

result is a Cupid who avenges perjury and consorts with Juno: in short, a contrivance of necessity.

Ovid certainly was familiar with the well-known motif of Aphrodite's revenge; he refers to it in the introduction to his story of Adonis (*Met.* 10. 524–26):

iam placet et Veneri matrisque ulciscitur ignes.  
namque pharetratus dum dat puer oscula matri,  
inscius exstanti destrinxit harundine pectus.

The inversion of the motif is in Ovid's best manner. Myrrha is avenged on Venus by the goddess's own instrument, but Ovid's earlier portrayal of Myrrha is the more powerful because her emotional state has a different cause (*Met.* 10. 311–14):

ipse negat nocuisse tibi sua tela Cupido,  
Myrrha, facesque suas a crimine uindicat isto.  
stipite te Stygio tumidisque adfluit echidnis  
e tribus una soror.

Cupid's denial has a function in the narrative; it also contains a note of polemic. The brief allusion which alerts the reader to a specific mythological variant is a feature of the learned style.<sup>14</sup> Here the reference is made by the figure of Cupid himself—an innovation by Ovid, whose rejection of the conventional scene is an assertion of originality within a tradition defined by Cinna.<sup>15</sup>

PETER E. KNOX  
*Harvard University*

14. Thus Virgil, in a parenthesis referring to the metamorphosis of Cynus (*Aen.* 10. 188): *crimen, Amor, uestrum*.

15. For other possible variations of Cinna's treatment by Ovid, see Lyne on *Cir.* 257 ff.; 260; 286 ff.; 369–77.

#### MARTIAL 2. 83

Foedasti miserum, marite, moechum,  
et se, qui fuerant prius, requirunt  
trunci naribus auribusque uoltus.  
credis te satis esse uindicatum?  
erras: iste potest et irrumare.

*Et* = *etiam* was sometimes used to introduce the second member of what was in essence a *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction, though its surface form might vary, as, for example, in Martial 6. 27. 9–10 “Caecuba *non solos* uindemia nutriat orbos: / possunt *et* patres uiuere, crede mihi” (= *non modo orbi, sed etiam patres uiuere possunt*; or, in other words, *non modo orbos, sed etiam patres uindemia nutriat*). The first member of the correlation could be deleted, leaving *et* alone to imply the whole construction, as in Martial 3. 32. 1–2 “possum / *et* uetulam,

sed tu mortua, non uetula es" (= *possum futuere non modo puellam, sed etiam uetulam*).

There is a type of epigram in Martial in which a strongly emphatic *et* is placed in the second last position in the last line, preceding a word which is paradoxical or climactic, and which can usually be interpreted as the second member of a *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction. The function of *et* is to highlight the final word, which, characteristically, contains the sting of the epigram. So, for example, at 6. 33. 4 ("iam miser et futuit") the wretched *pedico* Sabellus *even futuit*, such are the straits to which he has come. Here one could probably not rewrite with a *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction, because Sabellus seems to have been forced to give up *pedicatio* (cf. 11.87, on Charidemus, who is forced by poverty to change from a *pedico* to a *fututor*); but the paradox is marked. On the other hand, at 12. 68. 6 ("redeo, si uigilatur et hic") Martial suggests that, if his sleep is to be disturbed *not only* at Rome, where one expects interruptions, but *even here* (i.e., at Bilbilis), where one expects quiet (see 1. 49. 33–36), he might as well go back to Rome. For other epigrams with an emphatic penultimate *et*, see 1. 47, 9. 5, 12. 42. It is to this category that 2. 83 belongs.

A. Richlin has recently proposed *irrumari* for the active in the last line of 2. 83.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that she has failed to recognize that the epigram belongs to a type. Her rendition ("You are wrong; he can still be irrumated") assigns to *et* a weaker, "additive" force (= "also, in addition") rather than the climactic force which it has above. The adulterer could indeed be irrumated in addition, just as he could (for example) suffer *pedicatio*. But where is the surprise or paradox in that? *Irrumatio* was, after all, one of the punishments threatened against adulterers.

It does not help if one paraphrases in the form of a *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction (= "he can be not only mutilated but even irrumated"). The climax is feeble. *Irrumatio* is simply another punishment for adultery, and arguably a far less serious one than facial mutilation. With *irrumari* as its second member, an implied correlative would be left open-ended. It would not be brought to an abrupt halt, as it should be in this type of epigram, by an indisputably climactic word. One can easily think of additional punishments, of equal or greater severity, which might be tacked on (notably castration).

Mutilation was a ghastly penalty, the more so because the disfigurement was thought to remain in the afterlife.<sup>2</sup> Virgil indirectly bears witness to the horror which facial mutilations evoked. Such acts were so repulsive to him that he avoided admitting them in his battle descriptions, despite abundant Homeric precedent, and despite the fact that he was in other respects by no means squeamish.<sup>3</sup> In Homer the eyes (e.g., *Il.* 13. 616, 14. 494), tongue (5. 74, 292), nose (5. 291, 23. 395), and teeth (5. 291, 16. 348) are often damaged. In Virgil the eyes of monsters are occasionally mutilated (*Aen.* 3. 635, 8. 261), but otherwise facial disfigurement is an avoided topic. It is significant that the mutilation of Deiphobus'

D. M. Bain and H. D. Jocelyn made some useful comments on a draft of this paper.

1. "The Meaning of *irrumare* in Catullus and Martial," *CP* 76 (1981): 40–46.

2. See E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London, 1980), p. 481, with the passages cited.

3. For full details, see my article, "Anatomical Terminology in Latin Epic," *BICS* 27 (1980): 59–60.

ears and nose (*Aen.* 6. 497) is called an *inhonestum uulnus*. For the degradation of facial mutilation, it is also worth consulting Artemidorus 4. 27.

*Irrumatio* of a male was usually regarded as a humiliating and hostile act (note *CIL* 4. 10030 "malim me amici fellent quam inimici irrumant"),<sup>4</sup> but threats to *irrumare* someone, whether genuinely voiced by a speaker or read into a remark by a listener, were so banal that potential acts of *irrumatio* had become something of a joke. The threat would rarely have been taken or intended seriously;<sup>5</sup> for *irrumatio* as a source of humor, see Plaut. *Amph.* 348–49 (the threat to "make someone silent" is taken as a threat of *irrumatio*; the joke, in various forms, was a standard one: see Catull. 74. 5–6 [a paradox], Mart. 3. 96. 3, 14. 74),<sup>6</sup> anon. ap. Suet. *Iul.* 22. 2, *CIL* 4. 2360 (= *CE* 45), Sen. *Ben.* 4. 31. 4, Mart. 3. 82. 33.<sup>7</sup> The obvious hyperbole of Catullus 37. 7–8 ("non putatis ausurum / me una ducentos inrumare sessores?") suggests that the threat had degenerated into a mere manner of speaking, expressing aggression but no real intention on the user's part (cf. Suet. *Iul.* 22. 2). That is not to say that an aggrieved husband might not occasionally have vented his aggression by threatening a *moechus* with *irrumatio*. But it is ludicrous to suppose that an adulterer who had suffered a hideous facial mutilation would be much put out if threatened with *irrumatio*, especially since the threat and its fulfillment were two distinct things. Nor can I see any merit in arguing for *irrumari* as deliberate bathos. An anticlimax it would certainly be, but not a very pointed one. Whether *irrumari* is taken as serious or incongruous, it gives a weak conclusion to the epigram.

There must be an implied reference in the last line to the punishment of castrating adulterers.<sup>8</sup> The face of the adulterer has been mutilated, but that is not enough to stop his activities: he can still even *irrumare* (sc. as well as *futuere*;<sup>9</sup> there is an implied *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction), because he still has a *mentula*. Hence he should have been castrated. It does not tell against this interpretation that Martial composed a similar epigram at 3. 85:

quis tibi persuasit naris abscidere moecho?  
non hac peccatum est parte, marite, tibi.  
stulte, quid egisti? nihil hic tibi perdidit uxor,  
cum sit salua tui mentula Deiphobi.

4. For *irrumatio* as a more humiliating act than *pedicatio*, see *Pr.* 28, 35.

5. See further A. E. Housman, "Corrections and Explanations of Martial," *JPh* 30 (1907): 257–58 (= J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 733).

6. At Mart. 14. 74 ("corue saluator, quare fellator habetis? / in caput intrauit mentula nulla tuum") the crow cannot be *irrumatus*, because he is too noisy (a *saluator*). There is an allusion here to the belief that the crow *coil ore*: see Pliny *HN* 10.32 "ore eos [sc. coruos] parere aut coire uulgus arbitrat.".

7. On *CIL* 4. 2360, see Housman, "Praefanda," *Hermes* 66 (1931): 406–7 (= *Classical Papers*, p. 1179). On Sen. *Ben.* 4. 31. 4 and various other passages, see Housman, "Corrections," pp. 257–58 (= *Classical Papers*, p. 733).

8. For which see Plaut. *Mil.* 1398–99, *Poen.* 862–63; Hor. *Sat.* 1. 2. 45–46; Val. Max. 6. 1. 13; Mart. 2. 60, 3. 85; see further H. Herter, "Genitalien," *RAC* X: 25. Herter seems to take the same view of Mart. 2. 83 as that argued here. Mart. 3. 92, which is also quoted in this connection by Richlin, "Meaning," p. 45, does not necessarily refer to castration: "ut patiar moechum rogat uxor, Galle, sed unum. / huic ego non oculos eruo, Galle, duos?" *Oculi* might just be an ad hoc metaphor = "testicles" based on the literal sense of *testes*, but for poking out of the eyes as a punishment for a sexual misdemeanor, see Mart. 1. 92. 12.

9. See D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Corrections and Explanations of Martial," *CP* 73 (1978): 277: "surely the primary sense is 'iste potest (etiam)nunc non modo futuere sed etiam irrumare!'" Richlin makes no mention of Shackleton Bailey.

He often expresses the same sort of point in a pair of epigrams, with variations of presentation (e.g., 6. 33 / 11. 87, 12. 16 / 12. 33). 3. 85 provides a clue to the interpretation of 2. 83 which is not to be glibly dismissed. The epigram under discussion makes its point more elliptically than 3. 85, just as 6. 33 is more elliptical than 11. 87, and 12. 33 than 12. 16.

The active *irrumare* provides an excellent climax in association with a suppressed *futuere* in an implied *non modo . . . sed etiam* construction. *Irrumatio* was a step up from *fututio* in the scale of sexual violations.<sup>10</sup> One who “denies nothing,” according to Martial (12. 79. 4), *fellat* (i.e., *irrumatur*). But what is the object understood with *irrumare*? The word is not exclusively applied to a hostile act perpetrated against a male, though that seems to have been its predominating use; for a man asking a girl in neutral terms to submit to *irrumatio*, see *CIL* 4. 10197 “elige, [p]uela. iruman[ti] . . . nuli negant [sc. puellae].”<sup>11</sup> Martial himself talks of committing *irrumatio* with a woman in a nonaggressive context at 4. 17. 3 (“facere in Lyciscam, Paule, me iubes uersus, / quibus illa lectis rubeat et sit irata. / O Paule, malus es: irrumare uis solus”), though there he was speaking to a male and could disregard the sensibilities of the woman.<sup>12</sup> Martial might have meant at 2. 83. 5 that the adulterer was even capable of exacting *irrumatio* from the wife, as the ultimate form of sexual penetration. The disgrace to the husband would be greater than that from an ordinary adulterous act by his wife. But a different interpretation is suggested by Catullus 74. 3–6 “patrui perdepuit ipsam / uxorem et patruom reddidit Harpocratem. / quod uoluit fecit: nam, quamuis inrumet ipsum / nunc patruom, uerbum non faciet patruos.” Gellius is envisaged as not merely committing *fututio* with the wife of his uncle, but, as a culminating humiliation, inflicting *irrumatio* on the husband. Given the predominating use of *irrumo* (that with a masculine object), and given its more insulting tone when the potential victim of the act was a male, it is highly likely that the force of the last line is: *iste potest non modo uxorem tuam futuere, sed etiam te irrumare*. Since the *moechus* still has a *mentula*, he is capable of inflicting a far worse humiliation on the husband than mere violation of his wife. For a virile man spoken of as both a *fututor* of women and *irrumator* of men (against whom he has a grudge), see Martial 2. 47. 4 “confidis natibus? non est pedico maritus: / quae faciat duo sunt: irrumat aut futuit.”<sup>13</sup> It is pointless to ascribe to *irrumare* in 2. 83 a weakened sense (with Housman);<sup>14</sup> it must have its literal sense if it is to serve as a climax.

10. See W. A. Krenkel, “*Fellatio* and *Irrumatio*,” *WZ Rostock* 29 (1980): 77–88, esp. 81–83.

11. The part of the inscription printed here seems certain enough, if the transcription is to be trusted, but I cannot see much justification for the editor’s insertion of *manu polluenti* in the gap.

12. Shackleton Bailey’s objection (“Corrections,” p. 277) to the text at 4. 17. 3, that “the poet would hardly present himself literally as *irrumator*,” carries no weight. Martial presents himself as a potential *irrumator* of men at 3. 82. 33 and 3. 96. 3, and of a woman at 4. 50. 2. For another example of *irrumo* with a female object, see schol. *Juv.* 6. 51.

13. The effeminate Gallus of this epigram is having dealings with another man’s wife. The punishment of *pedicatio* holds no fears for him, but he has made a mistake. The husband is no *pedicator*: he *irrumat* (his male enemies), and *futuit* (women). For the idea that an effeminate *moechus* might look forward to the punishment of *pedicatio*, see *Mart.* 2. 60. 2.

14. Housman did, however, take the husband to be object of *irrumare* (“*Praefanda*,” p. 409 = *Classical Papers*, p. 1181): “*moechum naso et auribus carentem nihilo setius uxorem permolere posse dicit atque eo ipso facto insuper maritum irrumare, hoc est uindicta ad irritum redacta ultro ei illudere.*” Richlin was right to argue against Housman, but she supports her case with the following generalization about

*Possum* had a well-established elliptical use (with *futuere* deleted), which is common in Martial (3. 32. 1 twice, 3 twice; 3. 76. 4 twice; 11. 97. 1, 2). This makes it particularly easy to understand *futuere* as the unexpressed complement of *potest*.

J. N. ADAMS

*University of Manchester*

---

the behavior of the Latin basic obscenities ("Meaning," p. 42): "no other primary obscenity in Latin [i.e., including *irrumare*] shows signs of any weakening—*futuere*, *pedicare*, *fellare* [*sic*] are always used with their sexual meaning. Latin simply shows no sign of a phenomenon of which English affords a rich variety of examples." I shall deal with the weakening of sexual terms in Latin elsewhere. It will suffice here to draw attention to the example of *irrumo* found on a wall of the room of the Seven Sages at Ostia (see G. Calza, "Die Taverne der sieben Weisen in Ostia," *Die Antike* 15 [1939]: 103): "amice fugit te prouerbium bene caca et irrima medicos." There is no question here of *medici* suffering *irrumatio*, or being threatened with *irrumatio*; they are not even addressed. The act of *bene cacandi* constitutes a figurative *irrumatio* of doctors. The verb is no more than a generalized expression of contempt (= Eng. "fuck the doctors").

#### CRITICAL NOTES ON SYMMACHUS' PRIVATE LETTERS

Unless otherwise stated, passages are cited from O. Seeck's edition of 1883 (Mon. Germ. Hist. VI). My copy formerly belonged to W. B. Anderson, who left a few penciled notes in Books I and II. These two Books have appeared in the Budé series in 1972, edited by J. Callu. I am much indebted to criticisms made by the referee of this paper, Professor Charles E. Murgia (= C. E. M.).

1. 2. 7.           virtutem, Verine, tuam plus mirer in armis,  
                     Eoos dux Armenios cum caede domares,  
                     an magis eloquium morum vitaeque leporem,  
                     et—nisi in officiis, quotiens tibi publica curae—  
                     quod vitam innocuis tenuisti laetus in agris?

Callu has a comma after *eloquium* in 9, but the asyndeton seems intolerable. I had thought of *eloquium* <an> *morum*, but prefer *et* (C. E. M.) to *an*, leaving a binary division between the arts of war (military prowess) and peace (eloquence, personal charm, and a taste for country life).

1. 4. 1   studium quidem Menippe Varronis imitatis, sed vincis ingenium. nam quae  
           in nostrates viros nuper conditis epigrammata, puto hebdomadon elogiis prae-  
           nitere; quod haec aequae sobria,<sup>†</sup> nec tamen castigata sunt, illa bono metallo  
           cusa, torno exigi nescierunt.

Symmachus pater's epigrams equalled Varro's as to content, but had more polish. Callu reads "quod haec <et illa> aequae sobria, haec tamen castigata." More simply: "quod haec aequae sobria, nec tamen <in>castigata." Serious content went along with elegance of form. Anderson proposed "nec tamen ieiuna sed castigata."