

OVID, MARTIAL, AND POETIC IMMORTALITY: TRACES OF *AMORES* 1.15 IN THE *EPIGRAMS*

CRAIG WILLIAMS

Martial was clearly well read in Ovid. His epigrams display various turns of phrase and metrical features reminiscent of his predecessor, whom he cites on a number of occasions as an important figure in Roman poetry, sometimes implying that Ovid is second only to Virgil or even the equivalent of the latter in light verse.¹ Here I wish to consider the ways in which one of Ovid's meditations on his own poetic activity, *Amores* 1.15, leaves various traces in Martial. Throughout, my goal is not so much to prove that Martial was consciously thinking of *Amores* 1.15 (or any other text for that matter) when he wrote a given epigram as it is to describe significant and interesting relationships between earlier and later texts²—we will see that the epigrammatist's use of this Ovidian text goes far beyond isolated linguistic

1 See Zingerle 1877, Siedschlag 1972, and Szelest 1999 for helpful catalogues of passages displaying similarities in diction and meter, and Sullivan 1991.105–07 and Pitcher 1998 for thematic comparisons. Hinds 1998.130–35 considers several epigrams of Martial from an Ovidian perspective, asking in particular “how . . . Martial's *Ars amatoria* differ[s] from the *Ars amatoria* which we know and love.” For Martial's implicit comparison of Ovid to Virgil (a point not emphasized in contemporary scholarship), see 3.38.10 and 8.73.9–10 (n. 35 below); the judgment was encouraged by Ovid's own boast in a passage to which we will also return (*Rem.* 395–96).

2 As Fowler 1997a.19–20 puts it: “We require a correspondence to stand out and to make sense: that is, if someone wants to convince the interpretative community of a particular intertextual relation, s/he must say how the correspondence between the source- and target-texts is special, and s/he must do something interesting with it, make it mean.” It would be needlessly impoverishing to restrict our discussion to those few allusions that we can identify with reasonable confidence as consciously intended by the later author, and it seems most fruitful to start from, and always keep before us, what we already have in front

borrowings—and to consider how the exercise of reading Ovid through Martial might shed some light on the distinct but related stances toward their own poetry adopted by these two poets.

There is a noticeable tendency among ancient poets to place first-person meditations on their own poetic practice, generally accompanied by references to the immortality of their verse, at the beginning and end of a book or collection; among the most famous examples in Roman poetry are Horace's *Odes* 1.1, 2.20, and 3.30.³ Ovid's *Amores* 1.15 places itself firmly in this tradition.⁴ Here Ovid defends his choice to take up a career in poetry rather than pursuing the traditional paths of the military, law, and politics (Ovid *Am.* 1.15.1–12, 31–42):

Quid mihi, *livor edax*, ignavos obicis annos,
ingeniique vocas carmen inertis opus;
non me more patrum, dum strenua sustinet aetas,
praemia militiae pulverulenta sequi,
nec me verbosas leges ediscere nec me
ingrato vocem prostituisse foro?
mortale est, quod quaeris, opus. mihi fama perennis
quaeritur, *in toto semper ut orbe canar.*
vivet Maeonides, Tenedos dum stabit et Ide,
dum rapidas Simois in mare volvet aquas;
vivet et Ascræus, dum mustis uva tumebit,
dum cadet incurva falce resecta Ceres.
.....
ergo cum silices, cum dens patientis aratri
depereant aevo, carmina morte carent:

of us anyway: not the authors but the texts (cf. Conte and Barchiesi 1989). See Hinds 1998.50, however, for a salutary reminder of how “vocabularies of reader-oriented intertextuality . . . can never be truly hospitable to the possibilities of tendentiousness, quirkiness or sheer surprise which add spice to the allusive practices of real authors.”

3 See Kranz 1961 for a survey from Homer to Ovid.

4 Kranz 1961.122 argues that “im Dichtwerk Ovids hat die hier betrachtete Kompositionsform in gewisser Weise eine Vollendung gefunden.” See Paratore 1959 for further discussion of the technique in Ovid. McKeown 1989 ad *Am.* 1.15 asserts that “this final poem is the *sphragis*, the seal set on the book,” but most scholars reserve that term for texts in which the poet explicitly names himself and/or identifies his birthplace, and which have the function of asserting poetic paternity (Kranz 1961.15). Examples from Ovid's *Amores* would include the epigram at the beginning of Book I, 1.11, 2.1, 3.15.

cedant carminibus reges regumque triumphi,
 cedat et auriferi ripa benigna Tagi.
 vilia miretur vulgus; mihi flavus Apollo
 pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua,
 sustineamque coma metuentem frigora myrtum,
 atque a sollicito multus amante legar!
pascitur in vivis livor; post fata quiescit,
 cum suus ex merito quemque tuetur honos.
 ergo etiam cum me supremus adederit ignis,
 vivam, *parsque mei multa superstes erit.*

Gnawing envy, why do you reproach me with lazy years and call my poetry the work of an idle mind? Why object that I do not, after ancestral fashion, pursue the dusty rewards of military service while still young and strong, or that I do not learn wordy laws by heart, or sell my voice in the ungrateful forum? What you seek is mortal; I am seeking eternal fame so that I may be sung forever all around the world. Homer will live as long as Tenedos and Ida are standing, as long as the Simois rolls its swift waters into the sea. Hesiod, too, will live as long as the grape swells with its juice, as long as grain falls to the ground, cut back by the curved sickle . . . Cliffs and the tooth of the enduring ploughshare will perish over time, but poetry is deathless. Let kings and the triumphs of kings yield to poetry, let the kindly banks of the gold-bearing Tagus yield to poetry. Let the common people admire ordinary things. To me let golden-haired Apollo serve goblets full of Castalian water; let me wear cold-fearing myrtle in my hair and be read widely by the anxious lover. Envy feeds on the living; after death it quiets down, when everyone receives the honor he has earned. Thus even after the funeral flame has consumed me, I shall live, and a large part of me will survive.⁵

5 All translations are my own.

Ovid's response to the criticism that he is wasting his time is as blunt as it is effective: his chosen activity will give him something that he could never obtain from a more ordinary career, nothing less than worldwide renown and immortality. He illustrates the point with a catalogue of poets who have achieved immortality through their verse (Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Sophocles, Aratus, Menander, Ennius, Accius, Varro Atacinus, Lucretius, Virgil, Tibullus, Gallus), to which we will return, and finally reverts to the opening theme of *lavor*, noting that malicious criticism is the lot of poets only while they are alive. This remark is followed by a closing couplet whose second line recalls a ringing phrase from Horace's conclusion to his first three books of *Odes* (C. 3.30.6–7: "non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei / vitabit Libitinam").⁶ Throughout the poem, in fact, there are clear echoes of earlier poetic meditations on poetry elsewhere in Horace, in Propertius (assuming the relevant chronology), and in Callimachus.⁷ Built as it is around an invocation of authoritative predecessors, this poem has a strongly intertextual quality.

It should come as no surprise to find echoes of this proud, self-conscious text in a poet who, according to Pliny the Younger, wrote in the expectation that his work would last forever.⁸ Like Ovid, Martial defends his

6 Nor is this the only echo of Hor. C. 3.30. With the prayer for a myrtle wreath at *Am.* 1.15.37 ("sustineamque coma metuentem frigora myrtum"), McKeown 1989 aptly compares the final image of the Horatian ode (C. 3.30.15–16: "mihi Delphica / lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam").

7 Cf. Callim. *Hymn to Apollo* and Hor. C. 2.20.4 for the theme of *phthonos* or *lavor*; Prop. 2.30.22 for the rejection of military service ("non me . . . praemia militiae pulverulenta sequi"); Hor. C. 1.1.3–4 ("sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum / collegisse iuvat") for the imagery of dust. The distancing from the *vulgus* (*vilis miretur vulgus*) combined with ritual imagery ("mihi flavus Apollo / pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua") echoes, again, Callim. *Hymn to Apollo* and especially Hor. C. 3.1.1–4 ("odi profanum vulgus et arceo. / favete linguis: carmina non prius / audita Musarum sacerdos / virginibus puerisque canto") as well as 2.16.37–40 ("mihi parva rura et / spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae / Parca non mendax dedit et malignum / spernere vulgus"), but see also Prop. 2.13.9–16, 4.6. Propertius creates a contrast between *invidia* during life and *honos* after death in a couplet whose very structure resembles Ovid's contrast between *lavor* for the living, *honos* for the dead: compare Prop. 3.1.21–22 ("at mihi quod vivo detraxerit *invidia* turba, / post obitum duplici faenore reddet *honos*") with Ov. *Am.* 1.15.39–40 ("pascitur in vivis *lavor*; post fata quiescit, / cum suus ex merito quemque tuetur *honos*").

8 Pliny himself does not share Martial's optimism: "at non erunt aeterna quae scripsit: non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scripsit tamquam essent futura" (*Epist.* 3.21). Among Martial's own allusions to his poetic immortality, see 10.26.7, where Martial claims that by memorializing a dead man he is granting him *aeterno victurum carmine nomen*. For a survey of the "immortality" motif in Roman poetry, see Stroh 1971.235–49.

decision to pursue poetry on several occasions, characteristically emphasizing the opposition between the poorly remunerated path of poetry and a lucrative legal career,⁹ but it would be hard to argue for a specifically Ovidian touch in these passages, with the possible exception of 5.16.5–6 (“nam si falciferi defendere templa Tonantis / sollicitisque velim *vendere verba* reis . . .”), which recalls an image found in *Amores* 1.15 (5–6: “nec me . . . / ingrato *vocem prostituisse* foro”).¹⁰ An unmistakable echo of the Ovidian text is, however, to be found in the second of two self-referential epigrams that, significantly, are the opening poems of a revised version of the tenth book (10.2):¹¹

Festinata prior, decimi mihi cura libelli
 elapsum manibus nunc revocavit opus.
 nota leges quaedam sed lima rasa recenti;
 pars nova maior erit: lector, utrique fave,
 lector, opes nostrae. quem cum mihi Roma dedisset,
 “nil tibi quod demus maius habemus” ait.
 “pigra per hunc fugies ingratae flumina Lethes
et meliore tui parte superstes eris.
 marmora Messallae findit caprificus et audax
 dimidios Crispi mulio ridet equos:
 at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt,
solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori.”

The attention, previously fleeting, that I paid to my tenth
 book has now caused me to return to it after it had slipped
 out of my hands. You will read some things already familiar

9 See 1.17, 2.30, 5.16, 12.68. For Martial's complaints of poverty (which must always be understood in relative terms), see 2.16, 2.43, 4.77, 5.13, 5.18, 5.39, 5.62, 5.78, 6.5, 6.82, 7.46, 7.48, 7.92, 8.67, 9.2, 9.18, 9.49, 9.54, 9.59, 9.73, 9.85, 10.10, 10.74, 10.76, 10.96, 11.108, 12.47, 12.57, 12.92.

10 The Ovidian passage is related to Prop. 4.1.133–34 (“tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo / et vetat insano verba tonare foro”), which itself may also be exerting some influence on Martial: is the superficial similarity between *tonare* and *Tonantis* merely coincidental? The relative chronology of the Ovidian and Propertian texts cannot be determined, but is irrelevant to this discussion. For the language of “prostituting one's voice,” cf. Cic. *Quinct.* 13, Ov. *Ars Am.* 3.97, Mart. 7.64.9, Juv. 8.185.

11 The first epigram in Book X is likewise addressed to the reader, who is told to read only as many epigrams as he wishes, so that he not find the book too burdensome.

to you but recently touched-up with an eraser; the greater part of the book will be new to you. Reader, look favorably on both. O reader, my riches! When Rome gave you to me, she said: "I have nothing greater to give you. By means of him you will escape the slow stream of the ungrateful Lethe, and you will survive in a better part of yourself. The wild fig tree splits Messalla's marble, and the bold mule-driver laughs at Crispus's half-horses. Paper, by contrast, is harmed by no theft and is benefited by the passing of time; these are the only monuments that do not know death."

The epigram has a noticeably Ovidian flavor. Its opening lines, with their allusion to a revision (along with the poet's preference for the new version) and their emphasis on book numbers, recall the epigram placed at the beginning of the *Amores*.¹² The striking address to the reader (*lector, opes nostrae*) brings to mind Ovidian apostrophes to the *lector* in the exile poetry, although the explicit identification of the reader rather than the text as the source of the poet's immortality ("pigra per hunc [sc., lectorem] fugies ingratae flumina Lethes") is something new.¹³ Finally, Martial's "meliore tui parte superstes eris" echoes the closing words of *Amores* 1.15 ("vivam, parsque mei multa superstes erit"),¹⁴ themselves echoed in the final lines of the *Metamorphoses* (15.875–76: "parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis / astra ferar").¹⁵

Martial's epigram thus inevitably also recalls the memorable

12 Compare Ovid's "Qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli, / tres sumus; hoc illi praetulit auctor opus" with Martial's "Festinata prior, decimi mihi cura libelli / elapsus manibus nunc revocavit opus."

13 The point is clearly implicit in such Ovidian statements as *Trist.* 1.7.31–32 ("laudatus abunde, / non fastiditus si tibi, lector, ero") and is, in any case, logical enough, since poetic works will hardly obtain immortality if readers do not favor them, but it is the bluntness of Martial's remark that is characteristic. For Ovid's addresses to the *lector* (only found in the exile poetry), see *Pont.* 3.4.43, *Trist.* 1.7.32, 1.11.35, 3.1.2, 3.1.19, 4.1.2, 4.10.132, 5.1.66; for Martial's, see 1.1, 1.113, 4.55, 5.16, 7.12, 9.pr., 10.2, 11.16, 11.108; cf. also 1.2, 1.40. Citroni 1975 ad Mart. 1.1.4 observes that the technique is otherwise quite rare in Latin literature.

14 Note in each case the position of *tui / mei* before the principal caesura and the phrase *superstes eris / erit* at verse end.

15 The language recurs in Ovid's later poetry and in subsequent authors (Ov. *Trist.* 3.3.59–60, 3.7.50, Lygd. 2.17–18, Sen. *Tro.* 378–79, *Dial.* 11.2.6).

Horatian phrase, already cited, that lies behind Ovid's imagery (*C.* 3.30.6–7: “non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei / vitabit Libitinam”), and indeed, like *Amores* 1.15, this epigram as a whole stands in a close relationship with the Horatian ode. Or rather, it creates a network linking itself with three earlier texts: the end of the *Metamorphoses*, *Amores* 1.15, and *Odes* 3.30. When, for example, Martial places the statement of poetic immortality in the mouth of a personified Rome, he implicitly associates his immortality with the city's lasting might. Precisely this motif is found in *Amores* 1.15 (where Ovid, asserting Virgil's immortality, adapts and bolsters a more cautiously phrased Virgilian claim linking his survival to Rome's *imperium*), as well as in the closing lines of the *Metamorphoses* and in Horace *Odes* 3.30 (where the poets explicitly associate the lasting survival of their poetry with the survival of Rome itself).¹⁶ Likewise, the final line of Martial's epigram, with its bold assertion that literary texts (*charta*) are the only monuments that will last forever, is a characteristically compressed version of Ovid's proud contrasts in *Amores* 1.15 between poetry, which will live forever (*carmina morte carent*), and such passing human phenomena as kings and their triumphs—or even such seemingly durable features of the world around us as cliffs and rivers. The closing lines of the *Metamorphoses* come to mind as well, with their defiant assertion that the poet's achievement cannot be destroyed by the natural elements, the wrath of Jupiter, or the passage of time (*Met.* 15.871–72: “iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis / nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas”). And Horace's ode lurks here, too, with its equally proud image of the poetic text as capable of outlasting both human creations and natural phenomena (*C.* 3.30.1–5: “exegi monumentum aere perennius / regalique situ pyramidum altius / quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens / possit diruere aut innumerabilis / annorum series et fuga temporum”). Indeed, while commentators have not suggested the parallel, it is hard not to hear in Martial's closing line (“solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori”) a specific echo of this most famous

16 Ov. *Am.* 1.15.25–26: “Tityrus et fruges Aeneiaque arma legentur, / Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit” (cf. V. *Aen.* 9.446–49: “si quid mea carmina possunt, / nulla dies umquam memori vos eximet aevo, / dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum / accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit”); *Met.* 15.876–79: “nomenque erit indelebile nostrum, / quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris, / ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama, / siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam”; Hor. *C.* 3.30.7–9: “usque ego postera / crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium / scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.” See also Ov. *Trist.* 3.7.51–52: “dumque suis victrix septem de montibus orbem / prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.”

monumentum in Roman poetry. Finally, Martial's combination of an Ovidian-Horatian image for poetic survival after death ("et meliore tui parte superstes eris") with a reference to *monumenta*, a word that hints at both tomb and memorial,¹⁷ invites us to extend the chain of reference back further, to two celebrated proclamations of poetic immortality normally cited as predecessors of the Horatian ode: Virgil's "victorque virum volitare per ora" (*Geo.* 3.9) and Ennius's "volito vivos per ora virum" (fr. 17–18), from an epigram composed to be inscribed on its poet's tomb.¹⁸

In short, by pointing back to memorable moments of poetic self-praise, Martial's epigram reminds us that its creator is working in a tradition that has immortalized those who have participated in it in the past and will no doubt continue to do so in the future. But the epigrammatist adds his own touch. Ovidian and Horatian reflections on lasting poetic fame placed at the end of a book, collection, or epic have become a declaration of immortality authoritatively uttered in the voice of a personified Rome and confidently positioned at the beginning of the book.

While Martial thus follows the tradition of placing explicit references to his own poetry at the beginnings and endings of his books (where they share the spotlight with epigrams praising the emperor—a sign of the times in which he wrote),¹⁹ he does not limit himself to these positions; but neither, in fact, did Ovid and Catullus.²⁰ Indeed, in an epigram found neither

17 See Suerbaum 1968.327–28 for "*monumenta* und Dichtung." The contrast between Messalla's tomb, destined to crumble, and the poet's work, destined to last ("marmora Messallae findit caprificus . . . / at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt") is reminiscent of an earlier poem (8.3.5–7: "at cum rupta situ Messalae saxa iacebunt / altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt, / me tamen ora legend . . ."), likewise positioned among its book's opening epigrams. This pointed antithesis recalls, once again, the Horatian book-conclusion (Hor. C. 3.30.1–3: "exegi monumentum aere perennius / regalique situ pyramidum altius / quod non imber edax . . .").

18 See OLD s.v. *monumentum* and Suerbaum 1968.165–76 for a discussion of the Ennian epitaph along with Virgil *Geo.* 3.1–48, Hor. C. 2.20 and 3.30. Commentators usually trace the motifs of flying and of being on the lips of many back even further, to the famous lines of Theognis: σοὶ μὲν ἐνὸς πτέρ' ἔδωκα . . . εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσση / ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν.

19 As Weinreich 1928.27 observes, the beginnings of Martial's books are, without exception, marked by poems on the themes "emperor," "poetry," or both, and most books end with these themes as well. The first two books exemplify the tendency clearly enough: see 1.1–6, 1.118; 2.1–2, 2.91–93.

20 For Ovid, consider *Amores* 1.11. As for Catullus, Paratore 1959.175 observes that his poems on his own poetry, including those in which he names himself, are scattered throughout the corpus in such a way as to make a large part of the collection itself "una perenne σφραγίς."

at the beginning nor at the end of its book, Martial combines the motif framing *Amores* 1.15—invidious criticism (*livor*)²¹ directed against the poet—with an allusion to his achievement of worldwide fame made in terms echoing the same Ovidian text (Mart. 8.61):

Livet Charinus, rumpitur, furit, plorat
 et quaerit altos unde pendeat ramos:
 non iam quod *orbe cantor et legor toto*,
 nec umbilicis quod decorus et cedro
 spargor per omnes Roma quas tenet gentes:
 sed quod sub urbe rus habemus aestivum
 vehimurque mulis non ut ante conductis.
 quid imprecabor, o Severe, *liventi*?
 hoc opto: mulas habeat et suburbanum.

Charinus is dark with envy, he is bursting, he rages, he weeps, he looks for high branches from which to hang himself: no longer because I am sung and read in the whole world, nor because I am spread abroad through all the peoples under Rome's dominion, handsome with my scroll-ends and cedar oil. No, it is because I have a summer estate outside the city, and I ride around drawn by mules that are not, as previously, rented. What curse shall I call down upon this envious man, Severus? This is my desire: may he have mules and an estate outside the city.

As in *Amores* 1.15, the language of *livor* is present in the first line and then again towards the end of the poem, but not, however, in the final line itself. The potential significance of this formal similarity seems at first to be outweighed by a crucial difference: in Ovid, *livor edax* takes aim at the poet's decision to waste his time with verse and not to engage in traditional military and legal pursuits, whereas in Martial's epigram, Charinus is now envious *not* because of the epigrammatist's literary success but rather because of his desirable country estate; the remark that Martial no longer has

21 The Ovidian tag *livor edax* (*Am.* 1.15.1, *Rem. Am.* 389; *Lucan* 1.288, *Sen. Ph.* 493, *Sid. Ap. Ep.* 4.18.5) recurs in Mart. 11.33, where it refers, however, to the emotion felt by a losing charioteer's faction. Kranz 1961.124 observes that *livor* appears as a concluding device also in *Pont.* 4.16 and recalls the Callimachean *phthonos*.

to rent his mules introduces a characteristic tone of earthy specificity and gentle self-mockery. Yet by means of his clever variation on the technique of *praeteritio* ("Charinus is *no longer* envious because of my worldwide fame . . ."), Martial ensures that we are left with a clear image of himself as *both* one who is read throughout the known world *and* as one who enjoys material signs of success (cf. 9.97). Thus the sarcastic final words (*mulas habeat et suburbanum*) have the effect of restating in positive terms that which has just been referred to in negative terms ("non iam quod orbe cantor et legor toto . . ."). Let Charinus have the estate: Martial possesses something much more valuable.

In the end then, the framing allusions to *livor* serve a similar function in both Ovid and Martial, supporting the assertion of the poet's ultimate superiority over his critics—whether because he will be immortal or because he enjoys worldwide fame in the here and now—regardless of any nasty remarks they might make. Meanwhile, it is Martial's cool allusion to the worldwide renown his poetry enjoys ("quod orbe cantor et legor toto") that constitutes the most straightforward Ovidian echo in this epigram. While images of universal fame are found in countless poets before and since, the combination of the verb *cantare/canere* or *legere* with expressions like *toto in orbe* or *totum per orbem* is particularly characteristic of Ovid and Martial, being attested, surprisingly enough, in only one other author.²²

Martial's use of the Ovidian tag draws our attention, moreover, to a minor but revealing difference between the two texts. Whereas Martial matter-of-factly claims fame in the here and now, Ovid speaks of a goal ("fama perennis quaeritur . . . ut . . ."). In other uses of this language, he likewise discreetly casts the verb in the future, or at least the subjunctive (*Am.* 1.3.25, *Ars* 2.740, *Rem.* 363), only allowing himself present indicatives

22 In Ovid, see *Am.* 1.3.25 ("per totum pariter cantabimur orbem"), *Am.* 1.15.8 ("in toto semper ut orbe canar"), 1.15.13 ("semper toto cantabitur orbe"), *Ars Am.* 2.740 ("cantetur toto nomen in orbe meum"), *Rem. Am.* 363 ("dum toto canter in orbe"), *Her.* 15.28 ("canitur toto nomen in orbe meum"), *Trist.* 4.10.128 ("in toto plurimus orbe legor"); cf. *Trist.* 2.118 ("grande tamen toto nomen ab orbe fero"). In Martial, see 5.13.3 (*toto legor orbe*), 6.64.25 (*totoque legetur in orbe*), 7.17.10 ("quae cantaberis orbe nota toto"), 8.61.3 ("orbe cantor et legor toto"); cf. 1.1.2 ("toto notus in orbe Martialis"). The only other attestation of collocations like these turned up by a search on the PHI Latin disk is found in an epigram on Cicero's villa by his freedman Tullius Laurea: "ut, quoniam *totum legitur sine fine per orbem, / sint plures oculis quae medeantur aquae*" (cited by Pliny *N.H.* 31.6; see Courtney 1993.182–83). McKeown 1989 suggests that *Am.* 1.15.8 and 1.15.13 are echoing a Callimachean passage now lost to us.

in the exile poetry, when such coyness was beside the point (*Trist.* 2.118, *Trist.* 4.10.127–28). Martial uses an unashamed present indicative both here and in similar assertions that he is read and known all over the world (1.1, 3.95, 5.13).²³ Moreover, Martial's phrase brings together two images for poetic performance regularly kept distinct in Ovid: the traditional metaphor—however weakened it may have become over time—of “singing” (e.g., *Am.* 1.15.8: “in toto semper ut orbe canar”) and the more direct language of “reading” (e.g., *Trist.* 4.10.128: “in toto plurimus orbe legor”).²⁴ When read from an Ovidian perspective, the combination of the two verbs in Martial's boast (“quod orbe cantor et legor toto”) lends it a particular point: he is *both* read *and* sung.²⁵

As we have seen in *Amores* 1.15, Ovid backs up his retort to *livor*—that his choice to pursue poetry will give him a reward far greater than anything a legal or military career could offer—with an extensive catalogue of Greek and Latin poets who have achieved immortality.²⁶ The message is clear: Ovid hopes, indeed expects, to join their ranks after his death (41–42). Ovid again offers a catalogue of predecessors culminating with himself at *Ars* 3.329–48, a list of recommended reading for women (Callimachus, Philitas, Anacreon, Sappho, Menander, Propertius, Gallus, Tibullus, Varro, and Virgil) to which Ovid himself hopes to be added, both as reading

23 At 6.64.24–25 (“at si quid nostrae tibi bilis inusserit ardor / vivet et haerebit totoque legetur in orbe”) the verbs are in the future, but the confident tone is clear: *if* Martial chooses to write an attack, it will be read all around the world. For a related assertion of worldwide fame in the present, see 10.9 (“notus gentibus ille Martialis / et notus populus”), and consider 8.3.3–4 (“iam plus nihil addere nobis / fama potest”).

24 Ovid never simultaneously predicates *cantari/cani* and *legi* of his own verse: both images appear within *Am.* 1.15 (8: “in toto semper ut orbe canar”; 38: “a sollicito multus amante legar”), but the two phrases are nonetheless kept distinct. Such expressions as *carmen legere* or *in carmine legi* (*Ars Am.* 1.2, 3.333, 3.341, *Rem. Am.* 763, *Pont.* 1.8.10, 2.5.9, *Trist.* 1.7.12, 2.80, 2.220, 2.275, 4.4.14, 4.10.57) point to the artificiality of the metaphor of “singing,” or at least to the fact that a *carmen* may be a written text, but that is a different question.

25 Discussing the use of *cantare* in contexts in which the musical element is absent and where the verb has more or less the sense “recite” (cf. *TLL* 3.290.21–34), Allen 1972.11 claims that, in 8.61 and elsewhere in Martial, *legere* and *cantare* “seem interchangeable in meaning.” I am suggesting, instead, that *cantor* in Mart. 8.61 constitutes a reference, via Ovid, to the traditional language of Roman “song” for poetry (cf. *TLL* 3.269.12–271.11, 3.290.54–291.12), and that there is thus a meaningful distinction between *cantor* and *legor*. Among many discussions of the language of singing and writing in Roman poetry, see most recently Lowrie 1997.49–76 and Wheeler 1999.58–65.

26 See McKeown 1989 ad 1.15.9–30 for Ovid's use of such catalogues.

material for contemporary women and as immortal poet.²⁷ A noticeably abbreviated version of the technique is found in the final poem of the *Amores* (3.15), where Ovid observes that, just as Mantua rejoices in Virgil and Verona in Catullus, so one day the Paeligni of Sulmo will have someone to be proud of (“Mantua Vergilio gaudet, Verona Catullo; / Paelignae dicar gloria gentis ego,” 7–8). Elsewhere, speaking more directly of the present, Ovid offers a brief list of poets who have had the power to immortalize their beloveds: just as Nemesis, Cynthia, and Lycoris are famous thanks to Tibullus, Propertius, and Gallus respectively, Ovid’s own Corinna enjoys fame to such an extent that many wonder who she really is (*Ars Am.* 3.535–38).

Ovid would have been gratified to know that when Martial offers similar catalogues of literary predecessors in his own reflections on his and others’ poetry, he regularly includes Ovid in his list. And Ovid would no doubt have been amused to see that, having incorporated his predecessor in such catalogues, Martial follows in his footsteps by extending the list to include himself. Indeed, the practice is characteristic of precisely these two poets.²⁸ In 1.61, following and expanding upon *Amores* 3.15, Martial offers an impressive catalogue of those writers who have brought fame to their homelands—Catullus, Virgil, Livy, Stella, Flaccus, Apollodorus, Ovid, the elder and younger Seneca, Lucan, Canius, Decianus—and confidently concludes that Licinianus and Martial himself will do the same: compare his “te, Liciniane, *gloriabitur* nostra / *nec me tacebit* Bilbilis” (1.61.11–12) with Ovid’s “Paelignae *dicar gloria* gentis ego” (*Am.* 3.15.8). In 8.73, modulating and blending the motifs of homeland (*Am.* 3.15) and beloved (*Ars Am.* 3.535–38), Martial observes that Cynthia, Lycoris, Nemesis, and Lesbia have brought fame to their respective poets (Ovid had put it the other way around), and that if he manages to find a Corinna or an Alexis of his own, Ovid’s Paeligni and Virgil’s Mantua will be proud of him as well (9–10: “non me Paeligni nec spernet Mantua vatem, / si qua Corinna mihi, si quis

27 *Ars Am.* 3.339–40: “forsitan et nostrum nomen miscebitur istis, / nec mea Lethaeis scripta dabuntur aquis.” The *Remedia Amoris* offers a complementary recommendation *not* to read such *teneri poetae* as Callimachus, Philotas, Sappho, Anacreon, Tibullus, Propertius, Gallus, and Ovid himself (757–66).

28 It is not, to be sure, limited to them (cf. Prop. 2.34.85–94). But Horace’s practice stands in revealing contrast: consider *Sat.* 1.10.48, where, after listing other poets (Pollio, Varius, Virgil, Varro Atacinus), Horace dismisses himself as *inventore* [sc., *Lucilio*] *minor*; see also *Sat.* 1.4.39–40 (“primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetas, / excerptam numero”).

Alexis erit"). Remarkable here, apart from the boldness of Martial's assertion that *other* poets' homelands will be proud of him, is the same bluntness and lowering of tone seen in the epigram on Charinus and the mules. Martial wants to be added to the list of renowned poets headed by Ovid and Virgil not so much for the sake of immortality as for the sake of having an inspiring sexual partner in the immediate present (cf. 3–4: "si dare vis nostrae vires animosque Thaliae / et victura petis carmina, da quod amem").

In yet another epigram that rewards a reading in conjunction with *Amores* 1.15, Martial joins an abbreviated catalogue that includes Homer and Virgil, and that culminates with the poet himself, to the theme of a poet's reception before and after his death (5.10):

"Esse quid hoc dicam *vivis quod fama negatur*
 et sua quod rarus tempora lector amat?"
 hi sunt invidiae nimirum, Regule, mores,
 praeferat antiquos semper ut illa novis.
 sic veterem ingrati Pompei quaerimus umbram,
 sic laudant Catuli vilia templa senes,
 Ennius est lectus salvo tibi, Roma, Marone;
 et sua riserunt saecula Maeoniden,
 rara coronato plausere theatra Menandro,
 norat Nasonem sola Corinna suum.
 vos tamen o nostri ne festinate libelli:
 si post fata venit gloria, non propero.

"What shall I say of the fact that fame is denied to the living, that it is a rare reader who delights in works of his own time?" Clearly, Regulus, this is the way of envy: it always prefers the men of old to contemporaries. So it is that we ungratefully seek the ancient shade of Pompey's portico, and old men sing the praises of Catulus's cheap temple. While you still had Virgil alive, O Rome, it was Ennius whom you were reading; Homer was laughed at by his own generation; it was a rare theater that rang with applause for Menander, despite his wreaths; only Corinna knew her Ovid. As for you, O my books, don't rush! If glory comes after death, I am in no hurry.

The epigram begins and ends with characteristically clear and varied statements of its central theme (*vivis quod fama negatur* and *post fata venit gloria*), a theme complementary to that touched on at the beginning and explicitly formulated towards the end of *Amores* 1.15 (“quid mihi, livor edax, ignavos obicis annos” and “pascitur in vivis livor, post fata quiescit”). Ovid’s point is that malevolent criticism (*livor*) is the lot of living poets (*pascitur in vivis*) and leaves them only after their death (*post fata quiescit*). Martial observes that fame (*fama/gloria*) is denied living poets (*vivis negatur*) and comes to them only after their death (*post fata venit*).²⁹ The epigrammatist then presents illustrations of his thesis in the areas of architecture and literature, the latter consisting of three names prominent in the list in *Amores* 1.15—Homer, Menander, and Virgil—to whom Martial generously adds Ovid himself. Martial then summarizes with a phrase that simultaneously establishes a ring-composition and accomplishes an elegant variation not only on the epigram’s opening statement (cf. “*vivis quod fama negatur*” and “*si post fata venit gloria*”: contrast *vivis* with *post fata*, *negatur* with *venit*) but also on Ovid’s “*pascitur in vivis livor*; *post fata quiescit*” (contrast *fama* with *livor*, *post fata venit* with *post fata quiescit*).

The reprise, in the form of a protasis of a conditional sentence (“*si post fata venit gloria*”), is completed by an apodosis that constitutes the characteristic final twist (*non propero*), whereupon the tone is suddenly lowered from one of metapoetic meditation, complete with elevated apostrophe (*o nostri libelli*),³⁰ to assertion of the principle of self-preservation in the most immediate of terms: eternal renown is fine, but if fame really comes only posthumously, Martial is in no hurry!³¹ The joke is all the more amusing because Martial repeatedly—even in the same book as this—

29 Cf. Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.73–74: “scripta placent a morte fere, quia laedere vivos / livor et iniusto carpere dente solet.” Howell 1995 ad Mart. 5.10 aptly compares Quint. *Inst.* 12.11.7: “ac nescio an eum tunc beatissimum credi oporteat fore, cum iam secretus et consecratus, liber invidia, procul contentionibus famam in tuto collocari et sentiet vivus eam, quae post fata praestari magis solet, venerationem et, quid apud posteros futurus sit, videbit.” He also cites Ov. *Pont.* 4.16.3 (“famaque post cineres maior venit”), but Ovid’s point there is that he *already* has fame while alive and it will only increase (*maior*) after his death (consider the sentence immediately following: “et mihi nomen / tum quoque, cum vivis adnumerar, erat”).

30 See Citroni 1986 for discussion of the practice of apostrophizing one’s own verse in Horace, Ovid, and Martial.

31 Martial rarely resists reusing or recasting good material: more or less the same joke reappears in 8.69.

claims *already* to enjoy fame, sometimes in terms that recall Ovid's expression of hope for renown after death in *Amores* 1.15.³² In short, Martial's *non propero* is no modest statement that he is ready to wait for fame, but rather the cocky utterance of one who already knows that he is famous, and thus need not be anxious about the distant future.

This game will be familiar, precisely, to any reader of Ovid, who will, after all, surely be puzzled by that poet's presence (and indeed that of Virgil)³³ in Martial's catalogue of those who illustrate the principle *vivis fama negatur*. Directly contradicting Martial's claim that "only Corinna knew her Ovid"³⁴ are Ovid's allusions to the renown he has achieved in his own lifetime. Most relevantly, at *Remedia Amoris* 389–96 the poet joins an apostrophe to *livor edax*—the phrase occurs in Ovid only here and in *Amores* 1.15—to an assertion of achieved success ("rumpere, livor edax: magnum iam nomen habemus") and a boast that he has done for Roman elegy what Virgil did for epic ("tantum se nobis elegi debere fatentur, / quantum Vergilio nobile debet epos"), an accomplishment that Martial himself seems ready to grant him.³⁵ And indeed, while *Amores* 1.15 concentrates on the poet's success after death, the very fact that *livor edax* bothers to assail the poet for his choice of career presupposes that he is fairly well known.³⁶

32 See 3.95.7 (*ore legor multo*), 5.13.3 (*toto legor orbe*), and other claims of present and lasting *fama* (5.15.3–4, 5.16, 6.60, 6.64, 7.12, 8.pr., 8.3.4, 9.84, 10.2). Indeed, the proud statement at 1.1.4–6 ("cui, lector studiose, quod dedisti / viventi decus atque sententi, / rari post cineres habent poetae") directly contradicts the claim of 5.10. While it is possible that 1.1 was first published in a revised second edition of Books I–VII (see Citroni 1975 ad loc.) and that it was composed after 5.10, the fact remains that Martial published 1.1 and 5.10 together in the same collection.

33 As Howell 1995 observes on v. 7, "Martial ignores the fact that the *Aeneid* was only published after Virgil's death."

34 There is a slight ambiguity in Martial's phrase *norat Nasonem*, which might mean either that only Corinna knew Ovid or (by means of a common metonymy) that only Corinna knew Ovid's *verse*. In any case, Martial's claim is surprising, and is given particular prominence by the catalogue's crescendo structure: Ennius was preferred to Virgil during the latter's lifetime; Homer was ridiculed by his contemporaries; Menander was rarely applauded while alive; but Ovid was *absolutely unknown* to a contemporary public wider than his own mistress.

35 Consider Martial's linking of the names of Virgil and Ovid at 8.73.9 ("non me Paeligni nec spernet Mantua vatem"), discussed above, and 3.38.9–10 ("omnes gelidis quicumque lacernis / sunt ibi [sc., Romae], Nasones Vergiliosque vides").

36 Consider also *Am.* 3.1.19–20 ("saepe aliquis digito vatem designat euntem, / atque ait, 'hic, hic est, quem ferus urit Amor!'") and *Trist.* 4.10.121–24, an interesting pendant to *Amores* 1.15 ("tu [sc., Musa] mihi, quod rarum est, vivo sublime dedisti / nomen, ab exequiis quod

Martial's formulation, focusing as it does on Corinna, is likewise suggestive. We have already noted Ovid's remark that many readers want to know who Corinna is. Elsewhere the poet regrets that, because of his fame, he has prostituted his beloved (an interesting counterpart to the remark at *Am.* 1.15.5–6 that he has *not* prostituted his voice in the forum); elsewhere again, the poet tells us that one woman actually claims to be Corinna!³⁷ In short, attentive readers of Ovid, and certainly Martial himself, will be quite aware that not only did many of Ovid's contemporaries know him, but many wanted to know *Corinna*. In the face of Ovid's "multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant," Martial's "norat Nasonem sola Corinna suum" demands further attention. Confronted with the apparent discrepancy, scholars have explained that Martial is "exaggerating," "downplaying," "overlooking," or even "misremembering."³⁸ I would argue instead that Martial's epigram is playing with us—as readers of Ovid but also as readers of Martial. Despite their own occasional protests to the contrary, we know, thanks to these poets themselves, that the principle *vivis fama negatur* was illustrated, precisely, by neither of them. Moreover, as we have seen, an experienced reader of

dare fama solet. / nec, qui detractat praesentia, Livor iniquo / ullum de nostris dente momordit opus"). As with the statements on Corinna (see below), the historical reality behind Ovid's claim of achieved fame is less important for our purposes than the fact that Martial and many of his readers *knew* that Ovid had made the claim. In fact, there is no reason to doubt that Ovid did indeed achieve some renown in his own lifetime.

37 *Ars Am.* 3.538 (cited above): "et multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant"; *Am.* 3.12.10–12: "vendibilis culpa facta puella mea est. / me lenone placet, duce me perductus amator, / ianua per nostras est adaptata manus"; *Am.* 2.17.29: "novi aliquam, quae se circumferat esse Corinna." In his most explicitly autobiographical poem, Ovid states outright that Corinna was a pseudonym, repeats that she was renowned, and uses the collocation *totam cantata per urbem* (*Trist.* 4.10.59–60: "moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem / nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi"). But whether we take Ovid at his word or see it all as part of the game (i.e., there was no single real woman lying behind "Corinna"), we cannot read Martial's claim that only Corinna knew Ovid with a straight face.

38 Howell 1995 ad Mart. 5.10.10: "humorous exaggeration"; Barié-Schindler 1999 ad 5.10.7: "was Martial übersieht" and ad 5.10.10: "absichtliche Untertreibung." Shackleton Bailey 1993 ad 5.10.10 cites Ovid's remarks at *Amores* 2.17.29 and *Ars* 3.538 to the effect that "Corinna's identity was known only to himself," and suggests that since this is precisely the opposite of Martial's claim, "Martial's memory played him false" (a view endorsed by Walter 1996). Yet in the *Ars* passage, Ovid claims, "multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant," and in the *Amores*, "novi aliquam quae se circumferat esse Corinnam." The point is not—as it would have to be in order to be the opposite of Martial's claim—that no one knew of Corinna's existence, but rather that no one knew who she really was. The character "Corinna" was anything but unknown to a broad public, whereas this is precisely what Martial is claiming about Ovid in 5.10.

both Ovid and Martial will recognize that *Amores* 1.15 is itself markedly intertextual, recalling above all Horace, but also Propertius and Callimachus. Martial's invocation of Ovid in 5.10 brings home the point that neither Martial nor Ovid was the first, nor will either of them be the last, to reflect on these questions.³⁹

When Martial joins the number of poets who have meditated on current criticism and lasting fame—and who are now successfully immortal—with a clownish joke that he is in no hurry to join the gang if it means having to die first, we encounter the arch humor typical of this poet. But there is more to Martial's use of *Amores* 1.15 than this. By means of the various techniques we have reviewed, subtle and otherwise, Martial's text constitutes itself as the most recent link in chains of reference that have every sign of continuing on into the future—or, to use another image, it creates a hall-of-mirrors effect—and Ovid plays a critical role in this process. The cleverness of the artistry, but also the effectiveness of the claim, become that much clearer when Martial's allusive practices remind us that the author of the phrase “ars adeo latet arte sua” (“art is concealed by its own artistry,” *Met.* 10.252) played some of the same games himself.⁴⁰

*Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center,
City University of New York*

39 Another approach to Martial's claim “norat Nasonem sola Corinna suum” is to see it as an example of Martial's practice of making statements for the sake of a joke without regard to their objective truth-value: consider the contrasting stances adopted on such points as masturbation (9.58 vs. 11.58, 11.73) or whether or not he is married (11.19, 11.23 vs. 11.43, 11.104). This approach and that taken above are not mutually exclusive.

40 I wish to thank Stephen Wheeler for his helpful comments and criticism.