

Sven LORENZ, Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser. Tübingen (Gunter Narr Verlag) 2002. Classica Monacensia, vol. 23. X + 302 S.

This book deals with one of the most intriguing and, at the same time, most controversial issues in the research on Martial in the past 25 years or so: the Flavian epigrammatist and his relation to the imperial court, especially to Domitian, in whose reign Martial composed the great majority of his collections. Lorenz' (henceforth: L.) study is the first to examine the role of the Roman emperors (Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan) in the context of all of Martial's works, which is a humongous task involving a great deal of painstaking exegeses, which L. accomplished in an admirable manner.

The book is a revised version of L.'s doctoral dissertation, written under the guidance of Niklas Holzberg (Munich), who, almost simultaneously, published a new introduction to Martial,¹ for which see my *BMCR* 2003.07.20 review. And indeed, L. is greatly indebted to Holzberg, or vice versa, or both. Already the headline of the first chapter "*Noch ein Neuansatz zu einer Martialinterpretation*" (p. 1; my emphasis) is meant to allude to Holzberg's 1986 article on Martial in *WüJb*. Also, the attentive reader will detect that this obviously very fruitful student-teacher relationship manifests itself charmingly even in L.'s German diction and style.² It must be stressed that the arguments put forward in this excellent book, even where they seem to be rather closely connected to Holzberg's line of thinking, are completely independent products of a careful and well documented evaluation of the applicable source material.

Let me start with some rather general remarks (1., 2.) before I will turn to the details (3.-5.).

1. Methodology and dogmatism

L., just as his *Doktorvater*, lays emphasis on the importance of a *literary-critical* approach to the imperial poems (p. 4). Doing so, he frees himself of a socio-historical or ethical-critical explication of Martial's collections (e.g. pp. 22-24, 154-155, 214-215, *et saepius*).

¹ N. H., *Martial und das antike Epigramm*, Darmstadt 2002.

² I have always found it a little annoying, though, to speak of Martial's Books I-XII as the *epigrammaton libri (duodecim)* or of, say, Book XI as the *liber undecimus*. If I were to speak about my current hometown I wouldn't call it *Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium*. Perhaps I should. – "Die sexuelle Thematik dringt im neunten *liber* sogar wieder in einige Kaisergedichte ein" (p. 191) is unintentionally comic.

It is perhaps necessary for L. to dissociate himself almost polemically from any kind of 'biographical' or 'intentionalist' interpretation (p. 3 with n. 7) and to stress that the 1st person speaker, the poetic 'I' or however one wants to call it, is not identical with Martial, the poet. Consequently, L. offers an extensive prolegomenon on Martial's literary *persona*, the role of the speaker, and the various kinds of epigrammatic speech-acts (pp. 4-21). And yet, it is apparent that, no matter how vigilant one is, one's criteria (see p. 7) can always be attacked or accused of not being precise enough. One example from L.'s book may suffice: "Es ist zwar denkbar, dass auch Charakterzüge des historischen Martial in seine Dichter-*persona* eingeflossen sind, aber die Zeichnung des Ichs als eines lächerlichen *vir mollis* macht es sehr unwahrscheinlich, dass der reale Dichter sich selbst beschreibt." (p. 41) Well, that's pretty obviously a rather subjective reasoning. However, it is important to bear that statement in mind, since the 'ridiculousness' of the poet-*persona*'s behavior or appearance in the epigrams is a feature on which L. repeatedly elaborates throughout his study.

Also, I am convinced that even quite a few of those whom L. so passionately indicts for their 'biographical approaches' (see, e.g., CR 49 [1999], 403) are perfectly conscious of the texts' fictionality.

As regards the evaluation of the social and/or communicative setting of Martial's epigrams, it is not surprising that L. (pp. 9-10) at least partly disapproves of studies such as R. Nauta's *Poetry for Patrons*³ or C. Damon's *The Mask of the Parasite* (Ann Arbor 1997). I cannot see any particular need to regard the literary-critical and socio-communicative positions as mutually exclusive; also, it surely is permissible to be interested in a literary text's (and its author's!) interrelation with its (his) extra-literary context. See, e.g., Nauta's awareness of the speech-act problem in his discussion of "You and I" in Martial ([n. 3], pp. 39-58).

For sure, the question of the fictional 'I' is connected to the problem of the limits of interpretability of the imperial poems (or, *any* text).

Just two examples:

1.) I agree with L. that there are serious obstacles to an evaluation of poetic texts as sources for the explicit or implicit personal relation in Flavian Rome

³ Nauta's book (*Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* [Leiden 2002]) appeared too late to be considered by L., who can only refer to Nauta's dissertation manuscript of 1995. L.'s review of *Poetry for Patrons*, in *Plekos* 5 (2003), 75-86 can be read as a supplement.

(or any other time) between the actual poet (Martial but also Statius) and the emperor (pp. 43-45), and yet, this caveat does not make such an approach a priori futile or even illegitimate. See, e.g., Nauta's [n. 3] discussion of "Personal Patronage" at pp. 335-349.

2.) L. offers a shrewd explication of the 'imperial nature' of Book VIII (pp. 166-180). The quantity of Domitianic poems in that collection is obviously linked to the emperor's Sarmatan campaign in B.C.E. 93. Therefore, it is justifiable to examine, from a *historical* angle, the literary strategies involved in that book, as, e.g., K.M. Coleman did.⁴ L. (p. 43) is unfavorable to such an inquiry. This clash of interests, however, is L.'s problem alone, and it seems to be prompted by a shortsighted idea of the 'authorial intention' (see below, under 2.). For sure, L. aims at keeping his own critical ground, but even so, he ultimately concedes that the form and content of Martial's (as any other author's) panegyric poetry is not merely the result of a hermetic intra-literary system (p. 247). It is true that we often cannot accurately enough determine the historical or personal factors that have triggered individual poems, cycles, or entire books. The danger that arises from focusing on Martial's particular literary concept (and L. is aware of that danger) is perhaps twofold: How can we securely determine this personal concept without operating with probably as many presuppositions as the 'historicizers' and intentionalists? Being the supposedly 'more critical' interpreters, are we not equally running the risk of entering a vicious circle, the only difference being that we seem to be justified by our purely textual-literary approach? As a consequence, our investigation may seduce us to create an impressive construct that is seemingly coherent but in reality no less deceptive.⁵

After all, the methodological, *ut ita dicam*, foreplay (pp. 1-54) is laudably thorough and lucid, even though (or maybe, *because*) L.'s awareness of modern literary criticism, esp. the author/fictionality debate, is much more a practical than a theoretic one, or: his theoretic convictions *intend* to be pragmatic in L.'s (and only L.'s) discourse. If it is a pragmatically stable one – if we allow for other discourses or, simply, *interests*, remains to be seen.

⁴ "Martial Book 8 and the Politics of A.D. 93", in: *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10 (1998), 337-357.

⁵ L. (pp. 241-246) proffers a challenging comparison between the syncretistic Nervan-Trajanic poems of Book XII and Pliny's *Panegyricus*, which can further illuminate the potential vicissitude of his method: For, the 21st century interpreter is left in the lurch as to whether or not (or, to what extent) there existed explicit or implicit rules or precepts for imperial praise (cf. p. 247!) that influenced the respective author's literary individuality. The instructions given by the late antique Menander Rhetor (cf. pp. 163 and 216) must be used with great caution, as they are the product of compilation from various periods.

Of course, I do not subscribe to L.'s claim that, because the 'historical author' is hidden behind his *persona*, any exploration of the 'authorial intention' is inevitably speculative.⁶ (By the way: This seems likewise true of the poet-*persona's* literary intentions.) There is a vital chapter in M. Heath's recent book *Interpreting Classical Texts* (London 2002) on "Good intentions", pp. 59-97, esp. regarding the 'knowability' or 'unknowability' of authorial intentions (at pp. 79-83): "it is not, in fact, the case that other people's intentions are utterly unknowable. [... They] can be known *up to a point*, but not *ultimately*" (p. 82). Hence, Heath rationally, and at the same time *pragmatically*, takes up the cudgels for the use of an exploration of intentions also beyond sneered-at ('historical') intentionalism ("Are intentions interesting?", pp. 83-94) Here L. could positively use some additional backing from, or more theoretic reflection of, the on-going debate outside Classical Studies as well.⁷ And yet, the reader will profit from L.'s general assessment of Martial's *persona* – even more so, if s/he reads it in conjunction with Nauta's abovementioned position.⁸

As for L.'s own intentions, can *they* be known by his reader? Or: Does the reader know them simply by believing what L. tells him/her? I sometimes wonder *how* non-fictional scholarly books actually are, and am inclined to follow D. Fowler's however incendiary conviction that "it's no good pretending [we] didn't *make it all up*".⁹ In reading L.'s book, I have found it interpretatively useful to remind myself that I am reading an (excellent!) construct of scholarly fiction, that is, when L. tells me at the outset what he *intends* to do and not to do I need not believe him.

Finally, following especially D. Fowler ("Martial and the Book", *Ramus* 24 [1995], 31-58), L. rightfully considers Martial's epigrams in their context within

⁶ "Da sich der Autor jedoch hinter seiner *persona* versteckt, müssen alle Überlegungen zu seinen Intentionen spekulativ bleiben." (p. 54)

⁷ L. could perhaps have modified his stance by taking into consideration some of the material supplied by the on-going debate outside Classical Studies, e.g., on the notion and concept(s) of the 'author', for which see F. Jannidis *et al.* (eds), *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs* (Tübingen 1999).

⁸ It surprises me that the very last paragraph of the first chapter (p. 54) is simply filled by the conclusion that 'der 'ich' Sagende der Epigramme' in this book, as of p. 55, will simply be called 'Martial' – in order to avoid such 'odd expressions' as 'Sprecher' or *persona*. For stylistic issues, cf. above n. 2. The participial construction recalls Holzberg's idiom, as does the whole terminology (cf. p. 54 n. 211; p. 248). The entire issue, however, surely is much more complex and subject to a deeper theoretic debate.

⁹ "Postmodernism, Romantic Irony, and Classical Closure", in: I.J.F. de Jong, J.P. Sullivan (eds), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden etc. 1994), 231-256 at p. 237 (repr. in D. F.'s *Roman Constructions* [Oxford 2000], quotation there at p. 13).

the *published* book(s) (pp. 3-4, 9-11 with n. 31, and *passim*). But more than that: One of his core working principles, alluded to as early as on p. 1, is to consider Books I-XII as a coherent compositional entity (cf. pp. 111, 207, 221-222, 228-233). Fortunately, I must say, this hypothesis did not allure him to make each individual book be totally subservient to the collection as a whole, as Holzberg [n. 1], *passim* did, who under the duress of nothing but his own convictions had to explain away a number of obstacles in an overly forced manner. For, even if we have to take Books I-XII as *one* piece, the single books (published individually) do nonetheless exist as sub-entities of their own right. Thus, it is legitimate to examine an individual book independently.

Last of all, L.'s emphasis on a linear and 'forward looking' reception of a book of epigrams, that is, on a strictly successive reading from the very first to the very last item of a book, is important (cf. p. 51 with n. 196, and p. 111), since this takes into account the ancient reception mode. At the same time, he admits that "sich bei der *wiederholten* Lektüre *einzelner Gedichte* oder Bücher immer neue Erkenntnisse für deren Deutung eröffnen können" (p. 51; my emphasis). Here we go: The philologist (or literary critic, as it were) re-reads his/her primary material and thus generates second thoughts, which, just like the reader of Apuleius in Winkler's unsurpassed *Auctor & Actor* will subsequently modify his/her understanding of the text read.

2. L. in the context of previous scholarship

L.'s study is superb in taking into account virtually all previous work on Martial's 'imperial poems' and adjoining areas, such as Statius' *Silvae*. There is a terrific *Forschungsbericht* on pp. 45-50. Its focal point is, of course, a summary of extant research regarding the 'hidden-criticism controversy'. Here, L.'s quotation from the seminal article by D.F. Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan' [...]", is essential: "Intentions are open to ideological misrecognition; so is reception."¹⁰ (p. 48) Therefore, we ought to bear in mind that any utterance that we, the interpreters, take to be subversive or critical may not have been *intended* as criticism by the author and/or read in that way by his *contemporary* recipients, or both. The dilemma evolving from the mutability of reception is fundamental, and the gap between the exponents of the 'safe-criticism approach' (most notably J. Garthwaite, followed by the 'early' Holzberg) and its adversaries (who luckily constitute the majority) is perhaps indeed un-

¹⁰ In: A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London 1992), 26-58 at p. 46 (on Ovid's possible criticism of Augustus).

bridgeable.¹¹ After all, L. is matter-of-factly right in arguing that, due to a lack of reliable material, Garthwaite's view will never be ultimately *falsified*. Cf. p. 157 (on the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* vs. the adultery poems and Domitian's alleged sexual liaison with his niece Julia) and pp. 193-194 (on the Domitianic castration edict in the 'Earinus collection', Book IX). But who would ever want to falsify (or verify) an interpretation? I should think that intentions are as likely to be misrecognized as almost any other element that may feature in our interpretive construct of any text. If there ultimately seems to be no hope, all that remains is common sense, and L.'s book, auspiciously enough, is full of it.

3. Now the details:

The main body of this volume is divided into three sections: 1. Martial's *Book of Spectacles* and the *Xenia & Apophoreta* (ch. 2, pp. 55-110); 2. the Domitianic books (I-IX), which of course occupy the most space (ch. 3, pp. 111-208); 3. Nerva and Trajan in Books X-XII (ch. 4, pp. 209-246). This roughly corresponds with the historical development of the imperial court from B.C.E. 80 (*Spect.*) to c. 102 (XII), from the reign of Titus to Trajan.

3.1. *Spectacula*

L. gives a neat evaluation of the major problems involved in the interpretation of the *Liber spectaculorum* (pp. 56-64), as well as of its structure, which is severely blurred by its fragmentary condition and the problems of transmission.

His subsequent analysis of the book is based on the important narratological observation (p. 68) that the speaker in *Spect.* appears to be a spectator who watches the shows in the theater and narrates what he sees. Thus, perhaps similar to the Virgilian games in *Aeneid* V, the recipient becomes an observer who sees through the narrator's eyes.¹² As for the mythological scenes (pp. 70-75), see my review of Holzberg [n. 1], *BMCR* 2003.07.20, par. 25.

¹¹ I am not giving references to particular publications, since they can easily be tracked down via L.'s assessment. – N. Holzberg is a special case inasmuch as in his 1988 *Martial* (just as in his 1986 article), under heavy influence of the explications of Garthwaite and, additionally, of the MA thesis by C. Buchberger (*Der Hase-Löwe-Zyklus im ersten Buch Martials* [...], Munich 1987 [unpubl. ms.]), he argues in favor of the criticism theory, whereas in 2002 [see n. 1], influenced by its opponents and by L., his 'disciple', he withdraws this view. (By the way: That Garthwaite's theses got spread mainly through Holzberg [thus L., p. 46 with n. 178] applies if at all to the German-speaking world only.)

¹² The distinction between the "Dichter-persona" and the "Sprecher-persona" (*ibid.*) needs further clarification.

Despite *Spect.*'s obvious otherness, L. can show quite some conceptual parallels of it to Books I-XII; see, e.g., pp. 71, 72, 82.

One detail: If we accept that *spect.* 36 Sh.B. (= 32 Lindsay), transmitted along with 35 (31) only in the *Florilegium Gallicum*, belongs to the *Spectacula*, then 35 (31), *pace* L. (pp. 67-68), would be attractive as the book's final item. The *da veniam subitis* of line 1 would (as has often been plausibly suggested) refer to Martial's 'hasty production'. L.'s skepticism as to the meaning of *subita* is perhaps unnecessary if we compare, e.g., Plin. *epist.* I 16.2 *audiui causas agentem acriter et ardentem, nec minus polite et ornate, sive meditata sive subita proferret*. Or is it too unsophisticated to suspect that this distich could have been the closure of *Spect.*? (Against this view of mine one could as well point out that L.'s incredulity as to what is seemingly plausible is a plus inasmuch as it constantly forces him not to take over 'fallacious truths'.)

3.2. Books XIII and XIV

Regarding the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, I agree with L. (pp. 83-85) that their date is less certain than generally assumed; cf. *BMCR* 2002.08.38, par. 7. The analysis of the *Xenia* contains much valuable detail about that collection as a *literary* entity. It should go without saying that *Xen.* and *Apoph.* were not primarily or even exclusively meant to function as convenient gift-catalogs; however, the fact that the speaker (e.g. in items 42 and 119) mentions 'his' *Nomentum* (p. 92 with n. 175) does not mean that the recipient cannot *use* the respective epigram for a gift-tag. The collections' fictional self-representation as gift-inventories constitutes a seminal feature of their poetics, as I am trying to show in a forthcoming study (*Beiträge zur Altertumskunde*, vol. 167 [München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag], 2005), in which I shall return to the question of the authenticity of XIII 1-3 and the structural arrangement of items within *Xen.* and *Apoph.* The grouping of poems 183-196 of *Apoph.*, the 'literary works section', has so far not been explained satisfactorily, mainly because scholars did not take into account the book's Saturnalian character and the meaning of the 'rich-poor sequence' (XIV 1.5-6) in the *fictional* world of *Apoph.*¹³ L.'s discussion (pp. 100-103) offers quite some attractive solutions, which should be read by those who are concerned with the structure of *Apoph.*

¹³ See, e.g., T.J. Leary's commentary (London 1996) at pp. 19-20 and 247.

4. Books I-IX

The central 'Domitianic' section, chapter 3, consists of four sub-chapters: "Der Kaiser als Leser und Wohltäter" (on Books I-IV, pp. 111-142), "Obszönität und Panegyrik" (Books V-VI, pp. 142-162), "Krieg und Triumph" (Books VII-VIII, pp. 163-187), and "Der Abschied von Domitian" (Book IX, pp. 187-208). As we are able to fairly securely determine that Martial, as of B.C.E. 84, published one book more or less every year, L.'s 'chronological approach' (p. 111) is wise, since it enables him to consider the potential development of the role of Domitian from Book I up to Book IX. (See above on linear and forward looking reading.)

4.1. The Books of B.C.E. 85-88

L.'s focus in ch. 3.1. on the Domitianic poems in Books I and IV reflects the simple fact that in II and III the 'imperial theme' plays a rather marginal role (e.g., pp. 120, 135, 142).

In previous scholarship, the 'hare-and-lion epigrams' of Book I (items 6, 14, 22, 48, 51, 60, 104) have received a lot of attention, and the *communis opinio* that these poems convey a message through allegory seems well founded (pp. 128-129). One important conclusion of this chapter (e.g., pp. 130 and 134) is that this allegory is most unlikely one of hidden criticism (an approach for which see the references on pp. 46-48 and 126-127). Perhaps led astray by their own preconception of 'panegyric', some modern critics may have mistaken Martial's epigrammatic speech mode for criticism. A remarkable specimen of interpretive aberration is the recent study by J.-W. Beck which unfortunately appeared too late to be discussed by L.¹⁴

As for the overall development in Books I-IV of the emperor's role as reflected by his presence in, or absence from, the respective parts of the collections, L. – with some success, I think – demonstrates that it follows some intratextual 'inner logic', which he calls "gewisse 'Regeln' für die Integration der Kaisergedichte" (p. 142). However, as L. himself has to admit (*ibid.*) – and he will have to do so again rather frequently throughout his book – we cannot determine

¹⁴ Jan-Wilhelm Beck, *Quid nobis cum epistula? Zum Anfang von Martials erstem Epigrammbuch* (Göttingen 2002) = *AAWGö*, phil.-hist. Kl., Jg. 2002, 3, pp. 171-202. I have tried to give a detailed assessment of the methodological misfits of Beck's study in *GFA* 6 (2002), 1023-1028.

the potential impact of extra-textual (historical, social, or – alas! – personal) occurrences *vel sim.* on what L. labels as “Regeln”.

Again one detail: What L. has to say about IV 11 is partly questionable. In it, the poet-*persona* scorns L. Antonius Saturninus, the governor of Upper Germany, who stirred up a sedition against Domitian in the late 80s, for having been so naive as to try to overpower the emperor.¹⁵ Martial insinuates that the sole reason for Saturninus’ attempt to undertake this revolt was the pride he felt in being a namesake of great Marc Antony (*dum nimium vano tumefactus nomine gaudes / et Saturninum te pudet esse, miser*, 1-2) – a coincidence that ultimately portended the disastrous outcome (*ille etiam nostris Antonius occidit armis, / qui tibi collatus, perfide, Caesar erat*, 9-10). Here’s L.’s comment: “Die Argumentation [...] beruht allein auf der Namensgleichheit der beiden *Antonii*. Saturninus habe sich, so der etwas gezwungene Gedankengang, sogar geschämt, Saturninus zu heißen, und wäre lieber einfach ‘Antonius’ gewesen, um seinem ‘Vorbild’ näher zu sein.” (pp. 141-142) This is probably only half of the story: Why is the governor *ashamed* of his cognomen? Perhaps because he had yet another notorious namesake, L. Appuleius Saturninus (trib. pl. 103/100 BC) who was executed for his rebellious practices (for which see E. Badian, “The Death of Saturninus”, *Chiron* 14 [1984], 101-147), and whom Tacitus (*ann.* III 27.2) dubs *turbator plebis*. Moreover, L.’s contention that “[d]er Oktaviangegner M. Antonius wird [...] kurzerhand selbst zum *Caesar* erklärt. Man gewinnt den Eindruck, dass der Martial der Epigramme die historischen Zusammenhänge nicht begriffen hat” (p. 142) is bewildering. The poem’s punchline consists of a simple analogy: ‘Compared to you, traitor, Marc Antony was even a Caesar’, *Caesar* being used generically. It sounds odd to call the train of thought “gezwungen” or to assume that the poet-*persona* here plays a moron.

4.2. Books V-VI

Chapter 3.2 deals with the ‘juridical-societal epigrams’ of Books V and VI. In V, there are quite a few poems (in association with several items on

¹⁵ By the way: The epigram should be read in conjunction with IX 84, in which Martial addresses his friend Norbanus, equestrian procurator of Raetia, who helped to suppress Saturninus’ revolt (alluded to in ll. 1-2). (Consequently, Martial emphasizes Norbanus’ *sancta fides* [l. 2] in opposition to Saturninus’ *perfidia*.) Even if L. here shows no interest in going beyond the book in which the epigram is located it is interesting to find in Book IX the Norbanus-poem, which reads as an epigram to accompany a gift of Books IV-VIII (see ll. 9-10, and cf. Henriksén’s comm., vol. 2, p. 112).

Domitian's reinforcement of the *lex Roscia theatralis*) on people who failed in their attempts to rise to a higher social rank. Martial, the *poet-persona*, with his appeals to the emperor is one of them (pp. 146-152). Book VI has caused much greater dispute on account of the markedly sensible contrast between Domitian's re-enactment of the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* (esp. VI 2 and 4) and the many epigrams on (successful and unpunished) adultery (e.g. 6 and 22).¹⁶ Of course, L.'s focal point has to be on the vexed question of whether or not this tension is a trace of 'hidden criticism' (p. 156), especially if one follows J. Garthwaite's reasoning (*Prudentia* 22 [1990], 12-22). The epigram that is the pivot of the entire debate is VI 3, on Domitian's expected child, over whom the emperor's niece, Julia, shall watch (ll. 5-6) – an almost perverse alliance if the rumor (Suetonius, Juvenal, Pliny, Dio Cassius) were true that Domitian, after impregnating Julia, by a forceful abortion ultimately caused his niece-mistress' death! The bottom line of L.'s analysis, that is, that "Panegyrik und komische Dichtung einander nicht ausschließen" (p. 162), cannot be enough emphasized. And yet, after reading pp. 157-162, it surprises me that, at p. 157, L. is so carefully defensive as to deny the possibility of a once-and-for-all refutation of Garthwaite's theory. Why this implicit option to chicken out?¹⁷

4.3. The campaign-books VII and VIII

VII and VIII, the subject of ch. 3.3., depict Domitian primarily as a successful military leader in his campaigns against the Sarmatans.¹⁸

L. rightly adopts the view that in the opening sequence of VII (1-2, 5-8) the advent of god-like Domitian, i.e. his safe return from the war, almost reads like a formal κλητικὸς ὕμνος (p. 163 with n. 208), but I can only partially succumb to his contention that Martial here draws on Horace, *Odes* IV (pp. 163-164, 166, 172, 174), because it seems hard to tell the difference between real *allusions* or

¹⁶ VI 8 is, *pace* L. (p. 153), not an adultery-poem. As for the *cunnilingus* of VI 26, L.'s idea (p. 155 n. 173) that Sotades, the poor wretch, does not run the risk of being convicted of adultery (in its proper sense) solely because of his impotence may seem too forced to some.

¹⁷ L.'s interpretation of Book VI draws on P. Watson's insightful article ("Martial on the Wedding of Stella and Violentilla", *Latomus* 58 [1999], 348-356), in which the author – successfully, I think – takes the adulterous tone of that epigram to refer to Stella's production of *elegiac* poetry, which has prompted Martial to depict bride and bridegroom as formerly having been an 'elegiac', i.e. unfaithful, duo (p. 160). Hence, Domitian's law-enforcement has 'converted' them into a loyal, law-abiding couple.

¹⁸ That L. strictly follows his own critical approach becomes once more obvious from the fact that he mentions the historical background, which is so essential as to the motivation of VII and VIII, only in a tiny footnote (p. 163 n. 205).

references and parallels that are either *incidental* or motivated by the shared virtual intertext.¹⁹ Thus, L.'s list of verbal 'echoes' (nn. 209 and 210) may be dangerously deceptive.²⁰ He could perhaps have brought home his point by also referring here to the fact that Domitian, in many ways, aims to be 'the most Augustan of the Flavians'.

Either way, speaking of remote structural parallels, it would have been worth mentioning also the idea of R. Pitcher, followed by G. Galán Vioque, that *mutatis mutandis* the depiction of Domitian bears some similarity to Ovid's self-characterization as exile.²¹

L.'s treatment of Martial's "Huldigungskonzept in Buch 8" (thus the title of ch. 3.3.1., p. 166), among other items, includes VIII 21 (*Phosphore, redde diem*), some kind of a generic inversion of the 'dawn-song' (*Tagelied*), which is briefly characterized as an *allusion* to Hor. c. IV 5 ("Das Gedicht spielt auf die Panegyrik in der Horazode 4.5 an."), and L. Watson's insightful article on that poem is used as authority (p. 170 with n. 234).²² However, Watson does *not* speak of Horace's poem as the source or pretext of Martial's epigram! The Augustan poem (esp. its second stanza, *lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae*, etc.) is cited as a remarkable specimen of the appropriation of the sun imagery in Augustan propaganda (comparison of the emperor to the sun / conceptualization of him as a second sun, etc.).²³ Consequently, Watson (at p. 361) speaks of "[t]he particular *color* imparted to the theme by Martial". Again, I think we are looking at a conceit in its generic intertext.²⁴

¹⁹ There is, of course, not always a clear-cut dividing line between these qualities. Even more desirable would be some sort of discussion. See, e.g., R.F. Thomas, "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference", *HSCP* 90 (1986), 171-198 = *id.*, *Reading Virgil and His Texts* (Ann Arbor 1999), 114-141.

²⁰ Take, e.g., the use of *redi, veni, populo* and others in *Odes* IV 5 and 6, some of which belong to the general repertoire of the language of hymns, others (on account of the limits of linguistic expression in any language) seem to be simply Latin rather than distinctly Horatian. Similarly, *io Triumphe* at Hor. c. IV 2.49f. (for which see, e.g., Mankin on *epod.* IX 21 or Murgatroyd on Tib. II 5.118) cannot possibly be read as a pretext of Mart. VII 6.7 (*rurus, io, magnos clamat tibi Roma triumphos*).

²¹ See Picher's "Martial's Debt to Ovid" in my *Toto notus in orbe* (Stuttgart 1998), 59-76 at pp. 69-72; Galán Vioque's comm. on VII 5, p. 68.

²² "Martial 8.21, Literary *Lusus*, and Imperial Panegyric", in F. Cairns, M. Heath (eds), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 10 (1998) = *ARCA* 38, 359-372. – The reference should be to p. 361 of Watson's article; "350f." in n. 234 is erroneous.

²³ Note Watson's diction: The *Ode* (along with c. IV 2.46-47) is cited as an *example* ("Horace, for instance, [...]"), p. 361.

²⁴ C. Schöffel, in his recent commentary on Martial VIII (Stuttgart 2002), p. 222-223, misreads Watson's statement in the same way.

Speaking of 'genre', let me add one detail re. the prose preface to VIII, ll. 5-6 Sh.-B. (*minus itaque ingenio laborandum fuit, in cuius locum materia successerat*). For sure, the poet tells us that he did not have to 'labor with invention', since the subject-matter (*materia*), the emperor and his achievements, are ready at hand. Is it convincing to argue (as L., pp. 171-172, does) that this statement recalls the depiction of the Roman elegists' *puellae* as their 'inspiration'? Even if it is, what we would have here would (again) be a 'generic inversion' of the elegiac *recusatio*, which needs to be further contextualized.²⁵ At any rate, Martial (or his *persona*, if you so desire) does not run the risk of choosing a theme he is not capable of dealing with, so his *materia* surely is *aequa viribus*, as Horace (*ars* 38-39) would put it.²⁶

At a first glance, it seems a little surprising (to me) that L. more than once (e.g., pp. 170 and 175) downplays the notable increase of 'imperial poems', that is, of the significance of Domitian in Book VIII: The observation that '*not even 25 % of the book's items are panegyric / 'imperial''* (p. 170), statistically correct as it may be, must be read against the background of Books I-VII.²⁷ However, this somewhat unfortunate stance results from an overall persuasive reading of the opening sequence of Book VIII, esp. item 3, the dialogue between Martial and his Muse, Thalia (pp. 172-176). At VIII 3.1-8, Martial may indeed be thinking of switching from epigram to loftier poetic forms (p. 173) rather than of altogether giving up his job as a poet. But it must be stressed that this is not what Martial is explicitly saying. At any rate, his failure to change the poetic format is certainly to be viewed in the tradition of the *recusatio* (p. 174).²⁸ L. does allude to the comic effect of VIII 3 (praise of epigram vs. downgrading of epic and tragedy; p. 174), but of course this is a typical motif. As regards ll. 3-4 of the poet's speech (*iam plus nihil addere nobis / fama potest*), this does *not* mean "dass kleine Epigramme gewichtiger sind und mehr Ruhm einbringen als große Werke" (*ibid.*) but that the genre he had employed thus far (epigram) is the *only* form to earn fame. If we think this inversion (!) to an end we may conclude that non-epigrammatic panegyric will *not* bring renown – at least not in

²⁵ Giangrande dubs this phenomenon *Umkehrung*; the *locus classicus* in scholarship is still F. Cairns' *Generic Composition* of 1972.

²⁶ Cf. Iuv. 1.150-151. It seems that here is more at stake than a simple transformation of an elegiac idea. L.'s remark that VIII *praef.* contains "offenbar unvermeidliche (?) Anklänge an die erotische Dichtung [viz. elegy]" (p. 172) remains esoteric.

²⁷ See only K.M. Coleman's statistics in Cairns-Heath [n. 22], pp. 339 (with nn. 10-11) and 342-343; Henriksen [n. 14], vol. 1, p. 22; Schöffel [n. 24], pp. 17-18. – Martial's claim that *pars libri et maior et melior ad maiestatem sacri nominis tui* [sc. *Domitiani*] *alligata sit* does not imply any quantitative minimum.

²⁸ The mention of Callimachus' *Aitia*-prologue (*ibid.*), however, can stand to reason *only* if we read it through the eyes of the Augustan poets.

Martial's times, or to Martial. L. rightly points out the close connection of VIII 3 to 55, a dialogue between the poet-*persona* and a certain Flaccus (!), of which L. gives a neat interpretation (pp. 177-179). Things have changed: 'In Augustan Rome' – thus the straightforward argument – 'there were panegyric poets such as Virgil because they had their *Maecenates*; nowadays, because there are no patrons of that format, there is no poetry in the Virgilian fashion.'²⁹ Despite (or, rather, in addition to) L.'s reading, one wonders if an assessment of VIII 55 (and consequently also of 3) might not benefit as well from a socio-historical approach (which would be anything but counterproductive here).

4.4. Book IX

Book IX, the last Domitianic book, is at the same time the 'most Domitianic' one. So it *may* indeed be striking that its prefatory epistle is entirely Domitian-free (p. 188), especially if we compare it to VIII *praef.* Also, it *may* be an interpretive hardship (but only from the Classicist-reader's viewpoint, I think) that IX *praef.*, unlike the other prefaces, does not contain any 'obvious' statements re. the poetic concept of the book. Here, L.'s slant of considering IX *praef.* in conjunction with VIII *praef.* is surely the most fundamental idea to further our understanding of the indeed twisted communicative setting of the epistle with its *extra-oridinem-paginarum* epigram (pp. 189-191); and it may be added that, *mutatis mutandis*, our view of the preface to Book II (as linked to I *praef.*) would profit from some similar investigation.³⁰

But despite the fact that we focus on the *literary* function of the preface to the *published* book and of that very book's position within the dozen of Books I-XII, the different investigations by P. White, R. Nauta, and others (as mentioned in nn. 297 and 301) have obviously helped L. sharpen his focus: Is it not intriguing that White and Nauta can so coherently study the supposedly 'private nature' of Martial's epistle to Toranius and of the epigram, attached to that selfsame epistle, but addressing a certain Stertinius Avitus? In other words, do we not through that very approach (no matter how misguided it may seem to the overly dogmatic literary critic) catch one of the hallmarks of epigram as a genre? And is it not then intriguing that L. can no less rightfully assert the involvement in the preface of yet another (third!) addressee, the

²⁹ It is not clear, though, how the poem's "Gedankengang [...] erscheint gezwungen" (p. 178); see above, on IV 11. However, I shall do without a discussion of 'Gezwungenheit' (if that is a word).

³⁰ II *praef.* did not receive enough attention from L., nor did the parallel between I/II *praef.* and VIII/IX *praef.*

general reader (p. 189), who comes into play in the ‘epigram within the epigram’ (ll. 5-8 at 6)? That Avitus – whether or not he is real or fictional is irrelevant – has put up in his library a bust of Martial and that Martial now composes an inscription to be affixed to his *imago* and that, on top of all this, Martial calls Avitus *notus sublimi pectore vates* – that is, Avitus figures himself as a *poet*, a talented one in Martial’s opinion but lamentably enough one who will earn fame only after his yet-to-come death (*cui referet serus praemia digna cinis*, l. 2) –, is so blatantly allusive and metapoetic that it deserves much more critical reflection. For my part, I can hardly imagine any other genre that can so effectively be flippant and, in doing so, be so serious about its own standing. Taking this into account, one wonders how important the role of Domitian (p. 190) in that book can ultimately be. But that’s a different story.

The tension in Book IX between the poems celebrating Domitian’s castrated *puer delicatus*, Earinus,³¹ and the fact that the same emperor issued an edict to ban castrations is, of course, yet another playground for safe-criticism: did Martial *intend* to implicitly pass judgment on Domitian’s double standards? L. shows that the respective poems (11-13, 16-17, 36) can be read as affirmative panegyric (pp. 191-198, esp. 194-198, and cf. p. 200).³² But we may ask whether the question ‘Which thesis makes *most* sense, or *more* sense than its opposite?’ (pp. 194³³ and 197) is methodologically askable. (The situation as a whole is different, I think, from that of Book VI.) It is coupled with the notorious question of Martial’s (the poet’s) *intention* (p. 197), but in reality it is (again) much more an issue of continuity or change of reception. Sources such as Dio Cassius (LXVII 2.1-3 on Domitian’s hypocrisy *in rebus – ut Palladii verbo utar – castratoriis*), because they are post-Domitianic, are worthless (p. 193). Ultimately, ‘the’ reading of the Earinus-cycle does not exist. I follow L. simply because his *argument* is sound. L.’s surrender, however, is odd: “Es dürfte unmöglich sein, mit Sicherheit zu entscheiden, ob die Earinusepigramme schon zu Lebzeiten des Prinzepts als eine Kritik am Herrscher verstanden werden konnten [...]” (p. 193). Of course they could! – We simply don’t know if that really was the case and by whom.

³¹ It seems urologically inaccurate to say that the *mentula* is a “Körperteil, der Earinus fehlt” (p. 192); as a result of the castration the *mentula* was not altogether lacking but dysfunctional in terms of (one of) its ordinary purpose(s).

³² The equation of Domitian with Jupiter (and Earinus with Ganymede) is the crucial point, for which flip back to pp. 122-123 with the references in n. 42. See also L.’s assessment of the ‘Hercules-epigrams’ in the same book (items 64, 65, 101) at pp. 203-208.

³³ Esp. “Im Folgenden werde ich zu zeigen versuchen, dass sich der Earinuszyklus als affirmative Panegyrik lesen lässt und dass diese Deutung nicht weniger Sinn ergibt als die These von der Kaiserkritik.” (my emphasis)

One minor detail concerning IX 46, on a certain Gellius' frantic obsession to renovate his house: L. points out (rightly) that most of the repair or renovation work done by this maniac do-it-yourselfer concerns safety-related parts of his house, thresholds, doors, bolts, windows (p. 201). However, it seems totally ungrounded to speculate (*ibid.*) that the epigram alludes to *paraklausithyra* of Roman elegy, that is, Gellius makes his friends to *exclusi amici*. That the phrase *limina ponere* (l. 1) is attested only here and at Prop. II 6.37 (n. 347) may be correct, but it can hardly support this idea. The poem is sufficiently explicated by its commentator (Henriksén, vol. 1, pp. 218-219).

5. After Domitian's death: Books X-XII

I shall now come to the third and last 'big chapter' (4.), on the post-Domitianic collections, Books X-XII. The leading questions must inevitably be: Did, after Domitian's assassination, Martial's attitude to the then dead emperor change (p. 209)? (Whose attitude? The *persona's* or Martial's? The latter's, I suppose – and the historical author and his intentions come into play again.) Did his panegyric poetics change? That is, how do the new emperors, Nerva and Trajan, figure in the epigrams? In a general statement (based on some similarities between the Nervan or Trajanic and the Domitianic poems), L. speaks of "unverkennbare Kontinuität" rather than change (p. 210). The marked decrease of 'imperial poems' (p. 219) may not be all too surprising if we compare X and XI to the *early* Domitianic collections (I-IV). But perhaps it is futile to engage in too much speculation. However, X-XII may not that easily lend themselves to an 'unrestrained' comparison with I-IX, not the least because Martial's editorial routine changed after IX: The Trajanic Book X (B.C.E. 98), as we have it, is a second edition to replace (the previously Domitianic) X¹ of 95; XI was published under Nerva in 96; written in Spain, Martial's *liber Hispanus* (XII) of 101 (i.e. after a triennium of silence), is a special case anyway. It seems noteworthy, too, that Trajan, when he became the new *princeps*, was away from Rome on the Danube, and returned to the capital only about a year and a half into his reign, while Martial had already left for Spain. And it is hard to think that that did not have any impact on the format of the imperial panegyric.

It is good to see that L., unlike his *Doktorvater* [n. 1] at pp. 147-148, does not attempt to explain away the 2nd edition of Book X (e.g. pp. 220, 228). Instead, he argues (effectively, I think) that there are clear signals that X² is intended to *follow* XI, as a consequence of which we ought to read the final book sequence in a twisted order: IX – XI – X² – XII (pp. 221-222, 228). I do not quite understand for what reason L. poses the question why Martial has not subsequently changed the book numbers of X and XI "wodurch die für die Lektüre *sinnvoll-*

ste Ordnung der späten Bücher sicher gestellt worden wäre" (p. 220; my emphasis). Even *if* that had easily been doable³⁴ – it did not happen. Maybe, Martial ultimately cared less about the 'serial unity' of I-XII than L. wants him to?

As to the reason(s) for re-editing X, one cannot but speculate. However, I am not sure if the *communis opinio* (new edition of X after Domitian's death in order to eliminate excessive panegyric, viz. to adapt the book to suit the new political circumstances; see p. 220 with n. 46) is as implausible as L. (pp. 227-228) wants us to believe.³⁵ His own (however tentative) suggestion, based on a much-neglected article by W. Allen *et al.*,³⁶ does not prove the *communis opinio* 'wrong'. It can, however, give yet another, additional, explanation: We can indeed interpret the sequence (XI/)X/XII, along with the 'epic quantity' of books, as a would-be 'epic *nostos*' (pp. 228-231, 233), with X² announcing the poet's return to his hometown Bilbilis in Spain (see, e.g., the closural items X 103-104).

Book XII completes Martial's *nostos*; so, consequently, the poet dubs it *liber Hispanus*.³⁷ But XII throws up yet another problem: one of the textual transmission. XII contains both Trajanic *and* Nervan items; poem 4 (5) speaks of an abridged version of, or anthology from, X and XI, dedicated to a *Caesar* – Nerva? As a consequence, many have seen in XII a posthumous compilation of 'Book XII proper' plus that anthology (see p. 234 with n. 106). To challenge this view is L.'s main endeavor (esp. pp. 234-238): Since MSS family γ is lacking

³⁴ If I haven't overlooked anything, Book XI does not contain any numbering, and once it had been published in 96, a year or so after X¹, Martial could hardly make such a change. As L. himself admits (p. 228), it is quite impracticable in antiquity to withdraw a 'publication' and to entirely replace it by an up-dated or revised one. See only E.J. Kenney, in *CHCL* II, pp. 19-20. Quintilian, e.g., referring to some books by Hippocrates and Cicero, points to the problems involved in amending already 'published' texts (*inst.* III 6.64).

³⁵ See also K.M. Coleman, *AJAH* 15 (1990 [2000-01]) at p. 36.

³⁶ "Martial: Knight, Publisher, and Poet", *CJ* 65 (1970), 345-357, esp. pp. 351-352.

³⁷ The preface of XII is addressed to a good friend, Priscus, whom Martial, at the very end of the epistle asks 'to judge his trifles without favorable bias, lest he send to Rome *non Hispaniensem librum, sed Hispanum*'. Two comments: "Nicht ein Buch nach Art Spaniens will ich schicken, sondern ein spanisches" (p. 232 n. 94) misses the point twice: (1.) It leads the reader astray, for it ignores the syntax and, thus, the meaning of the sentence; (2.) "nach Art Spaniens" does not catch the gist of what Martial wants to say. Cf. (notably enough, I think) Velleius Paterculus (at II 51.3), who calls L. Cornelius Balbus, a Gaditane lacking Roman citizenship by birth, *non Hispaniensis natus sed Hispanus* (if we accept Lipsius' *coniectura palmaris*, for which see Woodman *ad loc.*). The distinction Martial makes is, just as Velleius', a political one of civil law, 'native-born' as opposed to 'Spanish Roman' (see R. Syme, *Roman Papers* I 37 with n. 5). So the *libellus* is wittily personified, and the question of 'his' civil rights or citizenship an integral aspect of the poetics of Book XII. The reader can eventually ask him/herself whether XII is Spanish or Spanish Roman.

quite a few items, which were allegedly part of the anthology (4, 5, 6 *inc.*, 11, 15, 28, 29, 36, 47) and all of which are transmitted in β , L. argues that γ has suffered from a *post-mortem-poetae* deletion of those items, whereas β preserves an older, thus 'more original', version of XII – an *not vice versa*; and indeed, this change of perspective can also explain the absence of item 47 (46) from γ (p. 235). As a consequence, following Lindsay's edition, L. prefers the arrangement of epigrams as presented in β to that of γ (p. 237).³⁸

L.'s final comparison of the panegyric in XII to Pliny's *Panegyricus Traiani* (notwithstanding my comment in n. 5 above) is attractive.

But I feel some urge to comment on Martial's application of the adjective *mitissimus* to both Nerva at XII 6.1 Lindsay (= 5.3 Sh.B.) and Trajan at 9.1 Li. = Sh.B.: That Martial had previously not used *mitis* to describe the emperor's quality is probably correct (I haven't double-checked), but to infer that it is "offenbar kein panegyrischer Standardbegriff, sondern kann bei der Beschreibung eines Machthabers gerade Assoziationen von zu großer Liberalität hervorrufen" (p. 239 [my emphasis], and cf. p. 241) is odd. Ovid used it of Augustus and Tiberius, Seneca the Younger of Augustus and Claudius, and Statius even of Domitian.³⁹ So, some (including myself) will have difficulty with L.'s syncretistic approach to items 6 and 9, according to which Nerva is *mitissimus* but ultimately lacks the power to be a potent ruler (i.e. *mitis* has a negative undertone), whereas Trajan is both *mitis* and powerful enough (i.e. the negative undertone is gone) (pp. 239-241).⁴⁰

At the end, there are valuable indices ("Namen und Sachen", "Stellen", pp. 279-302). The entry "Martial", with its many sub-entries, looks confusing, and inevitably so; but it is worth browsing through. – The bibliography (27 pp.) is admirably comprehensive and useful also beyond the scope of L.'s book.

The volume as a whole is well produced. Typos and other slips are scarce.⁴¹

³⁸ I tend to agree that Lindsay offers the better text in XII, esp. item 6 as transmitted in β (= 5.3-8 + 3.7-12 Sh.B.), for which see pp. 236-237. It is Lindsay's handling of the textual tradition in XII why L.'s entire work is based on the OCT edition (²1929) rather than the more recent Teubner ones (p. x). I haven't checked whether this decision has any further impact on chapters other than 4.3. It is reasonable anyway.

³⁹ *Alii* probably *alia*. See the passages compiled in *ThLL* VIII 1154.50ff.

⁴⁰ The reference to the use of *mitis dominus* in Pliny's *Epistles* (p. 239 n. 117) blurs the issue, I think, as the context is crucially different – not the least because Pliny talks about the relation between masters and *slaves* in the private realm.

⁴¹ Such as p. 53, ll. 12 and 14: read "*damnatio memoriae*" and "Verbindungen"; or p. 189 n. 295: read "*para hospitium*". – The first of the two original compilers of *LSJ*, H.G. Liddell,

I have heard some people say the book's title, "Erotik und Panegyrik", is pretentious or ostentatiously eye-catching. It is not. The title simply indicates what the book is about – and if that happens to catch people's eyes, it is for the better rather than worse.

Sven Lorenz deserves to be congratulated on having written a wonderfully stimulating book on a thorny subject. I truly hope that anyone who undertakes to pursue research in this or a related field will conscientiously utilize his book and find it as helpful and thought-provoking as I do.⁴²

Farouk F. Grewing
 Institut für Altertumskunde
 – Klassische Philologie –
 Universität zu Köln
 D-50923 Köln
 e-mail: f.grewing@uni-koeln.de

got deprived of his second 'l' (p. x). – The reference to P. Howell at p. 237 n. 114 should read "[1998a], 180f." – In the bibliography (p. 275), R. Verdière's article of 1988 got doubly disfigured; read: "'Considérations sur trois poètes de la **latinité** d'argent: Iulius Cerialis – Turnus – Arruntius Stella', *Eos* 76, 315-23". [my corrections in **boldface**] – In his discussion of Mart. VI 13, L. (p. 159 n. 189) refers to my 1998 piece on etymology in Martial, in which I pointed to the etymological link of Venus' epithet *Acidalia* to *acus* / ἀκίς ('needle'); *pace* L., this is *not* a 'Volksetymologie' (nor did I call it that way!). This etymology is part of the ancient *linguistic* discourse; see Serv. *Aen.* I 720, and A. Uhl, *Servius als Sprachlehrer* [...] (Göttingen 1998), 489-520, or, in general, R. Maltby, *OED*³, p. 562.

⁴² Regarding the Gunter Narr Verlag, it may be noted that their negligence in distributing and, thus, marketing their books is almost incredible. It took them no less than a year to mail me L.'s volume, after the editors of *GFA* had repeatedly almost suppliantly begged them. I dare say that such a practice is disrespectful to the authors and, I should think, harmful to the publishers themselves.