

CHAPTER ONE

PATRONAGE IN MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

The evidence for Martial's relations with his patrons is to be found almost exclusively in the *Epigrams* themselves. The major exception is a letter written by Pliny the Younger around 103, on hearing the news of Martial's death (*Ep.* 3.21)¹. The letter is instructive enough to be given in full:

Dear Cornelius Priscus,

I hear that Valerius Martialis has died and I take it to heart. He was talented, clever, and keen, and his writings contained a lot of humour and mockery, but were also full of compliments. (2) I had sent him on his way with a travel allowance when he retired from Rome: I had given it (*dederam*) in recognition of our friendship (*amicitiae*), I had given it (*dederam*) also in recognition of the verses he has composed about me. (3) It was an ancient tradition to reward with honours or money those who had written the praises of individuals or cities; but in our days, like much else that was splendid and excellent, this was among the first things to go out of fashion. For now that we have ceased to perform praiseworthy deeds, we think it inappropriate to be praised at all. (4) You want to know the verses for which I rendered my thanks (*gratiam rettuli*)? I would refer you to the publication, if I did not know some of them by heart; if you like these, you can look up the rest in the book. (5) He addresses his Muse, instructs her to seek my house on the Esquiline, to approach respectfully:

But look to it that that you do not knock drunkenly on his eloquent door at an unsuitable time. He devotes his days in full to stern Minerva, while for his audience in the centumviral court he works at speeches that the ages of posterity will be able to compare even to the productions of Cicero. You will more safely go to him at a later hour, when the lamp is lit: that is a suitable time, when Bacchus revels, when the rose is mistress of the feast, and hairs drip with perfume. Then let me be read even by the likes of stiff Cato. (Mart. 10.20 [19].12–21)

¹ Pliny's letter must be later than 101, the date of publication of Martial's last book, but not later than 104 (see Sherwin-White 1966: 31–32). On the dates of publication of Martial's books see the Appendix.

(6) Is it not deserved that he who has written this about me was then seen off by me as a good friend (*amicissime*) and is now mourned by me as a good friend (*ut amicissimum*)? For he gave me (*dedit*) the most that he was able to, and would have given (*daturus*) more if he had been able to. However, what greater gift can a man be given (*dari*) than fame and praise and immortality? "But his writings will not be immortal". Perhaps not, but yet he wrote them as if they would. Greetings,

Gaius Plinius

The addressee Cornelius Priscus either was consul or would become consul soon after, whereas Pliny himself had been consul a few years before². Thus, when Pliny writes that "we" have ceased to be subjects for panegyric (3), he is referring to the restricted scope for the acquisition of glory by senators, now that great deeds have become the prerogative of the emperor³. However, the purpose of the letter is to demonstrate from Pliny's own example that merit may still earn praise, and praise still earn fitting reward. The person providing the praise stands outside the circle drawn by the first-person plural: it is appreciated when he approaches respectfully (5). But in spite of this clearly articulated difference in status the relationship between Martial and Pliny is called *amicitia*, even emphatically so (2, 6). Whether there had been more to the *amicitia* than the exchange recorded in the letter is not clear: Pliny suggests that *amicitia* and verses were the two counts on which Martial had a claim to gratitude (2), but he may mean that the existence of the *amicitia* was based on the verses. In any case he talks of the "the verses for which I rendered my thanks" (4), and after quoting them asks if their author had not a right to be treated "as a good friend" (6). The obligation the poetry had created was apparently a lasting one: "then ... and ... now". Now Pliny reciprocates by honouring Martial's memory, *then* he had reciprocated by covering the expenses of the poet's journey to Spain. But Pliny had not "paid" Martial his "wages": he had rendered him *gratia* (4), he had *given* him something (2). In the same way Martial

² The consulate of Cornelius Priscus almost certainly fell in 104; cf. C.P. Jones 1968: 118. Pliny himself had been consul in 100.

³ Cf. *Ep.* 3.7.14: *quidquid est temporis ... si non datur factis (nam horum materia in aliena manu), certe studiis proferamus*. Indeed, the subject of Martial's eulogy is Pliny's oratory.

had *given* something to Pliny (6): not just poetry, but what poetry could bestow: "fame and praise and immortality".

Pliny's letter provides a perfect illustration of the Roman code of literary patronage⁴. There is patronage, because there is an informal relationship characterised by asymmetry, duration, and exchange, and the patronage is literary, because the exchange partly consist in literature. Support for the poet is motivated not by the quality of his poetry, nor by his financial circumstances, but by the services he renders with his poetry. If a poet offers "fame and praise and immortality", he is entitled to an adequate return. In the rest of this chapter it will be studied how the model provided by Pliny's letter relates to the evidence of the *Epigrams* themselves.

Preliminary: "You" and "I" in Martial

There are many poems of Martial which plainly praise their addressee, yet do not admit of a confident identification of that addressee. On the other hand, there are many poems of Martial which provide all the data a modern student of literary patronage could want. The difference is likely to correspond to a difference in Martial's intentions. Poems of the second group were apparently meant to contribute to the addressee's reputation among the readers—present and future—of the *Epigrams*. Poems of the first group, however, apparently had fulfilled a function for the addressee when they were offered to him or recited in his presence, but their publication must have been motivated by other reasons than that of presenting him to the public at large⁵. In the case of such poems, there may be "infor-

⁴ This formulation deliberately echoes Peter White's conclusion of his discussion of this same letter: "There did not exist a Roman code of literary patronage" (White 1978: 84). Further discussion of the letter is to be found at pp.142–145.

⁵ Fowler 1995 seems to suggest that those epigrams of Martial which present themselves as occasional are so only by way of generic pretence; in this context he stresses that no text can in and of itself disprove (or prove) its own fictionality. But various types of additional evidence (both about specific texts and about more general patterns in which these texts might fit) make it possible to form plausible hypotheses. Fowler seems to suspect that the search for such hypotheses is generally motivated by a wish to provide the texts with a specious transparency, or even to efface their textuality, but I hope that the sequel will bear out that that is not the case in the present book.

mation gaps", in the sense that information which was originally present in the context of situation is not necessarily recorded in the text⁶. The implications for the study of literary patronage are particularly severe when the missing information concerns the identity of the addressee. I will give a few examples.

In Martial's twelfth book we read the following poem on the birthday of Virgil:

Maiae Mercurium creastis Idus,
Augustis redit Idibus Diana,
Octobres Maro consecrauit Idus.
Idus saepe colas et has et illas,
qui magni celebras Maronis Idus. (12.67)

Ides of May, you brought forth Mercury, on the Ides of August Diana returns, but the Ides of October are hallowed by Virgil. May you often honour both the former and the latter Ides, you who celebrate the Ides of great Virgil.

Friedländer in his commentary identifies the unnamed addressee as Silius Italicus, and he is almost certainly right⁷. Martial had earlier addressed epigrams to Silius on the latter's acquisition of Virgil's tomb (11.48 and 50 [49]), and it is known from Pliny that at this tomb Silius "celebrated Virgil's birthday more devoutly than his own" (*Ep.* 3.7.8). If Friedländer's hypothesis is correct, this poem is evidence for the relationship between Martial and Silius, but we should realise that the hypothesis could only be framed because of the presence of additional data. When such data are not forthcoming, the absence of a name precludes the identification of the person honoured by Martial⁸.

⁶ My term "information gap" renders "Informationsdefizit", as discussed by Rösler 1980: 41–45.

⁷ L. Friedländer 1886: 2.256.

⁸ Apart from 12.67, the non-satirical epigrams to an unnamed addressee (on the importance of their being non-satirical see immediately below) all accompany gifts: 2.85, 4.19, 9.54, 10.94. One may compare, however, poems to (or on) named slaves, whose owner remains unnamed, e.g. 6.52, 7.87, 8.46 (where the identity of the owner may be deduced from 8.50 [51]: see p. 47), 9.56, 9.103 (where the identity of the owner may be deduced from inscriptional evidence: see p. 66, n. 91). Cf. White 1974: 40–41 (who also mentions 5.42, but there the second person seems to be generic).

But even if Martial does address someone by name, he often uses only a part of the name, mostly the *cognomen*⁹; if this *cognomen* is a common one, identification is often difficult or even impossible, for us as well as for Martial's original readers. Martial was well aware of the issue, as is proved by the introduction to Book 9. Here we find an epigram addressed to one Avitus, accompanied by a letter to Toranius, in which Martial writes: "The epigram ... is addressed to Stertinius the senator... I thought I should write to you about this, so that you might know the identity of this man I call Avitus" (9.*ep.*). But the letter to Toranius is an isolated instance in the text of Martial, and normally we have to make do with the epigrams themselves. Hence the identification of other Aviti in Martial with the senatorial Stertinius (*suff.* 92) meant here, is contested¹⁰. Similar problems arise with the Rufi and Severi addressed by Martial, because both *Rufus* and *Seuerus* belong to the ten most frequent Latin *cognomina*¹¹. Whenever a Severus occurs in Martial, Friedländer identifies him with the son of Silius Italicus, mourned in 9.86, and this looks plausible, until one encounters a Severus some years after 9.86, in 11.57: at least this one cannot be Silius' son¹². But the real extent of the issue is shown by the poems for (or on) Rufus. There are no less than five Rufi whose *nomen* Martial mentions: Camonius, Canius, Instanius¹³, Julius and Safronius Rufus. When we encounter a poem addressed to, say, Instanius Rufus (like 7.68, 8.50 [51], 12.95) or just Instanius (like 8.73, 12.98), we have no difficulty, but how about all

⁹ In a few cases he uses the *praenomen* only, which was a token of affection; cf. Howell 1980: 118.

¹⁰ Contrast Citroni 1975: 67 with Howell 1980: 144: one man according to Citroni, more than one according to Howell, following the unpublished dissertation of P. White (1972); cf. also Henriksen 1998–99: 1.52.

¹¹ See the statistics of Kajanto 1965: 29–30.

¹² Cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 2.196 and the index (by C. Froben) under "Severus (Silius)" (2.380).

¹³ Most editions print *Instantius* with the manuscripts. But from 8.50 (51).23–26 it appears that the vocative of the name has seven letters, whereas *Instanti* counts eight. H. A. J. Munro *apud* L. Friedländer 1886: 2.29 (followed by Shackleton Bailey in his editions of 1990 and 1993) assumed that Martial referred to an incorrect spelling *Istanti*, more closely approximating to actual pronunciation. But the name surely was *Instanius*: see Alföldy 1969: 164. Thus also Merli 1996a: 211–12.

the poems addressed to *Rufus* pure and simple? In these cases it is not even always certain that “Rufus” is real at all.

The problem arises when the addressee is not praised or flattered, but criticised or ridiculed. I shall give two examples from poems addressed to a Rufus. In one poem a Rufus is denounced not only as an inheritance-hunter, but as an incompetent inheritance-hunter at that:

Cum me captares, mittebas munera nobis:
postquam cepisti, das mihi, Rufe, nihil.
Vt captum teneas, capto quoque munera mitte,
de cauea fugiat ne male pastus aper. (9.88)

When you were trying to catch me, you used to send me presents: now that you have caught me, you give me nothing, Rufus. In order to keep me now that I am caught, go on sending presents now that I am caught: otherwise the boar might get hungry and flee from the cave.

It is hard to imagine that Martial wrote this poem for presentation to “Rufus”; more probably he composed it for the entertainment of his audience, employing second-person address to achieve greater liveliness and punch¹⁴. Second-person address allows the poet to employ a whole array of speech acts which otherwise would have been denied him: exhorting, warning, reproaching, etc. Thus in another poem a Rufus is chided for beating his cook:

Esse negas coctum leporem poscisque flagella.
Mauis, Rufe, cocum scindere quam leporem. (3.94)

You say the hare is not well cooked and call for the whip. Rufus, you would rather carve the cook than the hare.

Elsewhere Martial is perfectly callous about the beating of cooks (8.23), and the point of his criticism here is not that “Rufus” is cruel, but that he feigns a reason not to share his food with the guests¹⁵. Such a criticism can hardly have been really uttered in the face of the host, and again the more natural assumption is that the communication with “Rufus” is fictional. But even a fictional communication

¹⁴ Of course, the first person may be as fictional as the second person; see further below, pp. 48–58.

¹⁵ Poem 3.13 is exactly analogous. On cruel punishments of cooks (and waiters) see D’Arms 1991: 175.

situation can be constructed around real individuals, and the two poems as such do not preclude the hypothesis that they satirise an avaricious person called *Rufus* (or two such persons). But from the very beginning of his *corpus* of miscellaneous epigrams Martial informs his readers that in such cases not only the contexts of utterance, but also the names are fictional.

Martial begins the introductory letter to the first book with the following words:

Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salua infimarum quoque personarum reuerentia ludant; quae adeo antiquis auctoribus defuit ut nominibus non tantum ueris abusi sint sed et magnis. (1.ep.1–5)

I hope that I have struck such a balance in my modest compositions that no one with a good conscience will be able to complain about them, inasmuch as they have fun without losing respect for even the humblest characters. But the ancient authors were so lacking in this that they made free not only with real names, but even with great ones.

We know from Suetonius (*Dom.* 8.3) that Domitian prosecuted libellous writings against leading citizens. This implies that Martial and his contemporaries could no longer attack “great names”, unless they took care to remain anonymous¹⁶. Lesser names were apparently not legally protected, but Martial reassures his readers that he does not even attack those, abstaining as a matter of principle from any criticism of “real names” (*nomina uera*). Martial’s use of this term presupposes an opposition to “fictional names” (*nomina ficta*), and this opposition is indeed attested in a letter by Pliny, who writes on the work of one Vergilius Romanus: “He honoured virtue, criticised vice; he used fictional names properly, real names suitably; only in my own case did too much kindness lead him to exaggerate ...” (*Ep.* 6.21.5–6). The implication clearly is that Vergilius Romanus used real names when he praised virtue, but fictional names when he castigated vice. His audience will not have had any difficulty in under-

¹⁶ Martial repeatedly has to defend himself against allegations that he is the author of anonymously circulating abusive epigrams: see 7.12, 7.72, 10.3, 10.5, 10.33 (cf. also 5.15.2). Note that in 10.5.1–2 senators are specified as the victims of the abuse. From Suet. *Dom.* 23.2 it appears that even Domitian himself was sometimes attacked in anonymous epigrams (as earlier emperors had been: cf. Suet. *Tib.* 28, 59, *Nero* 39.2, Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.4, 4.31.1, 14.48.1).

standing his practice, because they were familiar with similar techniques from satire. Persius and Juvenal, and presumably the lost satirists of the Domitianic period such as Turnus, call the persons they attack by type-names or by names of figures from the past, but not by the names of contemporary individuals; in this respect they exercise more restraint than their predecessor Horace, whose satirical thrusts often concern real names, if never great ones¹⁷. Apparently, in the course of time, the scope for personal invective became ever more limited, in satire as well as in epigram.

Nevertheless, Martial feels constrained to explain his procedure, and sometimes reckons with uncertainty in his audience. An example is the following epigram:

Nomen Athenagorae credis¹⁸, Callistrate, uerum.
Si scio, dispeream, qui sit Athenagoras.
Sed puta me uerum, Callistrate, dicere nomen:
non ego sed uester peccat Athenagoras. (9.95b)

You believe, Callistratus, that *Athenagoras* is a real name. I'd be damned if I know who Athenagoras is. But suppose, Callistratus, that I do use a real name. Then it is not I but your friend Athenagoras who is at fault.

If some Athenagoras believes he has been satirised by Martial (viz. in 9.95, the epigram immediately preceding 9.95b), then not Martial, but Athenagoras is to blame—for answering to the satirical description. Martial is not interested in criticising individuals, but in satirising types: “My books know how to observe this rule: to spare persons, to speak of vices (*parcere personis, dicere de uitis*) (10.33.9–10)¹⁹.”

¹⁷ For a short sketch of the practices of Horace, Persius, and Juvenal see Coffey 1989: 90–91, 110, 136–37; a thorough treatment of the names in Horace's satires is to be found in Rudd 1966: 132–152.

¹⁸ Shackleton Bailey chooses the variant *quaeris* and translates “You ask Athenagoras' real name” (1993: 2.315), assuming that “Callistratus” believed *Athenagoras* to be a pseudonym. But that would result in an inconsistent transition from the issue of pseudonyms (for which cf. 2.23) to that of real names; cf. Merli 1996b: 2.788, n.135.

¹⁹ Cf. Phdr. 3.prol.45–50, where the same point as in Mart. 9.95b.3–4 is followed by the articulation of the general principle *neque enim notare singulos mens est mihi, / uerum ipsam uitam et mores hominum ostendere*.

Callistratus apparently did not know that this was Martial's practice, and believed that poem 9.95 mocked a real “Athenagoras”²⁰. But even if one does know that Martial did not write personal invective, one cannot always be certain whether a person mentioned or addressed by Martial is fictional or not. Witnesses to this uncertainty are the indices to the major editions of Martial, which all distinguish between fictional and real persons, but do not all put the same persons in the same categories. A certain measure of subjectivity is inevitable, because one cannot always objectively draw the line between friendly banter, which would still admit of a real name, and offensive ridicule, which would not. For this reason, when discussing the fictionality or otherwise of persons in Martial, I will often use such words as “perhaps”, “probably”, or “obviously”, thereby indicating the varying amount of subjectivity that I attribute to my judgement.

One specific type of uncertainty can be illustrated by returning to the example of Rufus. There are three poems in which *Rufus* is fictional according to Froben's index in Friedländer's commentary, but probably real according to Gilbert and Heraeus, and certainly real according to Shackleton Bailey: 5.51, 5.72 and 6.89²¹. The first is a skoptic epigram on a would-be orator (unnamed), the second a mythological joke at the expense of a mannered poet (also unnamed), the third an anecdote on the bibulous “Panaretus”. In all three epigrams, Rufus is no part of the contents of the poem and appears only

²⁰ One may ask why at such a late stage in Martial's production uncertainty could still arise. The answer is probably that in 9.95 Martial untypically used the combination of a *nomen* and a *cognomen* (*Alfius ... Athenagoras*), which is more suggestive of reference to a specific person than his normal practice of using only a single name (most commonly a *cognomen*, but occasionally a *praenomen* or a *nomen*). It must be noted, however, that both the reading *Alfius* (Heraeus: *Alphius* mss) and the interpretation of the epigram are uncertain; see Heraeus 1976: LI, and for more recent doxography Henriksen 1998–99: 2.145–50 (whose own interpretation, based on Barwick 1932: 65, is unconvincing in itself and does not explain *peccat* in 9.95b.4).

²¹ On 6.89 Froben deviates from Friedländer, who tentatively identifies Rufus here with Instanius (1886: 1.467, 470). Shackleton Bailey's opinion is that of 1993; in 1989 he took the *Rufus* of 5.51 as real, the one of 5.72 as fictional or uncertain, while the one of 6.89 was missing from his “Index nominum”. To add one other voice: Grewing 1997: 526 considers the *Rufi* of 5.51 and 6.89 “possibly real” (cf. also 569), but the one of 5.72 “probably fictional”.

in a vocative; I call this phenomenon, which is quite common in Martial, the *isolated vocative*. Now it is of course possible that the use of the isolated vocative is merely a variant of the direct address to the victim in skoptic epigrams: in both cases a fictional name would be introduced in order to achieve dialogic form. But there is a difference: the addressee in the isolated vocative is not satirised himself, and therefore *need* not be fictional.

When one draws up an inventory of all the isolated vocatives in Martial, one finds three classes of names. The first class consists of names which occur nowhere else in Martial (such as *Atilius* in 9.85); in itself, these could be fictional just as well as real. Secondly, there are names which occur elsewhere both as a real and as a fictional name (such as *Lupus* in 11.88)²²; these are also inconclusive. But thirdly, one also finds names which elsewhere occur exclusively as real names of friends of Martial: Faustinus, Severus, Avitus, Castricus, Flaccus, etc; when one takes this third category and compares the epigrams with an isolated vocative on the one side, and the epigrams with fully developed address to the same name on the other side, one notices a remarkable convergence of themes, moods and attitudes²³. E.g., when *Flacce* occurs as an isolated vocative, it is in epigrams with sexual themes, which is in accordance with the tastes of the Flaccus of the other poems²⁴. So it looks as if poems with an isolated vocative were addressed to real persons²⁵. By employing the isolated vocative, Martial was able not only to “motivate” his speech act by suggesting a context in which it is uttered, but also to “dedi-

²² *Lupus* is real in 10.48, fictional in 9.2, 11.55 and elsewhere; see further below, p. 60.

²³ Cf. for a full discussion Cartault 1903.

²⁴ Poems with isolated vocatives on sexual themes: 7.82, 9.33, 11.95, 11.98, 11.100, 11.101; similar poems with full address: 1.57, 11.27, 12.74; cf. also 4.42 and 8.55 (56). On the prosopographical problems surrounding Flaccus see below, p. 59.

²⁵ This is the conclusion of Gilbert 1896: 380: “*cae [scil. personae], quae vocativo a poeta appellantur, si ipsae nihil ad rem narratam attinent (ubi ego ‘ad eum’ scripsi), mihi quidem omnes verae videntur*” (similarly Heraeus 1976: 380; Shackleton Bailey in 1990 drops the label “ad eum”, but in 1993 treats addressees in the isolated vocative as real).

cate” his poem to a real person as a mark of homage²⁶. In the case of the three poems to *Rufe*, we may assume that they were addressed to a real Rufus, even if we cannot be quite sure to which one²⁷.

To conclude the discussion of *Rufi*, something must be said about the complicated case of 8.52, where *Rufus* is “doubtless Instantius [i.e. Instanius] Rufus” according to Friedländer in his commentary, but “plainly a fictional name” according to Heraeus in his “Index nominum”; Shackleton Bailey lists him as fictional or uncertain in 1990, but as real in 1993. This poem has an isolated vocative; but it is not *Rufe*, but *Caediciane*²⁸, to whom Martial narrates how he once lent a barber to Rufus, who insisted on such a thorough shave that the barber returned with a beard himself. Now it is interesting to note that this poem occurs in an environment of poems for Instantius: 8.50 (51) explicitly honours him, and 8.46 is addressed to a slave Cestus, who in 8.50 (51) turns out to be his page. Do we have, then, three poems delivered at the same banquet, 8.46 being addressed to the cupbearer, 8.50 (51) to the host, 8.52, gently mocking the host, to a guest, Caedicianus?²⁹ The problem with this hypothesis is that names of the type *Caedicianus* are often used by Martial as fictional names, so that there must be a strong suspicion that *Caedicianus* itself is also fictional³⁰. We cannot simply state that names in the isolated vocative are *always* real.

²⁶ On “dedication” of single poems (to be distinguished from the dedication of books) see ch. 2, p. 129. On (more or less) isolated address as a mark of homage in Hellenistic poetry, Catullus, and the Augustans, see briefly Kroll 1924: 231–35.

²⁷ Cartault 1903: 111 reasonably suggests the humorous Canius Rufus (on whom see below, p. 59) as the addressee of these three poems, as well as of five others in which *Rufe* occurs as an isolated vocative (2.11, 2.29, 2.84, 3.82, 3.97) and which had already been assigned to Canius in Friedländer's commentary; one might add the non-skoptic 2.48.

²⁸ The name *Caedicianus* occurs elsewhere in a further isolated vocative (1.118), and twice in a closely related auxiliary function, as belonging to the person who asks the question which sets the epigram in motion (10.32, 10.84).

²⁹ Arguments that at least 8.46 and 8.50 (51) could well have been performed at a symposium are provided at p. 101.

³⁰ Names of the shape – *ianus* are very convenient metrically, especially in elegiac distichs. Apart from *Caedicianus*, Martial has *Aemilianus*, *Caecilianus*, *Gargilianus*, *Laetilianus*, *Maecilianus*, *Mamurianus*, *Nasidianus*, *Pontilianus*, *Postumianus*, *Septicianus*, *Sextilianus*, *Sosibianus*, and *Tongilianus*, which are all fictional, and *Papirianus*, which only occurs in an isolated vocative (8.81).

consideration is consistent with the self-presentation in other poems, especially in such poems where the speaker can be identified with the poet. A case in point is provided by those epigrams in which the speaker specifies his domicile. In 5.22 the "I" complains about undertaking long journeys from his own abode on the Quirinal to the dwelling of "Paulus" on the Esquiline, only to be told that his august patron is not in. "Paulus" looks fictional, but it appears from other poems (to real addressees) that Martial did live on the Quirinal, at first in a rented apartment, later in a house of his own³³. He will have expected readers familiar with his work or with his circumstances to assume that in 5.22 he was speaking in his own voice.

A blatant example of *inconsistency* between speaker identities, on the other hand, is provided by the epigrams on marriage. There are a number of epigrams in which the speaker refers to his wife, and a number in which he implies that he is a bachelor³⁴. Now unless we postulate for Martial a rapid succession of divorces and remarriages³⁵, we must conclude that the speakers in one of these groups are fictional³⁶. But that does not imply that they are "real" in the other group. All references to a wife or the absence of one are jocular, and it is perhaps better to say that for the sake of a joke a poet could assume a *persona* which fitted that joke. Whether this *persona* corresponded with his identity outside the context of the joke was not necessarily at issue. The audience would understand that no biographical information was being conveyed, and—to stick to the pres-

³³ An apartment is specified in 1.108 (where the addressee could be fictional) and must also be meant in the contemporaneous 1.117. From Book 9 onwards Martial boasts of a house (9.18, 9.97, 10.58; for the location cf. also 10.20 [19] and 11.1). The intermediate epigrams 5.22 and 6.27 may refer to either, but more probably to the apartment; see Citroni 1975: 330 and 357, and below, p. 337.

³⁴ The speaker is married in 3.92, 4.24, 11.43, 11.104 (and cf. 11.84), unmarried in 2.49, 8.12, 10.8, 11.19, 11.23; 2.92 has been interpreted both ways.

³⁵ This is actually done by Bell 1984. For other views on Martial's civil status see Scamuzzi 1966: 180–87 (who argues that Martial was married) and Sullivan 1991: 25–26 (who argues that he was not).

³⁶ Thus Schuster 1930, but the point was already argued by Lessing in his *Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten*, first published in 1771; see Lessing 1973: 476–81 = 11.266–71 Lachmann–Muncker.

ent example—would not try to determine whether Martial was "really married" or not³⁷.

If pronouncements of an "I" on matrimony or celibacy are not necessarily to be taken as autobiographical, the same could conceivably apply to first-person utterances on wealth or poverty. I start with a poem presupposing wealth:

Hospes eras nostri semper, Matho, Tiburtini.

Hoc emis. Imposui: rus tibi uendo tuum. (4.79)

You were a permanent visitor at my Tiburtine estate, Matho. Now you buy it. I have cheated you: I am selling you an estate that is already yours.

This epigram is usually taken as evidence that Martial really owned an estate at Tibur (Tivoli), which he really sold³⁸. But rather than friendly bantering with an assiduous friend, Martial seems to criticise an importunate guest. Moreover, the name *Matho* is always fictional in other epigrams, so that it is likely to be fictional here. If that is the case, the question becomes whether the "I" is fictional too. There are some indications that it is. Book 4 contains other poems set in Tibur, and one in which Martial, still staying at Baiae, announces his intention of coming to Tibur to visit Faustinus³⁹; now it seems more probable that Martial stayed at Tibur as Faustinus' guest than that he owned a villa which he never mentions elsewhere. In fact the deal with "Matho" could well have been made by Faustinus (or one of his neighbours); it could have been the subject of a Tiburtine anecdote, wittily versified by Martial for the amusement of his host. In this case the addressee would have been real, but ad-

³⁷ Cf. Slings 1990: 11–12 on the "performer I" as situated between the "biographical I" and the "fictional I".

³⁸ E.g. Hardie 1983: 51 and 52. It is sometimes assumed that Martial here refers to his *Nomentanum* (Kuthan 1932; cf. Scamuzzi 1966: 169–72), but he certainly did not sell that before Book 10: see 10.61, 92.

³⁹ The poem announcing the visit is 4.57; the poems set in Tibur closely follow in the order of the published book: 4.60 and 62. For Faustinus' estate at Tibur see also 5.71 and 7.80.

dressed under a pseudonym in a fictional context of utterance and by a fictional speaker⁴⁰.

The situation is quite different with regard to an estate at Nomentum (near modern Mentana): this Martial mentions about a dozen times, from the early *Xenia* through the second edition of Book 10, and still in Book 12, mostly in poems addressed to named friends and patrons⁴¹; in this case we may safely take the information as autobiographical. The same holds for a house in the City, which Martial only mentions in poems to real addressees⁴², e.g. in a request to the emperor for permission to draw water from an aqueduct:

Est mihi—sitque precor longum te praeside, Caesar—
rus minimum, parui sunt et in urbe lares. (9.18.1–2)

I own—and I pray that I may long keep it under your rule, Caesar—a tiny estate, and I also own a small house in the city.

This is a serious speech-act, and even though Martial quite probably underplays the size of his possessions, there can be no doubt about the reality of these possessions themselves.

That Martial was indeed moderately well-off is confirmed by his references to slaves; these often occur in jocular epigrams to fictional addressees, where the speaker is liable to be fictional as well, but also in epigrams to real addressees; in the latter we find references to a bailiff and a bailiff's wife (on the Nomentan estate and later in Spain), as well as to an errand-boy, a flute-player and a page⁴³. A category in itself are the epitaphs on favourite slaves who have died young, such as 1.101⁴⁴:

⁴⁰ On to the use of pseudonyms cf. 2.23. There are two other poems on a *rus* which probably employ a fictional "I": 6.5 and 11.18 (on the latter see Kay 1985: 106).

⁴¹ Cf. 13.15, 13.42, 13.119, 1.105, 2.38, 6.27, 6.43, 7.31, 7.49, 7.93, 8.61, 9.18, 9.54, 9.60, 10.44, 10.48, 10.58, 10.92 (cf. 10.61), 10.94, 12.57; of all these poems, only 2.38 has a fictional addressee. From 13.119 it appears that Martial grew wine at his *Nomentanum* (cf. also 10.48.19), and it is possible that this provided him with an income; cf. Hardie 1983: 51.

⁴² See above, n.33.

⁴³ Fictional address e.g. in 2.32, 2.44, 5.50, 7.35, 8.13, 8.67, 11.39; cf. 3.46 on a freedman. Real address in 3.100 (errand-boy), 4.10 (errand-boy), 5.78 (flute-player), 8.63 (page), 10.48 (*uilica*), 10.92 (*uilicus*), 12.18 (in Spain: *uilica*, *uilicus*, *pueri*); cf. 8.52 (barber), discussed above. The lists of Martial's slaves in Scamuzzi 1966:

Illa manus quondam studiorum fida meorum
et felix domino notaque Caesaribus,
destituit primos uiridis Demetrius annos:
quarta tribus lustris addita messis erat. (1.101.1–4)

Once the trusted secretary of my studies, he whose handwriting brought good fortune to his master and was known to the Caesars, young Demetrius has abandoned his early years: four harvests had been added to three lustris.

Because of the claim that the Caesars had known Demetrius' handwriting, Martial must be speaking seriously and be referring to his real secretary. Not only did he own slaves (which all but the most indigent did), but he had a staff adequate to the management of his town house and his suburban estate as well as to the pursuit of his social and cultural activities.

But the most important single fact about Martial's financial resources is that he was a Roman knight, which presupposed a census of at least 400,000 sesterces⁴⁵. Before discussing what this meant in practical terms, I will take a brief look at the evidence for Martial's equestrian rank, in order to give another illustration of some of the methodological points made above. There are five poems in which the speaker—not to prejudice the question—refers to himself as a knight. The first of these (3.95) is a satiric epigram addressed to a fictional "Naevolus", who always answers the speaker's greetings, without ever being the first to greet; yet the speaker feels in no way inferior and lists his assets: an imperial privilege called the *ius trium liberorum* (5–6), success and fame as a poet (7–8), a tribunate and the equestrian rank connected with it (9–10), and successful intercession with the emperor on behalf of clients (11–12). The addressee is fictional, but the self-presentation of the speaker is consistent with

178, n. 167, Garrido-Hory 1981: 69–70 and Sullivan 1991: 164, n. 58 are compiled from both groups of poems indiscriminately; Garrido-Hory and Sullivan moreover include a number of epigrams on *pueri* who need not belong to the "I".

⁴⁴ See also 1.88, as well as 5.34 and 37 (both on Erotion; cf. 10.61). Poems 6.52 and 11.91 *might* be on other people's slaves (as 6.28–29 and 6.68 certainly are).

⁴⁵ On Martial as a knight see esp. Allen *et al.* 1969–70: 345–49, White 1978: 88–89 (on the equestrian rank of poets in general, revised in White 1993: 5–13), Saller 1983: 250–52.

Martial's self-presentation elsewhere⁴⁶, so that there is no obstacle to believing that Martial himself is the speaker. The situation is similar with the second epigram (5.13), where the speaker addresses an arrogant millionaire, a fictional "Callistratus", and states that he himself, though "of modest means" (*pauper*), is nevertheless "a knight neither unknown nor of ill repute" (2) and highly successful as a poet (3–4). In the third epigram (5.17) the speaker mocks a "Gellia", who only accepts marriage candidates of senatorial standing and looks down on the condition of "knights like me" (2), but ends up marrying a minor police official. In the fourth poem (9.49) we are safely on the ground of real communication: Martial writes of a toga given to him by Parthenius, in which he used to parade "a conspicuous knight" (4); he had thanked Parthenius, an influential imperial freedman, for the gift of this toga in 8.28. The fifth and last poem (12.29 [26]), taken in itself, is more problematic: the speaker is taxed by the addressee, an unnamed senator assiduous in attending the *salutationes* of the powerful, with being a "lazy knight" (2); here the contrast knight vs. senator *could* have been invented for the sake of the epigram. But by this point in the published works of Martial, the reader—ancient as well as modern—has acquired a certain knowledge of Martial's circumstances, and will deploy this knowledge in interpreting his works. This poem is not independent evidence, but it confirms the conclusion drawn from the earlier poems.

Once it is established that Martial was a knight, it needs to be asked what it meant, or could mean, to be a knight. In 5.13 equestrian rank is combined with being *pauper*, a term which did not mean "poor" in the modern sense, but covered the entire spectrum between more than indigent (*egenus*) and less than affluent (*diues*); elsewhere too, Martial calls himself *pauper* and denies that he is *diues*⁴⁷. Indeed, the historical evidence shows that equestrian rank did not

⁴⁶ For the *ius trium liberorum* see 2.90–91; for success and fame as a poet see the passages listed at p. 132, n. 131.

⁴⁷ Martial *pauper*: 2.90 (real addressee); cf. 4.77 (no addressee) and 10.10 (fictional addressee). Martial not *diues*: 5.15, 6.43, 7.46 (real addressees); cf. 2.30 (fictional addressee) and 4.77 (no addressee). On the meaning of *paupertas* see Scamuzzi 1966: 188–200 and Kay 1985: 142–43.

automatically entail wealth⁴⁸. Moreover, it did not automatically absolve one from performing the duties of a client, something the speakers of Martial's poems repeatedly complain about. In how far Martial himself was involved in these duties, has been hotly debated⁴⁹. If we want to achieve clarity, it is important to draw the evidence not from satirical poems to fictional addressees, where the speaker is likely to be fictional as well, but from poems to real addressees, where successful communication can only be achieved if Martial speaks in his own name⁵⁰.

One group of such poems is made up of the epigrams in which he talks about his impending departure for Spain—a biographical fact confirmed by the letter of Pliny discussed at the beginning of this chapter. In the last book to be published before the move, the second edition of Book 10 from the year 98, there are three poems addressed to real addressees in which Martial prepares or explains his decision by expressing dissatisfaction about his existence as a client in Rome. The first of these poems is 10.58, addressed to Frontinus, presumably Sex. Julius Frontinus, consul for the second time in this very year 98 and well-known author of technical works⁵¹. Martial had been a guest

⁴⁸ See Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 140–52, who argues that the majority of equestrians could not afford more than a modest lifestyle.

⁴⁹ Cf. esp. Scamuzzi 1966, Allen *et al.* 1969–70, White 1978, Saller 1983, Hardie 1983: 50–57, Garrido-Hory 1985, Holzberg 1988: 65–73, Sullivan 1991: 116–30, 159–62.

⁵⁰ Yet, as has been argued above (p. 49), it would have been possible to use epigrams to fictional addressees where the speaker is identified as Martial by traits which he shares with the "I" in poems to real addressees. Thus I think (against Damon 1997: 160–67) that the "I" is Martial in 1.108 (because he lives on the Quirinal), in 3.4 (because he sends a book on its way from Gallia Cisalpina to Rome), 10.74 (because he is a poet longing to leave Rome), 11.24 (because he is a poet whom *Roma legit*), and 12.68 (because he is a poet who now lives a quiet life far from Rome).

⁵¹ The identification of the Frontinus of this poem with the politician and author (*PIR*² I 322) is denied by White 1975: 295–96, n. 41, but it would be surprising if in a poem published (and probably written) in 98, *Frontinus* would not refer to the man who was consul in that year (as attested by the *Fasti Ostienses*: Vidman 1980: 45), the more so since Martial mentions the consulate at 10.48.20 (cf. Housman 1907: 252 = 1972: 729). Moreover, in 97 Frontinus describes Rome as *cui par nihil et nihil secundum* (Aq. 88.1), an almost hendecasyllabic line, which reappears a few years later at Mart. 12.8.2 (with the addition of *est* before *nihil*). It has been suspected that Frontinus' text is interpolated, but it is more likely that Martial paid Frontinus the

at his villa in Anxur (Terracina) (1–6), and acknowledges the hospitality in this epigram, which then continues in a somewhat unexpected direction. Martial contrasts the leisure at Anxur with his “fruitless toil” (8) at Rome, the unproductivity of his Nomentan farm, and the necessity of haunting, by day and by night, the thresholds of his patrons, a chore which leaves him no time for writing poetry (11–14). In this communication addressed to a high personage, which adduces biographical circumstances also attested elsewhere, there can be no question of a fictional speaker, and we must conclude that Martial was indeed involved to a high degree in the traditional duties of the client.

This conclusion is confirmed by the second poem, 10.70, in which Martial explains to Potitus why he does not produce more than one book a year⁵²: he gives a long enumeration of the various services he has to render his patrons in the course of the day, only to be awarded one hundred *quadrantes* at the end, the so-called *sportula*⁵³. One hundred *quadrantes* means 6 1/4 sesterces, and it is surprising that someone with a census of at least 400,000 sesterces should care for so small an amount. But we should not be duped by Martial’s rhetoric: if he mentions the *sportula*, it is as a particularly degrading symbol of his dependence, not as the motive for which he has sought that dependence in the first place⁵⁴. Not only knights, even senators were caught up in the necessity of paying court to patrons, as is attested by Martial in other epigrams (2.18, 10.10, 12.29 [26]) and by Juvenal in a well-known passage from his first satire (95–126). But when Juvenal pretends that even consuls and other well-to-do Romans were greedy for the *sportula*, his interpretation of the motives of these

compliment of quotation (thus Kappelmacher 1916), or that the line originated at a literary session of the kind extolled by Martial in 10.58, and was subsequently incorporated by both authors in their published work.

⁵² Potitus does not occur elsewhere, but because he is addressed as *docte Potite* (2), he must be real.

⁵³ On the *sportula* see L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.228. This poem is very similar to 11.24, but neglected by Damon (as in n. 50), when she argues that Martial is more reluctant to don the “mask of the parasite” in poems to real than in poems to fictional addressees.

⁵⁴ In 10.75, the same speaker who is prepared to pay 20,000 sesterces for an encounter with a first-class prostitute (1–2) also receives the *sportula*—which he then passes on to his slave (11–12).

people is a malignant distortion (unlike his description of their factual behaviour)⁵⁵. Senators and knights—even when in economic difficulties—were not interested in the daily dole, which to them could have no more than token value⁵⁶, but in the more irregular and more substantial gifts that patrons might bestow on those who paid court to them: Martial describes the rewards a senator may earn for attending the *salutatio* as consulates and governorships (12.29 [26]), and Juvenal himself elsewhere specifies inheritances as the objectives of a praetor making the morning rounds (3.128–30); other large donations in money or in kind could also be expected⁵⁷.

The third poem, 10.96, addressed to Avitus, again emphasises Martial’s dependence⁵⁸. At last he makes explicit his decision to withdraw to Spain: he praises the relaxed self-sufficiency of life there, contrasts it with his hardships at Rome, and concludes:

I, cole nunc reges, quidquid non praestat amicus
cum praestare tibi possit, Avite, locus. (10.96.13–14)

Well, pay court to patrons if you like, but all that you do not get from a “friend”, Avitus, you can get from a place.

In view of such lines, we cannot seriously doubt that Martial was indeed caught up in a web of obligations to patrons, and that the material support of these patrons made no negligible contribution to the

⁵⁵ Cf. esp. 99–101 and 117–23. It is generally held that Juvenal’s account, in which the *sportula* is distributed in the early morning (128: *sportula, deinde forum*) conflicts with the evidence in Martial (cf. e.g. Courtney 1980: 105, Howell 1980: 285, Braund 1996a: 98), and this has been used to qualify the picture in Juvenal as a “fantasy” (Cloud 1989). But in Martial, apart from passages pointing to distribution of the *sportula* at the baths (3.7, 10.70) or at the *cena* (4.68; cf. 3.30, 3.60), there are at least three passages where the *sportula* is unequivocally described as a reward for greeting the patron at the *salutatio* (14.125, 4.26, 6.68; cf. also 1.80 with Citroni 1975: 257). So the practice probably varied, and Juvenal chose that variety which suited him best.

⁵⁶ It did of course happen that senators were in economic difficulties (cf. Talbert 1984: 50–53, Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 127–32), but this cannot have led them to being interested in the *sportula* as such, as is assumed e.g. by L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.229, n. 6 and 233–34 and Citroni 1975: 256.

⁵⁷ On upper-class attendance at the *salutatio* cf. also Col. 1.pr.9–10 (the reward is *fascium decus et imperium*) and the passages adduced by Saller 1982: 129; on the gifts bestowed by patrons see Saller 1982: 119–43 and 1983: 251–55.

⁵⁸ On the identity of Avitus cf. p.41.

life-style he carried on as a Roman knight, an owner of slaves and of real estate. How exactly this worked will have to emerge from the following sections, where, in accordance with the methodological points I have been making, I will concentrate on those epigrams which contain address to real patrons, taking account of epigrams with address to fictional patrons only in so far as they provide evidence for the existence of certain expectations about the behaviour of patrons and clients generally.

Asymmetry

In poem 10.48, Martial invites a number of guests to dine with him; there is reference to the produce of the Nomentan estate (7–8, 19–20) and the tone is one of warm geniality (esp. 21–24), so that there is no reason to consider the communication as fictional. This is borne out by the names of the invited guests:

Stella, Nepos, Cani, Cerialis, Flacce, uenitis?

Septem sigma capit, sex sumus, adde Lupum. (10.48.5–6)

Stella, Nepos, Canius, Cerialis, Flaccus, are you coming? The couch takes seven, we are six; add Lupus.

All of these are addressed elsewhere in the *Epigrams*, and it is interesting to see what kind of company they make up.

The most prominent figure, not accidentally given pride of place, is Stella, L. Arruntius Stella with his full name, a young patrician, who was a politician as well as a poet, and associated also with Statius (*Silv.* 1.*ep.*, 1.2). Martial devotes epigrams to both sides of Stella's career: he flatteringly compares Stella's collection of love-elegies, the *Columba*, to Catullus' *Passer*, but he also describes the splendid games given by Stella after Domitian's return from the campaign against the Sarmatians, and even hints to Domitian that a consulate would be welcome—the consulate materialised only under Trajan (in 101), just in time to be included in Martial's last book⁵⁹.

⁵⁹ Stella's poetry: 1.7, 1.61, 6.21 (*uati*: 1), 7.14, 12.2 (3).11–14; his games: 8.78; his consulate: 9.42, 12.2 (3).10–11. These and other poems for Stella are discussed at pp. 155–159. His career is discussed in more detail at pp. 211–212.

The guest next mentioned, Nepos, makes a striking contrast. He occurs in only two other epigrams, from which it appears that he was a neighbour of Martial in Rome as well as Nomentum, in the habit of drinking the cheap wines from his cellar, because he wished to lay up the expensive ones for the dowry of his daughter⁶⁰. It is a reasonable guess that his resources and status were not much different from Martial's.

The same guess can be made for Canius (Rufus), who is regularly mentioned as a poet and as a cheerful companion, but never as a person of wealth or influence; when in one poem Martial wonders where his friend might be, he considers the villas of certain well-to-do Romans, but no villa of Canius' own⁶¹.

Of the fourth guest, Julius Cerealis, we know little more than that he was a poet, to whom Martial on one other occasion sent an invitation in verse⁶².

Flaccus is addressed very often, sometimes to be complimented with his wealth, but never to be lauded for political, military, or administrative accomplishments; perhaps he had none, but owed his wealth to commercial activities⁶³. In one poem, however, he seems to

⁶⁰ 13.124, 6.27.

⁶¹ 3.20.17–18. Canius Rufus further occurs in 1.61 (see Citroni 1975: 294), 1.69, and 3.64; all these poems celebrate his good humour, and he could be the recipient of any of the humoristic epigrams addressed to an unspecified *Rufus* (cf. pp. 45–47 with n. 27). In 7.69 his fiancée Theophila is described, a learned Greek woman.

⁶² 11.52. Kay 1985: 180–81 deduces from the traditions of invitation poetry that Cerealis must be a "benefactor who is socially superior", citing Phld. 27 Sider = 23 *GP* = *AP* 11.44 and Catul. 13, but the conclusion seems unwarranted, because (1) Martial insists on the quality of the food to be served (in opposition to Philodemus and Catullus), and (2) 10.48 proves that invitation poems could be addressed to social equals as well as social superiors; cf. also 5.78, where the invited guest leads the life of a client.

⁶³ His wealth is apparent from 1.59, where he acts as Martial's patron at Baiae (cf. also 11.80), and 12.74, where he is seen buying precious crystal from Egypt; on his journey to Cyprus see below, p. 69. He hailed from Patavium (Padua), like Stella (1.61.3–4; cf. 1.76.2). Howell 1980: 242 and Henriksen 1998–99: 1.172, 2.131, both following the unpublished dissertation of P. White, suggest that Flaccus may be identical with the Calpurnius Flaccus of Plin. *Ep.* 5.2, but the *cognomen* is common and there are no other indications. Moreover, following Sherwin-White 1966: 316, they suggest identification of this Calpurnius Flaccus with a Calpurnius who was suffect consul of 96, but that man's *cognomen* ended in *-icus* (cf. C.P. Jones 1968: 116).

be poor. There (1.76) he is urged to abandon poetry (in which he is said to excel at 1.61), because the Muses leave their worshippers penniless, unlike Minerva, who richly rewards the activities of her devotees in the Forum. Various explanations for the seeming inconsistency have been offered, among them the non-identity of Flaccus the “poor poet” with Flaccus the “rich friend”⁶⁴. However, the poem can be interpreted not as exhorting Flaccus to *take up* a more lucrative occupation than poetry, but to *stick to* it; this occupation, carried out in the Forum under the patronage of Minerva, might be judicial oratory, but could be commerce⁶⁵. On this view Martial does not seriously discourage Flaccus from writing poetry, but slyly hints that his own practice of the art has not brought him adequate reward, so that he could do with some financial support from his rich amateur colleague. This would give point to the magniloquent opening address “O, no cheap reward for my efforts,/ Flaccus, hope and nursing of Antenor’s dwelling”, which is perhaps meant to recall Horace’s similarly florid address to Maecenas in his first ode⁶⁶, where there is also a contrast of worldly occupations with the way of life of the poet (characterised in much the same imagery as is used by Martial). In this epigram the association with Maecenas is at most indirect, but elsewhere it is explicit: Martial’s famous description of Maecenas’ patronage in 8.55 (56) is addressed to Flaccus⁶⁷.

By contrast, no support is ever expected from the last-named guest, Lupus, although on one occasion Martial seems to hint at

⁶⁴ Thus the indices of L. Friedländer 1886 (by C. Froben), Heraeus 1976, and Shackleton Bailey 1990 and 1993. Another solution (that Flaccus was poor in his youth, and that 1.76 dates from that time) was proposed by P. White in his unpublished dissertation and accepted by Howell 1980: 242–43 and Kay 1985: 130. Cf. also Citroni 1975: 196 and 202–03 and Pitcher 1984.

⁶⁵ Minerva was the goddess of both manual and intellectual work (cf. e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 3.809–34), and could be associated with industry and commerce (Petr. 29.3, fr. 28.11 M.⁴) as well as oratory (Mart. 10.20 [19].14, Juv. 10.114–17); cf. Citroni 1975: 240–41 and Howell 1980: 277–78. The barrister of 1.98 need not be Flaccus (as assumed by Sullivan 1991: 19).

⁶⁶ With *O mihi curarum pretium non uile mearum,/ Flacce, Antenorei spes et alumne laris* (Mart. 1.76.1) cf. *Maecenas, atavis edite regibus,/ o et praesidium et dulce decus meum* (Hor. C. 1.1.1–2). There is a more immediate echo of Ov. *Ep.* 18 (17).163 *pretium non uile laboris*, but the context there is completely different.

⁶⁷ That epigram will be discussed below, p. 83.

some stroke of financial luck; since the few other poems addressed to Lupus do not provide more unambiguous evidence, it must remain a guess that Lupus was a social equal⁶⁸.

This survey leads to two conclusions. First, Stella and Flaccus seem to have disposed of considerably greater resources (political and economic) than Nepos, Canius Rufus, and Lupus (Julius Cerealis must remain a blank). These resources are often celebrated by Martial, but—and this is the second point—in the poem under consideration Stella and Flaccus are not treated any differently from the others. Elsewhere, too, Martial appears to be on quite easy terms with Stella and Flaccus: he frequently addresses teasing, joking, or otherwise frivolous epigrams to both of them—just as to Canius Rufus and Lupus⁶⁹. So asymmetry did not preclude a relaxed, seemingly egalitarian intercourse. Or to put it the other way round: if we find such intercourse, we may not infer from that alone that asymmetry was absent; on some occasions, asymmetry could be in abeyance, only to be reinstated on others.

One single poem has been enough to suggest the range and variety of asymmetry in Martial, but an accurate account must of course draw on a systematic exploration of all the poems. Therefore I will now attempt a concise survey of Martial’s (real) addressees, aiming at completeness for those people who are addressed on more than one occasion, but not for those who are addressed only once (I hereby anticipate the criterion of duration). I will omit the emperors and the imperial freedmen, because these will be discussed in Part III.

In a long and impassioned epigram against an unnamed detractor (6.64), Martial appeals to his success in the highest circles at Rome. The addressee has dared to carp at Martial’s “trifles” (*nugae*):

⁶⁸ The poem in which Martial hints at financial luck is 6.79 (cf. the key-words *felix* and *Fortuna* there and in 2.24). Lupus is further addressed in 5.56 and in two jocular poems where he occurs in the isolated vocative: 10.40 and 11.88. All other *Lupi* are fictional; cf. Kay 1985: 249. Balland 1998: 46–49 reads the line in which Lupus is mentioned as a sympotic riddle, hinting that his *praenomen* has seven and his *nomen* six letters, and suggests P. Iulius Lupus (*suff.* 98).

⁶⁹ Martial’s jocular poems for Canius Rufus and Lupus have just been referred to (nn. 54 and 61); on his jocular poems for Stella and Flaccus see pp. 155 and 163.

has, inquam, nugas, quibus aurem aduertere totam
 non aspernantur procures urbisque forique,
 quas et perpetui dignantur scrinia Sili
 et repetit totiens facundo Regulus ore,
 quique uidet propius magni certamina Circi
 laudat Auentinae uicinus Sura Dianae,
 ipse etiam tanto dominus sub pondere rerum
 non dedignatur bis terque reuoluere Caesar. (6.64.8–15)

10

these trifles, I say, to which the leaders of the city and the Forum do not scorn to lend an attentive ear, (10) which the book-cases of eternal Silius deem worthy, which Regulus repeats again and again in his eloquent voice, and which Sura praises, he who watches from nearby the contests in the great Circus and is neighbour to Diana on the Aventine, which even Lord Caesar himself, in spite of the heavy weight of his responsibilities, does not disdain to read through more than once.

Because the enumeration Silius–Regulus–Sura leads up to the emperor, and because Sura gets two lines, whereas Silius and Regulus get only one, it seems that Sura has the place of honour among Martial's non-imperial readers. L. Licinius Sura's period of greatest eminence was to come under Trajan (who awarded him a second and a third consulate), but already under Domitian he was greatly famed as a barrister, and he may have gained his first consulate already under this emperor⁷⁰. Martial addresses only one poem to him, a rather formal composition upon his recovery from an illness (7.47), and it looks as if Martial was not very close to him⁷¹.

To Regulus, on the other hand, Martial addresses a great many poems, and frequently mentions him as a famous barrister in poems addressed to others. This Regulus is none other than the notorious M. Aquillius Regulus, who had incurred much hatred as a political prosecutor under Nero, and had continued to make enemies under Domitian, among whom Tacitus and Pliny, who both paint his char-

⁷⁰ A first consulate in the early years of Domitian (before 87) was proposed by Barnes 1976, but refuted by Syme 1985b: 272–75 = *RP* 5.507–09 (summarised in Syme 1991c: 548–49; cf. also Syme 1991a: 405–07): the first consulate may have been in 93, but more probably was in 97, under Nerva. This makes Sura's prominence in this text of Martial all the more remarkable.

⁷¹ Cf. Citroni 1975: 155–56.

acter in lurid colours⁷². Nothing of this transpires from Martial, who consistently praises Regulus not only for his eloquence and wealth, but also for his affability and piety; yet the relationship apparently did not continue beyond the seventh book, and one possible explanation for this is that some of Martial's other addressees objected to Regulus' company, even if only in the pages of books of epigrams⁷³.

Silius Italicus too had sullied his reputation by acting as an informer under Nero (who had made him consul in 68), but unlike Regulus, he had "washed off the stain", as Pliny writes in the obituary letter with which he honoured Silius' memory⁷⁴. Pliny particularly commends that Silius, after having served as proconsul of Asia in 77/78, had settled for *otium*, devoting his time to the acquisition of villas and works of art, to the cultivation of the memory of Virgil, and to the composition of a long-winded historical epic, the *Punica*. In the years in which Martial wrote his epigrams, this work was taking shape, and was being tried out by Silius in frequent recitations⁷⁵. Martial pays abundant homage to this side of "immortal Silius", but does not neglect to put on record his other titles to fame: his activity as an orator, his own consulate under Nero and that of his son, granted by Domitian⁷⁶. There can be no doubt about the asymmetry at the political, social, and economic level, but it might be believed that at the poetical level both men were on equal footing—indeed Martial's reputation as a poet has generally been superior to Silius'. But Martial is careful to observe the hierarchy of the genres, even turning this into a hierarchy of their foremost practitioners; when he

⁷² See Tac. *Hist.* 4.42., Plin. *Ep.* 1.5, 1.20.14, 2.11.22, 2.20, 4.2, 4.7, 6.2. A consulate is not on record, but was plausibly inferred by Syme 1953: 161 = *RP* 1.254–55 and C.P. Jones 1970: 98, n. 7. A (rather apologetic) portrait of the man is sketched by McDermott and Orentzel 1979: 94–107.

⁷³ Another explanation will be suggested at p. 155, where Martial's poems for Regulus will be discussed.

⁷⁴ Plin. *Ep.* 3.7. On the career of Silius Italicus see McDermott and Orentzel 1977: 24–27, where the evidence is cited.

⁷⁵ On the chronology of the *Punica* see Wistrand 1956; the recitations are mentioned by Pliny *Ep.* 3.7.5.

⁷⁶ Martial's poems for Silius: 4.14, 7.63, 8.66, 9.86, 11.48, 11.50 (49) (on 12.67 see above, p. 40). In all of these Silius' identity as a poet is at least mentioned, but in 7.63, 8.66, and 11.48 he is also praised as an orator, and in 7.63, 8.66, 9.86 as the head of a consular family. On the group as a whole see pp. 148–150.

presents his “jests” (*ioci*) to the author of epic, he timidly suggests (with a disregard for chronology):

sic forsā tener ausus est Catullus
magno mittere Passerem Maroni. (4.14.13–14)

thus perhaps did tender Catullus dare to send his *Passer* to great Virgil.

Although the comparison with Catullus is in itself a proud one, the pride is necessarily turned into modesty by the inevitable further comparison of Silius with his venerated model Virgil.

Licinius Sura, Aquilius Regulus and Silius Italicus were certainly the most prominent recipients of poetry by Martial, with the addition of Cocceius Nerva, the later emperor, whom Martial already addressed under Domitian, praising his “quiet life” (*quies*) and his poetry⁷⁷. But there are many other senatorial addressees, among whom I list only those who are certain senators and certain recipients of poems on more than one occasion: Arruntius Stella, already discussed; the brothers Domitius Lucanus and Domitius Tullus, consulars and magnates⁷⁸; Pedanius Fuscus Salinator, who became proconsul of Asia⁷⁹; Domitius Apollinaris, suffect consul in 97⁸⁰; Instanius Rufus, who became proconsul of Baetica⁸¹; and Antonius Primus, the famous leader of the Flavian party in the civil wars of 68–69⁸². In other cases, the evidence is not clear enough⁸³.

⁷⁷ 8.70 (cf. 5.28.4), 9.26. For a sketch of Nerva's position under Domitian see Syme 1958: 1.1–9; on *quies* see p. 308. The poems addressed to Nerva as emperor will be discussed in ch. 9 (pp. 437–440).

⁷⁸ Both were consul under Vespasian (not later than 73, according to Zevi 1979: 190, n. 25 and Eck 1982: 289, n. 28). Domitius Tullus was consul for the second time in 98 (Syme 1953: 151 = *RP* 1.235 and 156–57 = 246), his brother having died (Mart. 9.51 mourns his decease). Plin. *Ep.* 8.18 testifies to their enormous fortune, as well as to the disapprobation they incurred by their ways of obtaining it; Martial, of course, is entirely laudatory. See further Birley 2000: 57.

⁷⁹ Pedanius Fuscus Salinator was consul around 84 and became proconsul of Asia probably in 98/99 (Eck 1982: 331, n. 198); he was identified with Martial's Fuscus by Sherwin-White 1966: 386 and by Syme 1982–83: 256 = *RP* 4.107.

⁸⁰ See Syme 1991c: 588–602, where it is shown that the Domitius of Mart. 10.12 is also Apollinaris.

⁸¹ He is congratulated with his appointment in 12.98. See Alföldy 1969: 164 (also on the correct form of the name [cf. above, n. 13]), Eck 1982: 336–37.

⁸² The fact that Martial celebrates the quiet life of the retired septuagenarian (9.99.4, 10.23) is insufficient ground to reject the identification (as is done by

Of these senatorial addressees, Sura, Silius and Regulus, as well as Fuscus (7.28.5–6) are praised as lawyers, but there are also lawyers in Martial who are not necessarily senators⁸⁴. This is true of Decianus, who is prominent in Martial's first two books but absent afterwards, and of Maternus, who was a jurist as well as a lawyer; both are addressed with respect by Martial, unlike Pompeius Auctus, who is treated with irony, and who probably was of lower status⁸⁵. Equally uncertain is the case of Paulus, who is addressed as an influential lawyer in 7.72. The name *Paulus* recurs a number of times, but mostly in skoptic epigrams, where the addressee is fictional⁸⁶. However, in two cases we have an isolated vocative (5.4, 6.12), and here identity with the lawyer is possible, even if no more than that⁸⁷.

Housman 1919: 76 = 1972: 3.990, followed by Shackleton Bailey 1990: 491 and 1993: 3.340).

⁸³ I subjoin a sample of prosopographical problems concerning senatorial addressees. Stertinius Avitus (*suff.* 92) is addressed by Martial in 9.*dedic.* (cf. 9.*ep.*); how many of the *Auiti* addressed elsewhere are the same man, if any (cf. p. 41)? Is the senator Licinianus of 1.49 to be identified with the Lucius of 4.55 and is he the Valerius Licinianus of Plin. *Ep.* 4.11 (cf. Howell 1980: 214)? How many of the *Seueri* addressed by Martial are Silius Severus, the son of Silius Italicus (cf. above, p. 41)? Is the Macer of 10.18 (17), *curator uiae Appiae*, the same as the Macer of 10.78, legate of Dalmatia (cf. Eck 1982: 331, n. 199, *PIR*² M 12–14)? Are the *Galli* of 1.108 and 3.92 Munatius Gallus, legate of Numidia in 100–103, who is addressed in 10.33 (cf. *PIR*² M 724 = 725, Eck 1982: 334, 1983: 186–87 with n. 476)? Is Atticus (7.32, 9.99.1) a son of Vestinus Atticus (*cos.* 65) and Stabilia Messalina (Balland 1998: 60–63)?

⁸⁴ On advocacy, which was open to men of all ranks, see L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.181–85. Other senatorial lawyers in Martial are Pliny (10.20 [19]) and Restitutus (10.87), if he is identical with the Claudius Restitutus of Plin. *Ep.* 3.9.16.

⁸⁵ Decianus is praised as a lawyer in 2.5. Maternus is addressed as a lawyer and jurist in 10.37; if he had indeed the *ius respondendi* (L. Friedländer 1886: 2.129), he probably was a senator; cf. Kunkel 1952: 271–89. On Pompeius Auctus cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 1.499.

⁸⁶ One of these epigrams, 12.69, was interpreted in a laudatory sense by Housman 1907: 263 = 1972: 2.737, but cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 148.

⁸⁷ Sherwin-White 1966: 641 identifies Paulus with the Velius of 9.31 and with the Velius Paulus mentioned as proconsul of Bithynia-Pontus around 79/80 at Plin. *Ep.* 10.58.3 (but note Eck 1982: 303, n. 89, who considers the possibility that the proconsul's name was Vettius, not Velius). However, Martial's Velius is much more likely to have been C. Velius Rufus, an equestrian military man (Pflaum 1960–61: 1.114–17), although this is not certain (Strobel 1986b: 265–66, n. 3).

Martial's close friend Julius Martialis may also have been a lawyer, but he will be discussed at the end of this section.

If we pass to equestrian addressees, we may start with someone who may have been senatorial: the military man Marcellinus, who was posted with the army in the North and later in the East⁸⁸. Among the certain equestrians, three attained to the highest pinnacles of the *cursus*⁸⁹: Norbanus, who as governor of Raetia contributed to the suppression of the revolt of Saturninus in January 89 and was Prefect of the Guard at the time of Domitian's murder in 96⁹⁰; Ti. Claudius Livianus, who was to become Prefect of the Guard under Trajan⁹¹; and Vibius Maximus—if indeed Martial's addressee is the later Prefect of Egypt⁹². Crispinus, on the other hand, probably never was Prefect of the Guard, but owed his power to his personal influence

⁸⁸ See *PIR*² M 183; the suggestion made there that Marcellinus served in the troops of his own father cannot be reconciled with 6.25. His father very probably was Faustinus (on whom see below): cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 1.286, Syme 1982–83: 251 = *RP* 4.106. Another military man of uncertain rank is Caecilius Secundus, stationed on the Danube in 7.84.

⁸⁹ One might add Cornelius Fuscus, who was Prefect of the Guard at the time of his death in the Dacian wars in 86 or 87, but Martial's one poem in his honour (6.76), a fictional inscription for his tomb in Dacia, was written on the occasion of the peace of 89 and is probably to be taken as a compliment to Domitian rather than as a sign of a personal relationship between Fuscus and Martial. On the career see Pflaum 1960–61: 1.77–80.

⁹⁰ 9.84, quoted at p. 77. In the older literature Norbanus was conflated with his fellow suppresser of the Saturninian revolt, the consular A. Bucius Lappius Maximus (as the correct name is, not L. Appius Maximus); the confusion was finally dispelled by Nesselhauf 1960: 165, n. 22 (on Norbanus) and—independently—by Assa 1964 (on Lappius). The new view is accepted in *PIR*² L 84 and N 162, *RE* S 14 (1974) s.v. "Norbanus (1a)", Pflaum 1982: 17–18, and elsewhere, but is often wholly or partly ignored by expounders of Martial (e.g. Sullivan 1991: 35, Shackleton Bailey 1990: 307 [with 513] and 1993: 2.304); the new commentary on Book 9 by Henriksen, however, is correct (1998–99: 2.112).

⁹¹ Livianus is not mentioned by name, but 9.103 celebrates the slave twins Hierus and Asylus, who on the evidence of an inscription (*CIL* 6.280) belonged to him; see Huelsen 1889 and *PIR*² C 913.

⁹² 11.106. On the vexed question of the identity of the various (Vibii) Maximi attested at this period see the lucid exposition by Syme 1985a: 326–33 = *RP* 5: 442–49. The Maximus of 1.7 and 1.69 was interested in poetry and poets, which the Vibius Maximus of 11.106 was not: so we have a different person (White 1973c). On the identity of the Maximi of 5.70, 7.73 and 10.77 nothing can be said. All other Maximi are fictional. On Statius' Vibius Maximus see p. 221.

with Domitian⁹³. To these equestrian addressees may be added a certain Sextus, who seems to have been Domitian's *a bibliothecis*, i.e. in charge of the imperial libraries⁹⁴.

Crispinus and Sextus were used by Martial as "brokers", i.e. as persons who served him with their contacts, in this case their contacts with the emperor. Other brokers with the emperor were leading imperial freedmen⁹⁵. Martial often addresses Domitian's *a cubiculo* ("chief chamberlain"), Parthenius, and once his *tricliniarcha* ("chief steward"), Euphemus. Entellus, who was *a libellis*, i.e. in charge of petitions, is not addressed as a broker, but it may be assumed that he too, functioned as one. Finally, Martial, like Statius, celebrates the first cutting of the locks of Earinus, a cupbearer and favourite of Domitian.

But not all of Martial's addressees pursued a career, whether as senator, knight or imperial freedman. There were also those persons one might call "gentlemen of leisure": members of the senatorial and (especially) the equestrian order, who—for whatever reasons—had foregone a career and devoted themselves to more private occupations. A probable representative of this type is one of Martial's most frequent addressees, Faustinus, who receives nineteen epigrams, but is never praised for any kind of oratorical, political, or military activity; what does receive attention is his literary production and his life of cultured leisure at his villas, of which four are individually praised⁹⁶. However, because Martial sometimes addresses a politi-

⁹³ See Courtney 1980: 207, Vassileiou 1984, B.W. Jones 1992: 69–70.

⁹⁴ See p. 343.

⁹⁵ On these see pp. 345–349.

⁹⁶ Literary production: 1.25; cf. 6.61 (60). Villas: 3.58 (*a uilla rustica* at Baiae; cf. 3.47); 4.57, 5.71, 7.80 (Tibur); 5.71 (Trebula); 10.51 (Anxur; but cf. n. 98). Citroni 1975: 86 and Howell 1980: 161 still consider it possible that Martial's Faustinus is the same as the Faustinus who is mentioned in the epigram found in the "grotta di Tiberio" at Sperlonga (*AE* 1967, 85 = 49 Courtney 1995), and Tandoi 1988 (written in 1969) even used the identification for wide-ranging speculations (as does, in a different manner, Hampe 1972, esp. 45–57), but it is now generally agreed that the Sperlonga epigram is much later: see Leppert 1978, Riemann 1980: 377 with n. 96, and Courtney 1995: 272. Recently, Bowersock 1994: 37–38 has revived the old identification (Hallström 1910) of Martial's Faustinus with the Faustinus addressed by Antonius Diogenes in his *Wonders beyond Thule* (cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 166, 111a.32–33); he has been seconded by Stramaglia 1999: 97–98, who connects this

cian without paying explicit attention to his career, it cannot be quite excluded that Faustinus was a politician after all; in that case he might be identified with Cn. Minicius Faustinus (*suff.* 91)⁹⁷. If on the other hand he was indeed a “gentleman of leisure”, the word “leisure”, which is a good summary of the impression conveyed by Martial, may nevertheless not be quite adequate to the underlying reality, of which poem 10.51 perhaps gives a glimpse: Faustinus longs to leave for his villa at Anxur (Terracina), but is kept in Rome by occupations which leave him “tired” (15)⁹⁸. When these occupations were not political, they were conceivably of a commercial kind: that would be in line both with Faustinus’ wealth and with Martial’s reticence about his activities—for commerce was not something openly to be boasted of by those who wished to be counted among the happy few⁹⁹.

This type of person is frequent in Statius’ *Silvae*, and it is not surprising that three of the six addressees Martial shares with Statius can be assigned to it: Atedius Melior, the splendid host, Claudius Etruscus, the owner of luxurious baths, and Novius Vindex, the *collectionneur* of precious *objets d’art*¹⁰⁰. Other representatives of the type in Martial include Castricus, who is complimented as the owner

hypothesis with the speculations of Tandoi. But even if Antonius Diogenes should indeed have written under Domitian (rather than in the second century), the identification is far from compelling: Faustinus was a common *cognomen* (Kajanto 1965: 272), and there is no evidence that Antonius Diogenes ever went to Rome or Martial’s Faustinus to the Greek East, or more specifically to Aphrodisias, where Antonius Diogenes may have been based (Bowersock 1994: 38–40).

⁹⁷ Cf. p. 161. Syme 1982–83: 254 = *RP* 4.106 states that Faustinus “does not look like a senator”, presumably because “through the years Faustinus is discovered only once at Rome (X 51)”, but in many poems the place of residence is not specified and could be Rome.

⁹⁸ Damon 1997: 162, n. 37, suggests that *Faustine* (5) in this poem is an error for *Frontine* (cf. 10.58); if so, the poems for Faustinus would look even more homogeneous. On the other hand, it would not be possible to refer this poem to Frontinus’ consulate in 98, because there seems to be a laudatory reference to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* (14), which dates the poem to before the death of Domitian in 96. Moreover, Frontinus’ consulate fell in January (cf. Plin. *Pan.* 61.6), whereas the poem is from May (1–2).

⁹⁹ On this theme see p. 310.

¹⁰⁰ They are more fully discussed in the chapters on Statius; see esp. pp. 226–229.

of a villa and as a poet, and someone mentioned only with his *praenomen*, Publius, who is teased as something of a dandy¹⁰¹.

Somewhat less certain is the case of Flaccus (who has already been discussed) and Terentius Priscus; both occur together in 8.45, where Terentius Priscus’ safe return from Sicily prompts Martial to express his hope that Flaccus too will return unharmed—he from Cyprus (cf. 9.90). Although it cannot be excluded that these journeys were undertaken in official mission¹⁰², it is quite conceivable that Flaccus and Priscus travelled on business. We have seen that Flaccus was associated in Martial’s mind with Maecenas; the same holds for Priscus. After his return to Spain, Martial proclaims that he has finally found his Maecenas in Terentius Priscus, adding that now, after Domitian’s death, it is safe to be generous, but that Priscus had already supported him under the tyranny (12.3 [4 + 6.7–12])¹⁰³. Indeed, in the earlier books there are a number of poems addressed to a Priscus, in one of which we hear of literary interests—it is a plausible guess that we are dealing with Terentius Priscus throughout¹⁰⁴. A third person to be associated with Maecenas by Martial is Voconius Victor, who is praised as the famous author of verses on his beloved

¹⁰¹ He is identified by Balland 1998: 53–59 with the young Hadrian, who however appears too young: at the time of 2.57, e.g., where Publius’ taste in mantles is mentioned (3), Hadrian was only around ten years old.

¹⁰² Eck 1983 conjectures that Flaccus may have been a quaestor or a proconsular legate (193, n. 522) and Terentius Priscus a proconsul (203, n. 579); Howell 1980: 242 and Henriksen 1998–99: 1.172 and 2.130–31, both following the unpublished dissertation of P. White, think that Flaccus went to Cyprus as a proconsul. Cf. above, n. 63.

¹⁰³ That the lines traditionally numbered 12.6.7–12 belong with 12.4 (in the traditional numbering) was proved by Immisch 1911 and has been accepted in all editions published since then.

¹⁰⁴ The Priscus of 9.77 wrote a book on the question *Quod optimum sit ... convivium* (1), a theme dear to Plutarch (the author of nine books of *Quaestiones convivales*), who dedicated his *De oraculorum defectu* to a Terentius Priscus (409d), probably the same person (Dessau 1911: 160, n. 2). The Priscus of 6.18 had Spanish contacts, and is therefore also to be identified with Terentius; the other (real) Prisci occur at 7.46, 8.12, and 10.3. Immisch 1911: 501–03 distinguishes epigrams to Terentius Priscus the father from epigrams to Terentius Priscus the son, but his chronological arguments are not conclusive, and I prefer to believe (with C.P. Jones 1971: 60, n. 74) that Martial addresses only one Terentius Priscus, and (with Shackleton Bailey 1993: 320–21) that the *pater* of 12.62.14 is this Terentius Priscus himself.

boy Thestylus (7.29). He may be identical with the Voconius whose lascivious poetry was commemorated by Hadrian in a funerary epigram, and who is called an *amicus* of that emperor by Apuleius (*Apol.* 11)¹⁰⁵; if so, we have another indication that he belonged to the upper class.

After his return to Spain, Martial was supported not only by Terentius Priscus, but also by Marcella, a wealthy and cultured woman; she was rich enough to provide the poet with a small estate, and she appreciated being complimented on the urbanity of her conversation¹⁰⁶. Marcella belonged to the provincial upper-class, but in the capital, too, there were educated ladies who took an interest in poets¹⁰⁷. Martial associated with at least two of them who were well-connected: Mummia Nigrina, whom he praises for sharing her inherited wealth with her husband, the senator Antistius Rusticus (*suff.* 90), and Argentaria Polla, said to be endowed with "wealth" (*censu*) and "blood" (*sanguine*) by Statius (*Silv.* 2.7.86), and widow of the poet Lucan¹⁰⁸. Other women addressed by Martial need not have been of high status¹⁰⁹.

In general, quite a few of Martial's addressees seem to have been social equals. We have seen that he addressed the invitation poem 10.48 not only to the patrician Stella and the wealthy Flaccus, but

¹⁰⁵ Hadr. fr. 2 (Courtney 1993: 382; *FPL*³ 344). This Voconius is usually identified (thus by Courtney) with the Voconius Romanus who receives a number of letters from Pliny, but that is unlikely (see Fein 1994: 104–06, Balland 1998: 50 with n. 62). I assume that Voconius Victor, who is mentioned with his full name only in 7.29, is the same as the Victor of 11.78, a ribald wedding poem which picks up the theme of preferring boys over women from 7.29.

¹⁰⁶ 12.21 and 31; the old romantic view, that she became Martial's wife (cf. e.g. Lessing 1973: 481 = 11.270–71 Lachmann–Muncker) is certainly incorrect.

¹⁰⁷ On women as patrons of poets see Hemelrijk 1999: 97–145 (esp. 128–42 on non-imperial women, for whom Martial and Statius provide the only direct evidence)..

¹⁰⁸ Mummia Nigrina: 4.75, 9.30; on her identity and that of her husband see Syme 1983b = *RP* 4.278–94. Argentaria Polla: 7.21–23, 10.64; on her identity see Nisbet 1978, with my discussion at pp. 223–225.

¹⁰⁹ These are: Aratulla, whose brother was exiled on Sardinia (8.32); Sabina in Atesta (10.93; discussed by Hemelrijk 1999: 139–40 as a patroness, although there are no indications of asymmetry); Claudia Rufina, of British descent, who is congratulated on the birth of a child (11.53); cf. also the poetess Sulpicia (10.35 and 38). The Lesbia of 5.68 (if real) will have been a courtesan.

also to four people who seemed to be without strong political or economic assets: Nepos, Canius Rufus, Julius Cerialis and Lupus. Three of Martial's most frequent addressees belong in this category¹¹⁰.

Q. Ovidius can be compared with Nepos, because he too was a neighbour at Nomentum; like Martial, he owned a vineyard there¹¹¹. In 7.93 Martial complains that Ovidius spends too much time at Narnia (in Umbria), where he may have owned further possessions, but more probably went to visit at the villa of some patron¹¹². Ovidius was a man who took social obligations seriously: he followed the consular Caesonius Maximus in exile, and later planned on leaving Nomentum in order to accompany an *amicus* to Britain¹¹³. As in the case of Martial himself, moderate wealth did not imply exemption from the duties of a client.

Another friend of more or less equal social position was A. Pudens, who appears in 1.31 as a centurion, with the ambition of becoming *primipilus*, the senior centurion of his legion; in 5.48 the promotion has materialised, and a year later, in 6.58, Martial anticipates his return home as a Roman knight¹¹⁴. This is in accordance with what we know about the *primipilate*: it lasted a year and automatically led to the bestowal of equestrian rank; after his period of service the *primipilaris* could either stay on in the emperor's service or take his retirement, upon which he received a fee of 600,000 sesterces (one and a half times the minimum amount necessary to

¹¹⁰ There are others less frequently mentioned, such as Juvenal, later to become famous as a satirist, whose life as a client is graphically described in 12.18.

¹¹¹ 13.119, 1.105; cf. 9.98, where *Ouidi* is isolated vocative in a poem on a fraudulent wine-merchant. That he was a good friend of Martial appears from 9.52–53, on his birthday.

¹¹² One wealthy Roman who owned a villa there was Pompeia Celerina, Pliny's mother-in-law (*Ep.* 1.4.1). Citroni 1975: 321 states that Ovidius also owned a Sabine property, but in 10.44.9 *Sabinis* must refer to his Nomentan estate (Nomentum was often considered Sabine: Verg. *A.* 7.712, Strb. 5.3.1, Plin. *Nat.* 3.107). Kleijwegt 1998: 270–72 thinks Ovidius was a patron, who moreover humiliated Martial by not accepting a gift (9.53; but cf. for a more positive reading Henriksen 1998–99: 2.28).

¹¹³ Exile with Caesonius Maximus: 7.44–45 (from 44.5 it appears that Maximus was a consular); on the background cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.71, where the manuscripts give the *nomen* as Caesennius. Planned journey to Britain: 10.44, surely this time not to accompany an exile (as Kleijwegt 1998: 272 proposes), but a governor or a legionary legate.

¹¹⁴ The correct interpretation of these poems has been established by Citroni 1982.

qualify as a knight)¹¹⁵. This seems to be what Pudens has done, for from Book 7 onwards we find him settled at Rome, pursuing his interest in poetry and boys¹¹⁶. In fact, *primipilares* were not the boorish and uncouth “varicose centurions” of the satirical tradition, but respected members of society, some of whom Pliny the Younger counted among his friends—and even the satirist Juvenal did not deny that the primipilate left a man well-off¹¹⁷.

In the same context Juvenal mentions the pleading of cases (14.192), and this could have been the career pursued by another of Martial’s close friends, Julius Martialis (the identical *cognomen* does not indicate kinship). The evidence for this comes in a poem in which Martial imagines a life of *dolce far niente* shared with his friend:

nec nos atria nec domos potentum
nec litis tetricas forumque triste
nossemus nec imagines superbas (5.20.5–7)

We would know neither the halls nor the houses of the mighty, nor grim lawsuits or the gloomy Forum, nor haughty ancestor busts

Line 6 could refer to practice as a lawyer, but Martial repeatedly declares that he neither is nor wants to be a lawyer¹¹⁸, so that the reference would have to be to Julius alone. This is difficult to reconcile with the use of the first person plural, and it is more likely that line 6, like lines 5 and 7, refers to the duties of a client: while 5 and 7 must refer to the duty of greeting the patron at the *salutatio*, 6 could refer to the duty of applauding his speeches in the law-courts. This would mean that Julius Martialis too was involved, like Martial, in the tedi-

¹¹⁵ Cf. Dobson 1970 and 1978: 115–27.

¹¹⁶ Poetry: 7.11, 8.63, 9.81; in the earlier books: 4.29. Boys: 8.63; in the earlier books: 13.69 (with Shackleton Bailey’s apparatus), 1.31, 5.48. Martial also knew Pudens’ townsman from Sarsina, Caesius Sabinus (7.97), who was a local benefactor, as appears from 9.58 and from inscriptions (cf. *PIR*² C 205). Cf. further *PIR*² P 1069.

¹¹⁷ The satirical tradition: Pers. 3.77–87, 5.189–91 (*uaricosos centuriones*), Juv. 14.193–98 (197 *locupletem*). Pliny’s friends: *Ep.* 6.25, 7.11.4, 10.87. Martial has two epitaphs on centurions: 1.93 (two *primipilares*) and 10.26.

¹¹⁸ See 1.17, 2.30, 2.90 (to Quintilian); cf. 12.68. Allen a.o. 1969–70: 348, Hardie 1983: 54–55 and others are wrong to suppose that Martial did plead cases; poem 8.17 is no evidence, since the “I” there is clearly fictional.

ous obligations of attending on the powerful¹¹⁹. As we have seen, it is no argument against this hypothesis that Julius was a man of some wealth. In 4.64 Martial praises his villa on the Ianiculum¹²⁰: a small property, but exquisitely situated, with a view of Rome, yet undisturbed by the dust and noise of Rome; in 7.17 we learn that it was equipped with a library. Martial’s tone in the first poem is admiring, in the second modest, and this might be taken as a sign of asymmetry; moreover Martial calls Julius (by implication) *diues*, a term which he never appropriates for himself¹²¹. On the other hand, Martial repeatedly testifies to a very affectionate relationship—but we have seen that this does not necessarily imply the absence of asymmetry¹²².

Looking back on this survey¹²³, we may state that many among Martial’s addressees had greater financial and/ or political resources, i.e. greater power, than he himself, but that he also addressed many people who had about equal resources (setting aside the resource of poetry). The members of the first group fulfil one criterion for being patrons, the members of the second group fall short of this criterion and therefore cannot be called patrons. This raises the question whether it is really enlightening to distinguish poems for patrons from poems for other addressees, in other words whether patronage is a relevant parameter at all. But to answer that question we have to consider the other two criteria.

¹¹⁹ This is the view of Howell 1980: 141–42, who argued that Julius was a client, but not a lawyer; Howell 1995: 100 suggests that he may have been a lawyer as well as a client (similarly Kleijwegt 1998: 273–75). Citroni 1975: 61–62 (and apparently Sullivan 1991: 17) holds that he was a lawyer, but not a client.

¹²⁰ From Martial’s topographical indications (esp. 18–24) it appears that the villa was not on the Ianiculum proper (i.e. the Gianicolo), but more to the North, on Monte Mario; see most recently Neumeister 1991: 216–17.

¹²¹ At 4.64.30 Martial compares Julius’ villa to that *facti modo diuitis Molorchii*. On Martial not calling himself *diues* see above, p. 54 with n. 47.

¹²² This may be illustrated from 1.107, addressed to *Luci carissime Iuli*, who might be the same as Julius Martialis (against Howell 1980: 328): in that poem Martial (jokingly) proposes that his dear friend should emulate Maecenas, so that we find affection combined with asymmetry.

¹²³ I have not discussed the many cases where the social position of an addressee cannot be determined at all. I list some who occur more than once: Caedicianus, Safronius Rufus, Fabullus, the father of Camonius Rufus (a wealthy man if Sullivan 1991: 31 is right in suggesting that he was Martial’s host at Forum Corneli), Dexter.

Duration

In the preceding section I have focused on persons addressed on more than one occasion, thereby anticipating the criterion of duration. But, as has been explained in the Introduction, one can only speak of patronage if the relationship does not only have a certain duration, but is also of a personal nature. In order to ascertain whether the latter was the case, one would have to examine each relationship as such, but a shortcut can be made by considering the terminology used by Martial. When Martial characterises an addressee as his *amicus* or *sodalis* (or himself as the *amicus* or *sodalis* of his addressee), or when he uses the words *amicitia* or *amare*, or when he calls someone *meus* or *noster* (or is called *meus* by the other), we have an indication of a personal relationship. Such terminology is found for most of the addressees considered in the previous section¹²⁴, but not for all of them; the major exceptions are Aquilius Regulus, Silius Italicus, Instanius Rufus, and Terentius Priscus. Martial's relationships with Silius and Regulus will be analysed in Chapter 3, where it will appear that Martial was a regular guest and companion of the latter, but seems to have been less close to the former, although close enough to console him on the death of his son (9.86)¹²⁵. As for Instanius Rufus, it will be argued in Chapter 2 that Martial was a boon companion, and it will be noted in Chapter 3 that 12.95 is a rather obscene jest, which Martial certainly could not have allowed himself if there had not been some degree of intimacy¹²⁶. Terentius Priscus, finally, the "Maecenas" of Book 12, receives

¹²⁴ In the order in which they have been discussed: Stella (*meus* at 1.7.1 and 4.5.11.2, 5.12.7, 6.47.1, 7.14.5, 12.2 [3].10), Flaccus (*meus* at 7.87.1), Fuscus (Martial wishes to become his *amicus* and *sodalis* at 1.54), Domitius Apollinaris (*meus* at 7.26.1 and 10, *noster* at 7.89.2; Martial is among his *amici* at 10.12.9), Antonius Primus (*amicitia* at 9.99.6, *amicus* at 10.73.1 [see p. 82, n. 157]), Decianus (*amicus* at 1.39.1; 2.*ep.* is addressed *Deciano suo*), Maternus (*noster* at 1.96.2, *sodalis* at 10.37.3), Paulus (he is supposed to call Martial *meus* at 7.72.16), Marcellinus (Martial is his *amicus* at 6.25.3), Norbanus (Martial entertains *amicitia* with him and is his *amicus* at 9.84; cf. below), Faustinus (*noster* at 3.58.1, *amicus* at 4.10.3; Martialis is his *amicus* at 7.80.5), Q. Ovidius (*amicus* at 9.52.6), A. Pudens (*amat* Martial at 7.11.3, *meus* at 8.63.4), Julius Martialis (*sodalis* at 1.15.1 and 12.34.10).

¹²⁵ See pp. 149–155.

¹²⁶ See pp. 101 and 165.

marks of affections already much earlier, e.g. in 8.45, where Martial shows himself overjoyed at Priscus' return from Sicily. So we can conclude that those relationships which are proved to have been of some duration by the mere fact that Martial wrote poetry on more than one occasion also had a personal character; in any case there is nothing resembling the impersonal relationship between employer and employee¹²⁷.

But even if we have poetry from Martial on only one occasion, there may have been a relationship of some duration, because there may have been interactions which did not leave identifiable traces in the books as we have them. Such traces could be of two kinds. In the first place, it evidently happened that Martial offered poetry to a person without mentioning that person; this was the case especially when the function of the poetry did not consist in publicising or memorising the addressee's name. In this way we can explain how in 4.82 Martial could ask Rufus to commend to Venuleius "these books, too" (*Hos quoque ... libellos*: 1), even though there is no epigram addressing Venuleius in any of the previous books (or in any of the following ones, for that matter): Venuleius will earlier have received books from Martial, but these did not contain epigrams which immortalised his name¹²⁸.

The second possibility is that the poet rendered services to his patron not by offering manuscripts of poetry, but by participating in sessions of recitation, improvisation, or literary talk, or simply by providing company (as Horace, Virgil, and other literary men accompanied Maecenas on a political mission¹²⁹). Thus, in a poem addressed to Frontinus, Martial recalls how at Frontinus' villa at Anxur (Terracina) "I had leisure to cultivate with you the poetic Muses" (10.58.5–6). Here it is the literary companionship which proves the duration.

But could it not happen that a poet was invited only once, for a single visit, serving a single, specific purpose? We might seem to have an example of this in 9.43–44, a pair of epigrams celebrating a

¹²⁷ Cf. Introduction, p. 22.

¹²⁸ Venuleius probably is L. Venuleius Montanus Apronianus (*suff.* 92); cf. Syme 1980a: 40–41, 57.

¹²⁹ Cf. Hor. S. 1.5. On companionship as a service provided by poets see White 1993: 23–25.

statuette representing Hercules, newly acquired by Novius Vindex, who is not addressed elsewhere in Martial¹³⁰; because Statius too describes the statuette, in terms very similar to Martial's¹³¹, it looks as if Vindex had simply invited a number of poets for the purpose of getting his acquisition publicised, without having necessarily cared for these poets beforehand or intending to protect them in the future. But Statius speaks of Vindex as a friend¹³², and Martial, too, may have known him for some time when he celebrated the statuette¹³³. Already in Book 4 he had written about the death, and more particularly about the testament, of a certain Vestinus, who is probably to be identified with a friend of Vindex of that name, mentioned by Statius¹³⁴. And even though testaments were favourite topics of gossip¹³⁵, it would be anomalous if Martial used an epigram merely to report the talk of the town: more probably, he wrote to please one of Vestinus' friends, perhaps Vindex.

Sometimes an addressee is mentioned in only one of Martial's epigrams, but is nevertheless termed *amicus*, *sodalis*, *meus* or the like¹³⁶. The most interesting example is the only epigram mentioning Norbanus, one of the suppressers of the revolt of Saturninus:

¹³⁰ The Novius of 1.86 is poor and for that reason cannot be identified with Vindex (Howell 1980: 290–91 is right against Citroni 1975: 267); the Novius who is seen playing the *ludus latruncularum* in 7.72.7–8 might be Vindex, but he is incidentally mentioned, not addressed.

¹³¹ *Silv.* 4.6; see pp. 102 and 256.

¹³² Statius calls Vindex *noster* and talks of the *honorem quem de me ... meretur* (*Silv.* 4.ep. 13–15); cf. also 4.6.12 (*uerus amor* reigning at Vindex' board).

¹³³ In Shackleton Bailey's text of Mart. 9.43, with the humanist conjecture *Alcides modo Vindicem rogabam* in 1, the phrase *risit, nam solet hoc* in 3 would refer to Vindex, and would constitute a sure indication of familiarity. But Kershaw 1997 and Henriksén 1998: 1.212–13 seem right in defending *Alciden modo Vindicis rogabam* (the reading of one branch of the manuscripts, while the other has *Alciden .. Vindicem*). One may compare Tull. *Gem. 7 GP = APl.* 103, in which another Lysippan statue of Hercules answers the poet's questions.

¹³⁴ Mart. 4.73; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.93–95 with Coleman 1988: 192, and see below, p. 229.

¹³⁵ For public discussion of wills cf. Plin. *Ep.* 7.24 and 8.18 and see Champlin 1991: 18–21.

¹³⁶ Cf., apart from Norbanus, to be discussed in the text: Fronto (1.55; *Martialis* is *tuus* at 1), Caecilius Secundus (only at 7.84, if he is not identical with the Secundus

Cum tua sacrilegos contra, Norbane, furores
staret pro domino Caesare sancta fides,
haec ego Pieria ludebam tutus in umbra,
ille tuae cultor notus amicitiae.
Me tibi Vindelici Raetus narrabat in oris 5
nescia nec nostri nominis Arctos erat:
o quotiens ueterem non infitatus amicum
dixisti: "Meus est iste poeta, meus!"
Omne tibi nostrum quod bis trieteride iuncta
ante dabat lector, nunc dabit auctor opus. (9.84)

When against sacrilegious frenzy your pious loyalty, Norbanus, was standing firm for Lord Caesar, I toyed with these verses, safe in the Muses' shade, I, that noted cultivator of your friendship. (5) The Raetian in the land of the Vindelici told you about me, and the North was conversant with my name. O, how often you acknowledged your old friend and said: "He is mine, that poet, mine!" All my work that these past six years you used to get from a reader, you will now get from the author.

Martial claims to be an "old friend" (*uetus amicus*), even "that noted cultivator of your friendship (*amicitia*)", which is surprising in view of the absence of Norbanus' name from Martial's published epigrams before or since. Also, the relationship cannot have been all that intensive, because in the six years that Norbanus had been away on duty, Martial had not kept up the contact, resuming it only when Norbanus was returning to Rome to become Prefect of the Guard¹³⁷. Martial glosses over his embarrassing negligence with a pleasing fancy: trusting in the wide dissemination of his books, he imagines that whenever a *lector* read popular poetry to Norbanus, the latter would promptly acknowledge that these verses were the work of "his own poet", his "old friend" Martial¹³⁸. The reality must have been less flattering, but Martial cannot have appealed to a connection that

of 5.80; *meus* at 1, *sodalis* at 5), Cerrinus (8.18; Martial is his *amicus* at 3 [and cf. 9]), Arcanüs (8.72; *amicus* at 8), Flavus (10.104; *noster* at 1).

¹³⁷ Book 9 is from 94 or 95, Norbanus was certainly Prefect of the Guard in 96 (D. C. 67.15.2), so that the appointment seems to have been the reason for his return.

¹³⁸ Shackleton Bailey 1990: 307 and 1993: 2.305, n. *e* states that the *lector* is someone who had sent the books from Rome, whereas Henriksén 1998–99: 2.115 thinks of a "brother in arms" who had taken them with him, but it is more natural to connect the *lector* with the inhabitants of the North, mentioned at 5–6, who recited Martial's verses to Norbanus.

had not existed at all: that would have made him liable to refutation and ridicule. So some kind of *amicitia* there must have been, and the claims to be derived from that must have been strong enough to bridge a gap of no less than six years.

We may be reminded of Pliny, who is likewise addressed only once in Martial, but nevertheless spoke of *amicitia*, and in the name of that *amicitia* wrote an obituary of Martial about six years after he had received the epigram¹³⁹. Pliny conceived of his *amicitia* with Martial as an exchange of gifts, and that leads to the third criterion of patronage.

Reciprocity

No other poet in Graeco-Roman Antiquity talks so often and so openly about the exchange of money, goods, and services as does Martial¹⁴⁰. As always, it is important to distinguish between poems with real and poems with fictional addressees. I will begin with the former category, dealing first with poems about gifts *given* by Martial, then with poems about gifts *received* by him.

There are about a dozen epigrams which were written to accompany material (i.e. non-poetic) gifts from Martial¹⁴¹. In a few cases the recipients are not named, otherwise they mostly belong to Martial's most frequent contacts, especially to those of high status, such as Regulus, Stella, and Flaccus. But we also find Martial's social equal Juvenal, who receives the traditional present of nuts for the Saturnalia (7.91). The gifts to the other recipients are hardly more substantial: Regulus receives incense and a book on one occasion (1.111) and foodstuffs on another (7.31), Flaccus gets cheap cups (12.74), and Stella earthenware (5.59). These are not gifts which are very valuable in themselves; often they are sent on ritualised occa-

¹³⁹ The only epigram in which Martial addresses Pliny, 10.20 (19), must have been written between 95 and 98, Pliny's obituary, *Ep.* 3.21, between 101 and 104 (see above, n. 1). The Secundus of 5.80 could conceivably be Pliny (the passion for the *lima* [13] would fit), but that epigram is addressed to Severus.

¹⁴⁰ For some general comments, treating the epigrams mainly as comments on the ethics of gift-giving, cf. Spisak 1998.

¹⁴¹ 1.111, 2.85, 4.19, 5.59, 7.31, 7.49, 7.89, 7.91, 9.54, 9.60, 10.94, 12.74.

sions for gift-giving such as the Saturnalia¹⁴². Basically, they are compliments, made the more agreeable by the pleasant verses which accompany them; their function is to maintain the relationship and at the same time to symbolise it¹⁴³. In that respect, the very lack of material value of Martial's gifts is part of their message, symbolising his comparative poverty. This message is often articulated in the accompanying poetry. Thus, when Martial is sending foodstuffs to Regulus, he emphasises that they are not from his Nomentan farm, which he presents as sterile; when sending cheap cups to Flaccus, he draws a contrast with the crystal goblets Flaccus imports from Egypt; and when sending earthenware to Stella, he writes:

Quod non argentum, quod non tibi mittimus aurum,
hoc facimus causa, Stella diserte, tua.
Quisquis magna dedit, uoluit sibi magna remitti;
fictilibus nostris exoneratus eris. (5.59)

If I do not send you silver and do not send you gold, I do so, eloquent Stella, for your own sake. People who give much, want to receive much in return. By my earthenware you shall be acquitted.

This draws attention to another function of gifts: that of serving as a "hook", as Martial puts it elsewhere (5.18.7). The size of a gift sets a standard for the exchange. Here, Martial unexpectedly disclaims interest in a large return, affecting a wish to spare Stella the expense. By a witty paradox, he symbolises the strength of his friendship by the smallness of his gift¹⁴⁴.

Much more frequent than material gifts are gifts of collections of Martial's own poetry. Whether these collections were published books or informal manuscripts will be discussed in Chapter 2, what value they had for their recipients in Chapter 3. Here I limit myself to two observations. First, the great majority of Martial's real addressees were recipients of epigrams accompanying collections of his own

¹⁴² At least 2.85, 4.19, 7.91 accompany gifts sent for the Saturnalia (cf. 5.18). 9.54 was sent on the *cara cognatio* (cf. 9.55), 7.89 perhaps on a (return of a) wedding (see p. 160 with n. 51).

¹⁴³ On the various types and functions of gifts see Veyne 1976: 74–84 and Baudy 1987.

¹⁴⁴ Less wittily, in 9.55 Martial explains to Stella and Flaccus that he has sent them nothing on the *cara cognatio* in order not to offend others who could also claim a gift from him.

poetry¹⁴⁵. Secondly, these collections were often explicitly described by Martial as *dona*, *munera*, etc.¹⁴⁶, and, like the non-poetic gifts, were regularly offered by him on institutionalised occasions for gift-giving, such as the Saturnalia¹⁴⁷. So on the one hand Martial's gifts of poetry were part of his general gift-giving, on the other hand his gift-giving had a special character, because his most frequent and important gifts were poems.

When we look at gifts received by Martial, we find a similar picture. The receipt of gifts is acknowledged in no more than some eight poems addressed to real addressees. Twice Martial receives food-stuffs from persons with (presumably) about equal or smaller material resources (7.27, 9.72), otherwise rather valuable gifts from persons with greater resources: togas from the imperial chamberlain Parthenius (8.28; cf. 9.49) and from the retired general Antonius Primus (10.73)¹⁴⁸, roof-tiles from patrician Stella (7.36), a precious silver bowl from the senatorial politician Instanius Rufus (8.50 [51]), and a chaise from Aelianus, who cannot be identified with certainty, but may well have been another senatorial politician (12.24)¹⁴⁹; when back in Spain, Martial thanks Terentius Priscus for generosity in general (12.3 [4]) and Marcella for a small estate (12.31). If this amounted to a complete inventory of the gifts received by Martial, there would be scant reason to attach much importance to exchange, especially since in only one of these poems (12.3 [4]) there is an explicit indication that the gifts were offered as a reward for or an incentive to writing. But Martial's poetry books were not his account-books. Even if the genre of the epigram allows him greater freedom to speak of the material aspects of patronage than Statius' more formal *Silvae*, where these aspects are hardly ever men-

¹⁴⁵ There is a full list of the relevant epigrams in Citroni 1988: 33, n. 54 = 1996: 55, n. 56; forty-odd addressees are represented.

¹⁴⁶ *Dona*: 7.84, 9.58; *munera*, etc.: 1.111, 3.2, 4.10, 7.17, 7.42, 7.80; cf. also 9.99. Often Martial simply uses the verb *dare*: 1.111, 7.26, 7.42, etc.

¹⁴⁷ 4.14, 5.30, 7.28, 10.18 (17), 11.15, 12.62. The collection accompanied by 10.87 was sent on a birthday (cf. p. 105 with n. 56).

¹⁴⁸ Shackleton Bailey (1990 and 1993) identifies the giver in 10.73 as a M. Severus, but see below, p. 82, n. 157.

¹⁴⁹ On the identification with L. Roscius Aelianus Maecius Celer (*suff.* 100) see Syme 1982–83: 243 = *RP* 4.96 (and 1985c: 194 = *RP* 5.642).

tioned¹⁵⁰, Martial too was bound by rules of tact, politeness, and convention. Thus, he never acknowledges cash gifts, although Pliny's letter is evidence enough that he did receive them¹⁵¹.

Moreover, if we take into account the epigrams to fictional addressees, we recognise that cash gifts and other money benefits were an important part of exchange in everyday life. Martial's "I" only once acknowledges receipt of a cash gift, and there the amount is only HS 6,000 (4.76), but expectations run as high as HS 200,000 (5.82)¹⁵²; in another poem (4.61), a fictional addressee boasts of having actually received HS 200,000. A special kind of large cash gift was help towards meeting the equestrian census of HS 400,000; although Martial himself stood in no need of this, he regularly complains that the practice has gone out of fashion¹⁵³. Loans may also be included under cash gifts, especially because it was not self-evident that they would be paid back; the amounts involved vary from HS 5,000 to HS 400,000, with four cases of HS 100,000¹⁵⁴. Inheritances and legacies, finally, were an important type of money benefit. In this case, there can of course be no complaints to an addressee for having given too little, but a few poems go as far as asking an addressee to die soon¹⁵⁵, and many comment on the *captatio*, i.e. the "hunting" of inheritances and legacies, by third parties¹⁵⁶; Martial presents one person (the same one who boasted of having received a

¹⁵⁰ See pp. 240–244.

¹⁵¹ Cf. further below, p. 81

¹⁵² See further 2.24, 4.37, 7.92, 9.46, 10.11, 12.53.

¹⁵³ See 14.122, 4.67 (the amount involved specified as HS 100,000), 5.19, 5.25. In 12.3 (4 + 6.7–12) Martial flatters Nerva by stating that the practice has been resumed.

¹⁵⁴ On (not) paying back: 1.75, 2.3, 3.41 (40), 6.5, 6.30, 8.9, 8.37, 11.76; further requests for (or comments on) loans: 2.30, 2.44, 4.15 ("I" the lender), 6.20, 7.92, 9.102, 10.15 (14), 10.19 (18), 11.76, 12.25.

¹⁵⁵ See 5.39, 11.67, 12.40, 12.73, and cf. 10.97. In 9.48 "I" is after an inheritance without specifying a wish for the death of the testator.

¹⁵⁶ A full list of passages on *captatio* in ancient authors is given by Champlin 1991: 201–02 (but subtract Mart. 3.52, 5.18, 6.27, 12.56, and add 2.76, 10.97, 11.67). In his discussion of the phenomenon (87–102) Champlin rightly stresses that the object of the "hunting" was usually the whole inheritance, so that it is inaccurate to speak of "legacy hunting", although sometimes the stake did consist in a legacy, as at Mart. 2.76 (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 133) and 9.8 (9), and in the stories about Regulus told by Plin. *Ep.* 2.20.

"Accipe diuitias et uatum maximus esto;
tu licet et nostrum" dixit "Alexin ames". (8.55 [56].5–12)

(5) Let there be such as Maecenas, Flaccus, then such as Maro will not be lacking: yes, your own lands will give you a Virgil. Tityrus had lost his acres near to unlucky Cremona, and wept in distress at the abduction of his sheep. With a laugh the Tuscan knight dispelled malignant poverty, (10) telling it to retreat in haste. "Here is wealth; now be the greatest poet", he said, "you may even love my slave Alexis".

The phrase "near to unlucky Cremona" (7) is a quotation from Virgil's ninth eclogue (28), where Menalcas is reported to have retrieved confiscated land with the help of his poetry. Menalcas was taken as an allegory for Virgil by Martial's contemporary Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.6.46–47) and apparently by Martial himself, even though at the same time he calls Virgil "Tityrus" on the basis of his allegorical reading of the first eclogue. In the biographical tradition about Virgil, the retrieval of the land is attributed to the help of other patrons, among them Asinius Pollio¹⁶², but Martial wishes to concentrate all the features of a beneficent patron in Maecenas. This can also be observed in his treatment of Alexis, the slave boy passionately desired by Corydon in the second eclogue. In the biographical tradition Alexis is supposed to stand for an Alexander, given to Virgil by Asinius Pollio¹⁶³, but in Martial it is Maecenas who made the gift. The effect on Virgil, Martial supposes, was that he gave up the lowly subjects of the *Bucolics*, to become, eventually, the author of the *Aeneid* (17–20)¹⁶⁴. But Virgil was not the only poet to be enriched by Maecenas:

Quid Varios Marsosque loquar ditataque uatum
nomina, magnus erit quos numerare labor?
Ergo ego Vergilius, si munera Maecenatis
des mihi? Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero. (21–24)

Why should I mention the examples of Varius and Marsus and the names of poets made rich, whom it would be a great labour to enumer-

¹⁶² Cf. *Vita Donati* 19 (from Suetonius) and *Vita Probi*; but *Vita Donati* 63 and *Vita Servii* include Maecenas.

¹⁶³ See *Vita Donati* 9 (not certainly from Suetonius), Servius on *Ecl.* 2.1 and 15, *Apul. Apol.* 10. In Martial, Alexis appears as Virgil's beloved also at 5.16, 6.68, 7.29, 8.63, 8.73; cf. Calp. *Ecl.* 4.73–75 and perhaps Juv. 7.69.

¹⁶⁴ On these lines see Housman 1919: 74 = 1972: 3.988–89.

ate? I then, shall I be a Virgil, if you were to give me the gifts of a Maecenas? No, not a Virgil, but a Marsus.

Surprisingly, even with the support of a Maecenas, Martial would not become like Virgil, i.e. an epic poet, but like Domitius Marsus, i.e. an excellent epigrammatist¹⁶⁵.

In a number of other epigrams, Martial rings the changes on these themes. In 5.16, he implicitly asks his reading public for an Alexis, not as an inducement to write epic, but as a reward for his epigrams; the reading public, of course, feigns not to understand. In 8.73 an Alexis would make Martial write "poems that would survive" (4), but unlike in 1.107 (quoted above), the claim of survival is not connected exclusively with the higher genres, since Alexis is here lined up with the women who inspired Catullus and the elegists. On the other hand, in 11.3, when Martial promises to write "pages that will survive" (7) if a Maecenas will support him, he clearly means epic¹⁶⁶. All these epigrams discuss the nature and value of Martial's poetry, and Maecenas serves more as a focus for poetological reflections than as a norm seriously proposed. Yet in the end Martial did find his Maecenas:

Quod Flacco Varioque fuit summoque Maroni
Maecenas, ataus regibus ortus eques,
gentibus et populis hoc te mihi, Prisce Terenti,
fama fuisse loquax chartaque dicet anus. (12.3 [4].1–4)

What Horace, Varius and greatest Virgil had from Maecenas, knight sprung from regal ancestors, I had from you, Terentius Priscus. This all peoples and nations will learn from loquacious fame and papyrus grown old.

This, however, was after Martial had returned to Spain; in Rome there was no Maecenas, there were not even such patrons as Martial

¹⁶⁵ Martial voices his admiration for Marsus' epigrams in 1.*ep.*, 2.71, 2.77, 5.5, 7.99; there is the same constellation Maecenas–Virgil–Marsus and comparison of himself with Marsus in 7.29. Against the interpretation that *Marsus ero* means "I will be a bad epic poet" (cf. 4.29) see Citroni 1968: 288–89 (and already Housman 1934: 188 = 1972: 1240).

¹⁶⁶ Kay 1985: 62 regards this poem as a *recusatio*, a witty excuse not to write epic in praise of Nerva. But "quiet" Nerva (see p. 64 with n. 77) boasted of no *proelia* (8); moreover, he himself had preferred elegy to epic (8.70).

had still known under Nero. In a poem to a fictional addressee he specifies:

Libras quattuor aut duas amico
 algentemque togam breuemque laenam,
 interdum aureolos manu crepantis,
 possint ducere qui duas Kalendas,
 quod nemo nisi tu, Labulle, donas, 5
 non es, crede mihi, bonus. Quid ergo?
 Vt uerum loquar, optimus malorum es.
 Pisones Senecasque Memmiosque
 et Crispos mihi redde, sed priores (12.36.1–10)

You give your friend four pounds of silverware, or only two, and a shivering toga and a short cloak, sometimes gold pieces clattering in the hand, which are enough to cover two months' rent, (5) and you are the only one to do so, Labullus, but believe me, you are not for that reason a good man. You want to know why? To tell the truth, you are the best of the bad. The Pisones, the Senecae, the Memmii, these I would like to have back, and the Crispi—I mean the former ones¹⁶⁷.

The speaker does not in so many words claim to have enjoyed the patronage of these past worthies himself, but in another poem to a fictional addressee (4.40), Martial has his speaker regret the patronage of the Pisones and the Senecae¹⁶⁸. If we identify that speaker with Martial, we may conclude that in his first period at Rome, he had indeed been supported, if not by other members of the great families he recalls, then at least by C. Calpurnius Piso, the later conspirator, who was noted for his patronage¹⁶⁹, and by the philosopher Seneca, who was a fellow-Spaniard, a fellow-poet, and extremely

¹⁶⁷ In line 10, Shackleton Bailey 1978: 293 = 1997: 90 conjectures *seu* for *sed* and prints it in his editions, but *sed priores* refers back to *Crispos* only, and makes it clear that Martial does not mean any contemporary Crispus (in 10.15 [14] a fictional "Crispus" was a stingy patron). For this use of *sed* in Martial see Citroni 1975: 144.

¹⁶⁸ That the speaker in 12.36 does not claim personal experience of the patrons he mentions is stressed by Kleijwegt 1999: 110–114, who, however, thinks that the speaker in 4.40 cannot be identified with Martial, apparently because that speaker, complaining about his fictional addressee, implicitly admits that he has made a wrong choice of patron in the first place (1998: 265; cf. 1999: 108–10). But the speaker's naïve trust is amplified in order to underscore the enormity of the addressee's treason.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. *Laus Pis.*, Juv. 5.108–112 (with Probus' scholium on 109), Tac. *Ann.* 15.48. See Champlin 1989 for a thorough discussion of this evidence.

wealthy; indeed there are good reasons to assume that Martial's Nomentan estate was a legacy from Seneca¹⁷⁰. And perhaps Seneca's nephew, the poet Lucan, may be added to the list, because Martial addresses his widow Argentaria Polla as his *regina*, i.e. his patroness (10.64.1)¹⁷¹. However that may be, such enlightened patrons firmly belong to the past: nowadays, Martial complains, patrons count themselves generous if they give two or four pounds of silver, a toga, a cloak, or money to pay the rent for two months. So there is patronage, but not as bountiful as Martial would wish, with the consequence that the poet could not limit himself to paying court to one or two very great men. Instead of one Maecenas or Seneca, there are a great many patrons on whose support Martial is dependent.

Initiative

If there was exchange of poetry for support, we would expect, in accordance with what was said in the Introduction¹⁷², that a transaction could be initiated by the poet as well as by the patron. This is indeed what we find, although the evidence is seldom very firm.

There are only a few texts which specify that Martial is writing on request. In 10.18 (17) he says that Macer "asks" (*petit*: 2) and "demands" (*poscit*: 3) a gift of poetry for the Saturnalia. Stronger language is used in 9.89, where Stella is said to "force" (*cogis*: 2) Martial to write epigrams; the explanation for this vocabulary is that the setting of the poem is a symposium, at which Stella is acting as the

¹⁷⁰ Seneca had owned large vineyards at Nomentum (Sen. *Ep.* 104.1, 6, 110.1, *Nat.* 3.7.1; Col. 3.3.3; Plin. *Nat.* 14.49–52), Martial's estate produced wine (13.119, 10.48.19), and Martial's neighbour at Nomentum, Q. Ovidius, who also grew wine there (13.119, 1.105, 7.93, 10.44; cf. 9.98), was connected with Seneca (7.44–45). Kleijwegt 1999: 114–16 rejects Seneca as the donor, because Martial describes his estate as not very productive, whereas Seneca's vineyards were a commercial success, but Martial surely received only a small part of Seneca's possessions. He also thinks that Martial would have mentioned Seneca as his benefactor in the same way as he mentions Marcella in 12.31, but that poem celebrates a recent gift from a living benefactress, whereas Seneca had long been dead.

¹⁷¹ Kleijwegt 1999: 106–07, n. 6 mistakenly glosses *regina* as "patron of the arts", denying its implications for a personal relationship, but cf. above, p. 16, with n. 51.

¹⁷² See p. 28.

master of the feast, enforcing a convivial “law” (*Lege*: 1)¹⁷³. A symposiastic background may perhaps also be assumed for 11.42, where Caecilianus “demands” (*poscas*: 1) lively epigrams, but sets lifeless themes. Not individual epigrams, but a whole book is at issue in the letter to Terentius Priscus prefacing Book 12, where Martial states that he has made haste to put the book together, because he did not want to deny Priscus’ request (*tibi ... exigenti*: 18). And that is all the explicit evidence on patrons taking the initiative, at least as far as real persons are concerned¹⁷⁴. But it would be wrong to argue from silence, and conclude that patrons’ initiative rarely occurred, because if it did occur, silence is precisely what we would expect: a literary tribute loses much of its force if it appears to have been commanded¹⁷⁵. So it is very well possible that Martial wrote more poems on request than appears at first sight.

This suspicion can be strengthened by consideration of an interesting complex of circumstantial evidence. Among the occasions celebrated by Martial, there are six which are also honoured by Statius in his *Silvae*—and Statius sometimes provides information on initiative in his epistolary prefaces. In one case he implies that the initiative had been his own: he reminds Melior that he has written his epicedion on the latter’s favourite Glaucias (*Silv.* 2.1) “in such a hurry that I had to apologise to your feelings for my swiftness” (2.*ep.* 8–9); similarly, Martial may not have waited for a request from Melior to offer him two epigrams in commemoration of Glaucias (6.28–29). In three other cases, Statius specifies patrons’ initiative, which thus becomes probable for Martial as well, although each case must be considered individually. In the preface to Book 1, he speaks to Stella of “your epithalamium that you ordered me to write” (*quod mihi iniunxeras*) (21), but we cannot automatically conclude that Martial’s poem on Stella’s wedding was written to order as well, because that is a teasing epigram (6.21), not at all comparable with Statius’ much longer and much more formal composition (*Silv.* 1.2). There is a stronger parallelism between the two poets in their com-

¹⁷³ See p. 100.

¹⁷⁴ Mart. 4.17 and 4.31 are jokes on requests by fictional addressees. Requests by real addressees to write “grand” poetry instead of epigrams (e.g. 1.107, 8.73; cf. 8.55 [56]) are in a different category.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. p. 245 (on Statius).

memorations of Lucan’s birthday (*Silv.* 2.7, Mart. 7.21–23), but unfortunately the relevant part of Statius’ preface is not clear. However, there seems to have been some kind of ceremony, organised by Lucan’s widow, Argentaria Polla, at which she seems to have asked Statius for a poem (2.*ep.* 22–24)¹⁷⁶; if so, it is unlikely that Martial’s epigrams were offered spontaneously. There is more clarity in the case of the poems on the locks of Earinus, the imperial favourite: Statius states that his poem (*Silv.* 3.4) was written to comply with a request (*desiderium*) from Earinus (3.*ep.* 16–20), and it may be assumed that Martial’s elaborate cycle of six epigrams (9.11–13, 16–17, 36) was similarly written to order¹⁷⁷. In the remaining two cases, the poems on the baths of Claudius Etruscus (*Silv.* 1.5, Mart. 6.42) and on a statuette of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex (*Silv.* 4.6, Mart. 9.43–44), Statius gives no explicit information on initiative, but he boasts that he has composed his poem for Etruscus in the course of a meal (1.*ep.* 30), and the main, descriptive part of the poem for Vindex may likewise go back to convivial improvisation, because it was at a meal that Vindex displayed his statuette (4.6.1–34)¹⁷⁸. It is likely that the poet’s performances at both occasions were not spontaneous, but took place at the bidding of the host, and the same may be assumed for Martial’s parallel compositions.

But there is little reason to doubt that the poet, too, could take the initiative, not only in offering individual poems (such as congratulations or consolations), but also in offering entire books. This may be illustrated from Book 12, which was composed (as we saw) at the request of Terentius Priscus, but was then sent from Spain to Rome with a dedication to Stella (12.2 [3]). There is little reason to assume that Stella had asked for this or had even been aware that after three years of silence (cf. 12.*ep.* 1–2) Martial had again produced a book. But Stella was the obvious dedicatee, because he was consul at the time (12.2 [3].10); moreover he was a poet himself (11–14) and had influence in literary circles, which gave Martial the confidence that he will be able to give the book a wide distribution: “He will give

¹⁷⁶ This is the interpretation given by White 1975: 281–83, who reads F. Skutsch’s *coleremus* for the corrupt *consuleremus*.

¹⁷⁷ The conclusion is, however, not certain: see Henriksen 1998–99: 1.92.

¹⁷⁸ See further pp. 102 and 256.

you [the book] to the people, the senators and the knights to read” (15). Patrons could help poets not only by giving them money and other material goods, but also by facilitating the reception of their work. But this type of support is more conveniently discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

MODES OF RECEPTION OF MARTIAL’S *EPIGRAMS*

Many of Martial’s epigrams were originally written for an occasion: they accompanied a gift, celebrated some event in a patron’s life, or contributed to the entertainment at a symposium. It is likely that the poet offered these poems to their addressees at the occasion itself: at least there seems to be no reason why he should have omitted to do so, even if he planned on later publication¹. So there are two levels at which the epigrams could function: the level of the occasion and the level of the published book. Some epigrams may have been written to function at both levels, others will have been written exclusively for the published book.

But this functioning at two levels, as it were, is a matter of choice, not of necessity, and we may assume that many epigrammatists never aspired to the second level, that of publication. For a long time, Martial seems to have belonged to this category. Although the publication of books of epigrams, even of an *opus* consisting of several books, was an established practice since Hellenistic times², it took Martial more than twenty years since his arrival in Rome in 64 before he published the first book of his mixed epigrams around 86 and the second book shortly afterwards (having previously published the so-called *Liber spectaculorum* in 80 and two books with distichs describing Saturnalian presents, the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, in 83 and 84 or in 84 and 85, respectively)³. Of course one could suspect that

¹ Note that this statement is made about single poems, not about collections.

² Publication of books of epigrams is known from the 3rd century B.C.E. onwards; see Fraser 1972: 1.607–08, 2.858–59, Cameron 1993: 3–10, 400, and especially Gutzwiller 1998: 15–46. I may add that book-numbers have been preserved for Lucilius (*AP* 9.572: dedication of his second book to Nero) and for Leonides of Alexandria (7 *FGE* = *AP* 6.328: dedication of his third book to Καῖσαρ, probably Nero or Vespasian) and seem to be already attested for the Hellenistic period (P. Vindob. G40611; cf. Cameron 1993: 10, Gutzwiller 1998: 23–24); so their use is not “strikingly original” in Martial, as claimed by Fowler 1995: 35.

³ That Martial came to Rome in 64 is deduced from 10.103 and 104, which he wrote in 98, immediately before returning to Spain, and in which he gives the dura-