



Hamillus/Sullimah: Sex, Fiction, and the Significance of Anonyms in Pompeii

Author(s): Matthew Panciera

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 106, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 53-60

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/659111>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 06:51

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*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

HAMILLUS/SULLIMAH: SEX, FICTION, AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANANYMS IN POMPEII

Martial declares in the prose preface to Book 1 that, unlike some of his poetic predecessors, he has refrained from using real names in his scoptic epigrams:

Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salva infimarum quoque personarum reverentia ludant; quae adeo antiquis auctoribus defuit ut nominibus non tantum veris abusi sint sed et magnis. mihi fama vilius constet et probetur in me novissimum ingenium.

I hope that I have followed such restraint in my little books that no one who thinks well of themselves can complain about them; they play with a healthy respect for real individuals, even those from the lowest rank. This respect was so lacking in ancient writers that they abused not only actual people, but also important ones by name. May fame and the latest trend in literary genius be reckoned and regarded by me as too contemptible.¹

Most modern scholars have taken Martial at his word.² Although it is likely that Martial based many of his caustic observations on actual people and the vices they displayed in the Rome of his day, it would seem a shrewd decision to have omitted the real names of these people. It was no doubt safer, especially under Domitian, and it might even have increased the interest of his readers.³ Martial's sexual invectives follow the rule set out in the preface. A review of these epigrams reveals no one who appears to have been an authentic, historical figure.⁴ But Shackleton Bailey, in an appendix to his Loeb translation of Martial, makes the following claim about the character Hamillus from epigram 7.62:

In at least two cases the original of a name was a recent celebrity, one being the poisoner Pontia (2.34; 4.43; Juv. 6.638), who is addressed as alive and dangerous in 6.75. The other is the sodomitic Hamillus of 7.62, identifiable with the pederastic schoolmaster of Juv.

1. The texts of Martial and Juvenal used in this note come from the Loeb editions of Shackleton Bailey 1993 and Braund 2004. All translations are my own.

2. See Citroni 1975, 3; Howell 1980, 96; Williams 2004, 8; Galán Vioque 2002, 105; Henriksen 1999, 149–50; Kay 1985, 78; Watson and Watson 2003, 13–14; Sullivan 1991, 63–64; Shackleton Bailey 1993, 3: 323. Williams (2004, 8) captures the consensus well when he states that “it is clear that epigrams attacking or satirizing individuals do not use real names. . . . A more difficult question is whether or not any of these names are pseudonyms for specific real people.”

3. The authors of popular lampoons attacking distinguished men and women were punished by Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 8.3). See Coleman 1986 for a discussion of Domitian and the literary establishment during his reign. In several poems Martial suggests that a name stands as a pseudonym, thus perhaps encouraging his readers to guess at the real person who lies behind the name. I think Williams (2004, 8) is correct to see this as a literary game, and it is in keeping with Martial's tendency to playfully interact with his readers.

4. The index of Shackleton Bailey's Loeb translation of Martial shows asterisks next to names thought to be fictitious, and all of the characters (except Hamillus) who are attacked in the sexual invectives are so marked.

10.224. Verification comes from two Pompeian graffiti in which his name is significantly spelled backwards (see Friedländer, p. 545). It seems reasonable to assume that both were legally convicted (he perhaps under the Scantinian law, enforced by Domitian; Suet. *Dom.* 8.3) and so became notorious.⁵

He concludes that this is one of the rare times when Martial identifies a real person by his true name in the sexual invectives. This relies heavily on the argument that in Juvenal there is a reference to the same Hamillus and that confirmation of this sexually notorious and historical Hamillus can be seen in the anonymous presentation of his name in Pompeii.⁶ I will argue that Martial and Juvenal's very different representations of Hamillus and his sexual transgression suggest that he was a fictional character. In addition, I will show that the reverse spelling of names in the Pompeian graffiti does not indicate anything sexual about the person named, but rather was an elaborate display of literacy.⁷ The Pompeian Hamillus was cleverly literate, but he had no connection to the literary Hamillus.

A recurring object of attack in Martial's sexual invectives is the character whose interest in playing passive sexual roles is hidden behind a deceptive display—a display that the poet reveals by the end of the poem to be a sham.⁸ Martial depicts just such a situation involving Hamillus (7.62):

Reclusis foribus grandes percidis, Hamille,
 et te deprendi, cum facis ista, cupis,
 ne quid liberti narrent servique paterni
 et niger obliqua garrulitate cliens.
 non pedicari se qui testatur, Hamille,
 illud saepe facit quod sine teste facit.

With the doors wide open you screw big boys, Hamillus,
 and you desire to be caught when you do it,
 lest freedmen, your father's slaves, and a malicious client
 with some secondhand gossip, might tell all.
 He who calls to witness that he is not butt-fucked, Hamillus,
 he often does what he does without a witness.

Hamillus' deception goes beyond the sort of feigned virility that these characters often adopt, to an actual demonstration of his capability in an insertive sexual role; but as the epigram progresses, a number of details hint at the true nature of Hamillus' sexual preferences. First, Hamillus leaves the doors of his house wide open so that all can observe that he has anal intercourse with his slaves. Just such a frank and public declaration of sexuality is cause for suspicion in another epigram. In 12.35 the narrator wonders what else the character Callistratus must be doing if he so readily admits to being anally penetrated. It is also noteworthy that those whom Hamillus penetrates are described as *grandes*—in all probability to be understood as *grandes pueros*.⁹ The

5. Shackleton Bailey 1993, 3: 325.

6. Galán Vioque (2002, 360) states in his commentary on the poem that the Hamillus of Juvenal and Martial may be the same person. Ferguson (1987, 109) is skeptical that the Pompeian graffiti and the literary Hamillus have any connection. Some famous and historical individuals do appear in the Pompeian graffiti, but it is *prima facie* unlikely that the Hamillus named on the walls of Pompeii sometime preceding A.D. 79 would be so memorable as to be meaningful to the readers of Martial and Juvenal 25–30 years later.

7. The practice of spelling a name backwards is not a common one for either ancient or modern writers, and thus there is no familiar term for it. "Anonym" does appear in the *OED*.

8. E.g., 1.24, 1.96, 2.36, 6.56, 7.58, 9.27, 9.47.

9. Galán Vioque 2002, 361.

adjective *grandes* can be taken one of two ways. It might refer to the fact that these boys have large penises, thus casting the suspicion that Hamillus is in fact penetrated by them. More probably it signifies that they are more physically mature and have gone through puberty.¹⁰ Although these *grandes* are now capable of playing the insertive role, Hamillus still chooses to use them as passive sexual objects. In either case Hamillus would be attempting to counter rumors by engaging in the opposite sexual role with *pueri* who have perhaps given rise to those rumors. Hamillus is clearly trying rather hard to counter the gossip about his sexuality. In addition, it is intriguing that the rumors are spread by his freedmen, slaves, and a malicious *cliens*. The freedmen and slaves would be subservient to Hamillus, even sexually subject to him, and the *cliens*, with his inside access to the *familia*, might very well know the secrets of the house. This suggests that their gossip is not simply idle talk by people unacquainted with the family, but emanates from direct knowledge or even personal involvement with Hamillus.

In the final couplet Martial cleverly unfolds his attack. On the surface it appears to be a rather bland and predictable accusation that someone who arranges for their actions to be witnessed is not to be trusted and probably follows their own desires when such witnesses (*testes*) are absent; but the spark in the invective is contained within the pun of the last line. In the final phrase Martial plays off the anatomical possibility of *testis* (= testicle), which we might have been anticipating after the occurrence of *testatur* in the previous line, in order to allude to Hamillus' passivity: "He often does that which he does without his own testicle," in other words, he does not use his penis (taking *testis* as *pars pro toto* for the entire male genitalia) in any insertive role, but instead is penetrated by others.¹¹

The Hamillus who makes a cameo appearance in the tenth *Satire* of Juvenal is ultimately a very different sort of character. Towards the midpoint of the satire the narrator is trying to describe the number of diseases from which old people suffer and he hits upon an unusual illustration: it would be easier to relate the wicked deeds of various malefactors. Thus Hamillus is only a peripheral figure here, mentioned as one of a number of disreputable people who committed their disreputable acts repeatedly (10.217–24):

praeterea minimus gelido iam in corpore sanguis
 febre calet sola, circumscilicet agmine facto
 morborum omne genus, quorum si nomina quaeras,
 promptius expediam quot amaverit Oppia moechos,
 quot Themison aegros autumnus occiderit uno,
 quot Basilus socios, quot circumscripserit Hirrus
 pupillos, quot longa viros exorbeat uno
 Maura die, quot discipulos inclinet Hamillus.

10. Although Shackleton Bailey (1993, 1: 169) interprets the narrator's desire for a *grandem puerum* in 2.48 to refer to a slave with a large penis, the *TLL* does not include any notion of a large penis for this use of *grandis*. *TLL* 6.2.2180.34–49 cites many passages, including Mart. 7.62, where *grandis* is the equivalent of *pubes* or *maturus*.

11. Adams (1982, 66–71) includes *testis* in a long chapter entitled "Mentula and Its Synonyms." Martial makes similar use of *testis* as part for the whole in 2.72. The poem has many similarities, down to specific vocabulary, with the invective against Hamillus. The narrator informs a certain Postumus that the story is going around (*narratur*) that his face/mouth (*os*) was slapped (*percisum*) at dinner the day before by Caecilius. The sexual nature of this outrage is only revealed in the last line: "What about the fact, Postumus, that Caecilius has witnesses/testicles (*testes*)?" The pun on *testes* makes clear that Postumus suffered an act of oral rape.

Besides, the little blood in his already icy body
 warms up only with fever. Every type of disease
 dances around him in a troop. If you ask their names,
 I could more readily state how many adulterers Oppia loved,
 how many sick patients Themison murdered in a single autumn,
 how many partners Basilus swindled, how many wards were
 cheated by Hirrus, how many men tall Maura sucks off
 in one day, how many pupils Hamillus bends over and screws.

The verb *inclinare*, of which Hamillus is the subject, refers to the bending of the passive partner over in order to penetrate him or her, anally or vaginally, from behind.¹² The masculine *discipulos* is a clear indication that this is a situation of anal intercourse. Thus Juvenal, like Martial, portrays Hamillus as playing the insertive role in anal intercourse. Yet it is not part of some cover-up of his true sexual nature as we saw in Martial; rather, he is a teacher who has taken advantage of his male students.¹³ The difference between these two representations of Hamillus from an ancient perspective—a difference perhaps not so great in modern conceptions of sexuality which tend to focus on the gender of the participants—is vast. From a traditional Roman point of view, Martial's Hamillus secretly engages in sexual behavior that is unacceptable for a free male; Juvenal's Hamillus, however, abuses the trust of his students and his students' parents, but with a sexual act that in other circumstances would not bring him condemnation.¹⁴

Despite the fact that Hamillus' sexual offense and his sexual nature are imagined very differently by Martial and Juvenal, Shackleton Bailey and Friedländer accept the idea that both authors were referring to a real person. To bolster this argument, they go back to a suggestion by Buecheler that a reference to this historically infamous Hamillus is found in two graffiti in Pompeii.¹⁵ The two inscriptions occur side by side:

Sullimah sodalibus · nec si[ne] dulcissima{m} philoth[ti]¹⁶ (CIL IV 3710)

Hamillus (says/writes hello) to his companions not without the sweetest affection

Sullimah Ehton · sic · amo (CIL IV 3711)

Hamillus (says/writes): Nothus, thus I love

12. Adams 1982, 192–93.

13. There are similar accusations made against Quintus Remmius Palaemon (Suet. *Gram.* 23), but I have found no other evidence mentioning specific Roman teachers making sexual advances on their students.

14. There are other indications here that Juvenal is more likely borrowing the name Hamillus (and, very loosely, a persona) from Martial's epigram rather than citing a real person. Most commentators recognize the first two people mentioned, Oppia and Themison, as historical figures. There does not seem to be any reference in any other source outside of Juvenal to the next three people preceding Hamillus in the list. In addition, both Maura and Hamillus are the subjects of present subjunctives (as opposed to the perfect subjunctives of Oppia and Themison), which contributes to the timeless and generic atmosphere of this part of the passage.

15. Shackleton Bailey 1993, 3: 325; Friedländer (1886, 545) states: "der Name Hamillus ist 2 Mal verkehrt in Pompeii angeschrieben: Sullimah: ut quem (d.h. dessen Gleichen) Ausonius epigr. LXX dicit perversae veneris fossorem, sinistro litterarum cursu significari arbitrer." Buecheler (1880, 397) first linked the evidence about Hamillus in Martial, Juvenal, and Pompeii. It is interesting that all three scholars assume, overlooking the true nature of Martial's attack in 7.62, that the insertive role in anal intercourse explains Hamillus' infamy. It is not clear that a negative view of both roles in anal intercourse was customary by the time of Ausonius, but the insertive role was certainly not a source of criticism during the Early Roman Empire, when Hamillus would supposedly have lived and had his name written on a wall in Pompeii. Nor should we rush to link the Pompeian Hamillus to the literary Hamillus on the basis of the relative infrequency of his name in an epigraphical context. According to Solin (2003, 1265–66), the name of Hamillus is actually found fifteen times in inscriptions from Rome.

16. This final word is the Greek φιλότιμ represented in Roman letters.

They are recognizable as greetings, a popular theme in the Pompeian graffiti.¹⁷ Yet they are somewhat unusual: the reverse spelling of the names of Hamillus and Nothus (in the vocative), the Greek noun φιλότης, and the verb *amare* are not customary elements of a greeting. Still, there is nothing in these inscriptions that directly alludes to the literary Hamillus. There is no mention of Juvenal's idea that he was a teacher, or of Martial's presentation of him as a sexual pretender. There is no sign of scandal or infamy, and the greetings are not overtly sexual in nature.

The scholarly belief that these graffiti concern the sexually infamous Hamillus is based on a single idea: that the reverse spelling of a name could indicate a person's desire to assume the receptive role in anal intercourse. It is not a completely alien idea for the Greeks and Romans. It is said that the Hellenistic poet Sotades was the first to write pornographic poetry (Strabo 14.1.41) and that reciters of his poetry were known as κιναιδολόγοι (Ath. 14.620e). The term κίναϊδος was even more significantly associated with a man who willingly allowed himself to be anally penetrated.¹⁸ Martial himself brings these two ideas together in an epigram where he contrasts his own style with a variety of contemptible poetic tricks. In 2.86 Martial argues that he is a serious poet who writes for a select audience (*raris auribus*). He lists a number of literary effects and meters that he avoids, making clear his disdain for them by expressing them in sexual terms. He does not indulge in reverse poetry (*carmine supino*), nor does Attis dictate to him a weakly effeminate galliambus (*mollem debilitate galliambon*), nor does he read the *cinaedus* Sotades backwards (*nec retro lego Sotaden cinaedum*).¹⁹

The sexual roles associated with these terms contribute to the negative impression that Martial wants to convey, but *cinaedus* takes on a quasi-technical force in combination with the name of Sotades. The reference to reading Sotades backwards would resonate with the popular understanding of the *cinaedus*, but it is also directed at one of the tricks of Sotades' versification. He had developed a metrical line which, when the words were reversed, was transformed into another metrical form. Thus, the reference to *cinaedus*, with its negative sexual connotations, contrasts with the superiority of Martial's own approach to poetry, but it also serves as a learned reference to Sotades' most famous metrical innovation, based on a rearrangement of words back to front.²⁰ Martial can at least imagine that reading or writing backwards in some form can have a sexual connotation.

So could the same logic be working in the Pompeian graffiti? Were Shackleton Bailey, Friedländer, and Buecheler right to interpret a name written in reverse on a wall in Pompeii as an indication of a person's sexual interests? And could the Hamillus from the walls of Pompeii refer to the same person as in the poems of Martial and Juvenal? An

17. The most obvious indicator of a greeting is *sal* (standing for *salve*, *salutat*, or *salutem dicit/scribit*). Yet a name in the nominative with another name or word in the dative, as in the first inscription, is typical of the genre. Also, a form of *sodalis*, either as speaker or addressee, is found in a number of greetings (CIL IV 1105, 2154, 3928, 4838, 10227, 10246g). The second inscription is more unusual, but the appearance of Hamillus again in the nominative in conjunction with another name in the vocative could also be understood to be functioning as a greeting.

18. See Winkler 1990, 45–70, for a discussion of the Greek conception of the κίναϊδος. Williams (1999) has a good discussion of the evidence for the *cinaedus* in Roman society. He argues that the *cinaedus* should be thought of primarily as a gender deviant, but the fact remains that the sexual act most commonly associated with the *cinaedus* was the receptive role in anal intercourse.

19. Williams (2004, 261–62) provides an excellent commentary on all the terms in this poem.

20. Bettini (1982) interprets the evidence for the *versi Sotadei*.

answer is possible only after we have considered the Hamillus graffiti in greater detail and examined them alongside similar inscriptions from Pompeii.

Hamillus' greetings are certainly unusual, and some of the vocabulary, especially *amare* and φιλότης, might lead to a sexual interpretation of these graffiti. Although the brevity of most of these graffiti makes them difficult to interpret, it seems that *amare* is frequently used with a sense of romantic love, and other elements of graffiti in which *amare* is found are sometimes overtly sexual. There is, however, in Pompeii only one potential example of *amare* being used to indicate a sexual act.²¹ In addition, it is important to note that in *CIL* IV 3711 there is no object of *amo* and it is not certain that we should supply Nothus as that object just because he appears in the vocative. As for the noun φιλότης, it is almost exclusively nonsexual in its post-Homeric usage.²² It is also true that other greetings recorded in Pompeii sometimes express an affection and warmth that make the appearance of *amare* and φιλότης less exceptional. Examples of such vocabulary include *fratrabiliter* (*CIL* IV 659) and *amabiliter* (*CIL* IV 5419, IV 10247).

The reverse spelling of Hamillus' name is the crucial feature that led modern scholars to propose that this was a reference to the sexually notorious character from Martial and Juvenal. Consequently, a review of all reverse names at Pompeii is essential for determining the true meaning of this unusual presentation. Twelve names are reversed (all in *CIL* IV): Nemesis (1547e), Aelius (1911), Curvius (2400e, 2400g), Sabinus (2395, 2400g, 2400f), Marcus Vibius Publius (2408b), Success . . . (3045), Hamillus (3710, 3711), Nothus (3711), Circius (3977), Aegeus (5070), P. Coelius (8687), and Aemilius (659, 660, 660a, 1759, 2400d, 2400e, 4737, 4741, 7494, 8409a, 8409b). Only one of these includes any sexual content, and this does not involve anal intercourse.²³ Many of these graffiti are simply a single name written in reverse, but two interesting patterns emerge: several of these graffiti are greetings (*CIL* IV 659, 2400d, 2400e, 2400f, 2400g, 3710, 3711); and a single name, Aemilius, accounts for almost half of the total number of occurrences.

Various evidence from this body of graffiti suggests that the reversal of a name has no sexual significance. First, in the greetings that contain a reversed name a cluster of them (*CIL* IV 2400d, 2400e, 2400f, 2400g) are written alongside a Greek palindrome: Ἡδὴ μοι Διὸς ἄρα πηγὴ παρὰ σοὶ Διομήδῃ (*CIL* IV 2400a).²⁴ It is impossible to know whether the greetings or the palindrome was first put on the wall, but the presence of the palindrome suggests a fascination with the potential of reading backwards rather than with anything specifically sexual.²⁵ Second, although it is impossible to know whether one and the same Aemilius was fond of signing his name this way, several of these graffiti are

21. Adams (1982, 188) cites *CIL* IV 1898 (*quiquis amat calidis non debet fontibus uti. I nam nemo flammis ustus amare potest*) in the midst of a discussion of *amare* as a euphemism for the physical act of sex.

22. LSJ, s.v. φιλότης.

23. *Suecae talus istis cunu* (*CIL* IV 5070). The name (Suecae, i.e., Aegeus) is not perfectly reversed, nor is the overall sense of the graffito clear, but it does not seem to be making reference to anal intercourse.

24. See Guarducci 1965, 254 n. 19, and 261. The same palindrome appears in Roman letters just below the Greek. This palindrome had a certain measure of popularity since it was also found as a graffito in a Roman house in Lausanne (see the note at *CIL* IV p. 465) and is recorded in the *Anth. Plan.* 16.387c1.

25. There are a few other graffiti from Pompeii that show a delight in letters and words running in unusual directions, including the magic squares at *CIL* IV 8623 (*Rotas/Opera/Tenet/Arepol/Sator*) and 8297 (*Roma/Olim/Milo/Amor*), both of which are found elsewhere in the Roman world. A general cultural awareness of this sort of literate play is indicated by the Roman fondness for the famous palindrome *Roma/Amor* and the backwards spelling of words in curse tablets (see Gager 1992, 5).

written in the form of an election poster. For example, (*Pro*) *omnibus / Suilimea rog(at) / Suilimea fac(it)* (*CIL* IV 8409a, 8409b), “(On behalf of) everyone, Aemilius asks (that you vote) / Aemilius makes this (sign).” This is a parody of election posters that always name a particular candidate and not just a generic “everybody,” but it provides a possible link. One of the more prolific *scriptores* was Aemilius Celer, and there are even three real, painted election posters where the reverse name appears: *P·P·P·A·V·C·F* [---] / *M·E·S·Q·M* [---] / *Suilimea* · [---] (*CIL* IV 660),²⁶ [---] *O·V·F·Suilimea · rog(at) · caic* [---] (*CIL* IV 660a),²⁷ and *Vettium aed(ilem) / OV F D·I·D·D·R·P·OV F Suilimea / rog(at)* (*CIL* IV 7494).²⁸ It is my hypothesis that Aemilius, the *scriptor programmatum*, was responsible for most occurrences of *Suilimea*.²⁹ Consequently, I would argue that for him, as well as for those who wrote in the room with the palindrome and all who wrote a name backwards, doing so was a bit of cleverness—a virtuoso performance of literacy—rather than any sexual indicator.³⁰

One last bit of evidence provides a final parallel for the Hamillus graffiti and lends credence to the theory concerning reverse names put forth here. In *CIL* IV 659, Aemilius painted a friendly greeting to a certain Cissonius: *Suilimea · Cissonio · fratribiliter · sal(utem dicit)*. This was immediately adjacent to two of the election posters mentioned above. Both of the Hamillus graffiti were also painted and appeared on a wall alongside several official election posters. In his commentary on the first of these (*CIL* IV 3710) the editor of *CIL* noted that it is “to the right of 3709 (an election poster), above, in the same color and, unless I am deceived, written neatly by the same hand” (“ad d. 3709, superius, eodem colore et, nisi fallor, eadem manu nitide scripta”). Thus, just as is the case with Aemilius in *CIL* IV 659, a painter of election posters, a trade which required much higher standards of literacy than the majority of the population, Hamillus showed off with a greeting that was recognizable only to those who were highly literate and in the know.³¹

In conclusion, we should be confident in restoring the literary Hamillus to the realm of fiction. Juvenal adopted the character’s name, and very generally the invented story of his sexual infamy, from Martial in a way that was quite common for the overlapping

26. Only part of this inscription is preserved, but the abbreviations at the beginning of this election poster stand for P. Paquius Proculus, A. Vettius (Caprasius) Felix, M. Epidius Sabinus, and Q. Marius (Rufus), all of whom are mentioned in an election poster at *CIL* IV 222. The use of abbreviations in the electoral posters is not uncommon.

27. *o(rat) v(os) f(aciatis) Suilimea rog(at) caic*.

28. *Vettium aed(ilem) / o(rat) v(os) f(aciatis) d(uovirum) i(ure) d(icendo) d(ignum) r(ei) p(ublicae) o(rat) v(os) f(aciatis) Suilimea / rog(at)*. To the possible objection that Aemilius has not characterized himself as the writer of these three election posters, see Franklin 1978. It was a frequent occurrence that a *scriptor* would instead record himself as a *rogator*. It is also true that the name Celer is nowhere present in these three election posters, but it may be that Aemilius tended to include his full name (and his designation as *scriptor*) in his more impressive commissions (see, e.g., *CIL* IV 3775, 3820, 3884).

29. If it is reasonable to assume that all of the election posters (whether real or parodic) that include the name of Aemilius in reverse form were written by the same Aemilius, then most of the occurrences of *Suilimea* would seem to have been created by one and the same person. The election posters include *CIL* IV 660, 660a, 7494, 8409a, 8409b. It seems logical to conclude that *CIL* IV 659 and 1759, which occur adjacent to *CIL* IV 660 and 660a, are also by the same Aemilius.

30. A number of studies in Humphrey 1991 emphasize that there was greater ability and creative use of literacy at lower levels of Roman society than Harris 1989 suggested.

31. Although it is difficult to assess what level of literacy a *scriptor programmatum* would typically have attained, their abilities at writing marked them as professionals (Mouritsen 1988, 31). And several *programmata* include seemingly off-the-cuff remarks unrelated to the candidate suggesting that the *scriptor* could do more than simply copy a pattern of letters. See Franklin 1991 for a general assessment of literacy as revealed in the Pompeian graffiti.

genres of satire and epigram.³² Nor does the Pompeian Hamillus turn out to have any connection to the fictitious Hamillus. There is no reference to anything sexual in his graffiti, and his only fame came when his clever greetings were preserved forever by the eruption of Vesuvius.

MATTHEW PANCIERA
Gustavus Adolphus College

32. See Colton 1991 for Juvenal's extensive use of Martial's epigrams. Colton notes Juvenal's use of Martial's Hamillus, but does not discuss it at length.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.
- Bettini, M. 1982. A proposito dei versi sotadei, greci e romani: Con alcuni capitoli di "analisi metrica lineare." *MD* 9: 59–105.
- Braund, S., ed. and trans. 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Buecheler, F. 1880. Coniectanea. *RhM* 35: 390–407.
- Citroni, M., ed. 1975. *M. Valerii Martialis "Epigrammaton" Liber Primus*. Florence.
- Coleman, K. M. 1986. The Emperor Domitian and Literature. *ANRW* 2.32.5: 3087–115.
- Colton, R. E. 1991. *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams: A Study of Literary Influence*. Amsterdam.
- Ferguson, J. 1987. *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal*. Brussels.
- Franklin, J. L. 1978. Notes on Pompeian Prosopography: *Programmatum Scriptores. Cronache Pompeiane* 4: 54–74.
- . 1991. Literacy and the Parietal Inscriptions of Pompeii. In Humphrey 1991, 77–98.
- Friedländer, L. 1886. *M. Valerii Martialis "Epigrammaton" Libri*. Leipzig.
- Gager, J. G. 1992. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*. Oxford.
- Galán Vioque, G. 2002. *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Guarducci, M. 1965. Il misterioso "quadrato magico": L'interpretazione di Jérôme Carcopino e documenti nuovi. *ArchClass* 17: 219–70.
- Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Henriksen, C. 1999. *Martial, Book IX: A Commentary*. Vol. 2. Uppsala.
- Howell, P. 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the "Epigrams" of Martial*. London.
- Humphrey, J. H., ed. 1991. *Literacy in the Roman World. JRA Suppl.* 3. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Kay, N. M. 1985. *Martial Book XI: A Commentary*. London.
- Mouritsen, H. 1988. *Elections, Magistrates, and Municipal Élite: Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy*. Rome.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. and trans. 1993. *Martial: "Epigrams."* 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Solin, H. 2003. *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: Ein Namenbuch*². Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1991. *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge.
- Watson, L., and P. Watson. 2003. *Martial: Select "Epigrams."* Cambridge.
- Williams, C. A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford.
- , trans. 2004. *Martial: "Epigrams," Book Two*. Oxford.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire*. London.