

his precursor only through a mediating poem more remote from his field, or is he submitting to a test of artistic strength, rewriting Tibullus while rewriting the Greek poem, simultaneously making all of it his own? Ovid's enterprise is especially daring in that the poem he is imitating is itself about the perils and rewards of imitation; but this fact could be interpreted as evidence of either bravado or a cagey and canny strategy of skimming even more lightly over the surface of Tibullus' corpus—of turning the poetic issues he must deal with into abstractions in order to face them. The polished, ironic surface of Ovid's poem deflects attempts to decide these questions, though not to trace his influences, which he has assuredly and ostentatiously mastered.

JOSEPH D. REED
*Institute for Research in the
 Humanities, Madison, WI*

MARTIAL 9.44 AND STATIUS

Martial 9.44, six lines on the Hercules statue belonging to Novius Vindex, has not, it seems to me, been fully appreciated, nor can it be without its full context, namely, Martial's previous poem, 9.43, and Statius *Silvae* 4.6, both on the same subject, and without a resolution of some textual problems. To the latter first. Martial 9.44:

Alcides modo Vindicem rogabam
 esset cuius opus laborque felix.
 risit, nam solet hoc, levique nutu
 "Graece numquid" ait "poeta nescis?
 inscripta est basis indicatque nomen."
 Lysippum lego, Phidiae putavi.

1 Alcides . . . Vindicem *ed. Rom.* (cf. Housman⁹, 1103) : -en . . . -cem γ: -en . . . -cis β, *edd.* 6 Lysippum (lis-) βγ (cf. Housman³ (ex Mart. ipso 5, 54, 2 Calpurnium afferre potuit)) : -ppu *Calderinus* : Λυσίππου *Aldus, edd. ceterum acumen, quod vix apparet, patefacere conatus est Henry, ingeniosius quam verius. sed tamen Phidiae ad gravitatem maiestatemque referendum videtur, quod ad lectionem in v. 1 pertinet* (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4, 6, 36)

So Shackleton Bailey's recent Teubner edition.¹ The first line is crucial; to whom is Martial speaking? Friedlaender allowed *Alciden* . . . *Vindicem* into the text, but Martial uses the double accusative with *rogo* only in the sense of "ask for," never "ask about."² For the reading *Alcides* . . . *Vindicem* Shackleton Bailey refers us to Housman. In his review of Heraeus, who printed *Alciden* . . . *Vindicis* and on 1.3

1. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, ed., *Martialis Epigrammata* (Stuttgart, 1990). In the apparatus Housman⁹ = *Classical Papers*, vol. 3, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), 1099–1104, a review of W. Heraeus, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* (Leipzig, 1925); Housman³ = *Classical Papers*, 2:711–39, 724–25; Henry = R. M. Henry, "On Martial IX, 44," *Hermathena* 71 (1948): 93–94.

2. Ludwig Friedlaender, ed., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* (Leipzig, 1886); for the double accusative with *rogo* cf. e.g., 4.77.1, 6.10.1, 11.68.1.

commented, "solet hoc] *sc. ridet Hercules poculum tenens, cf. Stat. s. 4, 6, 57*," Housman remarks,

If so, if the statuette had a fixed smile on its face (which, by the way, *solet* is incapable of meaning), it could not smile in answer to Martial's question, *non risit verum ridebat*; it must therefore have been Vindex who smiled and was wont to smile, and *Alcides . . . Vindicem* must be read. . . .³

Heraeus' reference to Statius, *tenet haec marcentia / pocula* (*Silvae* 4.6.57–58) is puzzling: there is nothing here to suggest that Hercules smiles as he holds the cup; indeed *marcentia* rather points to the soporific property of wine, but this reference is, in any event, quite extraneous here.⁴ And Housman, who himself was not averse to conversing with statues, surely pretends; to demolish Heraeus is not to establish the text!⁵

Heraeus, I suggest, was right to print *Alciden . . . Vindicis*, the reading of β. In his preface Shackleton Bailey provides a list of readings where one of the three families (α, β, γ) has preserved the truth against the other two.⁶ In this list are seven passages from Book 9, and in all has β preserved the correct reading in isolation. Indeed, Books 7, 8, and 9 have a combined total of sixteen passages on the list, and of these thirteen show β with the correct reading against αγ. Why, then, should we desert β here in what, barring coincidence, is its finest hour, particularly when the alternatives offered are, at best, difficult? Read

Alciden modo Vindicis rogabam

So in the final line of the poem β, this time together with γ, Housman, and Shackleton Bailey, is to be trusted and *Lysippum* to be read.

What does the poem mean? First the background; for this we go to Statius and to Martial himself.⁷ In addition to our poem, *Silvae* 4.6 and Martial 9.43 treat of this same statue. The latter is simple and to the point: the statue is described; it is a Lysippus; its previous owners include Alexander, Hannibal, and Sulla; it now rejoices to be in the home of the unassuming, learned Vindex. Martial 9.43:

Hic qui dura sedens porrecto saxa leone
mitigat, exiguo magnus in aere deus,
quaque tulit spectat resupino sidera vultu,
cuius laeva calet robore, dextra mero:
non est fama recens nec nostri gloria caeli;
nobile Lysippi munus opusque vides.
hoc habuit numen Pellaei mensa tyranni,
qui cito perdomito victor in orbe iacet;

5

3. Housman, *Classical Papers*, 3:1103.

4. More apposite would have been the previous line, *sic mitis vultus, veluti de pectore gaudens* (*Silvae* 4.6.55). For another statue smiling cf. *Anthologia Planudea* 174, where a speaking statue of Aphrodite prefaces its question with a smile, ἡ δ' ἀπαλὸν γέλαισασα.

5. See *A Shropshire Lad*, 51, "Loitering with a vacant eye . . ."

6. Shackleton Bailey, *Epigrammata*, viii–x.

7. Recent studies include Peter White, "The Friends of Martial, Statius, and Pliny, and the Dispersal of Patronage," *HSCP* 79 (1975): 265–300; Alex Hardie, *Statius and the "Silvae"* (Liverpool, 1983); K. M. Coleman, *Statius "Silvae" IV* (Oxford, 1988); J. P. Sullivan, *Martial: The Unexpected Classic* (Cambridge, 1991).

hunc puer ad Libycas iuraverat Hannibal aras;
 iusserat hic Sullam ponere regna trucem.
 offensus variae tumidis terroribus aulae
 10
 privatos gaudet nunc habitare lares,
 utque fuit quondam placidi conviva Molorchii,
 sic voluit docti Vindicis esse deus.

Silvae 4.6, by contrast, is an elaborate composition of more than one hundred hexameters; since it includes all the details of Martial 9.43, it has been suggested that the two poems were composed from a "recipe" supplied by Vindex (White, "Friends," 287). It is, for example, striking that both poems refer to the Molorchus tale.⁸ I would suggest that, whatever the circumstances of the composition of these two poems, Martial knew Statius' poem and wrote our poem, 9.44, in response to it. If this is so, we may be sure that Martial did not respond with an effort that fell flat, nor with one that is merely adequate.⁹

As has often been noted (e.g., Vollmer, *Silvarum Libri*, 473) Statius begins his poem with a Horatian air of informality. *Silvae* 4.6.1–4:

Forte remittentem curas Phoeboque levatum
 pectora, cum patulis tererem vagus otia Saepiti
 iam moriente die, rapuit me cena benigni
 Vindicis.

This is the very tone which, beginning with the second word *modo*, pervades Martial's poem; if Statius is on such familiar terms with Vindex, then Martial is equally intimate with the statue! Statius goes on to describe the simplicity of the dinner and tell us that poetry was the topic of conversation (4–16). Next comes Vindex's art collection. 4.6.20–22:

mille ibi tunc species aeris eborisque vetusti
 atque *locuturas* mentito corpore ceras
 edidici.

Such a description of the life-like appearance of a work of art is almost a commonplace; on Lysippus' genius compare, for example, *gloria Lysippo est animosa effingere signa* (Prop. 3.9.9). I wonder whether Martial's talking statue is a playful development of this detail from Statius. Undisputable, however, is Statius' claim to have learned from his patron. Vindex, continues Statius, is an expert. 4.6.22–24:

quis namque oculis certaverit usquam
 Vindicis artificum veteres agnoscere ductus
 et non inscriptis auctorem reddere signis?

8. In her preface (*Silvae*, xxi) Coleman dates Statius' poem to "winter 94/95," and, with less circumspection, in her commentary (137) to 94; the publication of the collection she dates to summer 95 (xx). For the publication of Martial IX see Sullivan, *Martial*, 42: "Book IX came out perhaps in the spring of 95."

9. Friedrich Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri* (Leipzig, 1898), reading *Alcides* . . . *Vindicem*, saw this poem (9.44) as Martial's attempt to compensate for the weakness of his first effort (9.43): "Martial scheint selbst die Schwäche des ersten empfunden zu haben; der zweite Versuch ist vortrefflich gelungen" (475). Cf. Hardie, *Statius*, 71: "9, 43 (*sic*) is a humorous personal exchange between Martial and Vindex over the statuette, reflecting pleasant and cultured informality." Henry, ("On Martial," 94) basing his reasons on the false reading *Λυσίππου*, supposed our statue a forgery, and that Martial's poem was written to relieve his artistic conscience after writing 9.43, a poem "that politeness required."

Patently alluded to by Martial who, the very opposite of Vindex, cannot identify an artist—even of a piece complete with inscription (*inscripta est basis*)—and who, the very opposite of Statius, has remained untouched by Vindex's expertise.¹⁰ Indeed it is feigned ignorance that is the premise, and supplies much of the humor, of Martial's poem: *cuius opus* asks Martial, who has but now told us in 9.43 that we are looking at a Lysippus!

Talking statues are much more the stuff of Greek poetry than of Latin, and in one sense Martial 9.44 is a "Greek" poem.¹¹ This makes the statue's inquiry *Graece numquid . . . poeta nescis* all the more amusing, and not only allows Martial to continue the *ignoramus*, *Lysippum lego*, *Phidiae putavi*, but also, in claiming to think our statue a Phidias, to pay Vindex what Sullivan termed a hyperbolic compliment.¹²

Phidias is introduced here, as elsewhere in Martial, as the measure of the art; compare 10.89.1–2:

Iuno labor, Polyclite, tuus et gloria felix,
Phidiacae cuperent quam meruisse manus,

which is, of course, not to demean Polyclitus. Similarly in our poem we should not suppose that Martial convicts Vindex's statue of inferiority by being "only" a Lysippus;¹³ nor, again, that he suggests the presence of any specifically Phidian qualities in this particular *objet d'art*.

In sum, Martial 9.44 is a witty retort to *Silvae* 4.6; it is a rare Roman treatment of a theme typically Greek. If, as seems certain, 9.43 was commissioned by Vindex, then 9.44 is a bonus that must have delighted that poetic patron.¹⁴

ALLAN KERSHAW
Loyola University, Chicago

10. I note here the very attractive suggestion of *CP*'s anonymous referee that the line *inscripta est basis indicatque nomen* is better understood as being spoken by Martial rather than the statue.

11. Cf. e.g., Callimachus, *Aetia* 114 Pf.; *Anthologia Planudea* 120, where a Lysippus speaks; 174, 183, 275: this poem, where another Lysippus speaks, is adapted by Ausonius (*Epigr.* 33) who, interestingly, substitutes Phidias for the Lysippus of the Greek version.

12. Sullivan, *Martial*, 124: "Such possessions and extravagance needed to be conspicuous to serve their purpose in a status-conscious society, and Martial is fully aware of this. . . . Hence also the hyperbolic compliments, often in *ex tempore* compositions, on grandiose acquisitions. . . ." Among his examples Sullivan includes our statue and poem. Apposite also is the observation of *CP*'s second anonymous referee on the last line of the poem: "the asyndeton here is the common colloquial type implying a strong adversative. . . ." This does, of course, add to the hyperbole.

13. Cf. Henry, "On Martial," 93: "In any case, if it be intended as a compliment, it is not one of Martial's happiest efforts, as it comes perilously near the meaning, 'I thought it was by Phidias, but I find it only by Lysippus after all.'"

14. A rather different version of this note was given at the Leeds International Latin Seminar in 1991. I am very grateful to Professor Francis Cairns for valuable comments at various stages of this piece, and also to K. R. Rowe of the School of Classics at Leeds who entered into a lengthy correspondence on the art-historical issues connected with this Hercules statue. I also thank Joseph Cotter for many long discussions of these poems.