2).
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