

### THREE WOMEN IN MARTIAL\*

- (i)                   Alphius ante fuit, coepit nunc Olphius esse,  
                          uxorem postquam duxit Athenagoras.<sup>1</sup>

(9. 95)

‘Ein völlig unverständliches Wortspiel’, said Friedländer.<sup>2</sup> There have been many attempts to solve the riddle. The older commentators, following Domizio Calderini,<sup>3</sup> offered a fantastic solution:<sup>4</sup> Athenagoras was a doctor specializing in leprosy (ἀλφός): ‘porro ducta uxore coepit lingere cunnum... unde factus est olficius, hoc est olfacit cunnum’! H. C. Schnur<sup>5</sup> emended to Olbius (ὄλβιος): Albius Athenagoras (Greek *cognomen* with Roman *nomen gentilicium*), by marrying a rich wife, became Olbius. This explanation deprives the name ‘Albius’ of any point; nor is it particularly witty to say that Albius married money. The most popular solution<sup>6</sup> points to the biblical ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ω [sc. ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος]<sup>7</sup> – it can be shown with some plausibility that the expression was known to the Romans of Martial’s time<sup>8</sup> – and to Martial’s phrases ‘alpha paenulatorum’ (2. 57. 4, 5. 26. 1) and ‘beta togatorum’ (5. 26. 4). Before marriage Athenagoras was A in his house; now he is last, in other words, henpecked. ‘Paenulatorum’ and ‘togatorum’, however, give ‘alpha’ and ‘beta’ a context which plain Alphius and Olphius do not possess. Moreover, in all the other passages which scholars quote in support of the A–Ω hypothesis,<sup>9</sup> a letter of the alphabet becomes a byname for an individual,<sup>10</sup> and is not incorporated in another

\* I would like to thank Professor R. G. M. Nisbet for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> It must be stated at the outset that I regard 9. 95 and 95b. as separate poems (they were first divided by Scriverius in 1618), in contrast to J. Mussehl, ‘Martial ix 95’, *Hermes* 58 (1923), 238 f., and F. Dornseiff, ‘Martialis ix 95 und Rotas-Opera-Quadrat’, *Rh. Mus.* 96 (1953), 373–8, who view them as one, and interpret accordingly. There is a clear break in sense between lines 2 and 3 (= 95b. 1). Also, Martial is fond of placing one after the other two poems on the same subject (some examples in K. P. Schulze, ‘Martialis Catullstudien’, *Neue Jahrb.* 135 (1887), 640): this appears to have been the original situation here. An exact parallel is furnished by 2. 21–3. Poems 21–2 attack Postumus and his *basia*, poem 23 begins ‘Non dicam, licet usque me rogetis, | qui sit Postumus in meo libello’, cf. 95b.

<sup>2</sup> *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri* (Leipzig, 1886), ad loc. Likewise T. Farnaby, *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammaton libri*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1633), W. Heraeus in the critical appendix to the Teubner edition (Lipsiae, 1925: *editio correctior* by I. Borovskij, 1976), ad loc., and H. J. Izaac, *Martial: Épigammes II* (Paris, 1930–33), p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> *M. Val. Martialis Epigram. Libri... adiectis... commentariis Domitii Chalderini atque Georgii Merulae* (Lugduni, 1522), ad loc.; cf. also E. Renn, *Die griechischen Eigennamen bei Martial* (Diss. Landshut, 1889), pp. 56 f.

<sup>4</sup> Other unlikely explanations have come from F. Nencini, ‘Su due Epigrammi di Marziale’, *RIFC* 44 (1916), 285 ff., and Dornseiff, op. cit.

<sup>5</sup> ‘On a Crux in Martial (9. 95)’, *CW* 48 (1955), 51.

<sup>6</sup> O. Crusius, ‘Alphius-Olphius (Martial IX 95)’, *Philologus* 19 (1906), 159 f.; J. M. Stowasser, ‘Etymologica’, *WS* 31 (1909), 150 f.; E. Pertsch, *De Valerio Martiale Graecorum Poetarum Imitatore* (Diss. Berlin, 1911), p. 46; Mussehl, op. cit. (with variations); J. G. Smyly, ‘Martial IX 95’, *Hermathena* 70 (1947), 81 f.; Dornseiff, op. cit.; A. G. Carrington, ‘The Alpha and the Omega: Martial IX 95’, *GR ser. 2*. 1 (1954), 127 f.; R. Helm, ‘Martialis’, *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 304.

<sup>7</sup> *Revelation of John* 1. 8 with 1. 17; 21. 6; 22. 13.

<sup>8</sup> See Dornseiff, op. cit. 376 ff.

<sup>9</sup> See conveniently Crusius, op. cit.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. βῆτα for Eratosthenes (Suda – *Life of E.*), Λάβδα for the θυγάτηρ χωλή of the Bacchiad Amphion (Hdt. 5. 92: from the old Corinthian Lambda with unequal legs).

name,<sup>11</sup> as would be the case with *Alphius* and *Olphius*. The presence of two names points to an etymological, not alphabetical, *jeu des mots*.

I suggest that we read 'Ophlius' for 'Olphius'. (There is no difficulty about the correction: an original Ophlius could easily have been assimilated to Olphius after Alphius).<sup>12</sup> Now Alphius calls to mind ἀλφάνω, ἀλφή and – according to one interpretation of the word – ἀλφιστής.<sup>13</sup> The root meaning of these terms is 'to procure, gain', or 'earn'. No doubt Horace had this etymology in mind when he coined his 'faenerator Alfius' (*Epod.* 2. 67).<sup>14</sup> Ophlius is modelled upon ὀφλισκάνω, ὀφλον, 'to owe'. Before his marriage, Athenagoras used to make a profit; now he has run into debt. In other words, his new wife is a spendthrift.

Complaints about such behaviour are voiced from the earliest times,<sup>15</sup> and Roman writers were not slow to take up the refrain.<sup>16</sup> Closest in spirit perhaps to Martial's couplet are Juvenal's tirade against wives who run through their husbands' cash (*Sat.* 6. 149 ff., 208–10,<sup>17</sup> 232, 508–11, and cf. also 355 ff.), Habinnas' ungallant – if no doubt exaggerated – remark to Scintilla 'excatarissasti me' (from ἐξ + καθαρίζειν,<sup>18</sup> sc. with your purchase of jewellery) *Petron.* 67. 10,<sup>19</sup> the inference, which we are invited to draw, in the Elder Seneca, *Contr.* 2. 5. 7, that such ruinous extravagance was widespread among wives, and Pardalisca's advice to the 'bride' at Plaut. *Cas.* 822 'vir te vestiat, tu virum despolies' (the verb is, at least in one sense, financial)<sup>20</sup> – unorthodox perhaps,<sup>21</sup> but coming uncomfortably close to home.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The sole exception is *A. P.* 11. 15 (Ammianus): *Εἰ μὲν τοὺς ἀπὸ ἄλλα μόνους κέκρικας κατορύσσειν, | Λούκιε, βουλευτὰς καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἔχεις: | εἰ δ', ὅπερ εὐλογὸν ἔστι, κατὰ στοιχείον ὀδεύεις, | ἤδη, σοὶ προλέγω, Ὀριγένης λέγομαι*, cited by Mussehl, who explains thus: Lucius is a doctor who, Ammianus pretends, is going to kill off all the A-people – senators (βουλευτὰς), and those whose names begin with ἀ, including his ἀδελφός. To forestall the danger of an alphabetical progression, Ammianus hastily changes his name to Ὀριγένης. Here, however, the play on the initial letter of Ὀριγένης is carefully prepared for by τοὺς ἀπὸ ἄλλα in the first line.

<sup>12</sup> On the question of transmission, see below.

<sup>13</sup> That is, 'gain-seeking'. So this Homeric word seems to have been understood by Aeschylus in a commercial metaphor at *Sept.* 766 ff.: *τέλειαι γὰρ παλαιφάτων ἀρὰν | βαρεῖαι καταλλαγαί... πρόπρυμνα δ' ἐκβολὰν φέρεϊ | ἀνδρῶν ἀλφιστᾶν | ὄλβος ἄγαν παχυνθεῖς*. Modern scholars, however, concur in deriving it from ἀλφι, barley-meal, ἄνδρες ἀλφιστᾶι being differentiated from savages, ἄνδρες ὠμησταί. See S. H. Butcher and A. Lang, *The Odyssey of Homer* (London, 1906), pp. 410 ff., and P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque* (Paris, 1968), s.v.

<sup>14</sup> For the suggestion, see G. Cipriani, *Letteratura Georgica e Investimento Fondiario alla fine del 1° sec. a.C.: Orazio Epod. 2* (Bari, 1980), p. 59, with the references there given.

<sup>15</sup> e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 593, Eur. *Hipp.* 630 ff., Ar. *Nub.* 55 and Theophr. *De Nuptiis* ap. Hieron. *Adv. Jovin.* 1. 47 (Migne *PL* 23. 276).

<sup>16</sup> Where laments about the high cost of maintaining a female are most frequently heard in extra-marital contexts (e.g. Plaut. *Trin.* 242 ff. and *Truc.* 31 ff., Lucr. 4. 1123 ff., Hor. *Sat.* 1. 2. 58 ff., Phaedr. 2. 2, Prop. 2. 24. 11 ff., and Ov. *Am.* 1. 10. 29 ff.), but do spill over into marriage.

<sup>17</sup> 'nullam invenies quae parcat amanti. | ardeat ipsa licet, tormentis gaudet amanti | et spoliis'.

<sup>18</sup> Thus Bücheler, persuasively. Other explanations, some yielding the same general sense, in Burman and Friedländer, ad loc.

<sup>19</sup> See 67. 7 for complaints in much the same vein by Trimachio to Fortunata.

<sup>20</sup> cf. Mart. 11. 49. 1 ff. 'Nulla est hora tibi qua non me, Phylli, furem | despolies: tanta calliditate rapis. | nunc plorat speculo fallax ancilla relicto...', 4. 29. 5, or the use of 'nudus' at 4. 28. 8 and Juv. 6. 232.

<sup>21</sup> That the *ancilla's* speech from 815 ff. humorously inverts the advice which was typically given to a Roman bride is shown by G. Williams, 'Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals', *JRS* 48 (1958), 17 ff.

<sup>22</sup> See further Lucil. 682 ff. M. on the wife who is bent on consuming her husband's money,

So much for the literary tradition behind 9. 95. It may be added that the play on Alphius and Ophlius reflects one facet of Martial's technique: elsewhere he shows a fondness for punning on the literal sense of Greek names, cf. 3. 78 (Palinurus), 3. 34 (Chione), 4. 9 (Sotae filia), 7. 83 (a barber Eutrapelus, 'nimble', who is anything but), and 3. 67. 10 'non nautas puto vos, sed Argonautas', said of lazy boatmen.<sup>23</sup>

Turning finally to more technical matters: since all three classes of Martial's manuscripts, while transmitting the name Ophlius under widely different forms,<sup>24</sup> show Olph- (or Olf-), it appears that the corruption arose early: in other words, in the single ancient source from which, it is widely held,<sup>25</sup> our three families descend. As a final point in favour of the emendation here offered, note that in a total of nine cases, a third of which are proper nouns, all three MS. traditions preserve the same wrong reading.<sup>26</sup> These are trivial errors, involving a single letter only. To this list should be added, perhaps, the equally slight, but much more significant, corruption of Ophlius to Olphius.

- (ii) Oculo Philaenis semper altero plorat.  
quo fiat istud quaeritis modo? lusca est. (4. 65)

On the face of it, this means that Philaenis sheds tears with her sound eye.<sup>27</sup> The actual meaning is much sharper. Philaenis weeps with her bad eye, from which she has a constant ('semper') discharge; cf. Juv. 6. 109 'semper stillantis ocelli'. Like the one-eyed thief (8. 59. 2), Philaenis has a 'lippa lacuna'.<sup>28</sup>

The technical term for a 'weeping' eye was 'lacrimare'<sup>29</sup> – a verb which may be used in both an emotional and a clinical sense. This opens the way to the ambivalent use of the related verb 'plorare' which Martial exploits in 4. 65.<sup>30</sup>

- (iii) Quicquid 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 hesterna patri cum luce salutem,  
'Naevia lux' inquit 'Naevia lumen, have'.  
Haec legit et ridet demisso Naevia voltu.  
Naevia non una est: quid, vir inepte, furis? (1. 68)<sup>31</sup>

the *furor* over the repeal of the Oppian law (Liv. 34. 1–8), and R. Schütze, *Juvenalis ethicus* (Diss. Greifswald, 1905), pp. 38 f.

<sup>23</sup> For the background to such etymological jokes on names, see E. Siedschlag, *Zur Form von Martialis Epigrammen* (Berlin, 1977), pp. 90 ff., and V. Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum* (München, 1962), pp. 82 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Olphius T Olfrus R (= A family), Olfius L Colphius P Coalfrus Q (= B), Olficius EXAG (= C).

<sup>25</sup> See recently M. Citroni, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber Primus* (Firenze, 1975), pp. lxxi f., and P. Howell, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1980), p. 13. The case is summarised by G. Pasquali, *Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo*<sup>2</sup> (Firenze, 1952), p. 418.

<sup>26</sup> See W. Heraeus, 'Zur neueren Martialkritik', *Rh. Mus.* 74 (1925), 323 f.

<sup>27</sup> Thus M. Raderus, *Martialis Epigrammaton Libri omnes*<sup>2</sup> (Ingolstadt, 1611), and Farnaby ('ἀπροσδοκῆτως... neque enim alterum habet'), ad loc.

<sup>28</sup> That her one-eyedness is of a fairly drastic variety is suggested by 12. 22: 'Quam sit lusca Philaenis indecenter | vis dicam breviter tibi, Fabulle? | Esset caeca decentior Philaenis'.

<sup>29</sup> Cels. 1. 9. 5 and 6. 6. 1 *passim*, Marcell. *Med.* 8. 20 and 199 Helmreich, Veget. *Mulom.* 2. 112. 3 Lommatzsch; cf. Cic. *Att.* 10. 14. 1, Romul. *Fab.* 77 Thiele.

<sup>30</sup> I have found no other cases where 'plorare' is employed of 'lacrimae' which are not those of emotion. However 'ploratus' at Plin. *HN* 12. 54. 116 describes the discharge from a tree, while 'flere' on occasion = not 'weep' but, in a transferred sense, 'stillare'; see *TLL* 6. 900. 65 ff.

<sup>31</sup> On this poem, see J. Flach, *M. Valer. Martialis Epigrammaton Liber Primus* (Tübingen,

The first six verses are straightforward enough. Rufus is so wrapped up in his beloved Naevia that she dominates his every action. Lines 5–6 give a laughable illustration of this state of affairs: only yesterday, when writing to his father, Rufus began, not with a salutation to him, but ‘Naevia lux, Naevia lumen’.<sup>32</sup>

Lines 7–8 have caused endless difficulty. ‘Haec,<sup>33</sup> ridet demisso...vultu,<sup>34</sup> Naevia non una est,<sup>35</sup> vir’<sup>36</sup> and ‘furis’<sup>37</sup> have all been interpreted in different ways.

Nevertheless, one explanation of 7–8 has held the field in recent years:<sup>38</sup> Naevia reads the letter (‘haec’), with its comically misdirected opening, and is amused, stifling a laugh (‘ridet demisso...vultu’). ‘Silly fellow’ (‘vir inepte’), counsels Martial, ‘why be madly in love with (or ‘you are mad to love’) one who mocks your passion? Girls like Naevia are ten a penny (‘Naevia non una est!’) The unspoken implication is: ‘you can easily find another to replace her’.<sup>39</sup>

This explanation falls down on its interpretation of ‘ridet demisso...vultu’. ‘Demittere vultum’ and the analogous ‘demittere lumen, oculos’, or ‘faciem’ are used to characterize a whole range of emotions – humility (e.g. Sen. *Contr.* 10. 3. 13; Tac. *Ann.* 12. 36 *fin.*; Virg. *Aen.* 12. 220), modesty (Sidon. *Epist.* 8. 6. 6),<sup>40</sup> especially female bashfulness<sup>41</sup> (Luc. 2. 361; Stat. *Theb.* 10. 63 and *Silv.* 1. 2. 12; Paulin. Nol. *Carm.* 6. 114), joy (Plin. *Paneg.* 73. 4), sullen hostility (Liv. 2. 58. 8; Hieron. *Hebraica. Quaest. in Gen.* 9. 1 Lag.), confusion (Apul. *Apol.* 99), fear (Ov. *Met.* 7. 133; Stat. *Ach.* 1. 795), and sorrow or distress (Ov. *Her.* 16. 225 and *Met.* 15. 612; Stat. *Ach.* 1. 95; Liv. 9. 38. 13; Q. Curt. 6. 9. 2). In spite of its impressive range of meanings, I can, however, find no evidence that ‘demittere vultum’ is ever applied to concealing an injudicious laugh.<sup>42</sup> The sense proposed becomes even less acceptable if, as seems likely, ‘vultum’ here is equivalent to ‘oculos’.<sup>43, 44</sup>

1881), ad loc.; W. Gilbert, ‘Zur Erklärung von Martialis Epigrammen’, *Neue Jahrb.* 135 (1887), 143; G. Friedrich, ‘Zu Martial’, *Rh. Mus.* 62 (1907), 366 f.; A. E. Housman, ‘Notes on Martial’, *CQ* 13 (1919), 68 f. (= *Cl. Papers* 982 f.); M. Schuster, ‘Zur Erklärung und Komposition von Martial 1 68’, *WS* 44 (1924–5), 120 ff.; Helm, op. cit. 309; U. Carratello, ‘Un Folle Amore in Marziale’, in *Studi Classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* III (Catania, 1972), pp. 391 ff.; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, ‘Corrections and Explanations of Martial’ *CP* 73 (1978), 274.

<sup>32</sup> cf. Ov. *Pont.* 4. 1. 11–12 ‘O quotiens, alii cum vellem scribere, nomen | rettulit in ceras inscia dextra tuum’.

<sup>33</sup> The letter (so most interpreters), or the anecdote related in lines 1–6 (Friedländer ad loc., Housman 68, Carratello 392)? <sup>34</sup> See the discussion of the phrase below.

<sup>35</sup> (a) ‘There are plenty of girls like Naevia’. (b) ‘There is more than one Naevia’ i.e. ‘I may mean another’ (Friedländer, Housman). (c) ‘Naevia is not alone’ i.e. has other lovers apart from Rufus (the early commentators: some details in Carratello 396 f.). (d) ‘una’ = ‘unā’ sc. ‘simul’! (e) Rufus, having read the epigram, becomes angry. Martial calms him down with ‘my epigram, like you, makes constant mention [“non una”] of Naevia’ (Carratello 393).

<sup>36</sup> ‘Fellow’ (*plerique*); ‘husband’ (V. Colleson in the *Delphin* ed. (1720), ad loc., Flach, and Housman). <sup>37</sup> (a) ‘amore insanis’ (b) ‘stultissimus es, qui talem ames’ (c) ‘irascaris’.

<sup>38</sup> Izaac op. cit. 1. 244, Citroni and Howell ad loc. and Helm loc. cit.; cf. also Carratello 392.

<sup>39</sup> Commentators cite Theocr. 11. 75 f. and Virg. *Ecl.* 2. 73 ‘invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin’.

<sup>40</sup> ‘cum quodam prologo pudoris vultum modeste demissus inrubit’.

<sup>41</sup> See further n. 49 below.

<sup>42</sup> Nor are the synonymous ‘deicere vultum, lumina’, or ‘oculos’ (*TLL* 5. 396. 46 ff., F. Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 2. 756).

<sup>43</sup> See Mackail on Virg. *Aen.* 1. 561 ‘Dido vultum demissa’ (probably modelled on Hypsipyle and Medea in Ap. Rhod. 1. 790 and 3. 1008 ἢ δ’ ἐγκλιδὸν ὄσσε βαλοῦσα), ‘not “with downcast face” the Latin for which would be *vultum summissa*, as in 12. 807 *summisso Saturnia vultu*; but “lowering her eyes”, from the throne on which (1. 506) she sat’. Further examples are Sen. *Thy.* 635–6 ‘haeret in vultu truci | imago facti’; ibid. 950 ‘imber vultu nolente cadit’.

<sup>44</sup> In any case, is *lowering* one’s countenance the natural way to conceal a laugh?

In conjunction with 'ridet demisso...vultu' we must consider a further problem: how does Naevia come to read a letter which is not intended for her? Schuster's explanation was impossibly elaborate, Friedrich's<sup>45</sup> not much better. A tempting solution, that Naevia was present while Rufus was writing the letter (Gilbert, cf. Carratello), or read it over his shoulder (Izaak, Helm), must be rejected, since it is tied to an unacceptable (cf. *supra*) explanation of 'demisso...vultu', which makes Naevia dissolve into ill-concealed laughter as she catches sight of Rufus' blunder. In any case, does a lover, snatching a few precious hours with his *puella* (cf. l. 106. 4–5), waste time writing to his father?

The difficulty can be simply resolved by assuming that the elder Rufus and Naevia live under the same roof.<sup>46</sup> Rufus, blissfully unaware of his error over the mode of address, sends the letter to his father, who shows it to Naevia. I would reconstruct the situation as follows: Naevia is Rufus senior's wife, *ergo* Rufus' mother or – much better – young stepmother<sup>47</sup> (which would lend plausibility to the father's suspicion). On receipt of the letter, Rufus' father angrily ('furis') confronts Naevia with it: she laughs in an embarrassed fashion ('ridet demisso...vultu'). 'Silly husband ('vir inepte')', says Martial, 'there are plenty of women called Naevia'<sup>48</sup> ('Naevia non una est'). Why assume that your Naevia is identical with your son's?

Note that, on this explanation, the 'pater' of 5 is one and the same as the 'vir' of 8.

This interpretation can be defended on several counts. In the first place, it ascribes to 'demisso...vultu' the emotions which the phrase most commonly registers, particularly where women are concerned,<sup>49</sup> namely shame or embarrassment. See for instance Virg. *Aen.* 1. 561 'tum breviter Dido vultum demissa<sup>50</sup> profatur',<sup>51</sup> Stat. *Theb.* 4. 768 (the mortal Hypsipyle's embarrassment at being addressed as a goddess), Sen.

<sup>45</sup> op. cit. 367, cf. Howell ad loc.: after the misdirected salutation, Rufus can no longer send the note to his father (why not simply erase the error?). Instead he shows it to Naevia, expecting her to be touched. She laughs.

<sup>46</sup> This solution was already arrived at by Flach on line 5 and Schuster 121, who however take 'patri' to mean Naevia's father.

<sup>47</sup> It may be objected that l. 106. 4–5 'numquid pollicita est tibi beatam | noctem Naevia?' suggests that N. is a *meretrix*. Consider, however, the case of Lesbia, who although a *matrona* makes brief nocturnal assignations with her lover: 'sed furtiva dedit mira munuscula nocte, | ipsius ex ipso dempta viri gremio. | quare illud satis est, si nobis is datur unis | quem lapide illa dies candidiore notat', Catull. 68. 145–8; on such amateur wantons, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 13 ff.

<sup>48</sup> So the phrase was interpreted by Housman 68 f., who explained as follows: 'vir' is any husband who happens to be married to a lady called Naevia. Such individuals are assumed to be angered by the suggestion of involvement with Rufus. Martial replies pacifically that there is more than one Naevia in the world: 'why assume that the Naevia to whom I refer is the same as yours?'

<sup>49</sup> For the phrase referring to maidenly embarrassment, see the examples cited p. 261 *supra*.

Note that the gesture – I am not speaking of cases involving 'demittere' only – is a characteristically female one, signifying *pudor* in various aspects: the natural *verecundia* of a woman in the presence of men (Ov. *Am.* 3. 6. 67, Sen. *Contr.* exc. 2. 7, Sen. *Tro.* 1137–8), the blushing bashfulness of a bride (Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 12, Luc. 2. 361), the false modesty of the elegiac *puella* (Ov. *Am.* 1. 8. 37) or – as here – the shame felt by a woman who has been erotically compromised, cf. 'erubui [sc. Canace], gremioque pudor deiecit ocellos' Ov. *Her.* 11. 35, *Met.* 2. 448, 6. 605–6, 10. 389. See further T. Köves – Zulauf (*Gymnasium* 85 (1978), 202 f.), Bömer, loc. cit.

<sup>50</sup> Donatus ad loc. comments 'non solum propter femineam verecundiam...verum etiam propter obiecta [lines 539–41]'. That Dido feels embarrassment at her people's harsh reception of the Trojans is shown by her next words 'Solvite corde metum, Teucri... | res dura et regni novitas me talia cogunt | moliri'. J. Henry (*Philologus* 11 (1856), 519) wrongly attributes Dido's gesture to 'Mitleid'.

<sup>51</sup> Compare *Aen.* 3. 320 'deiecit vultum et demissa voce locuta est' (Andromache's sorrow, and shame at having been Pyrrhus' concubine) and Q. Curt. 6. 2. 6.

*Ben.* 2. 2. 1 (shame at having to ask for a *beneficium*), *Ps. Aur. Vict. Epit.* 8. 4 'ac ne homo impudens in extremis saltem malorum, quae gesserat, rubore faciem demitteret, subiecto in mentum gladio...', *Ov. Met.* 10. 367 'demisit vultus sceleris sibi conscia virgo'.

In the second place it entails the translation of 'vir' as 'husband', thereby giving the noun a far more pointed sense than does the insipid '(silly) fellow'.<sup>52</sup>

Thirdly, the epigram is made to turn on a *motif* which has a well-established pedigree in Latin poetry, that of 'Vater und Sohn Rivalität' for possession of the same girl:<sup>53</sup> see, for example, *Plaut. Asinaria fin.* and *Casina*, or *Catullus* 64. 401–2<sup>54</sup> and 67.<sup>55</sup>

Finally, both the name *Rufus*<sup>56</sup> and the suggestion of incest (whether real or imagined is a question Martial slyly leaves open) could be an instance of Martial's ubiquitous borrowing from *Catullus*.<sup>57</sup> *Catullus* is fascinated by the topic of incestuous *amores*.<sup>58</sup> and, elsewhere, *Martial* writes in *Catullan* vein on the relationship of a mother with her son (2. 4), or *privignus* with *noverca* (4. 16).<sup>59</sup> One of these types, I contend, is in question in 1. 68.

At the same time, the topic of incest has a far more ancient lineage than *Martial's* predecessor of the 1st century B.C. Examples of incest between mother and son are legion. Of mythical examples, it will suffice to mention *Oedipus* and *Jocasta*, *Periander* and his mother (*Parthen. Erot. Path.* 17) or *Menephron* and *Bias* (*Ov. Met.* 7. 386–7, *Hygin. Fab.* 253), of historical instances *Tac. Ann.* 6. 49, or the tales which circulated concerning *Agrippina's* relationship with *Nero* (*Tac. Ann.* 14. 2, *Suet. Nero* 28. 2, *Dio C.* 61. 11. 3–4). Nor did the sensational plots of the *rhetores*, with their liking for the topic of incest, fail to utilize this particular variant; cf. *Ps. Quintil. Decl. Mai.* 18 and 19 *Lehnert*.

Cases of illicit love between *privignus* and *noverca* are understandably more rare, given that stepmothers were traditionally preoccupied, not with loving, but with destroying their stepsons. Still, as *Seneca* observed, (*Pha.* 356–7) 'Vincit saevas cura novercas', and tragic heroes (*Theseus*, *Phineus*) were, like *Rufus* père, only too ready to lend credence to unwholesome rumours concerning youthful second wives. Perhaps the most famous instance of a stepson's incestuous passion for his stepmother concerned *Antiochus*, the son of *K. Seleucus*, and *Stratonice* (*Lucian, De dea Syria* 17–18, *Val. Max.* 5. 7 ext. 1). Further examples are, however, not far to seek; cf. *Val. Max.* 5. 9. 1, *Parthen. Erot. Path.* 34, and *Marcellinus ap. Walz Rhetores Graeci* 4.

<sup>52</sup> This is not to say that 'vir' cannot = 'homo'. See *Citroni ad loc.* (whose examples are not all well chosen, however), *Plaut. Rud.* 1112 'quid ais, vir venefice?', *ibid.* 1058–9 *Da.* 'quid fecit tibi | vir scelestus?' *Tr.* 'homini ego isti talos subfringi volo', *Ov. Fast.* 2. 688, *Sen. Thy.* 211.

<sup>53</sup> See *F. Wehrli, Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie* (Zürich, 1936), pp. 56 ff., and, for a possible pictorial representation of the situation, *M. Bieber, History of the Greek and Roman Theater*<sup>2</sup> (Princeton, 1961), p. 138.

<sup>54</sup> On these lines, see *G. Giangrande, 'The Stepmother-motif in Catullus', Eranos* 73 (1975), 109 ff.

<sup>55</sup> According to the interpretation of *Giangrande, 'Catullus 67', Quad. Urbin.* 9 (1970), 84 ff.

<sup>56</sup> For *Rufus* in *Catullus*, see poems 69, 71 and 77 (also 58 and 100). *Catull.* 69. 1–2 'noli admirari... Rufe' reappears in *Martial* 6. 89, 8 as 'desine mirari, Rufe'. The clearest case of name-borrowing from *Catullus* is *Martial's* 'Lesbia' (1. 34; 2. 50; 5. 68; 6. 23; 10. 39; 11. 62; 11. 99).

<sup>57</sup> See *R. Paukstadt, De Martiale Catulli imitatore* (Diss. Halle, 1876), *Schulze op. cit.* 637 ff., *J. Ferguson, 'Catullus and Martial', PACA* 6 (1963), 3 ff.

<sup>58</sup> *H. Rankin, 'Catullus and Incest', Eranos* 74 (1976), 113 ff.

<sup>59</sup> The repetition of key words and names in both 4. 16 and 2. 4 is very typical of *Catullus*: compare e.g. poems 82 or 112. With 2. 4. 6 cf. perhaps *Catull.* 12. 4, and, for the theme of mother-son love, see *C.* 64. 403–4, 88–90, and 91. 5.

168. 10 ff., who even speaks of a law prohibiting unions between stepsons and stepmothers.

With such uninhibited individuals belong, perhaps, Naevia and Rufus.

*University of Sydney*

L. C. WATSON