THE PROSE PREFACES
OF MARTIAL AND STATIUS:
A STUDY IN LITERARY PURPOSE

GRANT PARKER

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

April 1991

Supervisor : Dr K M Coleman

Department of Classics
University of Cape Town

The prose prefaces of Martial and Statius:

a study in literary purpose

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I offer a detailed examination of the ten prose
prefaces which head the *Epigrams* of Martial (AD c45-c96) and the
Siluae of Statius (c45-c96). The most remarkable feature of these ten
short pieces of prose lies in the field of literary history: these are
the first extant instances of collections of *verse* which are headed
with pieces of *prose*, and it is chiefly from this angle that the
prefaces are studied.

The body of the thesis (Section B) is devoted to a close
thematic examination of the prefaces. Their content is discussed
under three main headings, namely justification, information and
request (chapters 5, 6 and 7 respectively). Within this framework the
prefaces are examined in the terms suggested by the four chapters of
Section A - the literary history of prefacing (both prose prefaces *per
se* and proems to collections of verse), the production and
dissemination of ancient literature, the patronage of letters, and the
biographies of the two poets (chapters 1 to 4 respectively). All
these topics are treated broadly in Section A and then with specific
reference to the prefaces in Section B.

Not only is an understanding of these areas essential for a full
analysis of the prose prefaces, but in fact the prefaces themselves
are shown to offer valuable evidence in these regards. It is evident
that most of the prefaces were composed for use at a late stage of
literary production, in many cases long after the poems themselves had
already served their purpose as occasional verse.

Chapter 8 is a study of the prose style of the two authors who are otherwise known only as poets. In the examination of the clausulae (prose rhythm) of the prefaces Martial and Statius are shown to follow in the Ciceronian mould. It would, however, be stretching a point to describe their styles more broadly as Ciceronian. The prose of Statius in particular is shown to have elements of the 'pointed style' associated with Silver Latin.

The penultimate chapter, surveying what alternatives to the prose preface were used by Martial and Statius, by implication reveals the limitations of the prose epistle as a prefatory mode. Only five of Martial's fifteen collections of verse are introduced in prose. The survey makes it clear that there were other means the poets could use to introduce their collections with much the same effect.

Deploying material used in both Sections A and B, the conclusion is directed at the question of what specific advantages the prose preface offered. This is answered in several respects, from both a practical and an aesthetic point of view. On the practical side, the prose prefaces facilitated the dedication of poetry to patrons, particularly as most of them are in the form of letters.

The aesthetic angle is more nebulous, involving as it does such questions as the relationship between verse and prose. However, it does appear that the juxtaposition of a prose introduction with poetry allows the poet to speak in his own voice, leaving aside the *personae* that characterise his verse.

CONTENTS

The prose prefaces of Martial and Statius:

a study in literary purpose

PROLEGOMENA

Literary form is arguably the most conspicuous feature of the prose prefaces heading Martial's *Epigrams* and Statius' *Siluae*. As prose introductions to works of poetry these ten prefaces are without direct literary precedent.

This fact alone imbues the five prose prefaces of Martial (40-c103) and the five of Statius (c45-c96) with great interest for the literary historian. In this thesis I offer a detailed thematic examination of the prose prefaces and, more generally, of the phenomenon of prefacing poetry with a piece of prose. By considering various elements arising from the use of the preface, the thesis is directed at identifying the particular usefulness (and limitations) of this type of introduction in the context of verse.

The aesthetic problems concerning the relationship between verse and prose are not broached till the conclusion, but as a means to that end the opening chapter deals with literary history. Here I trace in broad outline two aspects of prefacing that are relevant to Martial and Statius, namely prose prefaces *per se* - in which regard I am indebted to the useful work by Tore Janson (*Latin Prose Prefaces* Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1964) - and proems to poetry.

This is the first of four chapters covering preliminary material. These chapters, constituting Part A, sketch the background to the prefaces in that they set the scene for consideration of their content. Two aspects of Roman literature bearing centrally on the nature and status of the prose prefaces are their physical presentation and the socio-economic circumstances of poetic

production. This necessitates discussion of the ancient book and its circulation (chapter 2), with specific reference to problems raised in the seminal article by Peter White ('The presentation and dedication of the *Siluae* and *Epigrams*', JRS 64.1974.40-61). The chapter makes reference to a word-study appended to the thesis discussing the terms most often used in this connection.

The *Epigrams* and *Siluae* can largely be categorised as occasional verse, and this brings into focus the social circumstances of literary production, in other words patronage of letters (chapter 3). The lives and careers of Martial and Statius are sketched in chapter 4, chiefly in terms of personal patronage. Here I rely on the work of Peter White ('*Amicitia* and the profession of poetry in early Imperial Rome', JRS 68.1978.74-92), Richard Saller (*Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* Cambridge: University Press, 1982) and Alex Hardie (*Statius and the* <u>Siluae</u> Liverpool: Cairns, 1983).

Part B of the thesis focuses on the content of the prefaces of Martial and Statius. In chapter 5 I describe those elements of the prose prefaces which may be classed as literary apologia, an important feature of introductions in general. The prefaces also offer much information about the poems and their genesis, without the polemical edge of apologia, and this is surveyed in chapter 6. The prose prefaces reveal their epistolary character in the requests which often end them, and these I examine in chapter 7 in the context of other epistolary requests and their network of patronage relationships.

In rather different terms chapter 8 is concerned with the prose style of Martial and Statius, with particular attention given to prose rhythm. I attempt to identify the stylistic level at which the prefaces are pitched. The prose pieces provide limited but significant material in studying writers more renowned for their poetic output.

Only five of Martial's fifteen books of epigrams begin with a prose preface. In chapter 9 I survey the prefatory poems of the remaining ten books and discuss the problems involved in identifying supposedly prefatory poems scattered throughout the collections. Before discussing the usefulness of the prose prefaces, it is necessary to explain how certain books came to be prefaced in other ways.

The conclusion is an attempt to synthesise the various strands of the thesis in answering the question: Why did Martial and Statius make use of the prose prefaces? As suggested by the structure of this thesis, questions of patronage and the ancient book feature prominently in such an answer. These are the practical elements which are considered alongside aesthetic issues, most notably the relationship between verse and prose. In particular, I try to show what advantages were offered by the prose preface, given the improbability of this form in the context of verse.

I have used W M Lindsay's Oxford Classical Text of Martial (2nd edition 1929), and initially J S Phillimore's OCT of Statius' *Siluae* (2nd edition 1917) until this was superseded by the appearance of Edward Courtney's (1990) at a stage when my work on this thesis was approaching completion. Abbreviations of ancient sources are in accordance with the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed H H Scullard and N G L Hammond, Oxford: University Press, 2nd ed 1970); journal titles are abbreviated as in *l'Année Philologique*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SECTION A

Chapter 1

THE HISTORY OF PROSE PREFACES AND VERSE PROEMS

In this chapter I shall attempt to adumbrate the conventions of ancient prefacing, in order to show how the prose prefaces of Martial and Statius fit into the literary tradition. Within the confines of this project it is not possible to do more than sketch the broadest outline of such a large body of writing. I shall discuss in tandem conventions of the content and form of ancient prooemia. The bulk of this chapter is devoted to a literary history of the prefaces to (a) verse and (b) prose. Special attention will be given to the dedicatory and programmatic functions of proems.

By far the majority of ancient prefaces have the same (or a similar) form compared with the work itself; poetry, including drama, usually has verse prologues, whereas the prose genres (eg oratory, history and technical writing) have prefaces in prose, of which some are in the form of letters. The lost prologues to Seneca's tragedies present a problem in this regard in that they may have been written in prose, as will be discussed below. In conflict with the general trend, Statius and Martial seem to have been the first extant poets to have introduced their work with pieces of prose, though of course there may have been other instances which have been lost with the passage of time.

A. TERMINOLOGY

The most general terms for a beginning are *initium* and *principium*. These were occasionally used of literature, but never in a very specific sense: eg *Cic Brut* 297 'initium sermonis' (see *TLL*

7.1B.1654.21-43 and *OLD* sv *initium* 3a); Cic *De Orat* 2.310 'et principia et ceterae partes orationis' (see *OLD* sv *principium* 5b).

The term *prooemium*, a Latinised form of the Greek προοίμιον, is a hold-all term for the introductory section of a literary or musical work, and occasionally also of a period or process. For its application to epic poetry, see eg Quint 10.1.48: '(Homerus) utriusque operis sui ingressu in paucissimis uersibus legem prooemiorum... constituit'; it can also refer to oratory (*Rhet Her* 1.6; Quint 2.5.7), history (Cic *Orat* 230) and philosophy (Cic *Att* 4.16.2). Quintilian (4.1.1) expresses approval for this term: 'Quod *principium* Latine uel *exordium* dicitur, maiore quadam ratione Graeci uidentur prohoemium nominasse' (see further Stoessl 1979b:1179).

exordium, from *exordiri* (set up a warp in a loom in preparation for weaving), is commonly used of literature, particularly oratory, eg Cic *De Inv* 1.20 (*TLL* 5.2C.1566.72-1567.37), but also other genres: Lucil 875 'ex Pacuuiano exordio'; Var *Men* 354 'fabularum exordia' (*TLL* 5.2C.1569.60-82; *OLD* sv *exordium* 4).

In limited currency is *praefatio*, an introductory statement or description (eg Sen *Con* 2.4.6; Plin *Ep* 5.12(13).3 'materiam ex titulo cognosces, cetera liber explicabit...ut sine praefatione intellegatur'; Val Max 1.8.8). Sometimes the word appears to mean no more than an introductory formula or prefatory title, eg Liv 45.5.4; Plin *HN* 7.98, *prl*.

In connection with drama *prologus* (from the Greek προλέγειν and προλογίζειν) is the usual term, eg Ar *Frogs* 1120. Aristotle (*Poetics* 12.1452b 19) defines the prologue as 'the entire section up to (but excluding) the parodos'.

B. THEORY

Aristotle's *Rhet* 3.14 (1414b-1416a) is a discussion of proems, principally in the context of oratory.

Τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιόν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ λόγου, ὅπερ ἐν ποιήσει πρόλογος, καὶ ἐν αὐλήσει προαύλιον· πάντα γὰρ ἀρχαὶ ταῦτ' εἰσί, καὶ οἷον ὁδοποίησις τῷ ἐπιόντι. τὸ μὲν οὖν προαύλιον ὅμοιον τῷ τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν προοιμίω· καὶ γὰρ οἱ αὐληταί, ὅ τι ἂν εὖ ἔχωσιν αὐλῆσαι, τοῦτο προαυλήσαντες συνῆψαν τῷ ἐνδοσίμῳ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς λόγοις, δεῖ οὕτω γράφειν· ὅ τι γὰρ ἂν βούληται εὐθὺ εἰπόντα ἐνδοῦναι καὶ συνάψαι.   (1414 b)

The exordium is the beginning of a speech, as the prologue in poetry and the prelude in flute-playing; for all these are beginnings, and as it were a paving the way for what follows. The prelude resembles the exordium of epideictic speeches; for as flute-players begin by playing whatever they can execute so skilfully and attach it to the key-note, so also in epideictic speeches should be the composition of the exordium; the speaker should say at once whatever he likes, give the key-note and then attach the main subject.   (tr. J. H. Freese)

It is important to notice that ancient rhetorical theory acknowledged the 'programmatic' value of an introduction, as Aristotle goes on to illustrate. He speaks mainly of forensic and epideictic oratory, but also in passing of epic proems, dramatic and comic prologues:

ἐν δὲ τοῖς λόγοις καὶ ἔπεσι δεῖγμά ἐστι τοῦ λόγου, ἵνα προειδῶσι περὶ οὗ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ μὴ κρέμηται ἡ διάνοια· τὸ γὰρ ἀόριστον πλανᾷ· ὁ δοὺς οὖν ὥσπερ εἰς τὴν χεῖρα τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖ ἐχόμενον ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ. ... καὶ οἱ τραγικοὶ δηλοῦσι περὶ τὸ δρᾶμα, κἂν μὴ εὐθὺς ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδης, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ γέ που, ὥσπερ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς... καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία ὡσαύτως. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀναγκαιότατον ἔργον τοῦ προοιμίου καὶ ἴδιον τοῦτο, δηλῶσαι τί ἐστι τὸ τέλος οὗ ἕνεκα ὁ λόγος. (1415 a)

But in speeches and epic poems the exordia provide a sample of the subject, in order that the hearers may know beforehand what it is about, and that the mind may not be kept in suspense, for that which is undefined leads astray; so then he who puts the beginning, so to say, into the hearer's hand enables him, if he holds fast to it, to follow the story....Similarly, tragic poets make clear the subject of their drama, if not at the outset, like Euripides, at least somewhere in the prologue, like Sophocles....It is the same in comedy. So then the most essential and special function of the exordium is to make clear what is the end or purpose of the speech.

With regard to oratory Aristotle identifies at some length the importance of the proem in gaining the goodwill (εὔνοια) of the hearer, in other words the concept of the *captatio beneuolentiae*[1]. Also in the context of oratory, Quintilian (4.1.1-79) discusses the desirability, usefulness, structure, content and style of the proem. Again the *captatio beneuolentiae* is an important element:

Causa principii nulla alia est, quam ut auditorem, quo sit nobis in ceteris partibus accommodatior, praeparemus. (4.1.5)

It should be clear, then, that antiquity did have a theory of prefacing, however limited. In examining literature more broadly a number of problems can be seen to emerge. At the risk of circular argument, it can be said there is often a problem of definition. If prefatory material is taken to be that of the 'programmatic' kind mentioned by Aristotle, there can be no doubt that there is a great deal of overlap in content between preface and collection; Horace *Sat* 1.4, Propertius 2.10 and 3.9 are easily cited as examples of non-prefatory programmatic pieces.

C. THE LITERARY HISTORY OF PREFACING

I. Verse prefaces

Up till the time of Martial and Statius it was customary for collections of poems to have introductions in verse. In fact those two poets provide the earliest extant prose prefaces to verse. Rudolf Graefenhain[2] postulated that Greek literature offers no instances of prose prefaces to poems in Greek literature (Pavlovskis 1967:536).

The similarity between the introductory lines of the Homeric epics makes it clear that poetic prooemia were subject to convention from the earliest times.

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,
πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν

- 9 -

οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή,

ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε

'Ατρείδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος 'Αχιλλεύς.

(Iliad 1.1-7)

'Άνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ

πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσεν·

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,

πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν,

ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἑταίρων.

ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς ἑτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἱέμενος περ·

αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο,

νήπιοι, οἳ κατὰ βοῦς 'Υπερίονος 'Ηελίοιο

ἤσθιον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ.

τῶν ἁμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν.

(Odyssey 1.1-10)

The two proems are similarly constituted: first the theme, an invocation, a four-syllable adjective characterizing the theme, expanded into a relative clause, and further elaborated by two clauses. In both reference is made to the vast possibilities of the theme and the sorrows to be described; both presume the reader's general familiarity with the legendary framework and so begin 'in medias res' (Heubeck et al 1988:67; cf Van Groningen 1946 and Kirk 1985:51-52).

This striking similarity can be attributed largely to the oral genesis and consequent formulaic nature of the Homeric poems - in terms of the theory of Homeric composition associated with Milman Parry and Albert B Lord. Those types of poetry which are subject to human memory for their survival are likely to develop standard

expressions; the prologues are a case in point, since they occupy the most prominent position in any work (cf Bowra 1962:28-37; Parry 1986:19-24).

Given the centrality of the Homeric poems to Western literature, it is no surprise that Homer's prologues themselves exerted considerable influence on subsequent epic. Most notably, the first three words, 'arma uirumque cano', of Virgil's *Aeneid* evidence such a debt, as it simulates the structure of the proem to the *Iliad* and the language of the *Odyssey* proem (Austin 1971:27). The ritual invocation of the Muses (8-11) is a further conscious echo of earlier Greek poetry.

The poet of the Homeric epics and hymns was anonymous, and the impression was given that the poem emanated from the Muses or deity with the poet acting merely as an intermediary. Hesiod was the first poet to speak of himself and, though the Muses are mentioned (in accordance no doubt with convention), he was the first to initiate the development by which the poet was decreasingly subordinate to the Muses, and increasingly responsible for his or her own poetic creation. This change was accomplished during the fifth century. Hesiod also introduced the second person, the *Works and Days* being addressed to his brother Perses (Janson 1964:15-16; West 1978:142)[3].

Drama

In his survey of the prologues in tragedy Stoessl (1979a:11/1) has identified the main purpose as being expository: they unveil the fundamental issues the playwright wishes to explore. Within this framework the playwrights adopt various approaches. Euripides, largely followed by Seneca (Anliker 1959:11-48; Tarrant 1976:157-59), preferred the introductory monologue spoken by a major, or at least

omniscient, character (Kitto 1961:278-84). Sophocles tended towards the prefatory dialogue allowing him to begin *in medias res* (Webster 1969:110-11), whereas the Aeschylean prologues are varied (Rosenmeyer 1982:41-43). Prologues seem to have been part of tragedy from its earliest origins (Lucas 1968:136; Rosenmeyer 1982:41)[4]. Comic prologues do not carry as much weight as their tragic counterparts, since their main purpose is to sketch the plot so that the play can begin *in medias res*. Dramatic prefaces, both comic and tragic, are in the form of either monologue or dialogue (Stoessl 1979a:1172; cf Arist *Poet* 1449b 4; Ter *Heaut* 11, *Hec* 9). The problems attached to Terence's prologues will be outlined below.

Callimachus

Just as the Homeric prooemia proved important literary models for subsequent epic poetry in particular, so was the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia* of key importance to later Roman poets. This piece, which survives as fr 1, is in the form of a polemical reply to the Telchines; in the course of it Callimachus gives a powerful and vivid aesthetic manifesto. It falls into two parts, the first defending the poet in his debate with the Telchines and presenting the speech of Apollo, the second describing his meeting on Helicon with the Muses in a dream.

The most important aspects of this manifesto are summed up in the Greek word λεπτότης, by which Callimachus advocates a short, refined type of verse. In this regard the fragment has been taken to 'stand by way of an introduction to or apologia for Callimachus' entire poetic oeuvre'[5].

Given the Alexandrian influence on Augustan poetry, it is not surprising that Roman poets much imitated Callimachus' *Aetia* I fr

1.21-24, together with the coda of his Hymn to Apollo. In the former the poet is dissuaded by Apollo from attempting the epic genre. That this became a commonplace among them can be seen in the fact that the passage is echoed with variation in all of the following: Virg *Ecl* 6.3-5, Hor *Carm* 4.15.1-4, Prop 3.3.1-26 and Ov *Am* 1.1 (Barsby 1973:41; cf Hutchinson 1988:277-96).

The Greek Anthology

A unique form of prefacing is found in the Greek Anthology which, though compiled in part after the time of Martial and Statius, deserve further attention from a literary-historical point of view. Book 4 of the Anthology consists of the proems to the collections of Meleager, Philip and Agathias (the last of these comprising two poems). The Meleager proem, in which the work of the various contributors is compared with flowers, begins with an invocation to the Muse, and then proceeds to reveal the author's name and then that of the dedicatee.

The poem ends with a different sort of dedication, with the poet saying that the collection is intended also for his friends and indeed all initiates. The brief introduction of Philip is directed at one Camillus, and again comparisons are drawn between contributing poets and flowers. Of the four poems in the book, only these two antedate Martial and Statius, the Garlands having been written around 90 BC and 40 BC respectively[6].

Roman poetry

As a further example of poetic prefaces, the first four lines of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* may be cited as an example of how a proem can be

very revealing of its author's concerns and style. Despite its brevity, the tautly-worded proem fulfils this function in a number of ways, as has been shown by Kenney (1976:46-53), and also by Ahern (1990:44-48) in the case of the *Ars Amatoria*.

Persius

The content of the choliambic preface to Persius' Satires, which can in some respects be described as an anti-prologue, shows to what extent prefatory gestures had by the mid-first century AD become subject to standard procedure:

> nec fonte labra prolui caballino
>
> nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnaso
>
> memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem.
>
> Heliconidasque pallidamque Pirenen
>
> illis remitto quorum imagines lambunt
>
> hederae sequaces; ipse semipaganus
>
> ad sacra uatum carmen adfero nostrum.   (1-7)

Persius speaks of the mythical and metaphorical images for poetic inspiration - drink, the fount, mountain, dream, the muses' liquor, most of them dating back to Callimachus - as though these were literary clichés by his time[7].

Another significant aspect of Persius' preface concerns its metre. This fourteen-line piece is in choliambics, which provides in the first instance a formal contrast with the poems which follow it. This metre is in any case usually considered more lightweight than other verse metres (cf Raven 1965:60-62; Barr and Lee 1987:64); this is particularly so as it is juxtaposed with the hexameters which

- 14 -

constitute the corpus of Persius.

In offering ironic comment on the tradition of the poet's hallowed inspiration, Persius contrasts himself with the higher style of other poets, notably Ennius, and in this regard the prologue foreshadows the subject matter and even treatment of the first satire (Coffey 1976:102). The metre of the prologue accentuates the declared contrast between Persius' poetry and that of the grander writers.

Terence

An important aspect of prefaces generally is that of the author's justification of himself; the beginning of a work is perhaps the most obvious, prominent and forceful place for an author to defend his literary credo. An example of this already apparent is that of the *Aetia* prologue. Another author whose proems are generally associated with literary polemic is Terence. His prologues differ from those of his predecessors, Aristophanes, Menander and Plautus, in that they do not recount the plot, but are devoted mostly to countering criticism levelled against him. In the prologue to the *Andria* Terence says he did not want to bother with prologues but was forced by circumstance to use them for this polemical purpose:

> nam in prologis scribundis operam abutitur,
>
> non qui argumentum narret, sed qui maleuoli
>
> ueteris poetae maledictis respondeat.

He often gives the impression (if not says) that he has been brought to trial by his detractors, with the audience sitting in judgment; the proems consequently take on a rhetorical colour, various figures of speech (eg alliteration, juxtaposition) coming to the fore

more often than in the plays themselves (Shipp 1960:117). From his six comic prologues, each of them spoken by the *dominus gregis*, it is clear that Terence has to defend himself against charges of *contaminatio* (*Heaut* 16-34, cf *An* 1-23). This probably means the imitation of more than one Greek model in the composition of any single play[8].

The major source of criticism, says Terence, is a malicious old playwright ('uetus poeta'). The entire prologue to the *Eunuchus* is conceived as a *responsum* to criticism, and the image of a lawsuit is invoked: 'causam dicere' (10; cf *Heaut* 41). The *Eunuchus* prologue ends with an appeal for a sympathetic audience:

> date operam, cum silentio animum attendite,
>
> ut pernoscatis quid sibi Eunuchus uelit.

Viljamaa (1968:68-97) has shown to what extent poetic prologues in Byzantine literature were influenced by rhetoric. The history of Latin prose prefaces to poetry is surveyed by Pavlovskis (1967).

Younger Seneca

The supposed prefaces to the tragedies of Seneca present special problems. A chance comment by Quintilian (*Inst* 8.3.31) has it that *praefationes* of some variety headed the tragedies of Seneca and his contemporary Pomponius, and that these contained polemical debate on the question of tragic diction:

> nam memini iuuenis admodum inter Pomponium ac Senecam etiam
>
> praefationibus esse tractatum, an 'gradus eliminat' in tragoedia
>
> dici oportuisset.

The main question to arise from this piece (concerning which no other evidence presents itself) is as follows: does this suggest that the tragedies of these two poets were headed by prefaces in PROSE? This possibility cannot be ruled out, but the matter is predicated on the difficult question about the manner in which the Roman tragedy was presented and written down. The passage above can easily be thought to imply that the poets themselves read or dictated their own plays, prefacing the presentation by responding to criticism and attacking artistic rivals (cf Zwierlein 1966:165). In this light the *praefationes* mentioned by Seneca were comparable with the προλαλιαί and προθεωρίαι spoken by Greek orators at the beginning of their speeches (Immisch 1911:488 n1). On the grounds of other evidence it is, however, likely that excerpts of Seneca's plays were performed on stage (Dihle 1983; Coffey and Mayer 1990:15; further discussed in the conclusion).

II. Prose prefaces

Historical writing

History was the first genre to develop a definable type of preface, and certain standard themes (or ones which at least became standard with the passage of time) are already evident from the works of Herodotus and Thucydides: in particular the writer's impartiality, praise of history in general and the immortalizing of the subject-matter. A number of basic elements, evidenced first in the earliest Greek historians, became canonized by Hellenistic historians under the influence of Isocrates (Ogilvie 1965:23). Earl

(1972:842-46) has shown the considerable degree of overlap in the content of historical prefaces.

From Hellenistic times onwards, historical prefaces were canonized into rhetorical commonplaces as history became increasingly governed by rhetorical principles. A later manifestation of this phenomenon is shown by the precise guidelines offered by Lucian in his *Quomodo Historia* 53-54. Lucian advises the historian to limit himself to two rather than three points in the preface, and to stress the main thrusts of the work itself. Though written tongue-in-cheek, this still reflects the existence of a trend.

Rules for the composition of prefaces were formulated in rhetorical handbooks (see Halm *RLM* 1863:588). Major categories for the substance of historical prefaces were: (a) de persona, (b) de historia, (c) de materia (cf Engel 1910 *apud* Janson 1964:12).

This formulaic quality has implications for the relevance of a prologue to the work it heads: the preface to any given work cannot be considered specifically relevant if its composition is subject to purely rhetorical principles, rather than being in line with the work which follows it. This issue can be brought to bear on the monographs of Sallust, though the paucity of extant monographs means that it is difficult to see them in a literary context. Quintilian's comment on the prologues to Sallust's two monographs (appended to a discussion of the exordia of deliberative oratory) have been at the centre of considerable debate in modern times:

quos (sc Isocraten and Gorgian) secutus uidelicet C Sallustius in bello Jugurthino et Catilinae nihil ad historiam pertinentibus principiis orsus est.' (3.8.9)

Scholars have been divided as to how, if at all, the prologues are

linked with the works that follow them (cf Janson 1964:68- 69).
McGushin (1977:29-30, 291-92) and Paul (1984:9-11) have recently shown
that the prologues are not only an apologia for historiography, but
also a setting out of the moral, ethical and philosophical background
of the monographs in a number of important ways.

Oratory

As shown at the head of this chapter, the *captatio beneuolentiae*
was a major element of prefaces to speeches. An innovation here,
however, was the development of the polemical preface, first seen in
Isocrates' *Helen* (against the 'eristics') and the *Busiris* (in which a
literary predecessor, Polycrates, is attacked)[9]. An important preface
is that to the *Ad Nicoclen*, where two important themes come to light
for the first time in extant literature: the idea that a work is a
gift for the addressee and (secondly) the author's pretended
uncertainty as to whether he can write well enough. This can be
considered a development from the concept of the simple address as
seen from Hesiod onward; the address is conceived of as an honour paid
to the addressee, and from this the dedication can be thought to have
developed (see Janson 1964:17).

Technical works other than oratorical (specifically scientific and
didactic) did not witness any similar development in prefatory
conventions. Several of Xenophon's works have brief introductions
explaining the choice of subject, but the subsequent writings of
Aristotle have no such introduction, neither do those of Theophrastus,
the Hippocratic writers or Euclid.

Archimedes

It appears from extant literature that the third century BC mathematical writer Archimedes was key innovator in terms of prefatory conventions. Some of his prefaces are in the form of letters, the recipient in most cases being the otherwise unknown mathematician Dositheus. The fact that the letters and treatises are sent to a specialist mathematician means that there was no need to 'sell' his subject and justify his choice of topic to a wider audience. A theme important to subsequent literary history that emerges in these prefaces is that of the recipient's request. In the preface to *De Lineis Spiralibus* Archimedes emphasises the fact that Dositheus demanded the work (Janson 1964:20-22).

Rhetorica ad Herennium

All four books of the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* have prefaces. These are characterised by programmatic statements which keep in focus the various aspects of the work - a function which is fulfilled also by brief epilogues concluding each book. The first preface, which is longer than the others, is apparently also an introduction to the work as a whole. The *Rhetorica* itself had little influence on the literary tradition till much later, but its prefaces show many of the hallmarks of the prefaces to Cicero's subsequent treatises. Characteristic features are as follows: the prefaces concern the author's situation, his relationship with the dedicatee, his attitude to the subject and his predecessors. The same topics can be found in the prefaces to Cicero's *Orator* and *De Oratore*, even if the formal structure of these works is different (Janson 1964:32, 45).

The common subject-matter accounts for the similarities at least to some extent.

An important feature of the *Rhetorica* prefaces from the point of view of this literary history concerns the recipient's request, an aspect seen first in the prefatory letters of Archimedes. From the first preface this is made very clear: '...tamen tua *nos*, Gai Herenni, *uoluntas* commouit ut de ratione dicendi conscriberemus', and later 'Non enim spe quaestus aut gloria commoti uenimus ad scribendum quemadmodum ceteri, sed ut industria nostra tuae morem geramus *uoluntati*.' This theme can be paralleled in the other prefaces and epilogues, eg 1.17.27; 2.21.50. In accounting for the prominence of this theme in the *Rhetorica* Janson (1964:28-32) has suggested that it was necessary for the author to defend his composition because at this stage there was little prestige attached to the composition of Latin literature; this he does by stressing the practical need and the recipient's desire for it.

Cicero

The extent to which prefaces to technical works were often interchangeable is shown by an anecdote of Cicero (*Att* 16.6.4. = Shackleton Bailey 414). He tells Atticus that in his *De Gloria* he had mistakenly inserted a proem which he had previously used in the third book of his *Academica*. This came about, Cicero explains, because he had a collection of prefaces: 'id obuenit ob eam rem quod habeo uolumen prohoemiorum.' Having discovered the mistake, Cicero quickly scribbled down a new preface which he now sends to Atticus with the request that the new exordium be pasted down in place of the old: 'itaque statim nouum prohoemium exaraui et tibi misi. tu illud desecabis, hoc adglutinabis' (cf Büchner 1939:1128).

The post-Archimedean epistolary preface never completely replaced the non-epistolary, dedicatory preface in Greek literature, and in fact co-existed with it for a considerable time. The dedicatory preface was favoured by the Romans, particularly the non-epistolary type in classical times. There are important exceptions, however, and the epistolary variety may well have been in existence as early as Coelius Antipater, Lutatius Catulus and Cornelius Sulla (Peter 1901:243; Pavlovskis 1967:536). But it is not till the first century AD that the epistolary preface came into its own, as is shown by the extant works of Martial, Statius (*Siluae*), Quintilian and the elder Seneca (*Controuersiae*). The chief disadvantage of this form is the fact that it damages the unity of the work it heads (Sykutris *RE* 1931:205).

Elder Seneca

The topos of the recipient's request is seen also in the proem of the elder Seneca's *Controuersiae*; the education of his sons provides a convenient pretext. By this stage the request had become so standard that two writers have described it as fictional or at best semi-fictional (Lockyer 1970; Fairweather 1982:27). In terms of content, the lengthy prefaces provide considerable information on Seneca's private and public life, and that of his family, as well as his attitude to rhetoric (see Sussman 1978:46).

Elder Pliny

An unusual type of preface is that which heads the elder Pliny's *Natural History*. The entire first book is in effect an extended contents page of the mammoth work. The book begins with a letter

presenting the work to the future emperor Titus, in which various issues of literary apologia are raised (cf Wallace-Hadrill 1990:82). Pliny says he is submitting the work to Titus' literary judgment, which he has recently praised: 'subiturus ingenii tui iudicium, praesertim lacessitum' (pr6). He implies that it is better to dedicate a work than simply publish it: 'neque enim similis est condicio publicantium et nominatim tibi dicantium' (pr6). Describing his work as nugae in an adaptation of Catullus 1.3-4, Pliny goes beyond the norm in adopting a self-deprecatory attitude (Howe 1985:562, 574).

Though Pliny does not actually invoke the muses in the usual sense, his reference to them in the first line has much this effect. The preface thus has both a dedication and an effective invocation. This first line makes clear both the title of the work and the fact that it is headed by an epistolary preface: 'libros Naturalis Historiae, nouicium Camenis Quiritium tuorum opus, natos apud me proxima fetura licentiore epistula narrare constitui tibi, iucundissime Imperator.'

In Book 1 Pliny goes to great lengths in providing the names of his sources (something appropriate to the writing of an encyclopaedia). This is in a sense a parallel to the phenomenon whereby the occasional poet sketches the social circumstances in which each poem was composed. This will be examined in the chapter on information (pages 117-18).

Quintilian

Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria has not only 'prooemia' to seven of its twelve books (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12), but also an introductory letter addressed to his publisher, Tryphon. Unlike the

letter introducing the *Natural History*, this letter does not appear to have the same element of dedication. Unlike the future emperor Titus, Tryphon is no luminary. In terms of the content, there is little that could not have been said in the proems. Quintilian speaks mostly of the writing process, and he mentions (topically) Tryphon's encouragement in this regard and his own hesitancy:

> efflagitasti cotidiano conuicio ut libros quos ad Marcellum meum de institutione oratoria scripseram iam emittere inciperem. (*ep ad Tryph* 1)

cf ...cum a me quidam familiariter postularent ut aliquid de ratione dicendi componerem, diu sum equidem reluctatus (1*pr*1)

Indeed it seems that the purpose of the letter is simply to secure the bookseller's goodwill, and that it can not have been intended to head the published work, though of course it is impossible to be certain of this (*pace* Janson 1964:50-59).

D. IMPORTANT COMMON THEMES

Dedication and invocation

The similarity between the proems to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is indicative of a key element in proems generally (though by no means exclusive to them), namely the invocation of the divinities. Most commonly, one or all the Muses would be invoked, or else Zeus or one of the other gods. The Homeric Hymns (c700-500 BC) provide ample manifestation of this phenomenon. Of the 33 Hymns, the shorter pieces

are simply invocations, whereas the longer ones recount additional information about the gods to whom they are dedicated:

Ἄρτεμιν ὕμνει, Μοῦσα, κασιγνήτην Ἑκάτοιο
παρθένον ἰοχέαιραν, ὁμότροφον Ἀπόλλωνος... (9.1-2)

Ἀμφὶ Διὸς κούρους, ἑλικώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι,
Τυνδαρίδας, Λήδης καλλισφύρου ἀγλαὰ τέκνα... (33.1-2)

Given the importance of oral delivery to the Homeric poems, it is possible that the long hymns were suitable for one performance, whereas the short poems may have been a collection of stock beginnings and endings which could be attached to different hymns as the occasion required (Sowa 1984:8). In fact Thucydides (3.104.4) says that the hymns themselves were sung as preludes (προοίμια) to the Homeric epics.

Fragment 1 of Ennius' *Annales* constitutes an invocation to the Muses: 'Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum'[10]. Further invocations can be seen at Pindar *Nemean* 2, Theocritus 17.1, Virg *Ecl* 2.60, and Ov *Met* 10.148.

By the Augustan age invocation of the Muses had become clichéd; Horace (*Sat* 1.5.51) parodies the phenomenon, Ovid treats it ironically (*Ars* 2.704), Tibullus (2.1.35) and Propertius (2.1.3) substitute a friend and a lover respectively for the Muses. Compared with their earlier status in Greek literature, the invoked Muses faded from prominence as they were replaced by the emperors' apotheosis (eg Virg *Geo* 1.24-42; Ov *Fasti* 1.3-6; Curtius 1953:232).

Invocation was essentially the preserve of poetry. This is underlined by Livy's allusion when he breaks with historiographical tradition in ending his preface with one (Ogilvie 1965:29):

cum bonis potius ominibus uotisque et precationibus deorum

dearumque, si, ut poetis, nobis quoque mos esset, libentius

inciperemus, ut orsis tantum operis successus prosperos darent.

(*pr11*)

The concept of dedication is linked to invocation but is less

tangible. Traditionally it has been assumed that the prominent

mention of a person at the beginning of a work implies 'dedication'

(eg Nisbet and Hubbard 1970:1 and 1978:10)[11]. The received wisdom on

this issue has been questioned by White 1974, who has shown that the

'dedication' of literature was viewed in terms of gift-giving (52-53);

alternatively it was done under the pretext that the recipient had

requested the work, or that the writer was asking him to criticize the

work (53-55).

For the purposes of this thesis 'dedication' may be defined as

the conspicuous presentation of a work of literature to a human (ie

not divine) recipient. Examples of this are Germanicus *Aratea* 2-16;

Val Flacc 1.7-21; Val Max *praef*; Stat *Silu* 4prl-2: 'Inueni librum,

Marcelle carissime, quem pietati tuae dedicarem.' Mart 5.1 'Haec

tibi...mittimus, o rerum felix tutela salusque,...tu tantum

accipias....'

The first poem in the Catullan corpus is a good example of an

introductory poem conveying the elements of both dedication and

invocation (though the latter is textually suspect). Thus:

       Cui *dono* lepidum nouum libellum

       arido modo pumice expolitum?

       Corneli, tibi.....   (1-3)

quare *habe tibi* quicquid hoc libelli,

        qualecumque : quod, <o> patrona uirgo,

        plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.   (8-10)

The poem - and as a consequence the entire collection - is presented
(*dono*) to the biographer Cornelius Nepos, and at the end of the poem
(reading 'o patrona uirgo') Catullus invokes one of the Muses, perhaps
Calliope (see Fordyce 1960:86-87)[12].

Programme

The nature of the ancient papyrus roll made it difficult for a
reader (or prospective reader) to ascertain the nature of the contents
by means of a quick scanning (Earl 1972:856). Consequently the first
sentence and first paragraph, most easily seen when the papyrus roll
was partially opened, fulfilled much the same function as the title
page and list of contents in a modern book. For writers it was thus
necessary to establish clearly at the very beginning what type of
literature was being written. This applies to both prose and verse.

    Apart from the purely formal aspects outlined above,
introductions in both prose and verse also have the slightly different
function of setting the tone in a broader sense (cf Goodyear 1972:88).
Erren (1983:66-89) has illustrated how various prose proems reveal the
central concerns of their authors: 'Die Proömien sind vielleicht die
gewichtigsten Selbstzeugnisse, die es von den römischen Autoren gibt.
Wie nichts anderes beleuchten sie die Stellung, die der Verfasser in
der Literaturgeschichte einnimmt' (at 66).

    Hor *Od* 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1 for example, are all programmatic in
the sense that they contain some self-conscious utterance on Horace's

part about his own poetry; Prop 1.1 establishes the persona as a lover, whereas Tibullus in 1.1 sets up his poetic ideals of love and rustic life. Juvenal's first satire offers a justification for the writing of satire (cf Courtney 1980:82). The concept of the writer's programme is thus necessarily linked with the concept of *apologia*. Certainly in the case of Martial, elements of apologia are not restricted to poems which now head the collections, as shown by Citroni (1968) and Garson (1979).

Intended audience

One aspect of prefaces (important when we come to consider Martial and Statius) is that they contain references to an implied audience. This is a natural and, not surpringly, a common theme from early on, though limited to certain genres only. For example tragic prologues, like Greek tragedy generally, seem to contain very little reference to the audience, and in so doing sustain the dramatic illusion (see Bain 1975). An interesting example of this element can however be seen in the preface to Pliny's *Natural History*, where the author says he has in mind primarily a technical readership of practising agriculturalists and artisans, and only thereafter people who read for pleasure: 'humili uulgo scripta sunt, agricolarum, opificum turbae, *denique* studiorum otiosis' (pr6). The extensive 'bibliographies' offered by Pliny in Book 1 are proof that the main value of the work lies in the technical and scientific information it offers (Lochner 1986:21).

NOTES

[1] In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England the dramatic prologue became an acknowledged literary creation in its own right, often having no connection with the play it headed. Some writers, eg David Garrick and George Colman, gained fame in this capacity. See in general Knapp (1961). These were similar in nature to the Plautine prologues with their prominent *captatio beneuolentiae*: they strove 'to cajole the audience...so that they would be in a friendly frame of mind before the curtain was drawn up' (Knapp 1961:9).

[2] 'De more libros dedicandi apud scriptores Graecos et Romanos obvio', diss Marburg 1892 (unavailable to me)

[3] West (1966:150-51 and 1978:136-37) has commented on the difference between the two proems of Hesiod; the *Works and Days* begins a short invocation of Zeus, whereas *Theogony* is prefaced by a 115-line hymn to the Muses.

[4] This has been examined by von Arnim, J 1882, *De Euripidis prologorum arte et interpolatione*, diss Greifswald; Nestle, W 1930, *Die Struktur des Eingangs in der griechischen Tragödie*, Stuttgart (unavailable to me).

[5] Hopkinson (1988:86); cf Cairns (1979:8-9) and Hutchinson (1988:78-84). Alan Cameron (*Callimachus* forthcoming: chapter 1) has argued, against traditional wisdom, that the preface in its current form was an integral part of the original edition of the *Aetia*, and that the piece was not specifically directed against contemporary epic poets.

[6] The first of the Agathias proems differs in being much longer (134 lines against 58 and 14) and conforms to a different pattern. Dating to the sixth century, this proem is more an

apologia than the others in that, especially in the introductory section (1-46) and the coda (113-33), it explains the procedure followed by the editor. The poem has a prose introduction which states that the collection comprises new poems, and that it was presented to Theodorus. In the last line it is stated, curiously, that the proems were spoken AFTER the frequent recitations then in vogue (rather than before, as one might have expected).

A major part of the proem is devoted to an encomium of the Emperor Justinian (47-97), which the poet undertakes as an adornment ($\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu o\varsigma$) and so that the work may commence under good auspices (42-44). The collection is however presented to one Theodorus, as is made plain at 101-12. The Latin Anthology (also sixth century AD) offers nothing comparable to Book 4 of the Greek Anthology. However, the following prefatory poem may be cited as an interesting opening gambit:

Praefatio

Paruola quod lusit, sensit quod iunior aetas,

    quod sale Pierio garrula lingua sonat,

hic opus inclusit. tu, lector, corde perito

    omnia perpendens delige quod placeat.

            (Baehrens [ed] *Poetae Latini Minores* 4.278 'Incerti')

[7] See Jenkinson (1981:66); the problems arising from this prologue have been treated by Waszink (1963:79-82) and Harvey (1981:9-12).

[8] Willcock (1989) differs from Goldberg in asserting that *contaminatio* refers to aesthetic rather than technical criticism of the plays.

[9] The *Helen* exordium is in fact cited by Aristotle (Rhet 1414b1) and Quintilian (3.8.9) as irrelevant to its subject-matter.

[10] It is doubtful whether this was actually the first line of the work, as has been commonly supposed (see Skutsch 1985:143).

[11] The standard Latin words for this are *dedicare* (*TLL* 5.260.60-69) and *dicare* (*TLL* 5.966.69-73). White (1974:51-52) has shown that the use of these words was more limited than that of their English equivalent: 'Latin never acquired a noun or verb which expressed the concept of book- dedication in the abstract.'

[12] The question of Catullan editorship (on which see Quinn 1973:xxi, Clausen 1982:193-97, and Ferguson 1988:13) places a question-mark over the status of the proem. It is at least possible that the first poem originally headed a smaller collection or *libellus* designed specifically for Nepos. This poem could later have been placed at the head of the entire corpus either by Catullus or alternatively by a posthumous editor (cf Stat *Silu* 5). Either way, it does seem that the first poem is not at all appropriate for the collection as a whole. The light-hearted nature of the poem, particularly as it is written in hendecasyllables, makes it incongruous with the collection in its current form.

Chapter 2

THE PRODUCTION AND DISSEMINATION OF WRITTEN MATERIAL

The prose prefaces of Martial and Statius bear centrally on the dissemination of the poems that follow them; in analysing the prefaces it is therefore essential to form a clear understanding of the circulation of ancient literature. Being in large measure occasional poetry (ie verse composed for a specific occasion), the *Epigrams* and *Siluae* present particular problems in this regard: for example, In what units were they circulated? What is the significance of their being published in books? The object of this chapter is not so much to answer these controversial questions, which will be examined later with regard to the prefaces themselves, but to provide the framework necessary for fuller discussion. A pervasive danger is that of anachronism; the modern connotations attached to such words as 'publish', 'edition' and even 'book' are misleading when applied to the ancient world. Before attempting a brief sketch of the circulation of literature at Rome in the first century AD, it is necessary to clarify the terms which apply to the physical being of literature, the Roman 'book'[1].

To begin with, we must evaluate the importance of writing relative to other vehicles for literature. The importance to Greek and Latin literature of the spoken word cannot be over-emphasised[2]. It would not be extravagant to claim that all literature in ancient Rome was written to be listened to (Kenney 1982:3). The *recitatio*, the Roman manifestation of this trend, can be regarded as a development of the *symposium* and public performances of the Greeks (Sherwin-White 1966:115). An epigram of Martial implies that recitation is synonymous with being a poet:

> nil recitas et uis, Mamerce, poeta uideri.
>
> quidquid uis esto, dummodo nil recites.   (2.88)

The importance of patronage to the *recitatio* has been noted in the previous chapter; unless sponsored, the author himself had to meet the considerable cost of providing the venue or seating (Favez *OCD* 1970:910). In an age which did not know commercial printing, this became the main form of initial circulation, as it provided the cheapest and quickest means of making a work known to the largest available educated audience (Sherwin-White 1966:115). The invention of the practice is attributed by Seneca the Elder to Asinius Pollio, who in Augustus' time invited guests to readings of his own work (*Controu* 4 *praef* 2; cf Isid *Orig* 6.52). Undoubtedly, though, there are earlier vestiges of the practice. Our most complete evidence for the mechanics of the *recitatio* occurs at Pliny *Ep* 1.13, to Sosius Senecio, particularly at paras 3-4. Pliny the Younger, Martial and Juvenal frequently complain about the excessive number of *recitationes* in their time. This can be taken to signify that the *recitatio* had become firmly established as a vehicle for literature by the first century AD[3].

From a purely literary point of view it should be borne in mind that the *recitatio* often played an important part in the very composition of the poem. The Roman poets never completely lost the improvising ability of their archaic Greek predecessors. Lucilius, Virgil, Horace and Ausonius[4] all appear to have composed their poems by dictation (Quinn 1982:85-86).

Recent scholars have tended to stress the importance of oral presentation as a vehicle for poetry, and consequently it is necessary to restore the balance by underlining the particular value of writing. A poem committed to paper can be accurately preserved and transmitted,

by someone other than its author; reading can replace performance and the poem can gain its own identity independent of its performer and author. Writing also permits revision of the poem in a series of drafts, as well as detailed study and criticism of the text by others (Quinn 1982:88).

At several points Martial shows an awareness of the physical length of his poems. For example, at 10.69 he complains that poems of his which take up an entire column (*pagina*) are glossed over by the reader who is satisfied by the short poem:

> Consumpta est una si lemmate pagina, transis,
>
> et breuiora tibi, non meliora, placent. (1-2)

On a different occasion, however, he points out to one Cosconus that his poems are not long by comparison with those of others. Albinovanus Pedo and Domitius Marsus are cited as poets whose individual poems often stretch into two columns. The verb *tractat* ('drag') suggests that these poets are long-winded: 'Marsi doctique Pedonis/ saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus' (2.77.5-6). Significantly, Martial speaks of the physical rather than temporal length of the poems. One may conclude that, at least in the case of individual poems, Martial expected his readers to be aware of the physical appearance of his work.

A. THE PHYSICAL BEING OF LITERATURE

The most important writing materials used by the Romans were wooden tablets, papyrus and parchment[5]. Discussion of these materials will be prefaced with comments on the sources for our knowledge of

them. We have reasonably plentiful examples of Greek books extant from classical antiquity, most of them dating from the first to third centuries AD. However, little Latin literature has survived in the form of papyri (Kenney 1982:3). One reason for this is that the principal source of papyri is Egypt, where Greek was of more interest than Latin literature (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174). References in existing Greek works to the physical appearance of literature are sparse, and Latin literature before the first century AD does not have much more to offer[6]. Martial, Pliny the Younger and Juvenal make some occasional references to the outward form of literature. One of the few direct literary sources, Pliny the Elder's *HN* 13.11-12, is fraught with obvious inaccuracies.

Thus far this discussion has concerned itself with literary sources on the physical appearance of literature; the archaeological evidence should also be mentioned. An important discovery of papyrus codices of mainly Christian literature was that made in Egypt in the late 1920's, and the resulting collection of manuscripts became known as the Chester Beatty Papyri, after their discoverer (Kenyon 1951:98-101; Kleberg 1967:75). The five main areas from which surviving examples of Roman writing tablets come are Southern Italy (particularly Pompeii and Herculaneum, preserved by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in AD 79), Dacia (mostly AD 131-67), North Africa (45 tablets from the fifth century AD), Egypt (a great variety from the first to fourth centuries AD) and Switzerland (particularly from Vindonissa, a legionary fortress with tablets dating to the mid-first century AD) (Bowman and Thomas 1983:33-34). The discovery in 1973 of a number of writing tablets at Vindolanda (modern Chesterholm) has added substantially to our evidence of Roman writing materials, and necessitated reconsideration of earlier assumptions about the material and form of ancient writing tablets. The nature and implications of

these discoveries will be described below under the headings 'Materials' and 'Format'.

Materials

One of the most important basic writing materials for the Romans was papyrus, the manufacture of which was taken *mutatis mutandis* from the Greeks (Kenney 1982:15). In antiquity the main source of the papyrus plant, the *Cyperus Papyrus*, was the Nile delta of Egypt; but the plant has completely died out in Egypt by now (Skeat 1969:55). The method by which the papyrus roll was made is described by Skeat (1969:55) and Turner (1968:3 and 1977:44). Some points which bear recounting here are as follows. Whereas the medieval scroll was written from top to bottom along the length, ancient scrolls were written in a series of independent columns (*paginae*) running perpendicular to the length (Turner 1968:5). The papyrus sheet comprised two strips made from the fibres of the papyrus plant, superimposed at right angles to one another. Traditionally these two sides have been distinguished as 'recto' (the side with horizontal fibres, more carefully finished in order to receive the writing) and 'verso' (the rougher side comprising vertical fibres, seldom used for writing) (Schubart 1921:11, 129; Skeat 1969:56). These terms when applied to Greek and Latin papyri should be used only of rolls, rather than of individual sheets. The manufacturer's and retailer's unit was the roll or *charta* (Turner 1968:3-4).

Papyrus sheets were smoothed with pumice after being joined together, and a criterion for the quality of the paper was the extent to which it had been smoothed (Cerny 1952:6; Skeat 1969:55). Thus when Horace describes a book of his poetry as 'Sosiorum pumice mundus' (*Epist* 1.20.2) he intends the polished appearance of the book to

express also the polish of the poems contained in it. The poem as a whole is addressed to a now complete volume of poetry as if it were a pretty slave-boy absconding in order to make a living out of its looks, a comparison that brings out the winsomeness of the book (Macleod 1979:23-24).

Occasionally both sides of the papyrus were used, resulting in 'opisthograph' manuscripts. References to manuscripts of this type can be found at Juvenal 1.6 ('scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?') and Martial 8.62:

> Scribit in auersa Picens epigrammata charta,
>
> et dolet auerso quod facit illa deo.

This form was, however, the exception rather than the rule (Courtney 1980:85).

Papyrus had a number of uses other than for writing, and this gave rise to a topos concerning the fate of a book. Cheap papyrus was used for wrapping purchases (Lewis 1974:46, 95). Thus Catullus could predict that Volusius' *Annals* 'laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas' (95.8), and Statius can say of Grypus' worm-eaten book:

> quales ut Libycis madent oliuis
>
> aut tus Niliacum piperue seruant
>
> aut Byzantiacos cocunt lacertos   (*Silu* 4.9.11-13)

In keeping with a standard topos, bad literature is threatened with olives, spices, perfumes and fish, among other things - all of which reflects the versatility of papyrus (Parsons 1968:287-88; Coleman 1988:227-28 with further references).

The parchment notebook, expressed by the Latin *membranae*,

appears to be a Roman invention. Skeat (1969:61-63) and Turner (1968:9) have recounted the manner in which parchment and vellum are produced, through the process of 'tawing'. There is no literary or archaeological evidence for it from the Greek east (Roberts 1970:53). The earliest unambiguous reference to the publication of literature on parchment codices occurs at Martial 1.2. Here the poet suggests that the main advantage of this is that of portability; a traveller can take one with him on a journey:

> Qui tecum cupis esse meos ubicumque libellos
>
> et comites longae quaeris habere uiae,
>
> hos eme, quos artat breuibus membrana tabellis:
>
> scrinia da magnis, me manus una capit. (1.2.1-4)

Lightness, convenience, durability and ease of reference were factors likely to have weighed heavily in the favour of the parchment codex. Unlike a papyrus roll, a codex could lie open on a reader's desk and could be read using one hand only. Partly because it was possible to write on both sides, a papyrus codex could contain four or five times the content of a roll (Turner 1968:8). In addition, a major advantage of parchment over papyrus was the clarity of writing on the former (cf Persius 3.10 and Isidore *Orig* 6.11.4) (Paoli 1963:177). A major factor favouring the codex in a Christian context was that all four Gospels could be bound together into one book, whereas this was not possible with the papyrus roll (Metzger 1964:6)[7]. In evaluating the comparative advantages of parchment and papyrus as writing materials, Roberts and Skeat (1983:7-9) have noted that the outstanding advantage of the former was that of availability: 'whereas production of papyrus was limited to Egypt, parchment could be produced wherever the skins of suitable animals were available in

sufficient quantity' (1983:8). However the difficulties involved in processing this durable material delayed its widespread use. Our lack of evidence on the subject makes it impossible to speak of cost as a factor in comparing the two materials (Skeat 1982; Roberts and Skeat 1983:7).

Martial's *Apophoreta* include a number of books mentioned as being in codex form:

> 14.184 *Homerus in pugillaribus membranis*
> Ilias et Priami regnis inimicus Vlixes
> multiplici pariter condita pelle latent.

One may compare also 14.188 *Cicero in membranis*, 14.190 *Titus Liuius in membranis*, and 14.192 *Ouidi Metamorphosis in membranis*.

Martial's emphasis on the advantages of the codex makes it clear that this type of presentation was an innovation in his time (Howell 1980:105). Scholars are divided as to whether the poems 14.183-95 refer to complete works or to epitomes and anthologies. It is likely that Martial here refers to complete works; the epigrams would be pointless if they indicated epitomes, as there is nothing remarkable about the brevity of these. It is not impossible that the Romans had some system of miniature script. Such gifts would be expensive, but not out of keeping with presents of a good cook, an accomplished Spanish girl or an entire troop of actors (14.203, 214, 220) (Oliver 1951:248-49; Roberts and Skeat 1983:25-27; *pace* Kenyon 1951:94). Given the advantages of parchment over papyrus as outlined above, it remains to be asked why parchment took so long to supersede papyrus as the standard writing material. Skeat (1969:67) has suggested that this failure can be attributed to the conservative outlook of the Graeco-Roman reading public. More likely factors, perhaps, are those

of availability and price of suitable hide - which in all probability militated against the use of parchment for a considerable time (Paoli 1963:178).

The Romans continued to use various materials other than the standard papyrus, and later parchment. Quintilian (*Inst* 10.3.31) says that students used tablets for their lecture-notes; discoveries of tablets have corroborated the view that they were used for 'subliterary' purposes (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:175). Among his *Apophoreta* Martial lists tablets made of citrus-wood (14.3) and ivory (14.5). We hear also of Vitellian tablets, which from their context appear to be small tablets (probably named after their maker) used for billets-doux (cf 2.6.2):

<div align="center">

14.8 *Vitelliani*

Nondum legerit hos licet puella,

nouit quid cupiant Vitelliani.

</div>

Whereas the Egyptians used a slender rush (*Juncus maritimus*) in the manner of a fine brush, the Romans followed the Greeks in using instead a thicker stem (*Phragmites aegyptiaca*) with its end cut to a point to form a nib (*harundo*: Martial 1.4.10; 9.12.3). Occasionally a metal substitute was used (Skeat 1969:60). Pens were usually kept in bundles (eg *Fasces calamorum* Martial 14.38; cf Paoli 1963:180). The Egyptians invented and used a form of ink made from carbon, mixed with gum (which gave it adhesion) and water. The inert composition implied by this meant that the ink was not subject to fading and could survive an extremely long time. The metallic-based ink invented later had, in the long term, the extreme disadvantage that it ate through the material on which it was written (Skeat 1969:61).

Format

The roll was the natural way of storing lengths of papyrus. Folding subjected the cell of the papyrus fibres to excessive pressure, and in time cracks developed at the folds. Rolling, on the other hand, exerted little pressure on the cells and hence the papyrus could preserve its flexibity for a long period (Cerny 1952:10). Wound round a roller with one or two bosses (*umbilici*) on the end, the roll could easily be stored in a bookseller's pigeon-hole or case (*capsa*) (Coleman 1988:225).

The codex originated from the multi-leaved writing tablets used by both Greeks and Romans at various times. These were rectangular wooden boards, held together on one side by strings or leather thongs passing through holes. They were slightly hollowed out, and the resulting cavities filled with a layer of wax. Writing took place when a stylus was used to incise the wax. Wooden tablets of another type were those made smooth in order to accept writing in ink. These two categories have been called 'stylus tablets' and 'leaf tablets' respectively (Bowman and Thomas 1983:36). Tablets were an ideal vehicle for rough notes and memoranda, especially because deletion and alteration were easily effected by using the flat end of a reversed stylus (Skeat 1969:65). For example, the tablets found at Vindolanda contain information on military payment and supplies (Birley 1977:154). The format of the wooden writing tablet paved the way for the parchment codex, once vellum became widely enough available (Kenyon 1951:93; Skeat 1969:66).

There is disagreement among scholars over the relationship between the switch from papyrus to parchment on the one hand, and that from roll to codex on the other. The traditionally held view was that the replacement of papyrus by vellum, and of roll by codex went

hand-in-hand; consequently the papyrus codex was regarded as a 'transitional species' (Kenyon 1951:87). More recently Kenney (1982:25) has written that the replacement of the roll happened at much the same time as that of papyrus, though the two did not coincide completely. Against this Roberts (1954:183) and Turner (1968:8) have stressed that there is no essential connection between format and material. To quote Roberts and Skeat (1983:10): 'the transition from papyrus to parchment was of an entirely different character from, and quite unconnected with, the transition from roll to codex'. The papyrus codex is a phenomenon well attested by modern archaeology[8] and also by ancient sources, eg Ulpian *Digest* 32.52 *praef*. There is enough evidence of this nature for us to regard the papyrus codex as a significant form, which did for some time co-exist with the parchment codex (Roberts 1954:183)[9]. It is certainly clear, however, that as a format the codex offered the major advantage of relatively easy handling; it has also been suggested that the codex offered a cost-advantage as great as 26% over the papyrus roll (Skeat 1982:172-75).

The change from roll to codex was connected with the eventual triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire. Also, it is possible that Gentile Christians encouraged the use of codices in order to distinguish the New Testament scriptures from the Old Testament scrolls (Metzger 1964:6). The ascendancy of the codex had two drastic consequences for Roman literature: (1) the increased durability of the codex gave works of literature a greater chance of survival over the centuries; (2) only certain texts were chosen for transcription into the codex form, and the choice was made unmethodically. This led to the loss of a great many works which might otherwise have been preserved (Kenney 1982:26). In the fourth century classical literature was rewritten on vellum on a large scale (Pinner 1948:21).

New evidence from Vindolanda has revealed tablets with a 'concertina'-format, neither of the roll nor the codex variety (see Bowman and Thomas 1983:39). It was at first thought that this unknown form could represent some transitional stage between roll and codex (Birley 1977:154). However, Bowman and Thomas have revised their earlier ideas concerning this format (1983:40, 42). It appears that this rather unusual form found at Vindolanda should be regarded as another variety of writing tablet in its own right, rather than being in any way a forerunner of the codex.

The surprisingly high proportion of leaf tablets found at Vindolanda has raised doubts about what was previously a widely current notion: that the stylus tablet was the commonest writing material other than papyrus and skin. It is quite possible that leaf tablets were a much more common medium for ephemeral documents such as letters and accounts. Though they could not be re-used in the way that papyrus and parchment were, these leaf tablets had the advantage of being cheaper, more dispensable and easier to use (Bowman and Thomas 1975:471; 1985:44).

It is certainly likely that the length of papyrus rolls had an effect on the length and divisions of classical literary works, but it is not clear how direct this influence was. Certainly, by the first century AD the production of books must have reached a certain standard if it could provide papyrus rolls large enough to contain long works of poetry, such as books of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. Van Sickle (1980:29) has suggested that the 'material and manufacture of the papyrus roll were not so restrictive of its content, still less prescriptive, as might have been expected', and that the length of an individual book was determined by criteria that were internal to each genre. This is speculative and implausible (cf Kenyon 1951:40); it is impossible to gain clarity on such issues because of our lack of

technical and quantitative information on the writing materials of the time. Furthermore, the matter is complicated by the question of the implications of genre differences in classical literature[10].

B. THE DISSEMINATION OF LITERATURE

If there is little evidence concerning ancient writing materials, we know even less about the dissemination of literature. Whereas surviving fragments of Greek literature far outnumber those of Latin, Latin literature is much richer than Greek in references to books and the book trade (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174). Before the time of Cicero our knowledge is largely speculative; for his own time Cicero's correspondence with his friend and 'publisher' Atticus is a major source of information. In the century that followed, Martial's poems contribute substantially to our knowledge of the subject. The early history of the book trade is also shrouded in mystery. The first Athenian references to the circulation and collection of books date to the fifth century BC (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:173). It is very likely that the book trade at this time functioned on a small scale (Turner 1951:21).

It has been noted above that oral presentation is an important theme in any study of the dissemination of classical literature. It has also become apparent that 'publication' in the modern sense of the word is inappropriate in a Roman or Greek context. Nowhere is this more true than in the occasional poetry of Martial and Statius; so many other factors come into play in their circulation. Thus Starr's general comment (1987:213) is especially true of these two writers: 'Romans circulated texts in a series of widening concentric circles determined prmarily by friendship, which might...be influenced by

literary interests, and by the forces of social status that regulated friendship.' An important study on these lines had been produced by Peter White (1974). Given the centrality of White's study to the prefaces of Martial and Statius, many of his arguments will be discussed fully in the course of this dissertation. Suffice it here to summarise the main arguments, evidence and conclusions of White's paper.

The books of Statius' *Siluae* and Martial's *Epigrams* as we have them represent no more than the final and least significant means by which poems were presented to patrons. The books, as they were finally published, would not have been an effective vehicle for conveying complimentary verse, for three reasons: firstly, the honour coming the way of the dedicatee of any poem would be diluted by the poem's being placed among other poems addressed to other people, and often the book as a whole would be dedicated to another person; secondly, the time-lag between composition for a specific occasion and eventual publication weakens the force the poem would otherwise have; thirdly, in many poems by Martial the dedicatee is not identified, and such references implicit in poems would be recognised at the time only if the poem were given separately and directly (White 1974:40).

White uses evidence from the *Siluae* and *Epigrams* to show that these poems were communicated primarily through three means: impromptu performance, recitation and private brochure. Given that occasional poems were delivered in social situations dictated by *amicitia* relationships, extemporaneous production inevitably became their hallmark. Statius, for one, emphasises the speed with which the poems were produced (cf *Silu* 1pr13-15; Martial 9.89; Williams 1978:267). This was essential when poems were composed for *cenae* and visits to the country estates of rich *amici*. The *recitatio*, which has been described earlier in this chapter, is much referred to in the poems of

Martial and Statius (eg Mart 1.3.7-8; 12*pr*9-10; Stat *Silu* 5.2.162-63)
and also by Juvenal (7.82-86) and Pliny (*Ep* 6.15; 4.27). For a poet
who relied on the spin-offs of patronage these occasions were an
important showcase. It is also highly possible, in the case of
Martial and Statius, that copies of poems written were sent privately
and informally to their dedicatees before being given any broader
exposure. When poems were too short to merit this procedure they were
collected into small groups, or sometimes excerpts were taken from
larger works. The word *libellus* should be understood in these terms,
as being private, brief, pre-publication manuscripts (White
1974:42-45).

So much for what can be described as pre-publication
circulation. Now it is clear that at least some of the *Epigrams* and
Siluae were made available in the poets' own time in the form in which
we now know them. For this there is enough evidence in the prose
prefaces to those poems. Having established above the importance of
other methods of dissemination, it may well be asked what the purpose
was of the poets' ever publishing the poems in their current form
(White 1974:48-50). It will be necessary to consider this problematic
question in detail with regard to the prefaces themselves.

The mechanics of copying have long elicited controversy and
uncertainty among scholars. Birt (1882:351-53 and 1913:309-10) wrote
that copying took place by means of simultaneous dictation to a number
of scribes; Schubart (1921:157) acknowledged that several of the
extant errors in manuscripts are more likely to have arisen from
errors of reading. In an influential paper Skeat (1956:179-203)
showed that both methods of copying were used by the Romans, depending
on the circumstances (such as the number of copies required) (cf also
Skeat 1969:57-58). The fact that we know some of Atticus' slaves to
have had Greek names - Dionysius (*Att* 4.8a.1), Pharnaces and Antaeus

(*Att* 13.44.3) - suggests that at least a substantial proportion of them were Greek (Kleberg 1967:24). This difference of language could account for at least some of the mistakes in the copying of Latin texts (Pinner 1948:31-32; cf Marshall 1976:254). Quite apart from the practical demands of his work, a copyist could be exposed even to political danger. Suetonius (*Dom* 10) says that Domitian executed the copyists (slaves) of Hermogenes of Tarsus, who was himself assassinated for certain allusions in an historical work.

The importance of *amicitia* was a motif in the above account of the circulation of poetry. A well-documented *amicitia* relationship centred on the production of written material was that of Atticus and Cicero. Titus Pomponius Atticus (110-32 BC) helped Cicero get his work copied by lending Cicero his slaves as copyists; as Cicero's many *Epistulae ad Atticum* and their replies show, Atticus was also Cicero's literary adviser, political ally, and himself a writer (see Sommer 1926; Feger 1956:517-20; Shackleton Bailey 1965:3-59 at 13; Phillips 1986).

As a wealthy citizen Atticus had at his disposal several slaves and freedmen who could and did act as copyists and proofreaders: 'namque in ea [sc familia] erant pueri litteratissimi, anagnostae optimi et plurimi librarii' (Nepos *Att* 13.3; cf Cicero *Att* 4.8a.2, 13.44.3). The impression to be gained from the letters is certainly that Atticus provided this assistance to Cicero as a favour, rather than for commercial gain (*pace* Finley 1973:52); and hence it is misleading to describe Atticus as a 'publisher' (Kenney 1982:20). To quote Horsfall (1989:12): 'Atticus did employ copyists....but there is not a word in Nepos about a publishing business because it did not exist.' He goes on to point out that there is no evidence that Atticus' activities in the literary sphere were for financial gain, and that they should be viewed in terms of *amicitia* relationships

(1989:89 on Nepos *Att* 13.3; cf Phillips 1986:236-37). The chances are that Atticus was simply one of many cultured men to fit this description; it is probable that many well-off Romans had one or more of their slaves trained as a clerk, for use as a copyist when the need arose.

Though again it must be conceded that a lack of evidence has imposed severe constraints on our insights, a certain development does appear to emerge. In keeping with the *amicitia* system Atticus helped Cicero, but for later generations bookselling was more of a commercial venture[11]. Horace mentions the Sosii as his booksellers at *Ars P* 345 and *Epist* 1.20.2, briefly in both cases. In the former, Horace contrasts the wealth gained by the bookseller with the fame won for the author: 'hic meret aera liber Sosiis; hic et mare transit/ et longum noto scriptori prorogat aeuum' (345-46). The commentator Porphyrio describes them as the 'bibliopolae celeberrimi' of their time (*ad Hor Ars P* 345 and *ad Hor Epist* 1.20.2: Brink 1971:358).

Martial makes several references to his booksellers. In 1.2 he advises on where his books can be bought: 'libertum docti Lucensis quaere Secundum/ limina post Pacis Palladiumque forum' (7-8). Both 1.117 and 4.72 are addressed to people who ask the poet for copies of his poems, who are told that they should buy copies at a bookshop (of Atrectus and Tryphon respectively). In both poems Martial ends by agreeing with the addressee to the effect that the poems are not worth buying. In one he gives a description of the whereabouts of a bookshop:

> Argi nempe soles subire Letum:
> contra Caesaris est forum taberna
> scriptis postibus hinc et inde totis,
> omnis ut cito perlegas poetas.

illinc me pete. Nec roges Atrectum -

        hoc nomen dominus gerit tabernae - ;

        de primo dabit alteroue nido

        rasum pumice purpuraque cultum

        denaris tibi quinque Martialem.   (1.117.9-17)

Martial implies that his poems sell so well that the bookseller will
of necessity keep a copy easily to hand (Howell 1980:351). Tryphon is
mentioned as a 'publisher' (*bybliopola*) of Martial (*Epigr* 4.72;
13.3.4) and the same is implied with regard to Quintilian (*Ep ad
Tryph*).   Dorus is mentioned by Seneca (*Ben* 7.6.1) as a bookseller
stocking copies of Cicero and Livy (Carcopino 1956:215).

On several occasions Martial speaks of his poems as being read
throughout the world: 'Hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris,/ toto
notus in orbe Martialis/ argutis epigrammaton libellis' (1.1.1-3);
'quod orbe cantor et legor toto/...umbilicis quod decorus et cedro/
spargor per omnes Roma quas tenet gentes' (8.61.3-5); 'totoque legetur
in orbe' (6.64.25).   Sometimes Martial makes this claim to emphasise
the contradiction between his widespread fame and his unfavourable
financial position:

        Sum fateor, semperque fui, Callistrate, pauper

           sed non obscurus nec male notus eques,

        sed toto legor orbe frequens et dicitur 'Hic est,'

           quodque cinis paucis hoc mihi uita dedit.

                                        (5.13.1-4; cf 11.3)

The claim to universal readership is particularly Ovidian (cf *Trist*
4.10.128), and as a literary topos it can be traced back to Alcman
(148 Page) and Theognis (237-54) (Kleberg 1967:44-45; Kay 1985:63).

Martial's claim is however backed up by evidence suggesting that his work was available to some extent outside Rome. By the time of Martial and Pliny literature was widely disseminated in the Western empire, but it is unknown by what means (Sherwin-White 1966:490; Kenney 1982:20). Presumably Romans abroad on civic or military duty would have with them favourite works brought from home, in the absence of *recitationes*, or they may have reproduced literature for sale. Pliny is apparently surprised to find a bookshop at the major provincial centre of Lyons (9.11.2), and Aulus Gellius mentions that he found some Greek works for sale at Brundisium (9.4.1; cf Best 1968/69:210-11 and Marshall 1976:253 n6). Other authors indicate that there was a considerable trade in old and rare books, and that forgery was not unknown in this field: Pliny *HN* 13.83.86, Quintilian 9.4.39 (cf Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174)[12]. The story told by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 18.4) of a visit to the bookshop in Vicus Sandaliarius ('shoemaker's street'), where a braggart was defeated in argument with Sulpicius Apollinaris, suggests that bookstores served a function in literary life beyond their basic function (Holford-Strevens 1988:61).

It is uncertain whether a poet such as Martial could make any material benefit from the sale of his works. The general tone and content of Martial's references to the sale of books suggests that he had nothing to gain. At 13.3 Martial says that a *libellus* will cost the addressee four sesterces, but that if it cost two the bookseller Tryphon would still make a profit. He makes a passing reference to his own poverty later in the poem (line 6). Van der Valk (1957:2-3) assumes that the poet himself profited from the sale; it is possible that a bookseller might pay a poet for the right to be the first to copy his work (Howell 1980:2), but it is much less likely that he 'afterwards got a certain amount in proportion to the books which had been sold' (Van der Valk 1957:2 n6). In all probability the benefits

for the poet were the less directly obvious, in keeping with the *amicitia* system.

The surviving information about the price of books in Rome is extremely limited. A de luxe edition of Martial Book 1 cost 20 sesterces (1.117.17 'denaris quinque'); a copy of Book 13, which is half the length, cost 4 sesterces, with more than half that figure representing a profit for Tryphon (13.3.2). Statius (*Silu* 4.9.9) speaks of a *libellus* of his work costing 2.5 sesterces, which suggests materials of good quality. Presumably de luxe materials would merit the use of specialist copyists (Coleman 1988:226; cf Howell 1980:351-52). These figures imply that books in their standard form were cheap, if it is borne in mind that in this period a loaf of bread cost one or two *asses*, ie 1/4 to 1/2 HS, though shortages inflated prices from time to time (Duncan-Jones 1974:244).

Inevitably, textual errors resulted from copying by hand. As suggested above, the standard of education on the part of the copyist was in all likelihood a factor in the accuracy of the manuscript produced. Of errors in his own works Cicero complains 'ita mendose et scribuntur et ueneunt' (*QFr* 3.5.6). Martial is careful to protect himself from blame:

> Si qua uidebuntur chartis tibi, lector, in istis
>   siue obscura nimis siue latina parum,
> non meus est error: nocuit librarius illis
>   dum properat uersus adnumerare tibi. (2.8.1-4)

Naturally the speed at which the copyist works (*properat*) goes some way towards determining the number of errors perpetrated. That highly trained copyists were worth a great deal of money we can conclude from Seneca the Younger (*Ep* 27.6-8) and Horace (*Epist* 2.2.5-8) (Marshall

1976:254). The more up-market booksellers had special correctors (*anagnostae*) to check texts before they were made available (Kleberg 1967:32). Martial checked a certain number of presentation copies himself (*Epigr* 7.11; 7.17.7).

The concept of a 'second edition' presents certain inevitable problems when considered in a Roman context. Again, it is easy to be misled by modern notions of an 'edition'. Horace *Ars P* 389-90 suggests that there is some finality to the act of 'publishing' (by which is meant the last of the four stages of publication as outlined above): 'delere licebit/ quod non edideris, nescit uox missa reuerti' (*pace* Quinn 1982:89). In the context Horace is encouraging the poet to exercise care in his every utterance, and it is unlikely that this extract bears much weight as evidence for the circumstances of publishing.

Cicero is an important source for our understanding of the ancient edition. We know that while Atticus was having copies made of Cicero's *Academica*, Cicero himself was in the process of revising the work extensively; the letter dedicating the second edition to Varro survives as *Fam* 9.8. Evidently, Cicero was too late to stop the reproduction of the earlier version, as this has survived in part. The *Academica* is thus a rare example of a work which has survived from antiquity (in part at least) in more than one edition (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:23, 194; see Emonds 1941:265-74, *pace* Phillips 1986:233). Another possible case of different 'editions' occurs at Martial 10.48.23: 'de prasino conuiua meus uenetoque loquatur'. It is possible that the first edition of the book included the name of a charioteer (*Scrutus*) here but that in the version published after the poet's death the name, no longer topical, was replaced by the team to which the charioteer belonged (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:194)[13].

We know that Ovid's *Amores*, published originally in five books,

perhaps as early as 20 BC, was later circulated in a revised edition of three books. The latter edition probably took place shortly before Ovid wrote the *Ars Amatoria*. Only the later edition is extant; this is made clear by the epigram which heads the book. Despite the dogged efforts of several critics, it is impossible to ascertain with any clarity the difference between the two editions; the nature and extent of the changes effected by Ovid will remain an area of speculation (Cameron 1968:322; cf McKeown 1987:74-89).

From this it emerges that, in the case of Ovid's *Amores*, the second edition has survived, whereas in the case of Cicero's *Academica* we have parts of both versions. This is purely historical accident. The overwhelming impression is that once a work was reproduced for circulation, there was no effective means of correcting or recalling it, and therefore a second edition would not necessarily supersede the first (Kenney 1982:11).

The public library, so important a factor in the literary life of the Hellenistic world after the third century BC, was not a reality at Rome until the first century AD. For Roman libraries the great model was the Museum at Alexandria, established and run by the Ptolemies, which became a thriving cultural centre. The library at Alexandria, part of the Museum complex, gained legendary status; scholars in large number edited and copied texts to an extent never known before. Heading the institution were some of the foremost literary figures of the time, including Apollonius Rhodius, Eratosthenes and Aristophanes. The crucial contribution to literature made by the Museum was that of standardising texts; a number of other developments facilitated reading, such as the standardising of the literary alphabet, improvements to the punctuation system and the invention of a system of accentuation (see Reynolds and Wilson 1968:5-15; Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:173).

In the case of Rome a distinction must be drawn between public libraries on the one hand, and on the other hand the private libraries of bibliophiles such as Cicero[14]. The library excavated among the ruins of Herculaneum in 1750 is an example of one such private library, and the chances are that this particular one (consisting almost entirely of the Epicurean writings of Philodemus and others) belonged to Calpurnius Piso (Nisbet 1961:186-88). In the first century BC Lucullus had a large (private) library at Tusculum, which he made freely available. A chance reference in the preface to Martial's ninth book shows us that a private libraries sometimes contained decorations, in this case a canvas painting/bust: Martial says that his *amicus* Stertinius Avitus 'imaginem meam ponere in bibliotheca sua uoluit' (9 *praef*, prose lines 3-4).

Julius Caesar was the first to plan a large public library at Rome, using the help of Marcus Varro to collect and classify the books (Suet *Div Iul* 44; cf Dziatzko *RE* 1897:417); this intention was not realised until 39 BC when Asinius Pollio built a public library at the Atrium Libertatis. Augustus' establishing of public libraries in the Temple of Apollo (28 BC) and in the Campus Martius were important further developments (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:22-23). Both of these were linked to temples, and comprised separate Greek and Latin libraries with a hall or reading room where conversation was possible (Aulus Gellius 13.19-20; Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:608). By the middle of the fourth century AD there were 28 public libraries in Rome (Kleberg 1967:47; Platthy 1968:3)[15].

NOTES

[1] The terminology used in this chapter is discussed in Appendix A and the end of this thesis.

[2] Birt (1882:2) is indicative of a different emphasis evidenced in earlier scholars.

[3] eg Juvenal *Sat* 1.1-6, 3.9; Pliny *Ep* 8.21; 5.17; 6.15. Ancient references to the *recitatio* have been collected by Mayor (1853:38-39). Starr (1990a) has shown the seriousness the younger Pliny invested in recitations.

[4] Hor *Sat* 1.4.9-10; [Suet] *Vita Virg* 90-94, 132-39; Hor *Sat* 1.10.92; Auson *Ephem* 7

[5] The words 'parchment' and 'vellum' are here used interchangeably.

[6] On the paucity of evidence see Kleberg (1967:67) and Roberts and Skeat (1983:3-4).

[7] On the use of the codex by the Christians see Roberts and Skeat (1983:38-66).

[8] Classified by Turner (1977:20-31)

[9] On the papyrus codex see further Maunde Thompson (1912:27) and Kenyon (1951:95-112).

[10] Skeat (1982) has argued that the standard length of the papyrus roll was 20 sheets.

[11] To quote Starr (1987:221): 'the booktrade was merely an ancillary system of circulation beside the private channels that probably supplied the vast majority of literary texts'.

[12] It has been suggested, however, that Rome itself had only a small trade in used books: see Starr (1990b).

[13] On second editions in antiquity see in general Emonds (1941).

[14] On private libraries see especially Rawson (1985:39-40) with reference to late Republican times.

[15] On libraries at Rome see Saglio (*Dar-Sag* 1873:707-8), Boyd (1915), Platner and Ashby (1929:84-85), Dziatzko (*RE* 1897:405-23), Kenyon and Roberts (*OCD* 1970:607-8), Rawson (1985:39-42) and Starr (1987:216).

Chapter 3

LITERARY PATRONAGE

Since many of Martial's *Epigrams* and all Statius' *Siluae* can be described as occasional poetry, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the social circumstances within which the two poets were working. In this regard literary patronage is centrally important. In a broader context, patronage of letters must be situated in the characteristically Roman system of *amicitia*; this is, after all, an extension of the ordinary relationship between patron and client (Astin *OCD* 1970:790). In this chapter I shall attempt to outline personal patronage in the first century AD as experienced by Statius and Martial, and in particular to adumbrate their social and economic standing as poets.

The definition of the patron-client relationship offered by the social scientist Robert R Kaufman provides a convenient starting-point. He has described this phenomenon as a 'special type of dyadic exchange' which (a) 'occurs between actors of unequal power and status', (b) 'is based on the principle of reciprocity; that is, it is a self-regulating form of interpersonal exchange, the maintenance of which depends on the return that each actor expects to obtain by rendering goods and services to the other and which ceases once the expected rewards fail to materialize' and (c) is 'particularistic and private, anchored only loosely in public law or community norms' (Kaufman 1974:285)[1].

The importance of personal patronage in Roman history has long been recognised[2]. From Republican times patronage, expressed by the Latin term *clientela*, was a major factor in all facets of social life, as illustrated by Brunt (1971:47-50; cf Shelton 1988:13-17). Mutual interests and mutual services (*beneficia*), the stuff of patronage

relationships, welded together Roman political factions in an almost feudal form of clientship; from a favourable point of view these bonds were called *amicitia*, but otherwise *factio* (Syme 1939:157). The collapse of the Republic brought about the loss of democratic rights, and consequently patronage became a 'mainspring of public life' (de Ste Croix 1954:40). Under the Augustan Principate 'political competition was sterilised and regulated through a pervasive system of patronage and nepotism' (Syme 1939:386).

Nor is the continued importance of patronage in later times difficult to identify. In fact the Augustan principate was, above all else, a manifestation on vast scale of personal *clientela* (de Ste Croix 1954:40; Crook 1955:22; Yavetz 1988:96-97). The period following the death of Augustus did not witness any essential change in the system; in fact the *Epigrams* and the *Siluae*, together with the letters of the Younger Pliny, are among the most significant evidence of personal patronage at Rome in the first century AD. That the Romans regarded attachment to the rich as a respectable career in its own right is evident from Horace *Epist* 1.17 and 1.18, addressed to young men who~are~about to join the entourage of the rich as a preliminary step in the *cursus honorum* (White 1982:57).

So pervasive is *amicitia* in the lives of the poets that the money they received from patrons should be viewed essentially as a function of the *amicitia* system rather than as direct payment for the poems themselves - a misconception born out of anachronism (White 1978:87-88). In other words, while poets had little chance of direct remuneration for their efforts, their economic situation was in large measure informed by ties of patronage (of which their writing was one aspect). A result of the indefinite nature of patronage was that in financial terms the poet's situation was very insecure, as Martial is at pains to stress in his *Epigrams*. The words of one scholar in the

context of eighteenth-century England can be applied to Rome of the first century AD: '...the very irregularity and unreliability [writers] complained about was one of the actual system's most typical features, and helped underscore the subservient relationship of writer to patron that the system actually fostered' (Evans 1989:29).

The importance of reciprocity cannot be over-emphasised in this regard. This element, prominent in Kaufman's definition above, has considerable implications in a Roman context. In broad outline, it can be said that the poet's task of writing is paralleled at some level by the protection provided by the patron, protection in matters both material (for example inheritances, gifts of cash and land) and intellectual (eg help in meeting criticism). The writing of poetry was only one of the tasks fulfilled by *clientes*; others joined the rich man's entourage, advertised his importance, and provided him with cultured companionship during his official duties and during his leisure (White 1982:58). It does not follow, however, that poets received immediate remuneration for their work, and in this regard it is as well to bear in mind Martial's frequent protestations of the sad lot suffered by poets in this regard. Details of this will be considered in due course, but at this point suffice it to note that these relationships were a two-way process[3].

Typical of any institution which results in grouping, patronage had a contradictory effect on the social fabric of Rome. While on the one hand it was a strong integrating force (Saller 1982:38), on the other hand it gave rise to competition and hence civil strife. The difference between macrocosmic and microcosmic views of patronage is to some extent seen in the term *amicitia*: the word could mean anything from a political alliance to ordinary private friendship (Millar 1977:111).

When considering literary patronage during the reign of Domitian particularly, it is important to appreciate the rôle of the emperor himself. In terms of achieving advancement in society it is clear that proximity to the emperor on the part of the *cliens* was a key factor (Saller 1982:58-69). One effect of this situation, under the Julio-Claudians particularly, was that imperial freedmen and slaves reached positions of power quite incongruous with their low birth, and this provided a source of tension between emperor and aristocracy (Millar 1977:69; Saller 1982:66). Thus on the one hand, being an *amicus* of the emperor implied substantial public honour and privilege as well as the ability to distribute *beneficia* to others, but on the other hand it was an acutely unstable position which exposed a *cliens* to pressures and suspicion from the emperor, the imperial court and the public (Millar 1977:116). Saller has shown that the emperor treated equestrian and senatorial offices as gifts in his power to bestow, without following objective criteria in determining the political advancement of his subjects: '[no] attempt was made in the Principate to transcend the particularistic criterion of patronage by the introduction of the universalistic and rational criteria of seniority and merit (in the modern sense)' (1982:110).

A function of the supreme political power of the emperor was the arbitrary nature of his patronage. In this light one of the *Epigrams* shows the poet anxious about the outcome of a request for money made to Domitian, a request which seems to have been turned down:

at quam non tetricus, quam nulla nubilus ira,

quam placido nostras legerat ore preces! (6.10.5-6)

The context of the poem makes it clear that Martial had made a request himself, possibly in verse, and was observing the emperor's expression

as he read it (Millar 1977:496).

However, other poems show Martial and Statius to have been more
successful in their requests to the emperor, and in the process to
have received various *beneficia*. Statius secured from Domitian the
right to draw water from the latter's Alban property (*Silu* 3.1.61-64);
Martial made the same request and, from the fact that the poem
conveying the request was published (9.18), it is likely that he was
successful. An important aspect of public life, Martial requested and
gained from Domitian the *ius trium liberorum* (*Epigr* 2.91-92; 3.95.5-6;
9.97.5-6), having based his claims on his poetry, and he is proud to
have obtained citizenship for a considerable number of others
(3.95.11; cf Millar 1977:496). Comparison can be drawn with the
granting of the *ius trium liberorum* to Pliny the Younger, something
gained for him through a petition by a close intimate of the emperor,
Julius Seruianus (Pliny *Ep* 10.2) (Millar 1977:114). The fact that
this important right could be obtained by petition by or for the
childless again emphasises the extent to which political power was
centralised in the hands of the emperor.

The younger Seneca writes in his *Ben* 6.34.1-2 that the custom of
amicitia was first instituted at Rome by Gaius Gracchus and Livius
Drusus, acting in imitation of Hellenistic monarchs. He adds that it
became traditional for *amici* to be divided into three categories.
These were, firstly, the people admitted into the private audience of
the emperor; secondly, those admitted with a larger, but still
restricted, number; and, thirdly, those let in without any distinction
or additional privilege. It is uncertain whether Augustus or the
later emperors followed this tripartite division. It seems the
presence of this passage in Seneca can be ascribed to the Roman
predilection to attribute customs to a κτίστης (founder). The sources
do not give any substantial evidence on this issue, although there are

several references both literary and epigraphic (see Millar 1977:117) which suggest the existence of this division. However, the paucity of such evidence leaves doubt as to its continued existence (Millar 1977:111)[4]. In considering the role of patronage in literature, an entirely different approach is taken by Zetzel (1982). He denies strenuously the importance of patronage to Latin poetry, as opposed to its importance to the poets themselves. His argument rests heavily on the dubious assertion that the addressee of a poem is not honoured by the poem in any way. He argues that the use of an address in a poem is not necessarily dictated by the relationship between the poet and the person whose name is in the vocative, but that it is a 'correlate of both the subject and the style of the poem' (Zetzel 1982:88). This approach abolishes the notion of client-poetry, since the addressee is thus by definition not a patron at all, but rather a poetic fiction. Zetzel relies on dubious evidence in this regard (as shown by Badian 1985:350-51), and he is on still shakier ground when he asserts that 'in the case of organized poetic books there is no reason to assume that the individual poems ever had an independent existence prior to the creation of the whole' (Zetzel 1982:89)[5].

Terminology

Contrary to what one might expect from comparable modern English usage, the words *patronus* and *cliens* were scarcely used to describe relationships of patronage in classical Latin. In fact, Seneca, Tacitus, Pliny and Suetonius never use *patronus* of literary relationships, nor even more generally of an influential protector; the word is used only of a man who has manumitted slaves, is the formally designated sponsor of a town or corporation, or a lawyer engaged in defence (White 1978:79; Saller 1982:8-10). Similarly,

cliens was not used of people in the inferior position of these relationships, but rather of humble members of the lower classes; though used of a rich man's satellites, the related abstract noun *clientela* is never used of the relationship (White 1978:79-80; Saller 1982:9-10). The fact that these words were so infrequent suggests that there was some stigma attached to them; they can be thought to imply social inferiority and degradation (Saller 1982:9). However, White's claim (1978:79) that the word *patronus* was not used of the social role of the lordly man who receives the attentions of lesser men and in turn rewards them favours is overstated; in fact epigraphic evidence disproves the assertion (Saller 1982:10, esp n11).

amicus, the word most widely used to refer to patron and client, was ambiguous enough to encompass both the superior and inferior parties. The tendency to use *amicus* rather than the more demeaning *cliens* for the inferior party does not imply any egalitarian ideology: adjectives such as *inferior* and *minor* could be used when necessary to stress differences in status (surveyed by Saller 1982:11-15). A general trend in the language of *amicitia* is that words avoiding distinction of status are used far more often than words which imply differentiation. Also, there are more words to designate the rich friend (eg *locuples*, *potens*, *beatus*) and they occur more often than those which indicate the subordinate friend (White 1978:81-82). A significant early use of the word *amicitia* to describe patron-client relationships can be seen at Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* 1.140-41, where 'sperata uoluptas/ suauis amicitia' has been taken to refer to the relationships between Lucretius and his patron Memmius (Allen 1938:181; Wiseman 1982:35-36). Brunt has concluded from his study of patron-client relations in the late Republic that the term *amicitia* has a vast range, covering 'every degree of genuinely or overtly amicable relation' (1965:20). This conclusion can be extended to

embrace the Principate and the Empire (cf Mayer 1989:17). The term *amicus* is very seldom used in inscriptions as a formal designation to refer to clients of the emperor. This is probably because there were political dangers in claiming publicly a status which the emperor could revoke at his will (Millar 1977:116).

The basic words used to describe the exchanges so essential to patronage relationships may be summed up as follows. Most important was the term *officium*, which originally referred to the activity particular to a specific group of people; it then developed into an idea of rules or obligations peculiar to these categories, and later expressed the *fides* implicit in relationships of this nature (Saller 1982:15). From this it is evident that reciprocity is a prominent element of patronage relationships, as is clear from Cicero's *De Officiis*. *officium* in the sense of exchange is closely paralleled by *beneficium*, which literally means 'kindness' or 'favour', and *meritum* is semantically close to these. Though some scholars have tried to determine difference in the force of these three words[6], it is clear that there is at least a great deal of overlap between them (Saller 1982:17-21). The term *gratia* ('goodwill') differs from the other three in that it refers more to an attitude than an action (Saller 1982:21). The terminology for these reciprocal relationships and their agents can thus be described as largely unspecific.

The mechanics of patronage

Some attention should be given to the mechanics of patronage, the day-to-day processes whereby such relationships were conducted. Martial's *Epigrams*, together with the *Satires* of Juvenal, give considerable insight into the daily tasks of the *cliens* in the first century AD. A great many of the *Epigrams* are devoted to complaints

about the many demeaning chores to which a *cliens* has to devote himself daily, for example the *salutatio* mentioned at *Epigr* 1.70. It is essential to bear in mind, however, that Martial's poetry cannot be taken at face-value as a reflection of Roman life, since he was writing satirical epigrams rather than serious autobiography (Hardie 1983:51-56; Saller 1983:246). Hardie has pointed out that this 'mendicant facade' can be traced to Greek precedents, and he gone so far as to portray Martial's *persona* as a 'selective caricature' of the conditions of his life. Undoubtedly, Martial did have some duties to fulfil as a client, but there is every reason to assume that he has exaggerated (Hardie 1983:55-56)[7]. At the same time, it should be said that our knowledge of this Roman custom derives largely from hostile sources, such as Martial and Juvenal who were in the inferior social position within such relationships.

The *Commentariolum Petitionis*, traditionally attributed to Quintus Tullius Cicero (102-43 BC) but of disputed authenticity, divides clients into three categories according to the nature and extent of their duties. First there were the *salutatores*, who came in the morning to pay their respects and made several other calls as well (*Comment Pet* 35; cf Cic *Fam* 9.20.1); also the *deductores*, who stayed on to escort the great man as he went down to the forum and perhaps for the duration of the first business (*Comment Pet* 36; cf Cic *Att* 1.18.1; Cic *Mur* 70); and the *adsectatores*, whose devotion and duties were to one patron only and could thus remain with him for the entire day, helping in various ways (*Comment Pet* 37; cf Cic *Mur* 70-73). This last position, which was also the humblest, could often amount to a full-time occupation, whereas the *salutatores* were the least committed in terms of time spent attending any one patron (Wiseman 1982:29-30).

These categories would appear to give a fair indication of the various tasks involved in the role of client. Martial writes of his being expected at the early-morning *salutatio* (1.70; 9.100; 10.82), and also to join the patron's entourage on its way to the forum (3.46; 9.100; 10.82). At 3.46 Martial is seen attending his patron in the course of his daily work, including at court; the evenings might be devoted to attending dinner-parties of the patron to provide entertainment, even if that meant suffering his abuse:

> Inuitas centum quadrantibus et bene cenas.
>   - Vt cenem inuitor, Sexte, an ut inuideam? (4.68)

Martial stresses that the life of a client was tiring and tiresome; that is the impression conveyed by, for example, *Epigr* 10.70, 74 and 82 (Saller 1982:128-29). In sociological terms, such customs as the daily *salutatio* can be regarded as ritualisation which reinforced patronage relationships and gave them public visibility (Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984:58; cf MacMullen 1974:107-9).

The most demeaning of these customs are what Martial, for one, is eager to escape; to this end he requires patronage generous enough to free him from these duties. In this context Martial's declared aim of *otium*, ie literary leisure underpinned by financial security in the form of a country villa, for example, is the antithesis to the *ambitio*, the burdens of which plague the poet's life[8].

What benefit did the patron get from these relationships? Apart from the unique skills of a poet in adding *elegantia* to the rich man's leisure time, there were a whole host of functions which clients fulfilled. In many ways the institutions of Roman society were poorly developed, and so it was left to *amici* to supply services analogous to those of merchants, lawyers and insurers, for example (Hands 1968:32).

Direct commissions for poems as well as for other works of art, in the modern sense of artistic commissions, do not appear to have been the norm in imperial Rome or earlier, for that matter. It is likely that much was written on the prompting of a patron, but nowhere is there evidence that this was done with anything like the directness with which we associate a modern commission. Insofar as these promptings (to write for example celebratory poems) did take place, they tended to be more subtle than a commercial transaction. In fact we have no evidence of arrangements which commit patrons to pay for any poem, let alone stipulate an amount; it can be assumed that this would have been too crass for Roman sensibilities (White 1978:86).

In considering specifically literary patronage as distinct from other types of *amicitia* relationships, some consideration should be given to the directness of the patron's influence over the poet and his writing, which are two separate issues (cf Zetzel 1982). Traditionally it has been assumed that Maecenas conscripted poets to eulogize the ideals and personalities of the new state under Augustus (eg Syme 1939:253-55), but as Dalzell (1956:153-55) has pointed out, there is no real proof that Maecenas' intervention with the poets of his age was as direct as that. There is little justification for holding that Maecenas' patronage was conditional on a set political programme[9]. The occasional poetry of Martial and Statius, however, by and large fulfils a very direct social function (eg praising, thanking, requesting) whereas the extant Augustan poets do not seem to have been subjected to 'occasional' constraints to the same extent.

The position of the poet in society

The economics of the poet's position in society are centrally at issue in a discussion of this nature. Again the presence of a

literary *persona* in Martial makes it difficult to assess objectively the situation of a poet at this time. Whatever the extent to which poets had to use their craft as a source of income, it is clear that there were other opportunities of earning available. Military service and other types of civil service (particularly of an administrative or financial character) were among the other options open to poets (White 1982:53-55).

From the situations implied by Statius' *Siluae* it can be assumed that this poet was in a position similar to that of Martial with regard to .patronage; furthermore, it seems that their condition was closely matched by that of Juvenal some two or three decades later (White 1978:77). Statius' literary *persona* is based squarely on his status as a professional poet.

Origins

This situation of Roman literary patronage has its roots in the activities of Romans abroad; contact with Greek encomiastic poets particularly was a major factor. The advent of Greek slaves at Rome meant that many of these Hellenistic practices came to Rome. This was then assimilated into the cult of the emperor, and increasing imperial patronage of the arts brought with it increasing praise for the emperor (Hardie 1983:39). The Greeks provided poets with the archetype of writers needed by great men seeking political advantage from literary support; the tradition of Greek panegyric, dating from the fourth century BC, provided the technique and an available body of thematic material for these purposes (Williams 1982:9).

The purpose and value of patronage

Among the most problematic issues surrounding patronage is that
of the purpose it fulfilled for the poets. Did they need patrons to
fulfil their material needs, as one might reasonably conclude from
reading Martial's *Epigrams*, or was it more a matter of the patrons'
giving them support in literary disputes? Modern scholarship on this
issue witnesses a debate between White and Saller on the relative
importance of material and non-material support for the poets in terms
of *amicitia* relationships.

White's approach is that a poet in Martial's situation had no
urgent need of financial assistance, since he had enough resources to
fulfil the property qualification of an *eques*. Even the poorest
knight earned enough from rents and interests to lead a modestly
comfortable life; Martial was thus concerned not with how to secure
his basic income but how to enhance it, and thus to improve his
standard of living (White 1982:52). In this regard White (1978:90-91)
has formulated seven categories of *beneficia* in terms of which clients
could profit. These are (1) inheritances and bequests first and
foremost (non-senators needed the *ius trium liberorum* before they
could take up these); (2) cash gifts made during the rich man's
lifetime, of which Pliny's gift of a *uiaticum* to Martial is an example
(*Epist* 3.21: Pliny says clearly that the gift was made in recognition
of their friendship and the verses Martial wrote about him, and that
this took place in accordance with an old custom)[10]; (3) loans at low
or no interest, which would have been tantamount to gifts when given
to an unscrupulous borrower; (4) gifts of land and houses, such as
Horace and Martial benefitted from; (5) lodgings in the townhouses and
villas of the rich[11]; (6) sinecures and beneficial appointments
arranged for poorer friends; and (7) marriage to the daughters of rich

men. White emphasises, however, that the property qualification for a knight (400 000 HS) would in its own right have yielded enough income (from rents and interests) to ensure financial security without the additional benefits of patronage (White 1978:88-89).

Saller, on the other hand, has opposed the view that Martial's status as an *eques* necessarily implies financial independence of the sort that guarantees a desirable standard of living. In this regard the validity of White's evidence (1978:89) has been called into question. For one thing, Juvenal *Sat* 7, cited by White as evidence that the rich are reluctant to support poor poets, in fact implies that the rich were expected to provide the sort of support whose absence Juvenal bemoans. Furthermore, the fact that Martial makes relatively little mention of monetary gifts is of no significance; Martial's poem for Pliny (10.19) makes no reference to the gift we know Martial received (Saller 1982:28 n94). Saller (1983:250) has asserted that the equestrian census of 400 000 HS was drawn up in Republican times, and that in the rising cost of living at Imperial Rome this would certainly not have been enough to maintain a decent, let alone luxurious, standard of living. However, this reasoning is invalidated by the fact that there is no evidence of serious inflation or devaluation at Rome in this period[12].

Publication was a crucial benefit for poets in respect of patronage. In a society without a highly developed book trade and without laws of copyright, wealthy men were in a uniquely privileged position in their ability to bring the works of poets to public attention (White 1978:83; Wiseman 1982:37). Thus it is that Martial in *Epigr* 12.2 appeals to Arruntius Stella for assistance in the publication of his poems, a request matched in a different way by Statius in his *Silu* 2 *praef* addressed to Atedius Melior. Poets needed encouragement, publicity, protection and criticism of their work; in

particular, they required help from influential friends when, in the circumstances of unrestrained or distorted reproduction of their work, they might face the embarrassing problem of having libellous works falsely attributed to them. An example of this can be seen when Martial asks Paulus for help in such a situation (cf 10.3 to Priscus):

> si quisquam mea dixerit malignus
>
> atro carmina quae madent ueneno,
>
> ut uocem mihi commodes patronam
>
> et quantum poteris, sed usque, clames:
>
> 'Non scripsit meus ista Martialis.' (7.72.12-16)

These aspects of patronage must have had a very practical application in terms of a poet's success (White 1978:85; Saller 1983:247). Poets relied on patrons to organise and finance public readings (cf Pliny *Ep* 8.12); on a more aesthetic level Martial sometimes asked friends to read his poems with a view to suggesting improvements (eg 5.80 to Severus; Saller 1983:248).

Continuity

Some consideration should be given to Martial's frequent assertion that the standard of literary patronage had declined considerably by his time. However, as it has been noted previously, one should avoid taking at face-value what Martial says about his own circumstances: such is the nature of his literary *persona*. Certainly, it is one thing to speak of continuity in the overall style of patronage from one period to the next, and it is something completely different to consider whether the same amount of opportunity is available to a poet in one age compared with those of a previous age.

The gist of Martial's tirades bears more on the latter, ie that patrons are not as generous as they were in previous generations. The central development in *amicitia* since the first century BC was the centralisation of political power in imperial hands, beginning with Augustus; this meant that, by the magnitude and variety of the *beneficia* he could confer, the emperor himself was a key factor in the availability of patronage. If there really was a decline in literary patronage, the tastes of the reigning emperor would have played no small part. We have already seen that the emperor's discretionary powers were considerable, and it can be said that different emperors placed different degrees of importance on literature, and had different tastes in literature (see Williams 1978:280-86 and 1982:3-27).

Complaints about an alleged decline in the quantity and quality of patronage should certainly be seen against the background of widespread misgivings on the part of writers of the early empire about the prevailing condition of cultural decadence. Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus* is one important expression of this sentiment, even though the work is limited ostensibly to rhetoric[13].

Vessey (1973:16) supports the contemporary view that the first century AD witnessed decline in the standard of literary patronage. Similarly, Seager (1977:40-50) takes seriously allegations of a decline in *amicitia*, whereas LaFleur (1979) and Saller (1982:11 n15) and are more circumspect about the comments of Tacitus and Juvenal in this regard. As Saller has pointed out, there is no solid basis for evaluating the notion; decline was such a common motif in Roman literature that it should always inspire suspicion (1983:255); in the words of Mayer (1989:16) concerning Juvenal: 'The theme of abused friendship is part of a larger concern, the tottering rule of *officium* in Roman society.'

Much of what Martial says of a decline in literary patronage is expressed in terms of an ideal figure, namely Maecenas. In a much-quoted epigram, Martial says that the absence of large-scale literary patronage ('Maecenases') is responsible for the absence of first-rate writers ('Virgils'):

> sint Maecenates, non derunt, Flacce, Marones,
>
> Vergiliumque tibi uel tua rura dabunt   (8.55[56].5-61)

Generally speaking, Maecenas' name goes together with images of *otium*. In a poem to Lucius Julius, answering a challenge to write more poetry on a bigger scale, Martial says (cf 12.3[4].2; Mayor 1853:158-59 on Juv 7.94: Kay 1985:65):

> Otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
>
> Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo   (1.107.4-5)

Certainly, this image of Maecenas as the ideal patron, allaying all the poets' material difficulties, became a well-worn topos in literature; by the middle of the first century AD his name had become a byword for a good literary patron (Quinn 1982:117; Vessey 1973:16). That this topos lived long beyond classical times is adequately attested[14]. As White has commented (1978:77), it is quite probable that through their friendship with Maecenas Virgil and Horace were in more favourable circumstances than Martial, but in many ways that relationship should be considered the exception rather than the rule. There is no compelling reason to believe that the Augustan poets were in any radically different position to those of Martial's time, except insofar as the emperor's monopolistic tendencies increased. However, it is true that the Augustan poets mention fewer patrons than do their

Flavian successors.

NOTES

[1] In studying a later period Lytle (1987) views all social groups
as being formed in a continuum between friendship and patronage.
Speaking also of the Renaissance in the first instance,
Gunderheim (1981:3) describes patronage as 'one of the dominant
social processes of pre-industrial Europe. It is virtually a
permanent structural characteristic of all early European
material high culture, based as it is on production by
specialists.'

[2] eg Friedlaender (1908:196-202); Warde Fowler (1908:269-70)

[3] Hands (1968): ch3 'Giving for a return' and ch4 'The nature of
the return'; cf White (1978:76 n5)

[4] eg Seneca *Clem* 1.10.1 'cohors primae admissionis'; *ILS* 1078
Antonius Pius' 'salutatio secunda'. Concerning differentiated
access, an alternative view to that of Millar is given by Gelzer
(1969:104-6) and Rawson (1985:38-40).

[5] In marked contrast with this approach Evans, in connection with
Ben Jonson, has focused on what he calls the psychological
effects of patronage on a poet's work (1989:23-30).

[6] eg Hellegouarc'h, J 1963, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et
des partis politiques sous la republique*, Paris

[7] The problem of poetic sources for social history is not confined
to Martial. Archibald W Allen (*CPh* 45.1950.145-60) provided an
important exposition of persona theory as applied to Roman
poetry. Most recently Braund (1989:1-3) has examined this in
connection with satire. The matter is discussed in detail in the

○

conclusion.

[8] Taylor (1968:486) has discussed *otium* in these terms.

[9] It might be noted, though, that Horsfall (1981, at 1), followed by Griffin (1983) and DuQuesnay (1984), has revived the view that 'Maecenas did influence and indeed direct the Augustan poets'.

[10] Saller (1983:253) has stressed that these were important financially and more frequent than White suggests

[11] eg *Silu* 2.2, occasioned by Statius' stay at Pollio's villa at Surrentum; see Nisbet (1978).

[12] See Jones (1974:187-227). The phenomenon of inflation or devaluation seems to apply only to the late second century and beyond. This does not tell the whole story, however, as it should also be borne in mind that occasionally shortages of essential goods such as corn caused prices to rise sharply (Jones 1974:192).

[13] In one way or another, many of these value-judgments have filtered down to the modern age, through a long history of literary prejudice; merely the use of the term 'Silver Latin', as opposed to 'Classical' or 'Golden Latin', is testimony to this long-standing view (Williams 1978:6; White 1982:61).

[14] For example William Herbert, the Third Earl of Pembroke, was described as 'the greatest Maecenas to learned men of any peer of his time and since. He was very generous and open handed' (quoted in Brennan 1988:150, cf 83). See also Curtius (1953:416 n9) and Gold (1982:xi).

Chapter 4

THE LIFE AND CAREER OF MARTIAL

Apart from one letter of Pliny (*Epist* 3.21, addressed to Cornelius
Priscus), our sources for the life and career of Martial are
restricted to the *Epigrams* themselves. This presents grave
difficulties, given that Martial adopts so many (often contradictory)
poses or *personae* in the corpus of his poems. Generally speaking, it
is thus necessary to be wary of taking at face value anything the poet
says about himself[1]. The bibliography of Martial which heads
Friedlaender's edition (1886:1-26) represents a synthesis of earlier
work on this topic, and has been the starting point for subsequent
studies of the poet's life.

That Martial was born around AD 40 can be inferred from the fact
that his tenth numbered book (probably published in a second edition
in AD 98: 10.103.7, 104.10) coincided with his 57th year. He states
often that he was born on the Kalends of March (9.52; 10.24; 12.60)
and this has generally been followed by scholars (eg Friedlaender
1886:1; Helm 1955:55)[2]. His birthplace was Bilbilis (modern Bombola),
a Spanish *municipium* of Rome in Hispania Tarraconensis. He refers to
himself as 'nos Celtis genitos et ex Hiberis' (4.55.8). Like much of
Spain, Bilbilis must have become Romanized quickly; probably by
Martial's time Roman influences on all facets of life would have been
pervasive (Sikes *apud* Tanner 1984:2630; Bellinger 1928:426).

Traditional wisdom has it that, on the strength of poem 5.34,
Martial's parents were called Fronto and Flacilla (eg Friedlaender
1886:4; Duff 1964:397). But in all probability these names refer not
to the poet's parents but to those of the little slave-girl Erotion
whose death Martial laments at 5.34, 37 and 10.61[3]. Of his parents'
background we know nothing; however, the fact that he identifies

himself as being a 'real Spaniard' in appearance (1.49) suggests that he was descended from old Spanish stock (Syme 1958:618; Howell 1980:1). Martial does say that he received an education from them, or at least under their care (9.73.7-8). It is likely that Martial had his basic grammatical and rhetorical training in Bilbilis or perhaps Tarraco (Howell 1980:50; Szelest 1984:2564).

Of the first 40 years of Martial's life, little is known other than that he came to Rome around AD 64[4]. This was the 'obvious course for any talented and ambitious provincial' (Howell 1980:1), and in this respect the careers of the Senecas, Lucan, Columella and Quintilian may be compared.

It is not clear what effect the Pisonian Conspiracy of AD 65 had on Martial's career, but it is likely that its bloody aftermath deprived Martial of a number of patrons. In particular it would have eliminated the possible patronage of the elder Seneca (Boissier 1906:242). As an occasional poet writing for patrons, Martial must certainly have experienced some degree of political difficulty as a result of the conspiracy. In the absence of any detailed evidence, however, this must remain speculation.

We hear at 9.97.5 that Martial received the *ius trium liberorum* from two emperors, a personal *beneficium* which lapsed with the death of the emperor conferring it (Daube 1976:144). Helm (1955:56, following Mommsen 1887:888) believes that Vespasian and Titus were the benefactors. However Friedlaender has shown that the two emperors were most likely Titus and Domitian. It has been suggested that he originally obtained the *ius* from Titus in 80 or 81 as a reward for the *Liber Spectaculorum*, and that Domitian renewed the *beneficium* around 82 following the death of Titus (Daube 1976:146). This is discussed with further references by Szelest (1984:2565 n70). Allen *et al* (1970:347) have put forward the idea that Martial first received

tribunicia potestas and the *ius trium liberorum* from Nero in the early 60's; they agree that Martial first followed a public career until falling from favour with the Pisonian Conspiracy, and that his receiving the *ius trium liberorum* for the second time in 79/80 under Domitian marks a return to favour. This theory is seriously lacking in evidence; in any event, if he did come to Rome *ὡ* to pursue a political career under the Senecas and Piso from the early 60's, he is not likely to have survived the large-scale political killings after the failed plot.

As Friedlaender has pointed out (1886:6), Martial may have been made an *eques* as a result of his tribunician power (cf Helm 1955:56; Sikes *apud* Tanner 1984:2631) acquired under Titus. However, the connection between these two honours is uncertain and the subject of dispute, as equestrian status sometimes led to the legionary tribunate (Allen *et al* 1970:346).

Scholars cannot agree on whether Martial was married or not, a question occasioned by the fact that he twice received the *ius trium liberorum*. Ascher (1977:441-44) set out to prove that despite being given the *ius* Martial may in fact have been married, but her use of the evidence was impugned by Schnur (1978:98-99). Szelest (1984:2566; cf Kay 1985:276-77 on 11.104) is correct in stating that we do not have sufficient evidence to decide the issue, and the confidence of Howell (1980:4), Sikes (*apud* Tanner 1984:2632) and others is misplaced.

Around the age of 20 Martial went to Rome, where he stayed for 34 years with only a brief interruption. Apparently avoiding a more lucrative and conventional career in law (see eg 2.90), Martial preferred to write poetry on a more or less professional basis (Szelest 1984:2564-65). In this regard he would have been compelled to survive through the patronage established by contacts within the

amicitia system. No doubt poetry did not offer a career in the same sense as law in that it did not entail direct, regular and stipulated rewards, and it was practised according to a more loosely-defined social code. It is precisely this lack of direct payment which led to the plethora of poems in which Martial complains of stingy *amici* (surveyed by Mohler 1931).

On the strength of 1.98, Tanner (1984:2633) has surmised that Martial trained as a lawyer with the younger Pliny under Quintilian from AD 69-71, and thereafter practised for a short while with little success. But the poem itself is scant proof that Martial entered the profession.

A particular problem in the biography of Martial is the poet's financial position. The epigrams give the impression that the poet was chronically short of money; this claim is usually made a propos of his career as a poet. This has long been taken at face value by scholars, who imagined that Martial did indeed face financial insecurity (eg Friedlaender 1886:10-11). More recently, though, some scholars have seen a contradication here in that Martial did have equestrian status - implying that he must at least have been able to meet the property qualification of 400 000 sesterces. Hardie (1983:51) is largely representative of modern scholars in speaking of Martial's 'mendicant façade, or *persona*'. It has been demonstrated by Saller (1983:246-49) that the poet's poverty is a literary theme with a long history behind it[5]. In this light Martial's protestations of poverty are seen as a standard literary gesture rather than as a reflection of his actual circumstances (also Saller 1983:249). In fact Martial's references to his 'poverty' are demonstrably contradicted by mention of property owned by him, for example his estate at Nomentum (7.93.5: Sikes *apud* Tanner 1984:2631; Szelest 1984:2565)[6]. In addition he is known to have owned a villa at the

fashionable resort town of Tibur as well as a small town- house at Rome.

This evidence supports the thesis that Martial had sufficient resources to support himself (White 1978:88-89); his much-mentioned *paupertas* should be taken to mean 'sufficiency without surplus' (Hardie 1983:51). Saller (1983:250-54), resurrecting the older view, has attempted to prove that Martial was in fact NOT economically secure. A difficulty in deciding the issue concerns the fact that we cannot be sure of the state of the Roman economy at this stage. Saller (1983:250) speaks of 'the rising living costs and living standards of Rome of the emperors' - given that the equestrian census was established in Republican times - without giving evidence of the former (discussed at pages 69 and 74 n12).

Martial's first extant work, the *Liber Spectaculorum*, has been dated to AD 80, as it celebrates Titus' dedication of the Flavian Colosseum or Amphitheatre in that year. This was followed by the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta*, now known as Books 13 and 14 respectively, which are usually dated to 83 or soon thereafter (Friedlaender 1886:51-52)[7].

After the publication of Book 1, probably in 86, Martial published collections regularly at intervals of one or two years up till Book 11 in 96 (Kay 1985:1). In 98 a second edition of Book 10 was circulated. Book 12 was sent by Martial from Bilbilis to Rome in 101 or 102, and an enlarged posthumous version may have appeared later (Howell 1980:3-4). In 98 or early 99 Martial returned to Spain. Pliny's letter (3.21), in which he mentions the *uiaticum* he gave Martial, helps establish the dating of this event (Sherwin-White 1966:263).

But this was not Martial's first departure from Rome. Already in about 87 he had left the City to stay at Forum Cornelii (modern

Imola), and Book 3 was sent by the author from there to Rome for circulation (see Howell 1980:3). He says that the reason for his departure was his residual dissatisfaction with having to observe the duties of a client:

cur absim, quaeret: breuiter tu multa fatere:

'Non poterat uanae taedia ferre togae.' (3.4.5-6)

It is possible that Martial's spell in Gaul coincided with a bad patch in his career, resulting from his friendship with the dancer Paris and the scandal surrounding the latter's affair with Domitia (Hardie 1983:52). Various reasons have been offered for Martial's retirement to Spain. The poet gives continual signs of his dissatisfaction with the life of a client at Rome (eg 10.74) but, as has already been suggested, this should perhaps not be taken too seriously (pace Schmidt 1979:1053 and Szelest 1984:2567). Certainly, the fact that he left Rome calls for some comment. As Friedlaender (1886:11) and Sikes (apud Tanner 1984:11) have pointed out, a possible factor was Martial's illness (mentioned at 6.47, 70, 86) and its aftermath.

On his return to Spain Martial benefited from the generosity of Terentius Priscus (12.3[4]), the addressee of the preface to Book 12, and the wealthy widow Marcella, who provided him with a comfortable estate and home:

munera sunt dominae: post septima lustra reuerso

has Marcella domos paruaque regna dedit. (12.31.7-8)

The date of Martial's death (between AD 101 and 104) is established by Pliny Epist 3.21, in which it is mentioned Sherwin-White (1966:263), followed by Hardie (1983:53) and Szelest

(1984:2568), thinks his death occurred closer to the end than the
start of this period, whereas Helm (1955:58), Syme (1958:89 n2) and
Kay (1985:1) have opted for an earlier date.

THE LIFE AND CAREER OF STATIUS

Sources for the life of Statius are particularly scant, with only
Juvenal (*Sat* 7.82-87) providing any information outside the Statian
corpus[8]. The closest Statius comes to autobiographical utterance is
at *Siluae* 3.5 and 5.3, where a number of important details come to
light. These are poems addressed respectively to his wife Claudia
(persuading her to return with him to Naples from Rome) and to his
late father, in the form of an epicedion. This creates a context in
which autobiographical material occurs almost *en passant*; in the poems
Statius mentions significant events of his life only where relevant to
his relationships with his wife and father. In contrast to Martial's
'mendicant façade', Statius' statements about his own life have
traditionally enjoyed a high degree of credibility.

The date of Statius' birth is subject to mere estimation, based
on the year of his father's birth, AD 25 (see Hardie 1983:58, 13).
Other scholars have placed the elder Papinius' birth as early as AD 16
(eg Helm 1949:984), or AD 14 (eg Van Dam 1984a:1). Poems published
around 94 or 95 see Statius describing himself as a *senex* (3.5.13;
4.4.69-70; 5.2.158-59). As a result scholars have generally given 40
and 50 as the termini (Frère 1961:xvii; Gossage 1972:186), with 45 the
least contentious compromise (eg Wood *OCD* 1970:1011). Vollmer
(1898:16) placed the date as early as AD 40 (cf also Duff 1964:373),
whereas more recently Van Dam (1984a:1 and 13 n2) and Hardie (1983:58)

have opted for the latter part of the period.

Statius' origins and background, and in particular the career of his father, are central to understanding the nature of the *Siluae*. The elder Papinius, a native of southern Italy, was himself a professional poet who achieved success in such competitions as the Neapolitan and Achaean Games (5.3.134-45). He taught at Naples, the birthplace of his son (3.5.12-13), and later at Rome (5.3.176-77; cf Hilberg 1902:514-17). The elder Statius' teaching duties at Rome may have included at some stage the instruction of Domitian in religious lore (bibliography at Coleman 1988:xv n3). The move to Rome profoundly affected Statius' career, as the City rather than the Neapolitan or Greek professional circuits provided the focus of his activity (Hardie 1983:58). Statius received instruction from his father perhaps as a *grammaticus* but certainly as a teacher of poetry: 'decus hoc quodcumque lyrae primusque dedisti' (5.3.213). On the strength of 5.3.116-18 Coleman (1988:xv) has speculated that the family may have lost equestrian status through failure to meet the census requirement[9]:

> non tibi deformes obscuri sanguinis ortus
>
> nec sine luce genus (quamquam fortuna parentum
>
> artior expensis)

Statius' first major public performance seems to have been for a senatorial audience, with his father present (Coleman 1988:xvi):

> qualis eras, Latios quotiens ego carmine patres
>
> mulcerem felixque tui spectator adesses
>
> muneris!   (5.3.215-17)

The tone of the passage suggests that this performance was a success (see Hilberg 1902:517; Frère 1961:x-xi, 201 n4; Van Dam 1984a:1 and Vollmer 1898:17 n2).

Again in the presence of his father, Statius triumphed in the *Augustalia* in Naples, in which respect he emulated the older man:

> ei mihi quod tantum patrias ego uertice frondes
>
> solaque Chalcidicae Cerealia dona coronae
>
> te sub teste tuli!   (5.3.225-27)

This win provided the basis for a successful subsequent career, as this was not merely a local competition but the 'principal platform for Greek epideictic and musical talent in front of an Italian audience' (Hardie 1983:58). Van Dam (1984a:1) has dated this event to 78 or earlier.

It was around this time that Statius married the widow Claudia and began work on the *Thebaid* (3.5.35-36), his mythological epic and *magnum opus* which was not completed till 91 or 92 (Hardie 1983:61). Claudia was probably the Roman widow of a singer or musician, and had a daughter by this previous marriage (3.5.50-67). The *Agaue* libretto, composed by Statius for the pantomime artist Paris (recounted by Juvenal in *Sat* 7.82-87), must be dated to the early 80's[10]. Similarly the epic poem *De Bello Germanico*, known only in a 4 line fragment quoted by the fifteenth-century commentator Giorgio Valla on Juvenal 4.94 (see Highet 1954:258-59 and Griffith 1969; Jones 1982 has examined the sexual imagery of the extract). This fragment refers to the campaign against the Chatti in 82-83, and Juvenal *Sat* 4 is known to have been published between 82 and 86 (Hardie 1983:61-62).

Nothing is known of Statius' fortunes between 83 and 89/90, the two autobiographical poems being silent on those years. We know from

Silu 3.5.37-42 that Statius suffered serious illness at a later stage, and on this basis Hardie (1983:63) has conjectured that poor health may have been a factor at this earlier time as well. In addition, the disgrace of Paris (with whom Statius may have been closely linked) may have forced the poet to maintain a low profile during this time.

The first significant token of official approval, ending the spell, came in AD 90 or soon afterwards with a victory in the Alban Games, the *Quinquatrua Mineruae*. This is recounted at both *Silu* 5.3.227-30 and 3.5.28-30: 'me nitidis ferentem/ dona comis sanctoque indutum Caesaris auro/ uisceribus'. The date of this has been controversial (discussed at Van Dam 1984a:14 n15), but recent scholars (eg Hardie 1983:64; Van Dam 1984a:1; Coleman 1988:xvi) are largely in consent on the subject.

AD 90, which saw his failure to take the honours in the Capitoline Games as well as his father's death, was an important year in Statius' life. His disappointment at the Capitoline *repulsa* is patent from the two poems in which he mentions it in direct contrast with the Alban victory:

> nam quod me mixta quercus non pressit oliua,
>
> et fugit speratus honos: quam dulce parentis
>
> inuia Tarpei caperes! (5.3.231-33; cf 3.5.31-33)

Van Dam (1984b:2736), who has found it necessary to posit a dual edition of *Siluae* 5.3, and Helm (1949:984) have put the date at 79 and 81 respectively, but this is probably too early.

The early part of 90 witnessed important signs of imperial favour. Apart from his Alban triumph in March of that year, which presumably he would not have received if still subject to the emperor's disapproval, he also acquired from the emperor a water

supply for his Alban estate ('magnique ducis mihi munere' 3.1.61- 64: Hardie 1983:63). Statius' most productive period as an occasional poet coincided with this time; the poems of *Siluae* 1-3 which can be dated fall mostly into the period 90/91. This sudden activity may be taken as a sign of imperial favour. His changed circumstances may be explained by Domitian's need to reconcile all available literary talent to engender a suitable political climate, following Antonius Saturninus' revolt in 89 (Hardie 1983:64).

This successful period seems to have been cut short by illness, which struck him shortly after the completion of the *Thebaid* ('nuper Stygias prope raptus ad umbras' *Silu* 3.5.37-42). The bout of ill-health, together with the Capitoline *repulsa* and his father's death, may well have had a serious and long-term effect on Statius' morale (see Helm 1949:985).

The publication of *Siluae* 1-3 has traditionally and plausibly been dated to 93/94, that is some two years after the completion and publication of the *Thebaid*. These three books are generally thought to have been published together (Coleman 1988:xvi) or at least in close succession (Vollmer 1898:10; Vessey 1973:15). It is very likely that these books of *Siluae*, as indeed the fourth and fifth, were a selection of a large number of occasional poems written by Statius over a long period of his career (Vessey 1982:561).

White (1974) has questioned the significance of the publication of the *Siluae* in the modern sense of the term; in response Hardie (1983:65) has held that the real purpose of publication was to advertise the life of the poet himself. The joint issue of *Siluae* 1-3 was intended as the 'parting shot of an ailing and, perhaps, disappointed Statius as he departed to Naples', a move Hardie considers to signal his withdrawal from Roman society.

After Statius' return to Naples (*pace* Van Dam 1984a:1 and 14 n18) he again received imperial favour in the form of an invitation to the emperor's dinner-table (*Silu* 4.2.5-8). The whole of this poem is a thanksgiving to Domitian for the banquet, which can be dated to 94 or early 95. This event seems to have sparked a renewed interest in and demand for Statius' occasional verse, and the poems constituting Book 4 were probably written between late 94 and mid-95 (Vollmer 1898:13, followed by Marastoni 1969:227).

Nothing is heard of Statius after 96, and so he can be assumed to have died in that year or soon after. A second mythological epic poem, the *Achilleid*, was left unfinished. Several occasional poems, which had not been published in book form, were collected posthumously by an anonymous editor as the fifth book of the *Siluae*. The view of Legras (1907:338) - that Statius returned to Rome from Naples towards the end of his life - has found little credence among scholars and should be rejected (see Helm 1949:985).

From the above account it is evident that the production of the *Siluae* (which can be dated to 90/91 and 94/95) coincided with periods of imperial favour in Statius' life. The emperor's support was clearly variable and unpredictable, and for one thing the Paris affair could not have helped Statius' plight. In these terms it is obvious that the *Siluae* fulfilled a important social function, both as pre-publication *libelli* and as published collections, a function which is to be appreciated against the background of first-century patronage.

NOTES

[1] Carrington (1960:1-22), like the earlier tradition of Martial
     scholars, is guilty of underestimating the force of the personae
     in the Epigrams, and of consequently taking at face value what
     Martial says about himself (cf for example Simcox 1883:99-100).

[2] Lucas (1938) has tried to demonstrate that the choice of this day
     as a birthday was fashionable among the Romans, and that
     consequently Martial should not be believed on that score.

[3] For example Lloyd (1953:41) speaks without qualification of 'his
     parents'; Mantke (1967/68) has shown that these are unlikely to
     have been Martial's own parents.

[4] Again the dating is tied up with Book 10 (103.7 and 104.10).

[5] eg Callimachus *Iambus* 3, *Epigram* 32 Pfeiffer; Tibullus 1.1: cf
     Cairns (1979:20-21) and Murgatroyd (1980:48-49) on this
     commonplace.

[6] The value of this was probably upward of 150 000 HS, and it may
     have been owed to the generosity of Seneca (Hardie 1983:50-51).

[7] *pace* Pitcher (1985) who, by attaching undue significance to
     Martial's supposed references to the emperor's divinity, has
     suggested that Books 13 and 14 were published later than AD 84/85
     (Friedlaender's dating).

[8] For a modern bibliography on the subject see Cancik
     (1984:2725-26).

[9] *pace* Dilke (1953:29-30) and Marastoni (1969:220), who have argued
     that neither Statius' father nor grandfather was ever of
     equestrian status.

[10] Domitian banned public performances in 83, following the scandal
     surrounding Paris, and his subsequent murder.

SECTION B

Chapter 5

SELF-JUSTIFICATION IN THE PROSE PREFACES

The concept of a writer's expressed programme is central to the chapter on the history of prefacing; frequently a writer finds it necessary in the exordium to offer some justification of his subject-matter, style or views. The beginning is usually the most prominent and most natural place for such comments. Here they do not intrude on the body of the work itself; here the poet can offer his credo and also defend himself against criticism levelled against him. It is difficult to distinguish between manifesto and defence, and frequently the 'criticism' which occasions the author's response seems more imaginary than real. In the event a beginning, whatever its form, generally affords an author the opportunity of airing his views on contentious literary matters.

Though by no means unique to it, justification can be considered to hold an important place in the poetry of the Romans generally. 'Latin poetry, a child of the Hellenistic age, had almost *ab origine* been "self-conscious"..., that is to say given to reflecting upon itself, aware of its own limitations, of the means at its disposal, and of the ends it was aiming at. Theoretical considerations had a considerable share in producing it' (Fraenkel 1957:124). At the same time, in all literatures satire and related genres have a particularly self-conscious quality (see eg Highet 1962:14-16; Pollard 1970:1-4). Satirists often reflect on their own art, and hence a substantial part of satire and epigram is devoted to issues of literary criticism and apologia. In the case of Martial this is certainly true, as has been shown by Citroni (1968), Garson (1979) and Holzberg (1988:85-93).

Two writers are important when it comes to prefatory apologia: Callimachus (prologue to the *Aetia*) and Terence with his comic

prologues. As general influences, both should be borne in mind in considering the polemical quality of Martial's prefaces. Both contain an important justificatory element. It is already clear from chapter 1 that the *Aetia* prologue set an important precedent for polemical introductions in Latin poetry.

In this chapter I shall consider those elements of the prose prefaces of Martial and Statius which have some justificatory force.

A. MARTIAL 1 *PRAEFATIO* AND THE TRADITIONS OF APOLOGIA

1 *praef* sees Martial principally justifying his own position as a writer of epigram. Given the 'satirical' nature of the genre, it is not surprising that this piece has a great deal in common with the apologia or apology[1] offered in the satire of Lucilius, Horace, Juvenal and Persius, and also Catullus. In satire it is necessary for the writer to outline his credo (in aesthetic and other terms), and to define his position in relation to such contentious issues as libel. This may be described as the establishing of an author's persona (cf Anderson 1982:3-10, followed by Braund 1989:1-3; also Allen 1950). A satirical writer must state, for example, whether he is attacking real people, the dead, or character stereotypes.

By the same token this first prose preface of Martial is concerned with the establishing of a persona, and merits detailed consideration in that respect. Apologiae of this type have been described as the 'disclaimer of malicious intent' or the 'theory of the liberal jest' (Bramble 1974:190), and Martial 1 *praef* must be viewed in this light. In this section I shall begin with some preliminary considerations concerning the satirical apologia (eg legal constraint). Then, after examining Martial's apologia as manifested

in 1 *praef*, I shall survey other satirical apologiae, most notably Horace *Satires* 1.4, 10 and 2.1; Juvenal 1 and Persius 1, by way of comparison.

Libel, defamation and the law

The law of libel is relevant here insofar as the satirical apologia involves invective and personal attack. If this aspect of Roman law is difficult to grasp in itself, then its connection with literary invective is harder to pin-point. Broadly speaking, defamation falls under the law of *iniuria*, which goes back to the Twelve Tables. However it is likely that on this issue the Twelve Tables concerned only magical spells and incantations (cf Cicero *Rep* 4.11; *Tusc* 4.4; Smith 1951:169).

Sulla established a standing jury court *de iniuriis* under the *lex Cornelia*, at least partly as a means of crushing political opposition. Again it is uncertain what part defamation played in this; in all probability the court was concerned with physical violence rather than libel (Crook 1967:253; *pace* Smith 1951:173-77). It appears that it was not until Augustus' time that a *senatusconsultum* was issued adding libel and slander to the *lex Cornelia* (Suet *Aug* 55). Another apparently new development under Augustus is that libel came to be considered under the category of *maiestas*, whereas beforehand relative freedom of expression had prevailed. This set the tone for the subsequent history of the empire, and 'henceforward...there was always a danger that outspoken criticism of the regime or its personnel might count as treason' (Crook 1967:253).

This development in Rome's legal history is reflected in the tone of writers. Whereas Lucilius and Catullus enjoyed considerable latitude in criticising people in their writings, writers of a later

generation had no such privilege (see Rudd 1986:40-81). The satirists from Horace onwards did not criticise their contemporaries (cf Hor *Sat* 2.1 and Juv 1.169-71); the tone of these writers makes it clear that they did not consider free speech a right (Kenney 1962:36; Crook 1967:253). It seems poets, like orators, had no special privileges when it came to criticising people.

At the same time it should be borne in mind that, despite the severity of Roman legislation on defamation, we know of only two prosecutions on these lines - both of them referred to at *Rhet Her* 2.13.19 (involving Lucilius and Accius as the defendants). Both cases concern defamation made by actors on the stage; we know of no case involving anything said libellously in the senate, in the courts or *coram populo* (Crook 1967:254 and 1976:136).

The relative degree of personal liberty under particular emperors was a major consideration. Domitian's inhibiting, even oppressive, attitude towards literature has been documented by Coleman (1986:3111-15). Suet *Dom* 8.3 shows that legal constraints forbade writers to lampoon prominent Romans. The fact that a large number of poets, many of them writers of epigram, emerged under the less harsh rule of Nerva and Trajan is indicative of the restrictions experienced by those writing under Domitian's reign. In these circumstances it would have been at least unwise for Martial or a contemporary to attack real people under this regime (Coffey 1976:98-99; Howell 1980:96).

The literary tradition of apologia

It appears then that the law of libel was a factor in determining the extent to which writers could criticise their contemporaries - but exactly how significant a factor it is not easy

to establish. Apart from legal considerations, there are also issues of the literary tradition which must be taken into account in understanding disclaimers from writers of iambic, satire and epigram. This tradition seems in itself to be a major motivating force in apologetic utterances. Bramble (1974:190-204, appendix 4) has illustrated the persistence of a tradition of apologia, which seems to originate with Plato (*Laws* 935A-936A). It continues with Aristotle, who speaks variously of malicious and gentlemanly humour (eg *Eth Nic* 1108a; 1114a 24; 1128a) and Theophrastus (*Char* 28 κακολογία).

Cicero follows Plato and Aristotle in observing such a distinction: eg *Or* 88-89, *Off* 1.104, 134; *de Or* 2.244. One of these passages is particularly revealing:

> duplex omnino est iocandi genus, unum illiberale, petulans, flagitiosum, obscenum, alterum elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum. Quo genere non modo Plautus noster et Atticorum antiqua comoedia, sed etiam philosophorum Socraticorum libri referti sunt, multaque multorum facete dicta, ut ea, quae a sene Catone collecta sunt quae uocant ἀποφθέγματα. Facilis igitur est distinctio *ingenui* et *illiberalis* ioci. Alter est, si tempore fit, ut si remisso animo, grauissimo homine dignus, alter ne libero quidem, si rerum turpitudini adhibetur uerborum obscenitas. (*Off* 1.104)

This passage reveals that the Romans comprehended a clear distinction between what in English would be termed good-humoured criticism and invective[2]. Roman invective comprises a limited number of stock themes, as has been shown by Nisbet (1961:192-97).

It is therefore more important to examine the literary tradition which bears on criticism and invective. To quote Bramble (1974:194),

who admittedly uses slightly anachronistic language here: 'Following Callimachus, Roman satirists, iambists and epigrammatists profess innocence, inhibited more by the ethical and rhetorical dictation of charity and humanity in matters appertaining to the comic, than by legalistic considerations.'

Martial 1 *praef*

As Book 1 was Martial's first widely circulated collection of satirical epigrams, it is not surprising that he begins it with an apologia for the writing of satirical verse. Though no doubt Martial had written and circulated satirical epigrams in a different form before this, the previously published collections (now known as Books 13, 14 and the *Lib Spect*) are not of a satirical nature.

In this preface Martial says he hopes he has not upset the sensibilities of anyone with any degree of self-respect; he claims that his poems play their game (*ludant*) without treading on the toes of even the lowly:

> spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salua infimarum quoque personarum reuerentia ludant. (1-3)

On several other occasions Martial speaks of his verse in these terms: 4.23.6-7 'Cecropio satur lepore/ Romanae sale luserit Mineruae'; 7.8.1 'Nunc hilares, si quando mihi, nunc ludite, Musae'; 8.3.1-2 'Quinque satis fuerant: nam sex septemue libelli/ est nimium: quid adhuc ludere, Musa, iuuat?'; 11.6.3-4 'uersu ludere non laborioso/ permittis, puto, pilleata Roma'; cf 12.94.8 and 3.99.3-4.

Wagenvoort (1956:30-42) has shown that the word *ludere* and its derivatives are frequently used in connection with verse. It can contrast a witty, ingenious poem with a more serious creation (eg Hor *Sat* 1.1.27; Plin *Ep* 7.9.9 '...Lusus uocantur; sed hi lusus non minorem interdum gloriam quam *seria* ludo'), or small-scale verse with more serious (eg Ov *Fast* 4.9; *Culex* 1; Plin *Ep* 8.21.1-4; discussed in connection with Statius 1 *praef* later in this chapter). The word is used particularly of the lighter genres, eg·Cat 50.20, 25; Prop 2.3.20 (see *TLL* 7.2C.1775.10-1776.3). *ludus*, a parallel for the Greek παίγνιον, is used by Lucilius of his own satires, eg fr 1039.

Martial's practice is contrasted with that of other ancient writers, who he says attacked not only specific, real people but important ones at that (3-5). Martial says he is not interested in winning fame or displaying 'cleverness': 'Mihi fama uilius constet et probetur in me nouissimum ingenium' (5-6). It should be noted that *ingenium* is used here in an unusual negative sense (*TLL* 7.1.1534.1-35). The word is explained by the sentence which follows, particularly as it is then used in its adjectival form *ingeniosus*:

Absit a iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpres nec epigrammata mea scribat: inprobe facit qui in alieno libro ingeniosus est. (6-8)

This suggests that *ingenium* indicates not wit for its own sake, but rather the malicious phenomenon of false attribution. In terms of this a writer's work might be supplemented or adapted in such a way as to lampoon people whom the original writer had no intention of attacking. The circumstances in which literature was disseminated, as described in chapter 2, made this a common problem.

It has been suggested that 'this apparent rejection of "cleverness" is hard to reconcile with the final twists of hundreds of Martial's epigrams' (Garson 1979:11). But Martial's statement has more to do with the malicious rewriting of his works by others; this 'cleverness' refers more to the activities of these literary adversaries of his than to his own epigrammatic style.

In several poems Martial criticises those who try to pass off his verse as their own, eg 1.29, 38, 52, 53, 66, 72; 2.20; 10.100. The most sinister aspect of this type of plagiarism is the false attribution that this sometimes involves. At 10.3 Martial complains of a 'shady poet' (*clancularius*) who has circulated scurrilous material under Martial's name; from this Martial dissociates himself (cf 10.5):

> Vernaculorum dicta, sordidum dentem,
>
> et foeda linguae probra circulatricis,...
>
> poeta quidam clancularius spargit
>
> et uolt uideri nostra. credis hoc, Prisce?...
>
> procul a libellis nigra sit meis fama,
>
> quos rumor alba gemmeus uehit pinna
>
> (10.3.1-2, 5-6, 9-10)

This suggests comparison with the *uetus poeta* mentioned in the prologues of Terence (see pages 14-15).

The appeal to a friend to lend support in this regard is seen more obviously at 7.72:

> si quisquam mea dixerit malignus
>
> atro carmina quae madent ueneno,
>
> ut uocem mihi commodes patronam
>
> et quantum poteris, sed usque, clames:
>
> 'Non scripsit meus ista Martialis.' (12-16)

This underlines the need for the support of friends and patrons on the part of poets as outlined in chapter 3 (pages 68-70), whether for practical support (eg the providing of venues for *recitationes*) or moral, such as that suggested above in the context of possible libel accruing from false attribution. Martial's focusing on these possibilities of false attribution in the preface and certain poems is in itself a protection against accusations of libel he might have to face.

One aspect of Martial's apologia is his appeal to the precedent of earlier epigrammatists[3]. Speaking of the genre's *lasciua ueritas*, he says, 'sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus, sic quicumque perlegitur' (10-12). A similar catalogue is offered at 5.5.5-6: 'sit locus et nostris aliqua tibi parte libellis,/ qua Pedo, qua Marsus quaque Catullus erit.' Of these Catullus is undoubtedly the major influence on Martial, as shown by frequent allusions (2.71; 4.14.13; 7.99.7; 10.103.5; 11.6.16) and imitations (eg 11.3.6; 11.6.3). Domitius Marsus (*PIR*[2] D 153; Skutsch *RE* 1903:1430) also wrote epic (4.29.8). As an epigrammatist he is referred to at 2.71.3 and 7.99.7 (with Catullus); 7.29.8 and 8.55(56).24 ('Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero'). A member of Maecenas' circle, he wrote an epigram on the deaths of Virgil and Tibullus (Morel *FPL* 110-11).

Albinovanus Pedo (*PIR*[2] A 479; Rohden *RE* 1893:1314) is mentioned by Martial at 10.20(19).10; and also at 2.77.5 with Marsus as a writer

of poems longer than his own: 'Marsi doctique Pedonis/ saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus'. The only remaining fragment (23 hexameters) is however from an epic on Germanicus' German campaign (Morel *FPL* 115-16).

Cn Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (*PIR*[2] C 1390; Radinger *RE* 1910:465) was consul in AD 26. Nowhere else does Martial make mention of him, but we do hear of his erotic verse from Pliny (*Ep* 5.3) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm* 9.259 and *Ep* 2.10.6). It is unlikely that he is the same Gaetulicus (*PIR*[2] G 15; Skutsch *RE* 1900:1384-86) to whom nine epigrams in the Greek Anthology are ascribed (see further Citroni 1975:10 and Howell 1980:99-100).

With regard to citing literary precedents one may compare the younger Pliny (*Ep* 5.3.2), who in a letter to Titius Aristo finds it necessary to apologise for his versifying by listing an awesome array of earlier poets. The catalogue includes Cicero, Calvus, Asinius Pollio, Brutus, Sulla, Catulus, Scaevola, Varro, the Torquati, the younger Seneca, Verginius Rufus, Julius Caesar, Augustus, Nerva, Virgil, Nepos, Accius and Ennius.

Martial's list of predecessors in 1 *praef* does suggest a perceived generic division between satire and epigram. Whereas in their apologiae Horace, Juvenal and Persius look back to Lucilius as their great predecessor (Courtney 1980:83), Martial presents himself as falling in a canon which includes Catullus, Marsus, Pedo and Gaetulicus - all of them writers of epigram rather than satire. However, it is true that, despite the omission at 1 *praef*, Martial inevitably does reveal some debt to satirists, for example Lucilius (see Holzberg 1988:42-47).

One may compare the general freedom of speech which Martial at various times cites as a characteristic of epigram. Apart from 'lasciuam uerborum ueritatem' (1pr9), Martial says in the preface to Book 2 that epigrams are so frank that they don't need a 'messenger': 'epigrammata curione non egent et contenta sunt sua, id est mala, lingua' (2pr6-7)[4]. Here *mala* suggests that a certain degree of maliciousness is thought appropriate to the genre. In the preface to Book 8, in the context of showing how he has toned down the natural inclinations of epigram, Martial says:

> quamuis autem epigrammata a seuerissimis quoque et summae fortunae uiris ita scripta sint ut mimicam uerborum licentiam adfectasse uideantur, ego tamen illis non permisi tam lasciue loqui quam solent. (11-14)

The point here is that the imperial context of the book makes it inappropriate if not impossible for Martial to give free rein to the *lasciuia* which is usually so important to epigram. For a writer of satirical epigram dedicating a book to the emperor this implies something of a tightrope walk, and the preface is a useful place for Martial to comment on the aesthetic problems involved. The widely popular adultery mime appears to have been an important influence on Martial's work (see eg Best 1968/69:209; Kay 1985:76-77)[5].

To return to the preface to Book 1. In leading up to the point where he implies that his epigrams are written in the spirit of the Floralia and makes a joke at Cato's expense, Martial confidently says that anyone who does not have enough of a sense of humour to appreciate his poems should satisfy himself with the prose preface or, even better, the title:

Si quis tamen tam ambitiose tristis est ut apud illum in nulla

pagina latine loqui fas sit, potest epistola uel potius titulo

contentus esse. (12-14)

Martial here uses the expression *latine loqui* to characterise his

poems, which may be compared with 11.20.9-10: 'apsoluis lepidos

nimirum, Auguste, libellos,/ qui scis Romana simplicitate loqui'. In

this poem the word *simplicitas*, which is used in the same vein as at

1*pr*7 above, indicates behaviour uninhibited by the usual social

restraints and, by extension, language which is free of the

constraints of euphemism (Kay 1985:113). The two expressions carry

much the same force as the modern French 'gauloiseries' (Boissier

1906:234).

In addition, Martial's reference to a *titulus* in the above

quotation deserves mention. From the context it appears that this is

a *titulus* of the book as a whole rather than of any individual poems.

From the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* one may compare 13.3.7 ('Addita per

titulos sua nomina rebus habebis') and 14.2.3, where Martial speaks of

the brief headings to individual poems without which the epigrams of

those books would make little sense:

    Quo uis cumque loco potes finire libellum:

      uersibus explicitumst omne duobus opus.

   <u>lemmata</u> si quaeris cur sint adscripta, docebo:

      ut, si malueris, <u>lemmata</u> sola legas.

Viewed together, these quotations suggest that a *titulus* or *lemma* of

Martial is enough to warn off prudes and those uninterested, and to

obviate the need for them to read the entire collection.

The final part of the preface makes use of an anecdote, recounted by Valerius Maximus 2.10.8, in which the elder Cato leaves the Floralia festival so that the mime can go ahead unimpeded by the dampening influence of his conspicuous high morality. The piece ends with a direct address to Cato in the form of an epigram, which itself ends with epigrammatic antithesis (*ueneras...exires*):

Epigrammata illis scribuntur qui solent spectare Florales. Non intret Cato theatrum meum, aut si intrauerit, spectet. Videor mihi meo iure facturus si epistolam uersibus clusero:

> Nosses iocosae dulce cum sacrum Florae
> festosque lusus et licentiam uolgi,
> cur in theatrum, Cato seuere, uenisti?
> an ideo tantum ueneras, ut exires? (1pr14-21)

The Cato story is useful to Martial in more than one respect. By this means Martial can characterise his poems by, firstly, contrasting them with the moral rectitude (*grauitas*) of Cato and, secondly, by comparing them with the spirit of the Floralia. Martial has the mime actor, Latinus, say of himself: 'ille, ego sum,.../ qui spectatorem potui fecisse Catonem/ soluere qui Curios Fabriciosque graues' (9.28.2-4). Martial frequently portrays Cato, always ironically and irreverently, as a symbol of steadfast moral recitude, eg 5.51.5; 10.20(19).21 'tunc me uel rigidi legant Catones'; 11.39.15; 12.6.8; (cf Phaedr 4.7.21 and Petron 132.15). Curius and Fabricius are often presented in similar vein, eg 7.68; 11.16 (cf Juv 2.153-54; Quint *Inst* 7.2.38). The existence of these standard historical *exempla* can be attributed to the Roman practice of using favourite

subjects, sometimes collected in handbooks, in their *suasoriae* in the rhetorical schools (Nordh 1954:225).

Worship of the ancient fertility goddess Flora tended increasingly to ribaldry since the inception in 240 or 238 BC of games in her honour. These were eventually claimed by prostitutes as one of their feasts. Thus Martial (1.35.8-9):

> quis Floralia uestit et stolatum
>
> permittit meretricibus pudorem?

In this instance the word *Floralia* may be taken as metonymy for 'mimae quae in Floralibus nudantur' (Citroni 1975:117). Originally celebrated on 27 April, the *Ludi Florales* were expanded in imperial times to span six days, beginning with theatrical performances and ending with circus games and a sacrifice to Flora (see further Scullard 1981:110-11).

It is thus easy to see how Martial could associate the tone of his satirical epigrams with the *Floralia*. By the same token the publication of Book 11 at the *Saturnalia* (December 96) gives Martial a ready pretext for the obscene elements of his verse, and in a sense the *Saturnalia* come to symbolise this aspect of his work: 'clamant ecce mei "Io Saturnalia" uersus' (11.2.5); cf 11.6, 15 and Cat 14.15 (Kay 1985:71-72; Citroni 1989).

All this shows that in his literary-critical poems Martial speaks of the genre of epigram as being of the derisive variety ('Spottepigramme'), even though not all his poems fall into this category.

This preface reveals a marked gradation of tone. The beginning, in which Martial expresses the hope that he has not offended, is a very cautious one[6]. This is certainly true of the manner in which he contrasts himself with earlier epigrammatists. He acquires an increasingly assertive air, and this creates the impression that he is growing in confidence in the course of the preface. By the end this becomes a strongly polemical direct address to Cato in the form of the final epigram.

Other satirical apologia

Some comments by way of comparing Martial's apologia with those of the satirists can be offered. Professed literary precedents, an important feature of Martial's apologia, are found also in Horace *Sat* 1.4 and 1.10. Horace mentions Lucilius as a forerunner, but he goes to great lengths to distinguish his own writing from that of the earlier satirist. Lucilius, who is himself said to follow in the Old Comedy tradition of Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes, is directly criticised for his too-free, verbose style: Hor *Sat* 1.4.9-13 (see Fraenkel 1957:124-28; Rudd 1966:86-131 and 1986:14-18).

Whereas the other apologiae (and Martial 2 *praef*) have an interlocutor, Martial seems to be arguing more against predicted criticism, or at least criticism which is not quoted. Certainly there is a defensiveness in Martial's tone which puts the preface broadly into the tradition of satirical apologiae.

A word often associated with freedom of expression in the context of epigram, satire and comedy is *libertas*, and this word sometimes features in apologiae: eg Hor *Epist* 2.1.147 'libertas...lusit amabiliter, donec iam saeuus apertam in rabiem coepit uerti iocus'; Hor *AP* 'in uitium libertas excidit comoediae'

(*TLL* 7.2B.1314.28-1315.9; *OLD* sv *libertas* 5b and 7; cf DuQuesnay 1984:29-32; Barr and Lee 1987:3). The word is used by Martial (5.19.6; 6.88.3; 10.48.22; 11.5.7; 11.58.6) but never in this sense.

The most programmatic of Juvenal's satires is his first. The general comment that Juvenal is less autobiographical in his satires than Horace is particularly true of this poem. In it he begins by saying why he proposes to write poetry (1.1-20), and why satire in particular (22-80). *ira* (45) and *indignatio* (79) make it impossible for him not to do so, given the type of people who are prospering in Rome at this time. This leads up to the famous lines in which Juvenal describes the province of his writing in the following terms:

> Quidquid agunt homines, uotum timor ira uoluptas
>
> gaudia discursus nostri farrago libelli est. (1.85-86)

Powell (1987) has written on the problems raised by the expression *farrago* ('the fodder of my book', ie its subject-matter); on Juvenal 1 more generally see Courtney (1980:77-119).

In his survey of Horace *Sat* 2.1, Persius 1 and Juvenal 1, Kenney has identified a 'pattern of apology' (1962:36)[7]. The sequence implied by this may be summarised as follows. First, a lofty pronouncement of the satirist's purpose and mission; then a warning from a friendly interlocutor; third, an appeal by the satirist to the precedent of Lucilius, followed by a renewed warning; finally, there is some sort of 'evasion, retraction, equivocation.' The passages of particular relevance here are Horace 2.1.60-85, Juvenal 1.147-71 and Persius 107-34 (cf also Courtney 1980:82-83).

An advantage of using the interlocutor in these apologiae is that it allows the satirist to 'pose as the fearless unmasker of vice'; but it also allows the poet to 'make the necessary reservations

without seeming to withdraw in cowardly fashion' (Courtney 1980:83).
Martial 1 *praef* differs from the pattern evidenced in the satirists in
that it has no interlocutor. In a sense the defensive tone of the
first section obviates the need for one, but at the same time it
detracts from the force of the piece as a whole. On the other hand
much of the bite of the preface lies in the epigram which ends it, and
this is not paralleled in the work of the satirists.

B. MARTIAL 2 *PRAEFATIO*

In the preface to the second book of epigrams Martial again has
to come to his own defence, but the point of contention is of a more
specific, technical nature on this occasion. The issue concerns the
use of the epistolary prose preface, and in an important sense its
very occurrence at this point is self-contradictory. The first eleven
lines of the piece see the interlocutor (ie Decianus, the addressee)
stating various reasons why an *epistola* is not appropriate in this
context. The first is that the genre of epigram is flexible enough to
make provision for literary-critical issues, and they can speak for
themselves, as it were:

'Quid nobis', inquis 'cum epistola? parum enim tibi praestamus,
si legimus epigrammata? quid hic porro dicturus es quod non
possis uersibus dicere? (2-4)

The genres of tragedy and comedy, so the argument goes, need the
epistolary preface to make the sort of apologia which is not otherwise
possible, and in this regard they contrast with epigram:

'Video quare tragoedia atque comoedia epistolam accipiant, quibus

pro se loqui non licet: epigrammata curione non egent et contenta

sunt sua, id est mala, lingua: in quacumque pagina uisum est,

epistolam faciunt.' (4-8)

After instructing the poet not to indulge in impropriety of literary

style (expressed by the metaphor of a person dancing in a toga), the

interlocutor asks whether the poet would consider pitting a

net-gladiator (*retiarius*) against someone who fights using a wooden

sword (*ferula*):

'Noli ergo, si tibi uidetur, rem facere ridiculam et in toga

saltantis inducere personam. Denique uideris an te delectet

contra retiarium ferula.' (8-10)

The surprise comes at the end (11-15), when the poet indeed

agrees with the objections raised in this fashion: 'Puto me hercules,

Deciane, uerum dicis'. In mockingly self-critical vein the poet bows

to the criticism levelled against him. Referring to the long preface

which he would otherwise have used, the poet says that the reader can

thank Decianus that the poems themselves start without too much ado:

Quid si scias cum qua et quam longa epistola negotium fueris

habiturus? Itaque quod exigis fiat. Debebunt tibi si qui in hunc

librum inciderint, quod ad primam paginam non lassi peruenient.

There is no mistaking the self-critical tone of the preface as a

whole. The obvious paradox is that if the poet really agreed with the

cited reasons for not following this practice, he would have refrained

from heading the second numbered book with such a preface.

Various explanations have been offered for this paradox. One is that the *epistola* was originally simply that, ie a letter to a friend, to which some poems may or may not have been appended (White 1974:58). Another possibility is that the letter (which may have been a genuine exchange at an earlier time) was consciously placed there by Martial as a joke, with a certain amount of self-irony (Janson 1964:110-11; Bowie 1988:13). A look at the text of Martial shows that the authenticity of the letter is undisputed in the manuscripts; it has been part of the Epigrams since our earliest records of the textual transmission. The fact that Book 2 was published in Martial's lifetime would seem to suggest that the first suggestion is invalid. My own view tends towards the second suggestion, in other words, it seems likely that Martial has deliberately included the piece here as a gesture of witty irony. The irony lies first in the fact that Martial quotes at length the criticisms of an interlocutor and then agrees with them, and secondly that such an exchange should be rendered in this form at the start of the book in an obviously incongruous manner.

Two observations may be made in connection with the preface, however unsatisfactory the piece may appear in itself. Firstly, the possibility that this was a 'real' letter at an earlier stage can by no means be discounted. This consideration should certainly be borne in mind when examining the other prefaces of Martial, particularly those in which the epistolographic trappings have remained intact. Secondly, it appears from this piece that the usefulness and validity of epistolary prefaces was a topic of literary debate at the time. For all its internal contradiction, this preface seems to be an essay in this topic. The uncertainty surrounding the tragic *praefationes* of Seneca further clouds the issue when considered at this distance, and given the lack of evidence.

In terms of its formal conception, the preface may be compared broadly with the Platonic dialogue or Horatian satire, both of which are characterised by the the exchange of views. So too, in a less clearly defined way, the satires of Persius, where changes of speaker are often difficult to determine (Coffey 1976:101). Editorial convention has it that the first eleven lines up till *reclamant* may be regarded as the words of the interlocutor, with the poet speaking for the rest, and indeed there seems no reason to question this. The rhetorical figure which can be identified here (as in comedy), by which a speaker replies to the imaginary objections of an interlocutor, is known as *anthupophora* (discussed in chapter 8).

Another issue of rhetorical style which is brought to bear in this preface is that of *breuitas epistolaris*: in terms of this commonplace, brevity was considered naturally appropriate for the epistolary form. As a topos this can be traced back to Plato and Isocrates (see Sykutris *RE* 1931:193); one may compare Demetr *Eloc* 228, and Iul Vict *Rhet* 27 at Halm *RLM* 1863:448; cf also *RLM* 589. The idea occurs often in the letters of Jerome, eg 57.8.1 'neque enim epistulae breuitas patitur diutius in singulis morari'; 49.17 'transeamus ad reliqua - epistulari enim breuitate festinat oratio' (see Bartelink 1980:89-90). The phrasing of the first sentence in this preface is reminiscent of the younger Pliny: cf Plin *Ep* 3.9.27 'quid enim mihi cum tam longa epistula?'

There is an important thematic link between the prose preface and the first poem of the book (2.1). Addressed to the book, this poem laments the fact that length is a prohibitive factor for many readers, and ruefully points out the virtues of brevity: 'at nunc succincti quae sint bona disce libelli' (3). These are threefold: (1)

that not much paper is used up, (2) that the *librarius* completes a copy in a single hour and (3) that, whatever the standard of the poetry, it will not bore anyone (2.1.4-8). With an ironic final twist, Martial ends by saying that the book will still be long for many, however brief it may be. A further irony is that, at 12 lines, this epigram is itself fairly long.

Martial frequently speaks about the brevity of his own poems, usually in mock-modest vein, eg 2.6, 77; 3.83; 4.89; 6.65; 8.29; 9.50; 10.1. Often this is in the form of tongue-in-cheek criticism of readers who lack patience with his verse:

> lectis uix tibi paginis duabus
>
> spectas eschatocollion, Seuere,
>
> et longas trahis oscitationes. (2.6.2-4)

The couplet is in fact the minimum length for a poem (cf 6.65):

> Ut faciam breuiora mones epigrammata, Corde.
>
> 'Fac mihi quod Chione': non potui breuis. (3.83)

In contrast with the extreme brevity of Martial's distichs, the poems of Domitius Marsus and Albinovanus Pedo take up more space: 'Marsi doctique Pedonis/ saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus' (2.77.5-6).

Catullus 12.10-11 ('quare aut hendecasyllabos trecentos/ exspecta, aut mihi linteum remitte...'), imitated at Stat *Silu* 4.9.54-5, suggests the existence of a commonplace that long-windedness is a punishment for the reader, and Martial's continued concern with the length of his poems, and here with the length of the prose preface, should be viewed in this light.

C. MARTIAL 12 *PRAEFATIO*

Martial's lack of literary productivity is at issue in the preface to his 12th and final book (discussed in detail by Bowie 1988:12-30). He begins by acknowledging that he needs to apologise for failing to write anything since his retirement. The fact that he is supposedly in retired leisure makes his inactivity all the more difficult to defend, he says (12pr1-6). Much of the preface is devoted to rendering details about Bilbilis, but from the point of view of our distinction, it must be said that this information is principally intended to substantiate the justification which remains the *raison d'être* of the letter.

Martial adopts forensic imagery in offering this explanation, and from the start he argues in very much a defensive position in which self-critical language is not unknown: 'scio me *patrocinium* debere contumacissimae trienni desidiae' (12pr1-2), later 'absoluenda' (2), 'accipe ergo rationem' (6-7), 'in alieno foro litigare' (9). This legalistic language, used here in mock-solemn vein (Bowie 1988:16) is reminiscent of Terence's comic prologues, where the poet's reply to criticism is often couched in such terms (cf chapter 1).

Martial's reasoning is on the lines that his environment at Bilbilis militates against his being able to write poetry. He stresses this by (firstly) focusing on the aspects of life at Rome which had stimulated his literary activity:

si quid est enim quod in libellis meis placeat, dictauit auditor:
illam iudiciorum subtilitatem, illud materiarum ingenium,
bibliothecas, theatra, conuictus, in quibus studere se uoluptates

> non sentiunt, ad summam omnium illa quae delicati reliquimus
> desideramus quasi destituti (9-14)

and, secondly, bewailing the parochial prejudice, backbiting and general narrow-mindedness which for him characterise the place: 'accedit his municipalium robigo dentium et iudici loco liuor, et unus aut alter mali, in pusillo loco multi' (14-16).

This has had a serious effect on his morale:

> aduersus hoc difficile est habere cotidie bonum stomachum: ne
> mireris igitur abiecta ab indignante quae a gestiente fieri
> solebant. (16-18)

The images here suggest comparison with Ov *Met* 2.776 'liuent rubigine dentes' (the whole passage 2.760-82 is a personification of envy, *inuidia*; cf Mart 9.97). The idiomatic force of this and *stomachum* ('ill-temper'; cf Quint *Inst* 2.3.3 and 6.3.93) has been discussed by Bowie (1988:24-26). In the event, Martial's reaction to his repatriation is starkly at odds with his earlier views about the relative desirability of Rome and Spain. One of the main characteristics of Rome as presented by Martial is its patronage system; and Martial's attitude to duties as a client is overwhelmingly negative (see chapter 3), as for example at 3.4.6 when he speaks of the 'uanae taedia...togae'. There is a poem even in Book 12, presumably written before the preface, in which he boasts of the pleasures of living in the countryside. Addressing the city-bound Juvenal, Martial contrasts the leisure and peace of his rural life with the worries of the urban client's:

Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras

                    clamosa, Iuuenalis, in Sabura

                    aut collem dominae teris Dianae;...

                    me multos repetita post Decembres

                    accepit mea rusticumque fecit

                    auro Bilbilis et superba ferro. (12.18.1-3, 7-9)

By the same token, he speaks in very positive terms of his prospective
return at 10.103 and 104, though the final couplet of one of these
poems seems to presage the ill-feeling which subsequently troubled him:

            Excipitis placida reducem si mente, uenimus;

                aspera si geritis corda, redire licet. (10.103.11-13)

In marked contrast to the attitude revealed in the preface
Martial ends this preface by saying that he would be happy to spend
the rest of his days in such circumstances: 'Sic me uiuere, sic iuuat
perire' (26)[8].

In a sense this dichotomy of views evidenced in Martial is
indicative of the conflicting Roman response to the countryside (see
in general MacMullen 1974:28-56). Writers by and large depict urban
culture. Country life, expressed by the Latin *rusticitas*, represented
that which is uncouth and uncivilised, whereas on the other hand
urbanitas represented with positive connotations the fashions of the
city, in particular those of Rome. 'The concepts of *urbanitas* and
rusticitas immediately express the general view of the difference in
the level of culture between the population of town and country'
(Alföldy 1985:133). The usual view, contrasting the duties of city
life with the pleasures of country life, is seen at Plin *Ep* 1.9. Of

particular relevance to 12 *praef* is the difference in the level of amenities and leisure activities between Rome and the smaller settlements (cf Wacher 1987:105-6, 114-18; Wood 1988:115-19).

On the other hand there is an old tradition, dating back to Hesiod and manifested in pastoral verse, of nostalgia for the countryside (see Murgatroyd 1980:49 and, with regard to satire, Braund 1989:23-47, esp 28). This also had considerable appeal for Roman sensibilities (cf in general White 1977:36-49 'The country through the eye of a townsman').

D. STATIUS *SILVAE* 1 *PRAEFATIO*

It appears that Statius' main aim in writing the preface to his first book of *Siluae* is to justify his first published venture into a lesser genre, namely that of occasional poetry. In making this justification Statius stresses his status as an epic poet, for whom such a lightweight genre requires some defence. He conveys his supposed uncertainty by claiming to have been uncertain as to whether to publish these collected shorter poems in the first instance:

diu multumque dubitaui...an hos libellos, qui mihi... fluxerunt, cum singuli de sinu meo pro<fugissent>, congregatos ipse dimitterem. (1-5)

It is evident from this that Statius is now circulating the poems in a form different to the original, as has been discussed in chapter 2. The phrasing of the opening echoes Cicero's *Orator*, which begins: 'Utrum difficilius aut maius esset negare tibi saepius idem roganti an efficere id, quod rogares, *diu multumque*, Brute, *dubitaui*'.

Both these introductions evidence the common prefatory theme by which the author claims to be writing in response to the recipient's request, eg *Rhet Her* 1.1.1, Plin *Ep* 1.1 'Frequenter hortatus es ut epistulas, si quas paulo curatius scripsissem, colligerem publicaremque', Quint *Epist ad Tryph* 'Efflagitasti cotidiano conuicio, ut libros...iam emittere inciperem' (see further Janson 1964:28, 116-28). This topos should be viewed in terms of the equally common theme of the author's ostensible doubt about the merits of the work, often more generally about his own ability as a writer, eg Cic *Arch* 1.1 'Si quid est in me ingeni, iudices, quod sentio quam sit exiguum', Plin *HN* pr12 '(libelli) nec ingenii sunt capaces, quod alioqui in nobis perquam mediocre erat' (see further Curtius 1953:93-95, 410-15; Janson 1964:124-41).

Virgil and Homer wrote their earliest work in lighter genres, says Statius, as a prelude to their epic verse. If it was acceptable for these poets, then also for him:

> sed et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus; nec quisquam est illustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore praeluserit. (7-10)

The presence of such a defence and the comparison with Homer and Virgil suggests a sense of inferiority on Statius' part about the publishing of these occasional poems (Citroni 1968:261). Significantly, Statius here uses the term *praeluserit* to distinguish the early essays of great poets from their subsequent work, and thus the *Siluae* are to be appreciated against the background of Statius' epic verse. However, the parallel between Statius and the other epic poets is not complete: the *Siluae* were composed *after* Statius' *magnum opus*, whereas Homer and Virgil supposedly wrote small-scale verse by

way of preparation for their more serious efforts. Wagenvoort (1956:31-34, at 32) has shown that the word *ludere*, when used of verse, often 'has no absolute signification, but expresses a relation of the inferior to the superior, of the commencement to the completion, of growth to flowering'. Thus Ovid speaks of his earlier love poetry in these terms, to contrast it with his subsequent work: *Fast* 2.3-6; 4.9-10 'Quae decuit, primis sine crimine lusimus annis,/ nunc teritur nostris area maior equis'. The pseudo-Virgilian *Culex* is also presented in this light: 'Lusimus, Octaui, gracili modulante Thalia' (1); cf also Hor Od 4.9.9-10; Plin *Ep* 8.21.2.

CONCLUSION

Various aspects of apologia have been surveyed in this chapter, much of it having some bearing on literary criticism. In the case of Martial the self-consciousness that this reveals suggests comparison between the genres of epigram and satire. In particular, Martial 1 *praef* was dicussed as an epigrammatist's version of the satirical apologia. Heading the first of Martial's numbered books of epigrams, this serves an important programmatic function, though of course it should be remembered that only a percentage of Martial's poems are satirical.

Martial's other 'apologetic' prose prefaces are more limited in their focus, concerned as they are with the use of the prose preface (2 *praef*) and his lack of literary activity subsequent to his leaving Rome (12 *praef*). *An abiding concern of Statius in his prose prefaces is the speed at which he composed his Siluae. I have tried to present this as the uncertainty of an epic poet operating - before a wide public for the first time - in a small-scale genre of lower prestige.*

NOTES

[1] The OED (2nd ed 1989:553) states that the basic sense of 'apology' is a 'defence [or] speech in defence'; of relevance here is its more formal sense: 'The pleading off from a charge or imputation, whether expressed, implied, or only conceived as possible; defence of a person...from accusation or aspersion' (sv apology 1). The locus classicus of this in western literature is Plato's Apology (of Socrates). The currency of the Greek term in English can be largely attributed to the title of Cardinal Newman's Apologia pro Vita Sua, published in 1864. Apologia has been used in a more specialised sense: 'a written defence or justification of the opinions or conduct of a writer, speaker, etc.'

[2] A similar distinction of satirical style can be witnessed in the attitudes towards Horace and Juvenal of the 17th- and 18th-century tradition of English satirists. To quote Selden (1978:11):

> *The contrast between Horace and Juvenal was translated, in different periods, into distinctions between malignant and benign laughter, between a snarl and a smile, between vituperation and ridicule, between 'railing' and 'raillery'. It is, in essence, an ethical distinction projected onto a fictional form.*

See Selden (1978:11-44, esp 42); Weinbrot (1982:3-44) stresses more the varied style and wide borrowing of Pope and others.

[3] Highet (1962:15-16) has shown such a procedure to be typical of satire and related genres.

[4] curio has been cited as an example of Martial's unconventional diction: see Platnauer (1948:15).

[5] *See further Gaffney, G E 1976, Mimic Elements in Martial, diss*
Vanderbilt (unavailable to me).

[6] *cf Rudd (1986:14) on Hor Sat 1.4, 1.10 and 2.1: 'Nearly all the*
assertions are made from a defensive position.'

[7] *For a comparison of satirical apologiae see also Shero, L 1922,*
University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 15.148
(unavailable to me).

[8] *The strictly biographical issue of the circumstances in which*
Martial retired to Spain are discussed in chapter 4 (page 80).
This preface is discussed again in chapters 6 (pages 130-31) and 7
(page 150-51) insofar as it contains information and a request.

Chapter 6

INFORMATION IN THE PROSE PREFACES

A key element in the prefaces of both poets is that which involves the rendering of information concerning the poems and their composition. For the purpose of this thesis a distinction is drawn between such factual 'information' on the one hand, and on the other hand statements by which the poets either justify their own position (apologia), or make a request directly or indirectly.

The most obvious example from classical literature of an introduction which informs in this sense is that comprising the first book of Pliny's *Natural History*[1] (touched on at pages 22-23). The entire first book of this work is devoted to a list of its contents. The beginning will serve as an example of the entire book:

LIBRO II CONTINENTUR

An finitus sit mundus et an unus (1); de forma eius (2); de motu eius. cur mundus dicatur (3); de elementis (4); de deo (5); de siderum errantium natura (6); de lunae et solis defectibus (7) ....

After the contents of each book are summarised in this way, Pliny indefatigably lists the sources from which he compiled his information for that section:

Ex auctoribus: M Varrone, Sulpicio Gallo, Tito Caesare imperatore, Q Tuberone, Tullio Tirone, L Pisone, T Liuio, Cornelio Nepote, Seboso, Coelio Antipatro, Fabiano, Antiate ....

Monotonous as this may be, the same pattern is used for the entire

work consisting of 37 books, and this encompasses the whole of the first book. This type of 'contents-page' preface, so clearly seen in Pliny's work, seems to be unusual in classical literature. Yet it is one element deserving close attention in considering Statius' prefaces and, to a lesser extent, those of Martial.

A. STATIUS

Various other factors are of relevance in the *Siluae* and *Epigrams*. Almost all the *Siluae* and a large number of the *Epigrams* can be described as occasional poems, and hence issues of social context are brought to bear. The setting out of this context is one of the essentially practical aspects of prefacing as revealed in the two poets. Since the poems were originally a medium of communication between individuals now exposed to a wider audience, it was necessary to provide explanation about, for example, the circumstances of composition and the identity of recipients. Certainly, much of this information is very brief; in fact White (1974:40-41, followed by Coleman 1988:55) has gone so far as to say that the brevity and obviousness of Statius' details here is proof that the prefaces were intended for a wider audience than the named dedicatee. There could have been no other need for such obvious information, given that poet and recipient/addressee would have been acquainted with each other.

In the event, Statius provides a small amount of information on each of the poems in the first four books. The different circumstances in which the fifth book was published accounts for the fact that only the first poem of that book is described. In general, it can be said that in the prefaces Statius supplies some details of the actual subject-matter of the poems, but concentrates on the

circumstances of their composition more than anything else.

Some scant details of Statius' career are given, but this is an insignificant aspect of the prefaces as a whole. In fact all we can conclude from the prefaces about the poet's biography is that the *Thebaid* was all but complete before he collected and published the *Siluae*: '...adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo' (1pr6-7). Statius' professed 'fear' for the fate of the poem suggests that it is in the hands of copyists awaiting further circulation, and that he is ridden with anxiety in anticipation of its critical reception.

It is perhaps surprising that, beyond statements of this nature, very little can be cited as purely objective fact in the prefaces. There are indeed some brief pieces of explanation, often in the form of epithets or short appellations, for the recipients of poems. For example, 4.1 is addressed to Plotius Grypus, 'maioris gradus iuueni' (4pr23), and Manilius Vopiscus, recipient of 1.3, is described as 'uir eruditissimus et qui praecipue uindicat a situ litteras iam paene fugientis' (1pr25-26). Statius speaks of Maecius Celer as 'a sacratissimo imperatore missum ad legionem Syriacam' (3pr13-14). From these and similar brief tags it is uncertain whether the people thus mentioned were known to the recipient of each collection; at all events it is clear that Statius intended to highlight certain aspects of the persons concerned.

Related to these short descriptions is the issue of nomenclature[2]. Just as the poet finds it necessary to give brief descriptions of his recipients, so it is no coincidence that the prose prefaces contain names fuller than those in poems. For example, of *Silu* 2.7 Statius says, 'Cludit uolumen genethliacon Lucani, quod *Polla Argentaria*, rarissima uxorum...imputari sibi uoluit' (2pr2-4). The recipient, Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria, is described in the poem

itself only as 'castae...*Pollae*' (62, cf 120). An advantage offered
by the prose preface is that names may be included with relative ease,
whereas it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to align them
with Statius' lyric metres. One may compare also 'sequitur libellus
Rutilio Gallico conualescenti dedicatus' (1pr27) with *Gallicus* (4) and
the vocative form (34, 93); and also *Silu* 4.5:

> proximum est lyricum carmen ad *Septimium Seuerum*, iuuenem, uti
> scis, inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis, tuum quidem et
> condiscipulum, sed mihi citra hoc quoque ius artissime carum
> (4pr10-13).

with 'fortem atque facundum *Seuerum*' (4.5.3) and 'dulcem *Septimium*'
(34), in which the two components of the name are mentioned
separately.

Even though these literary circles included a great many people
and had only a small degree of overlap (as is illustrated by White
1975), it is likely that the recipient would have been acquainted to
some extent at least with the persons mentioned. The brief appellation
jogs the recipient's memory, and at the same time provides some
helpful information for a reader outside the immediate circle of
amici. A great deal of this information would have been obvious not
only to anyone who belonged to the same social circle as the poet; in
fact much of what is said about individual poems would be obvious to
any reader of the poems themselves.

Book 3 will serve as an example. 3.1, concerning Pollius Felix'
temple of Hercules at Surrentum, was honoured 'statim ut uideram'
(3pr11) - something the host, Pollio, who is also addressee of the
collection, would surely have known. Perhaps the rendering of such

details of composition may serve to remind the addressee, but it also makes the social context available to a wider readership. Maecius Celer, the addressee of the second poem, was about to undertake a military expedition to Syria, as Statius says (3pr11-15). This would be clear to any contemporary reader of the poem, which is in the form of a propempticon. The only real facts that Statius gives about the third poem is that it was written for Claudius Etruscus on the death of his father (3pr15-17). One may compare 3.3.12 ('pater est, qui fletur') and 14-15, where the old man's age is mentioned. It is equally obvious to any reader of the poems that 3.4 was written to honour the locks of Earinus which were sent to Asclepius at Pergamum (3pr17-21), and that with 3.5 Statius hoped to persuade his wife to return with him to Naples (3pr21-24). By way of qualification, however, one may say that the prefaces do serve the function of summing up the contents of the book, providing an overview of the contents and context of each poem.

Statius comments that 3.5 should be taken as a conversation (*sermo*) between husband and wife, and that its purpose was to persuade rather than delight: 'persuadere malit quam placere' (3pr24). It is not certain how seriously such a statement is to be taken. If the poem was conceived of as a private exchange with a specific purpose in mind, as one may partly consider it to be - 'uenies, carissima coniunx,/ praeueniesque etiam' 3.5.110-11) - it can hardly claim to have a place in a collection which seems at least partly directed towards public consumption. It can be noted however that Statius' use of the word *persuadere* above invites comparison with the rhetorical phenomenon of the *suasoria*, and in a sense this is how Statius here justifies its inclusion in the book.

Speed of composition

An abiding concern of Statius as revealed in the prefaces is that involving the speed at which he composed his *Siluae*. This is evident especially in the first three prefaces, to a lesser degree in the fourth and not at all in the fifth. To a large extent this is in keeping with the nature of the *Siluae*: see Newmyer (1979:5-9) and Hardie (1983:77-78), and compare Quint *Inst* 10.3.17 'Diuersum est huic eorum uitium qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo uelocissimo uolunt, et sequentes calorem atque impetum scribunt; hanc siluam uocant'[3].

In most cases Statius' emphasis on the haste with which he is supposed to have written the poems has an apologetic flavour. He stresses the quick genesis of the poems as an explanation for their seemingly careless and unpolished nature. For example, at the start of the first preface he says he doubts whether verses, 'qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi uoluptate fluxerunt' (1pr3-4), should be published; at 1pr31 we hear that 1.5 was written 'intra moram cenae'. Statius hopes that his epicedion for Glaucias will not be criticised too harshly as it was written in haste (2pr8-13). Ostensibly Statius is here giving factual information concerning the composition of the poems, but the overlap with apologia should already be evident, and hence this is discussed also in chapter 5.

In all probability Statius is overstating the case, as suggested by Fowler (1989:107). The *Siluae* may have been composed quickly only when compared with Statius' epic poems which, as we have seen, were regarded as a more serious endeavour deserving of careful attention. This is reminiscent of Horace's comments on what he regards as Lucilius' too-prolific and spontaneous versifying (briefly discussed at page 103 in connection with Martial 1 *praef*):

nam fuit hoc uitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,

ut magnum, uersus dictabat stans pede in uno:

cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere uelles:

garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,

scribendi recte: (*Sat* 1.4.9-13)

Inventory

In an important respect Statius' prefaces provide an inventory
of the contents of his books of *Siluae*. Some comment, however brief,
is made about each poem in the first four collections. This ranges in
length from less than one line (2*pr*15-17 on 2.4 and 5) to more than
eight (on 2.1: 2*pr*5-13). In the third preface roughly equal coverage
is accorded to each poem, which makes it unique in this regard. This
'contents-list' phenomenon has been taken to constitute the 'main
purpose' and 'most important function' of the prefaces (Van Dam
1984a:51 and 53), with the elements of circumstantial detail and
dedication being relegated to second and third most important. More
plausibly Howell (1980:95) and Janson (1964:107) stress the dedicatory
aspect as being of prime importance.

Factors motivating the use of an inventory are the need to
establish *auctoritas editionis* and, more generally, the dangers posed
by plagiarism (see Vollmer 1898:3 and Pavlovskis 1967:538). An
important (if obvious) implication of this is that we can be sure that
the collection was intended by Statius to have its current parameters.
By contrast, we have very little idea of the size and nature of the
ancient *libelli*, or pre-publication collections. Clearly, this does
not apply to 5 *praef*, as it does not seem to have been conceived

originally for its current position. Nor is any such confidence possible in the case of Martial (or for that matter Catullus); Martial's prefaces give no indication of what form the collections originally had, and there appears to be every chance that they could have been written for smaller *libelli*.

This inventory element can be traced back to a physical aspect of the ancient book: the tag (σίλλυβος) hanging out of a scroll as it lay in its *scrinium*, stating title and author (described in the appendix to this thesis). A forerunner of the modern contents page, this phenomenon reflects not the main purpose of the prefaces of Martial and Statius, but rather their ancestry[4].

MARTIAL

The element of information is much less prominent in Martial's prefaces. It is neither appropriate nor possible to provide circumstantial detail for a large number of brief poems. The epigrams are numerous and of such widely divergent nature that very little can be said by way of general introduction for any one collection; in any case, a great number of them are very short (see further Coleman 1988:54). The satirist's apologia (1 *praef*) and the imperial dedication (8 *praef*), are the most important introductory themes emerging from Martial's prefaces, and these are treated in chapters 5 and 7 respectively as they are not information in any purely factual sense.

B. MARTIAL 9 *PRAEFATIO*

This, the shortest of Martial's prefaces, presents a unique
case. It provides a gloss on the first poem of the collection, in a
manner roughly comparable with Statius' 5 *praef*. The entire preface
is devoted to explaining the identity of a man whom the first poem
concerns: Stertinius Avitus. That the preface was written (perhaps in
the form of a covering letter) for this very limited purpose is shown
by Martial's explanation at the end of the prose section: 'De quo
scribendum tibi putaui, ne ignorares Auitus iste quis uocaretur'
(9pr4-5). The need for such explanation suggests that Avitus was not
in the same social circle as Toranius.

The preface as a whole can be divided into a tripartite
structure: firstly, the prose piece to Toranius which sets the
subsequent poem in context; secondly, the first four lines of verse
addressed to the dead Avitus; and finally, the last four lines of
verse, which are in the form of a grave inscription. Whereas the
second section is spoken in the poet's persona, the last is put into
the mouth of Avitus, as is common for such inscriptions.

Avitus is presented here as a poet, distinguished within either
lyric or epic genres, or so it seems from the word *sublimi*: 'Note,
licet nolis, sublimi pectore uates' (verse line 1). In keeping with
'licet nolis', Avitus' glory as a poet ('praemia digna', verse line 2,
and 'non obscuris uiris', verse line 4) is contrasted with his own
humility. The inscription which comprises the final four lines is
characterized by the modesty of a poet who claims to be interested not
in the admiration of his readers, but in their affection and in his
continued popularity with them:

"gloss"

> 'Ille ego sum nulli nugarum laude secundus,
>
> quem non miraris sed puto, lector, amas.
>
> maiores maiora sonent: mihi parua locuto
>
> sufficit in uestras saepe redire manus.'   (verse lines 5-8)

Austin (1968:108-9) has shown that *ille ego...* is inappropriate to epic style, but suitable to the lighter genres: cf Ov *Am* 2.1.1-2 and *Trist* 4.10.1-2 (see Friedlaender 1886:49 *ad loc*).

nugae is also a term which attaches itself to lighter forms of verse, especially occasional verse and epigrams, and is used by Martial of his own work (1.113.6; 4.10; 5.80.3; 13.2.4); see also Cat 1.4 with Fordyce (1961:85 *ad loc*), Hor *Epist* 1.1.10: 'nunc itaque et uersus et cetera ludicra pono'. Possibly it is only following Catullus that the word came into common currency in connexion with verse (Copley *apud* Quinn 1973:89).

The tone of this line is at odds with the first line of verse as it suggests one of the genres humbler than epic or lyric, perhaps elegy; so too 'maiores maiora sonent'. *paruus* indicates variously both that which is 'small in size or extent' or 'insignificant or unimportant' (*OLD* sv 1 and 5 respectively). The second of these senses does not often apply in the context of poetry, though see Hor *Epist* 2.1.257 'paruum carmen' and *Od* 3.25.17 'nil paruom aut humili modo/ nil mortale loquar.'

Some prosopographical comment pertains here. L Stertinius Avitus (*PIR* S 659) was consul suffectus in AD 92, as is clear from *CIL* 14.245 . That he was a friend of Martial is shown at 12.24.9, where the poet expresses regret at his death. He is addressed at 1.16; 6.84; 10.96, 102; 12.75, all of which give the impression that the two were close friends up till Avitus' death.

Toranius, the addressee of the preface, is not known by any other name (*PIR*.T 214). The fact that he is addressed as 'frater carissime' (9pr1) suggests that he and Martial were intimately acquainted and of equal status, the impression given also by 5.78 in which Martial invites him to a humble dinner.

Form

9 *praef* raises some interesting questions concerning form. The textual tradition has it that the introductory epigram mentioned in the first line of the preface is attached to the text of the preface (compare Martial 1 *praef*, and contrast 8 *praef*). A further obvious but important observation is that the prose part of the preface is in the form of a letter, beginning and ending in a standard if informal way. From this it is possible to infer that what is now the preface was originally intended simply as an informal gloss on the first poem; again, the chatty tone might be thought to indicate that the preface was intended (in the first instance at least) for private rather than public purposes. One may note particularly the beginning: 'Haue, mi Torani, frater carissime' (9pr1), and the ending: 'Vale et para hospitium' (5-6), both of them phrases which reveal a certain degree of intimacy between writer and addressee. The problems in this passage are explored also in chapter 7, insofar as it constitutes a request.

It is in fact highly likely that this preface was intended to be a covering letter for a small collection of poems, a pre-publication *libellus*, rather than Book 9 in its current form. For one thing, the preface has no relevance to the book as a whole. As shown above, the language of the preface suggests that it was intended for a close friend rather than a larger audience. From this it is natural to

assume that Martial wrote this preface as a letter to accompany a small selection of poems sent to a friend. The fact that Book 9 was published in its full form in Martial's lifetime suggests (though by no means conclusively proves) that this piece was placed here, unaltered, by Martial's own hand as editor. However, there is no discounting the possibility that the preface was added from Martial's documents by a posthumous editor.

A chance comment by Martial in this preface brings to bear an interesting question concerning the physical placing of the preface. The second sentence begins, 'Epigramma, quod extra ordinem paginarum est...' (9pr2-3). According to received wisdom, this passage has been taken to indicate that such a prefatory piece would have been placed on the outside of the papyrus roll: thus Birt (1882:142 n3). One may note that in his edition of Martial's corpus Friedlaender (1886:49) prints first the eight lines of verse and then the prose section, presumably on the strength of this comment of Martial[5].

However, Birt's view is demonstrably incorrect. In the glossary of terms appended to chapter 2 it is made clear that *pagina* indicates in the first instance a column of writing, a parallel to the Greek σελίς (cf Turner 1968:5, Kenney 1982:16). Consequently, it is clear that Martial is saying merely that the prefatory epigram is outside the main body of poems; in other words in a column preceding the bulk of the collection (however short at this stage of literary production), but nonetheless in an adjacent position on the same side of the papyrus roll itself. Why it was necessary for Martial to mention the placing of the prefatory epigram is unclear. Possibly, it was simply in order to distinguish the prefatory poem from those constituting the rest of the book.

C. MARTIAL 12 *PRAEFATIO*

In a different way, the preface to Martial's 12th book of epigrams is also an exception to the general pattern. Most of the preface (which, with its 27 lines, is the longest he wrote) concerns the circumstances in which Martial finds himself at Bilbilis, where social conditions make it difficult for him to write. Once again, this is not pure fact; Martial offers these comments as a justification for his lack of literary activity. This is criticism or anticipated criticism which he is at pains here to counter, and it results in the legal image with which Martial begins (*patrocinium* 12prl; cf Bowie 1988:16).

On a factual level it is clear that Martial has compiled the collection with a view to the arrival of Priscus, in particular his *cena aduentoria*. He adds the detail that the collection (which of course may or may not have been in its current form) had been compiled in the space of a few days:

ne quid tamen et aduenienti tibi ab urbe et exigenti negarem...imperaui mihi, quod indulgere consueram, et studui paucissimis diebus, ut familiarissimas mihi aures tuas exciperem aduentoria sua. (12pr20-22)

The phrase 'studui paucissimis diebus' has been taken to indicate the process of composition (Coleman 1988:54). However, from the context there can be little doubt that Martial means here that he needed only a few days in which to *compile* the collection from work already written. An example already mentioned bears this out: 12.75 is addressed to a Avitus, probably the same person whose death is referred to in 9 *praef*. This suggests that the poems had been written

some years previously, and is perhaps the closest Martial comes to giving personal details in the prefaces.

CONCLUSION

The information surveyed in this chapter is mostly concerned with brief detail concerning the poems, their genesis and their recipients. In most cases this information is essentially factual, but occasionally it overlaps with apologia (eg Mart 12 *praef*) where issues close to the poet's life are concerned. It might be argued in this light that even Statius' frequent statements about the speed of his composition take on a polemical edge. The 'inventory' element, perhaps the most consistently noticeable aspect of Statius' prefaces, not least by its brevity endorses White's view that the prefaces to Books 1-4 were composed for wide circulation at a late stage of their production. The contrast between the information here and that in *Silu* 5 *epist* underlines the different circumstances in which the last collection was published.

NOTES

[1] I disregard for this purpose the dedicatory epistle.

[2] Names in the *tituli* should not be considered here, as it has been established as most unlikely that the *tituli* were written by Statius himself (see Van Dam 1984a:69-71, and Coleman 1988:xxix-xxxii with Courtney 1990:236).

[3] Hardie (1983:76) reveals scepticism of this and Fowler, reviewing Coleman (1988), has warned of the misleading tendency whereby

- 131 -

Statius' 'genial lies about the lack of *limae labor* are given too much credence' (1989:107). Newmyer is also guilty of erring on the side of credulity in this respect.

[4] One may compare the custom followed in modern French books, where there are often two contents-lists, of which both are usually at the back. In such cases, the shorter index renders just the titles of chapters, whereas the longer gives a more detailed breakdown of the contents of the book. Statius' first four prefaces, in which each poem is described in varying degrees of detail, can be considered similar to the latter.

[5] One assumes also that this is what Pavlovskis means when she says that 'it appears to have been common for introductions to be placed outside the books proper' (1967:537).

REQUEST IN THE PROSE PREFACES

Requests on the part of the author, be they direct or covert, bear centrally on the pragmatic function of the prose prefaces. This phenomenon is seen particularly at the end of Statius' prefaces, and also on occasion in Martial's. Chapters 2 and 3 (especially pages 69-71) made clear the very practical needs served by a literary patron, and it is in this light that the requests are to be examined. Since one of the prefaces, that to Martial Book 8, is addressed to the emperor Domitian, the context of imperial patronage and ruler cult necessitates some consideration of the emperor's status and its implications.

A. STATIUS *SILVAE* 2 & 4 *PRAEFATIONES*

Two of Statius' epistolary prefaces end with a request for material assistance, expressed by jussive subjunctives:

> haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerunt, a te publicum <u>accipiant</u>; sin minus, ad me <u>reuertantur</u>. (2pr28-30)

> hunc tamen librum tu, Marcelle, <u>defendes</u>. et, si uidetur, hactenus: sin minus, <u>reprehendemur</u>. (4pr35-37)

The first of these extracts makes it clear that Melior is influential in the success or otherwise of the poems. Statius implies that he has the ability to bestow a *publicum* on the poems, in other words that he

is a powerful patron of literature. To quote Van Dam (1984a:62): 'Statius makes Melior responsible for the success of the book: Statius hopes that the poems will find a public out of Melior's hands (*sic*), if he likes them; otherwise let him return them to Statius.'

The legal term *defendes* in the second extract presents Marcellus as a counsel for defence. As a dedicatee he is obliged to promote the work in terms of the *amicitia* system (Coleman 1988:62).

What does all this mean in practical terms? It should already be evident that literary patronage had a very pragmatic side to it and involved not least the providing of a venue for *recitationes*; in addition, an *amicus* might also be helpful in matters of literary dispute[1].

In the extracts above one may observe also the reservations which Statius expresses about the merits of his poems ('sin minus...'). The similar phrasing suggests that this is more a courteous gesture of modesty than a seriously intended request for criticism. It must be admitted however that there are many apparently genuine instances in which an author asks the addressee for critical comment on his work; in fact it appears that this was common practice among writers within a literary coterie. For example, in one of his letters Pliny asks Maximus to read his work before he risks it on a wider public. He does not want his circumstances of personal grief to be too strongly reflected in his writings, and this gives particular justification to his usual procedure:

Est autem mihi moris, quod sum daturus in manus hominum, ante amicorum iudicio examinare, in primis tuo. Proinde si quando, nunc intende libro quem cum hac epistula accipies, quia uereor ne ipse ut tristis parum intenderim. (8.19.2)

In another letter Pliny asks Terentius Scaurus for his literary judgment, promising that candid advice would sharpen his skills in writing and revising:

> Tu uelim quid de uniuerso, quid de partibus sentias, scribas mihi. Ero enim uel cautior in continendo uel constantior in edendo, si huc uel illuc auctoritas tua accesserit. (5.12.4)

Two comparable letters of Pliny merit special attention in this regard. 'rogo ut pari *simplicitate*, si qua existimabitis addenda commutanda omittenda, indicetis mihi' (3.11.5). 'A *simplicitate* tua peto, quod de libello meo dicturus es alii, mihi dicas' (4.14.10). In these two passages the emphasis on the frankness of the addressee's judgment suggests that Pliny's request was sincerely intended.

By comparison with Pliny's procedure, Statius' requests for such literary judgment have a suspiciously formulaic ring, suggesting affected modesty rather than genuine request. Again, there is plenty of evidence that such modesty was a particularly widespread commonplace in classical literature[2]. If it is borne in mind that the collections of *Siluae* in this form are at a late stage of their development with much of their contents having been written long since (White 1974:50), it is unlikely that now Statius would sincerely request suggestions as to how he might improve the poems.

More generally speaking, requests are a common feature of ancient letters[3]. Often these requests, which amount to instructions if the letter is sent from a *superior* to an *inferior amicus*, occur at the end of a letter[4]; thus eg Plin *Ep* 2.9; 3.6; 5.12 (quoted above); 5.19. In many of these terminal requests the recipient is asked to send a

letter in reply (*Briefbitte*); thus eg 2.11 'In summa, nisi aeque longam epistulam reddis, non est quod postea nisi breuissimam expectes. Vale' 2.12; 3.17; 6.4, 7; 9.15, cf Cic *Att* 1.14 (= Shackleton Bailey 14); 2.5 (ShB 25); 4.14 (ShB 88); 11.7 (ShB 218); 15.16a (ShB 392); *Fam* 7.30 (ShB 265); 11.20 (ShB 401).

The epigrams themselves contain many requests, though of course poetic gesture brings other factors into play. For example, at 4.82 Martial subverts the genre of the letter of recommendation in asking Rufus to recommend his verse to Venuleius, who, it is hoped, will give favourable criticism: 'Hos quoque commenda Venuleio, Rufe, libellos/ inputet et nobis otia parua roga' (1-2; cf 7.26). In an even more convoluted request at 5.6 Martial asks the Muses to ask Parthenius to recommend his poems to Domitian. Severus (5.6) and Priscus (12.1; cf 12 *praef* below) are directly asked for their criticisms of Martial's poems.

The presence of terminal requests in Statius 2 and 4 *praefs* underlines the epistolary character of the prefaces, and represents something of a parallel to the *Briefbitten* that end many of the letters of Pliny and Cicero[5].

B. STATIUS *SILVAE* 3 *PRAEFATIO*

The last sentence of the third preface ostensibly refers to the last poem of that collection, *Silu* 3.5. Statius is saying that this poem will be particularly liked by Pollius because of the connection with his own Neapolitan residence.

huic praecipue libello fauebis cum scias hanc destinationem
quietis meae tibi maxime intendere meque non tam in patriam quam
ad te secedere. (3pr24-27)

It is likely that the word *fauebis* carries connotations beyond its
immediate meaning of 'you will be well disposed (towards my
collection)'. By means of the flattering final comment (that Statius
and his wife would be coming to Naples on account of Pollius more than
anything else) one suspects that Statius is hinting at the prospect of
material support for his poems.

C. STATIUS *SILVAE* 1 *PRAEFATIO*

The element of request is lacking in the preface to Statius'
first book of *Siluae*, but there is every likelihood that this preface
would end with such a request were its text complete (Vollmer
1898:213).

This preface contains a covert request for support, but not of
the same type as witnessed above. Centrally at issue in this letter
is the length of time Statius took in composing the poems (14-15). In
the same vein, he stresses the fact that the second poem was written
in only two days, and he tells Stella that he hopes he will bear out
this assertion in the face of any challenge. On this subject Statius
says:

'potuisti illud' dicet aliquis 'et ante uidisse.' respondebis illi
tu, Stella carissime, qui epithalamium tuum quod mihi iniunxeras,
scis biduo scriptum. audacter mehercles; sed tantum tamen
hexametros habet. et fortasse tu pro collega mentieris. (21-24)

In this extract there are two indications of the relationship between author and addressee. Stella is here invoked as a 'witness', and this draws him into comparison with Domitian (himself presented as a divinity), whose name is adduced to prove that *Silu* 1.1 was written in a short period: 'primus libellus sancrosanctum habet testem' (16-17). Also, the direct address 'Stella carissime', echoing the more extravagant 'Stella iuuenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime qua parte et uoluisti' (1-2) at the beginning, indicates familiarity.

In this context the seemingly petty question of the length of time which it took Statius to compose any one of the poems takes on a different complexion. One should not take these comments at face-value, as there are grounds for inferring that Statius sought Stella's support in literary debate (if not in other ways determined by the workings of *amicitia*). In the extract above, this is particularly suggested by *respondebis* and *mentieris*, not to mention the fact that Stella is reminded that he in fact instructed Statius to write the poem: 'qui...iniunxeras'. At all events this comment can be regarded as a friendly prod rather than a formal request for support. But the cliquish nature of literary circles makes it likely that this implied far more than purely 'intellectual' support; such relationships ran deeper than that.

D. STATIUS *SILVAE* 5 *EPISTULA*

Nothing in the last preface can strictly be described as a request. This absence can be ascribed to the context of the letter, which amplifies the *consolatio* embodied in *Silu* 5.1. That Statius wrote the poem in order to secure the goodwill of the influential

Abascantus as a possible patron is, of course, another matter[6]. This can be inferred from the first part of the final sentence:

> sed quamuis propriorem usum amicitiae tuae iampridem cuperem,
> mallem tamen nondum inuenisse materiam. (5pr11-13)

The exact meaning of 'usum amicitiae' is difficult to establish. Vollmer (1898:495) comments that this points to Statius' admitted presumptuousness in making such an overture to the emperor's secretary; it is possible however that more is implied by the phrase. But there can be no doubt that Statius hopes by means of the poem to establish or strengthen a bond of *amicitia* between poet and addressee. This is particularly so in view of Statius' comment, slightly earlier in the preface, that he always tries to earn the goodwill of members of the court:

> praeterea latus omne diuinae domus semper demereri pro mea
> mediocritate conitor. nam qui bona fide deos colit, amat et
> sacerdotes. (5pr9-11)

It seems from this that in the course of securing the favour of Abascantus, Statius hints broadly that he wishes also to gain the goodwill of the emperor.

E. MARTIAL 8 *PRAEFATIO* AND RULER CULT

Although not a direct request for material assistance, this preface is characterised by an unvoiced 'request' for the support of the emperor Domitian as a possible patron. It therefore deserves

close attention not only in terms of the *amicitia* system but also against the background of Roman ruler cult, which is a related issue. The content of the preface may be summarised as follows: To head his eighth published book of epigrams Martial has addressed a prose epistle to the emperor Domitian, by which he effectively dedicates the collection. In the preface Martial pays tribute to the emperor's majesty, and says that he has toned down the frivolous side of the collection in keeping with the nature of this dedication.

Since I have already sketched the Roman system of patronage by way of introduction, it is perhaps worthwhile here to outline the basic features and development of ruler cult. The content and tone of the preface render both these subjects relevant[7].

The concept of honouring a living person is essentially a product of the Hellenistic world, deriving from the honouring of heroes. Italy itself had no indigenous hero cult. Under Greek influence divine honours were conferred on Roman officials in the eastern provinces from the second century BC, but not at Rome till the dictatorship and death of Caesar (45-44 BC). His deification was officially secured in 42. Because such practices were distasteful to the Romans, it was only through the careful moderation of Octavian/Augustus that some aspects of the ruler cult became acceptable at Rome. The assassination of Caesar and the fall of Antony provided Augustus with powerful precedents in what to avoid in this respect. After the death of Augustus in AD 14 the cult of *diuus Augustus* was formally established on the Palatine, with temples erected throughout the empire. This firmly established ruler cult at Rome and made it possible for subsequent rulers to be accorded divine honours in their own lifetime. The extent to which this occurred differed from one emperor to another: Gaius and Domitian required divine honours, whereas Nero and Commodus welcomed them (see Hammond

1933:102-9, *OCD* 1970:939; Fishwick 1987:55).

The growing tendency towards ruler cult in Rome has been well summed up as follows: 'In the late Republic people from various strata of society were ready to honour their favourites and benefactors in ways that brought them into closer relationship with the gods. Exceptional ability or success made an impression and men were receptive to the idea that an individual could be under divine protection or divinely inspired' (Fishwick 1987:55). As Fishwick goes on to conclude, another factor was that the first century BC saw a large influx of people from the eastern part of the empire where such phenomena were long current.

Whereas much of the Roman ruler cult can be ascribed to Greek origins, one characteristically Italian feature was that of sculpting images of the emperor (see Price 1984a:170-206). That these images, which do not merely express ideology but partly constitute it, were widely prevalent is seen in the opposition to it on the part of Christians (Price 1984a:171, 205). Price (1984b:79-95) has shown the importance of terminology in the study of ruler cult.

In political terms, ruler cult served an important integrating function over the empire in its entirety. To quote Liebeschuetz (1979:76):

The ruler cult would have collapsed under the weight of its own absurdity, if it had not been for imperative social need. The empire simply could not do without a language of loyalty. The emperor needed to cultivate the loyalty of his most powerful subjects and to assure himself that it existed. The subjects, whether for reasons of gratitude, or ambition, or just to avoid suspicion of subversive intentions, needed a means of demonstrating loyal sentiments.

Martial 8 *praef*

The contents and diction of the preface to Book 8 are such that it is to some extent a text of emperor-worship or ruler cult. For one thing, Domitian is addressed as *dominus* - a fashionable mode of addressing the emperor from Augustan times onwards. Suetonius (*Dom* 13.2) tells us that Domitian expected to be addressed as *dominus et deus*[8].

This phenomenon can be further illustrated from the writings of Statius. In his *consolatio* to Claudius Etruscus, the freedman courtier of Domitian, Statius suggests that the emperor is a god without saying so explicitly: 'semperque gradi prope numina, semper/ Caesareum coluisse latus sacrisque deorum/ arcanis haerere datum' (*Silu* 3.3.64-66). Similarly, in 5 *epist* Statius speaks in extravagant terms to Abascantus of the manner in which he cultivates the imperial household: 'praeterea latus omne diuinae domus semper demereri pro mea mediocritate conitor. nam qui bona fide deos colit amat et sacerdotes' (5pr8-10). Statius again falls just short of calling Domitian a god, though he moves in that direction by representing Abascantus as a priest.

The very fact that Domitian could be invoked in this manner suggests that he wished to be associated in the public mind with literature, as a patron par excellence; that Martial's efforts were recognised is proven by the fact that he was awarded the *ius trium liberorum* by two emperors. *supplicant*, of which the subject is *libelli*, is a word used in the context of supplicating a god (*OLD* sv *supplico* 2). From the start all this engenders a highly respectful tone which is sustained by such expressions as *caelesti uerecundiae* (9) and 'maiestatem sacri nominis tui'[15]. In the penultimate sentence

Martial says somewhat pleonastically that since the more important part of the book is linked to the emperor's holy name, the book must remember that it ought not to come to Domitian's temple without being cleansed by ritual purification: 'meminerit non nisi religiosa purificatione lustratos accedere ad templa debere' (15-17). The emperor thus fulfils a double rôle here: the book is dedicated to him AND he is invoked as a god. The same can be seen in the fulsome praise found in the preface to Vitruvius *De Architectura*, as well as that of Valerius Maximus' handbook for rhetoricians, addressed to Tiberius: ·

> te igitur huic coepto, penes quem hominum deorumque consensus maris ac terrae regimen esse uoluit, certissime salus patriae, Caesar, inuoco, cuius caelesti prouidentia uirtutes, de quibus dicturus sum, benignissime fouentur, uitia seuerissime uindicantur.

Martial says that the theme of homage to the emperor's sanctity is taken up in the *breuissimum epigramma* which occurs at the 'threshold' (*limen*) of the book:

> laurigeros domini, liber, intrature penates
>   disce uerecundo sanctius ore loqui.
> nuda recede Venus; non est tuus iste libellus:
>   tu mihi, tu Pallas Caesariana, ueni. (8.1)

Martial offers this epigram as a sample of the collection as a whole, as it underlines the purified character of the book. In fact Book 8, like Book 5, is without obscenity (Kay 1985:98). Only one-third of the epigrams in the book are derisive (*Spottepigramme*), compared with

fractions between a half and three-quarters for the first seven books (Szelest 1984:2584).

This introductory poem rests on a neat joke. On the one hand it employs the old contrast between Venus and Pallas Athena to symbolise the difference between amatory, private themes on the one hand and 'official', public on the other. In addition, however, Pallas was one of the favourite deities of the Flavians, as is brought out by the epithet *Caesariana* (see Scott 1936:166-88). Such terms as *laurigeros*, *penates*, *sanctius* are all standard fare in the context of expressing reverence to the emperor.

It can be noticed that the epigram shares many similarities with the preface. In both Martial mentions the idea of entering a religious sanctuary (line 1 of the poem, line 16 of the preface), and *domini* strikes a chord with *domine* in the first line of the preface, as does *uerecundo* with *uerecundiae* (9). The epigram can thus be seen as a fulfilment of an important idea of the preceding preface, namely that it is necessary to be ritually purified before coming into the emperor's presence.

On grounds of literary form one can compare the relationship between the preface and epigram that head Book 1. There some of the ideas mentioned in the prose part of the preface are compacted into and dramatised in a final poem, whose cheekiness consists in the direct address to Cato (1pr18-21). Apart from considerations of tone, a difference between the two pieces is that in 1 the poem is part of the preface (the last prose line reads: 'uideor mihi meo iure facturus si epistolam uersibus clusero...') whereas in 8 the poem is numbered the first of the book.

Martial does not make an explicit request that Domitian aid the circulation of his poems in the direct way that Pliny often asks his private *amici*, but there is no mistaking the subtext of the letter. A

covert inference can be drawn from the very start, when Martial portrays his *libelli* as paying homage to Domitian. In this sentence he pointedly reminds the emperor of his earlier support for his poetry: 'omnes quidem libelli mei...quibus tu famam, id est uitam, dedisti, tibi supplicant'. The obvious implication is that Martial hopes to receive this support once again.

fama is here equated with *uita*, as if Martial says that public acclaim constitutes his livelihood as a poet. In a large number of poems Martial boasts of his worldwide fame, so much so that this is one of the most common *topoi* of the *Epigrams*. Already at 1.1.2 Martial speaks of himself as 'toto notus in orbe Martialis' (cf 5.13.3; 6.64.25; 8.61.3: see further Citroni 1975:15).

One can note, also, that the *libelli* are here personified as *amici* or clients paying the emperor their respects. Compare 8.24, in which the *libellus* is again presented as a *cliens* nervously making a request of the emperor:

si quod forte petam timido gracilique libello,

inproba non fuerit si mea charta, dato. (1-2)

and also 5.6:

admittas timidam breuemque chartam

intra limina sanctioris aulae. (7-8)

In the first quotation the *libellus* is a petition rather than collection of poems. The word-study appended to chapter 2 (sv *libellus*) stressed the ambiguity of this word, which in the context of social relations usually indicates a petition to the emperor, answered by a *subscriptio* (see Millar 1977:240-52, 537-56 and Saller

1982:67-68; an ambiguity unacknowledged by White 1974).

What exactly Martial means by the next sentence is something of a mystery: 'Hic tamen...occasione pietatis frequentius fruitur.' Ker's Loeb translation is not beyond doubt: '...enjoys more frequently the opportunity of showing loyalty.' It may mean either that this, the eighth book, has in it more references to the emperor's *numen*, or that it is brought to the emperor's attention more often than are previous books. Ultimately this comes to mean what is clear from any reading of the book: that homage to the emperor is a more important theme than was the case in previous books.

The nature of this book is such that it offers a combination of adulatory and satirical material, though of course different subjects and people are the target of these different approaches. Clearly even in Martial's time the composition of the collection he refers to (if it was different to the present one) was such that the poet felt some need to explain. And so while excusing the presence of probably independent humorous epigrams amidst the more serious ones in praise of Domitian, Martial rather wittily, if transparently, tells Domitian that repetitious praise will more easily bore the emperor than satiate himself: 'ne caelesti uerecundiae tuae laudes suas, quae facilius te fatigare possint quam nos satiare, omnis uersus ingereret.' The fact that Domitian was the addressee of the collection was clearly of the utmost importance to its content - as is already evident. However, it is worth reflecting a moment on the diction with which Martial speaks of his poetic output. The key phrase has it that there was less need for Martial to struggle using his ingenuity, since the subject matter (viz the emperor) formed a substitute: 'minus itaque ingenio laborandum fuit, in cuius locum materia successerat' (5-6). In 1 *praef ingenium* was used with an unusual negative edge: see *TLL* 7.1.1534.1-32. In a letter to Caninius Rufus the Younger Pliny

described Silius Italicus as having written with greater effort than innate ability: 'scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio' (3.7.5). This reflects a distinction more common than that used here by Martial[9].

The literary ability of the dedicatee

It is surprising that nowhere in the preface does Martial praise Domitian's literary ability. It is a fairly common practice, if not standard procedure, for a writer to praise the talents of the person of whom he requests assistance; thus eg 3.2 to his *libellus* concerning Faustinus, 4.86 about Apollinaris, 9.26 about Nerva, 12.11 to the muse Thalia about Parthenius; Statius elaborately addresses Stella as 'iuuenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime qua parte et uoluisti' (1prl-2), and Melior as 'uir optime nec minus in iudicio litterarum quam in omni uitae colore tersissime (2prl-3). In the preface to his *Natural History* the elder Pliny effusively hails the future Emperor Titus, the addressee and dedicatee of the *epistola* and the work as a whole, with the following:

> fulgurat in nullo umquam uerius dictatoria uis eloquentiae, tribunicia potestas facundiae. quanto tu ore patris laudes tonas! quanto fratris famam! quantus in poetica es! o magna facunditas animi...! (*HN praef* 5)

Nowhere in this preface, nor in any of the prefaces of Martial for that matter, can a comparable example be found. We do know that Domitian was interested and active in literature. On the other hand his oppressive nature also extended at times to literature, and many writers perished in the Domitianic terror. This has been described as

a set of contradictory impulses in Domitian's reign: 'a concern for literature and a tendency to smother it' (Coleman 1986:3115; cf Suet *Dom* 4.4; Tac *Hist* 4.86.9). Martial is silent throughout the corpus on the subject of Domitian's own writing, and yet honours him in this preface. It is possible that this paradox in Martial in itself reflects the ambivalence of the emperor's attitude.

Martial's audience and the placing of the preface

Two phrases at the end of the preface are revealing in terms of Martial's immediate audience or readership, and also of the physical placing of the preface. Firstly, the last sentence provides clear proof that Martial had at least half an eye on a future wider readership. He sees fit to place a very brief epigram at the 'threshold' of the collection, so that those who in the future will read his poems can know that the poet values ritual purification in his preparation to 'address' the emperor: 'ut...lecturi sciant' (17). Martial's standard word for his target audience is *lector*, but there are variations on this. In the preface to Book 12, he says in praise of Rome that if there is anything praiseworthy in his poems, his *listener* was responsible: 'si quid enim est quod in libellis meis placeat, dictauit auditor' (10; cf also 9.84).

The fact that here Martial makes use of a future participle in *lecturi* suggests that the emperor is to have a preview of Martial's work, ie they will read (future tense) only after Domitian has seen it. A topos of later prefaces is the mock-modest one that the dedicatee is the only reader of the work (Janson 1964:148-49). To keep all this in a context, however, it should be realised that, despite the inferences of *lecturi*, nowhere in this preface does Martial focus directly on the idea of publishing. The same can be

said as a general comment on all Martial's prefaces, though the last sentence of 2 *praef* represents something of an exception here.

Secondly, a further glance at the phrasing of the final sentence raises a tricky issue: Where were the prefaces placed physically in the collection of poetry? When Martial here speaks of the epigram as being 'in ipso libelli huius limine', he could mean either that the preface AND the first epigram were in the first column of the papyrus on which the collection of poems were written; or it could be that the 'threshold' refers to some position before the first *pagina* or column. Interestingly, Statius also uses the rather uncommon word *limen* to refer the first poem in Book 3: 'nam primum limen eius Hercules Surrentinus aperit' (3.1.9-10)[10]. In chapter 6, in the context of Martial's second prose preface, it was concluded that the epigram described by Martial as 'extra ordinem paginarum' (Mart 2pr1-2) was in fact on the same side of the papyrus but in a preliminary column (*pace* Birt 1882:142 n3).

F. MARTIAL 9 *PRAEFATIO*

The brief prose letter which heads Martial's ninth book is relevant to this line of inquiry, however opaque its precise sense. The explanatory note ends: 'Vale et para hospitium' (9pr5-6). It is difficult to decide whether this comment was intended in concrete terms (ie that Martial was about to visit Toranius and openly looked forward to his hospitality) or whether it is more abstract than that[11]. It seems likely, at all events, that Martial is here asking for Toranius to ensure a favourable reception for his poems.

One thing about which there can be little doubt is that Toranius was a close friend of the poet. This is suggested by the familiar

formulation of the letter: 'Haue, mi Torani, frater carissime' (9pr1).
The same can be said about the final phrase with its staccato
phrasing.

G. MARTIAL 12 *PRAEFATIO*

The sentiment which ends this preface is very reminiscent of
Statius *Silu* 2 and 4. Martial asks the addressee, Priscus, to read
the collection, critically assessing its merits, so that (provided the
book meets with Priscus' approval) Martial can send to Rome a
collection not only written in Spain but one reflecting the character
of Spain[12]:

> tu uelim ista, quae tantum apud te non periclitantur, diligenter
>
> aestimare et excutere non graueris; et, quod tibi difficillimum
>
> est, de nugis nostris iudices nitore (candore *Housman*) seposito,
>
> ne Romam, si ita decreueris, non Hispaniensem librum mittamus, sed
>
> Hispanum. (12pr22-27)[13]

Like Statius' prefaces, this piece ends with its request. The
difference, however, is that this request appears to be more sincerely
formulated than those of Statius. Difference in circumstances counts
for a great deal here. Whereas Statius was at the end of a career at
Rome publishing his occasional poems as a parting shot after a career
which included the writing of very different poetry (see Hardie 1983:
esp 65), Martial was quite probably in a very different position.
Having left Rome to escape the unpleasant client's duties he so
complained about, the tone and content of this letter make it clear
that the supposed life of literary leisure in retirement at Spain was

not materialising, for the unexpected reasons he outlines in the preface itself. In these circumstances it would have been very helpful for him if his reputation at Rome could continue to bring him material benefits. Possibly, Martial felt the need to keep open the prospect of a return to Rome, even at this late stage of his life. The support of an influential *amicus* (as Priscus probably was) could well have been of great value in such circumstances.

Following on from this, it is quite likely that the assessment and advice Statius speaks of at the end of the preface is seriously intended (cf Van Dam 1984a:53). In all likelihood Martial, away from the literary and political nexus of Rome, needed tactful advice from someone more attuned to the political/literary climate than himself. Whereas Statius' requests for criticism were seen to have a formulaic ring to them, Martial stresses that he wants sincere advice, even if this is not in keeping with their friendly relationship. This is clear from the fact that Martial says it is difficult, or at least awkward, for Priscus to give completely honest advice in this manner, as well as 'candore seposito' (following Housman's text).

CONCLUSION

The prefatory requests discussed in this chapter seem all to be concerned ultimately with the desire to receive the support of patrons. This underlines both the epistolary character of the prefaces and the importance of social context to the *Epigrams* and the *Siluae*. The tone and language of Mart 8 *praef* amply illustrates the special circumstances involved in making an appeal to the emperor. Given the ill-defined and uncertain circumstances of patronage relationships, it is not surprising that these requests vary from

being direct and overt (if partly formulaic) in the case of Stat *Silu*
1-4 *praefs* and Mart 12 *praef*, to being covert and merely implied, as
in Stat *Silu* 5 *praef* and Mart 8 *praef*.

NOTES

[1] Thus for example Sherwin-White (1966:115), White (1978:85) and
Saller (1983:247), Van Dam (1984a:62).

[2] eg Ov *Fast* 1.19-20; Phaed 3 *praef* 62-63. The phenomenon is
documented by Curtius (1953:83-85), and cf Van Dam (1984a:53);
see also chapter 1 of this thesis with respect to prefatory
commonplaces, especially in oratory.

[3] This phenomenon appears to be largely undocumented in the
secondary literature on epistolography. However, Bradford Welles
(1934:xli-1, esp xlii-xliv) has shown how request, often verging
on instruction, is a standard theme of Hellenistic letters.

[4] Letters of recommendation also involve a request - that the
recipient support the subject of the letter - but diverge
slightly from the pattern in that an entire letter rather than
just the final section is usually devoted to the request for
support (see further Cotton 1981:1-6): thus Plin *Ep* 1.2; 3.2;
4.4; 5.19; 6.6; 7.31 (cf Fronto *Ep ad amicos* 1.7-9; 2.6).

[5] It must be admitted, though, that the requests of Statius and
Martial do not evidence the most common formulae of requests as
identified by Hofmann (1936:127-30, #117-20): *amabo*, *quaeso* and
oro.

[6] T Flavius Abascantus (*PIR*² F 194), previously Augustus' freedman
ab epsitulis, returned to favour and office under Domitian.

[7] Recent studies of ruler cult in the Roman empire have focused on

Asia Minor and the western empire, eg Price (1984a) and Fishwick (1987) respectively.

[8] A note about titulature. Domitian assumed the *cognomen* 'Germanicus' (Suet *Dom* 13.3); Holder (1977:151) has put the date at AD 83; see also Merkelbach (1979) and Coleman (1986:66). On Domitian's divinity more generally see Scott (1936:102-25) and Bengtson (1979:218-25).

[9] For the use of *materia* in the context of writing poetry see *TLL* 8.461.4-29 as well as Horace *Ars Poetica* 38 with Brink (1971:122-23) *ad loc*.

[10] For the metaphorical sense of this word see *TLL* 7.2.1406.63- 70 and *OLD* sv *limen* 4.

[11] *TLL* 6.3.3039.73-3040.37 is not particularly helpful on this occasion: 'de actione hospitalitatis (proprie)', cf Cic *Att* 9.6.2; 13.50.4; 13.52.2; 14.2.4; and Prop 3.23.16; Virg *Aen* 1.299.

[12] The last line has been well translated as: '...so that I won't be sending to Rome, if that is your decision, a volume not so much written in Spain as written in Spanish' (J P Sullivan *apud* Bowie 1988:30).

[13] Housman (1972:733-34, with further references) has defended his emendation, which is far from the MS readings of *nidore* (β) and *nitore* (γ), defining *candor* as 'that temper of mind which impels men to think well of the work of others'.

Chapter 8

THE PROSE STYLE OF THE PREFACES

This chapter is devoted to a stylistic examination of the prose prefaces, with specific attention to their clausulae. It is divided into two sections, focusing on Martial and Statius in turn. Within each half, the first section is a study of style in general terms, and this is followed by an analysis of the poet's use of prose rhythm. In the sections on prose rhythm I refer to two tables - appendices A and B at the end of this chapter[1] - showing (a) the provenance of clausulae expressed in numerical terms and (b) their relative frequency, expressed as percentages.

A. MARTIAL

The difference in content, if not intention, between Martial's five prefaces is matched by a marked disparity in prose style. This involves a range from the careful formality of the preface to Book 1 to the perfunctory brevity of 9 *praef*, which was obviously sent to an intimate friend. The remaining three prefaces can be situated between these extremes.

With its prolix and rather plain style, 1 *praef* has very much the feel of a public statement. The emphasis is on clarity rather than rhetorical flourish, and perhaps the only notable figure of speech is the anaphora and asyndeton of 'sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus, sic quicumque perlegitur' (10-12)[2]. Particularly at the beginning, where the poet is at his most defensive, sentences are long and phrased carefully, with an eye no

doubt to possible criticism:

> Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis
> queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salua infimarum
> quoque personarum reuerentia ludant; quae adeo antiquis auctoribus
> defuit ut nominibus non tantum ueris abusi sint sed et magnis.
> (1-5)

The end of the preface witnesses a more polemical stance on the poet's part, as suggested by the change to briefer, more matter-of-fact sentences:

> Epigrammata illis scribuntur qui solent spectare Florales. Non
> intret Cato theatrum meum, aut si intrauerit, spectet. Videor mihi
> meo iure facturus si epistolam uersibus clusero: (14-17)

Most of the verbs in the preface are jussive subjunctives (*constet* 5; *absit* 6; *intret* 15; *spectet* 16); the other main verbs also lack the force of factual statements: '*spero* me secutum...tale temperamentum' (1); 'Si quis tam ambitiose tristis est...*potest* epistola uel potius titulo contentus esse' (13); '*uideor* mihi meo iure facturus...' (16). All this points to the scrupulously formal tone of the preface as a whole.

2 *praef* is perhaps the most 'rhetorical' of the prefaces, both because of its extended use of the rhetorical figure 'anthupophora' (Coffey 1976:236 n27)[3], and also because of the presence of colourful idiom. This rhetorical figure, 'in which an objection is refuted by contrary reference or allegation' (*OED* 2nd ed 514; cf Quint 9.3.87 and Dion Hal *Dem* 54), sees Decianus quoted at some length on the subject

of the undesirability of prose prefaces. This part of the preface, which comprises the first ten lines, begins with three rhetorical questions (lines 1-3), followed by explanation (4-8), whereafter Decianus is made to state his own view, enjoining Martial to follow suit (8-11).

This part of the preface is characterised by striking images and colloquial language, beginning with 'Quid nobis...cum epistola?' (2). From the context, the expression *epistolam faciunt* (8) seems to be idiomatic usage meaning '...justify themselves with an introductory apologia in letter form'[4]. Decianus is quoted as saying that epigram does not need a 'crier' or 'herald' (*praeco*): 'epigrammata *curione* non egent' (6)[5]. The preface also evidences vivid images in close succession:

Noli ergo...rem facere ridiculam et *in toga saltantis* inducere *personam*. Denique uideris an te delectet *contra retiarium ferula*. (8-10)

The overall effect of these various rhetorical and stylistic effects is to suggest that the preface is indeed tongue-in-cheek.

At least at its start, 8 *praef* is less formal in tone than one might expect, given that it is addressed to the emperor Domitian. The word *domine* in the opening line denotes respect, as indeed does the content of the preface generally, but the clipped clauses at least of the first sentence seem more informal; *puto* (3) is even a colloquial touch[6]:

Omnes quidem libelli mei, domine, quibus tu famam, id est uitam, dedisti, tibi supplicant; et, puto, propter hoc legentur. (3-5)

With the possible exception of this opening sentence, the preface is written in a full style with plenty of linking words (*tamen* 5, 13; *itaque* 6; *quidem* 8; *autem* 11; *quam* 7 and *quod* 17 as connecting relatives)[7]. None of the six sentences lacks a subordinate clause.

The familiar beginning and end to the prose of 9 *praef* - 'Haue mi Torane, frater carissime' and 'Vale et para hospitium' - suggest a perfunctory and informal quality which is borne out by the style of the intervening section. Although the prose is highly metrical, it lacks any touches of high-flown rhetoric. The factual, explanatory purpose of the letter is seen both by the relative clauses of the first sentence (followed by a connecting relative), and by the fact that the second sentence sees the author all but apologising for having written the letter:

Epigramma, *quod* extra ordinem paginarum est, ad Stertinium clarissimum uirum scripsimus, *qui* imaginem meam ponere in bibliotheca sua uoluit. *De quo* scribendum tibi putaui, ne ignorares Auitus iste quis uocaretur. (prose lines 1-5)

12 *praef*, the last of Martial's prose prefaces has, like the first, the formal feel of a public statement. If it was in fact originally a letter between friends, it seems likely either that Priscus was not a close friend of the poet, or that the original letter was later revised for publication[8]. It is perhaps worth bearing in mind that both 1 *praef* and 12 *praef* are prefaces in which the element of justification is most important, albeit on completely different grounds.

The preface divides into two sections, separated by 'Accipe ergo rationem' (6-7). In the first the poet pleads guilty to (imaginary?) charges of literary inactivity over the period of three years since retiring to Bilbilis: 'contumacissimae trienni desidiae' (1-2). In the second and larger part he gives his reasons, sometimes in fairly impassioned terms, for this (7-22). The preface ends (22-27) with a request that Priscus comment critically on the collection.

In keeping with its self-conscious quality, the piece has a number of rhetorical flourishes. Describing those parts of Roman life which boosted his writing, the poet says: 'illam iudiciorum subtilitatem, illud materiarum ingenium, bibliothecas, theatra, conuictus,...' (10-12). This list employs asyndeton and, in the first two clauses, parallelism and polyptoton. It is also possible to point to alliteration (cf de la Calle 1935:14): 'et sine solacio et sine excusatione secessimus' (6). The final sentence evidences not only alliteration but also word-play, the latter inviting comparison with the style of the epigrams themselves, which often end with a witty resolution (cf eg Kay 1985:7-9):

et, quod tibi difficillimum est, de nugis nostris iudices nitore seposito, ne Romam, si ita decreueris, non Hispaniensem librum mittamus, sed Hispanum. (24-27)

The word-play of the last line may be cited as indicative of the predilection for pointed antithesis evidenced in prose writers of the first century AD (cf Norden 1923:288). This is, however, the exception rather than the rule, and it does seem that 12 *praef* is on a more elevated stylistic level than the other four prefaces. The above examples illustrate the 'extremely careful, sometimes mannered, structural arrangements and effects, with a noticeable building of art

as the piece progresses' (Bowie 1988:14).

It should be clear that Martial's prefaces vary greatly in their stylistic level, which suggests that each piece was intended for a different purpose on an *ad hoc* basis. In general it can be said that Martial makes use of plain, unadorned syntax. His prose contains a fair amount of subordination (eg relative clauses), but this contributes to the clarity of the prose rather than detracting from it. In stylistic terms, Martial has not made extensive use of the 'pointed' style characteristic of Silver Latin[9] nor with the florid quality that characterises the prefaces to the *Siluae*. Howell's comparison of Martial's prose style with that of Quintilian (1980:96) seems exaggerated.

Martial's prose rhythm

The prose prefaces of Martial are highly metrical, as illustrated by Havet (1903), and exhibit much the same pattern as those of Statius. Appendix B illustrates the overall similarity, and here I shall underline some of the more significant elements. In both sets of prose prefaces the cretic predominates, along with the molossus and its resolutions, as a penultimate rhythm. These account for 59 of the 93 identifiable clausulae, or 90%. The same percentage applies to the Statian prefaces. By the same token, the trochee/spondee and cretic are Martial's most common final rhythm, totalling 70 in number, or 75% (cf 76% in the case of the *Siluae*).

Whereas the cretic-trochee (or -spondee) and double cretic together amount to 57% of Statius' final sequences, the figure reads 55% (51 out of 93) in the case of Martial. These similarities are particularly striking when considered in the combinations above rather

than for individual clausulae.

Compared with the prose prefaces of Statius, there seems in Martial a discernible difference in the rhythmic patterns among the various prefaces, which might suggest either a change in prose style in the course of Martial's writing career or a difference in purpose and status between the five prose pieces.

In 1 *praef* there is a marked preference for the penultimate cretic (12 occurrences out of 20 clausulae, or 75%) and the final trochee/spondee (60%), particularly following a penultimate cretic (60%). The subsequent prefaces do not reveal the same degree of preference: for the remaining four these three figures read 60%, 40%, and 33% for the combined sequence.

Just as Martial's first prose preface shows the narrowest range of clausulae, so the final and longest, 12 *praef*, makes the most varied use of rhythms. Not only is 12 *praef* the only preface to deploy all the four penultimate and four final rhythms identified by Raven (1965:170), but it also makes broadest use of the combinations. Though the penultimate cretic (55%) and final trochee/spondee (45%) still dominate, the combined sequence amounts to a relatively low 38%, or 11 out of 29 clausulae.

A noteworthy feature of this preface is the occurrence of the uncommon epitrite as a penultimate rhythm on three occasions:

12*pr*5 prouinciali solitudine D+c

   22 exciperem aduentoria sua D+d

   23 tantum apud te non periclitantur D+d

although it occurs twice also in 8 *praef* (cf Statius *Silu* 2*pr*14 'in arborem certe tuam'):

8*pr*6-7   ingenio laborandum fuit   D+b

9   uerecundiae tuae laudes suas   D+b

It is clear that Martial uses strong clausulae to conclude the prose section of each preface:

1*pr*17   uersibus clusero   A+b

2*pr*15   lassi peruenient   B+a

8*pr*18   placuit epigrammate   A(res)+b

9*pr*5-6   et para hospitium   A+a(res)

12*pr*26-27   mittamus sed Hispanum   A+a

There are only two hexameter endings in Martial's prose:

8*pr*10   nos satiare

12*pr*6-7   Accipe ergo rationem

The second of these may perhaps be explained on the grounds that this is a short but pivotal sentence in the structure of the preface (as shown above), and for this reason is conspicuously phrased. No such reason can be advanced for 'nos satiare'.

B. STATIUS

The prefaces to the *Siluae* do not appear to be pitched at a high stylistic level, though Statius is not averse to the occasional flourish. He seems to have used a small range of standard clausulae, and this suggests at least some consciousness of style.

Relative clauses feature conspicuously as an element of Statius'
prose style. These should be seen in the same light as the elaborate
descriptive phrases or clauses with which Statius addresses the
recipients of his first three books of *Siluae*. A definite pattern
emerges: 'Stella iuuenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime
qua parte et uoluisti' (1pr1-2). (This may be compared with other
opening addresses discussed below.) '[Ursum] iuuenem candidissimum et
sine iactura desidiae doctissimum' (2pr18-19); Septimius Severus is
described as 'iuuenem, uti scis, inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis,
tuum quidem et condiscipulum, sed mihi citra hoc quoque ius artissime
carum' (4pr11-13). The relative clauses, which usually offer some
sort of explanation, are sometimes used in close succession: thus
'qua...exemit', 'cuius accipies', 'quam scribo' in

> tertio uiam Domitianam miratus sum qua grauissimam arenarum moram
> exemit: cuius [sc Domitiani] beneficio tu quoque maturius
> epistulam meam accipies quam tibi in hoc libro a Neapoli scribo.
> (4pr7-10)

and 'quos feci' and 'quam...opus' in

> centum hos uersus quos in ecum maximum feci, indulgentissimo
> imperatori postero die quam dedicauerat opus, tradere iussus sum.
> (1pr17-19)

In keeping with the inventory aspect of the prefaces, Statius
follows as standard procedure the method of using a relative clause
(or otherwise a shorter phrase) to describe the recipient of each poem
or, occasionally, the poem itself. The preface to the first book will
serve as an example. The sentence quoted immediately above refers to

1.1. Speaking of the following poem, Statius speaks of Stella 'qui epithalamium tuum quod mihi iniunxeras scis biduo scriptum' (1pr20-22). Manilius Vopiscus, to whom 1.3 is addressed, is labelled 'vir eruditissimus et qui praecipue uindicat a situ litteras iam paene fugientis' (1pr24-25). Statius speaks of Claudius Etruscus as 'qui balneolum a me suum intra moram cenae recepit' (31-32, where the 'little bath' referred to is poem 1.5). The last poem of the collection, entitled in the preface 'Kalendae Decembres' is said 'at least to have credence': 'quibus utique creditur' (32-33) - comment which would be more easily comprehensible if the last lines of the preface were extant.

This type of relative clause, using the indicative, may be described as 'determinative' (Woodcock 1959:187)[10], and should be distinguished from the generalizing, consecutive and concessive types, all of which take their verb in the subjunctive.

In general terms, three elements of the Statian prefaces can be contrasted on stylistic grounds. In the above discussion of the inventory aspect we can appreciate the stylistic implications of the many descriptions which are so important in the prefaces to the *Siluae*. It is already apparent that in giving a limited amount of information concerning a poem or its addressee Statius has to use a highly subordinated, if sometimes repetitive style. The style of these descriptions is fairly plain and unelaborate, the emphasis being on clarity rather than on stylish variation.

However, the second, dedicatory, element of the prefaces reveals a marked preference for lengthy sentences and involved syntax. For example, the initial addresses quoted at the head of this chapter are in a much more elaborate style. This is the most formal element and consequently the most artificial in stylistic terms. In the following quotations from the start of the first three prefaces the underlining,

which indicates the main clauses, illustrates the fragmentation of the main clause, as well as the intricacy of the sentence as a whole:

> <u>Diu multumque dubitaui</u>, Stella iuuenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime qua parte et uoluisti, <u>an hos libellos</u>, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi uoluptate fluxerunt, cum singuli de sinu meo pro<fugissent>, <u>congregatos ipse dimitterem</u>. (1pr1-5)

> <u>Et familiaritas nostra</u> qua gaudeo, Melior uir optime nec minus in iudicio litterarum quam in omni uitae colore tersissime, <u>et ipsa opusculorum</u> quae tibi trado <u>conditio sic posita est</u> ut totus hic ad te liber meus etiam sine epistola spectet. (2pr1-4)

> <u>Tibi certe</u>, Polli dulcissime et hac cui tam fideliter inhaeres quiete dignissime, <u>non habeo diu probandam libellorum istorum temeritatem</u>, cum scias multos ex illis in sinu tuo subito natos et hanc audaciam stili nostri frequenter· expaueris, quotiens in illius facundiae tuae penetrali seductus altius litteras intro et in omnis a te studiorum ducor. (3pr1-6)

In each case the lengthy appellations, 'Stella...uoluisti', 'Melior...tersissime' and 'Polli...dignissime', create a sense of anticipation in that they interrupt the main clause.

The third aspect is that by which Statius counters criticism or predicted criticism of his work. This 'informal and jocular polemic' has stylistic implications in that it usually involves a change to briefer sentences couched in a question-and- answer pattern (Coleman 1988:58). This is evidenced particularly in 1pr5-15 and 4pr24-35.

sed et sphaeromachia spectantes et palaris lusio admittit.
nouissime, quisquis ex meis inuitus aliquid legit, statim se
profitetur aduersum. ita quare consilio eius accedam? in summam,
nempe ego sum qui traducor; taceat et gaudeat. (4pr30-34)

Statius' prose rhythm

Like those of Martial, Statius' prefaces reveal a strong
tendency toward a limited number of standard Ciceronian prose rhythms,
particularly the cretic-trochee and the double cretic. Of the 148
identifiable clausulae in the prefaces to the *Siluae*, 70 (=47%) end
with a trochee or spondee, and 42 (=28%) with a cretic. This means
that these two rhythms, together accounting for 112 or 76%, easily
outnumber all the rest put together. Even greater is the predominance
of the cretic (94 times =64%), and the molossus and its resolutions
(39, =26%) as penultimate rhythms. Together they total 90% (ie 133)
of all Statius' penultimate sequences.

The most frequent combination of rhythms in the *Siluae* prefaces
is the cretic-trochee (or -spondee), which occurs 57 times or 39%.
This and the double-cretic, the next most common pattern, account for
84 clausulae, 57% of the total.

(a) Cretic-trochee

The importance of this as a final clausula is proven by the fact
that it ends the second, fourth and fifth prefaces (the end of the
first being lost): 'me reuertantur' (2pr28-29), 'minus, reprehendemur'
(4pr35) and 'inuenisse materiam' (5ep12). Its profusion can be
clearly seen in three successive clausulae in 1 *praef*: 'gratiam
celeritatis....longius tractum...diebus effusa' (13-15). The first

and last of these end sentences.

Other examples:

2*pr*4 epistola spectet A+a

15-16 epigrammatis loco scriptos A+a

3*pr*6 studiorum sinus ducor A+a

4*pr*27-28 dissuadere rem factam A+a

5*ep*2-3 morum tuorum pars A+a

Given the predominance of this rhythm, it is tempting to prefer Postgate's emendation *pro<cucurrissent>* at 1pr4, above Phillimore's *pro<fugissent>* and Krohn's *pro<uolassent>*[11]. The first gives a cretic-trochee, whereas the other two give a less usual double-trochee. *procucurrissent* is however longer than the thirteen letters suggested by the size of the lacuna in *M*.

(b) Double-cretic

This ending is common in the prefaces with the exception of 3 *praef*, where it is used only twice (=8%). By contrast, in the second preface (26%) it is used as follows in successive clausulae of the same sentence: 'ceteris indico...et dolenti datum...tarda solatia' (11-13). Other examples are:

1*pr*4-5 ipse dimitterem A+b

2*pr*1 nostra qua gaudeo A+b

2-3 colore tersissime A+b

3*pr*4 frequenter expaueris A+b

4*pr*31-32 inuitus aliquid legit A(res)+b

33-34 taceat et gaudeat A(res)+b

5*ep*3-4   praecipue marito potest   A(res)+b

  8   lacrimas tuas transeo   A+b

(c) Trochaic endings

It is already evident that the single trochee (or spondee) is a common ending, particularly after the cretic.   A common alternative is the double-trochee, which occurs 27 times (=18%). This is usually preceded by a molossus (11 times, 7%) or a cretic (8 times, 5%). Three successive clausulae in 3 *praef* ending with a double-trochee are 'Hercules Surrentinus aperit', 'litore tuo consecratum' and 'statim ut uideram' (10-11).

1*pr*23   pro collega mentieris   B+c

  30-31   sunt Kalendae Decembres   A+c

2*pr*23-24   forte +consuleremus+   A+c

3*pr*19-20   uersibus dedicarem   A+c

  22-23   persuadere malit quam placere   D+c

4*pr*15   de ipsis studiis meretur   B(res)+c

  18   Thebaidos meae publicaui   A+c

  26-27   hoc stili genus edidissem   D(res)+c

(d) Anomalies

Three clausulae distinguish themselves from the largely Ciceronian pattern of Statius' prose rhythm.   There is one hexameter ending:

2*pr*18   Vrsum quoque nostrum

On one occasion the sequence of trochees goes well beyond the norm
(cf Raven 1965:170):

5ep10 qui bona fide deos colit

Prose rhythm suggests that *complexus* (2pr6) should be taken as
an accusative plural of the fourth-declension noun, that is assuming
that its final syllable is long. Such a reading makes this clausula a
double trochee (*complexus amabam*). This, though less frequent than
the other two rhythmic patterns mentioned above, is much more likely
than the alternative of taking the word to be the masculine singular
of the the past participle from *complector*, which would result in an
unattractive hexameter ending: *complexus amabam*. Courtney has
obelized the entire phrase 'apud te complexus amabam iam non tibi' and
suggested a lacuna here.

NOTES

[1] In this chapter and its appendices I use to the abbreviations as
at Raven (1965:170). Penultimate sequence: A̲ cretic, B̲ molossus,
C̲ choriamb, D̲ epitrite. Final sequence: a̲ trochee/spondee, b̲
cretic, c̲ double trochee, d̲ trochaic sequence
(long-short-long-short-long).

[2] There is a textual discrepancy here between *scripsit* in *B*, and
the historic present *scribit* in *C*.

[3] Assuming, with Janson (1964:110) and Bowie (1988:13), that
Martial is not in fact quoting the actual words of a real person.

[4] cf *TLL* 5.2B.683.23-47 sv *epistula*; implying more than Ker's
'constitute an epistle' suggests.

[5] cf Treb *Gall* 12.4; Symm *Epist* 6.12.1: *TLL* 4.1489.43-52 sv *curio*); and cf Otto (1890:274 [#1386] and 299 [#1531])

[6] Thus Hofmann (1936:114-16) and *L-H-S* (1965:528-29 #289).

[7] cf Von Albrecht (1989:120) on the younger Seneca

[8] The possibility that an original letter was later revised for wider circulation is more likely if this collection was published before his death in AD 101 or 102 rather than posthumously. It is probable that a posthumous editor would have left such a letter untouched, as seems to have been the case with Stat 5 *epist*.

[9] As demonstrated by Summers (1910:xv-xcv) in the case of the younger Seneca; cf Norden (1923:270-343).

[10] cf Cic *Sen* 10 'Ego Q Maximum, eum qui Tarentum recepit, dilexi': 'telling "what" person or thing is referred to, not "what sort of"' (Woodcock 1959:187-88)

[11] None of these is supported by Courtney.

APPENDIX A : OCCURRENCE OF CLAUSULAE (NUMERICAL)

	PENULTIMATE A	B	C	D	dac	no	FINAL a	b	c	d	Total	A+a	A+b	A+c	A+d	B+a	B+b	B+c	B+d	C+a	C+b	C+c	C+d	D+a	D+b	D+c	D+d	tr sq	hex
MARTIAL																													
1 praef	15	5					12	5	2	1	20	12	3				2	2	1										
2 praef	13	5			1	1	8	5	2	4	19	6	5	1		2	1	1	2									1	
8 praef	10	3	1	2	1	1	5	11	2	2	18	4	5		1		3				1				2				
9 praef	5	2					3	2	2		7	3	1	1			1	1											
12 praef	16	8	1	4			13	6	6	4	29	11	1	4		2	3	1	2		1	1			1	1	2		
Subtotals	84						70				93	51																	
Total											93																		
STATIUS																													
1 praef	22	7	3	2			17	8	7	2	34	13	5	3	1	1	3	3		3									
2 praef	24	4	2	3	1	1	16	11	7	1	35	13	9	2		1	1	3	3	2	1								1
3 praef	12	7	4	1	1	1	12	6	6	4	24	9	2	1	1	1	4	2		2		2			1		1		1
4 praef	26	9		3	1		17	12	5	4	39	15	8	2	1	3	3	2	3			2		1	1	1			
5 epist	10	3		1		2	8	5	2	1	16	7	3				1	1			1				1	1		1 (1c)	
Subtotals	133						112					84																	
Total											148																		

Legend :

dac = DACTYL

no = NO DISCERNIBLE

tr sq = TROCHAIC SEQUENCE

hex = HEXAMETER

APPENDIX B : OCCURRENCE OF CLAUSULAE (PERCENTAGE)

	PENULTIMATE						FINAL				COMBINATIONS																	
	A	B	C	D	dac	no	a	b	c	d	A+a	A+b	A+c	A+d	B+a	B+b	B+c	B+d	C+a	C+b	C+c	C+d	D+a	D+b	D+c	D+d	tr sq	hex
MARTIAL																												
1 praef	75	25					60	25	10	5	60	15			10	10	10	5										
2 praef	68	26				5	42	26	11	21	32	26	5	5	11		5	11	9									5
8 praef	56	17	6	11		6	28	61	11	11	22	28	6	6	17	17	8		8	6	8			11				6
9 praef	71	29					43	29	29		43	14	14		14	14	14											6
12 praef	55	28	3	14			45	21	21	14	38	3	14		7	10	2	7		3				3	3	7		
Subtotals		90					75				55																	
Total											93																	
STATIUS																												
1 praef	65	21	9	6			6	24	21	6	34	15	9	3	38	9	9		9									3
2 praef	69	11	6	9	3	3	46	31	20	3	35	26	6	3	3	3	9				6		3	6	4		3	3
3 praef	50	29	17	4			50	25	25		24	36	8	4	4	17	8				8							
4 praef	67	23		8	3		44	31	13	10	39	44	21	5	3	3	8	5					3	3	3			3 ← error
5 epist	63	19		6		13	50	31	13	6	16	44	19		6	6	5	8						6			6	6 (6c)
Subtotals		90					76				57																	
Total											148																	

Legend :
dac = DACTYL
no = NO DISCERNIBLE
tr sq = TROCHAIC SEQUENCE
hex = HEXAMETER

THE VERSE PREFACES OF MARTIAL AND STATIUS

In determining the usefulness (or otherwise) of the prose prefaces of
Martial and Statius it is necessary to examine what alternatives were
open to the poets as a mode of introduction. Here the differences in
nature between the *Siluae* and *Epigrams* are especially apparent -
particularly those resulting from the relative length of the former.
In the case of Martial, I shall enter into some speculation as to how
the pre-publication *libelli* might have been prefaced, and then offer a
survey of the existing introductions to books which have no prose
preface.

A. STATIUS

The *Siluae* in their current form contain no verse prefaces, and
therefore we have no basis for direct comparison with the prose
prefaces. As was made clear in chapter 1, there was in classical
antiquity no shortage of models for verse prefaces to verse, or prose
prefaces to prose works. It would have been perfectly possible *a
priori* for Statius to have introduced a collection of *Siluae* with a
poem, particularly if this were in one of the 'lesser' metres, as is
the case in Persius' choliambic prologue (cf Harvey 1981:9-10). But,
as will be discussed in the conclusion of this thesis, it appears that
the idea of a verse preface to occasional poetry went against the
grain: in such a context a verse proem would dilute the honour
accorded to the recipients of individual poems, whereas the use of a
different (prose) form circumvented this problem.

By way of comparison, I shall survey briefly the proems to Statius' other extant poems, the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid*. Differences in genre and social context make for a very different type of preface; the pre-publication *libelli*, so important in the dissemination of the *Siluae*, are not likely to have been a very important phase in the genesis of the epics[1].

Thebaid

The first 45 lines of the *Thebaid* are of a prefatory nature. Here Statius sets the scene for the epic by sketching of the mythological context: *fraternas acies* (1) and *sontes...Thebas* (2) suggest from the start the Theban myth. The phrase 'unde iubetis/ ire, deae' (3-4) serves a double function: it is, with its direct address, in effect an invocation of the muses (cf 'quem prius heroum, Clio, dabis?' 41) and, in addition, it highlights the earlier sections of the legend not covered in the poem, as does the subsequent 'gentisne canam primordia dirae...?' (4) - a gesture necessitated by the complexity of the Theban legend.

A substantial section of the proem (17-33) is an extended dedication to the emperor Domitian, described as 'Latiae decus addite famae' (22). This includes a *recusatio* in which the poet promises yet to praise Domitian's deeds: 'cum Pierio tua fortior oestro/ facta canam' (32-33; cf 'Pierius menti calor incidit' 3). On stylistic grounds Kytzler (1960:337-40) has suggested that this was interpolated at a later stage, but this has been disputed (Schetter 1962:204-17). In his analysis of the proem Vessey (1973:60-67) has shown how Statius presents the central characters of the poem in an antithetical and almost allegorical arrangement[2].

Statius' unfinished epic has a proem of only 19 lines, which nonetheless has all the elements of the *Thebaid* proem, though less of the *dramatis personae*. Lacking the apparent diffidence which characterises the earlier proem, it begins with a 7-line sentence obviously imitating the beginning of *Iliad*:

> Magnanimum Aeaciden formidatamque Tonanti
>
> progeniem et patrio uetitam succedere caelo,
>
> diua, refer. ...

Various references (eg *Scyro* 5, *Hectore tracto* 6) in this initial sentence make it clear that Achilles is the subject of the poem. Then comes a further request that Apollo supply the inspiration ('da fontes mihi, Phoebe, nouos...' 9), in which Statius mentions his earlier epic.

Statius ends the proem with a *recusatio* deferentially addressed (*at tu...* 14) to the emperor Domitian, who is praised for both his military and poetic prowess: 'cui geminae florent uatumque ducumque/ certatim laurus - olim dolet altera uinci...' (15-16). The current poem is modestly described as a prelude to a greater one about Domitian's exploits: 'te longo necdum fidente paratu/ molimur magnusque tibi praeludit Achilles' (18-19).

Many elements of these introductions are formalities of the epic genre, eg the *recusatio* and request for inspiration. Yet there is some overlap between these and the prefaces to the *Siluae*, most notably the dedications. Given the generic differences, there is another point of comparison. Whereas the epic proems are programmatic

in the sense that they orientate the listener/reader within the mythlogical context of the poems, the *Siluae* prefaces provide some brief information sketching the social background of individual poems.

B. MARTIAL

I. Prefaces to the *libelli*

Once again, a major stumbling-block in the study of the Epigrams is our lack of evidence concerning the nature of the ancient *libellus*. Since not much is known about the proportions of such pre-publication collections, very little can be said with certainty about their introductions. However, a number of epigrams cover the same ground as the prefaces, and may be considered to have fulfilled a similar function at some stage of their production. In fact many such poems make little sense in their current position in the middle of Martial's corpus, whereas their subject-matter and tone often suggest that they may have headed some type of collection at an earlier stage of literary production. The survey of the prefatory poems reveals the diverse nature of these epigrams[3].

White (1974:56) has identified 'about forty poems which announce the presentation of a book'. These poems exhibit a 'limited range of overtures': those in which Martial (a) offers a collection of poems as a gift to a dedicatee, eg 1.111; 3.2; 4.10; 5.18; 7.17; 7.84; 9.58; 9.99; 10.18; (b) submits a collection ostensibly to the literary judgment of experts, eg 4.86; 5.80; 6.1; 7.28; 9.26; (c) pleads for a leisurely or tolerant reading, 1.4; 4.14; 5.30; 5.80; 7.97; 10.64; 11.15; 11.106; 12.1; (d) asks the recipient to forward his poems to a

third party whose support is desired, eg 4.82; 5.6; 7.68; 7.80; 10.93; 12.11; (e) asks an *amicus* for protection against slanderers, eg 1.52; 7.72; 10.33; (f) personifies the book as an adventurous youth entrusted to the care of friends, eg 3.2; 3.5; 7.26. In the first part of this chapter I shall be concerned to question the validity of this 'limited range of overtures'.

However useful such categories may be, a conceptual problem comes to the fore here. Such identification of 'prefatory poems' cannot be made with any certainty. It is justifiable, however, to see some overlap between the CONTENT of the prefaces and that of certain epigrams; it is in this light that White's categories should be viewed. At the same time it must be acknowledged that these poems should not be taken at face-value, but rather as essays on standard topoi, often representing a kind of standard literary joke between friends; the epigrams generally may be described as 'an exercise more in form than in substance' (Plass 1985:190).

Having set White's categories in this context, it is necessary to add some further qualifications. If it is a matter of showing the overlap between the sort of issues covered in both epigrams and prefaces, some other categories may be added. There are many poems whose content may also be considered in some sense prefatory, and may thus be considered as possible introductory poems. (a) There is a steady stream of statements by Martial on matters of literary style, which he often considers vis-à-vis that of other poets. Examples of these can be cited as 4.49; 7.12, 25, 68; 10.45; 11.15-17[4].

(b) White's fifth category deserves greater internal definition. It could be divided further into such categories: (i) Those people attacking Martial, eg 9.50, 81, 97; 10.5; (ii) those stealing from his work and passing it off as their own - the *plagiarii*, eg 1.29, 38, 52, 53, 72; 2.20; 12.63; (iii) the *maligni interpretes*, or those who add

their own poetry to his collections, thus potentially making him guilty of slander, eg 10.3, 5, 100 (cf Friedlaender 1886:9).

In the search for these 'prefatory' epigrams, one might add (c) the poems in which Martial places himself in the tradition of earlier poets, especially epigrammatists, eg 1.61; 4.23; 5.5, 10 (see Citroni 1975:3); (d) epigrams giving instructions as to where Martial's poems can be obtained, eg 1.2, 117; 7.51; and (e) those in which he shows awareness of his potential audience for his epigrams eg 3.68, 69, 86; 5.2; 11.16. This category could be broadened to include those which link his poems with mime (3.86; 9.28), the Floralia and Saturnalia (1.35; 3.86; 11.6, 15; cf Citroni 1989:212-14) and contrast them with such stock figures as the Fabricii and the elder Cato (6.64; 10.20; 11.2; cf Nordh 1954).

Lastly, the significance of the emperor as a conspicuous recipient at the start or end of certain books (eg 6.4; 8.82) cannot be overlooked. It may be asked whether other poems addressed to, or simply concerning, the emperor were not at some stage prominently placed in smaller collections. As will become clear in the following section, the emperor naturally takes on important proportions when at the head of a collection, whether or not the poems concerned are specifically dedicatory.

The categories listed above are necessarily speculative and inconclusive. In our attempts to identify introductory epigrams which might have headed earlier collections there can be no certainty; in fact the above survey reveals more than anything else the lack of firm criteria for singling out such poems[5]. There is little reason for believing that either poems isolated by White or those added by the above list should have headed a collection of any sort. As I shall now demonstrate, the variety of the poems which Martial did use to

head certain books constitutes ample evidence for this. Such variety is in itself characteristic of the genre of epigram, particularly by this relatively late stage of its history[6].

II. Verse prefaces

It is now necessary to survey the poems which head the various books of epigrams as they stand, in order to compare prose with verse introductions. There is, not surprisingly, a fair degree of overlap between the poems discussed above as possible prefaces to the earlier *libelli* and those currently at (or near) the head of the extant books. For the purposes of this chapter, the first ten poems of each book are considered arbitrarily to constitute its 'head', and it is within these parameters that I have sought 'introductory' material.

Liber Spectaculorum

The first three poems in the *Liber Spectaculorum* are similar in content and slightly longer than the poems that follow them, thus suggesting a prefatory cluster. The first of these emphasises the magnitude of the Amphitheatre, comparing it favourably with various wonders of the ancient world: 'omnis Caesareo cedit labor Amphitheatro/ unum pro cunctis fama loquetur opus' (1.7-8). The second poem focuses also on the glory of the Amphitheatre, contrasted with its humble beginnings: 'Hic ubi...' (2.1, 5, 7). The climax comes in the final couplet (cf line 8):

> Reddita Roma sibi est et sunt te praeside, Caesar,
>
>   deliciae populi, quae fuerant domini. (2.11-12)

The third and final poem in the opening sequence is concerned with the spectators at the games. Martial begins with a rhetorical question directed at the emperor:

> Quae tam seposita est, quae gens tam barbara, Caesar,
>
>   ex qua spectator non sit in urbe tua? (3.1-2)

This sets the context for the poem, as Martial goes on to mention people who have come from far-flung parts of the ancient world, eg Thracians, Sarmatians and Arabs (3-10). Again everything is turned to the emperor's credit, as he is presented uniting them in his leadership:

> uox diuersa sonat populorum, tum tamen una est,
>
>   cum uerus patriae diceris esse pater. (11-12)

Viewed together, these poems have a programmatic function in that they focus on the glorious Amphitheatre and on the audience of the games held there. Each of these poems brings the emperor conspicuously to the fore, and it is in this respect that they are dedicatory. The rest of the poems in this collection are concerned with individual displays and participants in the various *spectacula* and convey compliments to the emperor throughout.

Books 13-14

Length and subject-matter distinguish the first three poems of the *Xenia* (Book 13) and the first two of the *Apophoreta* (Book 14) from the rest of those collections, which comprise merely a title and a couplet. The introductory poems in general set the tone for the collections and defend them from anticipated criticism.

The *Xenia* begin with an adaptation of a favourite joke of Martial's concerning the possible fate of his poems. Ironically he invokes the Muses to destroy his papyrus sheets, so that tunny-fry can have a wrapper, olives a mantle, and the cockroach something to eat (1-4)[7]. He goes on to compare his poems with various games associated with the Saturnalia, the point of comparison being that his poems are chanced on the public just as games involve chance:

> haec mihi charta nuces, haec est mihi charta fritillus:
> alea nec damnum nec facit ista lucrum.   (13.1.7-8)

The second poem is addressed to a would-be critic (a *Nasutus* 1), to whom Martial says that carping criticism is uncalled for in the light of his own self-deprecating attitude: 'non potes in nugas dicere plura meas/ ipse ego quam dixi' (4-5; cf Coleman 1978:9-10). He suggests at the end that his collection is not useless if it is approached from a positive point of view (*candidus aure* 9).

Perhaps the most obviously prefatory poem is the third. Here Martial names the collection (*turba XENIORUM* 1), stating its price and where it is to be obtained (2-4). He suggests its contents, the mottoes, be sent in lieu of the gifts they would otherwise accompany (5-6), and also that the *titulus* of each couplet be enough to warn off those not interested in it: 'addita per titulos sua nomina rebus habebis:/ praetereas, si quid non facit ad stomachum' (7-8). A

slightly adapted, shorter version of the same joke is to be found at
14.2.

By the same token, 14.1 parallels 13.1-2 in content and diction.
This poem underlines the social context of the poems, namely as
guest-gifts for the Saturnalia (1-6). It includes both the poet's
self-deprecation (7-8) and a *recusatio* (9-11). Like 13.1, the poem
ends with a humorous comparison of the collection with nuts, a game
characteristic of the festival (cf 5.30): '"Lude," inquis, "nucibus":
perdere nolo nuces' (12)[8].

Book 3

With one exception (3.3), the first five poems of Martial's
third numbered book reveal considerable thematic and stylistic
similarity. The first, which lacks an addressee, makes it clear that
this collection of poems was written in Gallia Togata (part of
Cisalpline Gaul) and sent to Rome for circulation, rather than being
written in the city: 'Hoc tibi quidquid id est longinquis mittit ab
oris/ Gallia Romanae nomine dicta togae' (3.1.1-2). Poems 2 (*libelle*
1), 4 and 5 are all addressed to the book. In this manner Martial can
again emphasise that he was out of Rome at the time of writing the
book. This is particularly true of 3.4, which is in the form of
alternating question and answer. In instructing the *liber* how to
answer questions about him, Martial gives not only his current address
but also his reason for leaving the city:

> cur absim, quaeret: breuiter tu multa fatere:
>
> 'Non poterat uanae taedia ferre togae.' (3.4.5-6)

In 2 and 5, importantly, Martial mentions *amici* as possible protectors as he gives instructions to his book. The initial question 'Cuius uis fieri, libelle, munus?' is answered with 'Faustini fugis in sinum? sapisti' (3.2.1, 6). Faustinus was a wealthy friend of Martial who owned several villas and wrote poetry himself (*PIR*[2] F 127; Friedlaender 1886:180 on 1.25). In 3.5 the book is addressed as a client, the poet speaking as a patron in directing the book to another patron in the city:

> Vis commendari sine me cursurus in urbem,
>
>   parue liber, multis, an satis unus erit?
>
> unus erit, mihi crede, *sa*tis, cui non eris hospes,
>
>   Iulius, adsiduum nomen in ore meo. (3.5.1-4)

The Julius referred to here is probably Julius Martialis, one of the poet's closest and longest-standing friends (*PIR*[2] I 411; Friedlaender 1886:174 on 1.15).

From the sixth epigram onward there is no specifically prefatory element visible. 3.3, the single exception to the trends uniting the first few poems of the book, is a short piece of personal invective lacking any specific identification. This poem, found only in a ninth century Paris florilegium (T, part of the A group)[9], is in any case suspect. Modern editors generally follow Schneidewin in doubting its authenticity - presumably at least in part because of its improbable placing at the head of the book amidst more obviously 'prefatory' poems.

Book 4

In the poems which head Book 4 the emperor Domitian has pride of place, dominating the first three epigrams. The collection opens with a genethliacon which honours Domitian's 37th birthday and dates the collection to AD 88 (cf Friedlaender 1886:334 ad loc). In 4.2 the emperor is mentioned seemingly *en passant* rather than centrally ('sancto cum duce candidus sederet' 4), as at 4.8.9. Domitian is, however, central to the third poem, where his deceased son is presented in quasi-divine terms:

> quis siccis lasciuit aquis et ab aethere ludit?
>
> suspicor has pueri Caesaris esse niues.   (4.3.7-8)

The only other 'prefatory' material among the opening poems of Book 4 occurs fairly far into the collection, at 10. Addressed in the first instance to a slave-boy messenger, this poem dramatises the gift of a *libellus* to Faustinus: 'i puer et caro perfer leue munus amico/ qui meruit nugas primus habere meas' (3-4). The poem's final joke, concerning the sponge which can erase the poems, invites comparison with 3.100, the last poem of that collection, which employs the same joke. In this case the dedicatory element suggests that the poem may originally have accompanied a pre-publication *libellus* given to Faustinus.

Book 5

Book 5 opens with a poem which appears to dedicate the entire collection to the emperor. Martial says that he is sending it to

Domitian, who is described with elaborate reference to his political-religious powers (1-6). He asks merely that Domitian accept the collection, as Martial will then believe with Gallic credulity that it has had a good reception: 'Hoc tibi... /mittimus...../tu tantum accipias: ego te legisse putabo/ et tumidus Galla credulitate fruar' (5.1.1, 7, 9-10). This poem invites comparison with the sixth poem, directed at Domitian via his secretary Parthenius. The poem is dominated by an address to the Muses that they ask Parthenius to present Martial's collection to the emperor: 'admittas timidam breuemque chartam/ intra limina sanctioris aulae' (7-8). The piece ends with what appears to be the authorial comment that Domitian is in any case likely to take up the collection: 'si noui dominum nouem sororum,/ ultro purpureum petet libellum' (18-19).

In other epigrams heading this collection Domitian is described again in terms suggesting the prevalence of ruler cult at this time. Martial concludes 5.3, which concerns an embassy from the Dacians seeking peace, with a quote put into the mouth of the Dacian ambassador (brother of the king):

'Sors mea quam fratris melior, cui tam prope fas est
    cernere tam longe quem colit ille deum.' (5-6)[10]

In writing of Domitian's edict concerning seating arrangements in the theatre, Martial refers to the emperor by the term officially approved in AD 89 for use in official documents: 'edictum *domini deique* nostri' (5.8.1; cf Suet *Dom* 13).

A 'dedication' of a different order can be found in the second poem of the collection - one to matrons, boys and girls:

<div align="center">

Matronae puerique uirginesque,

uobis pagina nostra dedicatur.   (5.2.1-2)

</div>

The purpose of this epigram is evidently to disown the *lasciuia* of the earlier books in favour of moral rectitude, particularly in view of the emperor's majesty: 'quintus cum domino liber iocatur;/ quem Germanicus ore non rubenti/ coram Cecropia legat puella' (5.2.6-8). This is not a dedication of the sort involved in the conspicuous presentation of a collection to an important person (cf Ruppert 1911), but an indirect compliment to the emperor in that he is associated with moral chastity.

Book 6

Julius Martialis is the addressee of the first poem of Book 6: 'Sextus mittitur hic tibi libellus'. In this unassuming epigram of only five lines the poet asks that Martialis have the poems read to him, and recommend changes so that the collection can be sent to Domitian:

<div align="center">

quem si terseris aure diligenti,

audebit minus anxius tremensque

magnas Caesaris in manus uenire.   (3-5)

</div>

This poem is one of many which show that Martial's ultimate audience is the emperor, though other *amici* are honoured along the way. In this case the insubstantial nature of the first epigram and the fact that Julius Martialis pales into insignificance as an *amicus* next to

the emperor together suggest that 6.1 does NOT in fact constitute a
dedication of the collection as a whole. This poem was written for
the sixth numbered book ('sextus' 6.1.1), but it is as well to recall
at this stage White's point that the dedication of the 'book' was the
final and least important stage of literary production.

Domitian features importantly in the rest of the book's first
four poems. The second and fourth poems concern respectively his
decree forbidding castration and his moral legislation. In poem 4,
which begins with the address 'Censor maxime principumque princeps',
mention is also made of building plans undertaken in the city. Poem 3
is addressed to his unborn child, who is hailed as future ruler: 'cui
pater aeternas post saecula tradat habenas' (6.3.3).

In the seventh poem of the collection Martial casts an indirect
light on the emperor by referring to his enactment of moral reform:
'Iulia lex populis ex quo, Faustine, renata est/ atque intrare domos
iussa Pudicitia est' (6.7.1-2). The tenth epigram focuses on Domitian
as *amicus*[11]. The poet, who presents himself as a client making a
request, gets the following comfort from the goddess Pallas, the
emperor's confidante ('nostri...conscia uirgo Tonantis' 9): 'Quae
nondum data sunt, stulte, negata putas?' (12).

Book 7

Albeit in a different way, the emperor constitutes the most
prominent introductory theme of Book 7. Whereas Domitian's moral
reforms assumed considerable importance in the early poems of Book 6,
the opening epigrams of the following collection put the spotlight on
him by emphasising the success of his campaign against the Sarmatians
in AD 92. Thus the breastplate ('crudum thoraca Mineruae' 1) with

which the first poem opens is a symbol not only of the emperor's *numen* but also of his military prowess. In the second poem the focus is on Domitian's leather cuirass (*lorica* 1), which the poet addresses at some length. Poems 5 to 8 all concern Domitian's return to Rome in AD 93, particular attention being given to the public celebration of his triumph, eg:

> rursus, io, magnos clamat tibi Roma triumphos
>
> INVICTUSque tua, Caesar, in urbe sonas. (7.6.7-8)

It is in this festive context that Martial presents the levity of his own verse:

> fas est audire iocos leuioraque carmina, Caesar,
>
> et tibi, si lusus ipse triumphus amat. (7.8.9-10)

The other poems at the head of this collection (3, 4, and also perhaps 9 and 10) are characterised by personal invective to people no doubt of lower rank, and appear to have no element suggesting dedication or introduction. Presumably these were added for the sake of variety and bold juxtaposition.

Book 10

The poems introducing the tenth and eleventh books form a contrast with most of the collections above, but can be compared with 3.1 in that there is no dedication at all, or even praise of the emperor. Political change can be thought to account for this. The fall of Domitian in 96 must have brought about some embarrassment for

a poet who had so praised the emperor while he lived. It is thus no surprise that Book 10, published in a second edition in AD 98 (Friedlaender 1886:63-65), has no comparable element of ruler-cult. It is possible that the first edition began with an encomiastic element which had to be removed following the demise of Domitian

Poem 10.1 sees Martial joking about the length of his poems. He says that if the book (*liber* 2) is too long he will abbreviate it into a shorter *libellus*, and he in fact invites the unnamed general reader to make the collection as short as he might wish: 'fac tibi me quam cupis ipse breuem' (4).

In the second poem again the reader (*lector* 4) is addressed, as Martial asks for a favourable reception. It is obvious that this epigram was written for a second edition of the collection, and in this way it serves an important prefatory function. Martial begins by saying that the former version was circulated too hurriedly:

Festinata prior, decimi mihi cura libelli

elapsum manibus nunc reuocauit opus (10.2.1-2)

and he describes the work as having been revised: 'lima rasa recenti' (3). Martial puts great emphasis on the fact of speaking of his 'reader' in this poem. He says that Rome promised him an eternal readership outliving more material things, when she gave him a reader for the first time: 'lector, utrique faue,/ lector, opes nostrae: quem cum mihi Roma dedisset,/ "Nil tibi quod demus maius habemus" ait' (4-6).

Two of the early poems of this book evidence an element which one would not be surprised to find as a prefatory theme, namely that of plagiarism. In 10.3 he complains to Priscus of the various types of unbecoming, smutty material which had been circulated in his name

by a 'shady' poet: 'Vernaculorum dicta.../ poeta quidam clancularius spargit/ et uolt uideri nostra' (1, 5- 6). Martial complains of the negative and undeserved image this brings him, and he confirms the auspicious quality of his own verse: 'Procul a libellis nigra sit meis fama,/ quos rumor alba gemmeus uehit pinna' (9-10). The strongly-worded curse poem (10.5) is a virulent attack on slanderers and libellous poets; it ends with the wish that the Fury hound the slanderer into confessing the truth (*Scripsi* 19), using various tortures. The intervening poem (10.4) concerns a different topic of literary criticism, namely that of the relative merits of old-fashioned mythological epic on the one hand ('uana...ludibriae misera chartae' 7), and Martial's life-like poetry on the other ('hominem pagina nostra sapit' 10).

Book 11

Book 11 starts with a poem addressed to his *otiose liber* (1), again with definite implications in terms of literary patronage. The poet asks the book where it is going, and then warns it not to go to the imperial courtier Parthenius who is too busy reading petitions to have time for poetry ('libros non legit ille sed libellos' 5), but rather to the neighbouring Temple of Quirinus[12]. The prominent placing and teasing tone suggests that Parthenius, a personal friend of Martial, is dedicatee of the collection. However, this is not to say that Parthenius is honoured to the same extent as Domitian in the earlier books of Martial, as this is the only poem in the book in which Parthenius is mentioned.

The emperor Nerva features importantly in the other introductory poems of the book. Poem 2, addressed to him, concerns Martial's craft

(cf 1 *praef*). Whereas in the first prose preface the Floralia were a symbol of Martial's epigrammatist's freedom of speech, the Saturnalia fulfil much the same function here:

> clamant ecce mei 'Io Saturnalia' uersus:
>
> et licet et sub te praeside, Nerua, libet.   (11.2.5-6)

Just as the Cato anecdote ended 1 *praef*, so the exempla of Cato and the Fabricii are used here. Martial also takes the opportunity to dissociate himself from social constraint in establishing the authorship of his poetry ('iste liber meus est' 8):

> Triste supercilium durique seuera Catonis
>
> frons et aratoris filia Fabricii
>
> et personati fastus et regula morum
>
> quidquid et in tenebris non sumus, ite foras.   (11.2.1-4)

Nerva is also mentioned in the third poem, by his title *Augustus* in line 9 of 11.3, which functions both as a *recusatio* and a standard complaint about the lack of patronage (cf Saller 1983). As a prayer to the gods for Nerva's protection, the fourth poem is more conspicuously in the emperor's honour:

> ...et qui purpureis iam tertia nomina fastis,
>
> Iane, refers Neruae; uos precor ore pio:
>
> hunc omnes seruate ducem, seruate senatum;
>
> moribus hic uiuat principis, ille suis.   (11.4.5-8)

In the fifth and final poem of the opening sequence Nerva is compared to Numa, the second king of Rome, and other significant figures from

Roman history.

In marked contrast with the reverence for the emperor evidenced in these introductory poems, 11.6 can be considered programmatic in that it describes the Saturnalia as a context for his verse: 'uersu ludere non laborioso/ permittis, puto, pilleata Roma' (3-4). A further element which reflects on Martial's view of his own verse is the explicit reference to Catullus which ends the poem (on which see Howell 1985:71-76)

> Da nunc basia, sed Catulliana:
> quae si tot fuerint quot ille dixit,
> donabo tibi Passerem Catulli. (11.6.14-16)

CONCLUSION

Given the overall diversity of Martial's poems, it is not surprising that the poems introducing the various books of epigrams show little uniformity. However, an observation which can be made concerning these introductory epigrams will later be seen to bear also on the prose prefaces. For all their lack of thematic and stylistic consistency, the introductory poems reveal a certain flexibility of approach which must have been useful for their author. Specific issues which required emphasis, such as Domitian's Dacian victory, and Martial's own sojourn in Gaul, could thus easily be highlighted as the situation demanded. Domitian certainly is a major presence at the head of the books published during his own lifetime - as if bearing out Statius' directive of 'a Ioue principium' (*Silu* 1prl8) - which no doubt reflects the emperor's appetite for public honour.

It is clear that a certain limited number of perennial issues, such as comments on the character of his poems, or plagiarism, characterise the opening epigrams of the various collections. These often seem very standard and formulaic, but even these can be coloured by circumstances; for example at 5.2 Martial very conspicuously claims moral rectitude in the light of Domitian's moral reforms.

NOTES

[1] However, we do know that Virgil read sections of his *Aeneid* in *recitationes* before completing the work.

[2] Hall (1989:228-29) has suggested emendations to the proem: *Ogygio* for *ingenti* (40), and *alto* for *alio* (45). These emendations are to be preferred because *Ogygio* parallels *Lenaeo* (38), and *alto* is easily substituted for the nonsensical manuscript reading.

[3] Janson (1964:110) speaks vaguely of 'introductory poems', including those addressed to the book itself, without elaborating.

[4] These statements, throughout the *corpus*, have been surveyed by Citroni (1968) and Garson (1979).

[5] An interesting comparison is that with Ovid's *Amores*. It is possible that poem 1.2 prefaced an earlier edition, and perhaps for this reason it is included near the front of the revised edition (see Cameron 1968).

[6] On the Latin epigram before Martial see Kay (1985:9-13).

[7] cf chapter 2 on the fate of unsuccessful literature, and see further Coleman (1988:227).

[8] On the Saturnalian context see Coleman (1988:220 with references) and Citroni (1989, esp 206-12).

[9] *T* is one of the anthologies constituting Schneidewin's *A* (see Reeve 1983:240).

[10] With regard to ruler cult one may compare 5.5 addressed to Sextus, Domitian's librarian and *a studiis* (*PIR* S 487), which begins 'Sexte, Palatinae cultor facunde Mineruae,/ ingenio frueris qui propiore *dei*. In this poem Martial asks that Sextus accord his poems a place in the Palatine library alongside those of Pedo, Marsus and Catullus - cf 1 *praef*.

[10] cf chapter 3 on petitions to the emperor, and see further Millar (1977:473-77).

[11] It is possible that this indicates that Parthenius (*PIR* P 101) had changed his position from *a cubiculo* under Domitian to *a libellis* under Nerva (Kay 1985:54).

SECTION C

Chapter 10

The prose prefaces of Martial and Statius:

a study in literary purpose

CONCLUSION

A necessary caveat must preface any attempt to identify the *raison d'être* of the prose prefaces in the *Epigrams* and *Siluae*. It is already apparent that the prefaces of Martial are heterogeneous; in all likelihood different pieces were written with different purposes in mind. Literary apologia predominates in the prefaces to Books 1 and 2; 8 *praef* is a dedicatory epistle to the emperor; 9 *praef* is gloss on the identity of one of the recipients; and in 12 *praef* Martial appears concerned to attract sympathy and help in the light of his personal circumstances. The case of Statius is rather different, in that the posthumous publication of *Siluae* 5 gives the preface to that book a different status compared with that of the previous four. Whereas in the first four books the prefaces were obviously intended as introductions to the books they headed, 5 *praef* (which applies to only the first poem) seems to have been added by Statius' literary executors. This said, an attempt will nonetheless be made to offer some generalisations as to the basic purpose which Martial and Statius had in mind in beginning books of verse with prose introductions. In a summary of this nature, two separated but interrelated lines of inquiry will be followed: firstly, the practical reasons for the use of such introductions and, secondly, the aesthetic issues which arise from the prefaces and which can, by implication, be thought to have informed the choice of this medium.

A. PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

To begin with, a problem of definition. Much of the prefaces bears comparison with 'covering letters' sent by authors to accompany pilot editions of or selections from their work. Cicero *Fam* 9.8, Pliny *Ep* 1.2, 4.14 and 8.21 may readily be cited in this regard (see further Sherwin-White 1966:45). That such letters were honest requests for advice, and were not intended for publication with the work they accompanied, is suggested by the fact that in many such cases other irrelevant matters are discussed in the same letter (Janson 1964:107). It appears that by the first century AD this had become something of a literary commonplace, the request for advice having become more a formulaic gesture of honouring the recipient (he is credited with critical faculty and literary sensitivity) than a genuine request in any real sense. For example the final sentence of Statius *Silu* 2 *praef* reads more like a formality than anything else: 'haec..., si tibi non displicuerint, a te publicum accipiant; sin minus, ad me reuertantur' (28-30)[1]. Thus the distinction between actual dedicatory letters and other letters on literary topics had become blurred.

At the same time one should bear in mind, following White (1974:40), that 'the poets' published books represent only the last and least important means of presenting poems to patrons', the more significant means being those involving recitation, impromptu performance and private brochure. The contrast - between this contemporary form of the epigrams and *Siluae* on the one hand, and the smaller libelli on the other - has been fully examined by White (1974:44-48).

A key element of Statius' prefaces is that of the 'contents page' phenomenon, in terms of which the preface provides an inventory of the contents of the book which follows it - a purpose which

suggests the word *index*, though it does not occur in this sense in the *Siluae*. This can be thought to derive from the Roman practice of affixing a slip of papyrus to the roll as it lay in its *scrinium*. This is not to imply that Martial and Statius actually envisaged this as the physical format of their prefaces; rather it was with this long-standing practice in mind that the prefaces were written[2]. The expression 'extra ordinem paginarum' (Martial 9pr2) in fact indicates that the prefaces were written on the same papyrus roll as the poems, in the first column (*pagina*) preceding the poems proper, rather than on the outside of the roll (*pace* Birt 1882:142, followed by Howell 1980:95; Friedlaender 1886:238, and Vollmer 1898:209).

A later manifestation of the same principle was that witnessed in French books of the 19th century, where extended contents pages (often at the end rather than the beginning of the volume) carried fine details of the contents of each chapter. The modern practice, by contrast, is to offer a contents page with only the titles of chapters, and at the end an index of names or themes in alphabetical order (rather than a sequence reflecting the order of the contents).

In Roman times the 'contents page' phenomenon had an important additional purpose, concerned less with aesthetic than practical considerations. This was the phenomenon by which prefaces were a means of establishing the *auctoritas editionis* (Vollmer 1898:3). It must be stressed that any writer of this time was faced with dangers arising from the lack of copyright, especially in a context where literature was principally spoken rather than written; these dangers had not only an artistic angle but also a legal one[3]. All of which made it very necessary for a poet to distinguish what was authentically part of his collection from what might have been added later by those who wished either to earn the poet a bad name or to attain publicity for their own poems. This would have been

particularly true of any satirical material, in which questions of libel and defamation could conceivably have come to the fore.

Patronage

Given the nature of the *Epigrams* and *Siluae* as occasional poems, it is of crucial importance to understand the prefaces (which, *inter alia*, specify the intended recipients) in terms of Rome's *amicitia* system. Certainly patronage could be identified as an important factor in the *Epigrams* and *Siluae* generally, and one at least partly motivating the use of the prose prefaces. White (1974) has demonstrated that the 'publication' of a collection of poems in their final form, such as we have them today, was the final and arguably least important part of literary production. This may be so, but it cannot be denied that the dedicating of an entire collection offered the poet additional opportunities as a *cliens*. Both poet and dedicatee must, to some extent at least, have stood to gain prestige if a collection of poems were to be published with such a dedication.

When, for example, Martial Book 8 is dedicated to the Emperor Domitian, the poet can try to impress a wider audience by showing that his work had been presented to the supreme *amicus*. It might be said that dedication had both public and private aspects: firstly, the honouring of a recipient, usually a wealthy or influential person and, secondly, the attempt to gain public kudos from the name-dropping which this entails (Millar 1977:116). In terms of the relationship between author and patron, a bond of clientship could either be cemented by such a dedication, or else a poet could in effect simply be making an appeal for the support of a possible *amicus* (eg of Abascantus, Domitian's *ab epistulis*, in Statius 5 *praef*).

B. AESTHETIC QUESTIONS

More difficult are the aesthetic issues surrounding the use of a prose preface to head a collection of poems. One basic problem, about which it is difficult to reach any definite conclusion and about which little seems to have been written, concerns the relationship between verse and prose. At least there can be little doubt that the practice of using prose prefaces was subject to literary debate in the time of Statius and Martial. This much is clear from Martial 2 *praef*. From Quintilian *Inst* 8.3.31 one can conclude that the practice was prevalent in the first century AD, and that prefaces were used to discuss matters of literary criticism (cf Pliny *Ep* 4.14, where long prefaces are criticised). As an entrée into the prose/verse question, some attempt will be made to summarise the literary ancestry of the prefaces.

Certainly one may posit provisionally that an important aesthetic purpose of the prefaces was to give the poet an opportunity to speak in his own person about his craft. This is obvious from any reading of Statius' prefaces. Questions of literary debate and apologia had no place in the *Siluae* themselves, and so the preface (particularly using the more direct medium of prose - about which more below) was a natural option. It is indeed true that Statius' comments about his poems, both generally and specifically, in the prefaces are very limited and superficial (see eg Hardie 1983:74 and Coleman 1988:55); but the fact remains that the prefaces offered the poet a fairly direct means of self-expression which he might not otherwise have had.

Equally, for a satirical epigrammatist such as Martial the prose preface offered the valuable opportunity of being able to state a detailed and direct apologia, as is shown by the prefaces to Books 1

and 8. Why Martial sometimes used prose and other times verse will be discussed later in this chapter. Suffice it to say at this stage that the polemical aspect seen in these two prefaces, as well as in those by Statius, is an element common to prefaces, prologues and prooemia generally. The rhetorical prologues to Terence's plays, distinguished from other comic prologues precisely through this polemical element, present an instructive comparison. At the start of his plays Terence is consistently concerned with responding to criticism (see eg *Andria* 5-7, and cf Mart 12prl *patrocinium*).

Subsequent audience

An additional angle arises when it is considered that in their prefaces Martial and Statius may be casting an eye on not only their wider but also their subsequent readership. Given that many of Statius' comments about his poems would have been obvious to a contemporary audience within his circle of *amicitia* (Coleman 1988:55), it seems quite likely that they were directed at a wider audience not within the same social nexus, and also at subsequent readers. It should after all be borne in mind that the Statian prefaces were written as part of the final collections rather than pre-publication *libelli*, which explains partly the self-conscious quality they evidence (White 1974:60). These prefaces, intended as they were for this late purpose, can be considered as equivalent to the spoken *praefatio* delivered by the poet in his capacity as reciter[4]. White (1974:57-58) makes a valid point when he suggests that, whereas Statius wrote his prefaces with a view to a later readership, Martial 'does not play up the occasion of publication, nor give any sign of writing for the public eye'.

The emphasis in Statius' prefaces on the lack of topicality in the poems is additional proof that the final collections were edited (and the prose prefaces added) long after the poems had ceased to be of immediate social relevance. From a presentation point of view, this reflects a change by which the *Siluae* ceased to be purely impromptu compositions delivered orally by the poet, and were now to become published collections made available more widely than had previously been the case. Statius' stress in the prefaces on the impromptu nature of his composition (see White 1974:40) also gains new perspectives here. For this reason the prefaces had to speak for the poet, as it were, since they would now be read (rather than heard) in situations where their original social context would not be obvious, and hence the need for brief descriptions such as Statius so consistently provides.

The question of to what extent Martial and Statius had an eye to their subsequent readership is made relevant by the later tradition. The fourth-century poet, Ausonius, wrote prefaces (most of them in prose) in which the reader was openly addressed: for example two such prefaces begin 'Ausonius lectori suo sal.' (17.1) and 'Ausonius lectori sal.' (3) (Pavlovskis 1967:546)[5]. Retrospectively, it may well be asked whether Statius in particular may not have been tending in that direction, and whether he may not have had the same principle in mind without having the literary precedent to realise it fully. One may certainly consider the first four prefaces in this light, as Coleman (1988:55) suggests.

Literary heritage

The prefaces should be thought to derive from two separate strands of the literary tradition: firstly, that of poetic prooemia

and, secondly, that of the dedicatory epistle. Viewed in their entirety, the prefaces retain elements of both. The first four prefaces of Statius, and the first of Martial, show that *apologia* is a theme which is both common and natural to the prefaces (cf for example the programmatic *recusatio* of Propertius 2.1). Comparable 'poetic prooemia' or 'dedicatory epigrams' may be found in the *Epigrams*, where they are no longer necessarily at the beginning of a book (White 1974:47-48 cites and discusses 11.106, 4.82, 7.26 and 5.80). The implications of these two aspects should be considered separately.

Verse prefaces

Given that the prose prefaces bear comparison with other prefaces, the following question naturally arises: What was the specific significance of prefacing a collection in PROSE when evidently much the same function could be served by a verse prooemium? After all, the poems of the Greek Anthology, of Propertius, Horace, Tibullus, and Ovid, by way of example, are all introduced in verse.

It has been asserted that, given the generic qualities of occasional poetry, it was not possible for Statius to write a verse apologia at the head of each book. To quote Vessey, Statius 'could not make his defence in verse, for material of such a kind could not have been integrated with the other poems that are included in the *Siluae*' (1973:40, cf Hardie 1973:74). This seems to be a reasonable assertion (*pace* Coleman 1988:53-54). A poetic proem conveying the same ideas as Statius' prose prefaces would have drawn more attention to itself than was permissible; by focusing the reader's attention on the poet's persona, it would as a result have detracted to an undesirable degree from the dedicatees of the poems themselves. The book-dedications are conveyed in prose epistles. This distinguishes

them from the dedications of the individual poems, and therefore they do not dilute the honour accruing to dedicatees (*pace* White 1974:40)[6].

Persona

It appears that the issue of *persona* is highly relevant in explaining the use of prose prefaces[7]. Whereas certain scholars have either taken authors at face-value or held to the *persona* approach, Griffin (1985:32) stresses that it is not valid to separate 'literature' and 'life' as if they were clearly distinguishable entities; 'in reality, the two affect each other in a ceaseless mutual interaction'. Wilkinson (1946:19) highlighted the problem in a different context:

To obtain insight into the real mentality of Horace in particular it is not sufficient to collect *testimonia* from the pages of his works. We must take into account the social and literary climate in which he wrote, and our resultant impression of him may be one against which his own words may often be quoted. Those who take him at his face value have a superficial advantage in argument, but they leave an uneasy feeling in the mind that they have got things out of focus.

Without doubt the epigrams themselves are characterised by poetic personae which are quite often mutually contradictory. In this respect one may compare Roman satire, where persona can be considered to have particular relevance (as emphasised by Courtney 1980:18-30 and Winkler 1983:59-89). By writing his prefaces in prose Martial could go a considerable way towards escaping these personae, and establishing a mode of expression divorced from his usual 'mendicant

facades' (to use a term of Hardie 1983:51). In the process he could set up a different relationship vis à vis his listeners/readers. If it is remembered that the ancient letter was considered one of the most 'sincere' of genres[8], there is every chance that a subsequent reader particularly would consider such a preface in a different light to the poems themselves.

If the Romans were conscious of metre as being an element which either links or distinguishes poems within a collection (see eg Porter 1987:152 on the Alcaic metre linking the 'Roman Odes' of Horace Odes 3, and Harvey 1981:9-10 on the iambic prologue to Persius' Satires), they would certainly have been aware of the distinction between verse and prose if both are used in the same larger work. In passing, Pavlovskis hit on the right idea: '... it was discovered how a preface couched in prose stood out better from the remainder of the book' (1967:539)[9].

From this limited perspective alone it would have been sensible to introduce a collection with a piece which was, for external reasons, naturally distinguished from what followed. Menippean satire, as evidenced in Petronius and the *Apocolocyntosis* ascribed to Seneca, is apparently the only other extant literary form of this period in which prose and verse coexist on anything like the same scale as in Martial and Statius.

Given the topical nature of occasional verse, it would have been necessary for Statius to defend the publication of his *Siluae*. This much is evident from the fact that the subject of topicality comes up in several of Statius' prefaces, as seen above. Many of the *Epigrams* also fit into the category of occasional verse, but their heterogeneity makes such a defence impossible.

It must be borne in mind that occasional verse and epigram were considered to be among the 'lower genres', and it was only here that a prose preface was appropriate. Such a proem would not have suited, for example, lyric or elegiac poetry; nor epic, which is in any case a continuous poem rather than a collection of various poems[10].

Provenance

An important factor distinguishing Martial's prefaces from Statius' is their provenance. Statius used prose prefaces as a standard element in his collections of *Siluae*, and no doubt he would have followed the same system had the fifth book been published in his own lifetime. Martial's use of the prose preface was, on the other hand, more experimental. The five prefaces are heterogeneous; clearly they were written for different reasons, and served different purposes. The preface to the first book of *Epigrams*, centring as it does on the satirist's apologia, serves as a general introduction to Martial's satirical epigrams, while the other four were written variously on an *ad hoc* basis. This factor alone suggests that Martial 12 *praef*, for one, should be taken as a sincere explanation and request for help, rather than a expression of formulaic modesty[11].

The matter of provenance raises an issue which may well be considered in deciding on the value and usefulness of prose prefaces: If there are good reasons for using such prefaces, how is it that Martial could have begun several books without them, ie in what respect were they dispensable? Only five out of Martial's 15 books begin with prose prefaces, or five out of 12 if the unnumbered books are excluded. It is perhaps in keeping with the heterogeneity of the *Epigrams* that different methods are used in introducing the various books of the corpus. Given that the books of *Epigrams* are generally

longer than books of the *Siluae*, and that they contain so many more poems, it is natural that the identity of any book of epigrams should be more varied. Hence it would have been much more difficult for Martial to introduce a book of epigrams with a piece which characterised the entire book - though he in fact does just that in 1 *praef* and 8 *praef* - and hence the logic behind beginning a collection by plunging *in medias res*. It is clear that Martial often begins a book with a series of introductory poems, covering various prefatory elements; quite possibly the plethora of these introductory poems reflects the fragmented nature of the pre-publication *libelli*. For example, each of 1.1-3 could be considered introductory poems (see Roberts and Skeat 1983:24 and Citroni 1970 on 1.2 and 1.3 respectively).

CONCLUSION

There is every chance that the prefaces served several purposes at the same time. For one thing, most of them clearly have both practical and aesthetic elements. Thus the following assertion by Pavlovskis can be regarded as an exaggeration: 'To Statius, the value of the preface is purely utilitarian: it fulfils the function of dedicating and tabulating' (1967:539, followed by Vessey 1973:40). To be sure, the prose prefaces served an important aesthetic function as well, particularly if one bears in mind the issues of form which they bring into focus. One can thus dismiss as overstatement, also, Pavlovskis' view that 'the prose preface is superfluous for Martial's work, since he is skilled at providing his books with verse introductions' (1967:545).

Apologia has been identified as an important factor motivating their use. If the apologetic elements in the prefaces are somewhat limited in their scope, then that is because those were the only topics Martial and Statius needed to broach in their circumstances. At least the use of prefatory letters opened up a wide range of possibilities - possibilities which were perhaps not used as broadly as they might have been. The heterogeneity of Martial's prefaces is one indication of the various purposes to which the prose preface could have been put.

It remains true that the main virtue of the prose preface (insofar as generalisation serves any purpose) was that it was simultaneously a vehicle for aspects of the poet's apológia AND for dedication to a patron. These two elements are expressed in its dual nature as being both a preface to a collection of poems and a dedicatory epistle.

NOTES

[1] Specific circumstances suggest that in Martial 12 *praef* the request seems more sincerely intended.

[2] See Peter (1901:242-43, 246). One should add the qualification that the prefaces were not actually placed on the outside of the papyrus roll.

[3] 'Absit a iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpres nec epigrammata mea scribat: inprobe facit qui in alieno libro ingeniosus est' (Mart 1pr6-9).

[4] In this respect the prose prefaces may be compared with the προλαλιαί and προθεωρίαι spoken by Greek rhetors at the start of their speeches - cf Immisch (1911:488 nl), Zwierlein (1966:165)

and Branham (1985:237). It is instructive that Sutton (1986), in his attempt to prove that Seneca wrote his plays for the stage, does not mention this passage.

[5] Subsequent practice may have affected the false reading at the title of Martial 1 *praef*.

[6] Comparison has been made with the iambic prologues of Phaedrus (Coleman 1988:54). However this is not entirely apposite in that Phaedrus' prologues, though covering some matters of literary criticism, were too lightweight a form to convey a serious literary dedication.

[7] A modern account of persona theory is offered by Winkler (1983:1-22 and 59-89) as applied to Latin literature and, in the context of English literature, Elliott (1982). Both authors are guilty of going too far in counteracting the autobiographical approach, of which a notable exponent in recent times has been Gilbert Highet (1954 and 1974). An attractive *via media* can be found in Griffin (1985:1-64, esp 48-64 'Genre and real life in Latin poetry'), where the issue is discussed in detail.

[8] cf Demetrius *On Style* 227: 'The letter, like a dialogue, should abound in glimpses of character. It may be said that everybody reveals his own soul in letters. In every other form of composition it is possible to discern the writer's character, but in none so clearly as in the epistolary' (tr D C Innes at Russell and Winterbottom [eds] 1972:211). See also Williams (1970:104).

[9] The aesthetic implications of the distinction between prose and verse seem to have received little scholarly attention. See Norden (1923:432) and, in general, Kennedy (1989:184-99).

[10] The Senecan tragic prefaces mentioned by Quintilian present something of a problem here, but it should be said that such prefaces are not likely to have been part of the published

manuscript, or part of the work as a whole, in the way that those
of Statius and Martial often were. Zwierlein (1966:164-66) has
taken this extract as proof that Seneca's tragedies were recited
and not performed on stage. In this context Vollmer (1898:209)
calls the Senecan *praefationes* 'prosaische Episteln' and Peter
speaks of published 'wissenschaftliche Essays' (1901:248). More
recent scholarship defends the possibility of at least limited or
private performance (thus Calder 1984:225-26; Coffey and Mayer
1990:15-18).

[11] There are many comparable examples of satirical apologia, as
shown by Bramble (1974:16-23). In addition one may consider the
elder Seneca's introduction to his *Controuersiae*; though several
of the books have their own preface, that which heads the first
book nonetheless serves as an introduction to the work as a whole
(Sussman 1978:47; Fairweather 1981:29-30).

CONSOLIDATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahern, Charles F 1990, 'Ovid as *uates* in the proem to the *Ars Amatoria*, *CPh* 85.44-48

Alföldy, Géza 1985, *The Social History of Rome* (tr David Braund and Frank Pollock) London and Sydney: Croom Helm

Allen, Archibald W 1950, '"Sincerity" and the Roman Elegists', *CPh* 45.145-60

Allen, Walter J *et al* 1970, 'Martial: knight, publisher, and poet', *CJ* 65.345-57

Anderson, William S 1970, '*Lasciuia* vs *ira*: Martial and Juvenal', *CSCA* 3.1-34

Anliker, Kurt 1959, *Prologe und Akteinteilung in der Tragödien Senecas* diss Bern

Ascher, L 1977, 'Was Martial really unmarried?', *CW* 70.441-44

Astin, A E 1970, 'Patronage, literary' in *OCD*[2] 790-91

Austin, R G 1968, '*Ille ego qui quondam...*', *CQ* 18.107-12

-------- (comm) 1971, *Virgil: Aeneid* I Oxford: University Press

Badian, E 1985, '*Nobiles amici*: art and literature in an aristocratic society', *CPh* 80.341-57 (review of Gold [ed] 1982)

Balsdon, J P V D 1969, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* London: Bodley Head

Barsby, John (comm) 1973, Ovid *Amores* 1 Oxford: University Press

Bartelink, G J M 1980, *Hieronymus: Liber de optime genere interpretandi (Epistula 57): ein Kommentar* Lugduni Batavorum

Bellinger, A R 1928, 'Martial the suburbanite', *CJ* 23.425-35

Bengtson, Hermann 1979, *Die Flavier: Vespasian, Titus, Domitian* Munich: Beck

Bain, David 1975, 'Audience address in Greek tragedy', *CQ* n.s. 25.13-25

Best, Edward E 1968/69, 'Martial's readers in the Roman world', *CJ* 64.208-12

Birley, Robin 1977, *Vindolanda: a Roman frontier post on Hadrian's Wall* London: Thames and Hudson

Birt, Theodor 1882, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* Leipzig: Teubner

-------- 1913, *Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriss des antiken Buchwesens* Munich: Beck Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 1.3

Boissier, Gaston 1906, *Tacitus and other Roman studies* tr W G Hutchinson London: Constable

Bowie, M N R 1988, *Martial Book 12: a Commentary* diss Oxford

Bowman, A K and J D Thomas 1975, 'The Vindolanda writing tablets and their significance: an interim report', *Historia* 24.467-72

--------- 1983, *Vindolanda: the Latin writing-tablets* London: Society for Roman Studies (Britannia Monograph 4)

--------- 1986, 'Vindolanda 1985: the new writing tablets', *JRS* 76.120-23

Bowra, Maurice 1962, 'The Homeric poems and their authorship: composition', in Alan J B Wace and Frank H Stubbings (edd), *A Companion to Homer* London: Macmillan (38-74)

Boyd, C E 1915, *Public libraries and literary culture in ancient Rome* Chicago: University Press

Bramble, J C 1974, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* Cambridge: University Press

Branham, R Bracht 1985, 'Introducing a Sophist: Lucian's prologues', *TAPhA* 115.237-43

Braund, David, 'Function and dysfunction: personal patronage in Roman imperialism', in Wallace-Hadrill (ed) 1989:137-52

Braund, Susan H (ed) 1989, *Satire in Roman Society* Exeter: University Press (Exeter Studies in History 23)

Brennan, Michael G 1988, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: the Pembroke Family* London: Routledge

Brink, C O (ed) 1971, *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica* Cambridge: University Press

Brunt, P A 1965, '*Amicitia* in the Late Roman Republic', *PCPhS* (ns) 11.1-20

-------- 1971, *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic* London: Hogarth

Büchner, Karl 1939, 'M Tullius Cicero', *RE* 7A1 (2nd series) 1087-28

Cairns, Francis 1979, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* Cambridge: University Press

Calder, William M, III 1984, 'Seneca *Thyestes* 101-6', *CPh* 79.225- 26

Cameron, Alan 1968, 'The first edition of Ovid's *Amores*', *CQ* 18.320-33

-------- forthcoming, *Callimachus* chapter 1 'Prologue and Dream'

Cancik, Hubert 1984, 'Statius, *Siluae*: ein Bericht über die Forschung seit Friedrich Vollmer (1898)', *ANRW* 2.32.4.2681-2726 (revised by Harm-Jan van Dam)

Carcopino, Jerome 1956, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome* London: Routledge (tr Emily O Lorimer, 2nd ed)

Carrington, A G 1960, *Aspects of Martial's Epigrams* Phillipines: Eton

Cerny, J 1952, Paper and books in ancient Egypt London: University Press (inaugural lecture)

Citroni, Mario 1968, 'Motivi di polemica letteraria negli epigrammi di Marziale', Dialoghi di Archeologia 2.259-301

-------- 1970, 'Un Proemio di Marziale (1.3)' in *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi Sexagenario oblata* Rome (editor and publisher unknown to me)

-------- (ed) 1975, *M Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber I* Florence: La Nuovo Editrice

-------- 1989, 'Marziale e la Letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell'intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri), *ICS* 14.201-26

Cloud, Duncan 1989, 'The patron-client relationship: emblem and reality in Juvenal's first book, in Wallace-Hadrill (ed) 1989:205-18

Coffey, Michael 1976, *Roman Satire* London and New York: Methuen

-------- and Mayer, Roland (edd) 1990, *Seneca: Phaedra* Cambridge: University Press

Coleman, K M 1978, *Siluae* 4.9: a Statian name-game', *PACA* 14.9-10

-------- 1986, 'The Emperor Domitian and literature', *ANRW* 2.32.5.3087-115

-------- 1988, *A Commentary on Statius <u>Siluae</u> Book 4* Oxford: University Press

Commager, Steele 1962, *The Odes of Horace: a Critical Study* New Haven: Yale University Press

Cotton, Hannah 1981, *Documentary Letters of Recommendation in Latin from the Roman Empire* Königstein: Hain

Courtney, E 1980, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* London: Athlone

-------- 1990, review of Coleman 1988, *CPh* 85.235-38

Crook, John 1955, *Consilium Principis* Cambridge: University Press (repr New York: Arno 1975)

-------- 1967, *Law and Life of Rome* London: Thames and Hudson

-------- 1976, '*Sponsione prouocare*: its place in Roman litigation', *JRS* 66.132-38

Curtius, Ernst Robert 1953, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (tr Willard R Trask) London: Routledge

Dalzell, A 1955, 'C Asinius Pollio and the early history of public recitation at Rome', *Hermathena* 86.20-32

-------- 1956, 'Maecenas and the poets', *Phoenix* 10.151-62

Daube, David 1976, 'Martial, father of three', *AJAH* 1.145-47

de la Calle, Pedro Urbano González 1935, 'Algunas observaciones acerca de la prosa de Marcial', *Emerita* 3.1-31

Dihle, Albrecht 1983, 'Seneca und die Aufführungspraxis der römischen Tragödie', *AA* 29.162-71

Dilke, O A W 1953, 'The rank of Statius' father', *PCA* 50.29-30

Duff, John Wight 1964, *A literary history of Rome in the Silver Age* (3rd ed, ed A M Duff) New York: Barnes and Noble

Duncan-Jones, Richard 1974, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* Cambridge: University Press

DuQuesnay, I M Le M 1984, 'Horace and Maecenas: the propaganda value of *Sermones* 1', in Tony Woodman and David West (eds), *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus* Cambridge: University Press (19-58)

Dziatzko, K 1897, 'Bibliotheken', *RE* 3.1.405-24

-------- 1897, 'Buch', *RE* 3.1.939-71

-------- 1897, 'Buchhandel', *RE* 3.973-85

Earl, Donald 1972, 'Prologue-form in ancient historiography', *ANRW* 1.2.842-56

Eisenstadt, S N and Roniger, L 1984, *Patrons, clients and friends: interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society* Cambridge: University Press

Elliott, Robert C 1982, *The Literary Persona* Chicago: University Press

Emonds, Hilarius 1941, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum: Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur* Leipzig: Harrassowitz (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 14)

Erren, Manfred 1983, *Eine Einführung in die römische Kunstprosa* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft

Fordyce, C J (comm) 1961, <u>Catullus</u> Oxford: University Press

Evans, Robert C 1989, *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press

Fairweather, Janet 1981, *Seneca the Elder* Cambridge: University Press

Feger, R 1956, 'T Pomponius Atticus', *RE* suppl 8.503-26

Ferguson, John 1988, *Catullus* (Greece and Rome New Surveys 19)

Finley, M I 1973, *The Ancient Economy* Cambridge: University Press

-------- 1983, *Politics in the Ancient World* Cambridge: University Press

Fishwick, Duncan 1987, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire* vol 1.1 Leiden: Brill

Forehand, Walter A 1985, *Terence* Boston: Twayne

Fowler, D P 1989, 'Brief reviews: Roman literature' (*inter alia*, of Coleman 1988) *G&R* 36.100-9

Frère, Henri (ed) 1961, *Stace* <u>Silves</u> Paris: Bude (with H J Izaac, 2nd ed)

Friedlaender, Ludwig 1908-13, *Roman Life and Manners* (tr L A Magnus and J H Freese) London: Routledge

-------- (ed) 1886, *M Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* Leipzig: Teubner (repr Hildesheim: Olms 1965, and Hakkert: Amsterdam 1967)

Garson, R W 1983, 'Martial on his craft', *Prudentia* 11.7-14

Garzetti, Albino 1974, *From Tiberius to the Antonines: a history of the Roman Empire AD 14-192* (tr J R Foster) London: Methuen

Gellner, E 1977, 'Patrons and clients', in E Gellner and John Waterbury (edd) *Patrons and clients in Mediterranean societies* London: Macmillan (1-6)

Gelzer, Matthias 1968, *The Roman Nobility* (tr R Seager) Oxford: Blackwell

Gold, Barbara K (ed) 1982, *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* Austin: University of Texas Press (introduction xi-xx)

Freese, J H 1926, <u>Aristotle The "Art" of Rhetoric</u> (The Loeb Classical Library)

Hall, J B 1999, 'Notes on Statius Thebaid Books I and II', *ICS* 14.227-41

Goldberg, Sander M 1983, 'Terence, Cato, and the rhetorical prologue', *CPh* 78.198-211

Goodyear, F R D (comm) 1972, *The Annals of Tacitus* vol 1 Cambridge: University Press

Gossage, A J 1972, 'Statius', in D R Dudley (ed) *Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I* London: Routledge (184-236)

Griffith, J G 1969, 'Juvenal, Statius and the Flavian establishment', *G&R* 16.134-50

Griffin, Jasper 1984, 'Augustus and the poets: "Caesar qui cogere posset"', in Fergus Millar and Erich Segal (edd), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* Oxford: University Press (189-218)

-------- 1985, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* London: Duckworth

Gunderheim, Werner L 1981, 'Patronage in the Renaissance: an explanatory approach', in Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (edd), *Patronage in the Renaissance* Princeton: University Press (3-23)

Hammond, Mason 1933, *The Augustan Principate in theory and practice during the Julio-Claudian period* New York: Russell and Russell

-------- 1970, 'Patronage', *OCD*[2] 939-40

Hands, A R 1968, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* London: Thames and Hudson

Hardie, Alex 1983, *Statius and the Siluae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* Liverpool: Cairns

Harvey, R A 1981, *A Commentary on Persius* Leiden: Brill

Havet, Louis 1903, 'La prose métrique de Martial', *RPh* 27.123-24

Helm, R 1949, 'Papinius', *RE* 18.2.984-1000

-------- 1955, 'M Valerius Martialis', *RE* 8A.1.55-85

Highet, Gilbert 1954, *Juvenal the Satirist: a Study* Oxford: University Press

-------- 1962, *The Anatomy of Satire* Princeton: University Press

-------- 1974, 'Masks and faces in satire', *Hermes* 10.321-37

Heubeck : insert from * overleaf

Hilberg, Isidor 1902, 'Biographie des Statius', *WSt* 24.514-18

Hodgart, Matthew 1969, *Satire* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson

Hofmann, J B 1936, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* Heidelberg: Winter

Holder, R A 1977, 'Domitian and the title Germanicus', *LCM* 2.151

Holford-Strevens, Leofranc 1988, *Aulus Gellius* London: Duckworth

Holzberg, Niklas 1988, *Martial* Heidelberg: Winter

Hopkins, Keith 1978, *Conquerors and Slaves* Cambridge: University Press
    (Sociological Studies in Roman History 1)

Hopkinson, Neil (comm) 1988, *A Hellenistic Anthology* Cambridge:
    University Press

Horsfall, Nicholas 1981, 'Poets and patron: Maecenas, Horace and the
    Georgics, once more', North Ryde: Publications of the Macquarie
    Ancient History Association no 3

---------- (comm) 1989, *Cornelius Nepos: a selection, including the
    Lives of Cato and Atticus* Oxford: University Press

Housman, A E 1972, 'Corrections and explanations of Martial', in J
    Diggle and F R D Goodyear (edd), *The Classical Papers of A E
    Housman* Cambridge: University Press 711-39 = *JPh* 30. 1907.229-65

Howe, N Phillies 1985, 'In defence of the encyclopaedic mode: on
    Pliny's preface to the *Natural History*', *Latomus* 44.561-76

Howell, Peter 1980, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of
    Martial* London: Athlone

-------- 1990, 'Martial introduced' (review of Holzberg 1988), *CR*
    40.35-6

* Heubeck, Alfred, West, Stephanie, and Hainsworth, J B 1988, *A
    Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* vol 1 Oxford: University Press

Hutchinson, G O 1988, *Hellenistic Poetry* Oxford: University Press

---------- 1990, review of Coleman 1988, *JRS* 80.215-16

Immisch, O 1911, 'Zu Martial', *Hermes* 46.481-517

Izaac, H J (ed) 1969, *Martial Epigrammes* Paris: Bude (3rd ed)

Janson, Tore 1964, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* Stockholm: Acta Universitatis (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 13)

Jenkinson, J R (ed) 1981, *Persius: the Satires* Warminster: Aris and Phillips

Jones, A H M 1974, 'Inflation under the Roman Empire', in *The Roman Economy: Studies in ancient economy and administrative history* ed P A Brunt London: Blackwell (187-227) = *Economic History Review* 5.1953.293-318 (revised)

Jones, F L 1935, 'Martial, the client', *CJ* 30.355-61

Jones, F M A 1982, 'A note on Juvenal 7.86', *CQ* 32.478-79

Kaufman, Robert R 1974, 'The patron-client concept and macro-politics: prospects and problems', *CSSH* 16.284-308

Kay, N M 1985, *Martial Book 11: a Commentary* Duckworth: London

Kennedy, George A 1989, 'The evolution of a theory of artistic prose', in Kennedy (ed), *The Cambridge History of literary criticism* vol 1 Cambridge: University Press

Kenney, E J 1962, 'The first Satire of Juvenal', *PCPhS* 8.29-40

-------- 1976, 'Ouidius prooemians', *PCPhS* 22.46-53

-------- 1982, 'Books and readers in the ancient world', *CHCL* 2.3-32

Kenyon, F G 1951, *Books and readers in Greece and Rome* Oxford: University Press (2nd ed)

-------- and C H Roberts 1970, 'Books, Greek and Latin', *OCD*[2] 172-75

Kirk, G S 1985, *The Iliad: a Commentary vol 1: Books 1-4* Cambridge: University Press

Kitto, H D F 1961, *Greek Tragedy: a literary study* London: Methuen

Kleberg, Tönnes 1967, *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (tr E Zundken)

Knapp, Mary E 1961, *Prologues and Epigrams of the Eighteenth Century* New Haven: Yale University Press

Knoche, Ulrich 1975, *Roman Satire* (tr E S Ramage) Bloomington and London: University of Indiana Press

Kytzler, Bernard 1960, 'Beobachtungen zum Prooemium der Thebais', *Hermes* 88.331-54

LaFleur, R A 1979, '*Amicitia* and the unity of Juvenal's First Book', *ICS* 4.158-77

Lee,Guy and Barr, William (edd) 1987, *The Satires of Persius* Liverpool: Cairns (Latin and Greek Texts 4)

Legras, L 1907, 'Les Dernières Années de Stace', *REA* 9.338-48

Lewis, Naphthali 1974, *Papyrus in classical antiquity* Oxford: University Press

Liebeschuetz, J W G 1979, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* Oxford: University Press

Lloyd, L J 1953, 'Erotion: a Note on Martial', *G&R* 22.39-41

Lochner, A 1986, 'The structure of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*', in Roger French and Frank Greenaway (edd), Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the ELder, his Sources and Influence London and Sydney: Croom Helm

Lockyer, Charles W 1970, *The fiction of memory and the use of written sources: convention and practice in Seneca the Elder and other sources* diss Princeton

Lucas, D W (comm) 1968, *Aristotle: Poetics* Oxford: University Press

Lucas, Hans 1938, 'Martial's *Kalendae Natalicae*', *CQ* 32.5-6

Lytle, Guy Fitch 1987, 'Friendship and patronage in Renaissance Europe', in F W Kent and Patricia Simons (edd), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* Oxford: University Press (47-61)

McGushin, P (comm) 1977, *Sallust: Bellum Catilinae* Leiden: Brill

McKeown, J C (comm) 1987/89, *Ovid: Amores Text, Prolegomena and Commentary* Liverpool: Cairns

Macleod, C W 1979, 'The poetry of ethics: Horace *Epist* 1', *JRS* 69.16-27

MacMullen, Ramsay 1974, *Roman Social Relations 50 BC to AD 284* New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Mantke, Józef 1967/68, 'Do we know Martial's parents? (Martial 5.34)', *Eos* 57.234-44

Marastoni, Aldo 1969, 'Der Dichter Statius', *Das Altertum* 15.220- 37 (tr Franz Paschke)

Marshall, Anthony J 1976, 'Library resources and creative writing at Rome', *Phoenix* 30.252-64

Martin, Donnis 1939, 'Similarities between the *Siluae* of Statius and the *Epigrams* of Martial', *CJ* 34.461-70

Maunde Thompson, E 1912, *An Introduction to Roman Palaeography* London: Kegan Paul

Mayer, Roland 1989, 'Friendship in the satirists', in Braund (ed) 1989:5-21

Mayor, J E B (comm) 1853, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal* London: Macmillan

Merkelbach, R 1979, 'Warum Domitians Siegername Germanicus eradiert worden ist', *ZPE* 34.62-64

Metzger, B M 1964, *The text of the New Testament* Oxford: University Press

Millar, Fergus 1977, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)* London: Duckworth

Mohler, S L 1931, 'The *cliens* in the time of Martial' in Hadzsits, G P (ed), *Classical Studies in Honour of J C Rolfe* Phildelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Murgatroyd, Paul 1980, *A commentary on the first book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press

Parry, Milman 1986, 'The traditional poetic language of oral poetry', in Harold Bloom (ed) _Homer_ New York: Chelsea House 19-24

Newmyer, Stephen Thomas 1979, _The Siluae of Statius: Structure and Theme_ Leiden: Brill

Nisbet, R G M (comm) 1961, _Cicero: in Pisonem_ Oxford: University Press

-------- 1978a, '_Felicitas_ at Surrentum (Statius _Siluae_ 2.2)', _JRS_ 68.1-11

-------- 1978b, 'Notes on the text of Catullus', _PCPhS_ 24.92-115

Norden, Eduard 1923, _Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance_ Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner (2 vols)

Nordh, Arvast 1954, 'Historical exempla in Martial', _Eranos_ 52.224-38

Ogilvie, R M 1965, _A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5_ Oxford: University Press

Otto, August 1890, _Sprichworter und sprichwortliche Redensarten der Romer_ Leipzig: Teubner

Paoli, Ugo Enrico 1963, _Everyday Life in ancient Rome_ London: Longmans (tr R D Macnaghten)

Parsons, P J 1968, 'Papyrologica Mediolanensia II: XAPTAPIA', _Parola del Passato_ 23.287-90

Paul, G M 1985, _An historical commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum_ Liverpool: Cairns

Pavlovskis, Zoja 1967, 'From Statius to Ennodius: a brief history of prose prefaces to poems', _RIL_ 101.535-67

Peter, Hermann 1901, _Der Brief in der römischen Literatur_ Leipzig: Teubner (repr Olms: Hildesheim, 1965)

Phillips, John J 1986, 'Atticus and the publication of Cicero's works', _CW_ 79.227-37

Pinner, H L 1948, _The world of books in classical antiquity_ Leiden: Brill

Pitcher, Roger A 1985, 'The dating of Martial Books 13 and 14', _Hermes_ 113.330-39

Oliver, R P 1951, 'The first Medicean ms. of Tacitus and the titulature of ancient books', _TAPhA_ 82:232-61

Plass, Paul 1985, 'An aspect of epigrammatic wit in Martial and Tacitus', *Arethusa* 18.187-210

Platnauer, M 1948, 'Spicilegia Valeriania', *G&R* 17.12-17

Platner, Samuel Ball and Ashby, Thomas 1929, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* Oxford: University Press

Platthy, J 1968, *Sources on the earliest Greek libraries* Amsterdam: Hakkert

Pollard, Arthur 1970, *Satire* London: Methuen (Critical Idiom 7)

Porter, David H 1987, *Horace's Poetic Journey: a Reading of Odes 1-3* Princeton: University Press

Powell, Jonathan 1987, 'The *farrago* of Juvenal 1.86 reconsidered' in Whitby et al (edd) 253-58

Price, S[imon] R F 1980, 'Between man and god: sacrifice in the Roman imperial cult', *JRS* 70.28-43

-------- 1984a, *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* Cambridge: University Press

-------- 1984b, 'Gods and emperors: the Greek language of the Roman imperial cult', *JHS* 104.79-95

Quinn, Kenneth 1982, 'The poet and his audience in the Augustan Age', *ANRW* 2.30.1.75-180

Raven, D S 1965, *Latin Metre* London: Faber

Rawson, Elizabeth 1985, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* London: Duckworth

Reeve, M D 1983, 'Martial', in Reynolds (ed) 1983:239-42

Reynolds, L D (ed) 1983, *Texts and Transmission: a survey of the Latin Classics* Oxford: University Press

Reynolds, L D and Wilson, N G 1968, *Scribes and Scholars: a guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature* Oxford: University Press (2nd ed)

Quinn, Kenneth (comm) 1973, *Catullus: The Poems* London: Macmillan

Roberts, C H 1954, 'The Codex', *PBA* 40.169-204

-------- 1970, 'Books in the Graeco-Roman world and in the New Testament', in P A Ackroyd and C F Evans (edd), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* vol 1 Cambridge: University Press

Roberts, C H and Skeat, T C 1983, *The Birth of the Codex* Oxford: University Press

Rosenmeyer, Thomas G 1982, *The Art of Aeschylus* Berkeley: University of California Press

Rudd, Niall 1966, *The Satires of Horace* Cambridge: University Press

-------- 1986, *Themes in Roman Satire* London: Duckworth

Ruppert, Johannes 1911, *Quaestiones ad historiam dedicationis librorum pertinentes* diss Leipzig

Ste Croix, G E M de 1954, '*Suffragium*: from vote to patronage', *British Journal of Sociology* 5.33-48

Saller, Richard P 1982, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* Cambridge: University Press

-------- 1983, 'Martial on patronage and literature', *CQ* 33.246-57

-------- 1989, 'Patronage and friendship in early imperial Rome: drawing the distinction', in Wallace-Hadrill (ed) 1989:49-62

Schetter, W 1962, 'Die Einheit des Prooemium zur Thebais des Statius', *MH* 19.204-17

Schmidt, Peter L 1979, 'Martialis 1', *Der kleine Pauly* 2.324-27

Schnur, H C 1978, 'Again "Was Martial really unmarried?"', *CW* 72.98-99

Schubart, W 1921, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* Berlin: Vereinigung

Scott, Kenneth 1936, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* New York: Barnes and Noble

Selden, Raman 1978, *English Verse Satire 1590-1765* London: Allen and Unwin

Scullard, H H 1981, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* London: Thames and Hudson

Shackleton Bailey, D R (ed) 1965, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* vol 1 Cambridge: University Press

Shelton, Jo-Ann 1988, *As the Romans did: a sourcebook in Roman history* Oxford: University Press

Sherwin-White, A N 1966, *A Commentary on the Letters of Pliny* Oxford: University Press.

Shipp, G P (comm) 1960, *Terence: Andria* Oxford: University Press

Simcox, George Augustus 1883, *A History of Roman Literature from Ennius to Boethius* London: Longmans (2 vols)

Skeat, T C 1952, 'The use of dictation in ancient book production', *PBA* 38.179-208

-------- 1956, 'The use of *dictatio* in ancient book production', *PBA* 42.179-208

-------- 1969, 'Early Chistian book-production: papyri and manuscripts', in G W H Lampe (ed), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* vol 2 Cambridge: University Press

-------- 1982, 'The length of the standard papyrus roll and the cost-advantage of the codex', *ZPE* 45.169-75

Skutsch, Otto (comm) 1985, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* Oxford: University Press

Seager, R 1977, '*Amicitia* in Tacitus and Juvenal', *AJAH* 2.40-50

Smith, R E 1951, 'The law of libel at Rome', *CQ* 45.169-79

Sommer, Richard 1926, 'T Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken', *Hermes* 61.389-422

Sowa, Cora Angier 1984, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci

Spaeth, John W 1929, 'Martial looks at his world', *CW* 24.361-73

Starr, Raymond J 1987, 'The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world', *CQ* 37.213-23

-------- 1990a, 'Pliny the Younger on private recitations and C Titius on irresponsible judges', *Latomus* 49.464-72

-------- 1990b, 'The used-book trade in the Roman world', *Phoenix* 44.148-57

Stoessl, Franz 1953, 'Prologos', *RE* 23.1.632-41

-------- 1979a, 'Prologus', *Der kleine Pauly* 4.1170-73

-------- 1979b, 'Prooimion', *Der kleine Pauly* 4.1179

Sullivan, J[ohn] P 1987a, 'Martial's satiric epigrams', in Whitby et al (edd) 1987:259-65

-------- 1987b, 'Martial', *Ramus* 16.177-91

Summers, Walter C (ed) 1910, *Select Letters of Seneca* London: Mamillan

Sussman, Lewis A 1978, *The Elder Seneca* Leiden: Brill

Sutton, Dana Ferrin 1986, *Seneca on the Stage* Leiden: Brill

Sykutris 1931, 'Epistolographie', *RE* Suppl 5.185-220 (no first name given)

Syme, Ronald 1939, *The Roman Revolution* Oxford: University Press

-------- 1958, *Tacitus* Oxford: University Press

Szelest, Hanna 1984, 'Martial - eigentlicher Schöpfer und hervorragendster Vertreter des römischen Epigramms', *ANRW* 2.32.4.2563-2623

Tanner, R G 1984, 'Levels of intent in Martial', *ANRW* 2.32.4.2624-77

Tarrant, Richard (comm) 1976, *Seneca: Agamemnon* Cambridge: University Press

Taylor, Lily Ross 1949, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (Sather Classical Lectures no 22)

-------- 1968, 'Republican and Augustan writers enrolled in the equestrian census', *TAPhA* 99.496-86

Traglia, Antonius 1967, 'De P Papinio Statio Siluarum poeta', *Latinitas* 15.171-78

Turner, E[ric] G 1968, *Greek Papyri: an Introduction* Oxford: University Press

-------- 1977, *The Typology of the early Codex* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Van Dam, Harm-Jan 1984a, *P Papinius Statius, Siluae Book II: a commentary* Leiden: Brill

-------- 1984b, 'The *Siluae* of Statius', *ANRW* 2.32.4.2726-2789

Van der Valk, H L M 1957, 'On the edition of books in antiquity', *Vigiliae Christianae* 11.1-10

Van Groningen, B A 1946, 'The proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen* (ns) 9.4 Amsterdam: North-Holland

1963, 'EKDOSIS', *Mnemosyne*[4] 16.1-17

Van Sickle, John 1980, 'The book-roll and some conventions of the poetic book', *Arethusa* 13.5-42

Vessey, David 1982, 'Flavian epic', in *CHCL* 2.561-80

-------- 1973, *Statius and the Thebaid* Cambridge: University Press

Viljamaa, T 1968, *Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period* Helsinki (publisher unknown)

Vollmer,

←—Friedrich (ed) 1898, *P Papinii Statii Siluarum Libri* Leipzig: Teubner repr Hildesheim 1971)

Von Albrecht, Michael 1989, *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius: Interpretative Studies* (tr Neil Adkin) Liverpool: Cairns (ARCA Monographs 23)

Wacher, John 1987, *The Roman Empire* London: Dent

Wagenvoort, Hendrik 1952, 'Ad Stat *Silu* 1 *praefationem*', *Mnemosyne*[4] 5.235

-------- 1956, 'Ludus poeticus', in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* Leiden: Brill (repr New York and London: Garland, 1978) (30-42)

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew (ed) 1989, *Patronage in Ancient Society* London: Routledge

-------- 1989, 'Patronage in Roman society: from Republic to Empire', in Wallace-Hadrill (ed) 1989:63-87

-------- 1990, 'Pliny the elder and man's unnatural history', *G&R* 37.80-97

Warde Fowler, W 1908, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero* London: Macmillan

Waszink, J H 1963, 'Das Einleitungsgedicht des Persius', *WS* 76.79-91

Webster, T B L 1969, *An Introduction to Sophocles* London: Methuen (2nd ed)

Weinbrot, Howard 1982, *Alexander Pope and the Traditions of Formal Verse Satire* Princeton: University Press

Welles, C Bradford 1934, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: a study in Greek epigraphy* New Haven: Yale University Press

Whitby, Michael, Hardie, Philip and Whitby, Mary (edd) 1987, <u>Homo Viator</u>: *Classical Essays in Honour of John Bramble* Bristol: Classical Press

White, Peter 1974, 'The presentation and dedication of the *Siluae* and the *Epigrams*', *JRS* 64.40-61

-------- 1975, 'The friends of Martial, Statius and Pliny and the dispersal of patronage', *HSCPh* 79.265-300

-------- 1978, '*Amicitia* and profession of poetry in early Imperial Rome', *JRS* 68.74-92

-------- 1982, 'Positions for poets in early Imperial Rome', in Gold (ed) 1982:50-66

West, M L 1966, <u>Hesiod, Theogony</u> Oxford: University Press
-------- 1978, <u>Hesiod, Works and Days</u> Oxford: University Press

Wilkinson, L P 1946, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* Cambridge: University
    Press

Willcock, M M 1989, review of Goldberg 1984, *JRS* 79.187-8

Williams, Gordon 1970, *The Nature of Roman Poetry* Oxford: University
    Press

-------- 1978, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early
    Empire* Berkeley: University of California Press

-------- 1982, 'Phases in political patronage of literature in Rome',
    in Gold (ed) 1982:3-27

Winkler, Martin M 1983, *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*
    Hildesheim: Olms

Wiseman, T Peter 1982. 'Poets and Patrons in Late Republican Rome', in
    Gold (ed) 1982:28-49

Wood, E J 1970, 'Statius', *OCD*[2] 1011-12

Wood, Neal 1988, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought* Berkeley:
    University of California Press

Woodcock, E C 1959, *A New Latin Syntax* London: Methuen Yavetz, Zvi
    1988, *Plebs and Princeps* (new ed) New Brunswick: Transaction Books
    (1st ed Oxford: University Press 1969)

Zetzel, J E G 1982, 'The poetics of patronage in the late first
    century BC', in Gold (ed) 1982:87-102

Zwierlein, Otto 1966, *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas* Meisenheim am
    Glan: Hain

* * * * * * * * * *

APPENDIX

GLOSSARY OF TERMS CONCERNING THE ANCIENT BOOK

cf Chapter 2

Bibliopola

(Otherwise *bybliopola*) 'bookseller', derives from the Greek βιβλιοπώλης. The term is used of Tryphon (Mart 4.72.2; 13.3.4; 14.194.2); Hor *ArsP* 345; Plin *Ep* 1.2.6; 9.11.2; *CIL* 6.9218 (*TLL* 2.1955.32-51; Birt 1882:353)

Bibliotheca

Otherwise *bybliotheca*, from the Greek βιβλιοθήκη. A library, by which is meant either a collection of books or the building or room containing them--the distinction is not always clear; cf Cic *Fam* 13.77.3 'Dionysius, seruus meus, qui meam bibliothecen multorum nummorum tractauit'; Mart 7.17.1 'ruris bibliotheca delicati' (*TLL* 2.1955.52-1957.16). The word came to indicate particularly the public libraries of Rome once these came into being: eg Pliny *HN* 7.115 'bibliotheca, quae prima in orbe ab Asinio Pollione ex manubus publicata Romae est' (*TLL* 2.1957.17- 1958.74).

Capsa

A cylindrical case for holding papyrus rolls, and occasionally used also to refer to a receptacle for other things. Used in the former

context at Hor *Sat* 1.10.63; *Epist* 2.1.268; Pliny *HN* 8.107; 16.229; Stat *Silu* 4.9.21; Juv 10.117; cf Porphyrio *ad Hor Epist* 2.1.113 'scrinia capsas dicit...in quibus scripta omnia reponantur'.

Charta

(Or *carta*) is the Latinised form of the Greek χάρτης, which was used of the paper manufactured from papyrus eg 'cartae regiae nouae bibli' (Cat 22.6; cf Nisbet 1978:96-97); Pliny *HN* 13.74; 37.103; Juv 13.116. When indicating quantity the word implied a roll rather than a sheet of papyrus (Turner 1968:4; Lewis 1974:70-77). *Charta* quickly took on the generic connotations of meaning 'paper' (Lewis 1974:77). Eventually the word became synonymous with *scriptum* or *liber*: eg Cic *Cael* 40 'chartae...quae illam pristinam seueritatem continebant obsoleuerunt'; Mart 2.8.1 'Si qua uidebuntur tibi, lector, in istis/ siue obscura nimis siue latina parum' (*TLL* 3.998.46-999.54).

Codex

Or *caudex*, originally meant the trunk or stem of a tree (Virg *Geo* 2.30; Pliny *HN* 13.56; Gellius 5.3.3), and was sometimes used of the post onto which criminals were fastened (Plaut *Poen* 1153; Prop 4.7.44). It took on the technical meaning of a 'book' formed from wooden tablets or (later) other materials (*TLL* 3.1404.10-1406.52). Often the term referred to official records (Suet *Aug* 101.1, Sen *Dial* 10.13.4) or account-books (Cic *QRosc* 1.5, *Ver* 1.92, Juv 7.110) (*TLL* 3.1406.53-1407.22).

Cornu

This word (= 'horn') is occasionally used of books, in which context
it means 'the ends of the *umbilicus* or stick around which rolls of
papyrus were wound' (*OLD* sv 7d); 'projecting knobs' (Kenyon 1951:61).
Used in the plural in this context: [Tib] 3.1.13 'atque inter geminas
pingantur cornua frontes'; Ov *Tr* 1.1.8; Mart 11.107.1 'explicitum
nobis usque ad cornua librum'. The word came to have this special
sense 'quod uolumen explicitum simile sit aciei cornibus' (*TLL*
4.26-30; cf Birt 1913:331-32).

Edere

In essence this word means to 'bring forth' (offspring) or to produce
or render services. The specific meaning applicable here is 'to
publish' (writings), used esp of an author or bookseller: eg Martial
4.33.3 'Edent heredes...mea carmina' (*TLL* 5.2.88.15- 89.18; *L-S* sv 2B;
OLD sv 9).

Editio

Like *edere*, with which it is linked, this noun came to have a special
sense with regard to books (= 'publishing'), and it is in this sense
that the word has been taken into modern English usage. See eg Stat
Silu 4pr17 'de editione Thebaidos meae'; 'an editione sint digni'
Pliny *Ep* 3.15.1 (cf *TLL* 5.2.79.59-80.34; *OLD* sv 4).

Literally, that which points or indicates, referring sometimes to the forefinger or an informer. In its metaphorical sense it is often used in connection with the ancient book and inscriptions. Firstly, the term is used to indicate a small leaf of papyrus (*schedula*) attached to a roll supplying title and author. Thus Vitr 7*pr*10 'ego non alienis indicibus mutatis (sc ut plagiarius) interposito nomine meo id profero corpus', and Mart 3.2.11 'cocco rubeat superbus index'; cf also Cic *De Or* 2.14.61, Ov *Pont* 1.1.5, Liv 38.56 'index orationis habet P Scipionis nomen M Naeuii habet', and Birt 1882:223, 328. Secondly, it sometimes means a summary or epitome of the work it heads: 'summa argumenti, epitome uberioris scripturae', as in Pliny *HN* 30.4 'Hermippus...uersus Zoroastris indicibus...uoluminum eius positis explanauit'; Suet *Aug* 101.4 'indicem rerum a se gestarum'; Gaius *Inst* 3.54 'hactenus omnia iura quasi per indicem tetigisse satis est'. The third sense, linked to the first, is that of a catalogue, eg Sen *Dial* 9.9.4 'bybliothecas, quarum dominus uix tota uita indices perlegit'; Gell 3.3.1 'indicibus fabularum Plautinarum', cf Quint 10.1.57 (*TLL* 7.1A.1140.13-1144.10; *L-S* sv). Martial and Statius do not use this word in connection with literature, but it might have been used to indicate the Statian prefaces with their 'inventory' aspect.

The word parallels the Greek σίλλυβος, which means a parchment-label appended to the outside of a book: Cic *Att* 4.4a.1 '[librariolis] imperes ut sumant membranulum ex qua indices fiant, quos uos Graeci, ut opinor, σίλλυβος appellatis, cf ib 4.5.3 (Liddell-Scott-Jones sv II).

Libellus

Diminutive of *liber* (see below). It could be used of a small work
written for publication, a volume or a book: eg Pliny *Ep* 9.6.1 'inter
pugillares ac libellos' and Juv 1.86 'nostri farrago libelli'. When
Martial uses *libellus* in this context, ie as a synonym for *liber*, it
usually has apologetic overtones: eg Mart 5.2.5-6 'lasciuos lege
quattuor libellos:/ quintus cum domino liber iocatur' (cf Sage 1919:68
and Coleman 1988:226). In poetry the substitution of *libellus* for
liber was sometimes motivated *metri gratia* (Tanner 1984:3039).
Otherwise *libellus* was used of a single poem: eg Stat *Silu* 1pr2, 16,
27; 2pr15; 3pr2, 11, 23 (White 1974:45; Coleman 1988:226), cf Cic *Arch*
25, Prop 1.11.19 (*TLL* 7.1268.70-1269.4). The word could also
represent a notebook or register, or official communication or
documentation (*a libellis*). See also *TLL* 7.1262.51-1270.74.

Liber

Apart from its senses as a proper noun and an adjective, this was one
of the standard words for 'book'. In this context the word originally
indicated the inner bark of a tree: Curt 8.9.15 'libri arborum teneri
haud secus quam chartae litterarum notas capiunt'; cf Virg *Aen* 11.554
and Stat *Theb* 1.584 (*TLL* 7.2.1271.12-1272.28). It is uncertain, and
impossible to determine, whether this is because *liber* was used as the
equivalent for the Greek λέπος because it already indicated a now lost
type of 'book' written on bark, or because bark was the native
substance most closely resembling papyrus (Kenney 1982:15). In the
event, *liber* came to designate a book written for publication, a
volume or roll: Cic *Att* 2.6.1 'libris me delecto'; cf Sen *Controu*

1.3.11; Juv 3.41; Tac *Ann* 3.58. On a number of occasions the word is used of a single volume from a long work: Cic *QFr* 3.5.1 'sermo...in nouem...libros distributus'; Quint *Inst* 6.3.86 'de libro Enni annali sexto'. Statius refers to his second book of *Siluae* as 'liber meus' (2pr4). Specialist connotations of *liber* were as applied to sacred books containing prophecies consulted at times of prodigies (cf Cic *Div* 1.72; Livy 3.10.7), and to any lengthy document such as record-books or ledgers (Cic *Verr* 3.167; Sen *Ben* 7.10.5; Juv 9.84) (*TLL* 7.2.1272.29-1280.12; *OLD* sv 4).

Librarius

Used of both (1) a scribe, copyist or secretary or (2) a bookseller (*OLD* sv 3). Cicero's letters to Atticus mention *librarii* in the first sense on a number of occasions: eg Cic *Att* 4.16.1 'epistula librarii manu est'; *Att* 12.14.3 'quem librum ad te mittam si descripserint librarii'. See also eg Mart 2.1.5 'quod haec una peragit librarius hora' and *CIL* 1.594.1.3.14; Livy 38.55.8 (*TLL* 6.2.1347.14-51). A different meaning of the word is that of a bookseller or a dealer in books: eg Cat 14.17-18 'ad librariorum/ curram scrinia'; Sen *Ben* 7.6.1 'libros dicimus esse Ciceronis: eosdem Dorus librarius suos uocat' (*TLL* 6.2.1352-61). The diminutive *librariolus* is also found: Cic *Att* 15.7; 4.4a.1 (*TLL* 6.2.1346.76-84).

Membrana

The term for the skin of sheep and goats used for the preparation of writing materials, particularly parchment: eg Cat 22.7; Hor *Sat* 2.3.2

'Sic raro scribis, ut toto non quater anno/ membranam poscas'; Pliny
HN 13.70; Martial 14.186 (*TLL* 8.630.50-631.32).

Pagina

Corresponding to the Greek σελίς, is applied to the column of writing,
which at times could be so wide as to extend over two or three sheets
(Turner 1968:5). Later, the term was used of complete sheets of
writing. Thus Isidore (*Orig* 6.14.6), writing at a time when the
parchment codex had become the norm: 'partes libri paginae dicuntur,
eo quod sibi inuicem compingantur'.

Pugillares

A set of writing tablets, small enough to be held in the hand: eg Sen
Ep 15.6; Plin *HN* 16.68; Mart 14.7 'Pugillares membranei'; Plin *Ep*
1.22.11 'libellos et pugillares'; 7.9.16 'pugillares resumis'; 9.36.6
(*OLD* sv). *Pugillalarius* was used as a noun of agent, meaning a maker
of or dealer in small writing tablets (*CIL* 6.9841).

Titulus

Originally used of a flat piece of wood, or other material inscribed
with a notice supplying information, often identification. A frequent
use in this regard was as a tablet or inscription describing a
person's career; cf Ov *Ars Am* 2.265 'nocturnis titulos imponimus
actis', also *Rem Am* 302; Tib 2.4.54; Prop 4.5.51. The specific use of

this term in the context of Roman literature was as a heading for a
book or chapter, eg Ov *Tr* 1.1.7; *Pont* 1.1.17; Pliny *HN* pr 26; Mart
13.3.7 'addita per titulos sua nomina rebus habebis' (*OLD* sv). This
was often in the form of a piece of papyrus or vellum projecting from
the roll as it lay on a shelf (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174).

The word *lemma* (a subject for consideration, = λέμμα) is used by
Martial as a synonym for *titulus*: 'lemmata si quaeris cur sint
adscripta docebo:/ ut, si malueris, lemmata sola legas' (see *L-S* sv
2b) In this context it refers to the titles of the *Xenia* and
Apophoreta.

Umbilicus

Originally indicates the navel or umbilical cord of humans or other
animals. In time it acquired meanings as applied to objects
resembling the navel in position or shape, cf ὀμφαλός. This protrusion
was the boss at the end of the roller around which the papyrus was
wound (*OLD* sv), rather than the roller itself (*pace* Birt 1913:329-30).
The expression 'usque ad umbilicum' (or 'umbilicos') thus came to mean
reaching the end of a roll, and it is used with that connotation at
Hor *Epod* 14.8 and Martial 4.89.2 ('iam peruenimus usque ad
umbilicos'). They served as handles when the rolls were stored in a
bookseller's pigeon-hole or a *capsa*. 'Coffee-table' editions, those
intended primarily for display, often boasted two bosses: Stat *Silu*
4.9.8 'binis decoratus umbilicus'; Mart 3.2.9 'pictis luxurieris
umbilicis' (Coleman 1988:225-26).

Volumen

Deriving from *uoluere*, this word essentially means anything rolled. It soon came to take on the specialised meaning of a roll of papyrus forming a book or part of a book, and later even a book of any form: Ulp *Dig* 32.52 'librorum appellatione continentur omnia uolumina, siue in charta siue in membrana sint siue in quauis alia materia'. It was used also in very different contexts to designate a twist, wreath or fold. In its most common use, however, the word indicates a papyrus roll: eg Cic *Brut* 122 'in hac turba nouorum uoluminum'; Cic *QFr* 1.2.8 'uolumina selectarum epistularum'; Hor *Epist* 2.1.26 'pontificum libros, annosa uolumina uatum'; Mart 7.63.1 'numquam moritura uolumina' (*OLD* sv; Birt 1882:14-16). This became a specifically Roman word for a book, there being no Greek analogue for it (Kenney 1982:15).