

Embodied Poetics in Martial 11^{*}

DONALD LAVIGNE

Texas Tech University

SUMMARY: In this paper, I call attention to the way in which Martial uses the body of his “wife.” In particular, I focus on one act the poet associates with his wife in this *libellus*, that of anal sex. I argue that in order to understand this sordid act, we must first understand the poetic voice or persona. In other words, Martial’s representation of his wife and her bodily acts highlight the fact that “Martial” himself is part of the illusion. Through his wife, who can be seen as transformation of the women of Catullus and the elegists, Martial sullies the literary tradition as he inserts himself into it. This simultaneously transformative and visceral use of his wife is part of Martial’s larger epigrammatic program and indicative of his “embodied poetics.”

INTRODUCTION

IN THE CONCLUSION TO HIS RECENT MONOGRAPH ON MARTIAL, WILLIAM Fitzgerald offers the following assessment of the poet: “Martial, opportunis-

* Several people have read and commented upon the many drafts of this paper. First of all, thanks are due to Allen Miller and the anonymous referees for TAPA. Two audiences heard and offered advice on this paper during my time at Stanford where this paper was begun. In that time, Alessandro Barchiesi, David Leitaó, and Stephen Hinds all read the paper and made several early improvements that are fundamental to what is valuable in the current version. The following are deserving of special thanks for their advice and criticism at all stages: my friend and colleague David H. J. Larmour for invaluable and timely criticism; Tom and Julia Hawkins, for always being willing to entertain me and my ideas in this paper and others; Corby Kelly for lively discussions about things Latin and not; Allen Romano for his advice, questions and friendship; finally, David Smith, for his expertise in the field. One last person is deserving of mention, Ian Hodder, at whose behest this paper was born into the world and under whose tutelage I first considered the idea of embodiment. Others (and those listed above, when I could remember their individual contributions) who graciously offered comments are mentioned in the notes. Even with the aid of so many and learned colleagues, mistakes no doubt remain for which I alone am responsible. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

tic rather than anxious, has no interest in maintaining a persona. His books might be more appropriately thought of as kaleidoscopic because his world has no center; it is a world of opportunities and exchanges" (2007: 194). Martial, through his kaleidoscopic representation both of himself and his world, guarantees his poetic fame precisely because he is able to be both one and many. Understandably, a literary world with features such as this presents its readers with interpretative problems; often enough, critics looking for a center can be seduced by the reality-effect of this or that kaleidoscopic moment presented in Martial's *Epigrams*. This is especially true when they focus their critical lens on Martial's representation of sexuality—all too often, readers construe Martial's sexual explicitness as a mere joke or a symptom of the degeneracy of the real poet (and his time).¹ Readers who try to find in Martial a consistent picture of sexual life in Rome will ultimately be stymied as the poet turns the kaleidoscope on another subject and twists the mirrors upside down. What Martial does give his readers is a picture of sexual life in *his* literary version of Rome—a picture that is informed (but never fully determined) by Imperial Roman sexual mores and the sexual mores of Martial's literary predecessors.

In this paper, I will explore how Martial's representation of visceral sexuality and his attendant transformation of the Roman erotic literary tradition elucidate his poetic technique. I will argue that Martial employs an "embodied poetics" that revels in the obscene depictions of bodies and their acts. In fact,

¹ Studies of Martial's wife illustrate the point well. The typical argument states that Martial cannot possibly have involved his actual wife in the obscene acts he depicts in his poetry. So, these critics argue that either Martial was not married or that these poems represent an idealized, negative stance toward wives; cf. Kay's 1984 introduction to 11.104 and Watson 2002. Another method to smooth away the contradictions in the corpus, is pursued by Watson 2005, in which she argues that the cumulative effect of even the most obscene treatments of wives suggest a loosening of moral strictures for women in the imperial period. Her argument unfortunately does not deal with the poems adequately in terms of their literary context. In the end, her argument is not so different from those who claim to have shown that Martial, basically, if incredibly obscenely, espouses a notion of typical Roman masculinity. For example, O'Connor describes Martial as normative 1998: 187–88; Sullivan calls Martial's sexual stance traditional 1991: 186 and even prudish 1979; Richlin categorizes the sex acts in Martial and renders them into a hierarchy 1983: 55 and sees Roman invective against women as "the concrete manifestation of a societal notion of women" 1984: 67. Parker's "grid" eliminates the contradictions in the poetry in service to a structuralist ideal; cf. his statement, 1997: 48 "Roman sexuality was a structuralist's dream." All are surely right to see in Martial Roman norms of masculinity, but that does very little for our understanding of Martial unless his particular use of Roman gender norms is put in its poetic context.

like obscenity, Martial's practice of representation is often "tantamount to exposing what should be hidden" (Henderson 1991: 2). In creating a literary world peopled with a cast of everyday characters, exposure of their bodies and acts becomes problematic, especially given the Roman literary background against which these bodies and acts are set. In its contrast with both Roman social norms and erotic poetics, Martial's embodied poetics creates a tension that forces the reader to reflect on the very reality that this literary world supposedly evinces. This tension is a key feature of Martial's poetic *auctoritas* and guarantees Martial a privileged position within his literary world—he is the master and his readers (should) know it. In order to flesh out this tension, I will explore the way in which sex contributes to Martial's poetics through an analysis of the figure of the wife in Martial 11. In the first half of the paper, I will present an overview of the idea of embodied poetics in Martial's corpus and then turn in the second half to Book 11 to show how this poetic strategy is borne out in and through the bodies of the women and especially wives represented therein.

EMBODIED POETICS IN MARTIAL

Several studies of Martial's *Epigrams* have focused on the way in which Martial's books create his literary world.² For example, in a recent article on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, Sarah Stroup (2006) argues that the *Xenia* amounts to the embodiment of a literary feast and that the collection of epigrams embodies, in and through the poetry book, a meal (2006: 306–7). This embodiment is not meant to be akin to a realist still life, recreating, on a one to one basis, a table full of food—this literary feast is meant to surpass all possible "real" Roman meals and, thus, underlines the poet's authority as a creator of his literary world. On the one hand, in its introductory poems, the *Xenia* purports to be a separable compilation of tags (with coordinating couplets) for gastronomic gifts to be given during the Saturnalia. In fact, the organization of these tags according to the conventions of the Roman meal work against the separability the book announces and creates an integrated menu. The *Xenia* situates this dinner to end all dinners in the realia of the Saturnalia and, thus, calls the reality it represents into question. If this is a separable collection of tags, how can it be a dinner *cum* book at the same time? This kaleidoscopic collection, like Martial's persona, defies simple categorization and interpretation precisely because of its very concrete embodiment of discrete elements of Roman life.

²Most prominently, Fitzgerald 2007; Stroup 2006; and Roman 2000. Fowler 1995 remains basic.

While the representation of such a dinner is a rather obvious over-determination of the real world, it is more difficult to understand the way in which “embodiment” can be used to interpret the much more diverse, numbered books of epigrams. What sort of relationship obtains between the self-consciously realistic books like the *Xenia* and those that are composed of more variegated epigrams? Fitzgerald’s (2007) approach in his recent monograph on Martial has much in common with that of Stroup (2006) and offers a means to assess the poetic strategies evident in the various collections that comprise Martial’s books. Fitzgerald makes a comparison between reading epigrams and reading the newspaper, both of which readings, he argues, offer a total picture of the world (so created in and through these collections) (2007: 1–18). The strength of Fitzgerald’s approach lies in its recognition of the variety and dissonance in the *Epigrams* as a creative force and a central feature of Martial’s poetics. For instance, Fitzgerald, analyzing the picture of the poet presented in the beginning of Book 1, sees two contradictory “Martials” defined in and through the text (2007: 99). In 1.1, Martial is equated with his book and the fame it holds in the hands of the masses, while, in 1.4, Martial, this time separate from his books and in the hands of Caesar, is careful to make a distinction between reality and literature. Martial, through his self-identification with his physical texts and the duality that identification requires (as both singular and plural) illustrates the way in which he can manipulate the literary world through the embodiment of his persona in Roman society. It is this mastery of the literary world that most clearly characterizes Martial’s poetics—he is the ultimate arbiter of existence in this world, a fact highlighted by the way in which he collects contradictory material. This co-existence of contradictions forces the reader constantly to reevaluate his/her readings and to reflect on the poetic strategies that lead to this reevaluation.³

Both Stroup (2006) and Fitzgerald (2007), then, see Martial as a creator of specifically literary worlds in and through the act of collection. This is precisely how I understand the concept of embodied poetics in Martial—a poetics that foregrounds the poet’s control of his literary world through his

³ Most recently, Fitzgerald 2007: 10–13 and 121–23 has argued that “Martial” exposes Roman social norms concerning wealth by presenting himself in contradictory ways, at times a social climber, at other times a member of the upper class—the tension thus created fuels Martial’s poetics of juxtaposition and the creation of his literary world. See also, Fowler, on the productive tension between Martial’s representation of his books alternatively as deluxe and cut-rate (1995: 202–04). Roman’s formulation is central to my reading of Martial 11: “The relentlessness of Martial’s materialist fiction thus creates the basis for a striking polarization of hermeneutic options: the reader must either accept the problematic fiction afforded by the text’s literal account of itself, or assume a literariness the text persistently disavows” (2000: 129).

specification and manipulation of the objects in it. The composition of each poem mirrors the larger scale composition of the book in that the surprise ending often associated with the genre, the witty *pointe*,⁴ necessitates reflection on the art of its creation. Martial's epigrams regularly manipulate the reader's expectation, just as the books regularly offer inconsistent pictures of the various personages (and especially "Martial") featured within them. But the similarity goes further than that. As an example of this representational strategy, let us look at a poem found near the beginning of the *Liber de Spectaculis*, Martial's entrée onto Rome's literary scene and, significantly, a book that is a representation, in literature, of the games held in celebration of the opening of the Flavian Amphitheater (see Sullivan 1991: 6–12):

Qualiter in Scythica religatus rupe Prometheus
 assiduam nimio pectore pavit avem,
 nuda Caledonio sic viscera prae-buit urso
 non falsa pendens in cruce Laureolus.
 vivebant laceri membris stillantibus artus
 inque omni nusquam corpore corpus erat.
 denique supplicium <dignus tulit: ille parentis>
 vel domini iugulum foderat ense nocens,
 templa vel arcano demens spoliaverat auro,
 subdiderat saevas vel tibi, Roma, faces.
 vicerat antiquae sceleratus crimina famae,
 in quo, quae fuerat fabula, poena fuit.

As Prometheus, bound on Scythian crag, fed the tireless bird with his too abundant breast, so did Laureolus, hanging on no sham cross, give his naked flesh to a Caledonian boar. His lacerated limbs lived on, dripping gore, and in all his body, body there was none. Finally he met with the punishment he deserved; the guilty wretch had plunged a sword into his father's throat or his master's, or in his madness had robbed a temple of its secret gold, or laid a cruel torch to Rome. The criminal had outdone the misdeeds of ancient story; in him, what had been a play became an execution. (9. 7; trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993)

There are several mimetic layers in this poem. Ostensibly, the poem refers to the staging of a crucifixion and disembowelment in the arena and, thus, is already a representation of a representation. However, it goes further than the live representation could. By unpacking several literary and historical possibilities latent in this spectacle (one that should have been billed as the punishment

⁴See L. Watson 2006, who tempers the rigid *Erwartung/Aufschluss* with a more subtle model that sees more connection between the sections of a given epigram. Nonetheless, this argument still allows the ends of poems to have piquancy and to cause reflection—the reader may be prepared for a surprise, but does not know the exact form it will take.

of Laureolus), Martial highlights the way in which literature, when it controls bodies, can explode the act of representation. The description of the crucifixion culminates in the disembodiment of the poor wretch cast as Laureolus, who is described as a (now) disembodied body (l. 6). Thus, Martial suggests that the spectacle has appropriated material from mime and transformed it into a real-world production—in this “play,” none of the fictional conceits of mime apply and representation is equated with reality. Martial takes the spectacle further, though, by exposing the artifice of the mime *cum* spectacle through the artifice of his poem. Lines 7–10 expose the tacit conceit that allows the equation of punishment and mime through the disclosure of this “actor’s” criminal past. Here, the reality of this Laureolus’s crimes justifies and motivates his real punishment, albeit with a representational veneer. In contrast to the representational strategy of the spectacle, which depends on the suppression of the criminal’s actual identity in favor of his dramatic role, Martial, by foregrounding this Laureolus’s actual identity, focuses the reader’s attention on the tension between reality and fiction. By embodying his Laureolus in the realia of Roman life, Martial reveals the control he wields within the poetic world. Here, the witty *pointe* of the epigram (l. 12) invites the reader to draw a relationship between the body of Laureolus and the body of poetry—Laureolus had been the subject of mime, was the subject of torture and, implicitly, is now the subject of epigram.⁵ Furthermore, the effect of this poem is dependent on its position within *this* book and the games it recreates. Since this epigram is one of a series of poems meant to offer a literary version of a historical event, Martial’s embodiment of Laureolus not only exposes the tension between the represented and the real, but also is a constituent part of this literary world and, thus, suggestive of the poetics of the book as a whole.

EMBODIED *PUELLAE*

Thus far in my explication of embodied poetics, I have focused on the earlier books of Martial, where his persona is less apparent. I will now take an example from the numbered books in which Martial, as speaking persona, gives voice

⁵ The past tenses here may highlight the present moment of reading and the interpretive association I am arguing for—the scene *had been* a dramatic piece and it *was* an actual instance of torture. Given the representational layering, it seems likely that an astute reader would see that he is *now* dealing with an epigrammatic version. Coleman’s analysis of the social milieu that produced these games is instructive, “Part of the appeal of these performances must have been the incongruity of disturbing a traditional narrative pattern by the introduction of a maverick factor . . . because the slow agony of crucifixion was relatively lacking in spectacular appeal, it could be combined with a more spectacular mode of execution, thus effectively doubling the realism” (1990: 65).

to his poetics of embodiment with a special focus on the role women play in this poetics. As Wyke says of elegy, “The female is employed in the text only as a means to defining the male. Her social status is not clearly defined because the dominating perspective is that of the male narrator” (2002: 30). So, in defining his persona in and through women, Martial is akin to the elegists, but there is an important difference: Martial typically embodies his women in his text precisely by specifying their social status (as Martial had specified his Laureolus as a common criminal). The following epigram, rife with references to Martial’s poetic predecessors, is particularly illuminating in this regard (8.73):

Instanti, quo nec sincerior alter habetur
 pectore nec nivea simplicitate prior,
 si dare vis nostrae vires animosque Thaliae
 et victura petis carmina, da quod amem.
 Cynthia te vatem fecit, lascive Properti;
 ingenium Galli pulchra Lycoris erat;
 fama est arguti Nemesis formosa Tibulli;
 Lesbia dictavit, docte Catulle, tibi:
 non me Paeligni nec spernet Mantua vatem,
 si qua Corinna mihi, si quis Alexis erit.

Instantius, than whose heart none is accounted truer and of snowier sincerity, if you wish to give strength and courage to our Thalia and seek verses that will live, give me something to love. Cynthia made you a poet, frisky Propertius; fair Lycoris was Gallus’ genius; beauteous Nemesis is the fame of clear-voiced Tibullus; Lesbia, elegant Catullus, dictated your verse. Neither the Paelignians nor Mantua will spurn me as a poet, if I find a Corinna or an Alexis. (8.73; trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993 with slight alterations)

In this poem Martial presents poetic inspiration as an exchange between patron and poet through the body of a beloved and thereby refigures previous Roman erotic poetry. In this *recusatio*-like response to a patron, Martial asks Instantius to supply him with “something to love” (*da quod amem*) if he wants to get “verses that live” (*victura . . . carmina*) (l. 4).⁶ Martial follows with an artfully constructed list of the famous loves of the Roman erotic “classics.” Significant for our purposes is the odd man (and boy) out, Vergil

⁶Martial neatly encapsulates the reciprocal nature of poetic patronage by referring to “our Thalia” (*nostrae . . . Thaliae*, l. 3) and focalizes the poet’s individual responsibility at l. 9 (*me . . . vatem*). While Martial is certainly aware that he needs Instantius as patron for the production of his poetry, he also, perhaps a bit slyly, shows that, ultimately, in the dissemination of his poetry, it is his fame that is at stake. One anonymous reader pointed to the Ovidian quality of the phrase *da quod amem*.

(and Alexis). Not only is Alexis the only boy-love mentioned, he is the only beloved mentioned who Martial may have thought was exchanged between a patron and a poet (see 8.55 with 5.16, 6.68, and 7.29).⁷ The sketchy biographical details notwithstanding, we can at least hazard a guess as to Martial's take on Alexis from other poems. Here, all the paramours of elegy and Catullus's Lesbia are assimilated to Alexis and read by Martial as inspirational objects of exchange. Like his poetry, which Martial often situates in the world of exchange, the women who comprise the body of the Roman erotic classics are put on the market.⁸ In so doing Martial has conflated two ideas, namely woman as text (a fundamental aspect of Roman poetry from at least Catullus on) and the embodiment of those women in the realia of Roman society through the foregrounding of the institution of patron-client exchange. In this poem, Martial has given a programmatic statement of his poetics in relation to his predecessors—he tells his patron, “I will give you art if you give me the material to work with.”⁹ Of course, this is not the way Alexis was featured in Vergil—he never dramatized the giving of Alexis—this “fact” is supplied by the biographical tradition external to the poems and/or invented by Martial. Certainly, the various mistresses of the elegists and Catullus are not styled as objects of exchange between poets and patrons in the extant biographical traditions, much less in the poems themselves.¹⁰ Overall, then,

⁷ Goodrich 1949 reviews the biographical details and argues that Martial has confused Vergil and Horace.

⁸ Roman argues: “Martial chooses not only to represent a world composed of physical reality and sordid objects, but chooses to situate his own activity as a writer, and his book's existence, within the same potentially degrading framework. Martial's perspective, which retrieves the elegant Catullan *libellus* only to refigure it as the product of the arbitrary error of copyists, the merchandise of a bookseller, and the object of financial calculation, applies the epigram's predilection for realistic description to the continual scrutiny of classical literary standards” (2000: 125). Roman's analysis is much indebted to Fowler's 1995 response to White 1974. Here, Martial slyly uses an anecdote concerning Vergil as the *aitio* for this marketplace poetics.

⁹ In fact, the use of *victura . . . carmina*, both “verses that will live” and “verses that will conquer,” encodes the ambiguity of Martial's relationship with his poetic predecessors. On the one hand, he will merely be able to compete with them, on the other, he will one up them. Williams 2002a: 128–29 brings Martial 1.61 together with 8.73 and argues that Martial is responding to Ovid *Am.* 3.15 and trumping Ovid (and Vergil) by having Mantuans and Palaegnians esteem Martial, who has assimilated poetic immortality to sex in the present. In this sense, I would argue, Martial is highlighting his transformation of the use of women in Roman poetry.

¹⁰ I have not discovered any evidence corroborating Martial's biographies of these women. In contrast, as Miller 2004: 84–85 suggests, Propertius's Cynthia (and elegy) is involved in exchange, but of a literary, erotic and ideological nature.

the Roman erotic literary tradition, as read by Martial here, is seen as one comprised of written women (and one boy)—as poetry through the bodies of women—but, with the caveat that they are part and parcel of the real-world process of literary patronage. Like the dinner of the *Xenia* and the criminal *cum* Laureolus, Martial embodies women in his poems by situating them in a realistic world that he will eventually expose as representational.

This poem, then, highlights the difference between Martial and his predecessors—by embedding these women in the exchange relations between poet and patron, he transforms the notion of the *puella scripta*. As Wyke argues of the elegiac woman, “The *docta puella* operates not as a potential judge or rival in the field of poetic composition but as the embodiment of her author’s learned subject matter” (2002: 171–72). Similarly, for Oliensis, Catullus and the elegists create the situation of their poetry through their control of names and naming; contrary to their poetic stance as tortured lovers, they are masters of the women they depict (1997: 152–53). Of course, this poetic control is itself part of their fiction; as Kennedy states, “The capacity of signifiers to signify sooner or later evades our control, except in our fantasies; but our sense of control is created *in* our stories, *in* our pictures, *in* our representations” (1993: 9). While it is apparent, as Oliensis notes, that the *puellae* (“girl-friends”) of poets like Tibullus are embodiments of the poet’s literary practice (1997: 159), it is also apparent that these poets are consistent in their representation of women in their treatment of one important and underrated feature: all of the famous paramours of the Late Republic and Augustan period cannot be placed into a single social role as Roman women. These *puellae* are explicitly not wives, widows, or prostitutes. Although, as James argues, the *puellae* of elegy are, in terms of Roman literary history, styled as courtesans (2003: 36–41), I maintain that this stylization of the *puellae* is never made explicit.¹¹ In fact, as Miller has argued, these women lack “the internal consistency one normally expects from literary characters, changing in manner, physical appearance, and social status from one poem to the next . . . These women represent less simple identities than complex nexuses of conflicting Symbolic norms” (2004: 23–24).¹² Through a self-announced pretense of impotence before these

¹¹ I nevertheless agree with her statement that “the elegiac terms *puella* and *domina* do not belong to the domain of marriage, but further mark the *docta puella* as existing outside normal, standard social statuses and relations” (2003: 271n89). Moreover, I would extend the idea of “normal, standard social statuses and relations” to include the idea of a courtesan. It is important to remember that *puellae*, in the literal sense, i.e., “unmarried girls,” are perhaps the least visible and most guarded members of Roman society; cf. Hopkins 1965.

¹² Miller here reviews the scholarly disagreement over the various identifications of these *puellae*, providing the alternatives of courtesan, adulterous women, wealthy widows

ephemeral women, the elegists and Catullus created and controlled their literary worlds. The logic of elegy, and the relationships narrated therein, is predicated on a fundamentally illogical, that is, implausible, supposition—that these girls, whoever they are, control their men (Wyke 2002: 32–34).¹³ Their poetics is fundamentally opposite to that of Martial's, in that they disembodied the women that are depicted in their poems—the world of elegy and Catullus is not the quotidian world of Rome.

As we shall see, Martial breaks with his predecessors and controls the women whose bodies make up the matter of their poetry. Moreover, Martial typically embeds his women in recognized social roles, thereby highlighting the tension between the real and the literary world his embodied poetics requires.¹⁴ In addition, Martial's poetics highlights physical traits and acts in its depiction of bodies in the world. As Connolly has noted, the deferral of the physical body is a fundamental characteristic of Roman love poetry:

It is not merely the case that the details of the physical appearance of the elegiac characters are not *relevant* to elegy's project. It is literally impossible for elegy to sustain a focus on erotic bodies because the genre has such a strong discomfort with physicality in general—a discomfort that stands on its own as a vital component of the elegiac space (2000: 86–87; emphasis hers).¹⁵

In addition, she argues that this denial of physicality is complemented by the poet-persona's lack of identifying information in the poems (2000: 86). Martial's poetics takes exactly the opposite tack—he practically gives the world his address, among other exposures of the self,¹⁶ and exposes every nook and

or even wives (2004: 24 with the bibliography he cites at 241n56). He is right to suggest that no single social role could do justice to the elegiac characterization of these women. In Miller's view, it is precisely the multiformity of their representation that allows these women to function in elegy as "a traumatic eruption of the Real, of the literally unspeakable" (2004: 69 on Cynthia in particular). Miller's detailed treatment of Propertius's characterization of Cynthia is discussed further below.

¹³ It is significant in this regard to note that in 8.73 Martial designates the elegiac women (except Corinna) as the active partners in his list. In fact, Instantius and Martial are the only active males in this poem—Instantius, by his potential gift and Martial, by his potential love (ll. 3–4).

¹⁴ Whereas the elegists and Catullus create their fictional worlds by opposite means—distancing themselves and their women from Roman social norms.

¹⁵ Corby Kelly 2006 *per litteras* reminded me of Prof. Connolly's 2000 paper and, with his typical generosity, offered innumerable suggestions and improvements, including an alternate title for this paper, "Martial's Wife: The As(s)ymptote of Pleasure."

¹⁶ For a life of Martial garnered from the poems, cf. Sullivan 1991: 1–6, though he is sensitive to the pitfalls of the biographical fallacy; on the poems detailing Martial's home,

cranny of the bodies of his loves. In a word, he grounds the non-elegiac notion of the consummation of pleasure in the bodies of his work.

EMBODIED WOMEN IN MARTIAL 11

In Book 11, Martial represents his women as socially-embedded through reference to two distinct categories of real-world women: wives and prostitutes.¹⁷ As we have seen, this strategy whereby Martial realistically represents the Roman world in his poems offers insight into how Martial's visceral poetics uses social realia to create his literary worlds.¹⁸ In representing women in a similar way, Martial subverts the Catullan and elegiac persona's relationship with women

cf. Sullivan 1991: 26–27. This self-exposure also offers a stark contrast to the illusion of lack of authorial control in Catullus and the elegists—Martial represents himself as a “real” Roman *vir* and, therefore, master of the bodies he depicts.

¹⁷ Most important for our purposes are the references to wives. In all, there are eleven poems in Book 11 that contain direct references to wives or marriage: 11.7, 11.15, 11.16, 11.19, 11.23, 11.43, 11.53, 11.71, 11.78, 11.99, 11.104. Significantly, all of these wives are basically morally corrupt, except Claudia Rufina of 11.53, whose epigram reads like a laundry list of matronly virtues. The rub is, she is *not* a Roman, but a lowly Brit with a Latin heart. The motif is shared with one of the only other older women mentioned in a positive light in the corpus, the poet's “patroness,” Marcella, who is extolled as the best possible Roman wife in 12.21. It is almost as if, in Martial's poetry, a Roman woman cannot be a good Roman wife. Also interesting for this study, given the Roman erotic literary tradition to which Martial is responding, is his deployment of *puellae*. *Puella* only appears in the book in the following poems: 1.11 (Europa); 61.8 (to mark of the biological sex of a child); 15.7, 16.8, and 104.8 (sex objects, opposed to wives; discussed below); 22.9, 25.1, 45.2, 51.2, 60.5 and 81.2 (prototypical sexual objects); 64.1 and 2 (girls as the subject of Faustus's unrequited writing/poetry); 27.13–14 and 39.4 (specifically associated with Martial and referred to as *amica*—represent unattained or unattainable object); finally, 53.6, on Claudia Rufina, who, though a girl, is already a matron—this poem completely subverts the system, perhaps because, as I argued above, she is a bundle of contradictions, a real impossibility—Roman/British, Italian/Attic, girl/matron. Largely, *puellae* in this book are colorless, especially when contrasted with wives—Claudia Rufina is the anomaly that helps to orient the system by virtue of the fact that her ethnicity lets her transcend it. Women in “starring roles” are almost all styled as wives/old women (once wives)/prostitutes; though Shackleton Bailey's 1993 Loeb index offers several entries for women and boys under the heading “SEXES,” an entry for “girls” is nowhere to be found. Sullivan reviews the range of Martial's critique of women; *puellae* are largely absent and positive depictions in general are rare (1991: 197–207).

¹⁸ As I argued briefly above, Martial's initial forays into the public poetic world are near parodies of the connection between poetry and reality. His first books of epigrams, the *Liber de Spectaculis*, *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* are self-consciously modeled on *realia*; in general, cf. Sullivan 1991: 6–15 and on the increasing demand for realism in the arena during this time, cf. Coleman 1990: 67–68.

by depicting his women in clearly defined, social roles. This specification of roles requires the reader to come to terms with his represented relationships with those women (whereas elegiac and Catullan relationships discourage such a direct assimilation of the literary situation to daily Roman life). Like the tension between the real and the literary in Roman's (2000) and Fowler's (1995) accounts of the publication of Martial's poetry, Martial's depiction of women's bodies produces a tension between the real and the literary through its contrast with earlier poetic depictions of women. As we saw in the discussion of 8.73, Martial situates women in a realist poetics of exchange, in distinction to his predecessors, who, nonetheless, share with Martial the idea of woman's body as text.

This opposition to his poetic predecessors is particularly evidenced by his "creation" of wives in Book 11.¹⁹ The would-be wife of 11.19 offers some important insight into the embodied poetics of women in Martial 11:

Quaeris cur nolim te ducere, Galla? diserta es.
saepe soloecismum²⁰ mentula nostra facit.

Do you want to know why I won't marry you, Galla? You're literate. My dick often makes a solecism.

This literate woman, with her potentially suggestive name, wants to be Martial's wife. In a disturbing (to Roman ears) reported question, this Galla "proposes" to the speaker of the poem, presumably Martial. Her assertiveness and characterization as *diserta*²¹ recall Lesbia and the elegiac women and sug-

¹⁹ Here, it is interesting to note Hinds' 1997: 196–98 reading of Martial, 11.104, where he argues that Richlin's 1992: 26–32; 1983: 55–56 assessment of Martial's "staining" of the Roman elegiac tradition can be seen in an intertextual echo of Ovid's *A.A.* Martial, in what should be considered his usual fashion, transforms the coy Muse into masturbating slaves and innuendo into obscenity. The rarefied poetic stance of Roman poetry is brought down to earth and sullied. Similar is Fitzgerald's notion of banalization 2007: 167–90.

²⁰ The word is rare in Latin Literature; it is found in Martial here and at 5.38.8 and in Juvenal at 6.456, discussed briefly below, n23. The connections with the Greek epigrams of Lucilius (*AP* 11.138.2 and 11.143.6 of grammarian and rhetor; cf. Kay 1985: ad loc.) may suggest broader implications for a gendered analysis of Roman rhetoric.

²¹ It is important to note that this word is never used to describe a woman in the rest of Martial's oeuvre. Indeed, it is not so used in Catullus, Ovid, or Propertius (it does not show up at all in Tibullus). Catullus's use of *disertissime* to describe Cicero in 49 (line 1) is typical of the word's semantic range, even if it is a little tongue in cheek there. The characterization is similar to that of many active, independent, and, therefore, willful in Roman eyes, women; for example, compare Sallust's depiction of Sempronia at *BC* 25. In the present context, the end of 25.3 sheds the most light on Galla: "lubido sic accensa ut saepius peteret viros quam peteretur" (Her lust fired her up so much that she more

gest the implicit conceit of Roman elegy, i.e., the *domina* is in control. Martial refuses her advances for these very reasons in language that suggests a rejection of all such women because of his propensity for solecism. The metaphoric use of solecism removes the poem from the realm of the simply obscene and requires the reader to reflect on the connection between poetry and sex.²² On the surface, it seems that Martial styles himself as deficient before Galla; but, given the situation of the poem within Martial's book of epigrams, the reader has to be suspicious of his sincerity. I believe that "literate" (*diserta*) must be taken with more than a bit of irony, given the fact that it occurs in *this* poem and in *this* book. The reality is, as the reader can readily surmise, that Martial is in fact the literate/eloquent party and has suppressed the poetic utterances of Galla.²³ In this book, solecism, expanded to include deviations

often sought men than was sought). As Kay 1985 argues in his introduction to the poem, the paraprosochian of the second line activates the meaning "eloquent" for *diserta*—Galla is not only smart, she will tell you so.

²² Within the logic of the poem, *soloecismum* is the metaphoric link between a tongue and a *mentula* through the image of the mouth that does not speak correctly, cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. Martial's overt declaration of a lack of literary sophistication is portrayed in such a way as to suggest that he is not capable of performing cunnilingus, that most hated of sexual practices, cf. Sullivan 1991: 189 and Parker 1997: 51–53; literary achievement is here countered with obscenity. Moreover, Martial's self-confessed misuse of language ironically furthers his mastery of it—here, and elsewhere, he creates new language in and for his literary world. This language is obscene and, thus, shares something with the transgressive idea encoded in solecism. Maltby 1991 collects an etymology under the heading *soloecismos* (from Sacerd. gram. 6.449.18) that states that a solecism occurs in two cases, first, based on a total misuse of diction, and, second, drawn from the Solici, who spoke Greek well enough, but occasionally tossed in a word from their own language. Both definitions are, in a sense, operative in this poem. First, as a foreign word, *soloecismum* is itself a solecism and, second, *mentula* can be seen as a misuse of diction. Martial is creating his own language by appropriating the rules of the misuse of language. This is definitely mirrored in the end of 11.43, as we shall see. Farrell makes a distinction between solecism and barbarism; and says that a solecism is a mistake of usage made *from within* the Greek world (2001: 36). The inclusive nature of solecism in Farrell's 2001 formulation is interesting with regard to the meta-poetic significance of this poem. Martial's poetry allows speakers of Martial's poetic language (that is, Martial) to make such mistakes—in fact, Martial's poetic language can be seen to be constructed from such mistakes.

²³ Some support for this interpretation can be garnered from the reported, rather than direct, question of l.l. This articulate woman, especially in the suggestion that her prescribed mode of "speech" for Martial may involve the use of his tongue as a *mentula* (cf. n22 above) and the resultant suggestion of cunnilingus, the most active, penetrative of female sexual practices in the Roman mind, reminds me of Chisolm's analysis of the main character in Mary Fallon's 1989 novel, *Working Hot*. Chisolm observes that the

from discursive norms in the linguistic, poetic and sexual realms, will hold sway: whatever Martial says, his wife should do.

If 11.19 were the only poem on the subject of Martial's (here potential) wife, it could be read as an unimportant, if witty, castigation of an anonymous woman who would be wife. Indeed, outside of its context, it still can be read as such. However, we must take seriously the implications of the collection and Martial's role therein.²⁴ The distinctive, Saturnalian character of the book²⁵ along with the prominence of wives in general and Martial's wife in particular lend a particularly coherent structure to Book 11. The topsy-turvy world of the Saturnalia offers a good background for Martial's representation of wives

narrator's rhetorical style, which the narrator herself refers to as "cunning lingua," is built upon its affinities with cunnilingus. As Chisolm states: "A perverse performativity, cunning lingua reflects and elaborates the gestures of cunnilingus. Cunning lingua is, properly speaking, an erotics-poetics whose fictional dialogues and sexual dialects perform a blasphemous act of seductive illocution" (1995: 22). Perhaps Galla's own rhetorical style is to be similarly construed, with Martial here denying her the possibility of speaking in such a way by reference to his *mentula* and her implied lack of the same. Juvenal similarly suppresses the voice of a learned woman at 6.434–56 with this echo of Martial: "soloeicium liceat fecisse marito" (A husband should be allowed to commit a solecism); cf. Kay 1985: ad loc.

²⁴ Regardless of the prepublication state of the poems, i.e., that they may have been passed around among friends individually or in small groups, cf. White 1974, there is good evidence of a strong manuscript tradition for an early publication of the *Epigrams* in books, as we now have them; cf. Kay 1985: 1–4. Since each book, as an independent roll, could have been read individually, an analysis of a theme in a book is at least a valid principle of interpretation (among many, to be sure). What makes this book even more fit for such isolation is the strong sense of a beginning and an end (although this is not particularly odd for Martial); cf. Kay 1985: 5. The book begins with a dedicatory epigram that alludes freely to Catullus's opening poem, while the last four poems deal with various completions of reading. The final poem ends with *vale*. The interconnectedness of the individual epigrams was first forcefully argued for by Sullivan 1991: esp. ch. 4. On the importance of the book as unit of composition, cf. Roman 2000: passim, esp. 137. Holzberg offers a justification for reading Martial's poetry with the book in mind 2006: 145–48. In addition, a poetic ethos, or "poetics," is only constructed in poetry, and, to that extent, "Martial" or "the narrator" can be said to construct a poetics through his very presence, implicit or explicit, throughout the book. He is the constant that holds the book together; cf. 11.15.13 with Kay 1985: ad loc. On the importance of the book roll for influencing strategies of reading in the Milan Posidippus Roll, a Hellenistic epigram book, cf. Lavigne and Romano 2004.

²⁵ On the Saturnalian character of the book, cf. Kay 1985: 5–6; on the relation between the Saturnalian character of the book and Martial's relationship with Nerva, cf. Sullivan 1991: 46–7.

and their bodies and provides a framework that resonates with Martial's embodied poetics because both involve the overturning of expectations in and through bodily acts.

MAKING WOMEN EXPLICIT

The concept of embodied poetics, then, necessitates that the subject and objects of a given poem be made explicit. In fact, explicitness is a fundamental aspect of the genre of epigram in two related ways. First, the genre is prone to explicit language, i.e., language that exposes bodies and acts that are normally concealed. Second, the genre is often concerned with real objects of description, i.e., dedicatory or symposiastic epigram, for example, are based on a conceit that they represent a defined and limited historical person or event. Martial's embodied poetics, then, integrates these two basic aspects of the epigrammatic tradition and utilizes them, in the context of the collection, to inject himself into Roman literature. It is important to remember that "Martial" is not a self-evident, static entity—his poet-persona is defined in and through his poetry. In making his women explicit in Book 11, Martial, too, is made explicit.

As we have seen, the Saturnalian emphasis of the book offers an appropriate framework for explicitness, by sanctioning the exposure of social norms through their transgression. In an effort to illustrate how Martial exploits this framework, I will now turn to three programmatic poems, 11.20, 15 and 16.²⁶ In epigram 20, Martial adapts an epigram of Augustus in order to legitimize his poetry book. Like Augustus's poem, Martial's *libelli* will be *lascivi*. Lines 3–8 seem to be a direct quotation of Augustus and employ sexually charged language for political satire (Kay 1985: ad loc.). Perhaps a bit surprisingly, the object of Augustus's political attack is a woman, the notorious Fulvia—notorious precisely because she took after her mother, Sempronia, and had an active life in the predominantly male sphere of politics.²⁷ This woman, who attempts

²⁶ Martial relates the Saturnalian tone of this book to Catullan poetics in 11.6. However, as Shackleton Bailey 1993: ad 11.6.16 argues, perhaps too forcefully, Martial here gives an obscene sense to Catullus's *passer*. I would argue that Martial here has made explicit the obscenity latent in Catullan innuendo, but he does so by linking the anatomical interpretation of *passer* with the literary interpretation of *Passer*. Penis and poetic collection are explicitly connected; cf. Hallett 1996. A "programmatic" poem for the purposes of this paper is one in which the persona speaks openly about the content or audience of the poetry in which he functions as the narrator.

²⁷ On Fulvia, see Delia, who argues that "Octavian appears to have deliberately shifted the blame for the Perusine War away from Lucius and Antony onto Fulvia. Hence arose the

to force her sexual will on Augustus here, is bested by him according to the logic of Roman male sexuality that equates sex and fighting as fundamentally masculine activities (Parker 1997). When read in conjunction with the Galla poem (11.19), discussed above, Augustus's "epigram" suggests that *simplicitas*, i.e., obscenity, and especially the obscenity proffered by and deployed against a demanding woman, has as its referent real-life events in the world. If Augustus really wrote this poem, it no doubt represents a fictional exchange with Fulvia, but it is nevertheless presented as real. Through the body of Fulvia, Augustus, the poet-persona of the poem, situates himself in relation to real events and the politics surrounding those events. The programmatic import of the poem for Martial's book is found in the final couplet, emphasizing the epigrammatic use he will give this exemplum of the genre (11.20.9–10):

absolvīs lepidos nimirum, Auguste, libellos,
qui scīs Romana simplicitate loqui.

No doubt, Augustus, you pardon my charming little books, you who know how to speak with Roman frankness.

Martial has circumscribed the poetry of Augustus within his own poetry, the *libelli*, which are styled with the neoteric adjective, *lepidus*. Martial appropriates from Augustus "Roman frankness," i.e., non-euphemistic, sexual language,²⁸ but sets this *simplicitas* in a Catullan framework. Augustus, as representative of Augustan poetics, is less than a poetic master and Martial's claim of simplicity (indicating both plain speaking and obscenity) puts into relief the difference between the elegance of the Roman elegists and the Augustan poet Martial chooses to emulate here, namely, Augustus.²⁹ Also,

characterization of Fulvia as ill-tempered, headstrong, overbearing, and meddlesome" 1991: 206. Cicero, *Phil.* 6.4, sums up his invective use of Fulvia against Antony by saying that she simply dominated him: "mulieri citius avarissimae paruerit quam senatui populoque Romano" (He obeyed her more quickly than he did the senate and people of Rome).

²⁸ So Kay 1985: ad loc.; cf., especially on *pedicare*, Adams 1982a: 123. The parallel at 11.63.4 illustrates the tenor of *simplicitas*. Significant in this regard is Instantius's *nivea simplicitate* of 8.73.2, where Martial and his patron are aligned in their *simplicitas*. The import there seems to suggest that Martial's laying bare of the relationship of exchange that obtains between poet and patron is the basis of his poetic fame.

²⁹ One could begin to shed light on Martial's relationship to Nerva by seeing Augustus, the model emperor, as the poetic ancestor of Martial. As Nerva re-embodies Augustus, he simultaneously authorizes the re-embodiment of Augustan poetry; cf. 11.2.5–6. It is also significant that Augustus is the model, given Augustus's legislation on adultery. The legislation of 18 B.C.E. "enhanced the long-established Roman distinction between the respectable *matrona* and the disreputable *meretrix*" (Wyke 2002: 170). Martial's ability to

given the juxtaposition of this poem with 11.19, I see a correlation between *simplicitas* and *soloecismum*, in that both are offered as possible responses to domineering women. Furthermore, Martial's conversion of language to sexual act in the solecism of 11.19 and the obscene tone he adopts as a result of his programmatic citation of Augustus in 11.20 offer a coherent statement of the poetics of the book. Martial's tone, like that of Augustus, embraces *simplicitas*; in fact, Martial's poetics, and the authority of his voice, lies in its very explicitness. Furthermore, this explicitness is characterized in terms of Martial's books (*libellos*, l. 9) in opposition to Augustus's verses (*versus*, l. 1). Thus, Martial's poetry must be read within the collection. Like the bodies that are realized in a given poem, each poem is realized within the collection—the literary world is the frame of reference for the bodies that people it.

Two earlier poems can also be labeled programmatic and set the stage for the ideas presented in 11.20. With 11.15 and 11.16, Martial has formed a couplet that illustrates the poetics of the book by defining his audience and then contradicting himself, all in a highly Catullan mode.³⁰ As we will see, it is explicitness (elaborated later in 11.19 and 20) that motivates Martial's contradictory audience in 11.15 and 16.³¹ In 15, Martial begins to set up a distinction in his readership between the seriousness of proper Romans and the Saturnalian atmosphere of the book (Kay 1985: 71–72). Specifically, Cato's wife and the austere Sabine women should not read this poetry; i.e.,

make his wife either a Lucretia or a Laïs (11.104) can be read as a poetic appropriation of Augustus's political act in that he claims responsibility for the classification of women in his poetry. Tom Hawkins 2006 *per litteras* reminded me of Ovid's problems in this regard; Martial, in a way, is trumping Ovid here.

³⁰ The Catullan allusions are hard to miss, e.g., 11.15, l. 4 (cf. Cat. 1), l. 13 (cf. Cat. 16); 11.16, l. 5 (cf. Cat. 32), l. 7 (cf. Cat. 1, 14b). The Catullan references show that Martial is quite concerned with poetics and his place in the Roman poetic tradition. That is not to say, however, that these are the only places Catullus is mentioned. He is named (along with his "kisses" and his "sparrow") in what is almost definitely another programmatic piece, 11.6, the second hendecasyllabic poem in Book 11: Rome smiles on Martial's poetic play. Strikingly, the first poem of Book 11 strongly resembles Catullus's opening dedication in language, function, and meter. On the connection between Martial and Catullus in general, cf. Swann 1994, though his arguments do not take into account the very real connection between Martial and the elegists.

³¹ In fact, Martial's use of Numa in 11.15.10 as exemplar of the use of obscene speech prefigures his use of Augustus for the same end in 11.20. Numa and Augustus are naturally associated for their moral reforms. Cf. Scott 1925: 97 on Anchises' speech in *Aen.* 5.6, a point that is highlighted by Martial's use of Numa in 11.104.2, where Martial says that he is no Numa. Martial's contradictory use of Numa parallels his contradictory use of his wife.

paragons of womanly, and specifically wifely, virtue should not get involved in the “play.” The irony, of course, is that, while they should have nothing to do with the poetry, they help to comprise the very poetry that shuns them (or that they should shun). The personified book of poetry, perfumed and drunk, should both play with boys and love girls (11.15.5–7); boys and girls, as sexual objects, then, are the appropriate subjects (both the content and the audience) of Martial’s poetry. It is for this group that he emulates Augustus’s *simplicitas* and says plainly *mentula* (dick) (11.15.8–10). The narrator ends the poem by highlighting the constructedness of the persona (11.15.13):

mores non habet hic meos libellus.

This book does not contain my *mores*. (l. 13)

Like Catullus 16, Martial advises the readers not to see the persona as the man; the poet says, “I am a fiction.”³²

Epigram 16 picks up on the distinction, begun in 15, between austerity and play; however, the distinction is broken down; only the chaste Paduan girl³³ and Lucretia, the *dux Romanae pudicitiae* (the chief of Roman chastity), in Valerius Maximus’s words (6.1.1), will be left at the end of 16, and both will be transformed by the experience. The chaste girl gets “wet” (l. 8) and Lucretia abandons her weaving for the titillation of Martial’s poetry (11.16.9–10). The poem begins with a warning to overly serious readers and tells them to withdraw from the audience. The narrator then says (11.16.2): “urbanae scripsimus ista togae” (This we have written for the urban toga). The ambiguity of the referent of *ista* in this line has led to much confusion among interpreters of this poem (Kay 1985: ad loc.), especially because the *urbana toga* can indicate both traditional Roman austerity (*toga*) as well as playful poetic elegance (*urbana*).³⁴ Rather than clearly delineating what has been written for the

³² While I agree with Fitzgerald’s argument that Catullus 16 is not merely an apology based on the separation between poet and persona, I do not agree with his statement that Martial’s similar claim in 1.4.8, “. . . in the context of the more repressive atmosphere of the empire certainly did involve a distinction between life and art” (1992: 419n1). For Ovidian parallels of Catullus 16, cf. Barchiesi 2001: 98–99.

³³ The adjective used of this girl, *Patavina*, is meant to suggest chastity and provincialism; cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. In addition, as Alessandro Barchiesi 2005 *per litteras* has suggested to me, the adjective may also refer to Livy, a Paduan, whose representations of Lucretia and other Roman *exempla* in his history had, by Martial’s day, monumentalized the Republican figures paraded in this poem. Livy, another “great” of the Roman literary tradition, is dragged through the gutter.

³⁴ Since the toga can signify “city” as opposed to “country” in Martial, cf. 12.18.17–18, there could be a contrast to the rural atmosphere of the Saturnalia embedded in the phrase. Regardless, ambiguity remains—the poem is both for the Paduan girl and Lucretia.

“serious” and what for the “playful” reader, Martial confuses the matter; this confusion is indicative of his poetics and emphasized by the juxtaposition of the two poems. The effect of his explicit tone is to create a problematic audience, especially with regard to women. This slippage in the boundaries between frivolous and austere parallels the blurring of high and low literary value in Martial’s redeployment of the Roman erotic poetic tradition.

As stated above, poem 15 presents the reader with a sharp distinction between who should read this poetry and who should not. Wives of noble Romans of the glory days of the Republic, and, by extension, the men themselves,³⁵ should not read this book; the narrator of poem 15 claims to have written other material for these serious readers. Of course, only after reading 16 is the ambiguity of the first two lines of 15 clearly seen; austere Romans *are* reading this book.³⁶ In 11.16.5–8 the narrator claims that the old Republican standard-bearers of traditional mores will become erect and that even proverbially chaste girls will be titillated by reading this poetry, serious as they may be. The ultimate dismantling of a distinction among Martial’s readership hinges upon the ideal Roman wife, Lucretia (11.16.9–10):

erubuit posuitque meum Lucretia librum,
sed coram Bruto; Brute, recede: leget.

Lucretia blushes at my book and puts it aside, but only in the presence of Brutus; Brutus, retire: she will read.

The paragon of Roman wives will read Martial’s book, though she will conceal it. These two poems present a matrix of themes that is never stable and that reflects the larger project of Martial’s poetics. Martial promises an audience of lusty boys and girls but slips in virtuous Lucretia instead. The wives of epigram 15, whom Martial warns against reading the book, and the figures of Lucretia and the chaste girl comprise a primary element of Martial’s represented audience.³⁷ When 11.15 and 11.16 are taken together, the reader must come to terms with a contradiction; the wife simultaneously can and cannot read these poems. By manipulating his readers’ expectations (and other men’s wives), the persona of Martial remains the only stabilizing

³⁵ 11.16.6 expands on 11.2.1–2, where Fabricius and Cato are the exemplars of those who should not be reading the forthcoming poetry.

³⁶ In a similar vein, Kennedy argues that the address to serious readers in Ovid *Amores* 1.3–4 necessarily implicates them (1993: 22).

³⁷ It is significant that the only *puella* directly addressed by Martial in the course of this book is so chaste, and, thus, so atypical when compared to the *puellae* addressed in earlier poets. Perhaps the predicative use of *uda* (wet) is significant in this regard—Martial’s poetry makes *puellae udae*. Cf., above, n17, on the uses of *puellae* in this book.

force in the book. In 16, Martial's position as poet parallels that of Brutus as founder of the Republic in that they both exercise control over the use of Lucretia.³⁸ However, Martial can write Brutus out of the picture and titillate Lucretia with his frisky books. In fact, he literally rewrites the story by making Lucretia's chastity contingent upon masculine presence.³⁹ Martial makes explicit the hidden actions of Lucretia, thereby making explicit a focus of his book, namely wives as readers and *materia* of his poetry.⁴⁰

PRAECEPTOR PEDICATIONIS

Given this book's programmatic interest in wives, I will now turn to an analysis of their representation in Book 11 in order to illustrate the way in which Martial's embodied poetics refashions Roman erotic poetry. In three poems, 11.43, 78 and 104, Martial takes on the role of *praeceptor amoris*, albeit one who offers advice of an explicit nature—he becomes the *praeceptor pedicationis*. Two of these poems offer advice to Martial's wife (11.43 and 11.104), while the intervening poem (11.78) admonishes a young husband on the proper way to treat his new bride. As pre-eminent source of knowledge on sexual matters, Martial usurps Ovid.⁴¹ This usurpation is consummated in and through his

³⁸ Brutus is the emblem of Roman Republican mores and avenger of the rape of Lucretia. On this pretext, he kills Tarquin and founds the Republic. In this sense, then, he exercises an ideological control over Lucretia; cf. Joshel 1992: 114 on the rape of Lucretia as the foundation of the Roman state and pp. 122–25 on the use of Lucretia to effect the progress of Livy's Roman history.

³⁹ The famous account in Livy 1.57 makes it clear that Lucretia's virtue resides in the fact that she is precisely not like the other women, who feign virtue under male supervision, but abandon it when the men are absent.

⁴⁰ Hallett links 11.15 and 16 with 1.35 and argues that these poems reveal a phallic poetics wherein Martial's poems are styled as the *mentula* that penetrates the reader, styled as woman (1996: 323–26). Her analysis of 1.35 is particularly illuminating for my argument, in that the poem is styled as the *mentula* of a husband (poetry) that gives pleasure to his wife (reader). Williams 2002b expands Hallett's argument to include the idea of control inherent in the metaphor that springs from Roman notions of masculinity.

⁴¹ The poems addressed to Martial's wife, 11.43 and 11.104, contain exhortations and mythological *exempla* and, thus, parallel Ovid's method in *A. A.*; for a discussion of Martial's exploitation of *A. A.*, cf. Hinds 1997: 196–98. On the trope of the *praeceptor amoris*, see Cairns's 1972 index, s. v., *erotodidaxis*; for passages, see Murgatroyd 1991: 130. The origin of the trope is discussed in detail in Wheeler 1910: 495–50 and 1911, who sees the origins in especially the prostitutes and *lenae* of the comic literary tradition (1910: 445–50). Wheeler's work suggests several dichotomies that are useful for our understanding of Martial's use of the trope—prostitutes have their knowledge from bodily experience, whereas the elegists move to the psychological side of love. Martial could be reactivating the origins of the trope in this book. 11.78 is especially telling in this regard, since Martial seems to be working in concert with the *meretrix* who will eventually make Victor a man,

use of obscenity especially as applied to wives and, in particular, his wife.⁴² Martial's self-involvement in the relationship and the explicitly described acts of anal sex illustrate well the degree to which Martial has altered the world of Roman love poetry—Martial grounds his desire in the figure of the wife and the fulfillment of that desire in explicit acts that transgress Roman social norms, not to mention elegiac ones. Through the embodied poetics of his wife in Book 11, Martial guarantees his poetic authority and his place in the tradition of Roman love poetry.

Before examining these poems in detail, I will give some background for the Roman treatment of anal sex with women in an effort to show how transgressive these poems are.⁴³ In all of Latin literature the occurrence of

all, of course, at Martial's prompting. Overall, the contrast between Martial and Victor serves to emphasize Martial's successes in effecting his precepts. This contrast, in turn, suggests a difference between Martial and his literary predecessors in erotodidaxis, who more often fail than succeed in their ventures in love; cf. Lee-Stecum 1998: 154–55 and 244–45 on Tibullus 1.4 and 1.6, where she summarizes the poet's failures in this regard. One other difference presents itself, namely, the fact that the elegiac *praeceptor* is often himself suffering from the wounds of love (e.g., Ovid A. A. 1.21–24) whereas any such penetration of Martial is unknown to me in this book.

⁴² By Martial's wife, I mean the woman the speaker identifies as his wife, so the wife of the poet-persona. While it is possible to identify this with someone else's wife, the inclusion of such a poem in a collection by the speaking persona known as Martial suggests that it is probable that a reader is meant to think of this wife as that of the speaker, i.e., Martial. Whether or not this is Martial's actual wife is not important. On the debate over the historical Martial's wife, cf. bibliography cited above, n1. The striking apostrophizing of the wife highlights the importance of this figure and will be discussed further below.

⁴³ The following are the only more or less unambiguous references to the act of anal sex with a woman that I was able to find: Pl. Com., fr. 174.16 (in a list of offerings to Aphrodite); Ar. Lys. 1148, 1163, 1174 (all of which rely on the Spartan predilection for pederasty for their force); Ar. Pl. 149–52 (which also is motivated by the following pederastic joke; cf. Henderson 1991: 150), 304–5 and 1024 (both scatophagous references to anal sex, according to Henderson 1991: 194 with 200–01; I am not sure I agree with his interpretation); Ar. Pax 868 and 876 (like the passages from Lys., these are found in the context of mapping out a woman's body for sex); Ar. Eccl. 964–65 (could refer, as Pl. 152, to *coitus a tergo*); AP 5.54, Dioscourides; AP 5.116, M. Argentarius; AP 12.7. Strato; CP 3; Sen. Contr. 1.2.22 (CP 3 and the Seneca passage suggest an allusion to anal sex in Ov. Her. 16.161–62); Apul. Met. 3.20; Mart. 9.67, 11.43, 78, 99 and 104, 12.96; CIL 10.4483. In CP 25, 40, 48 and 73, women are referred to as *pathicae*. Women who are able to accommodate three men at one time are mentioned in AP 5.49, Gallus, AP 11.328, Nicarchus, Mart. 9.32 and 10.81, which Clarke 2003: 145–46 compares to an erotic lamp (Heraklion Museum, Inv. 9284) that depicts a three-some composed of a woman between two men). At CP 31, Parker defends the ms reading, *culo*, against Schoppius's *cunno*, 1988: 117. Petronius Sat. 140 significantly uses an adjective with a Greek base to describe the

the verb *pedicare* or even a euphemistic semantic equivalent with a woman as grammatical object is extremely rare (Adams 1982a: 123). Of these uses, 11.99, a poem addressed to a suggestively named Lesbia, contains the only representation of the male-female consummation (albeit metaphorical) of the act signaled by the verb *pedicare* (“to ass-fuck”)—i.e., only here is a woman the direct object of the verb and full recipient of its action.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the unexpectedness of the image of anal sex with a woman is mitigated here by the metaphorical use of the verb. Given this paucity of ancient discourse dealing with anal sex with women and the relatively unsavory nature of this material, it is not surprising that the subject remains largely elided or, at best, euphemized in modern scholarship.⁴⁵ In addition, when one turns to the

act, cf. Cratinus’s description of Aspasia as the offspring of Katapugosune, cited in Plut. *VPer.* 24.5–11: “Eumolpus, qui tam frugi erat ut illi etiam ego puer viderer, non distulit puellam invitare ad *pygesiaca sacra*” (Eumolpus, who was so ‘proper’ that I even seemed to be a boy to him, did not hesitate to summon the girl to his cheeky rites). Of course, to Eumolpus, everyone is a boy. Athenaeus 602d cites Hagnon the Academic, who says that the Spartans treat girls in the same way as boys; on this passage and the semantics of *lakonizein*, see Dover 1978: 187–89. One could also include Herodotus 1.61, though that is not an unambiguous passage. In general, see Henderson’s comments on the rarity and special character of references to women’s buttocks 1991: 149–50. There are several references to the beauty of a woman’s buttocks that do not entail anal sex: e.g., Hes. *Op.* 373; Semon. fr. 7.76–77; Ar. *Lys.* 82; Alexis fr. 103.10–12.

⁴⁴ Only one other example comes close, *CIL* 10.4483 from Capua: “Turtu[r] Cly] mene, caca, ut possimus bene dormire et *pedicare natis candidas ceiasinos (?) tuos*. Cunnu tibi fricabo. Digiti adiuvabunt prurigrin[em]” (Dove Clymene, shit, so that we can sleep well and ass-fuck your white cheeks. I will rub your cunt. My fingers will help you to exhilaration). It is interesting to note the picture scratched into the wall beneath this inscription, which shows a woman (presumably) defecating. This may represent the kind of sentiment that Martial is trying to blend into the relatively chaste Roman erotic tradition. The single extant possible allusion to anal sex with women in the Latin tradition before Martial occurs in Ovid, *Heroides* 16.161–62 where Paris proposes to Helen sex that will keep her virginity intact. This circuitous phrasing is a far cry from the *simplicitas* of Martial’s diction. In fact, in twenty-three uses of *pedicare* and its cognates in all of Martial, nine occur in Book 11.

⁴⁵ The most common discussion usually presents heterosexual anal sex in a suitably clinical light; e.g., Hallett 1988 explains the act, citing Martial and the *Priapea*, as a method of contraception. P. Watson 2005 has argued that a loosening of morality led to greater experimentation at this time; although, no doubt, there were aficionados of the act in the real world. I still see the semantics of *pedicare* as too harsh to be applied openly to one’s wife. As we will see, neither contraception nor loosening moral codes were Martial’s main concern in 11.43, 11.78, and 11.104. Williams discusses Martial 12.96 as evidence of the difference between anal sex with women (worse) and boys (better) and argues that this sexual hierarchy is related to the idea that Roman marriage has little to do with the fulfillment of male desire 1999: 50–51.

visual arts for comparanda, there is little material to be found. Given the vast catalogue of sexual positions represented in Roman wall-paintings and the other plastic arts as well as the related tradition of the ancient sex manuals, it is perhaps odd that no obvious depiction of this particular act occurs.⁴⁶ I have been able to find one fairly explicit image of the act, a *ménage-à-trois* depicted on a terracotta lamp from Kavousi, now in the Heraklion Museum (Clarke 2003: 146 fig. 99). This lamp, datable to the first century C.E., illustrates two men with a woman between them engaged in a sexual act, presumably involving both the woman's anus and vagina (Clarke 2003: 145–46). However, the ambiguity inherent in this relief exposes the problems that are involved in representations of scenes of this type.⁴⁷ More often than not, the Roman literary tradition mirrors that of the visual arts, in that the act of anal sex is usually suggested, rather than explicitly described.

Given the relative paucity of references to anal sex with women and the wholly negative valence associated with the practice, the fact that Martial involves *his* wife in this act is remarkable. Nevertheless, when placed in the context of his book and its embodied poetics, Martial's sexual treatment of his wife becomes intelligible, if no less remarkable.⁴⁸ Though Martial creates a

⁴⁶ On the encyclopedic origins of the sex manuals and their influence on artistic depictions, cf. Clarke 1998: 245–47; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 43.2 for such an erotic art gallery. Parker 1992 discusses the connections between the sex manuals, some of which seem to have been illustrated, and the prostitutes who are said to have written them. Skinner's 2005 comment on the iconographic convention of Greek homoerotic vases suggests the importance of Martial's violation of representational norms concerning sexuality: "The fact that certain artistic rules are in force makes their violation all the more meaningful. Further study of such violations would be welcome." While this paper does not advance the particular project Skinner has in mind, I hope that it does contribute to the general project of understanding violation in the ancient world.

⁴⁷ Boardman's 1980: 245 corrective of Dover's 1978 readings of Greek erotic art is apropos here—one cannot hope to discern anatomical detail in the case of much Greek art. However, it is true that some of the Roman statues and wall-paintings do provide a clear, anatomically differentiated depiction of vaginal sex; cf., e.g., Clarke 1998: 168 fig. 60 (a bronze mirror cover) and Clarke 1998: Plates Eight and Nine with his discussion on pp. 216–18 (wall paintings from the Naples Museum). Also, there are equally clear depictions of male-male anal sex on the Warren cup; cf. Clarke 1998: Plates One and Two with his discussion on pp. 61–68. This at least leaves open the possibility that there could be overt artistic depictions of heterosexual anal sex; nevertheless, the lamp from the Heraklion Museum provides no such detail.

⁴⁸ In twenty-three uses of *pedicare* and its cognates in all of Martial, nine occur in Book 11; the book is marked for *pedicatio*. The uses in Book 11 that I will not discuss are: 11.20 (as a threat, cf. Adams 1982a, 124); 11.45 (feigning intent to penetrate, really passive); 11.63 (boys do the bugging, concomitant threat); 11.87 (*pedico* who is forced to become a gigolo for old ladies); 11.88 (man stricken with diarrhea, cannot be

realistic literary world, wherein he is married and has discussions with his wife, his representation of obscene, socially unacceptable acts requires his readers to call this world into question. The importance of the wife for understanding Martial's poetics lies in her power to situate Martial's poet-persona within Roman society. As evidence of the importance of his wife, I will analyze her representation in 11.43 and 104. First of all, I want to point out how Martial's wife is placed into these poems. In both poems, the wife is apostrophized (in the first and last line of 11.43 and the first word in 11.104). While the emphatic, rhetorically charged placement of these wives is important and lends the figure emphasis, the bare fact that she is apostrophized is even more suggestive. As Culler argues in his excellent discussion of the trope, "Apostrophe is not the representation of an event; if it works, it produces a fictive, discursive event" (2001: 169). In other words, apostrophe calls attention to its status as a representational strategy.⁴⁹ In a way, the address to his wife functions like that to the elegiac women, but with the important addition of situating both the woman and the poet in the normative Roman social roles of husband and wife.⁵⁰ When these characters are so embodied, their actions become subject to the rules of Roman society. When those rules are transgressed, the reader must come to terms with the contradictions and realize that, in this literary world, the words of the poet-persona replace the rules of society.

By setting himself up as the *praeceptor amoris* of his wife in 11.43, Martial emphasizes his role as law-giver in the sexual realm, the authority on questions

penetrated); 11.94 (rival poet enjoys the narrator's boy). Also, the following circumlocutions include all the essential ideas of the semantics of *pedicare*, although the actual word does not occur in them: 11.46 (old man who vainly assaults *cunni culique*); 11.58 (Telesphorus threatens to withhold his favors for gifts).

⁴⁹ Propertius' use of the proper noun "Cynthia" is parallel to Martial's use of the indefinite noun *uxor*. As Kennedy argues, the realist conceit in certain poetry exploits the reader and asks her/him "to see the names that appear in its texts as people"; however, certain poetry, elegy included, exploits "realism to blur that distinction [between the 'fictional' and the 'actual'] or render it problematical" (1993: 83–84). While Propertius's apostrophe of Cynthia does blur the lines between real and fictional, I would argue that the direction of the blurring is opposite to that found in Martial's address to his wife. If the proper name requires a body in the world, by using the general noun, *uxor*, Martial suggests we have a body in the world (his wife) and that what is needed is a proper name. Among several helpful suggestions, Marcus Folch 2005 *per litteras* graciously recommended Culler's 2001 book to me.

⁵⁰ The *Laudatio Turiae* and similar *elogiae* of Roman wives were brought to my attention by Maud Gleason 2004 *per litteras*. Certainly, Martial is appropriating this literary form, one of the few in which wives are directly addressed, to add piquancy to the completely opposite epigrams he addresses to his wife.

of sexual mores. Although the querulous and indirectly reported statement of his wife prompts him to speak, Martial completely eradicates her voice and replaces it with his own through a series of commands and mythological exempla (11.43):

Deprensum in puero tetricis me vocibus, uxor,
 corripis et culum te quoque habere refers.
 dixit idem quotiens lascivo Iuno Tonanti?
 ille tamen grandi cum Ganymede iacet.
 incurvabat Hylan posito Tirynthius arcu:
 tu Megaran credis non habuisse natis?
 torquebat Phoebum Daphne fugitiva: sed illas
 Oebalius flammis iussit abire puer.
 Briseis multum quamvis aversa iaceret,
 Aeacidae propior levis amicus erat.
 parce tuis igitur dare mascula nomina rebus
 teque puta cunnos, uxor, habere duos.

Wife, when you catch me in the act with a boy, you criticize me with severe words and announce that you too have an asshole. How many times did Juno say the same thing to the frisky Thunderer? Nevertheless he lies with big Ganymede. The man from Tiryns used to put down his bow and bend Hylas over; do you believe that Megara didn't have a tush? Daphne was fleeing tortured Phoebus, but the Oebalian boy dispatched those flames. Although Briseis often used to lie with her back to him, his smooth friend was closer to Aeacides. Therefore, stop giving masculine names to your parts and think that you have two cunts, wife.

Martial's wife, like Galla in 11.19, actively wants to play a passive role in this relationship and, again, like Galla, her speech is indirectly reported. In addition, Martial characterizes her words as *tetricis* (severe, l. 1), which Martial often uses sarcastically of outdated morality (Kay 1985: ad loc. refers to Citroni's note on 1.62.2). The association of his wife's sexual proposition with an older, more austere morality is a bit odd, given she is asking her husband to sodomize her—as we have seen, this act does not have a secure justification in terms of the *mos maiorum* of conjugal relations. There is a way in which it is outdated, though, namely, in accordance with Martial's precepts, a fact which is only made clear at the end of the epigram. Before we get to the end, the moralizing tone of *tetricis* is made to seem even more odd by virtue of the long list of mythological exempla. The logic of such exempla suggests that Martial's countermanding of his wife takes its basis precisely from an older moral code, in line with his role as *praeceptor amoris*. However, the details reveal a recasting of Greek myth and language itself in the face of which the

wife's suggestion seems all the more plausible and austere. While I am not aware of any parallels for these particular stories, one in particular, is almost surely Martial's invention—the connection of the Hyacinthus and Daphne episodes (11.43.7–8, for the references, cf. Kay 1985: ad l. 8.).

These invented mythological exempla ready the reader for the final couplet, which presents Martial's new "rule." Although Martial elsewhere suggests that anal sex with women is inappropriate and inferior to anal sex with boys, he, nevertheless, does allow for the activity.⁵¹ His precept simultaneously conceals and reveals the act that it describes in the image of the dual *cunni*. Indeed, here, Martial transforms his wife's *culus* (asshole) into a second *cunus* (cunt); she offers her own allure, to be sure, but not that associated with the anal penetration of boys.⁵² Moreover, her poetic utterances are completely circumscribed by Martial, who exercises his poetic *auctoritas* by redefining the woman's very body in and through *his* language. Kay argues that the structure of the poem is significant and that "it is no coincidence that *culum* in line 2 is in the same position as *cunus* in line 12: the latter is M[artial]'s rewriting of the former" (1985: ad l. 12). Martial's language reconfigures that of his wife and transforms her words and body. The parallel with the Galla poem (11.19) is furthered strengthened when we recall his reposte to her in the second line, Martial's *mentula* often makes a solecism. Here, too, Martial has made a solecism that involves his *mentula*, but this solecism is intentional. Martial's radical refashioning of bodies puts into relief the creative power his misuse of language holds and suggests that the correct use of language for

⁵¹ Since it is frequently argued that Martial preferred sex with boys to sex with women, this sentiment may correspond to a general attitude illustrated in Martial's poetry; cf. Richlin 1983: 44; Sullivan 1991: 208 (anal sex with women is a "secondary formation"); P. Watson 2003: 47. However, Martial need not be consistent, and often is not, in representing his fictions; it will be argued below that this distinction between acceptable and unacceptable sex is turned on its head in 11.104

⁵² This plays into a common sentiment in Martial, that bodies have their proper sexual use; cf. 11.22.9–10 with Kay's 1985 introduction to the poem. Amidst the parallels Kay 1985 cites at line 10, particularly appropriate to the present context is 12.96.12. In this poem, a husband addresses his wife and answers her complaint about his sexual relations with boys. As in poems of the type in 11, the wife's voice is co-opted by the narrator and her willingness to submit to anal sex is countered with: "scire suos fines matrona et femina debet: cede sua pueris, utere parte tua" (A matron and woman ought to know her own boundaries: yield their part to the boys and use your own, 12.96.11–12). The poem illustrates well the relationship between the wife as female head of the family and the kind of sexual relations this figure should practice. Like the wife in 11, this one is "damned if she does, damned if she doesn't"; her reputation (and that of her husband) is soiled by the exposure. On Martial's preference for boys, cf. above, n51.

Martial requires solecism. With the assertion that his “wife’s” *culus* is really only a second *cunnus*, Martial has reinvented this woman thereby creating a poetic landscape of which he is the master. The wife’s body is here the site of Martial’s poetics—her *culus* is subject to his *nomina*.

In 11.78, Martial’s control is highlighted by an inexperienced bachelor’s lack of control. Reprising his role as *praeceptor amoris*, Martial offers a certain Victor⁵³ advice on how to handle his sexual life with his soon to be wife and the protests of his soon to be domineering mother-in-law. Martial opens the poem with an emphatic exhortation to Victor to adopt the practice of embracing women (11.78):

Utere femineis complexibus, utere, Victor,
 ignotumque sibi mentula discat opus.
 flammea texuntur sponsae, iam virgo paratur,
 tondebit pueros iam nova nupta tuos.
 pedicare semel cupido dabit illa marito,
 dum metuit teli vulnera prima novi:
 saepius hoc fieri nutrix materque vetabunt
 et dicent: “uxor, non puer, ista tibi est.”
 heu quantos aestus, quantos patiēre labores,
 si fuerit cunnus res peregrina tibi!
 ergo Suburanae tironem trade magistrae.
 illa virum faciet; non bene virgo docet.

Practice feminine embraces, Victor, practice them and let your dick learn a task it does not know. Your fiancée’s veils are being woven, already the maiden is getting ready, now your new bride will clip your boys’ flowing locks. She will grant to her desiring husband to ass-fuck her once, while she fears the first wounds of a new weapon: her nurse and mother will forbid this from happening any more and will say: “That is your wife, not your boy.” That one will make you a man; a maiden does not teach well. Alas, so many torments, so many labors you will endure if the cunt is a foreign concept to you! Therefore, give yourself as an apprentice to a Suburan teacher. That one will make you a man; a maiden doesn’t teach very well.

This advice is warranted by the fact that the bride will clip the hair of Victor’s boys (*tondebit pueros . . . tuos*, l. 4), which indicates that, once married, he will have to put aside his sexual relationships with them (Kay 1985: ad loc.). Martial, as sexual sage, suggests that it is inappropriate for the husband to

⁵³ Martin Dinter 2005 *per litteras* reminded me of the pun Victor might imply for the elegiac theme of *militia amoris*; on the topos, cf. Cairns’s 1972 index, s.v.. There is an ironic contrast between Victor, a real loser in love, and Martial (the etymology of his name might be felt here), the real master of the sexual field of battle.

sodomize his wife; he may get away with it once, but no more.⁵⁴ Notice that it is the new bride's mother and nurse, two socially embedded figures of Roman femininity, who give voice to this prohibition (11.78.7–8), but, these imposing (to Victor) women's voices are co-opted by that of Martial. In contrast to 11.19 and 11.43, where he reported the speech of such domineering women, here he is mimicking their probable future speech. What these women say is significant at this point, since, in essence, they propose a definition of *uxor* as the negative of *puer* (l. 8), thus prohibiting Victor from making his young bride one of the boys. According to Martial's precepts, as in 11.43, it is indecorous for a husband to treat his wife in such a way, and the narrator adds that the husband who is a foreigner to the *cunnius* must be prepared to suffer great woes (11.78.9–10). Victor needs to learn about the *cunnius*, so, in the last couplet, Martial hands his pupil over to a new teacher, one who specializes in feminine embraces. The final pentameter, which states that this prostitute/advisor will make Victor a man, presents a contrast between the prostitute and the young bride, who will refuse Victor anal sex. It is just possible that a visit to the Subura will satisfy Victor's anal sexual needs and educate Victor regarding something Martial already knows—the *cunnius* of a wife is dual. In other words, a reading of Martial's book, not just this poem, will solve Victor's potential problem.⁵⁵ Martial here, through his mastery of obscenity, gives Victor the key to a happy marriage—complementing his wife with a prostitute. As far as anal sex with wives go, whether Victor's or Martial's, a certain amount of double speak is necessary. *Pedicare* is not for women and their bodies do not even have a *culus*, according to Martial.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ This seems to be something of a trope in at least the Latin literary tradition, playing on the supposed confusion of two inexperienced sexual beings; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.22, quoting *CP* 3. Perhaps this trope begins with Herodotus's account of Peisistratus's famous sexual act with his young bride, described as οὐ κατὰ νόμον (not according to custom, 1.61). Her family quickly responds.

⁵⁵ It is interesting to note here that Martial and his books are often pictured hanging out in the Subura; cf. 5.22.5, Martial traveling through the Subura; 10.20.5, 12.2.9, Martial's poetry; 12.18, Juvenal wanders the Subura in contrast to Martial in Bibilis (suggests that he used to do this, cf. l. 14); 7.31, 10.94, Martial gets his produce here. In a sense, Martial is sending Victor to meet his poetry. Perhaps then he will learn the *res peregrina*, when he has familiarized himself with the haunts and denizens of Martial's verse.

⁵⁶ Indeed, the wider use of the word confirms this idea. The objects of *pedicare* are almost always men or boys, see Adams 1982a: 123. The exceptions Adams cites are 11.99, discussed briefly above, and 11.104, to be discussed below. The semantic range of *futuere* is comparable, where women almost never function as grammatical subjects of the active forms of the verb, Adams 1982a: 118–22. There is a similar limitation in Greek comic diction; the obscene word *prôktos*, while commonly used of male homosexual situations,

Unless, of course, you know the code. Indeed, Martial's seeming endorsement of the sexual boundaries of the verb *pedicare* in 11.43 and 11.78 only serves to underscore the contrast felt by 11.104.

LUCRETIA INTO LAIS

The final poem I will discuss falls near the end of Book 11; in fact, it is the last poem before the sequence that signals the dénouement of this *libellus*.⁵⁷ I will argue that its position is not the only reason it should be read as the climax. The text is as follows:

Uxor, vade foras aut moribus utere nostris:
 non sum ego nec Curius nec Numa nec Tatius.
 me iucunda iuvant tractae per pocula noctes:
 tu properas pota surgere tristis aqua.
 tu tenebris gaudes: me ludere teste lucerna
 et iuvat admissa rumpere luce latus.
 fascia te tunicaeque obscuraque pallia celant:
 at mihi nulla satis nuda puella iacet.
 basia me capiunt blandas imitata columbas:
 tu mihi das aviae qualia mane soles.
 nec motu dignaris opus nec voce iuvare
 nec digitis, tamquam tura merumque pares:
 masturbabantur Phrygii post ostia servi,
 Hectoreo quotiens sederat uxor equo,
 et quamvis Ithaco stertente pudica solebat
 illic Penelope semper habere manum.
 pedicare negas: dabat hoc Cornelia Graccho,
 Iulia Pompeio, Porcia, Brute, tibi;

is used of women only three times in Aristophanes; cf. Henderson 1991: 149–50. In a future article, I will discuss the way in which Martial denies others the ability he has to fashion the poetic world, especially with reference to the female homosexuals in 1.90, 7.67, and 7.70, all of whom are uniquely “active” in their sexual lives. Holzberg has started the project by reading 7.67 with 7.69 as a deflation of the elegiac *puella* and an association of this figure with that of Philaenis, the tribad, in 7.67, thus exploding the *puella domina* into a masculine woman, a process that Holzberg sees as epigram drawing out its relation to elegy, 2006: 155–56.

⁵⁷ 11.105 recalls the Sigillaria, held during the last days of the Saturnalia; cf. Kay 1985 on the introduction to this poem; 11.106 is an ironic poem to a busy patron who has not the time to read even these four verses all the way at the end of the roll, as the next poem highlights. Of the link between 11.106–8, Kay 1985: 284, in his introduction to the poem, states, “The three final epigrams in this book are linked together by the idea that the book has been long and the reader has, or should have, other things to do.”

dulcia Dardanio nondum miscente ministro
 pocula Iuno fuit pro Ganymede Iovi.
 si te delectat gravitas, Lucretia toto
 sis licet usque die; Laïda nocte volo.

Wife, get out or practice my mores: I'm neither a Curius nor a Numa nor a Tatius. Nights drawn out over pleasant cups please me; you sullen, having drunk water, are in a hurry to get up. You are happy in the dark; with the lamp as my witness, I like to play and bust a nut with light let in. Bras and tunics and obscuring robes hide you, but no girl lies nude enough for me. Their kisses seduce me like wooing doves: you give me the kind you give your grandmother in the morning. You don't care to help the job with movement or a word or your fingers, as if you were preparing incense and wine. Phrygian slaves used to masturbate behind the doors whenever the wife sat on her horse of Hector; and, although the Ithacan was snoring, the chaste Penelope used to always have her hand down there. You deny me ass-fucking: Cornelia used to grant this to Gracchus, Julia to Pompey, Porcia to you, Brutus; before the Dardanian steward mixed the sweet cups, Jupiter had Juno for his Ganymede. If severity pleases you, you can be a Lucretia all the day through, I want Laïs at night.

When the reader of Martial's book comes to poem 104, and hears the familiar ring of *uxor*, he/she should expect the narrator's exhortation to his wife (*mori-bus utere nostris*, "practice my morals," l. 1)⁵⁸ to imply that she would abstain from anal sex, which is the province of pederasty and not marital relations. This assumption is further encouraged by the second line, where Martial distances himself from exemplars of Roman virtue, recalling his rejection of his wife's *tetricis verbis* in 11.43.1.⁵⁹ Furthermore, the similarity between this exhortation and that to Victor in 11.78.1 ties the three poems together in their presentation of Martial as the rule-giver in his literary world and highlights the extension into this poem of the narrator's ability to control sexual mores as the *praeceptor amoris*. In fact, the poem is structured as a long list of advice to the wife on how she can improve her sexual prowess, many elements of which allude to the most famous poem in the tradition of the *praeceptor amoris*, Ovid's *Ars Amatoriae*.⁶⁰ In general, the catalog suggests that Martial's wife should act more like a courtesan, a suggestion made more explicit by virtue of the contrast between her flowing robes and the nude body of a *puella* (11.104.7–8).⁶¹ He inserts two mythological exempla of chaste wives who are,

⁵⁸ On this sentiment and its Ovidian connections, cf. Barchiesi 2001: 98.

⁵⁹ This is reinforced by the characterization of the *uxor* as *tristis* at line 4.

⁶⁰ For parallels to Ovid and others, cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. As should be clear, Hinds's 1997 analysis of this poem is central to my reading.

⁶¹ The identification with a courtesan is supported by the previous two couplets. The first, ll. 3–4, implies that Martial wants his wife to act like a girl at the symposium—to

nonetheless, lustful with their husbands, namely Andromache and Penelope. The exposure of his wife's sexuality is thus complemented by the exposure of that of two paragons of wifely virtue. However, this is not the end, nor the most explicit section, of the list.

This poem has been free of primary obscenities up to this point.⁶² So, after the long list of ways the *uxor* could spice up her sex-life, the narrator surprises the reader with the explicitly obscene *pedicare*. Jupiter's affair with Ganymede, among other historical *exempla*, serves as a justification for the *uxor* to submit to anal sex. The culmination and rhetorical climax of this poem is this exhortation to his wife to submit to anal sex. Not only does Martial thus rewrite his earlier prohibition of *pedicatio*, but he does so by rewriting the same mythological *exemplum* used to promote the wife's abstinence from anal sex in 11.43.3–4. Anal sex is both appropriate and inappropriate for the *uxor*. Should she pretend anal sex is vaginal or should she submit to *pedicatio* as a boy? The mythological example in 11.104, Jupiter and Juno "pre-Ganymede," is suggestive. Of course, Juno could not have competed with Ganymede for acclaim in anal-sexual prowess, but, before his arrival, she satisfied Jupiter's yearning for such activities. The contradiction the narrator presents is that, at once, the wife is both capable and incapable of submitting to *pedicatio*; her *culus* is simultaneously that of a desired *puer* and simply a second *cunnus*. The poem represents Martial in a position of complete dominance, emblemized by his linguistic mastery over her body and its sexual function. Martial's poetic mastery resides both in his control of signifiers and their signifieds and is complemented by his mastery of metaphors and what each one means—Juno

drink the whole night through and have sex; on the connection between sex and wine, cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. The second, ll. 5–6, makes a demand for her to participate in sexual acts in the light. As Kay 1985 notes, this request is immodest especially when compared to the passage to which it alludes, Ov. A. A. 2.619–20, which is part of a long excursus on the proper concealment of sexuality. Ovid says in summary: "nos etiam veros parce profitemur amores,/tectaque sunt solida mystica furta fide" (We scarcely announce even real loves and our secret tricks are concealed with a true assurance, 2.639–40). In contrast to Ovid, Martial wants exposure. 10.20.19, an epigram to Pliny, is illuminating here—in ll. 18–21, Martial's poetry, on its way to Pliny, is counseled to travel at night, by lamp—that is when it has its strongest effect (even stiff Catos will read it then). Night time is the right time for Martial's poetry, for sex, for Laïs, yet not in obscure darkness, but with enough light to see (how else will Cato read?).

⁶² The only possible exception is *mastababantur* in line 13, which seems to be an obsolete word that Martial revives; cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. and Adams 1982a: 211. Adams also suggests the word may have a coarse tone 1982a: 226. In any event, it certainly does not carry the obscene charge of *pedicatio*.

is made to exemplify two opposite sexual attitudes when Martial refocuses an already invented mythological exemplum from 11.43.

The contradiction Martial creates through his prescriptions of sexual mores for his wife is neatly packaged in the final couplet of 11.104. The wife here is urged by the narrator to take on the very ambiguity his poetry represents and is made to embody Martial's poetics; she is to become Lucretia, who blushes to read Martial's frisky verses, but reads them nonetheless. She is also to be Laïs,⁶³ the famous prostitute, but only under cover of darkness. Martial, by instilling proverbial chastity and celebrated promiscuity in the figure of his wife, has created a hybrid whose very impossibility is a testament to his poetic authority. The ephemeral mistress of Roman love poetry falls from her lofty pedestal and lands in the unfamiliar world of Roman social life, where she is made to serve the whims of the poet's fancy.⁶⁴ When compared to Lucretia, the wife recalls the audience represented in the programmatic poems (11.15 and 11.16) suggesting that Martial's poetic power is not limited to his wife. The process of reading, especially as dramatized in 11.16, shows that Lucretia's titillation by the poetry she is reading—the very poetry in which she is represented and which the audience, too, is reading—parallels the actual readers of the book as well.⁶⁵ This transformative capability is the ultimate fiction of Martial's poetics and is embodied in the wife he depicts as a transformation of the literary loves of his predecessors.

CONCLUSION

By proclaiming that his wife has two *cunni* or by directing his daytime Lucretia to act the Laïs at night, Martial has revealed what his illocutionary acts should conceal. This simultaneous revelation and concealment is an important part of Martial's embodied poetics. By virtue of the fact that these poems are about "Martial" and "his" wife, they encourage identification with real bodies in the world, that of Martial and his wife. The obscenity and concomitant anti-social tale they tell force the audience to question the relationship between the page and the real world. If, as Martial said at the outset, this book does not contain his mores (11.15.13), then whose does it contain? And what are

⁶³ On the fame of this prostitute, cf. Kay 1985: ad loc. The scholia to Ar. *Pl.* 149 and 152 suggest that the joke there, which hinges on anal sex with a woman, refers to Laïs. For more references to the famous prostitute, cf. McClure 2003: 195n30. The best evidence that she was legitimately famous at least by the fourth century B.C.E., is the fact that Epicrates wrote a comedy called *Anti-Laïs*; cf. Athenaeus 570b-d, which preserves a long fragment from the play.

⁶⁴ On the relatively high status of the *docta puella* in elegy, cf. James 2003: 223.

⁶⁵ Fitzgerald's analysis of the play of positionality in Catullus is parallel; cf. especially his discussion of Martial 11.90, 1992: 245.

we to do with the exhortation to practice *his* mores in the climactic poem of the book (11.104.1)? There is in Martial's literary world a vacillation, created by the embodiment of himself and his characters in this world, that simultaneously hides and exposes this fiction. When Martial commands his wife to be a Lucretia by day and a Laïs by night, he has her embody the program of transformative reading he set out in 11.16. Through his obscene depiction of sexuality, his poetry gets Lucretia hot when Brutus is not around. His wife is to be a Lucretia during the day, but a Laïs at night. The two combine into a transformation of the famous story of Lucretia, who is chaste even at night and in the absence of Brutus.

In his note on line 21 of 11.104, Kay (1985) states: "The whole of the Eleventh Book of M[artial] has been concerned with dispelling the *gravitas* which might be appropriate for normal times but which is contrary to the spirit of the Saturnalian season." Kay is certainly right to see in this poem's final expulsion of *gravitas* the consummation of this Saturnalian book. Pushing this further and exploring what Martial has left in place of *gravitas* has been the focus of this paper. The dignity that should characterize the idealized marriage between husband and wife has been undermined and made explicit. Martial constructs this relationship between *vir* and *uxor* in terms of the Latin literary tradition of love poetry, but makes it, too, explicit: first, by revealing the real world social implications it entails and, secondly, by exposing the typically concealed sexuality involved in this relationship.

In the end, Martial's embodied poetics allows him to accomplish a remarkable feat in the tradition of Roman erotic poetry: to create a wife who is equally a prostitute. As Paul Allen Miller observes of Propertius 2.6.41–42:⁶⁶

"nos uxor numquam, numquam seducet amica: / semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris" (Never will a wife, never will a mistress seduce us / ever will you be my mistress and ever my wife). Cynthia is to be *matrona* and *meretrix* in one, and consequently from the perspective of traditional Roman ideology she can be nothing at all since these categories are mutually exclusive. (2004: 63; text and translation his)

Significantly, the poem begins with one of the two extant references to Laïs in elegy.⁶⁷ Cynthia is compared to this famous prostitute precisely in her separa-

⁶⁶ The text is problematic here and lines 41–42 are variously transposed. Regardless, the couplet remains a description of Cynthia, whether assigned to 2.6 or its complement, 2.7, and still represents an unrealizable, in elegiac terms, person. In addition, I would argue that, even if the couplet is assigned to 2.7, it still gains some of its force in contrast to the images of the prostitutes in 2.6.

⁶⁷ In *Amores* 1.5.9–12, Ovid compares Corinna to Laïs even as he introduces her to the world for the first time. As Corinna comes on the scene, she is styled as the famous

tion from Propertius (2.6.1) who goes on to lament the loss of wifely virtue and to envy the wives of Admetus and Odysseus (2.6.23–24). Finally, he holds responsible for this decline in wifely virtue the first painter of obscene pictures because he exposed females to raw sexuality (2.6.27–32). When taken together with 2.7, an interesting dichotomy emerges in Propertius's representation of Cynthia. Whereas in 2.6 Propertius attempts to distance Cynthia from prostitutes and their sexuality, in 2.7, as Wyke has noted, Propertius denies any desire to marry Cynthia, precisely in language that recalls the Roman wife's relationship to the service of the Roman state (2002: 29). Propertius's diptych presents Cynthia with the two alternatives of socially embedded femininity, wife/Lucretia-figure and prostitute/Lais-figure, but represents her as neither. As we have seen, Martial is able to create, in contrast to Roman mores and elegiac precedent, a Lucretia who is a Lais precisely through his obscene exposure of sexual acts. By creating a literary world of which he is the master, one that exposes his wife to *his* sexual mores, not those of the *mos maiorum*, Martial effectively exposes a central conceit of Roman erotic poetry and thus writes himself into the erotic literary canon.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, J. N. 1982a. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.
- . 1982b. "Four Notes on the Latin Sexual Language: *CIL* 4.8898; Persius, 4.36; Martial, 11.104.17; Petronius, 21.2." *LCM* 7.6: 86–88.
- Barchiesi, A. 2001. "Teaching Augustus through Allusion." In Fox, M. and S. Marchesi, eds. and trans. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Poets*. London: Duckworth. 79–104.
- Boardman, J. 1980. "Review of K. J. Dover. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press." *JHS* 100: 244–45.
- Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chisolm, D. 1995. "The 'Cunning Lingua' of Desire: Bodies-Language and Perverse Performativity." In Grosz, E. and E. Probyn, eds. *Sexy Bodies: The Strange Carnalities of Feminism*. New York: Routledge. 19–41.

prostitute and made to act in one of only two sex scenes in Roman elegy (the other is Propertius 2.15), but a scene clothed in innuendo that ends with an almost epigrammatic final couplet, "Cetera quis nescit? Lassi requievimus ambo. / Proveniant medii sic mihi saepe dies." (Who doesn't know the rest? Worn out, we both rested. / Let my mid-days turn out this way often, 1.5.25–26). Corinna, while she is likened to a prostitute here, has nothing in common with a Roman wife. In fact, Ovid does represent his wife in the exile poetry, but never in the sexual way he treats Corinna. In the future, I plan to study the relationship between Martial and Ovid with respect to their treatment of their wives.

- Clarke, J. 1998. *Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art, 100 B.C.–A.D. 250*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2003. *Roman Sex, 100 B.C.–A.D. 250*. New York: H. N. Abrams.
- Coleman, K. M. 1990. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *JRS* 80: 44–73.
- Connolly, J. 2000. "The Asymptotes of Pleasure: Thoughts on the Nature of Roman Erotic Elegy." *Arethusa* 33.1: 71–98.
- Culler, J. 2001. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Delia, D. 1991. "Fulvia Reconsidered." In Pomeroy, S. B. ed. *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 197–217.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fallon, K. M. 1989. *Working Hot*. Melbourne: Sybylla Co-operative Press and Publications.
- Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1992. "Catullus and the Reader: The Erotics of Poetry." *Arethusa* 25: 419–43.
- . 2007. *Martial: The World of the Epigram*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fowler, D. P. 1995. "Martial and the Book." In Boyle, A. J. ed. *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J. P. Sullivan*. Bendigo North, Victoria, Australia: Aureal. 199–226.
- Goodrich, S. P. 1949. "Martial's Biography of Vergil." *CJ* 44.4: 270.
- Hallett, J. P. 1988. "Roman Attitudes toward Sex." In Grant, M. and Kitzinger, R. eds. *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome*, Vol. 2. New York: Scribner's. 1265–78.
- . 1996. "Nec castrare velis meos libellos. Sexual and Poetic *lusus* in Catullus, Martial and the *Carmina Priapea*." In Klodt, C. ed. *Satura Lanx. Festschrift für Werner A. Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag. Spudasmata* 62. Zürich: Georg Olms. 321–44.
- Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinds, S. 1997. "Do-It-Yourself Literary Tradition: Statius, Martial and Others." *MD* 39: 187–207.
- Holzberg, N. 2006. "Onomato-poetics: a Linear Reading of Martial 7.67–70." In Booth, J. and Maltby, R. eds. *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales. 145–58.
- Hopkins, K. 1965. "Age of Roman Girls at Marriage." *Population Studies* 18: 309–27.
- James, S. 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Joshel, S. R. 1992. "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia." In Richlin, A. ed. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 112–30.
- Kay, N. M. 1985. *Martial Book 11: A Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, D. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lavigne, D. and Romano, A. 2004. "Reading the Signs: The Arrangement of the New Posidippus Roll (*P. Mil. Vogl.* VIII 309, IV.7–VI.8)." *ZPE* 146: 13–24.
- Lee-Stecum, P. 1998. *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book One*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maltby, R. ed. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Francis Cairns Press.
- McClure, L. 2003. *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, P.A. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Murgatroyd, P. ed. and comm. 1991. *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- O'Connor, E. 1998. "Martial the Moral Jester: Priapic Motifs and the Restoration of Order in the *Epigrams*." In Grewing, F. ed. *Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven Der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 187–204.
- Oliensis, E. 1997. "The Erotics of *Amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace." In Hallet, J. and Skinner, M. eds. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 151–71.
- Parker, H. N. 1992. "Love's Body Anatomized: The Ancient Erotic Handbooks and the Rhetoric of Sexuality." In Richlin, A. ed. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 90–111.
- . 1997. "The Teratogenic Grid." In Hallet, J. and Skinner, M. eds. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 47–65.
- Parker, W. H. ed. and trans. 1988. *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God*. London: Croom Helm.
- Richlin, A. 1983. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1984. "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire." *Arethusa* 17.1: 67–80.
- Roman, L. 2001. "The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial's *Epigrams*." *JRS* 91: 113–45.
- Scott, K. 1925. "The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus." *TAPA* 56: 82–105.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. ed. and trans. 1993. *Martial: Epigrams*. 3 Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Skinner, M. 2005. "Response to *BMCR* 2005.10.23." *BMCR* 2005.11.07. Accessed 12 December 2005 <<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2005/2005-11-07.html>>.
- Stroup, S. C. 2006. "Invaluable Collections: The Illusion of Poetic Presence in Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*." In Nauta, R. R., van Dam, H.-J. & Smolenaars, J. J. L. eds. *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden: Brill. 299–314.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1979. "Martial's Sexual Attitudes." *Philologus* 123: 288–302.
- . 1991. *Martial: The Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swann, B. 1994. *Martial's Catullus: The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms.
- Watson, L. 2006. "The Unity of Martial's *Epigrams*." In Nauta, R. R., van Dam, H.-J. & Smolenaars, J. J. L. eds. *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden: Brill. 271–84.

- Watson, P. 2003. "Martial's Marriage: A New Approach." *RM* 146: 38–48.
- . 2005. "Non tristis torus et tamen pudicus: The Sexuality of the *matrona* in Martial." *Mnemosyne* 58.1: 62–87.
- Wheeler, A. L. 1910. "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources, I." *CP* 5: 440–50.
- . 1911. "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources, II." *CP* 6: 56–77.
- White, P. 1974. "The Presentation and Dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*." *JR* 64: 40–61.
- Williams, C. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002a. "Ovid, Martial and Poetic Immortality: Traces of *Amores* 1.15 in the *Epigrams*." *Arethusa* 35: 417–33.
- . 2002b. "Sit nequior omnibus libellis: Text, Poet and Reader in the *Epigrams* of Martial." *Philologus* 146.1: 150–71.
- Wyke, M. 2002. *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.