



Sighs of Lost Love: The Rufus Cycle in Martial (1.68 and 1.106)

Author(s): Alfredo M. Morelli

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 1 (January 2009), pp. 34-49

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/603570>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 07:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

ALFREDO M. MORELLI

Quidquid agit Rufus, nihil est nisi Naevia Rufo.
 si gaudet, si flet, si tacet, hanc loquitur.
 cenat, propinat, poscit, negat, innuit: una est
 Naevia; si non sit Naevia, mutus erit.
 scriberet hesterni patri cum luce salutem,
 "Naevia lux" inquit "Naevia lumen, have."
 haec legit et ridet demisso Naevia vultu.
 Naevia non una est: quid, vir inepte, furis?¹

This paper is a slightly modified and enlarged version of a lecture given at CUNY in November 2003. I wish to thank Dee Clayman and all her colleagues for their kind invitation, and in particular John Van Sickle, who was my teacher at the University "La Sapienza" of Rome over twenty years ago. I attended his course on the structure of Vergil's *Eclogues* (published as *Poesia e potere: Il mito Virgilio* [Rome, 1986]), a very important one in the educational path of many who were then students of classical philology in Rome. Many thanks to Yorick Gomez Gane and Leonie Gane, who helped me in revising my English.

1. "Whatever Rufus is doing, for Rufus there is nothing but Naevia. If he's happy, if he's weeping, if he's silent, he talks of her. He eats his dinner, drinks a health, asks a favor, refuses one, makes a sign: it's all Naevia. If there should be no Naevia, he will be dumb. When he wrote a greeting to his father yesterday morning, 'Naevia, light of my eyes,' says he, 'Naevia, light of my life, good morning.' Naevia reads this and smiles, lowering her face. There's more than one Naevia. Why, silly man, are you such a fool?" (trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993, 91–93). The text of Martial used throughout is Lindsay 1929. For the general interpretation of this much-discussed epigram of Martial, I follow Citroni 1975, 219–23. Further bibliography: Friedländer [1886] 1961, 209; Friedrich 1907, 367; Housman 1919, 68–69 (= 1972, 982–83); Schuster 1924–25; Isaac 1930, 244; Carratello 1972; Howell 1980, 263–65; Shackleton Bailey 1978, 274; Watson 1983, 260–64; Salanitro 1983, 68–69; Shackleton Bailey 1989, 132; Greenwood 1992.

non est una), admonishing the worthless (*ineptus*) Rufus to abandon his foolishness.

The very unity of the poem is achieved through the obsessive repetition of the name Naevia: seven times in the epigram.² This is strong use of the rhetoric of repetition, or better, of accumulation. This device is well balanced by anaphora and antithesis in line 2 (*si gaudet, si flet, si tacet . . . loquitur*) and by the asyndeton in line 3 (*cenat, propinat, poscit, negat, innuit*) that emphasizes the urgent progress of Rufus' actions. The word patterning in the verses is very artful. In the first line, the initial *quidquid* is picked up by *nihil* at the beginning of the second hemistich. In the polyptoton *Rufus . . . Rufo*, both elements occupy parallel positions at the ends of the hemistichs, the final *Rufo* being preceded by the first occurrence of the name *Naevia*. We meet with the name of the beloved again in line 4. The sentence that opens at the end of line 3 is closed by the subject *Naevia* at the beginning of line 4, in enjambment (*una est / Naevia*). The following clause opens in the first hemistich, bridges the diaeresis, and ends with the initial word of the second half of the pentameter, once again *Naevia* (*si non sit / Naevia*). The same balanced arrangement appears at the beginning of line 6: *Naevia lux* is picked up by *Naevia lumen* immediately after the pentameter diaeresis.

Traditional erotic literary language and topics are deployed in this epigram in witty and unexpected ways.³ In particular, scholars have pointed out the use of *lux* at line 6.⁴ *Lux* (and especially *lux mea*) is a very common apostrophe to one's beloved in the *sermo cotidianus* (see, e.g., Cic. *Fam.* 14.2.2) and hence in Roman love poetry, beginning with Catullus 68.160: *lux mea, qua viva vivere dulce mihi est*.⁵ I should add that this expression (like many others concerning the erotic sphere) is already found in Plautus (*sed quid hoc? quae res? quid video? lux, salve*, "But what is this? What is it? What am I seeing? Light, I salute you," *Mil.* 1344), where there is a play on words when the *meretrix* Philocomasium, rousing from her feigned swoon, greets both the light of the day and her beloved Pleusicles. Unlike *lux*, *lumen*, a typical word in cultured poetry, is not frequently used for pathetic apostrophes in erotic jargon, but see [Tibullus] 3.19.11–12: *tu mihi curarum requies, tu nocte vel atra / lumen*.

In my opinion, Martial gives the vocative *lux* particular emphasis: it is not only picked up by the following *lumen* but is also introduced by *hesterna . . . luce* in line 5. As scholars have noted,⁶ this formula is to be found also in Martial 4.15.1, *mille tibi nummos hesterna luce roganti* (see also Ov. *Am.* 2.2.3, *hesterna vidi spatiantem luce puella*—), but is in fact a very rare way of saying "yesterday" in Latin poetry. I believe that, within the rhetoric of repetition that dominates the poem, the polyptoton *luce . . . lux*

2. On frequent repetition of the beloved's name in Graeco-Roman poetry, see Howell 1980, 263, with due reference to Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 171, ad *Carm.* 1.13.1.

3. On the erotic language of Martial, see Rodríguez 1981; Fortuny Previ 1986 and 1988.

4. Citroni 1975, ad loc.; Howell 1980, ad loc.

5. See also Prop. 2.14.29, 2.28.59, 2.29.1; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.25, 1.8.23, etc.; [Tib.] 3.9.15, 3.18.1; Mart. 5.29.3; and, in the nominative, Mart. 7.14.7.

6. Citroni 1975 and Howell 1980, ad loc.

cannot be a fortuitous one. The preceding lines have informed us that Naevia means everything to Rufus; all is transformed by her or even into her. We have to conclude that the foolish Rufus transforms even the light of day (*luce*, 5) into the sole light of his life, namely, his beloved (*Naevia lux*, 6). Rufus immediately associates the morning sun with Naevia—for him, one and the same thing. The play on words involving the *salutatio* to the light of day and the usual erotic apostrophe *lux mea* is not only to be found in Plautus, as we have seen, but is also an important topic in the epigrammatic tradition.

In the time of Meleager the comparison between the beloved and the sun was a very common one (*Anth. Pal.* 12.127.1–4):

Εἰνὸδιον στείχοντα μεσαμβρινὸν εἶδον Ἄλεξιν,
ἄρτι κόμαν καρπῶν κειρομένου θέρεος.
διπλαῖ δ' ἄκτινές με κατέφλεγον, αἱ μὲν Ἔρωτος
παίδος ἅπ' ὀφθαλμῶν, αἱ δὲ παρ' ἡελίου.⁷

Even more interesting is an epigram by Lutatius Catulus (2 Blänsdorf = 2 Courtney, late second century B.C.E.):

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans,
cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra:
mortalis visus pulchrior esse deo.⁸

Here the young Roscius is compared to the rising sun: during the *salutatio* to the dawn, the poetical *ego* becomes aware of the arrival of Roscius. The young man comes from the left (*a laeva*, 2). If we accept the idea that according to Roman augural practice the poetical *ego* refers to a southern orientation of the celestial vault,⁹ we have to conclude that Roscius comes from the east and is therefore not juxtaposed to the sun, but in fact takes its place and rises in its stead (*exoritur*, 2; see *exorientem Auroram*, 1). Arrival from the left is in any case to be regarded as a good omen (at least for a Roman), and the boy rises like a second and more beautiful sun. In *Anthologia Palatina* 12.110 (Meleager), the *ego* addresses the boy, who is definitely transformed into the sun god, with greetings and prayers.¹⁰ Similar topics are also worked out in other poems in the *Anthologia Palatina* (12.59, Meleager; 12.55 and 61, anonymous, but approximately of the same period).

7. "I saw Alexis walking in the road at noon-tide, at the season when the summer was just being shorn of the tresses of her fruits; and double rays burnt me, the rays of love from the boy's eyes and others from the sun" (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 345–47). See Morelli 2000, 152. The text of the *Anthologia Palatina* used throughout is that of Gow and Page (1965, 1968), unless otherwise noted.

8. "By chance abroad at dawn, I stood to pray to the uprising deity of day; When lo! Upon my left—propitious sight—suddenly Roscius dawned in radiance bright. Forgive me, heavenly pow'rs, if I declare, me seem'd the mortal than the god more fair" (trans. Rackham [1933] 1956, 77).

9. Dahlmann 1981, based on various passages of Cicero's *De divinatione* (see the use of *laeva* in *Div.* 1.12, 1.45, 1.108, 2.80, 2.82).

10. "It lightened sweet beauty; see how he flasheth flame from his eyes. Hath Love produced a boy armed with the bolt of heaven? Hail! Myiscus, who bringest to mortals the fire of the Loves, and mayest thou shine on earth, a torch befriending me" (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 337).

In brief, to associate one's beloved with the sun, if not transform him/her into it, is an old epigrammatic topos. The elegiac tradition, too, closely links the light of day and the sweetheart; and Ovid, for example, plays with the topic (see, e.g., *lux quoque tecum abiit*, *Her.* 13.23, Laodamia to Protesilaus). Meleager, Lutatius Catulus, and the epigrammatic tradition even change the addressee of the religious ceremony of the *salutatio* from the rising sun to the beloved person. Martial, in a more grotesque and humorous way, transforms the everyday morning rite of Rufus' *salutatio* to his father into the delirious homage to Naevia, who was for Rufus tantamount to the light of day. He greets her in place not only of the sun, but even of his father! A slight shift from the ancient standard situation (the *salutatio* to the beloved/sun) is enough to achieve the amusing effects he aims at. The target of such a refined operation is certainly an ancient literary cliché: the melancholic, crazy lover, totally subjected to his darling, typical of the Meleagrean tradition, as well as of the Roman elegiac one. If we analyze the poem from this viewpoint, many details become clear.

I suspect that Naevia is a "talking name." In quoting the epigram by Lutatius Catulus we have already met with, Cicero mentions a poem by Alcaeus (or attributed to him) in which the *ego* exalts his beloved's mole, which in his opinion is bright like the light (*naevos in articulo pueri delectat Alcaeum; at est corporis macula naevos; illi tamen hoc lumen videbatur*, *Nat. D.* 1.79). Do we have a literary background for Martial's emphasis on Naevia ("The Spotty One") / *lux*, Naevia / *lumen*? This would certainly lend even more humor to the comical and pathetic characterization of Rufus as *amans demens* in lines 5–6.

Scholars have drawn a parallel between line 6, Ovid *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.1.11–12: *o, quotiens, alii cum vellem scribere, nomen / rettulit in ceras inscia dextra tuum*, and Claudianus *Carmina maiora* 10.9–10: *nomenque beatum / iniussae scripsere manus*.¹¹ First of all, I think it is useful to recall the well-known epigrammatic topos of the γραμματίδια, that is to say, epigrams shaped as mawkish love letters that the lover sends to his sweetheart, which were very common in the days of Catullus.¹² The first line of such messages usually contains sugary, exaggerated compliments to the beloved. Rufus is certainly well accustomed to such sentimentality, and that is the reason for his incredible mistake in naming his beloved instead of his father.

Martial fashioned the whole of line 8 from traditional linguistic and thematic material. The vocabulary (*inepte, furis*) belongs to the typical *sermo amatorius* of both epigrammatic and elegiac poetry, hinting at the old

11. Citroni (1975, 221), however, underscores that the Ovidian passage is not included in an erotic context.

12. See already Laevius, 28 Blänsdorf = 28 Courtney: *Mea Vatiēna, amabo* (reworked as *mea Vatiēna, amabo, mea cura, mea Venus* by Caesius Bassus, 262.18 Keil); *CIL* 4.4971: *Sei quid amor valeat nostei, sei te hominem scis / commiseresce mihi, da veniam ut veniam. / Flos Veneris, mihi* (Tiburtinus' epigrams in Pompeii, time of Sulla); parody in Catullus 32.1–3: *Amabo, mea dulcis Ipsitilla, / meae deliciae, mei lepores, / iube ad te veniam meridiatum*.

motifs of love as a disease or frenzy (*furor, dementia*) and stressing the condition of the poor lover who cannot resign himself to his unrequited love and is unable to do or even think of anything else.¹³ Scholars have noted many parallels to Martial's *Naevia non est una*,¹⁴ such as Theocritus *Idylls* 11.76 (εὐρησεῖς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν) and Virgil *Eclogues* 2.73 (*invenies alium si te hic fastidit Alexim*), but in Hellenistic and Roman love poetry such a form of apostrophe to the crazy lover (*quid . . . furis?*) is also traditional. We find good parallels, in fact, in the passages I have just mentioned: Theocritus *Idylls* 11.72: ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ, πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι; and Virgil *Eclogues* 2.69: *a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?* (see also 6.47: *a, virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit?* probably quoted from the *Io* of Calvus). Similar *rappels à l'ordre* are common in Meleagrian epigrams. Normally they concern pathetic allocations of the poetical *ego* to himself (or to his soul), as in *Anthologia Palatina* 5.182.5: τί ληρῶ; 12.80.1–2: ψυχὴ δυσδάκρυτε, τί σοι τὸ πεπανθὲν Ἔρωτος / τραῦμα διὰ σπλάγχχνων αὐθις ἀναφλέγεται;¹⁵ In Martial's poem, in any case, there is hardly any indulgence for the unhappy and inept lover: the derisive note prevails over the consolatory one, distancing Martial's new poetics from dominating ideas of both traditional erotic epigrams and Roman elegy. Such literary commonplaces are quite extraneous to Martial and his readers,¹⁶ and the poet can “wink at his reader,” using stock literary erotic language with different, mainly humorous aims. Martial surely wants to ridicule not only a literary tradition, but also contemporary trends: in his day not only Ovid, but also earlier Augustan elegists were highly appreciated and imitated.¹⁷

EPIGRAM 1.106

Interponis aquam subinde, Rufe,
et si cogeris a sodale, raram
diluti bibis unciam Falerni.
numquid pollicita est tibi beatam
noctem Naevia sobriasque mavis
certae nequitias fututionis?
suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit.
crebros ergo licet bibas trientes

5

13. *Furere* is very frequent in Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, especially as a key word in programmatic and metapoetic passages (e.g., Prop. 1.1.7: *et mihi, iam toto furor hic non deficit anno, / cum tamen adversos cogor habere deos*; Ov. *Am.* 1.2.35–36, on Eros' retinue: *blanditiae comites tibi erunt Errorque Furorque, / adsidue partes turba secuta tuas*). The verb occurs in Martial in similar erotic contexts: see 3.76.3 and 11.49.1 (*nulla est hora tibi qua non me, Phylli, furem / despolies*, another parody of the *furens amator*). An obvious background for the use of *ineptus* in Mart. 1.68.8 is supplied, for instance, by Catull. 8.1 (*Miser Catulle, desinas ineptire*) or Ovid's Pasiphae (*quid totiens positas fingis, inepta, comas?*, *Ars am.* 1.306); the word also hints at the melodramatic (and metapoetic) *inertia* and *segnitas* of the elegiac lover. As regards Greek epigrammatic tradition, the pathetic, but also self-mocking approach of Meleager to the theme of love as *μαῖνα* is excellently analyzed by Garrison (1978).

14. Citroni 1975, 223; Howell 1980, 264.

15. Morelli 2000, esp. 169–77, 208–10: the literary archetype is the *μορολογία* of the young lover in New Comedy.

16. For the social background of Martial's skeptical attitude toward the topos of love as frenzy and slavery, see Grewing 1996 (in particular, on homosexual love); La Penna 2000, 96–107.

17. Rosati 2005, 140; Wheeler 2004–5, 17–18.

et durum iugules mero dolorem.
quid parcis tibi, Rufe? dormiendum est.¹⁸ 10

The poetical *ego*, Rufus' companion, remarks on Rufus' strange attitude toward the joys of wine drinking. He interrupts the typical toast chain of the Graeco-Roman symposium, because when his turn comes he refuses to drink a toast with wine, "interposing water" (*interponis aquam*, 1), that is to say, breaking up the round of the toast.¹⁹

The sympotic frame of the epigram is a very traditional one. Hellenistic erotic epigrams appear very often as sympotic poems, inheriting many typical themes of Archaic sympotic poetry.²⁰ Some of the topics we find in Martial's poem are already found in epigrams of early Hellenistic authors such as Asclepiades and Callimachus, in particular: (1) the behavior of the unhappy lover before his companions (sighs, moans, tears, and silence in the middle of the symposium fun), showing the signs of the throes of love, a real sympotomatology; and (2) the exhortation to drink, drowning one's sorrows in wine.

As regards the first topos, the following epigram by Callimachus offers a good parallel (*Anth. Pal.* 12.134 = 43 Pfeiffer):

“Ελκος ἔχων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐλάνθανεν· ὥς ἀνιηρόν
πνεῦμα διὰ στήθεων—εἶδες;—ἀνηγάγετο,
τὸ τρίτον ἡνίκ’ ἔπινε, τὰ δὲ ῥόδα φυλλοβολεῦντα
τῶνδρὸς ἀπὸ στεφάνων πάντ’ ἐγένοντο χαμαί·
ὥπτηται μέγα δὴ τι. μὰ δαίμονας, οὐκ ἀπὸ ῥυσμοῦ 5
εἰκάζω· φωρὸς δ’ ἵχνια φῶρ ἔμαθον.²¹

Similar narrative flavor is to be found in the following epigram from the *Anthologia Palatina* (12.135, Asclepiades):

Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἐρᾶν ἄρνεύμενον ἡμῖν
ῆτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις·
καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνόστασε καὶ τι κατηφές
ἔβλεπε χῶ σφιγγθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος.²²

18. “You often take water in between your wine, Rufus, and if urged by a friend, you drink at rare intervals an ounce of diluted Falernian. Has Nevia promised you a night of bliss and do you prefer sure fornication in sober naughtiness? You sigh, you say nothing, you groan: she has refused. Well then, you may drink bumper after bumper and *throttle* [“kill,” Shackleton Bailey] harsh pain with neat liquor. Why spare yourself, Rufus? You have to sleep” (trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993, 121–23, with my change in italics). See Citroni 1975, 323–26; Howell 1980, 315–17.

19. On Martial's approach to wine drinking, see La Penna 1999; on the symposium as a “real” or “fictitious” setting for Martial's epigrams, see Nauta 2002, 96–105.

20. On the relationships between Archaic sympotic poetry and Hellenistic epigram, see now Bowie 2007, with earlier bibliography.

21. “Our guest has a wound and we knew it not. Sawest thou not with what pain he heaved his breath up from his chest when he drank the third cup? And all the roses, casting their petals, fell on the ground from the man's wreaths. There is something burns him fiercely; by the gods I guess not at random, but a thief myself, I know a thief's footprints” (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 351).

22. “Wine is the proof of love. Nicagoras denied to us that he was in love, but those many toasts convicted him. Yes! He shed tears and bent his head, and had a certain downcast look, and the wreath bound tight round his head kept not its place” (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 351). It is remarkable that, in Asclepiades' epigram, the drunkenness betrays the lover (as is traditional in Greek literature; the proverbial *incipit* of line 1 underscores this), while in Martial's poem, on the contrary, Rufus is convicted by his soberness.

Such a “symptomatology of love” is well attested throughout the whole history of the Greek epigram, up to the time of Martial and even later: see, for example, *Anthologia Palatina* 5.130 (Maecius, late first century B.C.E.), 5.87 (Rufinus, early second century C.E.), and so on. In Latin literature there are significant examples also in non-elegiac poetry, as, for example, in Horace *Epodes* 11.7–10:

heu me, per urbem—nam pudet tanti mali—
fabula quanta fui, conviviorum et paenitet,
in quis amantem languor et silentium
arguit et latere petitus imo spiritus.²³

For the second *topos*, it is sufficient to point out an example from Meleager (*Anth. Pal.* 12.49):²⁴

Ζωροπότει, δύσερως, καὶ σεῦ φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα
κοιμάσει λάθας δωροδότας Βρόμιος·
ζωροπότει καὶ πλήρες ἀφυσσάμενος σκύφος οἶνας
ἔκκρουσον στυγερὰν ἐκ κραδίας ὀδύναν.²⁵

We can readily appreciate the noteworthy difference in mood between such poems and Martial's epigram. In the poems we have read, the poetical *ego* normally shows a strong emotional involvement in the throes of the unhappy lover, recognizing in them his own sorrowful experiences (see esp. *Anth. Pal.* 12.134.5–6), and sometimes he is himself entangled in erotic troubles and simply confesses to the reader his sorry condition (see Hor. *Epod.* 11.8–11 or *Anth. Pal.* 12.49). In Martial, the *ego* maintains toward poor Rufus the same mocking attitude we have already encountered in 1.68. Poetical *ego* and reader have a new, disenchanting view of such old commonplaces and melodramatic poses. The kindhearted mockery culminates in the final quip: “Drink, Rufus, because you have to sleep!” Scholars have failed to point out that even this type of wit is based on humorous recycling of an epigrammatic and, in general, sympotic cliché; in my view, there is even skillful allusiveness to some particular literary texts, such as *Anthologia Palatina* 12.50 (Asclepiades):

Πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδῃ, τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐλήισατο,
οὐδ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνη κατεθήξατο τόξα καὶ ἰοῦς
πικρὸς Ἔρως· τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἄως·
ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;

5

23. “Ah me! (for I'm ashamed of such a sore affliction), how people talked of me throughout the town! I hate to recall the feasts at which my listlessness and silence and sighs drawn from my bosom's depths proved my love-lorn state” (trans. Bennett [1914] 1952, 393).

24. Citroni (1975, 325) subtly analyzes such parallels.

25. “Drink strong wine, thou unhappy lover, and Bacchus, the giver of forgetfulness, shall send to sleep the flame of thy love for the lad. Drink, and draining the cup full of vine-juice drive out abhorred pain from your heart” (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 305).

πῖν', οὐδὲν γὰρ Ἔρως· μετὰ τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πολὺν,
σκέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.²⁶

Here we find (for the first time) all of the topoi that we have singled out in Martial's epigram: there are love throes and tears during the symposium (line 1) and the admonishments to drink pure, not mixed wine (Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα, 5; see also *Anth. Pal.* 12.49.1 and 3; Mart. 1.106.9: *durum iugules mero dolorem*); in the two final couplets (lines 6 and 8) the poet introduces the image of the arrival of night and sleep. But there is a very important difference. In Asclepiades the motif is handled in a traditional way, one that is typical of sympotic literature. He says, "let us drink, night is coming; let us drink, because life is short and later we must sleep for a long night." He most certainly imitates the initial verse of one of Alcaeus' poems (346.1 Voigt): πόνωμεν· τί τὰ λύχιν' ὀμμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἡμέρα ("Let us drink: why are we waiting for torches? The day is but a finger's breadth"). Asclepiades (like Alcaeus²⁷) depicts the night in a twofold manner: it is the night that is coming, bringing an end to the joys of the symposium, and it is the symbol of death, which carries off life. The implicit or explicit statement that life is short is very commonly connected with exhortations to drink in sympotic contexts, and in general to enjoy life in every sententious context in Graeco-Roman antiquity.

In the Roman epigrammatic tradition we find such motifs from the very beginning (see *CIL* 4.4972, a poem included in Tiburtinus' cycle in Pompeii). Epigrams and lyric poems based on such themes are numerous in later Roman cultured poetry (see Hor. *Carm.* 1.11), and Martial himself reuses the topos in quite a serious way, also in sympotic contexts (see, e.g., 2.59; 5.64),²⁸ but it is Catullus who imitates the final sentence of Asclepiades' epigram in the closest way: *nox est perpetua una dormienda* ("we have to sleep through a continuous, never-ending night," 5.6) is an almost exact translation of *Anthologia Palatina* 12.50.8 (the initial admonishment is also noteworthy: *vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus*, "let us live, my Lesbia, and love").²⁹ Catullus' Poem 5 was the well-known source of the *basia*

26. "Drink, Asclepiades. Why these tears? What aileth thee? Not thee alone hath cruel Cypris taken captive; not for thee alone hath bitter Love sharpened his arrows. Why whilst yet alive thou lie in the dust? Let us quaff the unmixed drink of Bacchus. The day is but a finger's breadth. Shall we wait to see again the lamp that bids us to bed? *Drink, because Love is nothing* ["Let us drink, woeful lover," Paton, who reads with Kaibel πίνωμεν, ὄσπερος]. It is not far away now, poor wretch, the time when we shall rest through the long night" (trans. Paton [1916–18] 1979, 4: 305, with my changes in italics). In line 7, I accept Di Marco's (1997) correction (πῖν', οὐδὲν γὰρ Ἔρως) of the transmitted text πίνωμεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρως, which is still printed *inter cruce*s by Gow and Page. On the textual problem in line 7, see Handley 1996, 145–47; Di Marco 1997; Gutzwiller 1998, 148 n. 64; Ihm 2004, 72–73; see now fuller bibliography and *status quaestionis* in Guichard 2004, 267–69.

27. But there are some differences: in Alcaeus' poem the lamps (λύχνα) are the ones that open the real symposium, while in Asclepiades' epigram λύχνα are the torches illuminating the way back for the members of the symposium; see Gow and Page 1965, 2: 127–28.

28. Recent analysis in Heilmann 1998.

29. The topic appears also in Greek erotic epigrams of Catullus' time; see Philod. *Anth. Pal.* 9.570.3–5 (= 3.3–5 Sider): ἐν μονοκλίνῳ / δεῖ με λιθομήτῳ δὴ ποτε πετρίδῳ / εὖδειν ἀθανάτως πολὺν χρόνον ("I have to sleep on a single bed, cut out of stone, for a long, never-dying time"; see also lines 7–8).

Catulliana (cf. Mart. 11.6.14: *da nunc basia, sed Catulliana*), and Martial and his readers were well acquainted with it (see also Mart. 6.34). In both Martial 1.106.10 and Catullus 5.6 (two poems in hendecasyllables) we note the use of the gerundive *dormiendum/-a*, surprisingly rare in Latin literature (it occurs only in Cicero's epistles, *Att.* 9.7.7, and twice in Celsus *Med.* 1.3.3). It is clear that the ancient reader, recalling as a reference point such texts as Asclepiades *Anthologia Palatina* 12.50 and Meleager *Anthologia Palatina* 12.49, or Catullus 5, had no difficulty in appreciating Martial's refined intertextual achievements. Martial's *crebros ergo licet bibas trientes / et durum iugules mero dolorem* (1.106.8–9) sounds like a translation of Meleager's final lines (ζωροπότει καὶ πλῆρες ἀφυσσάμενος σκύφος οἶνας / ἔκκρουσον στυγερὰν ἐκ κραδίας ὀδύναν, *Anth. Pal.* 12.49.3–4); Asclepiades' poem (*Anth. Pal.* 12.50), probably a model for Martial, as we have seen, immediately followed Meleager's poem in the *Garland of Meleager*, and these two poems were still read in this precise sequence in Martial's day. The last three lines of Martial's poem appear to be a common admonishment to enjoy life, strongly influenced by Asclepiades or Meleager (cf. Asclep. *Anth. Pal.* 5.85: φεῖδῃ παρθενίης. καὶ τί πλεόν; . . . ὅστέα καὶ σποδιή, παρθένε, κεισόμεθα, with Martial's final line, *quid parcis tibi, Rufe? dormiendum est*), but the final quip, a *fulmen in clausula* typical of Martial, shows that such an exhortative attitude is only a refined, mocking caricature of an ancient topos. Justification for not "sparing himself" (*quid parcis tibi, Rufe?* 10) is not provided, in contrast with Asclepiades' or Catullus' poems, by the statement that life is short and later we must sleep forever. The final phrase *dormiendum est* is not to be understood to have such a meaning, not even in the consolatory sense we can see in Meleager's poem, that is, that sleep can lessen the throes of love. Martial attempts to throw his readers off balance. They know the old epigrammatic motif and probably even recognize an allusion to archetypal texts, and thus they expect an analogous conclusion to the poem. But *dormiendum est* here means that Rufus does not have to spare his energies for sexual activities, because after the symposium he simply has to sleep. The old literary topos is turned into very literal and pointed wit, exploiting an implicit possibility in the model of Asclepiades (see *Anth. Pal.* 12.50.6, "let us drink, are we waiting to go to sleep?"; 7, "drink, because Love is nothing").

Martial's handling of the topic is supported by his skillful use of erotic jargon, which has been nicely and thoroughly analyzed by Mario Citroni³⁰: the euphemistic tone of line 4, *pollicita est . . . noctem*, a stock phrase in literary love language, contrasts with the harsh *certae . . . fututionis* that follows (line 6)—a crude word, but one that is not used without literary refinement.³¹ This is a good example of Martial's tendency to "epigrammatize"

30. Citroni 1975, 325.

31. *Ibid.*; on *pollicita est . . . noctem*, see also Tandoi 1969, 107 (= 1992, 805). *Futuo* certainly belongs to a low linguistic register (it is very frequent in the Pompeian inscriptions): it occurs twice in Catullus' epigrams (71.5 and 97.9) and dozens of times in Martial. The term *fututio*, however, is rare, occurring only here, in Mart. 1.106.6, and in Catullus 32.8, in the love letter to Iphitilla we have already met with. It was almost certainly not in use in the spoken language.

traditional erotic topoi, with a taste for the *Romana simplicitas*, by using obscene vocabulary that is extraneous to both Greek epigram and Roman elegy.³² Even such a term as *nequitia*, a key word in elegiac poetry, is used with a very concrete meaning.³³ In contrast to the amusing approach whereby the poetical *ego* asks Rufus for information, the melancholic lover is depicted in a most traditional way as subject to the throes of his passion, and the linguistic fabric is very conventional within the tradition of Latin love poetry: see, in particular, line 7 (*suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit*), in which almost every term has a long history in Roman erotic poetry, and especially in Augustan elegy.³⁴

THE RUFUS CYCLE: STRIKING A BALANCE

In conclusion, I would like to return to Martial 1.68. If we compare 1.106, we find that it contains many clues for the interpretation of 1.68. Lindsay Watson supposed that the Naevia of 1.68 could not be anyone other than Rufus' stepmother: otherwise, we could not explain why she is able to read Rufus' letter to his father (line 7) and, what is more, why she should be so embarrassed, as line 7 suggests (*demisso . . . voltu*).³⁵ In such a context as 1.106, however, the identification of Naevia as Rufus' stepmother is unnecessary and even illogical. It is clear from the attitude of the *ego* that the fellow symposiasts regard Rufus' relationship with his beloved as nothing but an unhappy and often frustrated love, not as a shameful affair with his father's wife. We should most likely view Naevia as a *hetaera*, as is normal in sympotic contexts. For ancient and modern readers there would be very scanty evidence to identify Naevia as Rufus' stepmother in 1.68, and no evidence at all in 1.106, and there can be no doubt that Rufus and Naevia are the same personae in both epigrams. We must recognize that Martial does sometimes mislead his readers by using the same names for different personae, but that is not the case here. He gives the same two personal names to two pairs of lovers, who are described in exactly the same way in two similar poems in the same book—poems that share an identical literary background. We have to conclude that, in Martial's first book, Naevia is *una*.

We must be careful not to miss the point: the thematic core of both epigrams is the strange and pathetic behavior of a melancholic and old-fashioned lover, which is very traditional in Graeco-Roman love poetry but has come to seem ridiculous to Martial and to his readers. Such a tasteful "portrait of a poor lover" would be compromised by superimposing other topics inconsistent with that tradition, that is to say, an attack against a love intrigue involving a *noverca* and her stepson, or a satire about a jealous cuckold.³⁶

32. Hinds 1998, 129–35; see now Hinds 2007.

33. Citroni 1975, 325. In Martial's context, *nequitia* does not designate the general attitude of the lover or of the beloved person, but the lustful enterprises during the night (cf. Ov. *Ars am.* 2.392: *nec sint nequitiae tempora certa tuae*); it is noteworthy that *nequitia* is never used in the plural in Roman elegy.

34. Citroni 1975, 325.

35. Watson 1983, 260–64.

36. Housman (1919, 68–69 = 1972, 982–83) thinks that *vir inepte* (68.8) must refer to the betrayed husband of Naevia, jealous of his wife's love affair with Rufus, but, as Citroni correctly points out (1975,

The exact circumstances in which Naevia becomes acquainted with the contents of Rufus' letter are totally irrelevant for the poet, who does not specify them, and we have to imagine simply that she reads it in the presence of her unfortunate lover (or even of the messenger who erroneously brought her the letter?), and that this is the reason for her embarrassment. Naevia certainly does not love him, but she does not want to lose such a tender (and probably very generous) lover.³⁷

The items concerning Rufus' behavior in 1.68 mostly do not describe that behavior in general terms but rather place it in a well-determined context, a dinner party or symposium, as we also infer from the epigrammatic tradition we have reviewed. In line 2, *si gaudet, si flet, si tacet*, we can easily recognize two of the typical signs of the "symptomatology of love" (*flet . . . tacet*) as they appear to the lover's companions during the symposium. In line 3, *cenat, propinat, poscit, negat, innuit*, we have noted the series of unconnected verbs, but we now realize that they can represent typical acts at a symposium, just like the series that Martial gives us, in the same asyndetic pattern, in 1.106.7: *suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit*. *Cenat* refers to the moment that immediately precedes the symposium, the dinner, which is not always easily distinguishable from the actual symposium, but is, however, a well-established convivial occasion, fit for the pleasures of table and love (from Catull. 13 onwards; very often in Martial's poems *cena* simply means the banquet). The following *propinat* leads us again to the symposium in the strict sense of the word; *poscit, negat, innuit* could be understood as the orders given to the servants during the symposium, especially when asking for wine (*posco* is very often used by Martial in such contexts: 3.94.1; 7.20.4; 8.49.4; 8.67.7; 11.36.6). In any case, the convivial moments seem to be some of the privileged social occasions in which Rufus' strange behavior in 1.68 can be observed by the poetical *ego*, in accordance with an old tradition in Graeco-Roman erotic poetry.

I do not share Karl Barwick's ideas about cycles of poems in Martial, and I think that every poem enjoys its own autonomy from other poems of the same cycle;³⁸ still, there are cases in which some features of a single epigram can be illuminated by such comparisons. The importance of the sympotic

222–23), *vir* does not necessarily mean "husband" in Martial's poetry, or, indeed, in Latin. Moreover, the sudden apostrophe to a man other than Rufus would be awkward and almost incomprehensible to Martial's reader, and would simply make meaningless the graceful caricature of the unhappy Rufus that is worked out in the preceding three couplets.

37. My conclusions are again similar to those of Citroni (1975, 221–23). It is also possible that *haec legii* simply means that Naevia is reading the epigram itself: see Mart. 5.25.12 (I owe this suggestion to Alessandro Fusi). Salanitro (1983, 68–69) asserts that Naevia in line 7 does not show a derisive attitude, but a pleased one: she is flattered by Rufus' devotedness. This interpretation is interesting, and quite tenable from a linguistic viewpoint, but I think that it would weaken the general sense as well as the final quip of the epigram. If Naevia is amused by Rufus' behavior, but not ill-disposed toward him or even in love with him, Rufus' overall attitude would be less ridiculous to Martial's reader and the vigorous admonishment of the *ego* (*quid, vir inepte, furis?*) would be awkward: it sounds unmistakably like an exhortation for the crazy lover to abandon a desperate and unsuccessful task and to dedicate himself, like a new Cyclops, to the quest of another Naevia-Galatea. It is also unnecessary to think that the words in line 8 are spoken by Naevia, as supposed by Greenwood (1992, 866–67).

38. Barwick 1932 and 1958. See, contra, Citroni 1975, xxvii–xxix; Grewing 1997, 30–31.

element in Martial 1.68 can be better appreciated if we consider 1.106, as well as 1.71, a poem that follows 1.68 quite closely and is very similar to 1.106 in its thematic contents:³⁹ the poetical *ego* drinks a toast in honor of various girls, hoping that they will later come to spend the night with him, and because no one turns up, the poet wishes that at least the god Sleep will visit. The easy-going approach of the poetical *ego* stands in contrast to the unhappy attitude of Rufus in 1.68 and 1.106.

I wish to stress that 1.71 cannot be considered the “third poem” of Rufus’ cycle. In defining the concept of a “cycle” in Martial’s first book, and in considering Rufus’ cycle in particular, we have to take into consideration the interpretative categories recently proposed by Sven Lorenz in a stimulating paper:⁴⁰ cycles are “all groups of epigrams, adjacent poems, or scattered pieces that display a common theme or motif, common use of language, or common structural features,” and we have to take into account “all conceivable similarities that prompt readers to remember an earlier poem and compare it with the present one.”⁴¹ All cycles, and even every single poem in a given cycle and in the book, present thematic, structural, metrical, or linguistic connections with other poems or cycles. On the other hand, it is necessary to add that all poems and cycles are inserted in larger sets that intersect each other and run through the whole book, which include epigrams working out similar macrothematic, subgeneric, metrical, and linguistic features. The interconnection of different frames creates a particularly vivid kaleidoscopic effect.⁴² In particular, there is a noteworthy tendency, already noticed by scholars,⁴³ to organize the epigrams into small thematic groups, especially two-poem cycles. Two connected poems are closely juxtaposed in the book so that the reader can appreciate the effects of *variatio* obtained by the poet’s dealing with the same topic; otherwise, they recur far apart, like a tone in a painting, giving the reader the pleasure of recognizing a motif met with earlier. Such an approach is well suited to the aims of entertainment in Martial’s poetry. The unity of the book is created under the dominating eye

39. Laevia sex cyathis, septem Iustina bibatur,
quinque Lycas, Lyde quattuor, Ida tribus.
omnis ab infuso numeretur amica Falerno,
et quia nulla venit, tu mihi, Somne, veni.

“Let Laevia be drunk in six measures, and Justina in seven, in five Lycia, Lyde in four, Ida in three. Let each of my girls be numbered by the Falernian in my cup: and since none of them comes, do you, Sleep, come to me” (trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993, 95). Howell’s assumption (1980, ad loc.) about the final wit (that *Somnus* may be the name of a young, handsome servant) would seem to be unnecessary.

40. Lorenz 2004 (see esp. 255–60 for further bibliography and *status quaestionis* about the concept of “cycle”); see also Merli 1993, 1998; Scherf 1998, 2001; Moreno Soldevila 2004. On Martial’s Book 1, see Erb 1981.

41. Lorenz 2004, 257. Connections between different poems can include handling of exactly the same topic, presence of the same personae, and echoing of key words or significant *iuncturae*. See also Scherf 2001, 35–46. On Catullus as the model for Martial’s arrangement of his books, see Barwick 1958; Sullivan 1991, 218–19; Swann 1994, esp. 77; Scherf 2001, 22–25; Holzberg 2002, esp. 27, 47–48.

42. In particular, “Book I was characterized by its immense variety” (Sullivan 1991, 220). Of course there are also books in which a given subject matter largely dominates the others, as the author himself declares in the preface (see, e.g., Book 8); in any case, the taste for *variatio* is not lacking even in such *libri* (see Sullivan 1991, 220).

43. Grewing 1997, 38; Scherf 2001, 35–46.

of the author, who constantly wants to share with the reader his sharp, often ironical, viewpoint on such varied matters.⁴⁴

Martial's first book is based on a network of thematic and stylistic intersections, a system of overlapping circular waves that proceed from single poems as well as from well identifiable groups of poems. Thus a cycle of epigrams, like that of Rufus, can find some more or less important echoes in other cycles or single epigrams of the *liber*, and also forms part of a macrothematic area easily recognizable throughout the book.

Given this, we can now try to define the nature of the Rufus cycle. Walter Burnikel and Johannes Scherf state that 1.68 and 106 are a "Fortsetzungspaar," a pair of poems that if read together form a kind of "story," a narrative core.⁴⁵ This is perhaps true, but we must not lose sight of the book context into which such a cycle is inserted. The sympotic topics, which not only permeate 1.106 but also are very important in 1.68, give us the key, in my opinion, to the correct placement of the cycle in the book. We can distinguish (1) a large network of poems throughout the book dedicated to the macrothematic topics concerning wine drinking, its social conventions, and its literary tradition: apart from 1.68 and 1.106, we certainly have to consider as part of this network at least 1.11; 18; 26; 27; 28; 56; 71; 87; 105; see also the "convivial" 20, 23, and 43; and (2) smaller groups (cycles) of poems that show more evident links within this network, that is, poems dealing with exactly the same topos or combining the motifs in the same way; poems with strong linguistic (or metrical) connections; possibly poems involving the same personae. Rufus' cycle aside, wit about the strong drinker Sextilianus (1.11 and 26), or about stinking female drunkards (28; 87, an old epigrammatic topos), forms the thematic core of other cycles.⁴⁶

It is apparent that epigrams dealing with the symposium are arranged throughout the book in order to give the reader an amusing impression of *variatio*. It is also clear that 1.68 and 1.106 contain some thematic, metrical, structural, and linguistic echoes, namely, similarities or contrasts within the larger context of the "sympotic" poems, or even with other groups of inter-related epigrams. For instance, we have to consider Rufus' reluctance to drink in relation to the very old topos about the "*modus* in drinking" (not too much, but also not too little⁴⁷). Rufus' attitude has very significant counter-examples in the book (not only 1.71, but also the cycle of Sextilianus and the one about the *Säuferin*), and sometimes piquant analogies: the *cunnilingus* Charinus of 1.77 is a moderate drinker (and we have to observe that 1.77 cannot be defined *strictiore sensu* as a sympotic epigram). The linguistic emphasis given to names and the measurement of wine units is also noteworthy (*bis quina . . . bis decies* [1.11.1–2]; *quincunces . . . decem* [27.2]; *sex*

44. About relationships between Martial and his reader, see Spisak 1997; Nauta 2002, 91–147, with earlier bibliography.

45. Burnikel 1980, 90; Scherf 2001, 40 n. 110, with further bibliography.

46. Connections between these two cycles are well studied by Scherf 2001, 49. See also La Penna 1999, 169–70.

47. La Penna 1999, 167.

cyathis septem . . . / quinque . . . quattuor . . . tribus [71.1–2]; *raram . . . unciam* [106.2–3]; *crebros . . . trientes* [106.8]). Such a taste for hyperbolic measurement is well suited to the burlesque epos of drunkenness and soberness that runs through the whole book.

“Symptotic” cycles and poems, by interconnecting with each other (and also by echoing topics that are very much present in other poems of the first book) form the vivid tableau of a comical demimonde full of satiric and erotic implications: we find not only drunkards and boozers, but also stingy or falsely liberal hosts (18; see also the “convivial” 43⁴⁸), those with suspicious sexual tendencies (the “convivial” 23); irritating scroungers (27⁴⁹); and bad wine (56; 105; see also 18 and 103.9). Such topics are all traditional in ancient epigram, and it is in this context that the portrait of a pathetic and démodé lover finds its natural place.

Università di Cassino

48. La Penna 1999, 171.

49. The attitude of the *ego loquens* in 1.27 is noteworthy, as opposed to the satire against mean hosts in 1.18 and 43. The *ego* is reluctant to invite Procillus, although he promised to, probably because Procillus is not overly welcome (see 1.115, if this involves the same person) or because the *ego* depicts himself as a poor man, as is very common in the epigrammatic tradition and in Martial's poetry. In 1.86.8, the *ego* complains because Nonius does not want to have dinner with him, although they are neighbors. In any case, the *ego* maintains the unconventional and easy attitude we have already observed in 1.71 (in contrast with Rufus' frenzy in 1.68 and 1.106).

LITERATURE CITED

- Barwick, K. 1932. Zur Kompositionstechnik und Erklärung Martials. *Philologus* 87: 63–79.
- . 1958. Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleinen Gedichten des Catull. *Philologus* 102: 284–318.
- Bennett, C. E., trans. [1914] 1952. *Horace: The “Odes” and “Epodes.”* Repr. and rev. Cambridge, Mass.
- Blänsdorf, J., ed. 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum*³. Stuttgart.
- Bowie, E. 2007. From Archaic Elegy to Hellenistic Sympotic Epigram? In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip*, ed. P. Bing and J. Bruss, 95–112. Leiden.
- Burnikel, W. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*. Wiesbaden.
- Carratello, U. 1972. Un folle amore in Marziale . . . (Mart. I 68). In *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, 3: 391–401. Catania.
- Citroni, M., ed. and comm. 1975. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus*. Florence.
- Courtney, E., ed. and comm. 2003. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Rev. ed. Oxford.
- Dahlmann, H. 1981. Das Rosciusepigramm des Q. Lutatius Catulus. *Gymnasium* 88: 24–44.
- Di Marco, M. 1997. *Nihil est amor*: Asclepiade, AP 12.50 (= 16 G.-P.). In *Miscillo flamine: Studi in onore di Carmelo Rapisarda*, ed. A. Degl'Innocenti and G. Moretti, 161–69. Trento.
- Erb, G. 1981. *Zu Komposition und Aufbau im ersten Buch Martials*. Bern.
- Fortuny Previ, F. 1986. En torno al vocabulario erótico de Marcial. *Myrtia* 1: 73–91.
- . 1988. En torno al vocabulario erótico de Marcial (continuación). *Myrtia* 3: 93–118.
- Friedländer, L., ed. and comm. [1886] 1961. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Repr. Amsterdam.
- Friedrich, G. 1907. Zu Martial. *RhM* 62: 366–79.

- Garrison, D. H. 1978. *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Wiesbaden.
- Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page, eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- . 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Greenwood, M. A. 1992. Martial, Epigr. I, Ixviii, 7–8: A New Interpretation. *Latomus* 51: 863–67.
- Grewing, F. 1996. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen des Vergleichs: Martials Diadumenos und Catulls Lesbia. *Hermes* 124: 333–54.
- . 1997. *Martial, Buch VI: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen.
- , ed. 1998. *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart.
- Guichard Romero, L. A., ed., comm., and trans. 2004. *Asclepiades de Samos: Epigramas y fragmentos; Estudio introductorio, revisión del texto, traducción y comentario*. Bern.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Handley, E. W. 1996. Two Epigrams by Asclepiades (XXV, XVI G.-P.). *MH* 53: 140–47.
- Heilmann, W. 1998. Epigramme Martials über Leben und Tod. In Grewing 1998, 205–19.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- . 2007. Martial's Ovid / Ovid's Martial. *JRS* 97: 113–54.
- Holzberg, N. 2002. *Martial und das antike Epigramm*. Darmstadt.
- Housman, A. E. 1919. Notes on Martial. *CQ* 13: 68–80. Reprinted in *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), 982–95.
- Howell, P. 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.
- Ihm, S. 2004. *Eros und Distanz: Untersuchungen zu Asclepiades in seinem Kreis*. Leipzig.
- Izaac, H. J., ed. and trans. 1930. *Martial: Épigrammes*. Vol. 1, *Livres 1–7*. Paris.
- Keil, H., ed. 1855–80. *Grammatici latini*. 8 vols. Leipzig.
- La Penna, A. 1999. Immortale Falernum: Il vino di Marziale e dei poeti latini del suo tempo. *Maia* 51: 163–81.
- . 2000. *Eros dai cento volti: Modelli etici ed estetici nell'età dei Flavi*. Venice.
- Lindsay, W. M., ed. 1929. *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*². Oxford.
- Lorenz, S. 2004. Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial's *Epigrammaton Liber Quartus*. *AJP* 125: 255–78.
- Merli, E. 1993. Ordinamento degli epigrammi e strategie cortigiane negli esordi dei libri I–XII di Marziale. *Maia* 45: 229–56.
- . 1998. Epigrammzyklen und “serielle Lektüre” in den Büchern Martials. Überlegungen und Beispiele. In Grewing 1998, 139–56.
- Morelli, A. M. 2000. *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo*. Cassino.
- Moreno Soldevila, R. 2004. Algunas apreciaciones sobre la estructura del libro IV de Marcial. *Faventia* 26 (2): 99–109. <http://ddd.uab.es/pub/faventia/02107570v26n2p99.pdf>.
- Nauta, R. R. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace, “Odes”: Book I*. Oxford.
- Paton, W. R., trans. [1916–18] 1979. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Repr. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rackham, H., trans. [1933] 1956. *Cicero: “De natura deorum,” “Academica.”* Repr. and rev. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rodriguez, M. T. 1981. Il linguaggio erotico di Marziale. *Vichiana* 10: 91–117.
- Rosati, G. 2005. Elegy after the Elegists: From Opposition to Assent. In *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar*, vol. 12, ed. F. Cairns, 133–50. Cambridge.
- Salanitro, M. 1983. Sull'interpretazione di alcuni epigrammi di Marziale. *Cultura e scuola* 86: 64–76.
- Scherf, J. 1998. Zur Komposition von Martials Gedichtbüchern 1–12. In Grewing 1998, 119–38.
- . 2001. *Untersuchungen zur Buchgestaltung Martials*. Munich.

- Schuster, M. 1924–25. Zur Erklärung und Komposition von Martial I 68. *WS* 44: 120–23.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1978. Corrections and Explanations of Martial. *CP* 73: 273–96.
- . 1989. More Corrections and Explanations of Martial. *AJP* 110: 131–50.
- , ed. and trans. 1993. *Martial: Epigrams*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Sider, D., ed. and comm. 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemos*. Oxford.
- Spisak, A. L. 1997. Martial's Special Relation with His Reader. In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 8, ed. C. Deroux and J. Dumortier-Bibauw, 352–63. Brussels.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1991. *Martial: The Unexpected Classic; A Literary and Historical Study*. Cambridge.
- Swann, B. W. 1994. *Martial's Catullus: The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. Hildesheim.
- Tandoi, V. 1969. Il ricordo di Stazio "dolce poeta" nella satira VII di Giovenale. *Maia* 21: 103–22. Reprinted in *Scritti di filologia e di storia della cultura classica* (Pisa, 1992), 802–17.
- Voigt, E.-M., ed. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam.
- Watson, L. C. 1983. Three Women in Martial. *CQ* 33: 258–64.
- Wheeler, S. 2004–5. Before the *Aetas Ovidiana*: Mapping the Early Reception of Ovidian Elegy. In *Aetas Ovidiana?* ed. D. Nelis, special double issue, *Hermathena* 177/178: 9–26.