

## Citation style

Moreno Soldevila, Rosario: review of: Christer Henriksén, A Commentary on Martial, "Epigrams" Book 9, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, in: Exemplaria Classica, 17 (2013), p. 385-399, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v17i0.2345, downloaded from Website

**exemplaria**  
C L A S S I C A  
Journal of Classical Philology

## copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

CHRISTER HENRIKSÉN, *A Commentary on Martial, Epigrams Book 9*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 496, ISBN 978-0-19-960631-3.

This commentary was first published in two volumes by the University of Uppsala in 1998 and 1999 (C. Henriksén, *Martial, Book IX. A Commentary*, vol. I-II, Uppsala 1998-9). Henriksén (henceforward H.), a renowned expert in Martial's epigrams, offers now an updated and thoroughly revised version under the auspices of Oxford University Press. As the author acknowledges in his preface, his views on Martial have been influenced by recent "thought-provoking" works; advances in research, together with the perspective given by time and maturity, have resulted in a book that keeps much of the essence and material of the former version, while adding new insights into the epigrams. H. informs the reader familiar with his work that some of his interpretations even contradict his previous views, and hopes that this is considered a "healthy sign" (v).

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND TEXT

The commentary is preceded by a general introduction to book 9, dealing with issues such as the date of publication (AD 94), its general characteristics and metres, its themes and motifs, its structure, the manuscript tradition and the text of book 9, followed by a brief note on the use of this commentary. Although updated and revised, the introduction is quite similar to the 1998 edition. Upon closer examination, however, those having previous knowledge of this commentary will find some remarkable changes.

The Latin text differs little from the previous version. It must be noted that this scholarly work lacks a critical edition, although the text, the manuscript variants and editorial emendations are profusely discussed in the commentary. The text is based on Borovskij's *editio correctior* of W. Heraeus (*M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*, Lipsiae 1925, *ed. correctiorem curavit I. Borovskij*, Lipsiae 1976), with minor changes. As in 1998, H. follows Shackleton Bailey (*M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*, Stutgardiae 1990) only in minor points: he accepts his punctuation in the poem of the prefatory letter, putting lines 5-8 in inverted commas and printing *sed, puto*, (6), as well as in 9.57.12; in 9.44.6 he prints *Lysippum*; and in 9.59.19 he agrees with him in accepting *veros* instead of *vero*. Other divergences from Heraeus-Borovskij include Gaselee's emendation *arat* (instead of *amat*) in 9.21.4; H. judiciously retains *callida* from Heraeus in 9.48.8. Finally, he prints *Alphius* and *Olphius* in 9.95.1, for the reasons given in the commentary. It is a conservative, but correct text, supported by H.'s discussions in the commentary proper.

### 1.1. METRE

As will be noted below, H. has furnished his commentary with more information about metres, having benefitted from the work of R. M. Marina Sáez (*La métrica de los epigramas de Marcial: esquemas rítmicos y esquemas verbales*, Zaragoza 1998). Moreover, the introductory section about metrics has been expanded (xiv-xvi) and H. offers now a detailed explanation of the metrical influence of Ovid on Martial.

### 1.2. THEMES

H. has altered the order of two sections, focusing on its themes before dealing with its structure, the result being a clearer outline of book 9. Regarding the proportionately higher amount of “Domitianic epigrams” (xviii), H. seems to accept that this book forms part of what N. Holzberg (*Martial und das antike Epigramm*, Stuttgart 2002) has called a “Kaiser Triade”. In a footnote (xviii, n. 15) H. summarizes Holzberg’s idea that books 1-12 form a “dodecalogy” published by Martial as a complete edition, a theory that he considers “attractive” and “thought-provoking”. I believe that the books are more intertwined than commonly believed, but I also wonder whether during the reign of Trajan, when even those with a more secure position than our poet were anxious to clear themselves from any suspicion of collaboration with the previous dynasty, Martial would have ventured to publish a revised edition of the books containing so many adulatory epigrams about Domitian and other figures fallen from grace. The first subsection, *Domitian the commander*, outlines the historical context of the most prominent military campaigns in this book: the war against the *Chatti* and the Second Pannonian War. As regards the latter, H. interprets the attention given to this unsuccessful campaign “on the basis of Martial’s literary ambitions”; this war “provided a frame on which he could build his largest poetical cycle, producing for Domitian what Horace had done for Augustus in *Odes* 4, a suit of epigrams with *propemptikon*, *revocatio*, *reditus* and culminating in the celebration of peace” (xxiii). In the section about *Domitian the god*, H. has devoted a whole chapter to the comparison of Domitian to Hercules (xxviii-xxx), absent in the introduction of the previous version. After dealing with the comparison between Domitian and other gods and his presentation as a *deus*, H. rounds off this section of the introduction with a summary and he explains the increase in imperial panegyrics as the likely result of competition from Statius: “Martial might have felt that Statius was encroaching on a genre which hitherto had been his own domain” (xxxii). At this point he adds a paragraph about the relationship between both poets and the Emperor.

### 1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

H. has completely rewritten the chapter about the structure of the book, paying attention not just to cycles or pairs of epigrams as before, but also to other linking devices such as “juxtaposition”. Section 4.2 has been little altered, except for some bibliographical updates and a discussion of a cycle about the Pannonian War, which had already begun in book 7 (xli-xlii). Reference to this cycle was somehow misplaced in the introduction of the 1998 edition. However, he has expanded the preceding section (“4.1. The general pattern—beginning, end and in between”) considerably, and he also explores these links when dealing with the individual epigrams in the commentary. For instance, he sees a connection between 9.24 and 25, both dealing with “the motif of ‘gazing’” as well as sharing the verb *dare*. Epigrams 9.28 and 29 “mirror each other in that the former is about a philosopher whose actions are in utter conflict with his teaching, while the latter is about an actor of mimes—a genre noted for its immorality—who is himself morally impeccable” (xxxiii). Another contrasting juxtaposition is that of 9.29 and 30, two apparently unconnected poems, the first dealing with the remains of the deceased procuress Philaenis and the second with those of Antistius Rusticus (xxxiv): “The care for Antistius’ remains shown by Nigrina also makes the sharpest possible contrast to the fate wished for those of Philaenis in the conclusion of the preceding epigram” (135). This could have been reinforced by highlighting some other verbal echoes between both poems (*terra, rapta/rapto*). H. also links epigrams 9.30 and 9.31, both related to Northern provinces. What strikes me most, and is overlooked by H., is not just that 9.30 is related somehow to both the immediately preceding and following epigrams, as happens elsewhere in the book and in other collections by Martial, but that they form part of a kind of web<sup>1</sup>, which subtly relates neighbouring poems: thus, 9.29 and 9.31, which apparently bear no resemblance whatsoever to each other, also have something in common (an allusion to the supernatural, in the form of magic and omens), and share at least one word (*luna*), while 9.31 and 9.32 make common use of coins (the first related to the peace of Domitian, the second to the payment for the services of an *avara puella*). All this could be coincidental, but it is undeniable that sometimes Martial’s books seem to progress by an association of ideas. Let us see another example of this, which is not commented upon by H.: epigrams 9.39-42 deal with the birthday of Caesonia, a saucy anecdote involving a wife’s vow for the return of her husband (a Greek poet), an attack against a *masturbator*, and a vow to Apollo if he makes Domitian grant Stella a consulate, respectively; the reader, however, does not perceive the sequence as a totally unconnected whole, for there are echoes among the

<sup>1</sup> For the concept, see S. Lorenz, “Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial’s *Epigrammaton Liber Quartus*”, *AJPh* 125.2, 2004, 255-78.

distinct, apparently independent pieces: 9.39.5 *votorum sorte maritus*; 9.40.3 *vovit, 9 maritus*; 9.40.5 *castae... Sabinae*; 9.41.6 *casta Ilia*; 9.42.8 *debitorque voti*. Likewise, 9.43 and 9.44, which centre on the Hercules Epitrapezios of Novius Vindex, form a pair of epigrams, but it could have been added that the following poem, 9.45, is also related to them. It is addressed to Marcellinus, who after fighting on the Danube is now sent forth to the Caucasus. Martial naturally alludes to the myth of Prometheus, but the figure of Hercules (his liberator) is latent in the echoes from 9.43: 9.45.2 *tuleras... sidera*; 9.43.2 *quaeque tulit... sidera*; 9.45.6 *saxa... 'durior ipse fuit'*; 9.43.1 *dura... saxa*.

H. does not comment either on some puzzling juxtapositions: in 9.4 Aeschylus pays Galla, a prostitute, to keep silent, and the last word of 9.5 is *lupanari*; 9.36.1 deals with the cutting of Earinus' hair (*posito... crine*), while in the following epigram Galla, among other defects, is bald and needs a wig (9.37.2 *absentes... comae*). On xxxiv and 279, H. explains the connection between the petitions to the emperor in 9.64.7-8 and Fabullus' asking for the *ius trium liberorum* in 9.66 (3 *quod petis a nostro supplex dominoque deoque*). However, he does not make the reader aware of the sharp contrast between the impotence of Fabullus and the endless sexual vigour of the speaker and his *puella* in the following epigram (9.67). It must be noted that Fabullus' wife is described as *pudica puella* (9.66.1) and the speaker's mistress as *lascivam... puellam* (9.67.1).

He also links 52-55, about gifts, and 70 and 71, on the subject of peace (as noted by H. on 291, Caecilianus, the protagonist of 9.70, might also be reacting at the rudeness of 9.69 [291]). Many other internal echoes are suggested throughout the commentary, much more complete and insightful than the previous version in this sense.

Many of these associations may not be "immediately apparent", and, as H. points out, "the fixed points that provide the framework and keep the book together must naturally be more instantly apparent" (xxxv). The places where the structure of the book is more evident are the beginning and the end. Additionally, H. agrees with S. Lorenz ("Martial, Herkules und Domitian: Büsten, Statuetten und Statuen im Epigrammaton *Liber Nonus*", *Mnemosyne* 56.5, 2003, 566-84), who suggested that the poems about works of art, a recurrent motif in this book, were "pillars" for its architecture, signalling the different thematic sections, "a pattern (...) far too coherent to seem haphazardous [*sic*]" (xxxvi).

## 2. COMMENTARY

Those familiar with H.'s commentary will find this new version all the more useful, informative and, above all, perceptive. In general terms, it must also be added that the commentary has been made more readable and accessible. Collateral references and additional information have been moved

to the footnotes, making the arguments in the main text more evident<sup>2</sup>; the English has also been improved when needed and bibliographical references are clearer. But, obviously, these are not the most significant achievements, as will be shown below.

### 2.1 *LOCI SIMILES* AND LITERARY MODELS

One of the major improvements deals with the *loci similes*, an essential element in any commentary: H. gives more prominence to parallels which had been simply cited in the previous version, not just quoting them as is usual, but commenting on why they are relevant to the passage discussed.

See, for instance, the comments on 9.1.3 *famuli... Rheni* (p. 15); 9.1.6 *voce supplex... ture placabit* (p. 17); 9.3.9 *matrona Tonantis* (p. 31); 9.5.5 *virilitatis damna* (p. 41); 9.7.3 *ab ubere raptus* (pp. 45-6); 9.12.2 *cum breve... ver* (p. 66); 9.54.8 *arguto passere* (p. 234); 9.56.10 *bona fata manent* (p. 241); 9.61.5-6 (pp. 262-3); 9.61.21 *Perpetuos... frondis honores* (p. 267); 9.65.12 *Styga... Tartareumque canem* (p. 277); 9.67.5 *Inprobis quiddam* (p. 284); 9.68.2 *pueris virginibusque* (p. 286); 9.84 (pp. 329-30); 9.84.3 (p. 331); 9.99.6 *i, liber* (pp. 385-6, adding Hor. *Ep.* 1.20); 9.100.3 *haerere... lateri* (p. 388); 9.100.5 *vilisque vetusque* (p. 389), etc. On pages 193-4 he reinterprets *munus opusque* (9.43.6) in the light of Ov. *Pont.* 4.1.36, casting doubts on the authenticity of the Hercules Epitrapezios. The echo of Ov. *Pont.* 1.7, addressed to the son of M. Cornelius Messala Corvinus, Ovid's patron, suggests, according to H., a relationship of patronage also between Martial and Norbanus in 9.84.7 (*non infitiatum amicum*, p. 332); in 9.99.1 the Vergilian model "implies a flattering comparison of Antonius to C. Asinius Pollio" (p. 382).

New parallels are also put forward and explored, as in p. 130 on 9.29.3-4, p. 313 on 9.76.4, p. 387 on 9.99.9-10 (where H. quotes Ov. *Pont.* 3.5.17-18 instead of Call. *Hymn.* 2.108-112).

Some of the poems have been reinterpreted in the light of literary models, as in the case of 9.11 (see the introduction discussing the influence of Catullus on the poem and how it affects its interpretation, 58-9), 9.35 (an epigram of Philodemus, *AP* 11.44, explaining the choice of the name of the protagonist, Philomusus, an inversion of *μουσοφιλής*, 155-6), 9.42.11, explained by comparison with Hor. *Carm.* 4.2 (186-7) and 9.65 with Theocritus' *Idyll* 17 (274); epigram 9.84 is interpreted in relation to Vergilian intertexts (*G.* 4.559-66; *ecl.* 1.4-5; pp. 329-30).

<sup>2</sup> As in, for instance, p. 12 (cf. *Martial, Book IX. A Commentary*, vol. I, Uppsala 1998, 56); p. 220 (cf. *Martial, Book IX. A Commentary*, vol. II, Uppsala 1999, 19). Detailed discussions of other scholars are also conveniently placed in footnotes for the sake of clarity in the main body of the commentary: e.g. intro. to 9.97, pp. 376-7.

## 2.2. LANGUAGE, STYLE, METRE

The commentary has been furnished with new insightful comments on language and style, which provide the reader with a more profound understanding of the text:

Examples of these are the comments on 9.1.4 *Germanicarum magna lux Kalendarum* (p. 16); 9.2.1, on the abstract noun *amicitiae* (p. 21); 9.2.3 *illa... cunnis* (p. 22); 9.2.10, on the contrast between *addictus... cliens* and *te futuente* (p. 25); 9.2.14 *haec erat, haec* (p. 27); 9.2.14, on the “painful juxtaposition” of *cultris* to *mentula* (p. 27); 9.3.1 *Quantum... dedisti* (p. 28); 9.3.5, on the implications of the verb tenses in the conditional sentence; 9.3.7-11 (p. 29); 9.3.10 *res agit... tuas* (p. 32); 9.5.4-7 (p. 40); 9.7.4 *sordida* (p. 46); 9.7.8 *saeva libido* (p. 47); 9.12.3-4, on the exchange of the verbs *pingere/scribere* (p. 67); 9.20.10 *fulmen et aegis* (p. 92); 9.21 (pp. 92-3); 9.22.5 (pp. 95-6); on the alliteration of 9.22.13 (p. 98); 9.30.1 *saevis... oris* (p. 136); 9.32.1 *quae facilis, quae palliolata vagatur* (p. 145); 9.36.2-3 *alterius... Iovis... tuus... Caesar* (pp. 161-2); 9.36.5 *prima... lanugo* (p. 162); 9.41.2 *Veneri... amica manus* (p. 178); 9.43.3 *quaeque tulit spectat* (p. 192); 9.43.7, on the chronological arrangement of the historical owners of the Hercules Epitrapezios and their relative importance in relation to the space given in the epigram (one distich, one hexameter, one pentameter) (p. 194); on the double enallage of 9.43.11 (p. 196); 9.50.2, on the change of mode between *faciam* and *placent* (p. 221); on the chiasmatic position of the most relevant words in 9.50.3-4 (p. 221); 9.51.7, on the indicative *venit* in the conditional clause (p. 226); 9.55.5-6 (p. 237); 9.57 (p. 242); 9.67.1 (p. 283); 9.68.10 (p. 289); 9.71.1-2 (p. 297); 9.74.4 (p. 306); 9.75.3 (p. 309); 9.92.4, on the alliteration of *pervigil in pluma* (p. 358), etc.

As stated above, this new commentary pays more attention to metrical issues. Of special note are the discussions on the use of choliambic metre in 9.44.1 (14-5) and in 9.5 (37), or the implications of the predominantly dactylic rhythm of 9.38, “an unusually dactylic poem”: “the speed of the dactyls obviously serve [*sic*] to illustrate Agathinus’ juggling. But in connection to the verbal echoes from Ovid, it would probably have given the poem a particularly Ovidian feel. It may be that Martial, in describing a virtuoso juggler, wanted to present his poem in the style of the foremost virtuoso of his own trade” (168). On 9.82.3 *nam cenae fercula nostrae*, H. speculates on why Martial chose to write such a metrically “flat” *nam cenae*, instead of the expected *cenae nam*, offering a very lucid explanation: “it must be suspected (...) that he actually wants to make fun of the *quidam poeta* by really giving him something to complain about; this verse is probably not *exactus* at all” (324).

Among the new comments on metre, see also pp. 49-50 on *cui tu* (9.8.1); p. 62 on 9.11.8; p. 73 on *non te* (9.14.3); pp. 103-4 on 9.24.1; p. 136-7, a metrical

explanation for the choice of the plural *tumulis* (9.30.5); p. 231 on 9.53.1; pp. 287-8 on 9.68.7 *amphitheatro*; 9.93.6 (p. 362) on the impossibility to fit *Domitianus* into dactylic verse. Some discussions are very detailed, occasionally to excess: e.g. p. 206 on 9.46.3 *nunc has, nunc illas*, p. 208 on 9.47.1 *inexplicitos*, pp. 250-1 on 9.59.9 *testudineum... hexaclinon*; p. 292 on 9.70.1 *o mores! o tempora!*; p. 313 on 9.76.7 *et... pensis*. H. rightly calls his discussion on *sine lege* (9.65.9, p. 276) “a metrical digression”.

### 2.3. AMPLIFICATIONS AND CHANGES IN INTERPRETATION

Some of H.’s previous doubts have been dispelled and in this new commentary he makes more categorical assertions:

See e.g. pp. 11 and 19, on the comparison of Domitian with the Sun and his family with the stars (2012, 11: “He is also present...”; cf. 1998, 56: “He also seems to be involved”; 2012, 19: “The *astra* are the deified *Flavii*”; cf. 1998, 61: “The *astra* are very likely the deified *Flavii*”); on the Rhine (p. 16: “is the river-god”; cf. 1998, 58: “is regarded as a river-god”); on 9.4 (p. 34 “This epigram is an adaption of *AP* 5.126”; cf. 1998, 74: “The contents of this epigram are slightly reminiscent of *AP* 5, 126”). See also the notes on 9.5.6-7 (where H. adheres more clearly to Shackleton Bailey’s interpretation [“Corrections and Explanations of Martial”, *CPh* 73, 1978, 284], p. 41) and on 9.42.2, on the song of the dying swans (p. 184).

H. is now more assertive regarding the mutual influence between Martial and Statius: see, for instance, the note on 9.71.9 (298), where he claims that *pecudesque feraeque* is “a phrase which Martial evidently had picked from Statius”. The same applies to 9.75, whose introduction has been expanded with information previously given in the notes, so that the relation of this epigram with Mart. 6.42 and Stat. *Silv.* 1.5, both on the baths of Claudius Etruscus, is more apparent (307-8). In the general Introduction he no longer asserts that epigrams 50 and 81 “are important arguments for a possible dispute between Martial and Statius in the mid-nineties” (1998, 21), but rather the contrary: “There may be little reason to continue cultivating the idea on an enmity between Martial and his colleague [*sic*] Statius” (2012, xxxii).

Additionally, Martial’s epigrammatic *persona* is aptly detached now from the poet himself: where H. wrote “Martial”, now he has “the speaker” (e.g. 2012, 42, 88, 94, 300; cf. 1998, 80, 120, 125; 1999, 87) or “Martial’s poetic ‘I’” (2012, 53; 1998, 88)<sup>3</sup>. Likewise, in view of recent studies, the emperor of the *Liber spectaculorum* is no longer referred to as Titus (139).

<sup>3</sup> Similarly, in his introduction to 9.68, H. no longer interprets the writing of this epigram in autobiographical terms (cf. “apparently, some teacher used to give lessons close to Martial’s house in the Quirinal”, 1999, p. 76). In this same sense, he has deleted a speculative paragraph on the possible circumstances under which Martial could have composed 9.77 (1999, p. 99).

Some superfluous (or, less frequently, faulty) notes have been deleted, whereas abundant new notes to individual passages, phrases or words previously left uncommented have been included:

9.1.7, a detailed discussion of the inclusion of Julia in the poem (pp. 17-8); 9.3.13 *Auguste* (p. 34); 9.12.3, esp. *harundine* (p. 67); 9.12.7-8, esp. *ad sidera* (p. 69); 9.18.3 *sitientibus hortis* (pp. 83-4); 9.18.5 *Sicca domus queritur* (p. 84); 9.19.2 (p. 86); 9.20.3 *felix... quantis sonuit vagitibus* (pp. 89-90); 9.20.6 *astrifero* (p. 91); 9.25.7 *Alcides* (p. 108); 9.29.2 on the waters of the underworld (p. 129); 9.29.5 *heu quae lingua silet* (pp. 130-1); 9.31.5, on the goose's willingness to be sacrificed (p. 141); 9.31.6 *sanctis hostia parva focus* (p. 142); 9.31.9-10, on the wordplay between *argento*, *sanguine* and *ferro* (pp. 142-3); 9.32.2 *puero* (p. 145); 9.41.4 (pp. 178-9); 9.41.5 *generaret... tres* (p. 179); 9.43.1 *porrecto* (p. 191); 9.45.6 *senis* (p. 204); 9.46.6 (p. 207); 9.47.1 (p. 207); 9.50.5 *vivum* (p. 223); 9.51.5 *colis* and *habitor* (p. 226); 9.52.7 *Quinte* (p. 230); 9.54.4 *pinguis* (p. 233); 9.56.3 *molles* (p. 240); 9.56.8 *casside... liber* (pp. 240-1); 9.56.9 *moriatur amore* (p. 241); 9.57.9 *pigri* (p. 244); 9.58.5 *sollicitos... mea dona, libellos* (p. 246); 9.61.1 *Tartesiadis* (p. 261); 9.61.2 *placidum... Baetin amat* (p. 262); 9.61.21 *honores* (p. 267); 9.68.9 *Vicini* (p. 288); 9.68.11 *garrule* (p. 289); 9.71.4 *pariter socias... uterque dapes* (p. 297); 9.71.5 *fetu nemorum... mitibus herbis* (p. 297); 9.71.6 *rudis agna* (p. 297); 9.73.6 *pruris* (p. 303); 9.77.2 *facunda* (p. 315); 9.79.1 *Oderat... ducum famulos* (p. 319); 9.83.1 *tuae miracula... harenae* (p. 327); 9.84.6 *Arctos* (p. 332); 9.84.10 *auctor* (p. 333); 9.86.1 *Festinata... fata* (pp. 336-7); 9.92.11 *nec cunnum... lingis* (p. 360); 9.93.7 *basia* (p. 362); 9.94.3 *stupidus* (p. 365); 9.94.5 *Dulce... amaro* (p. 366); 9.99.3-4 *non infitianda... gloria* (p. 385).

Changes also include the expansion of some notes (9.11.12 *syllaba contumax*, p. 63; 9.11.16-17 *disertis... severiores*, pp. 64-5; 9.49.1 *Haec est illa* etc., p. 214; 9.58.2 *pio munere templa dedit*, p. 246; 9.61.22 *Pompeianae... manus*, p. 267; 9.67.3 *illud puerile*, p. 284; 9.68.5 *Tam grave percussis*, p. 287; 9.70.2 *sacrilegum... Catilina nefas*, p. 292; 9.70.3 *diris... armis*, p. 293; 9.73.5 *ardenti... crystallae Falerno*, p. 302-3; 9.73.7 *me litterulas stuti docuere parentes*, p. 303; 9.73.9 *Thalia*, p. 304; 9.74.3 *Florentes nulla signavit imagine voltus*, p. 305-6; 9.76.6 *de tribus una soror*, p. 313), minor corrections (9.46.1 *limina ponit*, pp. 205-6) or qualifications (9.29.2 *rapta... tam cito*, p. 128).

The introductions to some poems have been rearranged (e.g. 9.46, pp. 204-5), or amplified (9.4, pp. 34-5; 9.5, pp. 37-8; 9.7, pp. 44-5; 9.15, p. 73-4; 9.21, p. 92-3; 9.39, p. 170-1; 9.56, p. 237-8; 9.65, p. 273-4; 9.67, p. 281-3; 9.69, pp. 289-90; 9.71, pp. 295-6; 9.75, pp. 307-8; 9.80, p. 321) to make their point clearer (see esp. pp. 115-6 on the attacks on philosophers; p. 291 on 9.70),

as well as updated (see, for instance, the archaeological information on the location and form of the *Templum gentis Flaviae* on 12-3). Exceptionally, some introductions to individual poems have been abridged and the relevant material (pertaining to more than one epigram) conveniently placed in the general introduction (cf. 9.64 and pp. xxviii-xxx, on the comparison between Domitian and Hercules).

Another great asset of this new version is that it provides new explanations of some passages in book 9, at times even contradicting the author's former views. This is the result of a fresher and, at the same time, more mature approach to the work of Martial, as well as of an intelligent use of recent bibliography. Let us see some examples of his new approach to some of the epigrams:

Contrary to what H. claimed in 1998, Minerva does take part in 9.3: "She is on Domitian's team" (28).

Whereas in 1998 H. believed that *domino* (9.17.3) referred only to Aesculapius, now he comments on the ambiguity of the term, which could refer both to the god and to Domitian (80).

In the light of 6.42, H. concludes that the speaker of 9.19 suggests that the poet of 6.42 "is a dinner-hunting" poet (86); that is, Martial would be making fun of himself.

H. has rewritten the introduction to 9.22, linking this epigram with other poems of the book and offering a new interpretation based on recent bibliography (94).

Whereas in 1998 H. believed that the manuscript variants *petat* and *tegam* were both possible in the context of 9.25.5-6, now he maintains that the reading of  $\beta$ , *tegam*, is "erroneous" here and he adduces that Martial is echoing *Ov. met.* 10.349-50 and *AP* 6.126 (108).

In 1998 H. believed that 9.28 was a sepulchral epigram, whereas now he endorses L. Friedländer's opinion (*M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, 2 vols., Lipsiae 1886, repr. Amsterdam 1967) that the poem could have been written on the occasion of Latinus' retirement, not his death. However, this assertion might be qualified by the fact that 9.28 is placed before a pair of funerary epigrams, and that Latinus' *mores* contrast not only with the protagonist of the preceding epigram, as H. claims, but also with the mockingly mourned Philaenis in the following one.

In 1998 H. claimed that 9.29 was an epitaph, whereas now he describes it as a "miniature *laudatio funebris*" (126).

On 143–4 H. restates his conclusions about the literary models for Mart. 9.32.

On 148–9 H. acknowledges something he had incomprehensibly overlooked previously: the literary play between the names in 9.33, a Flaccus (evoking Horace) and a Maro (evoking Vergil), the latter endowed with such a large penis that he is applauded in the baths. He illustrates this with a very convincing *exemplum*: “it is unthinkable that a contemporary poet could write an epigram to a Harrison about a Jagger without the reader immediately thinking about the guitarist with the Beatles and the singer with the Rolling Stones”. Henriksén concludes: “the point in introducing Vergil is obscure; but there is no denying his presence”. A good explanation of the epigram, however, was provided by N. Holzberg, in an article almost contemporary to H.’s commentary (“Applaus für Maro: eine augusteische Interpretation von Mart. 9.33”, in A. Heil [ed.], *Noctes Sinenses: Festschrift für Fritz-Heiner Mutschler Zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg 2011, 68–73).

H. offers a new introduction to 9.34, partially based on an Euhemeristic explanation of the anecdote, which results in a neat equation of Jupiter with Vespasian and of Domitian with the god’s offspring (149–50). Additionally, H. has changed his views on the inclusion of Diana in the catalogue of gods with whom Domitian is equated (153).

Epigrams 9.43 and 44 have benefitted from H.’s second thoughts and recent bibliography. H. has added some information about the pedigree of works of art and its implications regarding the claims of authenticity, pondering on the same topic in 8.6. This is completed with a new note on 192–3 dealing with the same issue, especially in the light of Martial’s 14.93 and 3.41. As for 9.44, he thoroughly discusses in the introduction the manuscript variants and focuses on the relationship between this poem and Stat. *silv.* 4.6. His explanation of the poem as a conversation between Martial and the statuette is more convincing. H. has further rearranged the material in this commentary (moving some information from the notes to the introduction), so that the interpretation is presented in a clearer way. As for the final pun (*Phidiae putavi*), H. rightly adheres to W. J. Schneider’s (“*Phidiae Putavi*: Martial und der *Hercules Epitrapezios* des Novius Vindex”, *Mnemosyne* 54.6, 2001, 697–720) witty explanation involving a Greek wordplay.

H. has also enhanced the introduction to 9.50, emphasizing its importance, right in the middle of the book, and linking it with other epigrams in the collection. He readdresses the question of the alleged feud between Statius and Martial with more clarity.

In 1999 H. maintained that the unnamed addressee of 9.54 was Flaccus, the recipient of 9.55, whereas now he believes that the addressee “is deliberately

unnamed, perhaps so that this poem could be sent to more than one person" (236; see also 226).

H.'s interpretation of 9.65.14 is more perceptive: "In this case (...) his new looks would not have done it any good: should the Nymph who pulled down fair Hyllas into her spring set eye on the new Hercules, she would let go of the boy and take Hercules instead" (278).

The interpretation of 9.73 is completed with an allusion to "professional pride" on the part of the poet (301).

In 9.73.4 (300-1) H. defends the opposite of what he did before. He now accepts Shackleton Bailey's suggestion ("More Corrections and Explanations of Martial", *AJPh* 110, 1989, 141) that *decepti* means "cheated of his due, i.e. his expectation of life", rejecting the idea that *captatio* is involved here. In support of this, he adduces epigraphical parallels. In any case, he deems possible that *deceptus* here might also add the nuance that "the shoemaker has not used the inheritance in a way that his patron could possibly have intended" (*deceptus*="fooled").

Elsewhere H. offers now more than one interpretative possibility: in the introduction to 9.76, on the portrait of the deceased Camonius Rufus, he discusses the different possible meanings of *maior imago*, relating to his age (since the portrait depicts him as a baby although he died at 25) or to poetry offering a better image than the painting, but also referring to afterlife and deification (in the light of Verg. A. 2.773 and CIL 6.21521.17): "Martial's poem does not merely draw the picture of a Camonius who is older than the one in the portrait. It also draws a picture that is 'greater', ennobled by the very poem in which it appears, and that possibly hints at Camonius not being dead, but deified" (312).

H. has qualified his interpretation of 9.80, following L. Watson-P. Watson's idea (*Martial: Select Epigrams*, Cambridge 2003, 286) that *pascit* is related to *cunnilingus* (321).

In 9.89 there is a relevant change in punctuation which adscribes the second line to Stella: '*Licet scribere nempe malos*', following W. Gilbert (*M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*, Lipsiae 1886; *editio stereotypa emendatio* 1896) and other editors, including Heraeus and Shackleton Bailey. This is the only significant divergence between the text printed in this commentary and the one in 1998-1999.

In 9.90 H. no longer believes that the festivities in the honour of Venus on the Kalends of March were an exclusively Cypriot custom (351-2). In the *Matronalia*, a festival of Juno, presents were given to women in general, not just married

women, as suggested by some texts. In that case, “it is hardly surprising that it should be considered a feast of Venus as much as of Juno” (352).

#### 2.4. FURTHER SUGGESTIONS

There is little to criticize in such a carefully prepared work, although some paths for further exploration can always be suggested, since, as H. acknowledges, a commentary is never finished: “it is (...) in the nature of great poetry that it should tell us something new or different every time we turn to it. We shall find new layers in the text, we shall pose new questions, and the text will give us new answers” (v). I would suggest the following ideas:

9.2.5 *incensura* (22): the note is devoted exclusively to the red colour of the wine contrasting with the white *nives*, but Martial also plays here with the erotic connotations of *incendere* and the relation between wine and sexual arousal, a nuance which H. does perceive when commenting on 9.73.5 *ardenti... crystallata Falerno* (302).

9.2.6 *pulla venena* (23): a variation on the more common *atra venena* and *nigra venena*. Reference to 6.92.2 *bibis venenum* could be pertinent.

9.7.9-10 (47): for this topic of imperial propaganda, perhaps the reader could have been referred to Plin. *Pan.* 22 and 26.

9. 20.1 *patet tegiturque* (87): cf. 4.32.1 *et latet et lucet*.

9.27.5 *cana labra*: H. comments that there may be an “allusion to Martial’s idea, that those who practised oral sex attracted a sickly pallor” (117). However, the text recalls Catul. 80.1-2 *quid dicam, Gelli, quare rosea ista labella / hiberna fiant candidiora nive*, where the white stain is the result of practising *fellatio*: 5-6 *an vere fama susurra / grandia te medii tenta vorare viri?* This anticipates the final accusation of *os impurum*.

9.32.4 *quae pariter sufficit una tribus*: the main idea of the line is not discussed. H. adduces Prop. 1.13.29-30, but he does not explain the gist of *pariter sufficit una tribus*: the girl is able to satisfy three men at the same time, an indication of lust and sexual vigour. The phrasing is evocative of a scene of group sex, as in 10.81 *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*; 11.81 *Cum sene communem vexat spado Dindymus Aeglen / et iacet in medio sicca puella toro. / Viribus hic, operi non est hic utilis annis: / ergo sine effectum prurit utrique labor. / Supplex illa rogat pro se miserisque duobus, / hunc iuvenem facias, hunc, Cytherea,*

*virum*; cf. Priap. 34. Several epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* deal with the topic of a prostitute capable of having sex with three men simultaneously by using her three orifices (*AP* 5.59; 11.328). But the poet could be merely reversing the typically masculine boast of sexual ability found in previous amatory literature, in which the man claims that he is not easily fulfilled with a single lover: Prop. 2.22.36 *sic etiam nobis una puella parum est*; Ov. *am.* 2.10.22-23 *si satis una potest, si minus una, duae! / sufficiam*. The speaker of the epigrams does not wish to show off his sexual prowess with more than one lover, but with a woman with enough vigour to exhaust three partners at once.

9.32.5 *poscentem nummos et grandia verba sonantem* (146): H. believes that Martial is referring to two different kinds of women: prostitutes and arrogant matrons. Could it be possible that the line alludes to a single type of women, apparently haughty matrons who behave like prostitutes? The clue could be the phrase *grandia verba sonantem*, which recalls 9.27.8 (*loqueris sonasque grandibus minax verbis*), on a philosopher whose façade of moral uprightness is undermined by his addiction to *fellatio*.

9.49.7 *tremulo... tribulo*: the alliteration suggests trembling, implying both cold and old age.

9.58.5 *sollicitos* (of the book): cf. 6.1.3 *anxius tremensque*.

9.97 *rumpitur invidia*: it inevitably recalls the famous fable by Phaedrus (1.24) *Rana rupta et bos*, where the themes of *invidia* and bursting are also linked.

Regarding the themes and the linking devices, I perceive that infancy is another recurrent topic in this book and some verbal echoes may have been overlooked by H. Epigrams 9.5 and 9.7 deal with Domitian's edict against castration. What intrigues me is the reuse of certain vocabulary related to childhood in 9.7 (9.7.4 *vagitu*; 9.7.10 *infantes*; cf. 9.5.7 *infanti*) and in 9.20, a poem on the *Templum gentis Flaviae*, erected on the ground where Domitian spent his childhood (9.20.2 *infantis*; 9.20.3 *vagitibus*). It may be argued that this could be purely coincidental, although it must be taken into account that *vagitus* is not a term frequently used by Martial: in fact, he only uses it in these two instances. But it is also intriguing that in 9.20, when comparing Domitian's childhood with that of Jupiter, Martial mentions the *semiviri... Phryges* (9.20.8). H. devotes the note to explaining the traditional confusion between Curetes and Corybantes (91-2), but sees no connection with the poems on castration, especially with 9.7.8 *steriles... viros*. In fact 9.20.8 is not included either in the general index under the lemma "castration and castrates".

Childhood is also present in 9.74 and 76, on the portrait of the deceased Camonius Rufus. Here the *infans* is silent, he does not utter a cry (9.74.4 *ora.. muta*), and it is his portrait itself that has to speak in his stead: 9.76.9 *loquatur*.

## 2.5. PERSONAL NAMES

H.'s treatment of personal names deserves a mention, for although he could have taken advantage of recent bibliography on this field (e.g. D. Vallat, *Onomastique, culture et société dans les Epigrammes de Martial*, Collection Latomus 313, Bruxelles 2008, which is not even quoted), this is one of the fields in which the commentary has also improved considerably.

H. has provided new interpretations for some names: 9.4 *Aeschylus* (36) is related to oral sex, an explanation based on Watson-Watson (*Martial: Select Epigrams*, Cambridge 2003, 244); H. has added some interesting remarks on the name *Afer* (9.6.1, p. 42); he offers a suggestive explanation of the name *Philaenis* based on a Greek wordplay (9.29.1, p. 128); *Caecilianus* is equated with *Catilina* (9.70); *Tucca* is related to *Claudius Etruscus* (9.75; cf. 6.42; p. 308); on the obscure name *Condylus* in 9.92, H. comments: "perhaps it would have suggested thinness" (358). As for *Gaurus* (9.50, p. 221), he has linked the name with γαῦρος, as suggested by recent bibliography. Additionally, although he does not agree with J. Garthwaite's idea ("Patronage and Poetic Immortality in Martial, Book 9", *Mnemosyne* 51, 1998, 161-175) that all the *Gauri* in the epigrams refer to the same person, he explores his proposed parallel between juxtaposed epigrams involving *Parthenius* and *Gaurus* in 8.27/29 and 9.49/50. As regards *Parthenius*, H. has expanded the note on 9.49.10 *non est Partheniana, mea est*, perceiving a contrast between Minerva and Mars as well as a metapoetical play with the nature of Martial's epigrams (216).

Some more notes have been expanded (cf., e.g., 174-5 on *Diodorus*; 381 on *Coranus*), although not all the names have been explored to the full. For instance, in the note on *Chrestus* (9.27.1, p. 117), a philosopher accused of *os impurum*, H. notes that the name is used of a *miser* in 7.55: what he does not say is that in that passage he was threatened with *irrumatio*: 6-8 *linges non mihi — nam proba et pusilla est — / sed quae de Solymis venit perustis / damnatam modo mentulam tributis*. Additionally, it could have been noted that a *Chrestillus* is also accused of *os impurum* in 11.90.8. Similarly, H.'s account of *Carus* (9.23, p. 101) is very perceptive: it is suggested that he could have been a manumitted slave of Domitian's; thus, the terms *dominus* (9.23.3; 9.24.6) and *flavescere* (9.23.1) could hint at his becoming a *T. Flavius Carus* on his winning the *Agon Capitolinus*. H. could have added that this *Carus* had been identified by others (see, e.g., J. Ferguson, *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal*, Bruxelles 1987, 46) with the *Carus* in 10.77 and *Mettius Carus*, the *delator* mentioned in 12.25. *Bithynicus* was not commented upon in the former version, but the new

note (49) falls short, despite interestingly remarking that the name evokes wealth (cf. Man 4.761 *Bithynia dives*): nothing is said of the fact that in 2.26.3 he is a dowry-hunter similarly deluded by his “victim”. H. has added a note on the meaning of *Priscus* (9.10.1, p. 53), but fails to notice that 8.12 was a comparable joke about marriage addressed to a *Priscus* (probably Martial’s friend *Terentius Priscus*).

On the other hand, more could have been said about other names, such as *Chloe* (9.15), *Agathinus* (9.38) or *Herodes* (9.96.1). In 9.93.3 H. forgets to add that *Catacisse* is a brilliant emendation by Heraeus (*calacisse* β, *galacisse* γ). When commenting on 9.78.2, H. remarks that “it is impossible to decide whether there are any specific implications in the name” *Picentinus* (317): perhaps he is a poisoner and Martial puns on *piceus* (black as pitch) and the like, despite their different vowel length: cf. Ov. *met.* 2.800-1 *piceum... venenum*.

### 3. CONCLUSION

The suggestions in this review should not belittle the extraordinary value of this commentary, but rather the contrary. Reading it in depth has been both a pleasurable and enlightening experience. H.’s book is excellent in terms of its content and form<sup>4</sup>. All in all, Henriksén’s new commentary on book 9 is a remarkable achievement, based on conscientious work and intellectual integrity, a commendable book for which I truly congratulate the author.<sup>5</sup>

ROSARIO MORENO SOLDEVILA  
 Universidad Pablo de Olavide (Sevilla)  
 rmorsol@upo.es

<sup>4</sup> Typos are almost non-existent: *lutulena* for *lutulenta* (p. 98), an omission of the line number in 9.73.7, p. 303; a problem in the layout of 9.1 and 9.90, written in choliambics and hendecasyllables respectively.

<sup>5</sup> This paper forms part of the Project “Prosopografía de los Epigramas de Marcial” (FFI2009-10058). Thanks are due to Daniel Nisa for revising the English version of this review.