Craftsmen, Identity, and Status in the Literature of Flavian Rome

Emma Jane Brobeck

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2021

Reading Committee:

Stephen Hinds, Chair

Alain Gowing

Sarah Levin-Richardson

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Department of Classics

University of Washington

Abstract

Craftsmen, Identity, and Status in the Literature of Flavian Rome

Emma Jane Brobeck

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Stephen Hinds

Department of Classics

This dissertation integrates material, literary, and social historical perspectives on crafts to show how Flavian era authors reflect on the status and social value of their writing. The poet Martial is the focus of this study, and I pattern his descriptions of low-status trades and crafts with depictions in other writers of the period, including Pliny the Elder and Juvenal. The four chapters analyze the metaliterary potential of the full range of craft production imagery by looking in turn at materials, objects, and artists in Flavian texts. Chapter 1 traces the social and moral connotations of clay and highlights the use of the Latin word *lutum* (mud, clay) in Martial as simultaneously a mark of social inferiority as well as a mark of pride in the epigrammatic genre. Chapters 2 and 3 analyze the metapoetics and literary significance of clay objects such as tableware and statuettes. Chapter 2 suggests that Martial uses these objects as part of a larger allusive framework to panegyrize and subtly subvert the emperor during the Saturnalia, while

Chapter 3 examines how Martial conceives of the epigrammatic poet as an anonymous potter in contrast to renowned canonical artists. The raw material and the finished product are both significant images for imperial writers to organize and overturn moral and social hierarchies, and the artist and craftsman in these texts become catalysts for social approval and denigration. To highlight this phenomenon, Chapter 4 shows how Juvenal adapts Martial's and Pliny the Elder's texts to comment on the pitfalls of Roman patronage. Overall, my research highlights the versatility of craft imagery in the construction of identity between elite and non-elite circles in Flavian Rome and provides a counterpoint to grand imperial image-making.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing a dissertation in many ways can feel like walking through the mud, as Martial might say. But unlike the weary client of Martial's *Epigrams*, my experience has been made easier with the support and guidance of a large network of friends and colleagues. This dissertation would not have been possible without the insight and keen eye of the committee chair, Stephen Hinds. His breadth and depth of knowledge continue to spark new and substantive ideas on even the most nugatory parts of my research. I would also like to thank committee members Alain Gowing and Sarah Levin-Richardson, whose expertise in the areas of Roman history and archaeology ensured that I approached this project with nuance. I am grateful to Kate Topper; her courses in Seattle and Rome were the birthplace of my thinking on crafts in Flavian literature. Financially, the UW Department of Classics' Greenfield Dissertation Fellowship allowed me time and space to build my ideas and begin the writing process, and the UW Expository Writing Program gave me the flexibility to see this project to fruition. And, of course, the warm and supportive nature of the faculty and graduate students in the Department of Classics at the University of Washington, Seattle has made the completion of this dissertation feel anything but solitary.

I extend especial thanks to Christopher Polt for his mentorship during my education at Carleton College and in the years after and to Alice Sanford and Maria Marable for their engaging Latin teaching in my formative years. All three have been exemplary figures of passionate and caring instruction who fueled my excitement for the study of the ancient world and certainly have positively influenced many others.

I am most grateful to my family, in particular my mother, Linda Carter, who is a model of persistence and humility and my father, Kurt Brobeck, who instilled in me a love of literature.

Amongst friends, Anna Simas has been an intellectual companion throughout my graduate study and a source of respite in between the work. I owe many thanks to Édgar García and Grace Funsten for their patience in listening to my many monologues on ancient mud and for their insights which helped to refine this study. Finally, Joshua Zacks has provided unconditional love and support in addition to stimulating conversation throughout the process of writing this text. This dissertation bears the marks of our many discussions on ancient poetry and is undoubtedly better for it.

INTRODUCTION

THE SCOPE OF CRAFTS IN ROMAN LITERATURE

In Book 2 of his *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian first describes the stages of education before turning to instruction in rhetoric, and as part of this outline he picks up a well-worn topic for ancient rhetoricians and philosophers alike: whether rhetoric is an art (*ars* or τέχνη). The Flavian era teacher of rhetoric and tutor to Domitian's great-nephews opens his discussion on this topic with a rhetorical question that makes clear his stance:

> nam quis est adeo non ab eruditione modo sed a sensu remotus hominis ut fabricandi quidem et texendi et luto uasa ducendi artem putet, rhetoricen autem maximum ac pulcherrimum, ut supra diximus, opus in tam sublime fastigium existimet sine arte uenisse? (*Inst. Orat.* 2.17.3)
>
> For who is there, I will not say so unlearned, but so lacking in ordinary human sense, as to imagine that there are arts of building and weaving and fashioning vessels from mud, but that rhetoric—the greatest and most splendid of achievements, as we have said—can have reached its lofty eminence without the aid of art?[1]

It is obvious to Quintilian that if "minor crafts", as Reinhardt and Winterbottom call them, are considered arts, then lofty rhetoric is certainly an art as well.[2] In contrasting what he deems to be

---

[1] All translations of Quintilian adapted from Russell 2002.

[2] Reinhardt and Winterbottom 2006: 308. In their commentary the term "minor crafts" is in reference to weaving and pottery rather than building. The issue of what qualifies as an art or a craft in antiquity has been treated extensively by scholars. Burford 1972 takes a broad historical look at craftsmen in Greece and Rome; D'Ambra and Métraux 2006 have edited a collection of essays which consider issues of identity and self-representation in the art of citizens and freedmen in antiquity, and these essays touch on items that would be considered by a modern eye to be "crafts". Clarke 2003 also looks at non-elite viewers in ancient Rome. Tanner 2000 gives a detailed analysis of the social status of artists in ancient Greece, which offers useful comparanda for Roman craftsmen. In this dissertation, I generally use the term "art" to refer to high-status objects or pieces that are assigned a prestigious lineage, while I use "craft" to refer to the process of creating a piece or to a low-status object. There is some slippage, of course, for objects that defy a clear-cut category, such as ornately decorated tableware.

lowly skills—building, weaving, and pottery—with the very topic of his grand literary undertaking, Quintilian expresses a view frequent in ancient texts that the realm of arts and crafts can be ordered in a hierarchy of prestige. This hierarchy of arts as a framework for understanding the nature of rhetoric was not a new tactic for Quintilian's discussion, and whether rhetoric was an art was a matter of debate in sources extending back to Plato. Other rhetoricians, such as Sextus Empiricus, even use the social prestige of different crafts to argue the inverse of Quintilian: that in fact rhetoric is not an art.[3] In this regard Quintilian operates within a long tradition of assessing the value of various crafts alongside and as means for understanding the nature of speech and writing.[4]

For someone who wants to highlight rhetoric's position as an *ars* or τέχνη by depreciating other crafts, Quintilian chooses at least two arts notable for their programmatic associations with writing. Building (*fabricandi*) and weaving (*texendi*) are common metapoetic symbols for speech and writing throughout Greek and Roman literature. The association between weaving and poetry extends back to Homer's *Odyssey*, in which Odysseus' faithful wife Penelope weaves and unweaves a funeral shroud in order to delay the many suitors vying for the ruler's position.[5] We might also read the ekphrasis of Achilles' shield in the *Iliad* as a comparable example for Quintilian's building terminology, to the extent that the verb *fabricare* can generally apply to metalworking rather than building proper.[6] If Quintilian does have this

[3] Sextus Empiricus introduces robbery as an absurd example of something that might be considered a craft but should not be regarded as such (*Against the Rhetoricians* 12).
[4] The connection between literary and visual arts is present from Homer onwards in his depiction of the Shield of Achilles. Scholarship on the competition between the arts draws from Lessing's 1766 discussion of the Laocoön statue.
[5] Scholarship on the metapoetics of weaving in the *Odyssey*: Barber 2007, Clayton 2003, Tuck 2006.
[6] Reinhardt and Winterbottom 2006: 308 note uses of *fabricare* for metal- and wood-working.

general sense of *fabricare* in mind in this passage, then he has listed two fundamental crafts from Homeric epic. These hardly seem "minor" in the literary sense. And even if we suppose Quintilian intends to convey building or construction, we still may find metapoetic importance in the craft. One instance that comes to mind is the construction of the Argo, built with Athena's help. This story is described briefly in Apollonius' *Argonautica* (1.18-19) and in more detail by Catullus (64.1-11), while the Hellenistic text will later be taken up in Latin by Quintilian's contemporary Valerius Flaccus.

Depictions of these crafts are firmly rooted in Greek literature but are just as important to the metapoetics of Roman texts. Catullus 64, in addition to describing the Argo, presents an extended ekphrasis on the woven tapestry at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, while in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid uses the story of Arachne's weaving contest with Minerva to show the punishment that befalls those who anger the gods. Scholars treat this latter story within the context of Ovid's own exile for his *carmen et error* under Augustus, and through this interpretation Arachne's weaving becomes analogous to Ovid's writing. Rome's own great epicist, Vergil, also centers the first book of his *Aeneid* on the shipwrecked protagonist staring in wonder at the construction of Carthage, which he metaphorizes as the craft of busy worker bees. By the time Quintilian wrote his *Institutio Oratoria* these various programmatic images were common knowledge and the subject of reception and adaptation in both visual and literary works.

With these various literary examples in mind, the third craft Quintilian lists initially appears incongruous. Despite his deprecating tone on the topic, building and weaving have literary significance. Can we really say the same for muddy pottery? This is the subject for the present study, and as I will demonstrate in the following chapters clay crafts not only carry a

metaliterary function distinctive from their higher prestige art relatives but also are particularly significant to the literary sphere of Flavian Rome. When read against the backdrop of metaliterary discussions among Quintilian's contemporaries, his choice to include pottery—especially pottery made from mud (*lutum*)—gives his otherwise traditional framing of rhetoric as an art through the depreciation of other crafts renewed significance for his time. In fact, his inclusion of pottery within a list comparing various arts with rhetoric reveals his engagement with contemporary discussions of the status of rhetoric and, moreover, literature at large.

An immediate suggestion of metapoetic symbolism in Quintilian's description of pottery is the use of the verb *ducere* to describe the fashioning of vessels. This verb often applies to the creation of objects from various materials ranging from precious metals to wax, and, likewise, the verb is used to describe the fashioning of song.[7] The dual potential of *ducere* to refer to the fashioning of a song or a precious metal object immediately evokes the previously mentioned ekphrasis of Achilles' shield in Homer, which is itself a programmatic object for the epic tradition and also an exemplary rhetorical topic in the Roman Empire due to the vividness of Homer's description.[8] During Quintilian's time we also see this use of the verb *ducere* in an ekphrastic distich in Martial's *Epigrams* that describes a life-like lizard "fashioned by the hand of Mentor" into a silver *phiala* (*Inserta phialae Mentoris manu ducta | lacerta vivit et timetur argentum.*, 3.40).[9] I will discuss Mentor's craft in relation to pottery in Chapter 3; it suffices here

[7] In their note for this phrase, Reinhardt and Winterbottom 2002 list several occurrences of *duco* in metallurgy, including Vergil's *Aeneid* 7.634. *OLD* s.v. 'duco': to produce, form, construct, make, fashion, shape, dispose. We should also think of the semantic relationship between *ducere* and *deducere* which has its own extensive poetic programmatic usage in neoteric poetry, and famously opens Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.
[8] Hubbard 1992 for the metapoetics of the shield.
[9] Instances of *ducere* for metallurgy include Vergil *Aen*. 7.634; Horace *Epist*. 2.1.240; Tibullus 1.3.48; Martial *Epigr.* 3.40.1.

to point out Martial's clever compression of ekphrasis into epigram's most elemental form. In this distich Martial emphasizes the life-like nature of the silver lizard, a masterful feature. This aspect of art occurs as well in *Aeneid* Book 6, when in the same breath Vergil invokes Romans both as artists and orators who will fashion living features from marble (*vivos ducent de marmore vultus*, 6.848) just as they will plead cases (*orabunt causas melius*, 6.849). Later in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, he compares writing speeches to fashioning works of art, stating that it is best to be careful and to "shape the work from the first stages in such a way that it needs only to be chiseled into shape, not built again from scratch" (*atque ab initio sic opus ducere ut caelandum, non ex integro fabricandum sit*., 10.3.18). Quintilian's use of *fabricandum* is especially pointed given its earlier appearance in his discussion of whether rhetoric is an art; his uses of the verb throughout his text shows that it can apply both to plastic arts as well as rhetoric and literature. Likewise, in Book 10 Quintilian has merged written, verbal, and visual arts into a single simile introduced with the verb *ducere*. We should treat Quintilian's description of fashioning pottery (*luto uasa ducendi*), then, in the same way: as a metapoetic device.

Ducere, as mentioned above, often describes the creation and manufacture of objects, which can then metapoetically represent writing, while also applying directly to the construction of song. Horace's *Satire* 1.10 is a fundamental text for this semantic range of the verb,[10] and the broader representations of genres throughout this poem establish a network of terminology that is important for Flavian discussions of the status and art of writing. In his final poem of *Satires* Book 1, Horace builds upon arguments made in *Satire* 1.4 about the quality of various literary genres, and he stakes a claim for satire's presence within the literary landscape. In a list of poets

[10] Other significant instances of *ducere* applied to song include Propertius 4.6.13, Calpurnius Siculus 4.80, Statius *Silv.* 5.3.92. Quintilian uses the verb to refer to writing at *Inst. Orat.* 3.7.15, 4.2.58, 4.2.58.

exemplary within their respective genres, Horace states that Varius fashions (*ducit*) piercing epic like no one else (*forte epos acer, ut nemo, Varius ducit*, 1.10.44). This lofty description contrasts with Horace's satiric predecessor Lucilius, who he accuses of speaking in a muddy manner in *Satire* 1.4 (*cum flueret lutulentus*, 1.4.11), a sentiment he reiterates in 1.10 (*at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum*, 1.10.50) only to downplay this depreciation of Lucilius later in the satire as typical literary critique of one's predecessors. Lucilius' muddy stream of speech derives from Callimachus' vision of the muddy (λύματα γῆς, *Hymn to Apollo* 109) Assyrian river, likely the Euphrates, which competes with a clear spring,[11] and so, when Horace invokes this imagery pejoratively of Lucilius in *Satire* 1.4, he suggests that his own poetry aligns with Callimachean poetics.[12]

While Horace's censure of Lucilius recalls Callimachus' image of the muddy river, Horace praises Varius for his work in the grand-scale genre of epic, suggesting that the mere size of a work is not a mark of inferior quality. In this regard, the distinction between the high genre of epic and low genres of satire and comedy in *Satire* 1.10 parallels the three water images of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*: the ocean, the river, and the spring. If Lucilius is represented by the river, then Varius would likely be the ocean, as Homer seems to have been for Callimachus,[13] yet Horace's description of epic as *epos acer* aligns with Callimachus' spring, which is the pinnacle, the choicest of waters (ἄκρον ἄωτον, *Hymn to Apollo* 112), since the two terms, *acer* and ἄκρος, are etymologically related.[14] Through this etymological parallel the image of Varius'

---

[11] For an overview of scholarship on this image, see Stephens 2015: 73, 98 and Williams 1978: 85-89.
[12] See Gowers 2012: 157 for bibliography on Augustan reception of Callimachean poetics.
[13] Williams 1978: 85-89.
[14] Beekes s.v. ἄκρος and de Vaan s.v. 'acer' both show that *acer* and ἄκρος are etymologically related to one another. Gowers 2012: 326 suggests that *acer* as "fierce" suggests military strength of Varius' epic.

epos acer works doubly as a military image, as Gowers suggests, with the valence of *acer* as "fierce" and as a point of refinement, with *acer* functioning rather as "sharp" or "pointed". The expansion of the meaning of *acer* in turn extends the reading of *ducit* at *Sat.* 1.10.44 as the act of creating a sharpened (i.e. refined) work of art.

A key element in Horace's portrayal of Lucilius is that his *speech* lacks restraint, and in this way, we can use Horace's description as a framework for Quintilian's discussions of rhetoric. Lucilius' chattiness (*garrulus*, 1.4.12) is tied to the assumed prose quality of Roman satire, a quality that Horace also does not deny of his own poetry, which he admits is more akin to prose (*neque, si qui scribat uti nos | sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam*, *Sat.* 1.4.41-2). Horace will, of course, go on to show how his work qualifies as poetry, but this dichotomy of muddy speech (or even simply pedestrian speech) and refined poetry returns us to the issues raised in Quintilian's text on whether rhetoric qualifies as an art. The incongruity of a fashioned muddy vase (*luto uasa ducendi*) adds humor to Quintilian's preface on rhetoric as an art. Yet, through the lens of Horace's discussion of muddy satire, Quintilian's example of muddy vessels acquires greater programmatic significance. He teaches rhetorical arts that will produce a Horace rather than a Lucilius of the courtroom.

In both Horace and Quintilian, the word *lutum* is used pejoratively to describe the quality of a work. However, pottery—the art to which Quintilian refers—should not be seen as an inherently inferior craft in imperial Rome. As Pliny the Elder outlines in *Natural History* Book 35.160-162, there were several areas famed for their pottery production, and his description suggests that items from these areas were held in high regard by the Roman consumer:

> Samia etiam nunc in esculentis laudantur. retinent hanc nobilitatem et Arretium in Italia et calicum tantum Surrentum, Hasta, Pollentia, in Hispania Saguntum, in Asia Pergamum. habent et Trallis ibi opera sua et in Italia Mutina, quoniam et sic gentes nobilitantur et haec quoque per maria, terras ultro citro portantur, insignibus rotae

> officinis. Erythris in templo hodieque ostenduntur amphorae duae propter tenuitatem consecratae discipuli magistrique certamine, uter tenuiorem humum duceret. Cois ea laus maxima, Hadrianis firmitas, nonnullis circa hoc severitatis quoque exemplis. (*NH* 35.160-62)
>
> Among table services Samian pottery is still spoken highly of; this reputation is also retained by Arezzo in Italy, and, merely for cups, by Sorrento, Asti, and Pollenza, and by Saguntum in Spain and Pergamum in Asia Minor. Also Tralles in Asia Minor and Modena in Italy have their respective products, since even this brings nations fame, and their products also, so distinguished are the workshops of the potter's wheel, are carried to and from across land and sea. In a temple at Erythrae even today are on view two wine-jars which were dedicated on account of their fine material, owing to a competition between a master potter and his apprentice as to which would make thinner earthenware. The pottery of Cos is most famous for this, but that of Adria is most substantial, while there are also some instances of severity also in relation to pottery.[15]

Far from Quintilian's deprecation of pottery, these cities are praised (*laudantur*) for their craftsmanship, and clay pieces with prestigious provenance maintain a certain excellence and fame (*nobilitas*) that make them noteworthy for Pliny's encyclopedia. The breadth of exportation across land and sea (*per maria, terras*) speaks to the popularity of these pieces, so much so that individual workshops have distinguished themselves in the market, though unfortunately Pliny does not give any names for individual *officinatores* (workshop owners). Pliny also applies the same art historical lens to this art form by relating the story of two precious amphorae created in a contest between student and teacher, a competition fit for his chapters on metalworking or painting.[16] Like these higher prestige media, clay can be made into something ornate by a master artist, and the contest between student and teacher is a test of who can fashion the thinner, and therefore more precious, earthen vessel (*tenuiorem humum duceret*). In his description Pliny uses

[15] All translations of Pliny the Elder are adapted from the Loeb editions of the text. Here the translation is from Rackham 1952.
[16] We might think of the story of Zeuxis and Parrhasius vying for the most realistic painting (*NH* 35.65).

the neutral term *humus* (earth) rather than Quintilian's loaded *lutum*, which gives the story a positive exemplary aspect.

Quintilian must be aware of the popularity of pottery to include it as one of three crafts to introduce his chapters on rhetorical art, and he likely is also aware of Pliny's description of famed pottery producers. However, he undercuts pottery's potential value with his use of the word *lutum*. This is condescending: for Quintilian, those who lack sense think that something made of mud is fashioned (*ducere*) in the same manner of prestigious arts. Yet, as we see in Pliny's account, pottery can indeed be a prestige art form. This does not mean that *all* pottery is regarded as valuable, and Pliny's singling out of the two amphorae highlights this issue. But Quintilian's deployment of pottery in this one-dimensional way is an unforgiving take on what is a wide-ranging and varied craft.

The descriptions of pottery in Quintilian and Pliny the Elder show the prevalence and popularity of this craft in imperial Rome. They are hardly the only authors to examine the value of low-status crafts and to use these crafts in discussions on the relationship between visual and literary arts. Quintilian's contemporary, Martial, for example, uses the word *lutum* more than any other Roman poet, and like the teacher of rhetoric, he employs this word in programmatic ways throughout his corpus. Because of the frequency of clay imagery in the *Epigrams*, Martial is the focus of this study, and the following chapters examine the same questions raised here on the status and value of writing through descriptions of clay objects.

As Quintilian's statement about pottery and rhetoric makes clear, Roman authors employ craft imagery in moralizing discussions that privilege certain arts over others. The moral connotations of clay compared to other art materials will form a common thread throughout this study. In addition to moral connotations, clay imagery has a social component, particularly for

the poet Martial, who frequently writes of daily life in Rome. Martial uses the moral and social aspects of craft materials together in order to represent his literary endeavors within the larger social fabric of imperial Rome. Chapter 1 explores how Martial and Pliny the Elder use these two aspects of art materials, particularly *lutum* and *pulvis* (dust), as markers of social and moral worth for their texts. The two authors build their clay imagery from a long tradition of Roman moralizing on luxury and frugality, but Martial expands the significance of clay through his use of the word *lutum*. In this case, he uses *lutum* as simultaneously a mark of social inferiority, both in sexual relations and in the patronage system, as well as a mark of pride in the epigrammatic genre through his metaliterary descriptions of clay tableware. The dust (*pulvis*) imagery in his *Epigrams* is equally important in that dust represents the inverse of mud (i.e. dry vs. wet), and Martial uses this contrast to develop his representations of mud and clay.

Craft imagery also becomes an important metaliterary marker under the Flavians, and Chapters 2 and 3 emphasize pottery as metapoetic objects in Martial's *Epigrams*. Chapter 2 examines how Martial characterizes the social role of the poet through clay objects, specifically figurines and tableware in his Saturnalian collection, *Apophoreta*. In this chapter I argue for an overarching metaliterary program in Martial's Saturnalian poetry, and I propose that he envisions himself as a potter and his poems as clay objects through several literary allusions and jokes. The Saturnalia holiday, known for gift-giving between patrons and clients, also provides a framework for Martial to discuss Roman patronage, and the gifted craft objects become the primary vehicles for Martial to express his views on social status and poetic identity. In regard to patronage, Chapter 2 picks up the social and moral components of objects fashioned from the clay material discussed in Chapter 1.

Chapters 3 and 4 focus both on the craft object and the artist. In these chapters I explore how Martial and subsequently Juvenal contrast pottery and potters with precious art objects that have supposed provenance from canonical Greek artists such as Phidias. As with Chapter 2, the Saturnalia is an essential component of my analysis in Chapter 3, but in this portion of the dissertation I highlight how Martial extends the metapoetic range of Saturnalian clay gifts to the rest of his corpus. Martial's Saturnalian themes are picked up again by Juvenal in *Satire* 5, which is the central poem for examination in Chapter 4.

Across the four chapters I integrate literary, material, and social historical perspectives from the Flavian era to decode Martial's craft imagery. On the one hand, Flavian writers are deeply engaged with the texts of their predecessors. Quintilian's comment on rhetoric and pottery is indebted to earlier Greek and Roman rhetorical treatises, but as I have shown above, examining programmatic discussions of literature in other genres, such as those in Horace's poetry, provide greater context to Quintilian's unique spin on a traditional topic. The same applies to Martial, who playfully and adeptly transforms Augustan poetry to fit the needs of his own literary world. For instance, the Horatian passages on Lucilius' muddy poetry quoted above will appear at points in this study as comparanda for Martial's use of mud in his own lowly genre of epigram. More than he is for Quintilian, Horace is a fundamental figure for Martial's conception of his poetic persona. Flavian-era writers also maintain close intertextual ties with their contemporaries. To understand the importance of craft objects in Martial, the reader must consider his adaptations of examples and themes from Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*.[17] Similarly, allusions to Martial's poetry in Juvenal reinforce a metapoetic reading of Martial's

[17] Blake 2008, 2011 both cover the thematic relationship between Martial and Pliny the Elder's texts.

texts by highlighting the objects that are characteristic for his epigrams and hence important self-referential markers. I will explore this further in Chapter 4. Just as Juvenal incorporates Martial's imagery within his poetry, Martial in turn uses political and social imagery found in Statius and Silius Italicus' epic texts. The interweaving of key imagery from the texts of Martial's contemporaries adds complexity to Martial's own depiction of crafts; the poet is not an isolated figure who writes abstractly about his literary program but instead actively engages with the political and social discourse of his time.

Martial uses the visuals and iconography around him to synthesize his craft imagery with the political sphere. The Flavian emperors were responsible for extensive renovations of Rome, and so poets had ample new material with which to work. New bathing complexes, the monumental Colosseum, Vespasian's *Templum Pacis*, and Domitian's Forum Transitorium restructured a large swath of the urban landscape. This physical transformation of Rome was the visual representation of the Flavian rejection of Neronian luxury through the return of public space to the populace.[18] In all of these spaces—particularly the *Templum Pacis* which displayed art taken from the provinces during Roman military conquests—art was now available for public consumption.[19] Moreover, the emperors used these spaces to aggrandize their image; Statius' description of a bronze equestrian statue of Domitian erected in the middle of Rome exemplifies the key features of Flavian iconography. I will discuss this statue more in Chapter 2. The Flavian transformation of private space into public space and the attendant beautification of public space with artwork together create an ideal environment for the literary negotiation of social identity

[18] Zissos 2016 includes several chapters on the iconographical program of the Flavians and their restructuring of the urban landscape. For a rejection of Neronian luxury, see Zissos 2016: 7.
[19] Macdonald 2017 provides an overview of the artwork displayed in the *Templum Pacis*; Pollard 2009 describes the botanical aspects of the space that celebrated Roman imperialism.

through descriptions of arts and crafts, and Martial takes full advantage of his contemporary material world to discuss his place as a poet and the place of his poetry in Rome.

But even though Martial incorporates imperial iconography into his epigrams, he also emphasizes the lowly nature of the epigrammatic genre, the opposite of the grand expressions of imperial power. With this in mind, I now turn to the humble and even sordid materials of clay and mud.

CHAPTER 1

THE SOCIAL AND MORAL CONNOTATIONS OF CLAY IN MARTIAL AND PLINY THE ELDER

The semantic range of the Latin word for material (*materia*) includes both the physical and literary worlds: it describes wood, mortar, or any basic substance that composes a larger object. *Materia* is the substance through which life exists, but it is also the stuff of art, of the mind, of speech, and, therefore, of literature.[1] This applies to poetry, as Ovid makes clear in the introductory lines of his *Amores*, which describe the thematic content of the work as material fit for a chosen meter (*materia conveniente modis*, 1.1.2). *Materia* equally encompasses prose: Quintilian, for example, applies the term to the study of rhetoric and its component parts throughout his *Institutio Oratoria*.[2] By extension, material metaphors abound in ancient literature. The specific valence of *materia* as "timber" finds its extension in the Latin *silva* (woods), which Latin authors, adapting from Greek models, use to metaphorically describe a text.[3] Thus, we have Statius' *Silvae*, a collection of occasional poems, as well as Cicero's description of oratory as a sort of woods at *Orator* 12.[4] While *materia* and *silva* are both material metaphors for literature and speech, they are by no means the only images ancient writers use to describe their writing and different genres of literature.

---

[1] *OLD* s.v. 'materia': Contrast definition 1. "wood as building material" with definition 6. "the object or material upon which an art, study, virtue, or sim. is exercised".
[2] Quintilian uses *materia* and its cognates 189 times.
[3] *OLD* s.v. 'materia' 4.b. The collective *silva* and singular *materia* are both counterparts for the Greek ὕλη (timber, woods).
[4] For a general discussion of *silva* in a literary context see Hinds 1998: 12 as well as Coleman 1988: xxii-xxvi. Hinds notes that Cicero uses the phrase as shorthand for oratory. The line in Cicero's *Orator* 12 runs thus: *omnis enim ubertas et quasi silva dicendi ducta ab illis est*.

Other notable materials include gold, silver, bronze, and stone, all of which carry ample metaphorical and metapoetic value in the Greek and Roman literary imagination, and authors from Homer to Lucian use these materials to represent their texts. Some of the earliest instances include metal and textiles: the shield of Achilles, composed of bronze, silver, and gold, depicts society and the cosmos at large, while Penelope's weaving may be understood as an enactment of the repetitive process of oral poetics.[5] Later, the epigrammatic genre self-consciously reflects on its name "to write upon" and original associations with stone.[6] Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, on the other hand, emphatically depicts the transformation from one material into another through stories of stones coming to life and human forms returning to nature. These playful transformations comment on the genre-bending aspects of Ovid's text. Several generations later Lucian reflects on his banausic origins in *The Dream*, and in doing so, he connects the art of sculpture with the art of oratory. These are only a few examples from a long tradition.

Various materials make apt literary metaphors for Greek and Roman writers, and they derive much of their symbolism from ancient conceptions of their value, both monetary and moral. Expensive and rarified materials such as gold can symbolize the pricelessness of a poet's work, but through associations with luxury they can conversely represent moral corruption. Depending on the needs of the author and genre, a material may be exploited for disparate and even opposing imagery, so that what carries a positive social valence for a poet may become a negative image in a moralistic text. It is with this understanding of the potential ambiguity in the

[5] For Achilles' shield as an ekphrastic device, cf. Becker 1995 and Byre 1992. For Penelope's weaving as representative of oral poetics, see Clayton 2003.
[6] *Epigramma* literally means "written upon" something, typically stone. See Day 2007 for the early history of Greek epigrams and their relationship with inscribed objects.

use of material metaphors that this chapter considers the semantic range of the humblest and most sordid material of all: clay.

1.1 Overview of Clay Terminology and Programmatic Language

There are many terms for clay and the objects made from it, and often a Latin word for clay may refer on separate occasions to clay-like soil and mud as well as types of clay used in art and architecture. Thus, when referring to clay as material for pottery or building, authors often use *lutum* (clay, mud, filth) or *argilla* (white potter's clay).[7] While both appear in descriptions of art objects, *argilla* is a more specific type of clay, and thus has a more restricted usage primarily in agricultural texts.[8] *Lutum*, on the other hand, has a wider semantic range as both clay and mud or filth and is found in a greater variety of contexts and images. *Lutum* has other common synonyms such as *caenum* (mud or filth) and *limus* (mud or lime), which occasionally describe earthen objects.[9] *Caenum*, specifically, has a negative sense implying uncleanliness and is used for objects or people who are morally or physically foul. In this way it may be read as synonymous with *lutum* on a metaphorical level.[10] Like *argilla*, the Latin *creta* (soil) can describe earthenware but also specific types of soil, and it is often closely aligned with the Latin

---

[7] *OLD* s.v. 'lutum' and de Vaan 2008 s.v. 'lutum': the word is cognate with Greek λύθρον (gore, clotted blood), λῦμα (dirty water, moral filth), and λύμη (maltreatment, damage).

[8] *TLL* s.v. 'argilla': this is a loan word from Greek ἄργιλλος, a white potters' clay, which is connected to Greek αργός (gleaming white). See also Beekes 2009: 126. s.v. 'ἄργιλλος'.

[9] *TLL* s.v. 'limus' lines 7.2.1428.63-7.2.1429.34 cite instances of *limus* used for buildings and objects. *TLL* s.v. 'caenum' (3.0.97.70) states that *lutum* and *limus* are synonyms for *caenum* and further that it is related to the Greek βόρβορος and ἰλύς. Martial vastly prefers the word *lutum* to describe mud and the subsequent moral and social filth. *Caenum* only appears once at epigram 7.33.1 in a context very similar to Martial's use of *lutum*.

[10] For Cicero, terms such as *lutum* and *caenum* are clearly synonymous. Compare, for instance this interjection from *De Domo Sua* (*O caenum, o portentum, o scelus!*, 47) with this interjection from *In Pisonem* (*O tenebrae, o lutum, o sordes, o paterni generis oblite, materni vix memor!*, 62). The same is found in Catullus 42 addressed to a woman who has stolen Catullus' writing tablets (*o lutum, lupanar,| aut si perditius potest quid esse!*, 42.13-14). In each case, *lutum* and *caenum* are employed as pejoratives.

terra (earth) or *humus* (soil, land).[11] These are all words that are associated with clay or earth as a material, but Latin also has adjectival descriptors for clay objects such as *fictilis* (earthen), which in turn is related to the potter (*figulus*) and other technical terminology for working in clay (*figlina*, *figularius*, etc.).[12] Sometimes even a word such as *pulvis* (dust) applies to clay objects, though this is rare.[13]

When thinking about clay as a material metaphor, whether in authorial self-representation or as a stand-in for writing itself, I consider the full range of Latin words for clay, but some terms are more prominent than others in literary discussion. For instance, Martial, who is the central node for the present study, favors the term *lutum* more than any other extant Latin poet. *Pulvis* is also especially marked in Martial, since he is the only Latin author who explicitly associates the term with clay objects. I will turn to this form of dust imagery at the end of this chapter. Martial uses *creta* the most after *lutum* in mud and soil imagery, though notably never of clay objects.[14] Finally, he uses the adjective *fictilis* in describing earthenware in the epigrams; the term occurs almost entirely in the work most explicitly about objects, the *Apophoreta*.[15]

While Martial's use of *lutum* is notable for the frequency with which it appears, because of its broad semantic range, it also occurs in a variety of contexts and genres. Unsurprisingly, the term and its cognates appear in the agricultural treatises of Cato the Elder, Varro, and Columella:

---

[11] *OLD* s.v. 'creta' and *OLD* s.v. 'terra' 4, 6b. Pliny's *Natural History* frequently discusses types of *creta*, a popular one being *creta Cimolia*.
[12] *OLD* s.v. 'fictilis' and *OLD* s.v. 'figulus'. Both are derived from *fingo*: de Vaan 2008: 221 s.v. 'fingo'.
[13] *TLL* s.v. 'pulvis' lines 10.2.2628.54-10.2.2628.64 for citations of *pulvis* in relation to constructing things, including the swallow's nests and pottery. Martial 14.102 uses *pulvis* to refer to Surrentine clay cups and 14.114 uses *pulvis* to refer to a Cumaean clay dish.
[14] Martial uses *creta* and its cognates at 2.41 (for makeup), 6.93 (to reduce smell), 8.33 (Fabulla's face), 12.28 (a whitened napkin), and 12.61 (chalk for writing graffiti poetry in the bathroom).
[15] *Fictilis* in Martial's epigrams: 5.59, 14.98, 14.106, 14.119, 14.171, 14.178, 14.182.

in these cases *lutum* more often is taken to refer to types of soil, though even in a seemingly straightforward reference to soil in an agricultural text there exists a potential for metaliterary reference. The semantic range of *lutum* meaning soil or clay also appears in Pliny the Elder, whose *Natural History* is also highlighted in this chapter. *Lutum* likewise appears in everything from comedy and satire to the poetry of Tibullus and Horace and even the philosophical texts of Seneca the Younger. Cicero uses the term on several occasions, though each time it is clearly pejorative.[16] *Lutum* as clay material later becomes prominent in Christian texts, but that is well beyond the scope of this dissertation. In all of these sources, *lutum* can have a moral sense, and this secondary aspect to the term becomes important when assessing the metaphoric value of clay in Roman sources.

For the Flavian authors Martial and Pliny the Elder, clay imagery is significant to the greater themes and purposes of their writing. As I have just noted, Martial uses *lutum* and its cognates more than any other poet, and he does so in thematically significant portions of his epigrams. And while Pliny the Elder uses *lut-* words proportionally less frequently than an author such as Columella, clay terminology is found throughout the *Natural History* in everything from medical contexts, art imagery, and the habitats of animals. For both authors, clay suggests a certain pedestrian quality to the text. From the outset of Pliny's *Natural History* he juxtaposes the encyclopedic purposes of the text with more ornate or refined authors:

> Meae quidem temeritati accessit hoc quoque, quod levioris operae hos tibi dedicavi libellos: nam nec ingenii sunt capaces, quod alioqui in nobis perquam mediocre erat, neque admittunt excessus aut orationes sermonesve aut casus mirabiles vel eventus varios, iucunda dictu aut legentibus blanda. sterilis materia, rerum natura, hoc est vita, narratur, et haec sordidissima sui parte, ac plurimarum rerum aut rusticis vocabulis aut externis, immo barbaris, etiam cum honoris praefatione ponendis. (*NH* pr.12-13)

[16] Most notably at *In Pisonem* 62.1. Further negative uses include *Pro Rosc.* 20.15; *In Verr.* 2.2.191.3, 2.3.35.8, 2.4.53.8; *In Pis.* 1.8, 27.1.

> My own presumption has indeed gone further, in dedicating to you [Titus] the present volumes—a work of a lighter nature, as it does not admit of talent, of which in any case I possessed only quite a moderate amount, nor does it allow of digressions, nor of speeches or dialogues, nor marvelous accidents or unusual occurrences—matters interesting to relate or entertaining to read. My subject is a barren one—the world of nature, or in other words life; and that subject in its least elevated department, and employing either rustic terms or foreign, nay barbarian, words that actually have to be introduced with an apology.

Pliny characterizes the entire work through an agricultural image: the writing is necessarily rustic sounding, since the vocabulary derives from the periphery (either the countryside or foreign lands), not from the urban center. Whether this is genuine or not is another matter, of course; scholars have interpreted this passage with heavy irony and paradox.[17] Pliny does indeed write at length about Roman affairs, yet he always carefully contrasts the moral corruption of the city with the upstanding qualities of a simple pastoral life. More importantly, however, Pliny states that his material is *sterilis* (barren), and with this phrase he conjures negative images of unproductive soil or earth. Pliny's message is an ambiguous one, though, for just as he speaks apologetically about the subject matter, he still undertakes something quite bold: the material is "life itself, the nature of things" (*rerum natura*, *hoc est vita*). The reader must acknowledge that this is far from *sterilis*,[18] and in this sense one might see the potential for productive literary soil in the ensuing chapters of the *Natural History*.

Martial claims a similar status for his poetry, although he boasts rather than apologizes for the pedestrian nature of his work. Epigram 10.4, for example, parallels the above passage from Pliny in the programmatic discussion of genre through reference to material:

> Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,
> Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?
> quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,

[17] Carey 2003: 84, Damon 2011.
[18] Damon 2011: 144 mentions the paradox of this claim.

quid tibi dormitor proderit Endymion?
exutusve puer pinnis labentibus, aut qui
odit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?
quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est.'
non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi. (*Epigr.* 10.4)

> You that read of Oedipus and Thyestes in the dark and Colchian dames and Scyllas, of what do you read but monstrosities? What good will ravished Hylas be to you, or Parthenopaeus and Attis, or Endymion the sleeper, or the boy who was stripped of his dropping wings, or Hermaphroditus, who hates the amorous waters? What pleasure do you find in the empty sham of a wretched sheet? Read *this*, of which life can say: 'It's mine.' You won't find Centaurs here or Gorgons or Harpies: my page smacks of humanity. But you don't want to recognize your own behavior, Mamurra, or to know yourself: you should read the *Origins* of Callimachus.[19]

This is one of several poems in which Martial contrasts genres such as epic and tragedy, whose content is largely mythic, with the material of epigram: life and human affairs.[20] Just like Pliny, Martial claims *vita* (life) as the material for his poetry, or more precisely, his poetry claims it for itself; the verb *sapit* in line 10 even adds an extra sensory element to the boast. Here Martial and Pliny both emphasize that they do not write about grand topics or in high genres but instead focus on the mundane stuff of the everyday.

I have provided these two examples not so much for their direct correspondence to clay imagery, but for the larger authorial claims in both passages. The assertion of pedestrian topics and of imagery that is more crude or sordid or based in reality rather than high-flung myth or Hellenistic aetiology (as in Martial's reference to Callimachus' *Aetia*) qualifies the type of literary material preferred by each author. This is a literary material that aligns quite well with

[19] Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Martial's epigrams are adapted from Shackleton Bailey 1993.
[20] Hinds 2007: 136-38, Watson & Watson 2003.

the moral and social range of lowly materials. Both are more the substance of clay than gold, and I will cover this aspect of the texts throughout this chapter.

Of course, why Pliny and Martial, seemingly very different authors with very different aims? Pliny's prose is sprawling (37 books in all) and attempts an encyclopedic cataloguing of the entire world.[21] Martial on the other hand writes concise epigrams, known for their biting and satirical humor. But there is more alike than meets the eye. The sheer number of epigrams can often feel like an encyclopedic cataloguing of Martial's experience in 1st century CE Rome. Blake, for example, has noticed that despite their differences, Pliny's work does have much in common with Martial's *Epigrams*, especially the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, which read like an encyclopedia to the "domestic material culture of Flavian Rome".[22] The same may be said for the literary values espoused by each. Pliny's text has an overall moral purpose. As Isager notes, Pliny's aim is to place man within the natural world, to reveal the extent to which man is part of nature and must live in accordance with it.[23] Martial moralizes in his own right, but about issues of status and patronage under an emperor, about sexual *mores*, and generally about human relationships.

A substantial theme in Pliny's work, which Isager and others have emphasized, is the utility (*utilitas*) of materials. At its core, the *Natural History* has deeply old-fashioned Roman morals that value the utility of an object, material, or idea over the current luxury (*luxuria*) Pliny notices around him. In part, this exists alongside Vespasianic ideology—the emperor promoted his Italian ancestry, his military career, and generally more closely aligned himself with

[21] For more on this genre and Pliny's authorial aims, see Carey 2003 and Murphy 2004.
[22] Blake 2011: 357.
[23] Isager 2013: 32-42.

Augustus, who was old-fashioned in his own right.[24] Pliny, therefore, is careful always to distinguish the current imperial family from the libidinous and greedy Nero or Caligula.

Because Pliny's aims are moralistic, he maps certain moral and social values such as *utilitas* onto his descriptions of clay materials, and any other material for that matter. In turn, clay easily conveys certain morals, as a humble substance in contrast to materials such as marble, bronze, or gold. Clay readily assimilates to old-fashioned Roman morality due to its primordial nature. The same holds for Martial's descriptions of clay: when *lutum* appears in his poems, it does so with specific though varied moral and social connotations. At times Martial follows the model of clay as primordial substance or denoting age, at other times the portrayal of clay is more complex. Martial invests it with cheap or dirty qualities, but he will do so in a way that expresses pride in this fact. This will be a topic for later in the chapter.

We may subdivide the moral associations of materials both precious (silver, gold, gems) and cheap (clay), into several categories with contrasting pairs. First, the difference between luxury and cheap goods can pertain to social class, the difference between elite and non-elite members of society, and the expected behaviors of each group. Secondly, in literature clay or mud has a spatial element: it carries different associations with the city and the country. Authors might use *lutum* to highlight the filthiness of city life or the rusticity of the country. Likewise, the comparison between clay and precious metals highlights the differences between the country and the city. Finally, clay can be a temporal marker: it may represent the past in contrast to a luxurious present, although the past could range from mythical times to simply the previous generation. This is by no means a clean-cut list of divisions, and as several examples in this chapter reveal, the depiction of clay in Pliny and Martial often blends several of the above

[24] Tuck 2016: 109.

categories. Likewise, in any given division, there is still ambiguity as to whether the author intends a positive or negative image; this may even shift within the same author. Does Martial consider rusticity a positive or a negative? Ultimately it depends on the addressee and the intended joke. Martial's poetry, more so than Pliny's text, is prone to shapeshifting.

Throughout the rest of this chapter I cover the temporal and spatial distinctions in clay imagery and then move to the social aspects of the material. Finally, I conclude with Martial's related use of dust in his larger poetics of material and show how Martial links dust with clay in his authorial self-representation.

1.2 Temporal and Spatial Dimensions of Clay Imagery

In order to understand the social and moral dimensions of clay imagery as part of the larger literary discourse on natural materials, we must first examine this topic within the historical backdrop of foreign wealth entering Rome during the Republic. The aftermath of the Macedonian Wars and conquest of Greece and Asia are pivotal moments for the Roman conception of morality and culture in relation to material wealth. Ancient writers use this period of rapid expansion to demarcate Rome's descent into the corrupt avarice of more contemporary society, and imperial writers such as Pliny the Elder reflect on luxury and frugality through the lens of Greek and Asian wealth. In *Natural History* Book 33 he states as a matter of fact that the conquest of Asia introduced Rome to luxury (*Asia primum devicta luxuriam misit in Italiam*, 33.148) and that Scipio's subsequent triumph displayed a wealth of silver and gold not seen before in Rome and weighing in total nearly three tons.[25] But Pliny also believes this to be just the beginning of Rome's loosening morals; in his view the bequest of Asia after the death of

[25] I base this number on the Loeb translation of the text.

Attalus was even less profitable for Rome (*at eadem Asia donata multo etiam gravius adflixit mores, inutiliorque victoria illa hereditas Attalo rege mortuo fuit*, 33.148).

Pliny's characterization of Rome's inheritance (*hereditas*) of Asia as less useful (*inutilior*) than Scipio's victory is an important facet of his larger argument about material wealth and morality. Within Book 33 Pliny chronologically inventories the various precious items and art entering Rome and the negative effect these items have on the citizens. He lingers on certain domestic and personal items in his larger moralizing, devoting an entire section to gold rings and also frequently associating tableware with the overall wealth of the household. In this regard, Pliny's use of the term *hereditas* to describe Rome's acquisition of Asia fashions the city as functioning within a familial or friendly relationship in which one expects to inherit from older generations.[26] Inheritance was a prominent issue for imperial writers, and we find in Martial a general disdain for people who seek out inheritances through *captatio*. For Pliny, then, Rome's own inheritance of Asia seems to fit the mold for the increasing degeneracy of contemporary society exemplified by avaricious inheritance-seeking. Pliny's use of the adjective *inutilior* to describe this inheritance also associates material worth with social and moral values. Beginning in the preface, he emphasizes how he intends his *Natural History* to be of service to the reader, and the information he catalogues about materials in the natural world highlights their usefulness to humanity.[27] As much as gold and silver can be financially useful to the city, the luxurious lifestyles that these materials bring about are decidedly not morally useful.

---

[26] *Hereditas* is a technical term used also in Livy (Per. 58). Pliny's use of the term perhaps derives from Livy's description, but he moralizes further.

[27] See Wallace Hadrill 1990: 86, "The idea of man's *luxuria* is as central to the purpose of the *Natural History* as that of Nature's providence. For the whole work is underpinned by the simple idea that Nature supplies, unasked and ungrudgingly, everything man needs, but that man, blinded by *luxuria*, abuses nature and turns it into the tool of his own destruction; the function of

The discourse on luxury and its opposite, frugality, existed in Republican Rome, too, and Pliny's chronology of wealth entering Rome derives from earlier authors such as Livy, Sallust, and Polybius.[28] Discussions on luxury and frugality highlight the objects associated with each, namely precious metals and humble materials such as old-fashioned clayware. These are common images within Roman sources, and to the extent that they are associated with the Roman past (clay) and a more cosmopolitan present (gold and silver), they also provide a general spatial and temporal framework for understanding the social and moral aspects of art and craft materials. One instance of direct comparison comes from Livy's representation of a speech given by Cato the Elder on the benefits of the *Lex Oppia*, a sumptuary law enacted during the Second Punic War (*AUC* 34.1-8). In his speech Livy has Cato compare Greek statues to the earthenware of Roman temples, stating that he sees too many people praising and wondering at these ornaments from Corinth and Athens (*iam nimis multos audio Corinthi et Athenarum ornamenta laudantes mirantesque, et antefixa fictilia deorum Romanorum ridentes*, 34.4.5). Cato, unsurprisingly, prefers Rome's ancient clay decorations (*antefixa fictilia*) to the Greek statues, which are, in his words, morally questionable "enticements of pleasure" (*libidinum inlecebris*, 34.4.3). This critique of foreign wealth occurs under the framework of a sumptuary law directed at Roman women, who often are associated negatively with clay or mud in Latin texts. Martial, as I will show below, uses the word *lutum* to portray various unseemly qualities of women, from old age to sexual preference, and so it is notable that Cato's speech about the need to maintain a law that curbs women's potential for excess avoids any connection between clay and women. Instead, for Cato clay is a temporal marker of positive Roman morality.

---

science is to reveal the proper use of nature and so save mankind." For further discussion of the usefulness of materials, see Isager 2013.

[28] Zanda 2011 provides an overview of ancient literary sources on the influx of luxury in Rome.

In general, Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* is a major reference point for Pliny's discussions of wealth in Rome, and like Pliny after him Livy states that luxury was brought to Rome from the army in Asia (*luxuriae enim peregrinae origo ab exercitu Asiatico inuecta in urbem est*, *AUC* 39.6.7). Livy also elaborates the types of sumptuous household objects the army took, including bronze couches, various textiles, tables, and sideboards (*lectos aeratos, uestem stragulam pretiosam, plagulas et alia textilia, et quae tum magnificae supellectilis habebantur, monopodia et abacos Romam aduexerunt*, 39.6.7). Livy asserts a deleterious cause and effect from this foreign wealth, for these new luxury domestic items increased the popularity of decadent dinner parties in Rome (*epulae quoque ipsae et cura et sumptu maiore apparari coeptae*, 39.6.8) and even led the Romans to reconsider the value of certain types of slaves such as the cook, who was formerly the least valuable to the Romans (*tum coquus, uilissimum antiquis mancipium et aestimatione et usu, in pretio esse, et quod ministerium fuerat, ars haberi coepta*, 39.6.9). As Livy moves through his examples of objects and social practices imported from Asia, he focuses on the banquet (*epulae*) as a space for ostentatious luxury with an emphasis on the atmosphere of this setting (i.e. music, food, furniture). He does not mention at this point the tableware that would be present in this space.

Pliny the Elder also associates dining with wealth but notably with more explicit reference to tableware and the contrast between humble and expensive materials. For example, he wonders at the amount of silver plate Scipio Africanus brought back from Carthage, stating "This was the amount of silver owned by the whole of Carthage, Rome's rival for the empire of the world, yet subsequently conquered by the show of plate on how many dinner-tables!" (*hoc argenti tota Carthago habuit illa terrarum aemula, quot mensarum postea apparatu victa*, *NH*

33.142). Later, as a point of comparison in this section Pliny mentions one Aelius Catus, an *exemplum* of Roman frugality:

> . . . item Catum Aelium, cum legati Aetolorum in consulatu prandentem in fictilibus adissent, missa ab iis vasa argentea non accepisse neque aliud habuisse argenti ad supremum vitae diem quam duo pocula, quae L. Paulus socer ei ob virtutem devicto Perseo rege donavisset. (*NH* 33.142-143)
>
> . . . and the same as to Aelius Catus's not accepting the silver plate presented to him by the envoys from Aetolia who during his consulship had found him eating his lunch off earthenware, and as to his never till the last day of his life having owned any other silver but the two bowls given to him by his wife's father Lucius Paulus in recognition of his valour at the time when King Perseus was conquered.

Pliny brings in Aelius Catus and his rejection of silver for clay as the foil to the Scipios who brought in so much silver from Carthage. The reference to this exemplary figure is formulated in such a way that expects the reader to have prior knowledge of Aelius Catus, though the name actually differs from versions of the story found in other authors.[29] A fuller version appears in Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, though here Valerius names a Q. Tubero Catus:[30]

> Curi et Fabrici Q. Tuberonem cognomine Catum discipulum fuisse merito quis existimauerit. cui consulatum gerenti cum Aetolorum gens omnis usus uasa argentea magno pondere et exquisita arte fabricata per legatos misisset, qui superiore tempore gratulandi causa ad eum profecti retulerant fictilia se in eius mensa uasa uidisse, monitos ne continentiae quasi paupertati succurrendum putarent cum suis sarcinis abire iussit. quam bene Aetolicis domestica praetulerat, si frugalitatis eius exemplum posterior aetas sequi uoluisset! nunc quo uentum est? a seruis impetrari uix potest ne eam supellectilem fastidiant qua tunc consul uti non erubuit. (*FDM* 4.3.7)
>
> One would be right in thinking that Quintus Tubero, who had the extra name of Catus ("the wise"), was a student of Curius and Fabricius. When he was consul, the Aetolian nation sent envoys to him bringing him silver vessels of every kind, which were very heavy and made with wonderful artistry. These envoys had gone to congratulate him previously and had reported home that they had seen earthenware

[29] Badian 1988, Maslakov 1984, Bloomer 1992: 139.
[30] Badian 1988: 10 n. 22 discusses the connection between Pliny and Valerius Maximus' stories. Despite what Valerius suggests, Q. Aelius Tubero was not a consul.

> vessels on his table. But Catus advised them not to imagine that self-control was like poverty and needed donations; then he ordered them to leave with their parcels. How right he was to prefer our native goods to Aetolian luxuries! If only later ages had been content to follow the example of frugality he set! Where have we come to now? You can hardly stop slaves turning up their noses at crockery that a consul was not embarrassed to use in those days.[31]

Valerius connects Catus to several virtues in this story, which occurs half-way through the Roman examples from a chapter on restraint and self-control (*De abstinentia et continentia*, *FDM* 4.3). Catus' key virtue, however, is his frugality (*frugalitatis. . . exemplum*). With his *frugalitas* and *continentia*, Catus embodies some of the primary virtues of the Roman Republic.[32] Other imperial writers associate him additionally with poverty (*paupertas*).[33] This network of old-fashioned Roman virtues belonged to the entire Tubero family, which had a long Republican history, though the name seems to drop out of the historical record by the early empire.[34] The fact that the family seems to have fallen into obscurity during the empire could be the reason they function so well as models of old-fashioned values for imperial authors. Without prominent members of the family under the Empire, it becomes easier to maintain a rosy view of the family and allows imperial writers a contrasting image contemporary to the Scipios, who were seen as responsible for bringing *luxuria* into Rome.

Intriguingly, Valerius has Catus speak out against a direct connection between his restraint and assumed poverty, and he cautions the Aetolian embassy not to give him aid for what they suppose (*putarent*) about him based only on sight. This statement portrays *paupertas* as a

---

[31] Translations of Valerius Maximus by Walker 2004.
[32] Zanda 2011. Other Republican virtues include *labor*, *disciplina*, *industria*, *gravitas*, and *parsimonia*.
[33] Seneca the Younger refers to Catus/Tubero in three separate *Moral Epistles* as a model of *paupertas* (*Epist.* 95.72, 98.13, 120.19). As Rosivach 1995: 92 points out, Tubero would hardly have been considered poor during his life.
[34] Badian 1988: 9-10 writes of a certain Staienus in the late Republic who adopted the name Aelius Paetus, which suggests that this was a "vacant name" in Rome.

negative value, which Catus rejects for himself, though the very next chapter of the *Facta et Dicta* pertains to the positive attributes of poverty. The disconnect highlights the varying aspects of virtues Romans applied to the different social classes, and the sentiment appears again in Valerius' final authorial statement in the story. In his evaluation of Aelius Tubero Catus' frugality, Valerius Maximus bemoans the luxury of present-day Rome where even slaves disdain the clay tableware that caused no shame for Republican consuls to use. The vast power difference between slaves and leaders of state and the loaded terminology for their reactions (*fastidiant*, *non erubuit*) to the same pieces of clay-ware is hyperbolic, but Valerius' selection of members from opposite ends of the social hierarchy expresses elite expectations for virtuous behavior within different classes of Roman society. For men in the senatorial class it is a social benefit to use tableware below their station, since it reveals them to be morally superior like Catus. For the lower classes, however, there is no possibility of vying for a higher station without appearing shameless or impudent.

In the above story the Aetolian embassies equate clay tableware with poverty, to Catus' dismay, but the association is also portrayed positively by ancient authors. Throughout Roman literary sources clay often connotes rusticity and the attendant poverty (*paupertas*) of country life. The programmatic first poem of Tibullus' *Elegies*, for example, offers a general framework for clay and rusticity that Flavian authors such as Martial pick up in his epigrams on the same theme.[35] In this elegy Tibullus juxtaposes many stock oppositions for the genre, including poet and soldier, countryside and city, and poverty and luxury.[36] The collocation of

[35] Maltby 2002: 116 notes that Tibullus prefers bucolic and erotic poetry, and thereby programmatically rejects both epic and the "ostentation" of Callimachus. In this respect, his poetry is an apt model for Martial, who writes of the country life occasionally throughout his epigrams and in Book 12 withdraws entirely from Rome to his native Spain.
[36] Gaisser 1983 discusses the network of contrasting imagery between soldier, lover, and farmer.

countryside/poverty and city/luxury also exists in Roman literature beyond elegy, and we see clay appear as a significant component in the overall discussion of these topics in imperial authors. For instance, as I have shown in the previous section, Pliny and Martial both contrast *divitiae* (wealth) and *paupertas* (poverty) in characterizing their writing and authorial *personae*, and each fit the topic to the requirements of their respective genres.

One section of Tibullus 1.1 is relevant for the association of clay with rusticity found in later Roman authors, in particular because of the learned etymologizing within the passage:

> Hic ego pastoremque meum lustrare quotannis
> Et placidam soleo spargere lacte Palem.
> Adsitis, divi, neu vos e paupere mensa
> Dona nec e puris spernite fictilibus.
> Fictilia antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis
> Pocula, de facili composuitque luto.
> Non ego divitias patrum fructusque requiro,
> Quos tulit antiquo condita messis avo:
> Parva seges satis est, satis requiescere lecto
> Si licet et solito membra levare toro. (*Eleg.* 1.1.35-4)

> Here I am accustomed to purify annually my shepherd and to sprinkle mild Pales with milk. Be present, gods, do not scorn gifts from a poor table nor from pure earthenware. The ancient peasant first made for himself earthen cups, and he made them from pliable clay. I do not miss the riches of my fathers or the fruits, which the harvest bore stored up by my ancient ancestors. A small crop is enough, it is enough if I am permitted to sleep on my bed and to lighten my limbs on a familiar couch.[37]

Here, as at the beginning of the poem (*Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro | et teneat culti iugera multa soli*, 1.1.1-2), Tibullus contrasts the relative poverty of the farmer (*paupere mensa*) with the riches of Roman countrymen (*divitias patrum*).[38] The poet propitiates the rustic deity

[37] Translation adapted from Postgate 1913.

[38] This view of the contrast between riches and poverty in relation to clay items is one that Martial resumes in a specifically Saturnalian context; see MacDonald 2017. In fact every instance of the word *fictilia* in Martial's corpus appears in a Saturnalian context: (5.59 to Stella about his gifts of *fictilia*, and earlier six instances in the *Apophoreta* (14.98, 14.106, 14.119, 14.171, 14.178, 14.182) In only one of these poems does Martial draw the etymological

Pales, which gives the poem a primitive and Italian tone, and for the ritual the poet uses simple clay cups characteristic of both a rural and ancient lifestyle. He goes on to state that a small field and a small crop is enough.

Not only does the image of Pales programmatically tap into old-fashioned and rustic ideals,[39] so does the etymological gloss between earthenware (*fictilia*) and pliable clay (*de facili . . . luto*).[40] In this gloss at lines 39-40 Tibullus combines and locates the temporal and spatial semantic range of clay within the image of the ancient peasant (*antiquus . . . agrestis*) who has made the cups. Tibullus aligns the material (*lutum*), the object (*fictilia . . . pocula*), and the maker (*antiquus . . . agrestis*) in this moment, and by drawing the connection between all three, he enables the reader to apply the same moral valence to each. Maltby and Putnam have both noted that the adjective *purus* (pure) in line 38 connotes the moral worth of the clay cups just as much as the cleanliness and purity for the religious ritual.[41] Through the connection between the material, object, and maker in the subsequent lines, Tibullus applies the same *purus* connotation to the clay and to the farmer.

Right after the etymology for the clay cups, Tibullus finally states in lines 41-43 that a small crop (*parva seges*) will be enough for him in contrast to the fruits (*fructus*) of his ancestors.

---

connection between *fictilia* and *facere*: namely 14.182, about a clay hunchback made by Prometheus. For further discussion of the *Apophoreta* distichs, see Chapter 2.

[39] Maltby 2002 on Tibullus 1.1.36 notes that Pales was a native Italian deity who Augustus incorporated into his religious reforms and who featured in Vergil's *Georgics* (rustic) and Ovid's *Fasti* (old-fashioned).

[40] For the etymology of *fictilis* from either *facio* or *fingo* see Cairns 1979: 94 and Maltby 2002: 136. As Cairns has explicated, Latin authors recognize two potential etymologies for *fictilia* (clay objects) from *facere* or *fingere*. At epigram 14.182 Martial uses the etymology from *facere* in describing the clay hunchback made by Prometheus, yet at 9.45 he uses *fingere* in relation to Prometheus. However, Martial does draw an oblique connection between the two terms through the addition of *lutum* at 8.6 and 10.39. I will return to 10.39 later in this chapter, while the significant metapoetic value of 8.6 will be addressed in Chapter 2.

[41] Maltby 2002 and Putnam 2005.

I believe we may see one further oblique reference to clay in the image of the harvest from which it springs. *Seges* may equally refer to the crop and to the soil and field.[42] In this way the *parva seges* is a continuation of the little hand-fashioned clay cups (*pocula*) and even the poor table (*paupere mensa*) from the earlier lines of this section.

Just as *lutum* is a marker of rusticity because of the association with simplicity and the natural world, it also typically appears in discussions of animal habitats. Spatially, these move from the rustic into the wild, but animal habitats can also function temporally, with the natural world as representative of primordial settings. For instance, in the latter half of *Natural History* Book 7, known generally as Pliny's anthropology, the author lists various apocryphal inventions and discoveries of man.[43] In Pliny's account the natural world is fundamental to human progress and the development of civilization, and we see this play out in the list of inventions both through primordial man's need to shelter himself from the elements and in creating tools through observation of the natural world. Pliny establishes, then, a type of tense symbiotic relationship between early man and nature, since man uses nature to progress past it. Some of the earliest developments in Pliny's list include building with clay as animals do.

The structure of this portion of the *Natural History* is noteworthy as it underscores Pliny's priorities within the text. He first assigns certain inventions to gods such as Liber and Ceres (*NH* 7.191), and the inclusion of these two gods in particular makes clear the important connection between nature and society. Next, he lists several forms of writing, an art form he considers to have always existed (*NH* 7.192-3) and which speaks to the value he places on his own role as a writer and chronicler. The image of inscribed bricks from Babylonia creates a

---

[42] *OLD* s.v. 'seges'.
[43] See Beagon 2005: 416ff. The list of inventions functions as an addendum to the larger discussion of the history of man and society.

smooth transition from writing to building and allows Pliny to turn towards early inventions of shelter made from clay. With regards to the organization of the list, the placement of clay directly after the gods and writing conveys its chronological and thematic significance; it is a necessary first step towards a civilized society but also derives from the natural world:

> Laterarias ac domus constituerunt primi Euryalus et Hyperbius fratres Athenis; antea specus erant pro domibus. Gellio Toxius Caeli filius lutei aedificii inventor placet, exemplo sumpto ab hirundinum nidis. (*NH* 7.194)
>
> Brick-kilns and houses were first introduced by the brothers Euryalus and Hyperbius at Athens; previously caves had served for dwellings. Gellius accepts Toxius son of Caelus as the inventor of building with clay, the example having been taken from swallows' nests.[44]

Pliny uses specialized vocabulary, such as the Latin for a brick-kiln (*lateraria*),[45] alongside more generalizing and pedestrian language, such as muddy edifices (*lutei aedificii*), and in so doing he showcases technical accomplishment during early stages of civilization. He also expresses a desire for chronological accuracy in his discussion of early inventions by positioning *laterarias* before *domus*: the kiln is necessary in order to build the house. This accuracy is further reinforced by the citation of authors such as Gnaeus Gellius as sources for Pliny's information on the topic.[46] Other predecessors include Theophrastus, whom Pliny cites for several inventions soon after this portion of his text on clay and who also refers to a Hyperbius of Corinth, inventor of the potter's wheel.[47] These two examples of building with clay, however, offer competing

---

[44] Translation by Rackham 1942.
[45] *Lateraria* only occurs five times in extant Latin: Pliny the Elder *NH* 7.194, 19.156, *Dub. Serm.* 44.2; Vitruvius *De Arch.* 10.14.3.1, 10.15.3.9.
[46] Beagon 2005: 418. Pliny here cites Gnaeus Gellius' almost completely lost *Annales*.
[47] Theophrastus' mention of the Corinthian Hyperbius is mentioned in the scholia on Pindar *Ol.* 13.27 (Blümner 1887: 37). The name Hyperbius appears in several Greek accounts of inventors and discoverers; for this topic see Jahn 1854: 29-30, which mentions several references to a Hyperbius and suggests that the name is an apt signifier of human discovery. For the topic of Greek accounts of invention and discovery, see also Beagon 2005: 426.

ideas about the origins of this art form, and the addition of the Roman Gellius' view on the matter is an important facet of the discussion that allows Pliny to closely connect human progress with the natural world. The Augustan-era writer Vitruvius also describes this same invention in a sentence from his *On Architecture* stating that the human need for shelter from the elements led men to imitate swallows and move from cave dwellings to mud huts:

> . . . coeperunt in eo coetu alii de fronde facere tecta, alii speluncas fodere sub montibus, nonnulli hirundinum nidos et aedificationes earum imitantes de luto et virgulis facere loca quae subirent. (*De Arch.* 2.1.2)
>
> Hence after thus meeting together, they began, some to make shelters of leaves, some to dig caves under the hills, some to make of mud and wattles places for shelter, imitating the nests of swallows and their methods of building.[48]

For Pliny and Vitruvius society develops out of nature, whether by using nature as an example (*exemplo*) in the case of Pliny's text or by imitating nature (*imitantes*) in Vitruvius' text. Similarly, in both passages clay, specifically *lutum*, connects society and nature, for it is a useful building material for men and animals. The swallow's muddy nest may be an apt model for both authors due to the behaviors of the bird as it cares for its young, which, at *Natural History* 10.92, Pliny portrays like an anthropomorphized image of domestic exemplarity:[49]

> Halcyonum nidi figura reliquarum quoque sollertiae admonet; neque alia parte ingenia avium magis admiranda sunt. hirundines luto construunt, stramento roborant; si quando inopia est luti, madefactis multa aqua pinnis pulverem spargunt. ipsum vero nidum mollibus plumis floccisque consternunt tepefaciendis ovis, simul ne durus sit infantibus pullis. in fetum summa aequitate alternant cibum. notabili munditia egerunt excrementa pullorum, adultioresque circumagi docent et foris saturitatem emitter. (*NH* 10.92)
>
> The conformation of the kingfisher's nest reminds one of the skills of all the other birds as well; and the ingenuity of birds is in no other department more remarkable. Swallows build with clay and strengthen the nest with straw; if ever there is a lack of clay, they wet their wings with a quantity of water and sprinkle it on the dust.

---

[48] Translation by Granger 1931.
[49] Borthwick 1988 notes the domestic symbolism of the swallow in Greek literature as well as later periods.

> The nest itself, however, they carpet with soft feathers and tufts of wool, to warm the eggs and also to prevent it from being hard for the infant chicks. They dole out food in turns among their offspring with extreme fairness. They remove the chicks' droppings with remarkable cleanliness and teach the older ones to turn round and relieve themselves outside of the nest.[50]

This passage largely follows the content and structure of Aristotle's *History of Animals* 8.612b.19-31. In Aristotle's account, however, the behavior of the swallows is a copy of human behavior (θεωρηθείη μιμήματα τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς, 8.612b.19-20). The birds make their nests just as men build houses (στιβαδοποιεῖται καθάπερ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, 8.612b). In contrast, Pliny's description of mud building in *NH* 7.194 emphasizes the human imitation of nature, and the above passage from *NH* Book 10 continues to highlight the swallow's ingenuity as a source of wonder (*admiranda*) and thus also of admiration that could lead to emulation. Importantly, this does not lessen man's intellect; instead it brings man closer in line with nature, an essential point for Pliny's moralizing throughout his work. Ultimately, man is doubly indebted to the earth: he utilizes natural materials in his very imitation of the natural world.

For poets such as Martial, however, the swallow's nest is rather an opportunity for humorous mythological allusions. Literary sources alternately assign Procne and Philomela as figures transformed into the swallow and nightingale,[51] but in Martial's two epigrams on this mythological pair, Philomela becomes the nightingale (14.75), while Procne becomes the swallow (11.18). This generally aligns with prose sources that use the swallow as a symbol of domesticity, though the tragic fate of Procne and Philomela would seem to complicate this image of domestic exemplarity. As an epigrammatist Martial does not mind resorting to tasteless jokes

[50] Translation by Rackham 1940.
[51] Ovid, for instance, makes Procne the nightingale and Philomela the swallow at *Met*. 6.668-70.

on this subject matter,[52] and in epigram 11.18 he uses the image of a swallow's nest alongside a reference to Procne to jest about the small size of a farm gifted to him by Lupus (*et sublata volantis ungue Procnes | in nido seges est hirundinino*, 11.18.19-20).[53] Here Procne appears to have taken the crop from the farm in her talon to use as part of her mud and straw swallow's nest. This crop (*seges*) is reminiscent of the *parva seges* that quite contents Tibullus at 1.1.43, but Martial seems less satisfied. He ends his epigram with a punning wish for a meal (*prandium*) rather than the gift of a farm (*praedium*) (*nam quo tempore praedium dedisti, | mallem tu mihi prandium dedisses*, 11.18.26-7).

Throughout epigram 11.18 Martial alternates between mythological figures and diminutive items symbolic of his small country farm, which creates a contrast between high and low in a similar manner to his insistent disavowal of epic and tragic genres throughout his corpus, for example in epigram 10.4. We should be wary, then, to take his incredulity at the tiny farm at face value, for the humor that arises from this image is perfectly fitting for the epigrammatic genre. We will see this play out in epigrams that specifically utilize mud imagery later in this chapter, but for now we can connect Martial's use of the swallow with Pliny's.

The above examples highlight the associations of clay with ancient rusticity and the mythical primordial origins of society. Romans associated other popular mythological figures with clay, most notably Prometheus. Known as "forethought" personified, father of Deucalion (who Ovid associates with sculpture in his *Metamorphoses*),[54] stealer of fire,[55] for which he was subsequently punished, Prometheus also created man from clay. Certain aspects of Prometheus'

---

[52] In the *Apophoreta* Martial describes a gift of a nightingale by retelling Philomela's story: *Flet Philomela nefas incesti Tereos, et quae | muta puella fuit, garrula fertur avis*, 14.75.
[53] Grewing 2010: 159-61.
[54] For Deucalion and sculpture: Ovid, *Met.* 1.381-413.
[55] Pliny the Elder lists Prometheus instead as the discoverer of fire at *NH* 7.199.

mythology, such as his punishment, were more prominent in the literature of the late Republic and early Empire, but his creation of man from clay is featured in several poems, including two of Martial's epigrams.[56] Prometheus appears alongside two other notable figures from Rome's mythic and historical past, Numa and Brutus, in Martial's epigram 10.39, which epitomizes the temporal connotations of clay:

> Consule te Bruto quod iuras, Lesbia, natam,
> mentiris. Nata es, Lesbia, rege Numa?
> sic quoque mentiris. namque, ut tua saecula narrant,
> ficta Prometheo diceris esse luto. (*Epigr.* 10.39)

> You swear, Lesbia, that you were born during the consulship of Brutus; you lie. Were you born, Lesbia, during the reign of Numa? Even still you lie. For, as your age tells, you should say that you were made of Promethean clay.

The punchline of this poem is that Lesbia is as old as dirt, and Martial employs the three famous figures to emphasize her age. As the poem progresses Martial reaches further and further back in time from the consulship of Brutus in 509 BCE to the reign of Numa, second king of Rome, and finally all the way to the mythic Prometheus who first fashioned men from clay. By finally settling on the image of Prometheus, Martial suggests that Lesbia is indeed so old as to be the original human.[57]

While Prometheus is an obvious choice for a joke about old age and clay, what of Brutus and Numa? Both figures serve as stock temporal markers for early Rome,[58] but they also

---

[56] Prometheus appears in six epigrams, which showcase various facets of his story. *Spect.* 7, *Epig.* 9.45, and 11.84 describe Prometheus bound to a mountain, 14.80 refers to his discovery of fire, 10.39 and 14.182 associate him with clay.

[57] Putnam 2005: 127 n. 13 on Prometheus imagery in Latin texts. Putnam regards the Promethean man as a model of humility and simplicity. See Otto [1890] 1964: 202 s.v. 'lutum'

[58] Martial uses the consulship of Brutus as a marker of the addressee's age in epigram 11.44, which pertains to legacy-hunting rather than a joke about the obscenity or crudeness of old age. See Sullivan 1991:47, Daniels 2000: 131, and Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019: 427 for Numa as representative of the ancient past.

represent traditional morality and uprightness. Valerius Maximus cites Brutus as an *exemplum* of piety towards one's country (*FDM* 5.6.1) as well as of severity towards children for his punishment of his sons who wanted to reinstate the tyrannical Tarquin family as rulers of Rome (*FDM* 5.8.1). In addition to old-fashioned Roman morality, Brutus is closely associated with his co-consul, P. Valerius Publicola, who was himself an exemplary figure of poverty (*paupertas*) and its resulting humility. He appears in a section on poverty in Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Deeds and Sayings* (4.4.1) and in Pliny's *Natural History* 36.111-12, which contrasts Nero's *Domus Aurea* with the relatively small size and humble status of Publicola's home. Martial also connects the theme of poverty to the time of the consulship of Brutus in epigram 11.44, which jokes that the only true friends of the unnamed addressee, born under Brutus, are those he gained when he was still young and poor (*sunt verae, sed quas iuvenis, quas pauper habebas*, 11.44.3). His youthful poverty is therefore temporally linked to the time of Brutus. In 10.39 as well as in the above examples Brutus is not directly linked with clay as Prometheus is. Instead, his way of life—*pietas*, *severitas*, *paupertas*—contrasts with Lesbia's moral and sexual crudeness, qualities that Martial highlights through Promethean mud.

Like Brutus, Numa is closely associated in the Roman imagination with moral uprightness, though his founding of several religious and cultural institutions in the city ties him to the realm of crafts. Numa is a pillar of *virtus* whom Martial invokes largely in *Epigrams* Books 10 and 11,[59] written after Domitian's death, and Henriksén suggests that Martial does this in order to associate Nerva's rule in particular with Numa.[60] But Martial also uses Numa's morality to humorous effect, as Hinds has shown for epigram 11.15, published during the

[59] Numa appears fifteen times in Martial's *Epigrams*: 3.62, 6.47, 9.27, 10.10, 10.35, 10.39, 10.44, 10.52, 10.76, 10.97, 11.5, 11.15, 11.104, 12.3, 12.62.
[60] Henriksén 2012: 118-119; Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019: 426-7.

Saturnalia. The image of Numa and the *mentula* (penis) in this epigram plays up this Saturnalian book's newfound licentiousness under a new emperor.[61] Other epigrams continue to build a humorous contrast between Numa and sexual licentiousness: epigram 10.35 jokes about Numa's trysts with the nymph Egeria, and 10.52 jokes of his interactions with a eunuch named Thelys. A similar joking nature is present in 10.39, which pits the aged Lesbia against the moral worth of not only Brutus but also Numa, who ultimately serves as a punchline through the contrast between his old-fashioned morality and the bawdy nature of epigram.[62]

Regarding Numa's development of various political and civic institutions within Rome, we find in Plutarch that Numa created craft guilds in Rome as an attempt to cease the factions between Roman and Sabine citizens.[63] In his description Plutarch emphasizes the foundation of the guilds with the mixing together of materials:

> διανοηθεὶς ὅτι καὶ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ φύσει δύσμικτα καὶ σκληρὰ καταθραύοντες καὶ διαιροῦντες ἀναμιγνύουσιν, ὑπὸ μικρότητος ἀλλήλοις συμβαίνοντα μᾶλλον, ἔγνω κατατεμεῖν τομὰς πλείονας τὸ σύμπαν πλῆθος: ἐκ δὲ τούτων εἰς ἑτέρας ἐμβαλὼν διαφορὰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκείνην καὶ μεγάλην ἀφανίσαι ταῖς ἐλάττοσιν ἐνδιασπαρεῖσαν. ἦν δὲ ΄διανομὴ κατὰ τὰς τέχνας, αὐλητῶν, χρυσοχόων, τεκτόνων, βαφέων, σκυτοτόμων, σκυτοδεψῶν, χαλκέων, κεραμέων. τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς τέχνας εἰς ταὐτὸ συναγαγὼν ἓν αὐτῶν ἐκ πασῶν ἀπέδειξε σύστημα. (*Numa* 17)
>
> [Numa], therefore, aware that hard substances which will not readily mingle may be crushed and pulverized, and then more easily mix and mingle with each other owing to the smallness of their particles, determined to divide the entire body of the people into a greater number of divisions, and so, by merging it in other distinctions, to obliterate the original and great distinction, which would be lost among the lesser ones. He distributed them, accordingly, by arts and trades, into musicians, goldsmiths, carpenters, dyers, leatherworkers, curriers, braziers, and

[61] Hinds 2007: 123.
[62] For more on Numa, see Roman 2001: 142 for Nerva as Numa in Martial's poems, Andrews 2015: 58, Larsen 2015: 211 for Numa and poverty in epigram 11.5, Hinds 2007, Toner 2015, Smith 2007. Plutarch credits Numa with founding the grove of Libitina on the Esquiline, Horace, *Epist*. 2.1-2 relates the descendants of Numa Pompilius, and Livy 1.19 shows Numa safeguarding Rome against *luxuria*.
[63] Bond 2016: 114 mentions Numa's guilds in a larger discussion of tanners in Rome.

> potters. The remaining trades he grouped together and made one body out of all who belonged to them.[64]

According to Plutarch, the decision to create guilds of artisans and craftsmen was motivated by the idea that a people is like a mix of materials, and the smaller the pieces, the better they mix together. In its portrayal of mixed materials, this passage invests Numa with the theoretical frameworks and disposition of Greek philosophers with whom he was supposedly well acquainted. Ancient authors note that he was even buried with the writings of Pythagoras,[65] despite the fact that Numa would have lived two centuries before the philosopher.[66] Moreover, by representing the people as material, Plutarch suggests that Numa is the ultimate artisan in his crafting a finished product of a unified and durable citizenry. This is not dissimilar to the passage from Tibullus 1.1 in which the artist, object, and material work in unison, and it provides insight into the larger apocryphal tradition surrounding the second king of Rome.

Another reference to Numa in Martial's epigrams parallels the imagery of a mixed citizenry found in Plutarch's *Life of Numa*. At 10.10.3-4 Martial asks his patron Paulus, "What do you leave for us, Paulus, us of Numa's commons, the close-packed crowd?" (*quid nobis, Paule, relinquis, | qui de plebe Numae densaque turba sumus?*). The reference to Numa's plebeian class relates to Numa's divisions of the populace along lines other than Roman or Sabine ancestry and thus is comparable Plutarch's description of the guilds.[67] Within this

---

[64] Translation by Perrin 1914.
[65] Livy, *AUC* 1.20.5-7, 1.31.8. For further details see Prowse 1964.
[66] Cornell 1995: 125. The tradition of Numa as pupil of Pythagoras goes back to Aristoxenus of Tarentum.
[67] Numa's plebian class also appears in epigram 10.76.

context, the *densa turba* has a similar quality as Plutarch's image of pulverizing and crushing a hard material to allow it to better mix together.[68]

The references to Brutus and Numa in Martial 10.39 highlight ancient morality first rather than any overt connection to clay imagery, but as we have seen, the exemplary qualities of both men tangentially support positive aspects associated with clay, i.e. ancient and rustic Roman morals. That these men were also founders of Roman political and civic traditions also invests them with a degree of dignified *Romanitas*. But Martial subverts the upright morality of both men by the poem's end in line 4 through the final invocation of Promethean clay (*ficta Prometheo diceris esse luto*), and in doing so, he suggests that Lesbia be viewed as a negative moral *exemplum* and object of ridicule. Prometheus is a complicated figure known equally for his ingenuity and for his transgressions against the gods. The well-known image of Prometheus bound to a rock because he steals fire from the gods shows the horrible punishment for his craftiness. Since this is a topic in several of Martial's previous epigrams (14.80, *Spect*. 7, 9.45), it would be in the background for a reader of Book 10. However, the image of Promethean clay in this poem recalls more pointedly *Apophoreta* distich 14.182 about a hunchback:

182 *Sigillum gibberi fictile*

Ebrius haec fecit terris, puto, monstra Prometheus:
Saturnalicio lusit et ipse luto.

182 *Little clay figure of a hunchback*

Prometheus, I suppose, was drunk when he made these
from earth: Even he plays with Saturnalian mud.

[68] The *densa turba* of epigram 10.10 is one instance within a larger network of poems about the *turba*, whether that is the Roman populace or Martial's epigrams. Stroup 2006 notes the use of *turba* to describe the crowd of poems in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*; in general it is part of the larger anthropomorphizing of objects and texts in Martial.

This is the final distich in Martial's sequence on artwork in the *Apophoreta*, and I will return to the poem in Chapter 2. Here, the significant thematic connection between Prometheus' clay hunchback and Lesbia's old age is physical deformity.[69] The hunchback originates from Prometheus' drunkenness during the Saturnalia, and so it is the joking result of holiday license. Lesbia, too, is presented as a joke in epigram 10.39, and her association with Promethean clay reveals how her old age as deformed her.

However, licentiousness is also at play here. Because the addressee is a woman (and a woman named Lesbia, at that) we can connect the image of Promethean clay with the connotations of *lutum* as a pejorative term for female genitalia. In several epigrams (3.74, 7.67, 11.47) Martial refers to cunnilingus specifically while also using *lutum* in the poem. Richlin has connected the word *lutum* with uncleanliness and thus also with female genitalia.[70] We can think specifically of Catullus 42 in which the poet chastises a woman for taking his writing tablets by calling her "o filth, o whorehouse" (*o lutum, lupanar,* | *aut si perditius potest quid esse!*, 42.13-14). All of these elements come together in epigram 10.39 as Martial deems Lesbia's old age as filthy and morally negative.

For Roman authors clay could be treated positively or negatively depending on the larger context and requirements for the genre. The connections between clay and an idealized past readily portray the material as a humble sign of Roman morality, but antiquity also has its drawbacks. In this case, Martial's joke about Lesbia's old age shows how clay imagery can be employed as a mark of condemnation. Social and sexual mores are wrapped up in this

[69] For more see Trentin 2011.
[70] Richlin 1992: 26-27.

description of Lesbia, and in the next section I consider the markers of status that become further entangled in the network of clay imagery in Martial's poetry.

1.3 *Lutum* as a Marker of Social Status in the Urban Landscape of Rome

While Roman authors often use clay imagery to refer to antiquity and rusticity, the semantic range of *lutum* referring to mud has equal associations with the city. Martial in particular uses *lutum* to discuss patronage and social status within the messiness of Rome. In four epigrams (3.36, 7.61, 10.10, 12.29) Martial describes walking through the mud while performing daily obligations and services. Being dragged through the mud is an idiomatic expression found as well in Roman comedy, and Martial's imagery here is certainly indebted to this genre.[71] Whether Martial speaks for himself or for someone else, the issue of walking through mud within the city of Rome also does more than simply portray the dirtiness of urban life.[72] As with the instances found in Roman comedy, Martial's use of *lutum* in the streets of Rome highlights the anxieties of social interaction between the various strata of society in the city.

Epigram 3.36, the earliest in Martial's corpus to include the phrase of being dragged through the mud, establishes the fraught nature of the patronage system for the client. This is also the first poem outside of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* to use the word *lutum*, and so it has a programmatic quality for Books 1-12. The epigram addresses one Fabianus, who still bids Martial all over the city despite the poet's years of service:

> Quod novus et nuper factus tibi praestat amicus,
> hoc praestare iubes me, Fabiane, tibi:
> horridus ut primo semper te mane salutem

[71] The closest parallels are found in Plautus' *Pseudolus* line 984 and Terence's *Andria* lines 776-77. A similar image is also found in Catullus 17.9 of throwing someone into the mud. Otto 1890 s.v. 'lutum' offers several variations on the "walking through mud" expression: 1. it may refer to being in a quandary, or 2. trying to free oneself in vain, or 3. digging oneself into a hole. This seems to be at the heart of Martial's imagery.

[72] In this case, Rimell 2008 has a detailed discussion of Martial's reaction to filth in the city.

per mediumque trahat me tua sella lutum,
lassus ut in thermas decima vel serius hora
te sequar Agrippae, cum laver ipse Titi.
hoc per triginta merui, Fabiane, Decembres,
ut sim tiro tuae semper amicitiae?
hoc merui, Fabiane, toga tritaque meaque,
ut nondum credas me meruisse rudem? (*Epigr*. 3.36)

> You tell me, Fabianus, to give you the service that a new friend, just recently acquired, gives you. I must always wait upon you shivering at crack of dawn. Your chair must drag me through the mud. At the tenth hour or later I must wearily follow you to Agrippa's baths, though I myself use Titus's. Have I deserved this, Fabianus, through thirty Decembers—to be forever a raw recruit to your friendship? Have I deserved this, Fabianus, with my threadbare gown that I bought myself—that you don't think I've yet earned my wooden sword?

Throughout the poem Martial presents himself as a client in a series of subservient positions. He calls Fabianus his *amicus*, a generous yet common name for the patron,[73] and he reinforces the allusion to a warm relationship in lines 7-8 by describing the friendship (*amicitia*) that has existed between the men for thirty years.[74] However, the various tasks Fabianus sets before Martial reveal a different and more disparate relationship and unmask the euphemistic language used of patronage in Rome. Martial must follow this "friend" around the city early in the morning and accompany him to the baths—a typical location for clients to seek dinner invitations, as we see Selius doing in epigram 2.14. In performing these services, Martial is dragged through the mud, a fitting image for his social inferiority in this epigram. More accurately, though, it is Fabianus' chair (*sella*) that drags Martial through the mud. The chair and mud as metonyms for political and social positions highlight the disparity between the two men, as one is held above the Roman populace while the other dirties himself in the process of

[73] Nauta 2002: 14-16 discusses the use of *amicus* for both patron and client.
[74] The "thirty Decembers" in line 7 also refers to the Saturnalia and thus to the gift exchange aspects of patronage.

keeping the other clean.[75] The image of the chair further places Martial in a servile position since the task of carrying a litter through the city was often assigned to slaves.

Martial's slave imagery continues in the final line through a reference to the wooden sword (*rudem*) given to victorious gladiators upon their discharge from the sport.[76] Gladiators were typically enslaved individuals, and so this image falls in line with the earlier image of Martial as litter-bearer. The gladiator reference also parallels Martial's description of himself as a young military recruit (*tiro*, 8) through the expectation of violent attack for both. The soldier image complicates Martial's servile imagery, though, by adding a layer of social inferiority that is rather associated with men of provincial origins who have joined the army in hopes of gaining citizenship. For both the gladiator and soldier, age and value are important factors in later gaining freedom and citizenship,[77] and Martial laments that even at his age there is seemingly no end to his service for Fabianus, while even these men are able to finish theirs. The irony, of course, is that this epigram presents a fiction: scholars regard Fabianus as a fictional character used in Martial's more satirical epigrams,[78] and by Book 3 of his epigrams, Martial, though a foreigner, would hardly be a social inferior in Rome. Yet Martial insistently depicts himself as a grudging social inferior in this epigram, thus commenting on the tensions of the patronage system and portraying life as a commoner in the urban landscape as messy and degrading.

---

[75] Hartnett 2018: 4 notes a similar distinction in social class and how they experienced the streets of Rome in his examination of Juvenal's *Satire* 3.

[76] The wooden sword appears in the opening lines of Horace's *Epistle* 1, addressed to Horace's patron Maecenas (see Mayer 1994: 87). Martial would have this reference in mind in the current epigram, especially given that it is addressed to another patron. Ovid's *Tristia* 4.8.24 also uses this image to refer to his old age, something that would likewise be relevant to this epigram, since Martial emphasizes his thirty years of service to Fabianus. For the idiomatic usage, see Otto 1890: 303.

[77] Ovid's reference to old age and the wooden sword is an apt parallel for this aspect of the image in epigram 3.36.

[78] Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019: 225.

Martial moves from a fictional patron to the ultimate Roman patron, Domitian himself, in epigram 7.61. As with the previous example, Martial uses an idiomatic expression for walking through the mud, with the mud representing an everyday reality of the urban landscape. Similarly, Martial refers to the spaces of daily life in Rome; in 3.36 he names the Baths of Agrippa and Titus, while here he speaks generally of commercial shops. Throughout the various examples of shops in Rome in epigram 7.61, Martial focuses on the demarcations of urban space and how fluid boundaries shape the lives of individuals within the city:[79]

Abstulerat totam temerarius institor urbem
  inque suo nullum limine limen erat.
iussisti tenuis, Germanice, crescere vicos,
  et modo quae fuerat semita, facta via est.
nulla catenatis pila est praecincta lagonis
  nec praetor medio cogitur ire luto,
stringitur in densa nec caeca novacula turba,
  occupat aut totas nigra popina vias.
tonsor, copo, cocus, lanius sua limina servant.
  nunc Roma est, nuper magna taberna fuit. (*Epigr*. 7.61)

> The audacious retailers had appropriated the entire city; no threshold kept within its own bounds. You bade the narrow streets expand, Germanicus, and what had lately been a track became a road. No column is girt with chained flagons, and the praetor is not forced to walk through the mud. The razor is not drawn blindly in a dense crowd, nor does the grimy cook shop monopolize the whole street. The barber, the taverner, the cook, the butcher keep to their own thresholds. Now it is Rome, it used to be a big shop.

Several scholars have discussed the exceptional nature of this epigram due to the administrative subject matter; the poem refers to Domitian's 92 CE edict forbidding shops from taking up space in the streets of Rome.[80] For both Rimell and Roman, boundaries are the central focus of the poem, especially from a metaliterary perspective in which the spatial layout of Rome provides the backdrop for the design of Martial's poetry. The thresholds with formerly no boundaries—

[79] See Roman 2010 for Martial's poetry and topography.
[80] Rimell 2008: 24-25, Roman 2010: 114-15.

here Martial takes advantage of the full semantic range of the word *limen*—describe both the city and the text, spaces that equally could become a tangled mess of pedestrian material. Domitian has imposed order within the city, and as a growing presence in Martial's epigrams he likely also imposed order within individual books.[81] In this regard, the reader might well equate Martial's individual epigrams with the various shops that no longer stretch into the street.

This would not be the first time that Martial described his poetry in commercial language. The final statement that Rome was once one big shop (*magna taberna*, 10) recalls Martial's early programmatic poems from Book 1. Epigrams 1.3 and 1.117 function as bookends to this first collection, and both describe where to find Martial's *libelli*. In 1.3 the book prefers to dwell in the shops of the Argiletum (*Argiletanas mavis habitare tabernas*, 1.3.1), and 1.117 clarifies that they are sold in a book shop owned by Atrectus near the Forum of Caesar (*contra Caesaris est forum taberna | . . . nec roges Atrectum | — hoc nomen dominus gerit tabernae*, 1.117.10, 13-14). Rimell connects epigram 1.3 to Martial's poetic predecessors, Horace and Ovid, who write about the reception of their poetry within the topography of the city. Horace, for example, worries that his poetry will be subjected to degradation if sold in a shop; Ovid, on the other hand, wants his book to reach the Roman crowd so that he may hope for a return from exile. As Rimell notes, Martial plays with the collapsing of public and private in his desire to keep his book safely away from the public for which it yearns.[82]

The Argiletan shops in 1.3 are portrayed as public space in direct contrast to Martial's home: the two words (*taberna* and *domus*) are even placed in the first and last lines of the epigram. While the *tabernae* in this poem have traditionally been taken literally as the bookshops

[81] Poems on Domitian reach their peak in Books 7-9, which see increasing flattery and panegyric of the emperor.
[82] Rimell 2008: 63-65.

that sell Martial's published poetry to the public, the general term *taberna* could refer to any number of shops where the Roman crowd gathers and converses. This is the sense of the term in epigram 7.61. Martial names several occupations now constrained by Domitian's edict, including the barber, tavern keeper, cook, and butcher (*tonsor*, *copo*, *cocus*, *lanius*). Along with these occupations, Martial describes some of the goods that have spilled out onto the streets, namely flasks (*lagonae*) that have been chained to pillars as display pieces for passersby. All of these are part of the great, big shop that makes up Rome, and all could be implied in the *tabernae* of 1.3. Of course, epigram 1.117 specifies the *taberna* as a bookshop, and this has limited scholarly interpretations of 1.3. As Blake has shown, though, we cannot take the opening bookshop images of Book 1 too literally; they rather fulfill a programmatic and symbolic function.[83]

The *lagonae* of 7.61 carry a similar function, as they also appear alongside the *taberna* in Horace's discussion on poetry in his *Satires*. Horace describes in *Sermones* 1.4 how he does not want his poetry displayed on the columns of a shop (*nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos*, 1.4.71), an image quite similar to the *lagonae* chained to pillars in Martial's 7.61. The idea of books hanging upon pillars on view for any passerby literalizes the commodification of published poetry. The books upon the columns could also be a less literal expression for the titles written on the columns as advertisements to potential customers. Either way, Horace is ultimately concerned that books as advertised commodities might be subjected to degradation. Martial's imagery in epigram 1.117 is entirely in line with Horace's description; the names of poets are explicitly written on the door posts as a way to quickly attract customers (*scriptis postibus hinc et inde totis, | omnis ut cito perlegas poetas*, 1.117.11-12). Through this network of poems it is possible to read the *lagonae* of Martial's 7.61 as symbolic of poetry that is now

[83] Blake 2014.

constrained by the emperor and placed within the limits of the shop rather than running amuck through the streets. The *lagona* also is an apt symbol for the poetry book: it is a small jug for carrying various liquids, frequently wine. In the sense that this is a personal container rather than the much larger amphora it functions like an individual poetry book, a small text for personal consumption. I will return to this image in Chapter 3, but for now it is enough to highlight the various metapoetic possibilities within epigram 7.61.

We can also apply this metapoetic angle to the other images in 7.61, for example, the presence of mud on the streets of Rome. Martial praises Domitian in this poem because of the new confinement of shops within their bounds, which allows individuals to finally use the streets and sidewalks as intended. Martial singles out the praetor, who no longer must walk through the mud to avoid the unruly shops (*nec praetor medio cogitur ire luto*, 7.61.6). As with the *lagonae*, on a literal level Martial expresses how citizens no longer must walk through trash and debris in the streets,[84] and the choice of the praetor shows a preference for the space now allowed to the elite citizens of Rome. The *densa turba* still remains, after all. But with the increasing presence of Domitian in Books 7-9, we also may note more restraint within Martial's satirical epigrams. This book was published for the Saturnalia of 92 CE, and so we would expect a licentious book (such as, for example, Book 11), but instead the opening sequence of poems praise Domitian. Elite citizens, by extension, are less likely to be dragged through the mud by Martial in this book of epigrams. Inasmuch as Martial's epigrams purport to represent the Roman city, Domitian's urban renewal has found its way into the poems themselves.

[84] Galán Vioque 2002: 357 takes this image literally.

The *densa turba* and muddy streets of 7.61 reappear in epigram 10.10, which I have discussed in the previous section in regard to Numa and the lower classes. This is the third poem in Martial's *lutum* sequence:

Cum tu, laurigeris annum qui fascibus intras,
  mane salutator limina mille teras,
hic ego quid faciam? quid nobis, Paule, relinquis,
  qui de plebe Numae densaque turba sumus?
qui me respiciat dominum regemque vocabo?
  hoc tu — sed quanto blandius! — ipse facis.
lecticam sellamve sequar? nec ferre recusas,
  per medium pugnas et prior ire lutum.
saepius assurgam recitanti carmina? tu stas
  et pariter geminas tendis in ora manus.
quid faciet pauper cui non licet esse clienti?
  dimisit nostras purpura vestra togas. (*Epigr.* 10.10)

> When you who enter the year with laurel-bearing *fasces* wear down a thousand thresholds paying your respects of a morning, what am I to do here? What do you leave for us, Paulus, us of Numa's plebeians, the dense crowd? Shall I address a prospective protector as "lord" and "king"? You do that yourself, and how much more flatteringly! Shall I follow litter or chair? You don't refuse even to shoulder one and fight your way in front through the middle of the mud. Shall I keep on rising in my seat at his poetry recitation? You are on your feet stretching out both hands at once towards his face. What shall a poor man do, who isn't allowed to be a client? You and your like with your purple have discharged our togas.

This epigram uses the same imagery as the earlier 3.36 and 7.61, but it amplifies the terminology and moves away from euphemism, thereby making more explicit the tensions within the patronage system in Rome. Martial strips away euphemistic language by showing how even elite men are still clients to others in the larger social and political hierarchy of the early empire. No longer is the patron a friend (*amicus*); now Martial wonders if he should address patrons as masters (*dominus*) or kings (*rex*). Likewise, he names the poor man—himself implied—as a client (*cliens*). This is a far cry from the supposed *amicitia* relationship between the poet and Fabianus in 3.36. The poet still must get up early in the morning and dirty himself with mud by carrying a patron's chair, but this time he also must vie for this degrading service with his social

superiors. In this case the poet directly aligns himself with the general populace (*densa turba*), the same group that he contrasts with the praetor in 7.61. He more directly associates himself with the Roman poor, but in 10.10 we also see the dissolution of boundaries in the social hierarchy, as Paulus willingly walks through the mud, degrading himself for someone a little higher up than himself.

Finally, epigram 12.29 (26) describes a senator who also must perform his duties as a client despite his high political position. Notably, this epigram occurs in the second of only two books written outside of Rome,[85] offering an outsider view of the urban situation:

Sexagena teras cum limina mane senator,
  esse tibi videor desidiosus eques,
quod non a prima discurram luce per urbem
  et referam lassus basia mille domum.
sed tu, purpureis ut des nova nomina fastis
  aut Nomadum gentes Cappadocumve regas:
at mihi, quem cogis medios abrumpere somnos
  et matutinum ferre patique lutum,
quid petitur? rupta cum pes vagus exit aluta
  et subitus crassae decidit imber aquae
nec venit ablatis clamatus verna lacernis,
  accedit gelidam servus ad auriculam,
et 'rogat ut secum cenes Laetorius' inquit.
  viginti nummis? non ego: malo famem
quam sit cena mihi, tibi sit provincia merces,
  et faciamus idem nec mereamur idem. (*Epigr.* 12.29)

> You, a senator, wear down sixty thresholds of a morning; so me, a knight, you look on as an idler because I don't run here and there about town from daybreak on and bring home, tired out, a thousand kisses. But you do it to give a new name to the purple records or to govern the peoples of Numidia or Cappadocia. But I, whom you would force to break off my sleep halfway and endure and bear the morning mud, what do I look for? When my wandering foot leaves its broken shoe and a sudden heavy shower of rain is falling and the slave who went off with my cloak doesn't come to my shout, a flunky approaches my frozen ears and says: 'Laetorius requests your company at dinner.' For twenty sesterces? Not I. I prefer to go hungry

[85] Book 3 was written from a country estate in *Gallia Togata* while Book 12 was composed during Martial's retirement in his home country of Spain.

> rather than to be rewarded with a dinner while you get a province, so that we do the same work but don't get the same pay.

Several items in this poem connect it concretely to the earlier poems in the sequence. The description of a client as *lassus* (tired) circles back to the initial depiction of the poet as *lassus* in 3.36.5. Likewise, the use of the verb *teras* (to wear away) at 12.29.1 recalls Paulus as a *salutator* wearing away the thresholds of his patrons in 10.10.2. The new image of enduring the morning mud (*matutinum . . . lutum*), meanwhile, invests the *salutatio*, an essential component of Roman patronage, with the dirtying of the client. As with the earlier *lutum* epigrams, mud signifies social or economic inferiority, but here this can apply to a fellow senator or a knight in addition to someone even lower. In this final poem Martial is very explicit that the senator and the poet do the same work but with very different rewards. However, Martial does seem to suggest an improvement in circumstances by aligning himself with the knights (*equites*) rather than Numa's plebeian class from 10.10. As the final book of Martial's oeuvre, this reveals the benefits that his fame as a poet has brought him. At the end of the day, though, Martial still insists that his services to patrons come with meager rewards compared to others such as Laetorius, who is rewarded with a province. It is best for Martial to not participate in the social hierarchy at all; this explains his retirement from Rome in his final book. Martial excuses himself from public degradation.

Overall, this group of four poems are clearly linked in their discussions of patronage, of which *lutum* is a significant part. However, who is patron and who is client varies widely. When taken together, these poems are notable for the ways in which Martial expands the definition of a client in imperial Rome. Epigram 3.36 portrays the poet as client, which is an expected image in

Martial's corpus.[86] From there the poems expand outward to Martial's wealthier addressees Paulus in 10.10 and Laetorius in 12.29. Even in 7.61 the entire city of Rome benefits from the edict of the emperor, who is the ultimate patron, and in this case Rome itself is the client of the emperor. Domitian is also the only addressee in this series known to be real; Laetorius and Fabianus are fictional characters, while Paulus is likely fictional.[87] We might wonder, then, to what degree Martial's Domitian is equally fictive. Regardless, this set of poems shows the difficulties of patronage in Rome, and by the end of the sequence it seems that the only person who does not become befouled by the system is the emperor himself.

One image in epigram 3.36 is not found in the other three poems but is noteworthy for offering another example of social muddiness: the act of a client following his patron to the bath houses. Throughout his epigrams Martial juxtaposes the mud of the street with the seeming cleanliness of the baths. However, bathing is hardly a clean process in Martial's poetry and is even assimilated with the muddy streets Martial wants to avoid, as so happens in 3.36.[88] This applies to bathhouses symbolically, since they are spaces in which clients hope to win dinner invitations, thus appearing like socially inferior comedic parasites. We should remember Selius from 2.14 who runs all over town looking for a dinner invitation and visiting every bathhouse in the process. In this epigram Martial lists several landmarks of Rome, both well-known and obscure: Selius runs to the Portico Europae, the Saepta Julia, the Temple of Isis, the Hecatostylon, the Theater of Pompey, and finally several bath complexes:

nec Fortunati spernit nec balnea Fausti
  nec Grylli tenebras Aeoliamque Lupi:
nam thermis iterum ternis iterumque lauatur.

---

[86] See Nauta 2002: 27 for the poet as a special type of client. Saller 1983, Tennant 2000.
[87] Jones 1982 suggests that Paulus is real.
[88] For bathing in Martial's poems, see Dyson and Prior 1995: 251-52: baths figure in the sexual and social world of Martial.

(*Epigr*. 2.14.11-13)

> He doesn't spurn the baths of Fortunatus or the baths of Faustus, or the shade of Gryllus and the Aeolian [cave] of Lupus. But now he washes himself again and again in the three bath houses.

Just as Selius attends the baths again and again, he circles the Campus Martius in his pursuit of a dinner invitation, and the repeated washings parallel the cyclical nature of Selius' daily journey. Yet, Selius' visits to the baths are not truly cleansing; he remains defiled by his subservient social position. No matter how many times he washes himself, he will never cleanse himself of his client status.

As with epigram 2.14, Martial tends to name specific popular bathing establishments throughout the city. This specificity also allows the reader to distinguish between the free bathhouses that are open to the *turba* and private bathhouses with a cost of entry and therefore an added layer of exclusivity.[89] When the crowd enters public spaces, they bring the filth in from the city and streets. Thus, the bathhouses function as microcosms of the messiness of the larger urban environment. But even smaller and exclusive establishments can be dirty, though in these instances Martial connects bathing with the filthiness of sexual license. Later in Book 3 Martial offers several examples of female sexuality on display at the baths. In epigram 3.72 he chastises Saufeia for not bathing with him; she must have some physical defect to hide from him. Again at 3.87 Martial jokes that Chione should cover her face instead of her genitals in the baths, the implication being either that she is unattractive, or more likely that she engages in oral sex. Her *cunnus* remains *purus*; however, her mouth does not. In these cases it seems that no amount of

[89] For different types of bathhouses see Fagan 2001 and 2011. There is not necessarily a clear distinction between the terminology of *thermae* and *balnea* in the epigrams, though since the *balnea* are generally acknowledged to be smaller spaces, they perhaps offer more opportunities for privacy.

bathing will actually cleanse the individuals of their undesirability and presumed uncleanliness. Epigram 1.23 combines these images by paralleling the bathhouse as a site for patronage and as a site for sexual license. Cotta apparently only dines with men he has met in the baths. Since he has never invited Martial to dinner, the punchline is that he does not find Martial attractive, and thus a viable object of sexual pursuit. In aligning the *patronus* with the *amator*, Martial suggests that the client and the beloved are in similarly subservient positions.

As the above examples make clear, Martial portrays the baths in Rome as spaces of sexual promiscuity,[90] and this extends to both men and women. Furthermore, the *palaestra* within larger bathing establishments is a space for sexual pursuit, as is apparent in 7.67:

Pedicat pueros tribas Philaenis
et tentigine saevior mariti
undenas dolat in die puellas.
harpasto quoque subligata ludit
et flavescit haphe, gravesque draucis
halteras facili rotat lacerto,
et putri lutulenta de palaestra
uncti verbere vapulat magistri:
nec cenat prius aut recumbit ante
quam septem vomuit meros deunces;
ad quos fas sibi tunc putat redire,
cum coloephia sedecim comedit.
post haec omnia cum libidinatur,
non fellat — putat hoc parum virile —,
sed plane medias vorat puellas.
di mentem tibi dent tuam, Philaeni,
cunnum lingere quae putas virile. (*Epigr.* 7.67)

> Lesbian Philaenis sodomizes boys and, crueler than a husband's lust, penetrates eleven girls per diem. She also plays with the harpastum high-girt, gets yellow with sand, and with effortless arm rotates weights that would tax an athlete. Muddy from the crumbly wrestling floor, she takes a beating from the blows of an oiled trainer. She does not dine or lie down for dinner before she las vomited six pints of neat wine, to which she thinks she can decently return when she has eaten sixteen collops. When after all this she gets down to sex, she does not suck men (she thinks

[90] Rimell 2008: 23-24 has noted Martial's pairing of bathhouses and oral sex.

> that not virile enough), but absolutely devours girls' middles. May the god give you your present mind, Philaenis, who think it virile to lick a cunt.

This is one of three poems that include a punchline about cunnilingus (the other two are 3.74 and 11.47), and it is also explicit in describing the filthiness of the space. Through her exercise at the *palaestra*, Philaenis becomes muddied (*lutulenta*), but for Martial she is muddy even more so in her sexual preferences. The poem toggles between these two images of mud and clay: the first pertaining to Philaenis' wrestling, the second to female genitalia as foul and thus closely associated with *lutum*.[91] Martial's depiction of Philaenis as muddy adds another facet to portrayals of female ugliness throughout the corpus, just as previously we saw in epigram 10.39 about Lesbia's old age. In both cases Martial represents the women as socially inferior by depicting them with mud and clay imagery.

In the bathing poems and in the jokes about female sexual promiscuity, Martial may be tapping into the larger etymological connections between *lutum* and its Greek cognates: λύθρον (gore), λῦμα (dirty water, moral filth), and λύμη (maltreatment).[92] In Latin *lutum* is related to *polluo* (to defile) and more tangentially to *luo* (to loosen) and *lavo* (to wash).[93] *Lavo* is related to the Greek λούω, which perhaps causes some confusion with the similar sounding λύω.[94] In any case, if there is a connection between *lavo* and *lutum*, it is a symbolic one in Martial's poetry,

---

[91] Richlin 1992 and Adams 1987 both explicate the associations between *lutum* (filth) and genitalia and other bodily functions.
[92] Beekes 2010 also notes that *Lustrum* and *lustrari* both may apply to brothels and those who frequent them.
[93] Maltby 1991 s.v. 'lutum' cites Paul. Fest. 120, *lues . . . tractuma Graeco* λύειν. *hinc dictum lutum terra humore soluta*, as well as Isid. *Orig*. 1.29.3, *ex contrariis ut a lavando lutum, dum lutum non sit mundum*.
[94] One might think of Pliny's occasional confusions with medical terminology as a misremembering of the Greek. See Doody 2011.

since the bathhouses—where one should expect to clean oneself—end up being just as dirty (socially) as the streets of Rome.

Throughout Martial's epigrams *lutum* appears in a range of scenarios but all with the larger intention of expressing inferior social status. Often the people Martial depicts as befouled are so because of either their subservient or deviant behavior. A senator for example would not naturally be associated with *lutum*, and yet it is the action of currying favor with his social and political superiors that has made him appear dirty to Martial. For others, such as Philaenis, their dirtiness is ingrained in their personal maintenance and sexual behavior. Martial even extends this depiction to the poet himself in the role of client in Rome. In this regard there is a sense of futility to the image, since Martial portrays himself first as obligated to fulfill this role in order to live in Rome and then ultimately excusing himself from the system entirely upon his retirement to Spain.

These social and moral dynamics of *lutum* can add new shades of meaning for epigrams about art and craft objects, bringing a new dimension to more traditional ekphrastic readings. However, one further material is important to understanding how we might mesh the social role of natural materials with metaliterary commentary: dust (*pulvis*), the relative of *lutum*.

1.4 The Poetics of Dust in Martial's *Epigrams*

Just as Martial uses *lutum* (mud, clay) in metapoetic and programmatic contexts, throughout the epigrams he also employs the image of *pulvis* (dust). *Pulvis* as a material for earthenware occurs twice in the *Apophoreta* to describe first what Surrentine cups are *not* made of (14.102) and second a Cumaean plate (14.114). I will discuss these items and their relationship to other Saturnalian gifts in Chapter 2, but here I consider how dust, the material, appears elsewhere in the epigrams, since the material on its own is illuminating for my

subsequent interpretation of *pulvis* in descriptions of clay objects. The range of scenarios in which one encounters dust in the epigrams speaks to the social dynamics of Martial's Rome, and we may even read a poetics of dust in the epigrams through the accumulation of dust imagery.

Pulvis and *lutum* are inversions of one another. One dry, one wet, the pair are temporal opposites, with *pulvis* representative of the summer and *lutum* suggesting winter weather. Likewise, they have different uses in the same spaces: *pulvis* lines the floor of the exercise area in the baths, while athletes cover themselves in a muddy (*lutosus*) oil and clay mixture. In this setting the one (*pulvis*) has the ability to transform into the other (*lutum*) when mixed with sweat and oil on the exercising individual's skin. The ability to cover an individual also leads both materials to be considered sordid and dirty by ancient writers.

A cursory look at *pulvis* and its cognates in the epigrams reveals several distinct situations in which dust is present, including travel, bathing, and descriptions of monuments.[95] I will begin with dusty travel imagery, which Martial applies to both the ordinary citizen and the emperor, though notably the social status of the traveler determines whether dust is treated as a positive or negative marker. Five instances explicitly mention travel: two describe the personified book traveling to Rome (3.5, 12.5), two more describe the emperor's return to Rome after a military campaign (8.65, 10.6), and one describes a private citizen, Cotta, traveling away from Rome to Baiae (10.14). We can further group 10.6 and 10.14 together through the common image of both Trajan and Cotta with their retinues leaving a trail of dust (*longusque . . . pulvis*, 10.6.5 and *in longo pulvere*, 10.14.2) that, on a straightforward reading, reflects the dry roads of summer travel. However, these two poems, so close together in Book 10, also create a humorous

[95] *Pulvis* and cognates occur nineteen times in the text: *Liber Spectaculorum* 30, *Epigrams* 1.82, 3.5, 4.19, 5.65, 6.38, 7.32, 8.3, 8.65, 10.6, 10.14, 11.84, 12.5, 12.50, 12.82, 14.48, 14.102, 14.114.

contrast between the heroically depicted emperor, Trajan, whom all of Rome longs to see return successful from a military campaign and the luxurious private citizen Cotta, who acts like a desperate elegiac lover in spite of his good fortune.[96] The disparity between the epicized emperor (Trajan) and the wannabe elegist (Cotta) is only apparent through the joint plumes of dust stirred up by attending horsemen (*eques*, 10.6.7 and 10.14.2). Treating this pair as a unit that plays with the differences in genre also helps to frame the contrasts between Martial's epigrams on his traveling book and epigrams on traveling emperors, each operating as their own pairs of epigrams and in contrast to one another.

Epigrams 8.65 and 10.6 specifically describe the emperors Domitian and Trajan arriving in Rome from successful military campaigns:

Hic ubi Fortunae Reducis fulgentia late
templa nitent, felix area nuper erat:
hic stetit Arctoi formosus pulvere belli
purpureum fundens Caesar ab ore iubar;
hic lauru redimita comas et candida cultu
Roma salutavit voce manuque ducem.
grande loci meritum testantur et altera dona:
stat sacer et domitis gentibus arcus ovat;
hic gemini currus numerant elephanta frequentem,
sufficit inmensis aureus ipse iugis.
haec est digna tuis, Germanice, porta triumphis;
hos aditus urbem Martis habere decet. (*Epigr.* 8.65)

> Here, where shines far and wide the gleaming temple of Fortune the Home-bringer, was but lately a lucky space. Here stood Caesar, beauteous with the dust of north warfare, pouring brilliant radiance from his countenance. Here Rome, her hair wreathed with laurel and clothed in white, saluted her Leader with voice and hand. Another gift attests the signal merit of the spot: a sacred arch stands exultant over subjugated nations. Here twin chariots number many an elephant, and Himself in gold suffices for the colossal cars. This gate, Germanicus, is worthy of your triumphs; Mars' city deserves such an entrance.

[96] Epigram 10.14 jokes that Cotta is miserable in his wealth and therefore assumes the role of the love-sick elegiac poet. Henriksén 2018: 402-3 analyzes this epigram alongside 10.13, which expresses Martial's longing to travel outside of Rome, and he suggests that together these epigrams thematize the role of the poet through their intertextual resonance with Ovid's poetry.

Felices, quibus urna dedit spectare coruscum
  solibus Arctois sideribusque ducem.
quando erit ille dies, quo campus et arbor et omnis
  lucebit Latia culta fenestra nuru?
quando morae dulces longusque a Caesare pulvis
  totaque Flaminia Roma videnda via?
quando eques et picti tunica Nilotide Mauri
  ibitis, et populi vox erit una 'Venit'? (*Epigr*. 10.6)

> "Happy they to whom the urn has granted it to see our Leader gleaming with northern suns and stars. When shall be the day on which ground and tree shall shine and every window, adorned by Latium's daughters? When shall be the sweet delays, the long trail of dust behind Caesar, and all Rome to be seen on the Flaminian Way? When shall the cavalry ride and the painted Moors in their tunics of Nile, and one voice of the people be heard: "He comes."

Book 8 is part of the three-book series (7-9) that sees an increase in poems about Domitian, and 8.65 panegyrizes the emperor who has foregone a triumph for his recent success in the Sarmatian War. Though he does not hold a triumph, Domitian has returned in grand style, celebrated by the people, who commemorate his victory through the construction of the Temple of Fortune and a triumphal arch. Martial highlights Domitian's greatness throughout the epigram with various expressions of radiance (*fulgentia* 1, *nitent* 2, *candida* 5, *aureus* 10). Dust is paradoxically included in this list as the emperor appears beautiful with dust from his northern campaign (*Arctoi formosus pulvere belli*, 8.65.3). Within extant Latin the combination of *pulvis* and *formosus* occurs only in this epigram, but there is a precedent for this unusual image, as Schöffel notes, in Horace's *Ode* 2.1 about Pollio's history of the civil wars.[97] Here Horace states that he has seen the great generals sordid with not unbecoming dust (*videre magnos iam videor duces | non indecoro pulvere sordidos*, 2.1.20-1). Harrison connects this image with Horace's discussion of Pollio's dramatic texts in the first half of the ode in addition to the heroic battle imagery

[97] Schöffel 2002: 546 n.1.

appropriate for Pollio's current literary project. The description of dust, Harrison contends, expands on the theme of tragic performance in the ode.[98] Likewise, the performative context for generals covered in dust fits well with the nature of Martial's epigram, which describes Domitian in a triumphal context despite the lack of triumph in reality. Through the use of vocabulary emphasizing visual brilliance and an image of dust that recalls dramatic performance, epigram 8.65 places Domitian on a stage to be seen and admired by the people of Rome for his military success.

Likewise, epigram 10.6, on Trajan's impending return to Rome, employs similarly brilliant vocabulary (*coruscum* 1, *lucebit* 4) as well as a corresponding dust image in the form of the trail of dust that Trajan will bring in from his military campaign along the Rhine (*longusque a Caesare pulvis*, 10.6.5). Additionally, Martial uses the adjective *Arctous* to describe the northern campaigns of both Domitian (8.65.3) and Trajan (10.6.2), which adds a sense of continuity between the two emperors.[99] But we also must remember that Book 10 was revised after Domitian's death and that the poems on Domitian have been expunged and replaced with several poems on Trajan. In this regard, the continuity in imagery between Trajan and Domitian comments on Martial's revision and replacement of poems in the book. Fearnley reminds us that 10.6 and its neighbor 10.7 emphasize Trajan's absence from Rome,[100] but these poems also emphasize Domitian's absence from the book. The common imagery in 8.65 and 10.6 ultimately

---

[98] Harrison 2017: 53.

[99] Schöffel 2002: 545 explains that the adjective *Arctous* was first used in Latin poetry by Seneca the Younger and that the formulation of *Arctoum bellum* occurs only elsewhere in Lucan (3.89). He then points to a specific association between Domitian and the adjective found also in Silius Italicus (3.614) and Statius' *Thebaid* 1.18ff. Martial uses *Arctous* six times in his epigrams, and these instances do not exclusively refer to Domitian. However, given that the word is also used to refer to Domitian in two separate epic poems suggests that the specter of Domitian would be present in 10.6, especially given the revised nature of the book.

[100] Fearnley 2003: 628.

shows how Trajan has replaced Domitian both as emperor and as the topic for Martial's revised epigrams.[101]

The common association of military grandeur and dust from the battlefield in these two poems is also deeply traditional and extends back to imagery from Homeric epic. This is something that Martial's predecessor Horace invokes in *Ode* 2.1 and even more explicitly in *Ode* 1.6, in which he defers to Varius in writing epic material that includes the dust of Troy (*pulvere Troico*, 1.6.14). Like Horace, Martial also prefers not to write epic, as he plainly states in his programmatic epigram 10.4 (*Non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque | invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit*, 10.4.9-10). But as with Horace's invocation of Troy in *Ode* 1.6, Martial, too, performs a sort of *praeteritio* on epic themes, and when it comes to the panegyric of emperors, this is appropriate material. *Pulvis* becomes a visual symbol that conveys the heroic qualities of the emperors and associates them with epic heroes in a genre that typically disavows such themes.

While Martial's association between dust and warfare derives from epic generally, his lexical formulations are contemporary to Flavian Rome and find direct correspondence in Statius' *Thebaid*. Beyond epigram 8.65 the formulation *pulvere belli* at line end is found only twice elsewhere at *Thebaid* 4.261 and 10.729. Book 4 of the *Thebaid* illustrates the assembly of troops against Thebes, and in line 261 the young hero Parthenopaeus longs to soil his golden hair with the dust of war and return victorious (*prosilit audaci Martis percussus amore, | arma, tubas audire calens et puluere belli | flauentem sordere comam captoque referri | hostis equo*, 4.260-

[101] From a more skeptical view, this replacement might not reflect Trajan in the most positive light. It is as if Martial has simply inserted a new name in poems that could fittingly describe the former emperor, and given Domitian's *damnatio memoriae*, the replacement of panegyric for him with panegyric for Trajan might ring hollow.

3). Later in Book 10 the hero Menoeceus deceives his father in order to gain access to the walls of Thebes while the battle is still raging by saying that his brother Haemon, injured and in need of medical treatment, lies in the dust of war (*gemit Inachia mihi saucius Haemon | cuspide; uix illum medio de puluere belli | inter utrasque acies, iam iamque tenentibus Argis*, 10.728-30). This deceitful story enables Menoeceus to enter Thebes and commit a sacrificial suicide from the towers of the city, thus securing the city's safety.

Similarly, the use of *longus* as a descriptor for *pulvis* in a phrase that suggests a long trail of dust only occurs twice outside of Martial's epigrams and, intriguingly, in Books 4 and 10 of Statius' *Thebaid*. At 4.136 Hippomedon appears on a horse kicking up a trail of dust (*illum Palladia sonipes Nemeaeus ab arce | deuehit arma pauens umbraque inmane uolanti | implet agros longoque attollit puluere campum*, 4.136-8). Then at 10.550 Statius describes how Antheus, struck with an arrow, is dragged along the ground by his chariot, his head and hair creating a long trail of dust in its wake (*longo sequitur uaga puluere ceruix, | et resupinarum patet orbita lata comarum*, 10.550-1). The image of Antheus appears strikingly like that of Hector's corpse in the *Iliad*.

The publication of Statius' *Thebaid* around 91 CE predates the publication of Martial's Books 8 and 10, published and republished in 94 and 98 CE respectively, so it seems likely that Martial has these specific moments in mind when he writes of dust in relation to the emperors' military exploits. But what does Statius' narrative add to the epigrams? Martial's incorporation of Statius' language into his panegyric of Domitian is one of many contemporary epic images Martial uses to refer to the emperor throughout his corpus. For instance, the poet alludes to another Flavian epicist, Silius Italicus, in his much earlier Saturnalian collection, the *Apophoreta*. At 14.176 Martial writes of a German mask that strikes fear into a boy (*Sum figuli lusus russi*

persona Batavi. | *quae tu derides, haec timet ora puer*., 14.176.1-2). The larger section on artwork in the portion of the *Apophoreta* to which this mask belongs has been shown by Prioux to be a large-scale panegyric to the Flavian dynasty, and in the mask we see a recollection of Domitian's military exploits against the Chatti and Batavi. The image of the *puer* in this distich plays with panegyric imagery in Silius Italicus' *Punica* in which he describes the young Domitian frightening the Batavi (*at tu transcendes, Germanice, facta tuorum,* | *iam puer auricomo praeformidate Batauo*., 3.607-8). I will discuss the epigram on the German mask and its epic allusion in more detail in Chapter 2, but what is pertinent here is the connection between Martial's poetry and his epic contemporaries in panegyrizing the emperor. Beginning early in his published works, Martial employed epic material in descriptions of Domitian, and so a reference to the recently published *Thebaid* is not out of place in his work.

However, unlike an allusion to the epic invocation of Domitian in the *Punica*, a reference to the *Thebaid* creates additional mythological baggage for Martial's panegyric since the various dust images in Statius' epic are attached to specific figures in the text. The image of the young Parthenopaeus imagining himself heroically covered in dust, returning victorious from battle, is thus a suggestive reference for Martial's depiction of the victorious Domitian in 8.65. By the publication of Book 8, Domitian was no longer the youthful prince as portrayed in the *Punica*, but this parallel with the young hero could recall his early military days and likewise Martial's panegyric from that time. Statius' larger presentation of Parthenopaeus, though, does not immediately seem like flattering material for Martial to direct towards the emperor. As Parkes succinctly states of this introductory image of the boy: "Parthenopaeus is in love with the idea of war, specifically the idea of himself in war".[102] Historians generally note that Domitian was not

[102] Parkes 2012: 164.

as sharp a military officer as his father and brother, who led successful campaigns in Judaea; his early experience in Gaul and Germania seems to have been a way to show himself equal to Vespasian and Titus and is criticized by Tacitus for this reason.[103] In this regard, young Domitian's tactics would certainly fit with the characterization of Parthenopaeus in *Thebaid* Book 4, and in a fairly critical light.[104] The same goes for Statius' depiction of Parthenopaeus' golden hair, a primary characteristic of his beauty. Seo points out that Statius' emphasis on the hero's youth and beauty foreground his death in Book 9 and that his dust-filled hair suggests a dishonorable death.[105] This would be a difficult image to place in Book 8 at the height of Martial's panegyric of Domitian, though it works quite nicely with Martial's commentary on revision and replacement in Book 10 and his epigram on Trajan's dusty military campaign. Parthenopaeus' hair would also have been a personally touchy subject for Domitian, who notoriously worried about his baldness and even wrote a treatise on haircare.[106] The various criticisms and barbs that arise through a comparison between Domitian and Parthenopaeus suggest that this would best be read into the poem after the publication of Book 10.

Despite the various negative parallels, it is still possible to provide a positive spin to a *Thebaid* allusion in epigram 8.65. The young Parthenopaeus longs for combat but is destined for an untimely death; Domitian on the other hand has returned to Rome successful. The allusion Martial creates through the dust of war (*pulvere belli*) thus rewrites Parthenopaeus' story and creates a sort of wish-fulfillment for the character. Domitian, who was engaged in military

---

[103] Jones 1992: 126.
[104] It is worth considering Statius' use of Thebes as a framework for contemporary political circumstances in Rome. Braund 2006 suggests that Thebes was as important as Troy in Roman conceptions of origin and identity, though she does not believe Statius' portrayal is a subversive critique of the Flavians.
[105] Seo 2013: 132-35.
[106] Seo 2013: 136; Morgan 1997.

pursuits since he was a *puer*, has in fact completed the task Parthenopaeus longed for, and he has returned home gleaming with dust. He has accomplished what the tragic hero could not.

The change of emperors complicates this panegyric image, not only through the act of wiping Domitian from Book 10 and placing Trajan in a similar military position but also through the additional allusions to heroes in the *Thebaid*. As I have suggested above, a reading of Domitian as Parthenopaeus could be positive in Book 8 and reread as negative in Book 10 through the separate image of Trajan's trail of dust (*longus pulvis*) that is found likewise in *Thebaid* Books 4 and 10. But there are also other mythological characters that one could read into Martial's verbal resonances with Statius. For instance, the other appearance of the phrase *pulvere belli* in the *Thebaid* occurs during Menoeceus' conversation with his father as he attempts to enter Thebes and sacrifice himself for the city. Through this story, we could view Domitian as a twisted version of Menoeceus; through his assassination Domitian has finally preserved Rome.[107] Of course, this is a retroactive reading that would only occur by connecting 10.6 with the earlier 8.65.

We might also consider the mythological characters who leave trails of dust in the *Thebaid* as appropriate parallels to the new emperor Trajan, though one works better than the other. This imagery occurs in the initial image of Hippomedon in Book 4 as well as the fall of Antheus, who is dragged by his chariot with hair in the dust, in Book 10. The latter nicely connects to the earlier images of Parthenopaeus' hair and in this way should be read as a continuation of the rereading of epic language applied to Domitian in the epigrams.

---

[107] To add to this reading: the Thebans call Menoeceus a peace-bringer and savior, attributes that Domitian played up during his reign. We might see a parallel in Martial's use of *dominus et deus* in epigrams 5.8, 8.2, and 10.72. The latter two epigrams work within the larger reading of Books 8 and 10 in conversation with one another.

Hippomedon, on the other hand, symbolizes military strength as he alone is able to raise the dust from the plain in a fashion more expected of an army.[108] However, we know that Hippomedon will die in the same book as Parthenopaeus later in the *Thebaid*, and so the reader of 10.6 must overlook the larger characterization of the mythological figure and instead focus on the effect of epicizing language in depicting the new emperor with the heroic quality of military prowess.

The epic language in epigram 10.6 is also humorously counterintuitive when placed in the context of the opening sequence in Book 10. In epigram 10.4 Martial programmatically disavows the epic and tragic genres, stating instead that his poetry speaks of the stuff of life and men (*hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'Meum est.'* | . . . *hominem pagina nostra sapit*, 10.4.8, 10). In the list of mythological figures Martial will not write about is, pointedly, Parthenopaeus (10.4.3). Yet, just two poems later, Martial uses epic language that recalls the *Thebaid* and prompts the reader to think about the earlier allusion in Book 8 to Parthenopaeus. Martial shows himself quite capable of incorporating epic themes and images into his epigrams despite what he may claim about his genre, and to his credit he does not actually write about mythological characters. Indeed, his pages do taste of (*sapit*) men, specifically one man, Trajan, whom he celebrates in epic language and who replaces the previous emperor known later in Book 10 in a sort of mythical framework through the epithet *dominus et deus* (*dicturus dominum deumque non sum*, 10.72.3). Ultimately, Martial conspicuously replaces Domitian and his attendant praise of him by creating a network of epic images centered around dust.

So Martial uses dust imagery within the context of epic military prowess among the most powerful members of Roman society, the emperors. However, he also uses *pulvis* to characterize all levels of the social hierarchy in Rome, and the remaining two epigrams that employ dust as a

---

[108] Parkes 2012: 115.

symbol of travel, like 8.65 and 10.6, comment on social status as well as genre. In epigrams 3.5 and 12.5, rather than writing of emperors, Martial speaks of his own personified books travelling to Rome. He portrays each book as a social inferior looking for patronage and a warm welcome. Placed in the same position within each book, which are notably the only books published outside of Rome, 3.5 and 12.5 are clearly connected, and as with 8.65 and 10.6, the latter epigram comments on the earlier by building up and refining common themes. In 3.5 for instance, Martial sends his book to friends in Rome who will receive it, though dusty:

Vis commendari sine me cursurus in urbem,
Parve liber, multis, an satis unus erit?
Unus erit, mihi crede, satis, cui non eris hospes,
Iulius, assiduum nomen in ore meo.
Protinus hunc primae quaeres in limine Tectae:
Quos tenuit Daphnis, nunc tenet ille lares.
Est illi coniunx, quae te manibusque sinuque
Excipiet, tu vel pulverulentus eas.
Hos tu seu pariter sive hanc illumve priorem
Videris, hoc dices 'Marcus havere iubet,'
Et satis est: alios commendet epistula: peccat
Qui commendandum se putat esse suis. (*Epigr*. 3.5)

> Little book, who are about to hasten to the city without me, do you wish to be recommended to many or will one suffice? One will suffice, believe me, one to whom you will be no stranger: Julius, a name forever on my tongue. You will look for him forthwith right at the threshold of the Covered Way. The house which Daphnis once tenanted, he tenants now. He has a wife, who will receive you with hands and bosom, though you arrive covered in dust. Whether you see them both together or him first or her, you will say: 'Marcus sends his greetings,' and it is enough. Let others be recommended by a letter. Anyone who thinks he needs a recommendation to his own folk is mistaken.

The proemial series of epigrams in Book 3 offer some insight into Martial's poetics of dust in this epigram.[109] The poet wrote this book during the summer of 87 CE while staying in Cisalpine

[109] The proemial sequence sets up several further connections with earlier collections: The book as a slave in 3.1 recalls Martial's worry for the book that has now left the safety of its master's home in 1.3 (See Rimell 2008 for this topic). The image of a book doomed to become wrapping for food (3.2) occurs also in the *Xenia*. And the ideal of a well-dressed book appears again in 5.6.

Gaul, and the epigrams emphasize its foreignness and distance from Rome. Epigram 3.1 opens with Martial contrasting this Gallic book with those written in Rome, who are depicted as home-bred slaves (*debet enim Gallum vincere verna liber*, 3.1.6); he then hastens the book to seek out first Faustinus (3.2) and then Julius Martialis (3.5), who will take care of the book as if it is part of the family. Epigram 3.4 clarifies that Martial is currently residing in Forum Cornelii because life in the city has become too tiring. We know that he will later explicate some of these urban responsibilities in 3.36 addressed to Fabianus. So on the surface the dusty book conveys geographic and temporal specificity. It is a foreigner travelling to the city because Martial is tired of Rome, and it undertakes travel during the summer months, when the roads would be dusty from the dry weather.

Given that the book has travelled through the dusty summer heat, it is perhaps reasonable that after the proemial series Martial immediately turns to the baths in epigram 3.7. However, this poem reveals one of the reasons Martial has left Rome: legislation (apparently short-lived) eliminating the dole given to clients.[110] Throughout the rest of Book 3 Martial focuses on aspects of patronage and daily life in the city, revealing this book to be far more Roman than the proemial sequence admits,[111] and part of Martial's focus on the urban environment in this book includes the baths. Bathhouses and bathmen appear in nine epigrams in this book, the highest frequency throughout Martial's corpus,[112] and therefore the dusty book has ample opportunity to physically clean itself, even if we know it will remain socially dirty in the process. The repeated appearances of baths in this book finally lead to a clever inversion in the final poem. Epigram

[110] Fusi 2006.
[111] Livingstone 2008: 110-11.
[112] *Thermae* appear in epigrams 3.20, 3.25, 3.36, 3.44, and 3.68 while *balnea* and *balneatores* appear in 3.7, 3.20, 3.25, 3.51, and 3.93.

3.100 again addresses a friend who has requested a copy of Martial's book, but the boy sent to retrieve the text ends up caught in a rainstorm:

> Cursorem sexta tibi, Rufe, remisimus hora,
> Carmina quem madidum nostra tulisse reor:
> Imbribus inmodicis caelum nam forte ruebat.
> Non aliter mitti debuit iste liber. (*Epigr*. 3.100)

> I sent your runner back to you at midday, Rufus, and I imagine he was wet through when he brought my verses, for the sky happened to be pouring with torrential rain. That book deserved to be sent in no other way.

Scholars have remarked on the chronological discrepancies of this final epigram, since it suggests an earlier version of the book.[113] Regardless of the logic behind the imagery of book production and distribution, this final poem reveals the book to no longer be dusty (*pulverulentus*), having been soaked through with rain. Even without this final soaking, the book has certainly had an opportunity to get wet from the various trips to the bathhouses. Furthermore, if we take the dust imagery to also be a mark of the book's initial foreignness as Martial sends it from Gallia Togata, then the downpour has also finally Romanized the book by getting rid of this mark of travel.

The image of bad poetry erased by water is familiar enough for Latin authors, and this is certainly at play in 3.100. But the final water image in this epigram works with Martial's larger material metapoetics. In a straightforward reading the rain at the end of Book 3 expresses the change of seasons: the reader starts in the dry heat of summer with a dusty book and ends with a rainstorm indicative of winter weather, which notably begins the very next book. The watery connection between 3.100 and Book 4 also offers an intriguing example of the continuity

[113] Fusi 2006.

between books.[114] This connection to Book 4, published for the Saturnalia, clarifies that there is a change of seasons at the end of Book 3, but it also shows how Martial returns to his usual subject matter after his time away from Rome. The transition between Books 3 and 4 shows that, at heart, Martial is a Roman and specifically a Saturnalian poet, a topic which I will explore in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

The dust imagery that begins Book 3 is important in this transition, for the use of dust and rain at the opening and closing of the book reveal Martial's potential to find new meaning for what at this point had become traditional programmatic terms. After all, a dusty (*pulverulentus*) book caught in the rain may not become clean: it instead becomes muddy (*lutulentus*). Importantly, Martial never explicitly calls his poetry *lutulentus*—that would place it too close to the negative connotations of muddy poetics from the Hellenistic period on and explicitly said pejoratively about Lucilius—but his poetry *is* muddy, particularly in relation to its Saturnalian themes.[115] Martial express this muddiness, for instance, in the distich about the hunchback that Prometheus has fashioned from "Saturnalian mud" (*Saturnalicio. . . luto*, 14.182.2). So the change from a dusty summer book to a wet (and presumably muddy) winter one fits with the self-referential imagery from the *Apophoreta*. As I have also shown in this chapter, Martial expresses the conditions for muddiness in his poetry through the image of the Roman client. Mud is the symbol for the messiness of everyday life in the capital, whether this is literally the filth in the streets of Rome, the mess of the baths, or the quality of Saturnalian gifts. Dust, then, is an important inversion and extension of this imagery.

---

[114] Lorenz 2004: 275-76 discusses 3.100 and the opening of Book 4. The article as a whole examines water imagery and the unity of the collection.

[115] For more on Horace's denigration of Lucilius' poetry through a Callimachean image, see the Introduction.

Martial returns to dusty travel in the only other collection produced away from Rome: Book 12. At 12.5 the poet tells the book to travel along the "no longer dusty" *Via Sacra*, a testament to the change of seasons as the book has traveled from Spain to Rome:

> Quae modo litoreos ibatis carmina Pyrgos,
> Ite sacra—iam non pulverulenta—via. (*Epigr*. 12.5)
>
> Poems that were lately on their way to coastal Pyrgi, go, no longer dusty, by the Sacred Way.

This epigram has troubled scholars due to its seemingly fragmentary nature. Recently, Carson has read this as a complete distich that contrasts Martial's poetry departing Rome for the provinces in the first line and then returning to Rome from the provinces in the second line.[116] The poem thus succinctly expresses Martial's changing conditions. However, the content of this distich also parallels 3.5 and 3.100, suggesting that this could be a late written hinge upon which to read the earlier epigrams. The placement in the collection as well as the dust imagery immediately associates this poem with 3.5, while the description of the collection as *carmina* travelling along the coastline recalls the description of watery poems in 3.100. In a reading that takes these three poems together, then, it is significant that Martial describes the road to Rome as no longer dusty. Yes, it points to a temporal change, but it can also suggest that the poetry itself, though written away from Rome, is no longer a dusty foreigner.

Martial also uses dust in a programmatic context beyond, yet still evocative of, travel. In this case, *pulvis* appears in descriptions of ruins. At 1.82 and 8.3 Martial describes monuments that have turned to dust, whether from accidental destruction or through the passing of time. Through the image of monuments turned to dust, we can yet again treat *pulvis* as the temporal inversion of *lutum*: whereas Latin authors associate mud/clay with primordial imagery and a

---

[116] Carson 2018: 70-71.

Golden Age past through their relationship with Prometheus and with humans imitating animal habitats, dust represents a distant future. Thus, in 8.3 Martial tells the Muse that his poetry will survive long after the funerary monuments of Messalla and Licinus have fallen and turned to dust (*et cum rupta situ Messalae saxa iacebunt | altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt*, 8.3.5-6).[117] In this epigram Martial's poetry is the antithesis of monuments turned to dust, for he imagines his books carried by readers to their homelands (*me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes | ad patrias sedes carmina nostra ferret*, 8.3.7-8). The reason for his poetry's survival and the disintegration of the funerary monuments points to the value of dispersal rather than a sedentary memorial. The monuments of Messalla and Licinus are made of durable material for now, but they will break down over time with no one to move them. Martial's books, however, are compact and transportable, as he makes clear from the outset of Book 1. These little books may not be physically as durable as marble, but their ability to move keeps them alive. In this way, the ephemeral becomes eternal, and travel is an essential component for preservation.

These aspects of dust allow us to create a more nuanced discussion of craft objects in Latin literature and specifically Martial's epigrams. As I mentioned in the beginning of this section, Martial uses *pulvis* to describe clay objects twice in the *Apophoreta*, once for a plate from Cumae sent to the gift recipient from the Sibyl (*Hanc tibi Cumano rubicundam pulvere testam | municipem misit casta Sibylla suam*, 14.114.1-2) and once to describe what Surrentine cups are not made of (*Accipe non vili calices de pulvere natos, | sed Surrentinae leve toreuma rotae*, 14.102.1-2). Martial's use of dust in different contexts throughout the epigrams adds

[117] Schöffel 2002 discusses the contrast between the celebrated literary patron Messalla and the imperial freedman Licinus. See also Canobbio 1994: 138, Lorenz 2002: 172.

meaning to the dust imagery in these early poems. For instance, the use of dust as an indicator of ruins and age works in tandem with the appearance of the aged Sibyl in 14.114, while the fact that she sends the plate to Rome invokes travel imagery. Similarly, the assertion that Surrentine cups are not made of cheap dust, when read against the discussion of Martial's books as dusty or muddy, opens the possibility that the cups are instead made from *lutum*. The description of cups made lightly on the Surrentine potter's wheel (*leve toreuma rotae*) would then more readily connect with other instances of *toreuma* in Martial's epigrams, including 4.46 about muddy Saguntine cups (*luteum rotae toreuma*, 4.46.16). This last epigram will be the focus of Chapter 3.

The same applies for Martial's use of clay terminology throughout the epigrams. Themes such as antiquity, rusticity, and Roman morality as expressed in clay/mud terminology as well as the connection between mud and social status create added social and moral valences to Martial's descriptions of clay objects. The abundance of muddy imagery in his epigrams, particularly in relation to earthenware, is therefore not coincidental but part of a larger poetics of crafts, and this in turn is a key component for understanding his authorial self-representation. In the next chapter I will turn to these objects in greater detail.

CHAPTER 2

THE SATURNALIAN FUNCTIONS OF CLAY OBJECTS IN MARTIAL'S *APOPHORETA*

2.1 The Roman Saturnalia and Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*

Two of Martial's earliest books of poetry, the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, are structurally unique within his larger corpus: both are composed almost entirely of distichs that function as gift tags for banquet foods (in the *Xenia*) and Saturnalia gifts (in the *Apophoreta*).[1] For a long time these collections were relegated to social and cultural analysis and were seen merely as a point of reference for food and gift items in Rome. However, recent scholarship has highlighted that the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* express much more than matter-of-fact statements about everyday items. Instead, these books showcase Martial's prowess as an epigrammatic poet who revels in metaliterary imagery.[2] Furthermore, the Saturnalia holiday is fundamental to any allusive and metaliterary reading of these collections. The gift-giving holiday provides the circumstance for the format and the publication of the two collections, and thus is integral in shaping the meaning and symbolism of the individual distichs. Even beyond these two collections, Martial's entire poetic corpus is characterized by Saturnalian gift-giving, and so understanding these early collections is fundamental to the interpretation of Martial's later works.[3]

The overtly Saturnalian nature of the *Apophoreta* and *Xenia* imbues these collections with the paradoxes of the holiday,[4] paradoxes which ultimately arise from the murky nature of

---

[1] The books date to 82-84 CE. For a discussion of the publication history, cf. Citroni 1989 and Sullivan 1991.
[2] Hinds 2007, Roman 2001, and Stroup 2006 all explore the metaliterary nature of the texts.
[3] Citroni 1989 has proposed that over half of the fifteen books of epigrams were published in December, making the Saturnalia and its attendant gift-giving tradition a foundational aspect of Martial's conception of his writing at large.
[4] For scholarship on the Saturnalia, see Citroni 1989, Guittard 2003, and Versnel 1993.

the holiday's eponymous god Saturn.[5] He is both a god and a pseudo-historical king of Latium, a foreigner and native to the region, and simultaneously a bringer of agriculture and civilization.[6] Furthermore, the Saturnian realm in myth represents a beneficent and peaceful Golden Age. This imagery coalesces under the Roman emperors beginning with Augustus, who depicts himself as a bringer of peace, and is still very much in play in Domitian's image-making.[7] Within the *Apophoreta* Martial invokes this Golden Age through various items such as the sickle, which is simply a sword transformed by the peace ushered in by the emperor (*Pax me certa ducis placidos curvavit in usus.* | *agricolae nunc sum, militis ante fui.*, 14.34.1-2). However, the Saturnalia is also a time of moral relaxation; gambling and license are encouraged, and social roles are reversed and suspended. This loosening of morals, of course, cannot be maintained indefinitely, and thus a tension arises within the imperial celebration of the Saturnalia: the holiday represents an age of peace that one wants to extend yet has temporal limits. The Saturnalia, with all of its merriment, is ultimately ephemeral. Order and morality must return to Rome and, significantly, the citizens must return to their social roles and original identities.

This is the historical and social backdrop for Martial's early collections, and Martial fills his *Apophoreta* with these inconsistencies and moral ambiguities (e.g. Golden Age vs. moral laxity). The text does not immediately appear ambiguous due to the unrelenting gift-tag structure of the book. The distichs superficially alternate between rich and poor gifts and thus impose a rigid social structure upon the relaxed holiday. Yet, ambiguities arise in the discrepancy between

[5] Versnel 1993: 136-227 thoroughly reviews the origins and social contexts of the festival. My analysis follows his argumentation.
[6] Brelich 1976 discusses Saturn as a parallel to Aeneas, Latinus, and Romulus. All are seen as universal culture bringers.
[7] The emperors become Saturnian kings who bestow gifts upon the people. Versnel 1993 examines the pitfalls of this imagery for the emperors, especially Nero and Claudius.

gift and gift-tag. Like the Saturnalia itself, the gifts described are temporary (all the more so for the foodstuffs of the *Xenia*), but the publication of the gift tags extends the life of each gift. The distichs thus present the ephemeral as everlasting. Even further, Martial reduces the gifts themselves to the smallest epigrammatic formula. In this way, the large becomes small (i.e. paintings, statues, books are all reduced to two-line descriptions), but in his skill as a poet Martial manages to open simple gifts up to broad interpretations through the very concision of the gift-tags. The insistent alternations in value throughout the book also simultaneously collapse and uphold the social distinctions between gift-recipients. The gifts represent the whole world reduced to commodities to be bought and sold in Rome and further reduced to a slender collection of distichs, which Martial playfully suggests may be reduced even further by reading only the titles to each poem (*lemmata si quaeris cur sint adscripta, docebo: | ut, si malueris, lemmata sola legas.*, 14.2.3-4). Thus, we find in these gifts the external and internal commodities of Rome, the citizen and foreigner, the native and exotic all made equal through the distich structure and jostling for attention as gifts for the reader to sample.[8]

The gift items in the *Apophoreta* are wide-ranging, from tools, birds, and clothing to artwork and books. Across this expanse many of the objects metaphorically and metapoetically deal with the Saturnalia and the qualities of Saturnalian epigram as a genre. For instance, Martial ends his introductory poem with a disavowal of tragedy and epic through the request of his imagined reader, who prefers that Martial play with nuts rather than write about Thebes, Troy, and Mycenae (*vis scribam Thebas Troiamve malasue Mycenas? | 'Lude,' inquis, 'nucibus'. Perdere nolo nuces*, 14.1.11-12). The cities represent the genres in which they are best known,

[8] In the third poem of the *Xenia*, Martial refers to the distichs as a *turba* (crowd). This image appears throughout his other collections of epigrams.

while the *nuces* (nuts) playfully parallel the similar sounding and programmatic *nugae* (trivial things) of epigram. Martial, like his predecessor Catullus frequently refers to his poems as *nugae*,[9] and so the verbal similarities ask the reader to imagine the nuts as a physical Saturnalian stand-in for the epigrammatic genre. Further, the verb *perdere* (destroy, lose) humorously places the nuts in the same position as the city Troy, itself a stand-in for epic. Thus, the juxtaposition of the cities (symbols of genre) with the trivial nuts encourages the reader to view the poems of the *Apophoreta* as the literal Saturnalian gifts and on equal terms with higher genres.

Other items in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* lend themselves to metapoetic treatment: wine immediately invokes the banquet setting for the Saturnalia and for sympotic epigram, and the types of wines Martial lists at 13.106-125 become allusive signposts to his poetic predecessors. Likewise, the poems on books (14.183-196) are perhaps the most obviously symbolic items of poetic production, and Martial humorously reduces Livy, Vergil, and Homer to two-line gift-tags.[10] In the distichs on literature, Martial emphasizes how during the Saturnalia the epigrammatic genre subsumes all others. Similarly, as I will discuss later in this chapter, the artwork poems (14.170-182) also readily open themselves to metapoetic discussion. This sequence draws from the ekphrastic tradition and the larger competition between literary and visual arts. Scholars have further shown miscellaneous items to be symbolic of epigram; for instance, the garland of roses at the end of the *Xenia* and the pastries at the end of the *Apophoreta*.[11]

---

[9] Swann 1994 compares the programmatic vocabulary of both poets.
[10] See Roman 2001: 134-35 for the book sequence in the *Apophoreta* and Hinds 2007: 114 for Ovid in particular.
[11] Grewing 2010: 134-49 discusses the metapoetics of the *adipata* (pastries) at 14.223, and Roman 2001: 133-34 connects the garland of roses at 13.127 with Horatian imagery.

In relation to both wine and artwork, we find an illuminating antecedent for Martial's poetry in Ovid's *Tristia* 2. Throughout his defense of his earlier poetry, Ovid lists various genres which escaped censure despite their risqué nature, including several types of Saturnalian poetry. The Saturnalian poetry that Ovid describes is didactic and joking, and it treats trivial subjects including types of gymnastic equipment, pigments, and even clay:

> alter humum, de qua fingantur pocula, monstrat,
> quaeque, docet, liquido testa sit apta mero.
> talia luduntur fumoso mense Decembri,
> quae damno nulli composuisse fuit. (*Trist*. 2.489-92)

> Another describes the clay from which cups are fashioned and teaches which bowl is suitable for the clear wine. Such poems are jested in the smoky month of December, but nobody was ruined for composing them.[12]

This striking note on clay objects during the Saturnalia is the point of departure for the present chapter. The existence of didactic poetry about clay, specifically in relation to banquets and the Saturnalia, suggests that these objects are of special importance for the *Apophoreta* and that Martial had literary predecessors in mind in his distichs about tableware and other clay objects. Therefore, clay may be added to the list of metapoetic items in the *Apophoreta*.

Martial expresses a preference for humble objects throughout his epigrams, and the tableware and clay objects in the *Apophoreta* represent epigram on a grand scale. This chapter highlights how clay objects function symbolically for the epigrammatic genre broadly and are fundamental for the critical analysis of Saturnalian epigram. Furthermore, the patterning of rich and poor gifts (such as precious metals and clays) offers an avenue for interpreting Martial's negotiation of identity and inversions of status within the Saturnalian framework. The following sections explore several themes within the *Apophoreta*, all centered around clay objects and the

[12] Translation adapted from Wheeler 1924.

contrast between earthenware and more valuable gifts. In addition to emphasizing the ambiguities and inconsistencies of the Saturnalia, the clay objects in the *Apophoreta* form a larger allusive framework with more valuable gifts in order to simultaneously panegyrize and subtly subvert the emperor. This oscillation between praise and criticism of Domitian through the imagery of the alternating gifts is part of the ambiguous nature of the Saturnalian collection.

2.2 *Apophoreta* 14.93-121: A Saturnalian Banquet Sequence

The thematic core—and literal center—of the entire work is the tableware sequence (14.93-121). In his descriptions of cups, plates, and utensils Martial reminds the reader of the ultimate destination of the gifts which the distichs supposedly accompany: the Roman *convivium*.[13] More specifically, the imagined space of Martial's *Apophoreta* is the private banquet rather than the public banquet in front of the Temple of Saturn and the later public banquets furnished by Domitian.[14] This section is doubly symbolic because *apophoreta* here refer to the very items used at the banquet itself,[15] though the hodgepodge of clay and metal tableware seem to defy any realistic depiction of a banquet. Instead, the proximity of low and high-status gifts creates a humorous image of a banquet littered with mismatched tableware.

Martial refers to the banquet setting in the introductory poem by exhorting the reader to "accept these lots alternately for rich and poor; let each one give his guest his own prize" (*divitis alternas et pauperis accipe sortes: | praemia convivae dent sua quisque suo*, 14.1.5-6). The use of the imperative *accipe* reflects the invocations of the gift tags in the rest of the book and

[13] MacDonald 2017: 311. Scholars have often tied the poems to a physical setting. For example, Prioux and Lehmann both connect the artwork poems (14.170-182) to the *Templum Pacis* of Vespasian, and while MacDonald does not reject this, she emphasizes that the gift tags evoke the transactional nature of the marketplace.
[14] A prime example is the Saturnalian banquet of Statius' *Silvae* 1.6.
[15] See Blake 2008: 59-60 for the tableware as take-away items at Roman banquets.

implies that the *Apophoreta* as a whole is Martial's single gift to the reader.[16] Likewise, Martial's characterization of the dinner guest as a *conviva* refers to the Roman *convivium*. By further placing the tableware in the central position of the book, he highlights the convivial setting of the entire collection. In turn, this allows for a self-referential and allusive reading of the section: the gift of the tableware literalizes the imagined banquet of the larger book by commenting on the very physical nature of the objects used in the *convivium*, and the poems about the tableware celebrate both the objects and the very occasion for their presentation.[17]

If the tableware section symbolizes the larger convivial setting of the book, then the categories of utensils also underscore the important rituals of Martial's Saturnalian banquet. Nineteen of the twenty-nine items refer to drinking vessels; this is first and foremost a drunken party fit for the tipsy days (*madidis . . . diebus*, 14.1.9) of the Saturnalia. The emphasis on drinking cups in this section also parallels the extensive wine section of the earlier *Xenia*, which offers a comparably long sequence of 20 distichs about wine (13.106-126). In that case, the wine gift-tags form the final and most important sequence of Saturnalian foodstuffs. Martial offers a few connections between the two passages such as the repetition of Surrentine wine (13.110) and Surrentine cups (14.102), and these unifying elements between the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* reveal the importance of wine and drunkenness to Saturnalian writing.

The numerous cups in the *Apophoreta* are steeped in allusive images. There is, in particular, a deep vein of Greek symposiastic literary allusiveness in these poems (as we see as well with the artwork sequence), and Martial blends more typical Roman convivial motifs and

---

[16] *Accipe* appears nine more times for various gifts: 14.27, 14.28, 14.87, 14.89, 14.96, 14.102, 14.159, 14.185, 14.219.

[17] The banquet setting also appears implicitly at other points in the text, as I will show in the *puer* sequence in the artwork poems (14.170-176). In that case, the speaker commands a slave (*puer*) to pour wine in honor of Domitian's victory over the Chatti in 14.176.

morality with riddling and complex allusions. The Second Sophistic writer Aulus Gellius provides a fitting example of this merging of Greek and Roman traditions in his own recollection about celebrating the Saturnalia in Athens (*Noctes Atticae* 18.2). In this anecdote Gellius attends a banquet for the Saturnalia in which all guests must answer riddles and questions of grammar and philosophy in order to win a prize. Gellius' Saturnalia in Athens, both in location and in ritual, is a Hellenized Roman celebration. While the gifts in Martial's *Apophoreta* are not prizes in a contest, they do convey a range of learned allusions, and when interpreted correctly, the gift tags take on more comical or even cynical meanings. These allusions form their own code or game of sorts for Martial's banquet, and the reader is rewarded with a literary *tour de force* when he correctly parses the allusions throughout the text.

The injection of Greek symposiastic themes within the Saturnalian banquet is nowhere more evident than in the central poem of the tableware sequence which describes the *calathi* used by Bacchus and his companions:[18]

107 *Calathi*

Nos Satyri, nos Bacchus amat, nos ebria tigris,
Perfusos domini lambere docta pedes.

107 *Goblets*

The Satyrs love us, Bacchus loves us, and so does
the tipsy tigress that has been taught to lick her
master's wine-drenched feet.[19]

In a section that foregrounds banqueting, the central poem describes the god of wine, Bacchus, and his drunken Satyrs and tiger. For Calandra this poem celebrates the potential of wine throughout the tableware series, and this is even more pronounced by its placement at the center

[18] The *cantharus* on the other hand was associated with wine and Dionysus (Hilgers 1969: 46).
[19] All translations of Martial are from Shackleton Bailey 1993.

of the tableware.[20] It also merges Greek and Roman banquet settings through the use of Greek loan words *calathus* (Greek κάλαθος) and Bacchus (Greek Βάκχος) for an item given during the Roman Saturnalia. Through the invocation of the Greek god, Martial invokes the symposium as well as the Roman *convivium* that is the larger setting for the *Apophoreta*. Furthermore, Leary proposes that Martial has in mind a particular iconographical image of Bacchus riding a tiger, which laps up the wine at his feet.[21] This imagery is found in Greece and Italy; one particularly well-preserved mosaic from the House of the Faun in Pompeii shows Bacchus as a child, with *cantharus* in hand, on the back of a tiger. A similar mosaic with adult Dionysus is also found at Delos, suggesting that this was a wide-spread image. Martial, then, has cleverly hidden an artistic reference within the tableware sequence (and not in the artwork section itself), and he also uses the distich to self-referentially evoke the banquet setting of the entire *Apophoreta* if we imagine these mosaics as stock imagery within dining spaces.

Martial's use of the *calathus* rather than *cantharus* is also notable. The *calathus* is a large vessel, either a wicker basket for carrying foodstuffs or a large cup for wine and other liquids. In Latin the term more frequently describes wicker baskets than cups; in fact, Hilgers cites only one other instance of a *calathus* being used for wine at *Eclogue* 5.71 (*uina nouum fundam calathis Ariusia nectar*).[22] The rarity of this use in Latin suggests that Martial has Vergil's *Eclogues* in mind as a counterpart for his cross-cultural blending. In this case, Vergil imbues the Roman pastoral setting with distinctly Greek elements such as the Ariusian wine that hails from Chios. Several verbal parallels throughout *Eclogue* 5 serve to strengthen this reference. In this poem Menalcas and Mopsus each sing a lament for the dead Daphnis. Menalcas sings that Daphnis

[20] Calandra 2003.
[21] Leary 1996: 170.
[22] Hilgers 1969: 128-29.

yokes tigers to a chariot and introduces Bacchus' cult to the region (*Daphnis et Armenias curru subiungere tigris | instituit, Daphnis thiasos inducere Bacchi | et foliis lentas intexere mollibus hastas*, 5.29-31). Meanwhile Mopsus' statement that Daphnis "loved us" (*amauit nos quoque Daphnis*, 5.52) is echoed in the *calathi* of the *Apophoreta* stating that the Satyrs, Bacchus, and tigers "love us" (*Nos Satyri, nos Bacchus amat, nos ebria tigris*, 14.107.1).

Throughout both songs, Vergil presents images of Bacchus' tigers, satyrs, the *calathus* full of wine, and a general convivial setting, all of which are present in Martial's distich. Beyond the potential physical references to the convivial setting, Martial incorporates a subtle literary allusion to a text which itself has been studied for its self-referentiality. Coleman's commentary notes that Menalcas was likely a persona for Vergil himself, making Martial's use of the *calathus* even more pointed.[23] Likewise, Hubbard has explicated several possible readings of Vergil's allusion to the opening of *De Rerum Natura* Book 5 in *Eclogue* 5.[24] Hubbard argues that a portion of Menalcas' song in which the shepherd has the natural world say of Daphnis, "that one is a god, a god, Menalcas" (*'deus, deus ille, Menalca!'*, Ec. 5.64), alludes to Lucretius' same proclamation of Epicurus in *De Re. Nat.* 5.8. This allusion gives *Eclogue* 5 a distinct Epicurean undercurrent, which Martial appears to playfully pick up. The *calathus* distich in the *Apophoreta* follows directly after a joke about the Stoic Fronto seeking water with an *urceus fictilis* (14.106). This explicit reference to a prominent philosophical school paves the way to read a hint of Epicurean philosophy in the *calathus* poem through allusion to Vergil's eclogue. Martial also employs a typical Saturnalian jesting contrast between the stern Fronto asking for cold water (*Stoicus hoc gelidam Fronto petebat aquam*, 14.106.2) and the drunken satyrs and tigers in

[23] Coleman 1977: 173.
[24] Hubbard 1995: 19ff.

14.107, which would further highlight a stereotypical Epicurean lifestyle. Through the invocation of Vergil's *Eclogue* 5, this distich succinctly expresses the merging of Greek and Roman identities within the Saturnalian setting while also expressing a range of literary allusions beyond the simple description of the object. The reader, meanwhile, may find new meaning in the tableware sequence by adding the layers of interpretation of Vergil's poem to Martial's use of this literary predecessor.

Several more tableware poems represent the transformations and alternations between Greek and Roman practice. The first four poems of the sequence describe in order cups made by Mentor (14.93), plebeian cups (14.94), a golden *phiala* made by the famed Mys (14.95), and finally cups in the appearance of the Roman *delator* Vatinius (14.96). In this arrangement the expensive items are of Greek artistic provenance (with the addition of Spain in the metal of the *phiala*) while the cheap items are Roman. As we will also see with the artwork, these alternations are more complex than an initial reading suggests, and the difference between material value or provenance can be subjected to Saturnalian inversions. This is especially the case for the moral worth of an object, and often the material and the morality of objects are complicated through Martial's invocation of exemplary figures in the distichs.[25]

For example, the tableware section opens with "antique cups" (*pocula archetypa*) which were made and used by the famed Hellenistic artist Mentor:

93 *Pocula archetypa*

[25] As I have discussed in Chapter 1, Roman authors frequently invoke dining and tableware in discussions of morality. Gold and silver are thus equated with *luxuria* while clay is a marker of old-fashioned Roman morality and rusticity. The tableware section of the *Apophoreta* operates under the same framework of moral usefulness as the excursus on silver and gold in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* or the philosophical letters of Seneca. However, just as we have seen in the structure and patterning of the artwork poems, Martial complicates what seems to be a straightforward alternation of material value in the rich and poor gifts with the moral value which the gift-giver or object asserts for itself.

Non est ista recens, nec nostri gloria caeli:
primus in his Mentor, dum facit illa, bibit.

93 *Antique cups*

Not of recent origin nor of Roman chisel is this
glory. Mentor was first to drink from these cups
while he was making them.

These cups initiate the sequence in the same grandiose fashion as the golden statue of Victory will in the artwork section (14.170), and in many ways they highlight themes that will reappear throughout the later distichs on art. On the surface, the designation of *archetypa* makes these the most valuable gifts amongst the tableware, and they are presented as extremely valuable not only because they are made by a famous artist whose works were highly sought in Flavian Rome but also because the artist supposedly used them himself, thus guaranteeing their authenticity. This claim of authenticity occurs later with the Brutus Boy statuette (14.171), and both reveal a preoccupation with authentic art compared to Roman copies and forgeries in Martial's epigrams.[26] As Henriksén has stated in his comments on epigram 9.43, the name Mentor appears throughout the Martialian corpus within a specific context of forged art, and thus when Martial invokes him he does so to cast doubt on the objects used in the elite display of wealth and connoisseurship in Rome. In beginning the tableware section with this fantastical story of Mentor drinking from the cups, Martial opens the entire sequence to questions of true worth and an underlying concern about fraudulent objects.

Secondly, the image of Mentor drinking from his cups foreshadows another thematically significant distich, 14.182 and the drunken Prometheus forming a hunchback out of clay. Distich 14.93 depicts Mentor rather paradoxically by stating that he drank from the cups as he made

[26] We can also connect this preoccupation to plagiarism. See Nisbet 2020 on plagiarism.

them — at what point within the creative process was he able to drink from the cups? — but this places him in the same position as Prometheus who is drunk while working. If we envision the poems as gifts given sequentially through the course of a night, the transition from Mentor to Prometheus also represents the increasing drunkenness and playfulness which takes place throughout the Saturnalian festivities. Yet the connection to Prometheus reveals another subversion on the part of the poet: if Mentor is drunk while creating the cups, are they really things of beauty? Perhaps, like the clay hunchback, the *pocula archetypa* are in fact grotesque objects made in jest. Of course, it is only in the repeated reading of the *Apophoreta* that this jab at the value of the work becomes apparent.

Martial includes other complicated exemplary figures in the subsequent distichs. The Neronian *delator* Vatinius and the ancient Etruscan ruler Lars Porsenna appear in two of the "poor" gifts following closely after Mentor's cups:

96 *Calices Vatinii*

Vilia sutoris calicem monimenta Vatini
accipe; sed nasus longior ille fuit.

98 *Vasa Arretina*

Arretina nimis ne spernas vasa monemus:
lautus erat Tuscis Porsena fictilibus.

96 *Vatinian cups*

Accept a cup, a cheap memorial of cobbler
Vatinius, but *that* nose was longer.

98 *Arretine ware*

I advise you not to be too scornful of Arretine ware.
Porsenna was luxurious with Tuscan crockery.

Unlike the "rich" gifts attributed to Mentor and Mys, renowned artists, these two figures are not positive *exempla* within the Roman tradition. In 14.96 Vatinius is the object of ridicule based on his physical appearance, and in this we may again look to the hunchback statuette of 14.182. The cups (*calices*) seem to be fashioned in the image of Vatinius, who was known for his long nose, but even here the cups fail at showing the true nature of the man: his nose was even longer (*nasus longior*).[27] The cups are described as cheap (*vilia*), and this ultimately lowers the respectability of the man illustrated on them.

It is unsurprising that Martial would further lower Vatinius' reputation through a joke about his nose: he was a known *delator* under Nero who, according to Tacitus' description, was universally despised.[28] Vatinius came to prominence by performing in the court of Nero, perhaps adding a further skewed link to the overall banquet setting of the tableware sequence. Martial also introduced Vatinius by his profession as a cobbler rather than his reputation, and in so doing, Martial further diminishes his status and turns him into a punch line.[29] Cobblers are frequently subjected to ridicule in Martial's epigrams: they appear in six instances (2.17, 3.16, 3.59, 9.73, 12.59, and here), and in these poems Martial further connects cobblers with oral sex because of the association with chewing leather to soften it.[30] Thus, Vatinius is a negative moral *exemplum* both politically and socially, and his appearance within the *Apophoreta* reveals a grotesque underbelly to the festivities in the form of ridicule, another paradox of the holiday. That this is one of two Roman images in the opening four distichs of the tableware sequence also

[27] Whitehouse 1999 asserts that these are glass cups made in Vatinius' image, or at least were characterized by a long nose.
[28] Vatinius is described in Tacitus *Ann*. 15.34, *Hist*. 1.37.2 and in Dio 63.15.
[29] Mayer 2012: 120 discusses the ridicule of Vatinius' occupation in the overall negative reception of the man.
[30] Bond 2016 Ch. 3 discusses the stereotypes and status of cobblers.

suggests that Martial subverts the expected positive depiction of a Roman holiday that was boosted by the emperors so that they might show their beneficence to the citizens.[31]

Epigram 14.98 urges the gift recipient to treat Arretine ware with higher esteem due to the prestigious lineage of Arretine objects, and the distich ultimately grounds this history in the legendary king Porsenna. This invocation of an exemplary figure from the past is functionally similar to the earlier justification that the *pocula archetypa* are valuable because their creator, Mentor, used them himself. Likewise, this epigram again opens the question of the authenticity of a gift. While the image of Mentor drinking from his own handiwork is hyperbolic, the image of Porsenna is only slightly more believable. Primarily, the speaker does not assert that Porsenna used this very tableware. Instead, he simply asserts that Porsenna owned something similar (and that he owned something similar because he was an ancient king of Arretium). The proximity to a grand lineage is enough of an assertion of value for the Arretine ware and is more in line with the social expectation of the "poor" gifts in the collection. In other words, it would be impudent to claim that Porsenna himself owned this tableware, and instead the depiction of 14.98 shows local pride through the invocation of a famous king.

Part of the humor in this distich is the fact that the reference to Lars Porsenna is entirely anachronistic. Modern scholars have traced the production of Arretine ware to the late Republic, specifically after Sulla and into the reign of Augustus.[32] Wiseman has suggested that the large-scale production of Arretine ware did not begin until after the confiscation of land and colonization of Arretium by Sulla in 82 BCE. Arretine ware was immensely popular under

---

[31] Again, Statius' *Silvae* 1.6 is a prime example of the positive associations between the emperor and the Saturnalia, as the poem depicts Domitian's beneficence towards the citizens during a grand event at the Colosseum.
[32] Pryce 1942 and Wiseman 1963.

Augustus before production of similar clay objects moved to Gaul. If Lars Porsenna, an Etruscan king who fought against Rome after the ousting of the Tarquins in 507 BCE, were to use any sort of clay tableware at all, it is much more probable that he would have acquired it from Greece.[33] Even if Arretine ware had been used in the generations before Martial's lifetime, he must have been aware of the disconnect in his claim that the Etruscan king used this type of pottery.

Thus, this distich makes a bold assertion in connecting a legendary king to the tableware, but at its core this claim reinforces the local pride for the commodity. Local pride in this case goes beyond the tableware itself, since Etruscan identity at large was a point of pride for local aristocrats of the late Republic and early Empire.[34] Lars Porsenna in this case exemplifies the long and prestigious history of the area, especially if one imagines that the gift-giver is of Etruscan descent. Attaching significance to a seemingly humble object through the image of a famous figure reflects the importance of maintaining Etruscan ethnic identity at a point in which Rome had largely subsumed Italic communities. This is even more pointed when read against the next distich (14.99) about a basket from Britain which now Rome prefers to call its own (*sed me iam mavolt dicere Roma suam*, 14.99.2). The Etruscans and Britons are both communities under Roman rule by this period—one more recently than the other—but Martial highlights both through their merchandise now available for Roman consumption.[35]

While Lars Porsenna highlights Etruscan identity in 14.98, he is a complicated exemplary figure for the Romans with a rich literary presence. He is an enemy king who attacks Rome, either to aid the Tarquins or to take Rome for himself depending on the source. When he appears

[33] Ridley 2017 for the historicity and mythology of Lars Porsenna. I draw a likelihood to Greek pottery because of the extensive trade between Greece and Etruria.
[34] Farney 2007.
[35] Blake 2008: 152 for the British basket and the conquest of provinces.

on the Shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* Book 8, he is threatening (*illum indignanti similem similemque minanti | aspiceres*, *Aen*. 8.649-50). Livy's description on the other hand is much longer and largely positive. As Ogilvie notes in his monumental commentary on Livy Books 1-5, Porsenna goes "from being a ruthless foe [and] is turned into a sentimental king with an admiration for Roman virtues which passes into a friendship".[36] In each account he is the inverse to the great exemplary Roman military figures G. Mucius Scaevola, Cloelia, and Horatius Cocles, and he reacts in awe at their defense of Rome and acts of courage.[37] In his role as an enemy of Rome, Porsenna aligns with the description of Vatinius in 14.96 as a negative moral representation, but his description in this distich is morally ambiguous both through the ambiguous literary tradition and furthermore in the description of the king as luxurious (*lautus*).

As a figure known within the context of military exploits, Porsenna's use of clay tableware portrays him in a similar light to Romans such as Aelius Tubero, who also used clay tableware and spurned silver when it was offered to him at his camp (see Chapter 1).[38] From a regal perspective, Porsenna is laudable in this distich because, even though he is a king, he still is luxurious in his use of clay objects. This is all the more striking considering that the Etruscans were known for their great wealth and their excellence in metalsmithing, and thus the crux of Martial's joke is the image that *even* the king of a decadent and wealthy community would find value in the supposedly humble clay tableware of Arretium.

Indeed, part of the Saturnalian joking of this distich relies on existing Greek and Roman stereotypes about Etruscan culture.[39] The Etruscans were seen as decadent and unable to control

---

[36] Ogilvie 1965: 255.
[37] These deeds are described in Valerius Maximus, *FDM* 3.2.2 and 3.3.1.
[38] The story is found in Valerius Maximus, *FDM* 4.4.9.
[39] Roman sources seem to have adopted the attitudes expressed in the Greek historians, starting with Herodotus.

their appetites. Horace, Catullus, and Vergil all characterize Etruscans as fat (*pinguis*, *obesus*), drawing a connection between the fertility of the land in what Farney describes as a moment of environmental determinism.[40] In regard to my interpretation of 14.98, the fertility of the land perhaps plays a part in the excellence of the clay objects from that area, since *pinguis* may refer to fertile soil. Beyond a connection to the rich land of Etruria, however, the Greek insistence on Etruscan decadence, lack of control, and effeminacy led historians such as Herodotus to suggest a genealogical connection with the Lydians, an equally decadent community in the Greek view, most famously through the fabulously wealthy Croesus.[41]

Much of the Etruscan stereotype resides in a fundamental misunderstanding of Etruscan banqueting, and Martial obliquely alludes to this by placing Porsenna within the larger convivial setting of the tableware section in the *Apophoreta*. While Martial frequently plays with Greek symposiastic traditions in the *Apophoreta*,[42] the Etruscans were likewise known for their grand banquets.[43] To the Greeks, the Etruscans were unusual for their inclusion of women in their banquets and the relative frequency of the festive occasions to the point that the Etruscans were regarded as overly decadent and morally lax because of it. Martial plays with this stereotyping in his poem through the humorous contrast between the humble material of clay and the praise for it through the figure of Porsenna. Therefore, the description of Porsenna as *lautus* (luxurious, sumptuous) places him within a specific convivial setting that is morally positive.[44]

---

[40] Farney 2007: 139.
[41] Farney 2007: 138.
[42] Such as in the *calathus* poem.
[43] Becker 2016: 295-98 discusses the Roman and Greek perceptions of Etruscan banquets.
[44] Cicero for instance uses *lautus* in close context with *urbanus* (*In Verrem* 2.1.17.2) along with *elegans* and *exquisitus*.

Throughout the tableware sequence Martial jests about various local and cultural traditions. One intriguing example is the description of a *panaca* at 14.100:

100 *Panaca*

Si non ignotast docti tibi terra Catulli,
potasti testa Raetica vina mea.

100 *Panaca*

If the country of learned Catullus is not unknown to you, you have drunk Rhaetian wines in my jar.

This distich represents the only instance of the term *panaca* in extant Latin, a word which appears to have a Celtic origin.[45] The *panaca*, then, is of distinctly provincial origins like the *bascauda* (basket from Britain) before it (14.99). We know from the description of the object as a *testa* that this was an earthenware vessel, and the context of the poem makes clear that it was used for drinking. The *panaca*'s special association with Rhaetian wine produced in the region of Verona adds value to an otherwise humble clay object, and the further invocation of Catullus portrays the vessel as prestigious just like the Arretine ware before it, which asserted its own value through its connection to Lars Porsenna. The same also occurs two distichs later when Surrentine cups proclaim that they are not made from cheap dust (*Accipe non vili calices de pulvere natos, | sed Surrentinae leve toreuma rotae*, 14.102.1-2). Martial explicitly connects these cups with their counterpart, Surrentine wine, earlier in the *Xenia* (13.110), and the reader of the *Apophoreta* distich must recollect this earlier collection in order to understand the full valuation of the cups.

In all three cases clay drinking vessels highlight their local fame as an indicator of their quality, but as with the distich on Arretine ware, Martial complicates the value of the *panaca*

[45] Leary 1996: 161-62.

through the reference to a famous local resident, in this case, Catullus. The speaker of Martial's distich portrays a positive association between the *panaca* and Catullus especially in the use of the adjective *docti* (learned) to describe the poet; at first glance the *panaca* might also be seen in this light. However, Leary points to a line from Servius' commentary on the *Georgics* regarding Rhaetian wine that contradicts this initial association. Apparently, Catullus hated the wine (*contra Catullus eam vituperat et dicit nulli rei esse aptam*, *In Verg. Georg.* 2.96).[46] Leary suggests that Martial's reference to Catullus is a playfully ironic: for those who really knew their Catullus, they would know that he hated the wine that is typically served in the *panaca*.[47] The ironic twist of the poem relies on the play between the learned connoisseur and provincial pride in Verona's learned poet.

Servius' comment pertains to a reference in the *Georgics* to the quality of Rhaetian wine, and he suggests that, while Catullus seems to have disliked the wine, Cato praised it. If Martial intends a learned literary allusion, he also expresses a tension between the neoteric writing of Catullus and the writing of Cato, or in other words a distinction between the urbane and the rustic. In the poem this appears through the close connection of the land (*terra*) and the learnedness of Catullus (*docti . . . Catulli*). If one knows Catullus and also knows the writings pertaining to Rhaetian wine, then he would understand both the positive and negative reactions to the wine. This also suggests a tension between the local pride of the *panaca* and the potential disdain of the urbanite. In this way, the *panaca* reveals a similar duality to the Arretine ware—locals are proud, but Romans may disdain the wine. On the other hand, in his commentary on the

---

[46] The full quote runs: *hanc uvam Cato praecipue laudat in libris quos scripsit ad filium; contra Catullus eam vituperat et dicit nulli rei esse aptam, miraturque cur eam laudaverit Cato*.
[47] Leary 1997: 323 "Could it be the epigram's intention, at least in part, to observe wryly that while patriotic locals proudly offered visitors to Verona the region's famous vintage, served in local earthenware, the region's most famous offspring thought the stuff was muck?"

same line from the *Georgics*, Mynors notes that Augustus was especially fond of Rhaetian wine. As I will discuss in the next section of this chapter, the *Apophoreta* has a clear panegyric strain within it, and given that the Flavians aligned themselves with Augustus through their iconography, the *panaca* and Rhaetian wine could be held in a more favorable light through this association with Rome's first emperor. Again, this highlights the duality of the distich and the possibility of both positive and negative readings within the same text.

Both the *panaca* and the Arretine ware highlight their local fame, and both seem to invoke a positive moral connotation while revealing complex negative undertones through their cultural and literary allusions. I turn now to another clay object which places a degree of pride in its origins, the Cumaean plate of 14.114:

114 *Patella Cumana*

Hanc tibi Cumano rubicundam pulvere testam
municipem misit casta Sibylla suam.

114 *Cumaean dish*

The chaste Sibyl has sent you this platter red with
Cumaean earth, her fellow townsman.

The representation of this platter closely connects to the *panaca* as a provincial object that conveys a mark of humility. Both distichs describe the object as a *testa* (piece of earthenware), which Leary cites as a specific lexical marker of humility, due to the representation of earthenware in Tibullus 2.3.47-48: "But in my feast's happy course let there be only the pottery of Samos or the slippery clay that Cumae's wheels have shaped." (*at tibi laeta trahant Samiae convivia testae | fictaque Cumana lubrica terra rota*).[48] However the introduction of the Sibyl herself conveys both modesty and boasting—modesty in that she is chaste (*casta*), boasting in

[48] Leary 1996: 177.

that she is an exemplary figure who lends a degree of renown to this specific plate. The plate is prestigious not through its location but through its gift-giver, for by the imperial period Cumae was in a state of disrepair.[49] The use of *pulvis* (dust) to describe the earthenware plate may hint at the dilapidated state of Cumae in that it evokes the age of the city, though perhaps there is a joke as well about the age of the Sibyl embedded in this use of *pulvis*. Martial uses the word *pulvis* to describe earthenware in one other epigram, 14.102 about the Surrentine cups which, like the Arretine ware, vie for a higher status and evaluation of their worth by urging the recipient to "accept the cups not born from cheap dust" (*Accipe non vili calices de pulvere natos*, 14.102.1). The Cumaean plate, on the other hand, makes no such claim for a higher status, suggesting that it is indeed cheap.

As with the other poems in this sequence, Martial employs a Saturnalian joke in this distich. The "chaste Sibyl" (*casta Sibylla*) appears also at Vergil's *Aeneid* 5.735 when Anchises directs Aeneas to visit Tartarus. Martial thus establishes yet another literary link, particularly an epic link, for the learned reader to decipher. However, he comically plays with the image of the chaste Sibyl through the description of the plate as *rubicunda* (reddening), which itself evokes a blush. In this sense, Martial emphasizes the Sibyl's chastity through the clay, a humble material. The root word *rubor* frequently refers to blushing, while the specific *–cundus* suffix emphasizes the quality or act.[50] The irony of this poem resides in the fact that someone morally, religiously, and sexually pure would give a gift that is decidedly of little material purity.

---

[49] Richardson 2002: 77 n. 3 for bibliography on the deterioration of Cumae and its ports during the imperial period.

[50] See Allen and Greenough 253 b. for *–cundus* and *–bundus* adjectives that "denote a continuance of the *act* or *quality* expressed by the verb". Other instances of *rubicunda* that are pertinent include Ovid's mention of a woman who walks like the "red wife of the Umbrian", a reference to her rusticity (*Illa velut coniunx Umbri rubicunda mariti | Ambulat, ingentes varica fertque gradus*, *Ars Am*. 3.303-04), as well as Priapus in *Fasti* 6.319 (*rubicunde Priape*).

Finally, this contrasts the earlier distich about the golden *phiala* (14.95), which describes itself as reddening (*rubeam*) from the metal of which it is made, and the distich about the clay *urceus* (14.106), which is described as red (*ruber*). By using three cognate words for three different pieces of tableware, Martial calls for a re-reading of the sequence and a re-evaluation of the earlier pieces. In the case of the golden *phiala*, the distinction appears to be between the blushing nature of the metal and its nobility (*generosa*). This is at odds with the relative poverty of the Cumaean plate, but both objects appear to take similar steps to appear humble. The use of redness as a characteristic of both clay and gold objects also further levels out the value of the Saturnalian gifts that at first glance would appear to be quite disparate.

So far, I have considered the literary allusions and exemplary figures which highlight the nature of the Saturnalian banquet in the tableware sequence, with special attention to Roman and provincial identities. These distichs draw connections between one another and to Martial's literary predecessors, but there are further self-referential moments within Martial's epigrams beyond the *Apophoreta* that underscore how important this early work was for Martial's conception of his writing and the fashioning of his poetic identity. In this case, we may turn to epigram 8.6: a poem which juxtaposes the expensive and the cheap while also containing an internal allusion to the tableware sequence of the *Apophoreta*.

In epigram 8.6 Martial mocks the supposedly valuable cups of Euctus, a man who claims an ancient and epic pedigree for his tableware during a dinner party. However, in showing off his knowledge of literary epic, Euctus actually misremembers various details of Homer, Ovid, and Vergil.[51] In a series of deictic statements Martial lists the tableware and its lineage:

---

[51] Watson 1998 runs through the various misquotes and incorrect information about the mythological origins of the tableware. For instance, Euctus distorts Ovid's description of the walls of Troy, he merges details from Homer and Horace concerning the doves in line 10, and he

Archetypis vetuli nihil est odiosius Eucti
— ficta Saguntino cymbia malo luto —,
argenti fumosa sui cum stemmata narrat
garrulus et verbis mucida vina facit:
'Laomedonteae fuerant haec pocula mensae:
ferret ut haec, muros struxit Apollo lyra.
hoc cratere ferox commisit proelia Rhoetus
cum Lapithis: pugna debile cernis opus.
hi duo longaevo censentur Nestore fundi:
pollice de Pylio trita columba nitet.
hic scyphus est, in quo misceri iussit amicis
largius Aeacides vividiusque merum.
hac propinavit Bitiae pulcherrima Dido
in patera, Phrygio cum data cena viro est.'
miratus fueris cum prisca toreumata multum,
in Priami calathis Astyanacta bibes. (*Epigr*. 8.6)

> Nothing is so boring as old Euctus' originals (I had rather have cups shaped from Saguntine clay), when he rehearses the smoky pedigrees of his silver and turns the wine moldy with his chatter: "These goblets once belonged to Laomedon's table: Apollo built the walls with his lyre to get them. With this mixing bowl fierce Rhoecus commenced battle with the Lapiths; you see how the piece was damaged in the struggle. These two bases are valuable because of long-lived Nestor; the dove shines, polished by the Pylian thumb. Here we have a bowl in which Aeacus' grandson bade more and livelier wine to be mixed for his friends. In this dish fairest Dido pledged Bitias when she gave dinner to the Phrygian hero." After you have much admired the antique embossments, in Priam's vessels you will drink—Astyanax.

Through her analysis, Watson shows that the humor in this poem depends upon the reader's recognition of literary allusions. This is certainly the case, but one line in particular, line 2, shows that Martial not only alludes to epic works but to his earlier poetry. This allusion adds to the humor of the poem and to Martial's larger authorial self-representation. With its contrast between the clay cups from Saguntum in line 2 and the supposed archetypes that have an epic pedigree, this poem falls into the category of epigrams that deride genres such as epic and

---

provides anachronistic details about the types of cups and elements of contemporary Roman dinner parties.

tragedy while praising Martial's own genre.[52] This imagery offers a humorous generic contrast between the archetypes and the clay cups, and the specific allusion in line 2 to the Saguntine cups of Martial's *Apophoreta* 14.108 also keys the reader into Martial's poetic identity:

108 *Calices Saguntini*

Quae non sollicitus teneat servetque minister
sume Saguntino pocula facta luto.

108 *Saguntine cups*

Take cups made of Saguntine mud which your
servant may hold and keep without anxiety.

14.108 and 8.6 are two of only three references in Martial to items from Saguntum. The other is epigram 4.46, which is about the Saturnalia; the gift from Saguntum in that case is a *synthesis* (dressy outfit).[53] While the *synthesis* in 4.46 works as a reference to the opening poem of the *Apophoreta*,[54] Martial clearly has in mind 14.108 when describing clay in 8.6. In both poems, Martial depicts a clay cup made from a very specific type of clay (*lutum*), and the matching line positions ensure that Martial alludes to the *Apophoreta* distich:

Sume Saguntino pocula facta luto (14.108.2)
Ficta Saguntino cymbia malo luto (8.6.2)

The only distinction between the two lines is the substitution of *cymbia* for *pocula*. Importantly, this nearly direct quote from the earlier distich engages Martial's disavowal of the high genres of epic and tragedy by directing the reader to a collection, the *Apophoreta*, which itself opens with a refusal to write about epic themes, as I have shown in the introduction to this chapter. Likewise, if Euctus' cups metapoetically refer to epic poetry, then the cups become a metapoetic signal for

[52] Here I have in mind poems such as 10.4, quoted in the introduction to this chapter. Hinds 2007: 136-37 discusses 4.49, as well, as a poem that disavows the epic genre.
[53] Epigram 4.46 is the subject of Chapter 3 in this dissertation.
[54] For more on the programmatic importance of the *synthesis*: Hinds 2007: 140.

epigram. More specifically, the allusion to 14.108 asserts a boastful preference for a very particular brand of poetry: Martial's Saturnalian epigram.

By expressing this preference for the cups made of clay, Martial also enacts the very leveling out of preciosity of material that happens in the *Apophoreta* at large.[55] The expensive item is cheapened by proximity to the cheap item in the *Apophoreta*; in 8.6, however, Martial reveals that the archetypes are imposters just like their owner Euctus who could be read as someone of a lower social status vying for a higher station in society, like Petronius' Trimalchio. Martial's preference is moral as well as literary—at least the Saguntine clay is humble.[56]

It is striking that Martial fixates specifically on clay from Saguntum. He seems to draw from Pliny the Elder's statement about the prominent cities for pottery production. In his *Natural History* Book 35.160 Pliny writes that Samian and Arretine pottery have a positive reputation and that Surrentum, Hasta, Pollentia, Saguntum, and Pergamum are known for clay cup production.[57] It is not surprising that the poet Martial would turn to Pliny as a source for his Saturnalian gift tags; Sarah Blake, for instance, has shown that despite their generic differences, Martial's *Apophoreta* and Pliny's encyclopedia contain thematic and formal similarities, including a focus on Roman consumerism in the empire.[58] But Pliny's claim that these cities were known for their pottery does qualify Martial's use of the Saguntine pottery in his own poetry. Far from being worthless items, the Saguntine cups in 14.108, 4.46, and 8.6 all are

---

[55] Stroup 2006.
[56] If we want to think within the epic genre itself, there also exists a possibility that the reference to Saguntine clay is meant as an allusion to Silius Italicus' *Punica*, which describes at length the Siege of Saguntum during the Second Punic War. Saguntum appears in the earlier portions of the *Punica*, and so Martial would have been aware of this material by the time of Book 8's publication at the beginning of 94 CE.
[57] Arretine, Surrentine, and Saguntine pottery all also appear in the tableware sequence of Martial's *Apophoreta*, as I have discussed throughout this section.
[58] Blake 2008 and 2011.

valuable precisely because of their provenance. They might be made of a cheap material, but their craftsmanship is renowned. And if we read these as metapoetic items, as a statement about Martial's poetry, we begin to see that Martial really takes pride in his genre. Epigram, like clay cups, might not be the most prized genre (that would go to epic), but Martial's ability and craftsmanship add value to his poetry.[59]

The allusion between 8.6 and 14.108 functions etymologically as well, since in the two poems Martial provides the two alternate etymologies of *fictilis* as either from *facio* (to make) or *fingo* (to mold, shape). Just as Cairns has shown how Tibullus expresses his preference in a known etymological debate from antiquity by linking *fictilis* with *facio* and *facilis* in his opening poem (1.1),[60] in epigram 8.6 Martial states his preference for the etymology from *fingo* rather than *facio*. In epigram 14.182, which I will examine in the next section, and in 14.108 Martial etymologizes clay objects (*fictilis*) from the verb *facio*. 14.182 runs as follows: *Ebrius haec fecit terris, puto, monstra Prometheus | Saturnalicio lusit et ipse luto*. However, in epigram 8.6 and again at 10.39 about Lesbia's age,[61] both of which were published at later dates, Martial appears to have revised his position on the etymology, instead settling on *fingo*. Martial's etymologizing in these poems also expresses a continual return to his earlier Saturnalian texts as fundamental to his entire corpus, and he playfully reveals his preference for the new etymology over his choice in the *Apophoreta*. When Martial states "I prefer cups fashioned from Saguntine clay", he

[59] This is also in line with the playful inversions of quality in the other tableware distichs of the *Apophoreta*, such as Mentor's cups that initially appear valuable but may in fact be fraudulent.
[60] Cairns 1979. Tibullus' programmatic first poem is also a study in contrasts: the contrast between the poet and the soldier, the countryside and the city, poverty and luxury, and thus is an apt parallel for Martial 8.6, which contrasts the simplicity of clay cups and the luxury of expensive, however fraudulent, silver, and by extension the underlying epigrammatic and epic genres.
[61] For further discussion of 10.39, see Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

simultaneously alludes to his earlier Saturnalian epigrams and to his revised opinion of the etymology, essentially: "I prefer *fingo* over *facio*."

Martial's description of clay cups in 8.6 is an important element of his authorial self-representation. Not only does Martial suggest a preference for cheap clay over what is ultimately fraudulent silverware, but the metapoetic valence of the clay cups functions as an expression of pride in the value of the epigrammatic genre and acknowledges the fundamental importance of Saturnalian themes in Martial's poetry.[62] Likewise, the etymology in this poem presents a humorous reflection on the recollection of one's own poetry and the revision of one's ideas over time. Overall, for Martial, the clay tableware first described in the *Apophoreta* and then elaborated upon in his later epigrams is a marker of his evolving poetic identity.

2.3 The Structural Unity of Martial's *Apophoreta* 14.170-182

The artwork sequence in Martial's *Apophoreta* is a tightly structured unit that, like the tableware sequence before it, highlights the interactions between clay objects and more precious materials. Martial's contrasting imagery for the different art objects in the sequence thus can be used as a case study for the moral connotations and self-referential use of clay arts. The relative specificity with which Martial writes about the various artworks in this portion of the *Apophoreta* has garnered scholarly interest for decades and has created a desire to assign straightforward historical interpretations of the individual pieces and their potential display in Rome under the Flavians.[63] However, recent years have seen several pieces of scholarship that move away from a strictly literal reading of the sequence, including Prioux's analysis of the

[62] Again, Citroni 1989 considers about half of the corpus to be Saturnalian—either thematically, in the case of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, or regarding publication dates.
[63] Lehmann 1945 proposes that the various pieces in this sequence were displayed in Vespasian's *Templum Pacis*.

imagery within the context of imperial propaganda that connected the Flavian emperors with the early Julio-Claudians and MacDonald's article, which uses the Saturnalia setting as the primary interpretative framework and examines the cultural transformations and appropriations of art in the Roman marketplace.[64] Additionally, Hinds examines the literary allusions within several epigrams in this sequence, and his connections between the *Apophoreta* and Ovidian texts establishes a similar Julio-Claudian significance for the section as Prioux's examination. This scholarship is foundational for my reading of the artwork sequence, and in this section, I highlight the metapoetic potential of the thirteen art epigrams and show how Martial builds a commentary on his craft through the descriptions of high and low art forms. This metapoetic reading hinges upon the central poem in the sequence about a German mask (14.176) as well as the final poem about the clay hunchback fashioned by a drunken Prometheus (14.182):

176 *Persona Germana*

Sum figuli lusus russi persona Batavi.
quae tu derides, haec timet ora puer.

182 *Sigillum gibberi fictile*

Ebrius haec fecit terris, puto, monstra Prometheus:
Saturnalicio lusit et ipse luto.

176 *German mask*

I am the joke of the potter, mask of a red-haired Batavian.
The face you mock, the boy fears.

182 *Clay figurine of a hunchback*

Prometheus, I suppose, was drunk when he made these
monsters from earth. He too jested with Saturnalian clay.

[64] Prioux 2008, McDonald 2017.

Both distichs contain clear self-conscious markers, not least in the reference to the mythical artisan Prometheus, who I have discussed briefly in Chapter 1. The significance of the two distichs is immediately visually apparent; both poems occupy prominent positions in the sequence as the middle and final distichs. Importantly, the mask does not have a corresponding "rich" gift, and scholars are divided over whether a poem has dropped out.[65] I would argue, though, that the mask doesn't need a corresponding gift, and, in fact, by placing it alone in the sequence, Martial draws more attention to its thematic significance. Indeed, the mask already stands out among the other artworks because it is not a "typical" piece of art (and what I thereby mean is that this piece is not a statue or painting like the rest of the sequence; the only commonality is the clay material).

As a piece of art, then, this mask is perhaps decorative, as Lehmann suggested in his foundational article on this sequence.[66] In terms of a larger thematic significance, though, the very nature of the mask gestures towards the theater. The mask even speaks (*sum figuli lusus*), and thereby fulfills the function of a stage mask. Yet, it goes one step further in speaking for itself, without an actor; it is art that becomes animate—self-consciously so—and in a functionally similar way to poetry that addresses its status as poetry. This mask, then, is a metapoetic object.

It also immediately evokes Saturnalian reversals and changes of identity and status. Martial returns to masks as representative of identity in later Saturnalian texts as well. For instance, in the opening sequence of Book 11, published for the Saturnalia, Martial's epigram

[65] See Leary 1996.
[66] Lehmann 1945 suggests that the mask is a terracotta architectural decoration.

11.2 offers an inverse image of the German mask as Martial bids farewell to characters such as Cato and "masked arrogance" (*personati fastus*):

> Triste supercilium durique severa Catonis
> frons et aratoris filia Fabricii
> et personati fastus et regula morum,
> quidquid et in tenebris non sumus, ite foras.
> clamant ecce mei 'Io Saturnalia' versus:
> et licet et sub te praeside, Nerva, libet.
> lectores tetrici salebrosum ediscite Santram:
> nil mihi vobiscum est: iste liber meus est. (*Epigr.* 11.2)

> Gloomy brow and stern countenance of unbending Cato and Fabricia, the plowman's daughter, and pride in its mask, and moral code, and everything that in the dark we are not: out you go. Look, my verses shout "Hurrah for the Saturnalia!" Under your rule, Nerva, it's allowed, and it's our pleasure. You austere readers learn jerky Santra by heart, I am not concerned with you. This book is mine.

Unlike a Cato figure, the German mask depicts a foreigner with a lower social status, and it thus exemplifies the Saturnalia and its topsy-turvy donning of an alternate persona.

One further metapoetic element is that the mask is the "joke of a potter" (*lusus figuli*). On the one hand, this is apt for the Saturnalia since it is a time for joking and license. In the opening poem to the *Apophoreta*, for example, Martial jokes that the reader prefers for him to "play with nuts" using the cognate word *lude* (*'lude' inquis 'nucibus': perdere nolo nuces*, 14.1.12). On the other hand, the term *lusus* is a metapoetic signpost for epigram at large. It is one of several words which Martial self-consciously picks up from Catullus' descriptions of his own poetry (others include *ioci* and *libellus*).[67] Martial uses the phrase in the programmatic epigram 1.4, when he states that a censor may permit harmless jests and that while his poetry is wanton, his life is still morally upright (*innocuos censura potest permittere lusus: | lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*, 1.4.7-8). The distinction between a joking poem and an upright life is very

[67] Swann 1994: 55-59 for the use of *ludere* in Martial and Catullus.

Catullan, and generally 1.4 shows how fundamental the *lusus* is to Martial's conception of his writing. Ultimately, beyond the Saturnalian resonance, the mask's self-identification as a *lusus* marks it as a symbol of the epigrammatic genre.

The other metapoetic hinge in this sequence is the final poem about the clay hunchback, and there are several parallels between this and the German mask: the *figulus* in 14.176 finds its antecedent in Prometheus, the mythical first potter, and the *lusus* finds its cognate in Prometheus' joking around with clay (*lusit*). Even the clay itself is part of this network due to the similarity in sound of *lusus*, *lusit*, and *lutum*. As for metapoetic significance: Mattiaci draws a link between the drunken Prometheus and Phaedrus' *Fables*, a low genre such as epigram and the only other instance in ancient literature of a drunken Prometheus.[68] In Mattiaci's view, Martial uses the allusion to the carnivalesque nature of fable to comment on the status of epigram and, in my view, of the Saturnalia at large. And if Martial uses Prometheus to allude to Phaedrus, we may draw a further connection between Prometheus and Martial himself. In this case, Martial as the poet operates under the same conditions as Prometheus: both make Saturnalian art. Furthermore, we may retroactively read the *figulus* as Martial, the potter of the joking epigrams. This portrayal of Martial as *figulus* is especially important in a self-referential reading of epigram, since unlike an *artifex*, the potter has a lower social status and lesser renown. There is a degree of anonymity to the *figulus* unlike the master artist, and this seems to me to be indicative of Martial's portrayal of the epigrammatic genre as well as the book of Saturnalian poetry in which everything is topsy-turvy and master and slaves switch roles.

These two poems, which occupy important positions in the sequence, self-consciously refer to the epigrammatic genre, specifically the Saturnalian epigram, and this reading affects the

[68] Mattiaci 2014.

larger sequence of artwork. Considering the prevalent Flavian iconography within these poems, the German mask and the hunchback further pattern the poet against the imperial household, which itself appears from the very start of the artwork sequence.

The first four poems of the artwork section, describing two pairs of alternating rich and poor gifts, are thematically linked through the presence of a *puer*,[69] though Martial notably represents the *puer* in four different contexts and in poems to vastly different addressees:

170 *Signum Victoriae aureum*

Haec illi sine sorte datur cui nomina Rhenus
vera dedit. deciens adde Falerna, puer.

171 *Βρούτου παιδίον fictile*

Gloria tam parvi non est obscura sigilli:
istius pueri Brutus amator erat.

172 *Sauroctonos Corinthius*

Ad te reptanti, puer insidiose, lacertae
parce; cupit digitis illa perire tuis.

173 *Hyacinthus in tabula pictus*

Flectit ab inviso morientia lumina disco
Oebalius, Phoebi culpa dolorque, puer.

170 *Gold statue of Victory*

She is given without drawing of lot to him to whom Rhine has given a true name. Ten times pour the Falernian, boy.

171 *"Brutus Boy" in clay*

Not dim is the glory of so small a figurine. This is the boy Brutus loved.

[69] Prioux 2008: 260 recognizes the *puer* cycle as part of a series of pendant images.

172 *Lizard slayer in Corinthian bronze*

Spare the lizard, insidious boy, as she creeps toward
you; she wants to die by your fingers.

173 *Painting of Hyacinthus*

The Oebalian boy, Phoebus' fault and sorrow, turns
dying eyes from the hateful discus.

The first appearance of a *puer* occurs as a command for a slave to pour Falernian wine in celebration of the emperor's victory over the Chatti in 83 CE.[70] As the initial poem in the artwork sequence, 14.170 sets the tone for the rest of the poems: Martial plays with the social contrast between the emperor and a slave, who Martial forces together in the brief structure of the distich. The two lines unite figures from the most disparate rungs of the social strata in Rome, however, the grammatical structure of the distich emphasizes the difference between the two. The dative case used for Domitian places the emperor at a remove from the speaker, and the larger clause (*cui nomina Rhenus | vera dedit*) shows his expansive presence over the festivities. Meanwhile, the poet addresses the slave in the vocative, revealing that he is close enough to receive a command. It is in this play of proximity and social interaction that Martial illuminates the social expectations of the poet/speaker in the poem. The speaker, despite presenting a presumably "rich man's" gift, is deferential to the emperor in the grammatical structure of the poem and is ultimately closer (expressed physically here) to the slave who ends the distich. Just as Prioux has noted that the German mask in the center of the sequence calls into question the value of the alternating rich and poor gifts, the very tension of the gift-giver's status in relation to the emperor and to the slave suggests from the outset that the artwork section will be full of inversions and tensions between social roles.

[70] For an overview of Domitian's military campaigns, see Jones 1992.

The choice of material in poem 14.170 is also deceptive and makes the ambiguous boundaries of social status even more apparent by the poem's end. Across ancient literature gold is the most expensive and precious material, so it is a fitting introduction to Martial's artwork section. And in fact, when we consider the "expensive" art gifts in order, we find two lists descending in order of preciosity: 1. gold-bronze-marble (170-172-174) and 2. bronze-silver-marble (177-179-181).[71] This generally follows the order of Pliny's *Natural History*, which moves from gold, silver, and bronze, to stone, painting, and clay. Martial also doesn't use just any bronze in 14.172 and 14.179; this is Corinthian bronze, noted by Pliny for its exceptional quality.[72] In this regard, bronze vies with silver and gold, which Martial expresses in the slightly uneven ordering between the two sequences listed above. Beyond the symbolic worth of each material, Martial also employs diminutives throughout the sequence to establish a hierarchy of gifts. The word *signum* in 14.170 aligns the grandeur of the object with the grandeur of the material: the golden Victory is characterized as a statue rather than a statuette (*sigillum*).[73] This contrasts with the clay items in this sequence (14.171, 178, 182), which are described as *sigilli*. Notably, because the clay hunchback ends the art sequence, Martial begins with a gold *signum* and ends with its opposite, a clay *sigillum*. As the only *signum* within the artwork section, then, the statue of Victory seems to be more of a boast than anything else (boasting is more typical of

[71] Prioux 2008: 259-60 has noted the symmetry in the descending order of materials through 14.170-182.
[72] Leary 1996: 97 cites Pliny *Natural History* 34.1 for the value of Corinthian bronze.
[73] It is unclear how large this gift could have been since it is likely given during the Sigillaria and is thus closer to a statuette. Leary 1996: 231 states that this is a statue since that would be fitting as an expensive present with the emperor as recipient. We should not assume that this is a gift to the emperor himself, though; it could also be in honor of him. Macdonald 2017 follows this interpretation by suggesting these are all art pieces given during the Sigillaria.

"poor man's" gifts, which must assert their value). Since it is dedicated to the emperor, the boast is warranted.

The next statue (14.172) also boasts of its value, though it does so by emphasizing its prestigious lineage. Whereas the previous gift is made of gold, the "Brutus Boy" statuette is simple clay (*fictile*). Not only is the difference between the golden Victory and clay "Brutus Boy" a material one, but it is also seemingly of size (*signum* vs. *sigillum*). Size does not necessarily mean a lack of value, of course, and it could equally convey refinement, but the contrast between the golden statue and the clay statuette suggests on a basic level that the two objects are opposites. As such, even more than the Victory statue, the clay "Brutus Boy" relies on the connoisseurship of the recipient to establish its worth from lineage rather than material.[74]

Martial achieves this by insisting that though the statue is so small (*tam parvi*) its glory is not obscure (*non est obscura*).[75] This is a typical maneuver in the *Apophoreta*; cheap items beseech the recipient to not spurn them.[76] More specifically, the portrayal of the fame (*gloria*) of the Brutus Boy connects this statuette with the first two poems of the earlier tableware sequence about Mentor's original cups and Mys' embossed golden saucer:

93 *Pocula archetypa*

Non est ista recens nec nostri gloria caeli:
primus in his Mentor, dum facit illa, bibit.

95 *Phiala aurea caelata*

Quamvis Callaico rubeam generosa metallo,
glorior arte magis: nam Myos iste labor.

---

[74] Calandra 2003 stresses that Martial plays with ideas of connoisseurship as well in the tableware section through the invocation of Mentor and Mys.
[75] *Gloria* in Martial: 2.91 refers to Domitian as *gloria terrarum*, 8.15, 8.82.
[76] This occurs again in 14.178 on a clay Hercules statue.

93 *Antique cups*

Not of recent origin nor of Roman chisel is this glory. Mentor was first to drink from these cups while he was making them.

95 *A chased gold bowl*

Although I am noble and ruddy with Galician metal, I glory more in my workmanship, for this is the work of Mys.

These distichs are the only other instances of *gloria* and its cognates within the *Apophoreta*, and both epigrams convey the prestige of the objects through an assertion of famous provenance, with the *pocula* being supposedly made and owned by Mentor and the *phiala* made by Mys. The Brutus Boy is presented in a similar fashion, though instead of connecting the statue to its artist, Strongylion, this distich connects it to its famed owner, Brutus.[77] Notably, however, Martial does not claim that Brutus owned *this* statue, for this appears to be a clay copy of the original.[78] The claim for a famous lineage, then, is purely one of proximity and likeness rather than of true historical value. The issue of proximity and likeness may further point back to the dedication of the golden Victory to the emperor, who Martial depicts as a looming presence over the sequence but who we cannot be sure is present at the *Apophoreta* gift-exchange.[79] Both epigrams function mostly as invocations of famous political figures, individuals who are associated with each object but do not possess the actual gift on display in the epigram. Henriksén's argument about Mentor's name as shorthand for forgery is also worth considering in relation to the Brutus Boy. Mentor is an easy target for forgery because of the prestige of his name, and the similarly famed

[77] For the artist and ownership see Pliny *NH* 34.82.
[78] The original is the subject of two later epigrams by Martial.
[79] One thinks of the discussion in Roman 2001: 135 about the distichs on famous pieces of literature as the exchange of physical copies rather than the poem itself as an art piece.

lineage of the Brutus Boy statue would make it an equally apt piece to forge. In this epigram, though, Martial makes it quite clear that this is a copy rather than a forgery since the work is made in clay and not bronze. The statue does not deceive anyone, but it does want to gain value through association if not through authenticity, and Martial's use of *gloria* in this distich after the two distichs on Mentor and Mys emphasizes the tension between authenticity and value in art.

Even though it is a Roman replica, the Brutus Boy in this distich still displays a Hellenizing flair, which adds to the larger theme of connoisseurship in this poem. The Greek phrase βρούτου παιδίον immediately highlights the (original) statue's Greek origin, and through this name the prestige of Greek art is transferred to something obviously Roman. As MacDonald elaborates, there is a certain irony in the use of Greek, for the statue acquires its fame not through its Greek creator, Strongylion, but through its later Roman owner, Brutus.[80] This is not just any Brutus, either, but Brutus the tyrant-slayer who acted for the preservation of the Roman Republic. However, in his own description of the statue at *Natural History* 34.82, Pliny the Elder associates Brutus and his love for this statue primarily with the Battle of Philippi (*idem fecit puerum, quem amando Brutus Philippiensis cognomine suo inlustravit*), a battle which he lost against Octavian. This casts Brutus in a negative light, even more so because Pliny shares this detail immediately after a story about another statue made by Strongylion and carried by Nero during his journeys (*Strongylion Amazonem, quam ab excellentia crurum eucnemon appellant, ob id in comitatu Neronis principis circumlatam*, *NH* 34.82).[81] Nero was also known for being a

[80] Macdonald 2017: n. 22 states: "Undeciphered, the Greek letters in this lemma promise to spell out the original title of Strongylion's statue — but of course it could only have acquired the nickname 'βρούτον παιδίον' after falling into Brutus' Roman hands. When the reader arrives at the Latin word *fictile*, moreover, it becomes clear that this is not just Strongylion's work under a new name, but a recreation of that work in a new material."

[81] Prioux 2008: 304-05 also discusses the parallels between Martial and Pliny's descriptions, though she suggests that the poem frames Domitian as Augustus and Nero as Brutus. In this case,

lover of Greek arts and, under the Flavians, was represented as the antithesis of Augustan values. Martial must have been aware of Pliny's pairing of Brutus and Nero through their common fondness for Strongylion's art, which gives the Hellenizing aspects of Martial's distich a negative undercurrent. This is even more pointed within a sequence of the *Apophoreta* that highlights Flavian imperial iconography and its connection with Augustan imagery. This poem thus expresses a Saturnalian inversion of Greek art changed into Roman art while also showcasing oppositional political images.

Finally, this Hellenizing tendency in 14.171 plays out in the second appearance of a *puer* in the artwork poems. Here the Roman *puer* is equivalent to the Greek παιδίον, and intriguingly the term παιδίον is itself a diminutive just like *sigillum* and can refer to a slave, as we find in 14.170. Additionally, Martial characterizes Brutus as the *amator* (lover) of the statue, so the *puer* of this poem could be either a slave boy used for sexual purposes or possibly a Greek pederastic *eromenos* figure. The Brutus Boy as slave boy or possible *eromenos* connects this distich with 14.170 through the broader theme of sympotic poetry. The speaker in 14.170 asks for a slave to pour Falernian wine, thus marking the poem clearly within the Roman convivial setting, while the relationship between Brutus and the παιδίον evokes the Greek symposium. Leary suggests that the erotic undertones of the passage are meant to impugn the honor of Brutus,[82] but the close connection in convivial settings between the two poems retrojects this negative reading back to the golden Victory distich. The boundaries between Roman and Greek and positive and negative political *exempla* in these two epigrams are quite porous, and the reader could take the two distichs as diametrically opposed or fundamentally connected to one another.

Domitian and Augustus attempt to make works kept by their enemies open to the public after their victories.

[82] Leary 1996: 233.

The next pair of poems, 14.172 and 173, offer a similar juxtaposition of social roles through the image of the *puer*, the use of material, and the addressees. This pair also further elaborate the connections between the first pair of poems. To begin, 14.172 describes a Corinthian bronze statue of Apollo Sauroctonos, the Lizard-Slayer, and it features a direct address to the god as a boy (*puer insidiose*). The vocative completely reverses the vocative of 14.170: before the speaker ordered a slave to pour wine, but here the speaker addresses a god—and Apollo at that—through the object of the statue. Because the statue represents a god, the distich functions doubly as an ekphrastic poem and prayer to the god, and it is significant that the two converge in the *puer* who represents both god and statue. As an ekphrastic poem, 14.172 describes the action of the piece: a lizard crawls up the side of a tree as Apollo looks on with hand raised, ready to pierce the animal with an arrow. On the other hand, the use of *parce* (spare) in line 2 suggests a prayer for clemency,[83] a feature of the poem that Prioux suggests highlights the incongruity of Apollo as a model for Augustan virtues; after all, the Apollo Sauroctonos will kill the lizard, as its name makes clear.[84] The suggestion of Augustus' clemency may extend to Domitian's iconography as well. As an emperor recently returned from a victorious military campaign, Domitian could highlight his own possible *clementia* towards the Germans. In this case, Apollo as *puer* verbally resonates with the slave of epigram 14.170 but thematically resonates with the emperor who has the power to conquer and even kill another (with the lizard in the same position as Germania).

---

[83] *Parce* occurs in 15 epigrams of Martial including two other times in the *Apophoreta*: 1.77, 3.68, 5.7, 6.27, 7.68, 7.93, 10.62, 10.74, 10.82, 11.22, 11.43, 14.105, 14.118, 14.172.
[84] Prioux 2008: 305 shows how *parce* introduces the virtue of *clementia* for the young Apollo who otherwise will ruthlessly kill the lizard. She suggests that this highlights the incongruity of Apollo as a model for Augustus.

In turning to 14.173, we also find that the *puer* corresponds to the boy in 171. Here Martial describes a painting of Hyacinthus, the beloved of Apollo. As with 171, this is an ekphrastic poem, and the boy of this epigram appears within the description of the piece rather than any direct address by the poet/speaker. Hinds has noted that this is also one of several recognizable Ovidian allusions in the *Apophoreta* and that this poem closely connects to the subsequent Hermaphroditus statue.[85] For Hinds and Lausberg, Martial miniaturizes epic through clear references to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Within the context of the *puer*, the link between Hyacinthus and Hermaphroditus does not only serve to playfully warp Ovidian epic to fit the epigrammatic genre, but the Hermaphroditus poem provides a transition from the masculine to the feminine. The marble Hermaphroditus statue of 14.174 (*Masculus intravit fontis, emersit utrumque: | pars est una patris, cetera matris habet.*) links the male Hyacinthus (in the role of *eromenos*/*puer*) and his lover, Apollo (equivalent to Brutus), with the female Danae and Leda who appear in distich 14.175 alongside Zeus, who by extension also stands in the same role as Apollo and Brutus. The context of Hermaphroditus' transformation is left unexpressed in 14.174, but the reader would certainly know the Ovidian story and Salmacis' role in dragging Hermaphroditus into the water.

The six poems leading up to the German mask (14.176) clearly build upon one another and thus inform the reading of each subsequent epigram. When looking primarily at the role of the *puer* and the amatory relationships which both 14.171 and 14.173 highlight, we find this:

170: *puer* as slave
171: *puer* as beloved of Brutus
172: *puer* as child Apollo and statue of Apollo
173: *puer* as Hyacinthus, beloved of Apollo
174: Hermaphroditus as beloved of Salmacis (implicit)
175: Danae and Leda as beloved of Jupiter

[85] Hinds 2007: 141-43 and Lausberg 1982: 204.

Martial distorts the expectations for individuals from different social statuses through the compression of identities in the single use of *puer* throughout the first four poems and then again through the switch to Hermaphroditus and again to two *puellae* (though the word *puella* is never used). As the reader makes her way through the artwork sequence, she is left questioning the distance between Brutus and Apollo, and again Brutus and Jupiter, or the distinctions between the child Apollo and a slave. In the backdrop of all these interactions is Domitian, the emperor who is mentioned only indirectly at the outset of the sequence (*cui nomina Rhenus | vera dedit*, 14.170).

The key for understanding Domitian's role is still to come, in the fifth and final use of *puer* within the distich about the German mask:

176 *Persona Germana*

Sum figuli lusus russi persona Batavi.
quae tu derides, haec timet ora puer.

176 *German mask*

I am a jest of the potter, mask of a red-haired
Batavian. The face you mock, a boy fears.

The *puer* of this poem is an unnamed child, and Martial does not specify whether he is free or a slave. Beyond the contrast with the ambiguous *tu* (you), the presence of a *puer* is conditioned by the four previous uses of the phrase, but even here there are a range of identities (slave, boy, Apollo, Hyacinthus). Leary interprets the *puer* very generally as a child and has taken the poem quite literally by suggesting that children are simply scared of masks.[86] This is the case even with a mask meant to be a comic mask—the adult mocks it—and in this case the child's fear functions

[86] Leary 1996: 238.

as yet another Saturnalian reversal. However, after four pointed uses of *puer* in 14.170-173, I believe that this *puer* also has a degree of specificity lurking in the background and that the *puer* intended here is in fact the emperor himself.

First, the German mask poem refers to the historical defeat of the Chatti by Domitian in 83 CE, the same defeat in the background of the distich for the golden Victory. Prioux has woven together the poems about the Victory (14.170), the mask (14.176), and the silver Minerva (14.179) as parts of a larger iconography of Domitian's defeat of the Germans, and she cites as evidence a surviving torso from an equestrian statue of Domitian which depicts Minerva's Gorgoneion, a winged Victory, and a conquered German.[87] This is compelling evidence for a broader reference to Domitianic iconography, and Prioux also suggests that the material (golden Victory and silver Minerva) along with the central placement of the mask, give the three images greater prominence within the rest of the sequence.[88] These three epigrams are crucial for understanding the praise of the emperor throughout the entire artwork sequence. However, Prioux takes a positive view to the emperor's presence here by suggesting that this is indeed praise.[89]

The Saturnalia is all about license, a relaxing of morals, the reversal of master and slave, and this extends to potentially subversive readings of a text that would appear to portray the

[87] Prioux 2008: 287-90.
[88] Prioux 2008.
[89] For example, Prioux 2008: 256 states that this sequence is a celebration of the majesty of the emperor.

emperor positively.[90] In the case of the *puer* who fears the mask of the German, we find an allusion to a passage in Book 3 of Silius Italicus' *Punica*:[91]

> at tu transcendes, Germanice, facta tuorum,
> iam puer auricomo praeformidate Batauo. (*Pun*. 3.607-8)
>
> But you will surpass the deeds of your family, Germanicus,
> even as a boy you frightened the golden-haired Batavian.

In this passage Jupiter prophesies Roman success in the Punic Wars and further prophesies the future exploits of the Flavian emperors. After brief mentions of Vespasian and Titus, Jupiter turns to Domitian using the title Germanicus and suggesting that even as a child, the emperor frightened the Germans. The resonance with Martial's epigram is apparent: two verbs for fearing (*timet* vs. *praeformidate*), the reference to the title Germanicus, and specifically the Batavians, a German tribe affiliated with the Chatti.[92] Even the description of the Batavians as golden-haired (*auricomo*) corresponds to Martial's description of the Batavians as red (*russi*).[93] On the one

---

[90] Heuze 1994 discusses the mask as playful Saturnalian material; Versnel 1993 discusses the two types of emperors associated with the Saturnalia.

[91] An allusion apparently unnoticed in previous scholarship. McDermott and Orentzel 1977 and Tipping 2010 don't draw a precise connection between the two authors. McDermott and Orentzel assume that Silius' praise of Domitian is sincere (34). They emphasize that at this time Domitian would more rightly be an *adulescens* rather than a *puer*. Johnson 1942: 33 suggests that both poets are operating in adulation and flattery of the emperor. McGuire 1985 recognizes a certain subversiveness in Silius' description of *praeformidate* (Domitian never quite made it to the Batavians). Prioux 2008: 292 cites Giroldini 2005 for Martial and Silius' insistence that Domitian could prove his value as a mere child in contrast to his father (as *senex*) and brother (as *iuvenis*).

[92] Previous scholarship recognizes the two images within a larger imperial ideology of Domitian as a child and as conqueror of the Germans, however, I would go a step further and suggest that one alludes to the other due to the close verbal parallels.

[93] Dalby 2000: 206 says that the *auricomus Batavus* and *russus Batavus* represent the typical German, "typical enough to imitate in a children's toy mask". Dalby also refers to the *auris Batavus* in Martial 6.82 as untrained to pick up his wit.

hand the adjective refers to the color of the clay mask, a reddish terracotta, but it also falls within the visual description of golden hair.[94]

The problem of publication dates perhaps cannot be solved. Both the *Apophoreta* and *Punica* Book 3 date to around 84 CE based on Domitian's victory in 83 CE; therefore, it is very difficult to determine which text came first. If we were to venture a guess, though, it is appealing to place Martial after Silius Italicus because of the potential for a Saturnalian reversal of the praise of the emperor in the *Punica*.[95] My tentative proposal is that Martial published the *Apophoreta* shortly after an initial publication of *Punica* Book 3, or at the very least had heard a recitation from Silius, whom he portrays as a dear friend in other epigrams.[96] In this way, Martial operates within the realm of panegyric of the emperor but is able to comically twist Silius' words: Germanicus as a *puer* supposedly frightened the Batavians, but in the world of the Saturnalia, the Batavians scare the boy. The *puer* of 14.176, then, refers to Domitian himself, and thus offers a fairly negative image of the emperor's military prowess. Also, as the final appearance of a *puer* in the sequence, this line offers a complete reversal of the initial image in the golden Victory distich. The emperor is no longer at some distant remove from the speaker but has become the boy himself. Of course, if Silius published his book after the *Apophoreta*, then it allows for a slightly more subversive reading of the *Punica*. As the central poem of the

---

[94] Leary 1996 notes the dual association between the color of the clay and color of German hair. Johnson 1942 assumes that Martial disdained the Batavians as another provincial group who had already aspired to what he hoped to be. Thus, "Martial knows better than to attack the Batavians on their military record that would have been futile and fatuous -but he does attack them at a point where they were perhaps vulnerable, viz., their lack of literary appreciation" (34).

[95] Citroni's 1989 suggestion that the *Apophoreta* would have been published during the Saturnalia helps this reading, though I am hesitant to say that the book had to have been published for the occasion it represents.

[96] Silius Italicus appears in the following epigrams: 4.14, 6.64, 7.63, 8.66, 9.86, 11.48, 11.50, 12.67.

sequence, the mask acts as a hinge and allows for a complete reversal of the initial image in the golden Victory distich. As a side note, this poem also returns us to the issue of the status of the speaker and recipient of the gift. The *tu* in this poem is indeed vague, but inasmuch as it seems to refer to a gift recipient (or even the reader), it places the individual in a superior role to the emperor who is now in the role of the child.

The subsequent poem on the infant Hercules is crucial for my interpretation of the emperor as the boy of 14.176:

177 *Hercules Corinthius*

Elidit geminos infans nec respicit anguis.
iam poterat teneras Hydra timere manus.

177 *Hercules in Corinthian bronze*

The infant strangles two snakes without looking at them. Already the Hydra might fear his tender hands.

Though Martial does not describe a *puer* in this distich, the infant (*infans*) Hercules functions in a similar way. Again, Prioux has drawn a connection between this poem and existing imperial iconography of the infant Hercules.[97] For instance, an equestrian statue of Domitian from the Sacellum of the Augustales in Misenum and now housed in the museum in Baiae depicts an infant Hercules on the statue's clothing.[98] This bronze statue is most notable for the replacement of Domitian's face with Nerva's and thus is a frequent topic for the issue of *damnatio memoriae*. However, the *paludamentum* and cuirass on this statue feature two mythological figures: at the

[97] Prioux 2008: 291ff.
[98] Muscettola 2000: 29-34 provides an overview of the statue and its decoration. This statue, unlike the one Statius describes in Rome, emphasizes Domitian's *virtus* as he goes to war rather than the peace that he brings upon his return. A dedicatory inscription for this statue dates it to around 95 CE, around the time of the completion of the Via Domitiana that linked the area around Misenum to Rome.

center of the breastplate is a Gorgoneion with snakes tied in a Herculean knot, while on the right shoulder strap of the cuirass is a depiction of the infant Hercules strangling two serpents. This may be read as a self-referential mythological story; Domitian ultimately frames himself as a new Hercules and further associates himself with Augustus through this Herculean imagery.[99] For our purposes the equivalence between Hercules and Domitian in existing art allows us to retroactively view the *puer* who fears the German mask as the emperor, though admittedly the depiction of the *puer* grounds the poem within reality. Just as Hinds terms the Hyacinthus and Hermaphroditus poems as moments of "deflationary epic", the German mask represents an instance of "deflationary imperial iconography". Finally, the *puer* and infant Hercules are antithetical: the one fears a mere mask of a German, while the other has the superhuman strength to slay snakes as an infant.

Throughout my analysis of the first half of the artwork sequence, I have attempted to show that Martial's poems operate on multiple layers of socio-cultural and political meaning as well as metaliterary commentary. My interpretation of the German mask so far has hinged on the allusion to Silius Italicus' representation of Domitian's interactions with the Chatti as well as his larger imperial self-fashioning as a Hercules figure. However, the combination of the Batavians in poem 14.176 and the subsequent two Hercules poems convey a potential non-elite interpretation.

---

[99] For Domitian's self-fashioning as a new Hercules, see Tuck 2005: 232. Muscettola 2000: 33 also notes that the Hercules image on the equestrian statue at Misenum signalled Domitian's future status as a hero. Galinsky 1972: 141 also shows that this is a common tactic for emperors after Augustus, and he further views Martial's depictions of Domitian as a Hercules figure as "the vilest flattery". However, the Saturnalian context of the *Apophoreta* Hercules images discussed in this chapter hopefully rehabilitate Martial from the view of the author as shameless court poet.

The Batavians were known for their cult to Hercules Magusanus, who, judging from the double name, is a typically syncretized deity in the provinces. Archaeological excavations at Empel and Elst in the past several decades have revealed cult sites to Hercules Magusanus; notably archaeologists have recovered several votive offerings including a bronze Hercules statuette.[100] In addition to these cult sites, which Martial likely never saw, we also have a fairly robust epigraphic record for Batavians, including dedications to the god.[101] Unfortunately, the epigraphic evidence containing references to Hercules Magusanus in Rome are from the Antonine period and later, but it is conceivable that Martial knew of the Batavian cult to Hercules Magusanus. Roymans suggests that the syncretization of Hercules and Magusanus occurred under Augustus, and at the same time the Batavians became important cavalry guards for the imperial family in Rome. It was not until the revolt under Julius Civilis in 69 CE that the Batavian cavalry was disbanded in Rome.

Admittedly this can be nothing more than conjecture, but when pressing the artwork sequence for layers of meaning based on the rich and poor in a gift exchange, the sequence of Batavian Mask—Bronze Hercules—Clay Hercules presents a possible reference to the prominent Batavian cult of Hercules Magusanus. Archaeological evidence alongside a description from Tacitus' *Germania* 13 suggests that the cult of Hercules Magusanus had significant initiation purposes for young Batavian men.[102] Is it possible that the infant Hercules and adult Hercules in quick succession could further be read as an oblique reference to Hercules Magusanus' association with young men from the Batavi (a people mentioned explicitly in distich 14.176)?

---

[100] Roymans 2009: 228.
[101] Derks 2009 includes several useful charts documenting the inscriptional evidence for Batavians in imperial Rome.
[102] Roymans 2009: 232-34.

There is no way to prove this, unfortunately, but nonetheless it is a tantalizing line of interpretation.

2.4 Martial's Vergilian *Apophoreta*

The German mask is the central epigram of the entire artwork section, and just as it ends a distinct sequence involving the emperor Domitian and the *puer*, it also begins a smaller sequence of four epigrams which further advise and jokingly chastise the emperor in his role as military commander. Martial formally connects this sequence within a sequence—comprised of the German mask (176), bronze Hercules statue (177), clay Hercules statue (178), and silver Minerva (179)—with the alternation (ABAB) of clay and metal materials as well as the repetition (AaBb) of the verbs *timere* (to fear) and *habere* (to bear). Additionally, the mask and the clay Hercules statue both begin with a first-person statement:

176 *Persona Germana*

Sum figuli lusus russi persona Batavi.
quae tu derides, haec **timet** ora puer.

177 *Hercules Corinthius*

Elidit geminos infans nec respicit anguis.
iam poterat teneras Hydra **timere** manus.

178 *Hercules fictilis*

Sum fragilis: sed tu, moneo, ne sperne sigillum:
non pudet Alciden nomen **habere** meum.

179 *Minerva argentea*

Dic mihi, virgo ferox, cum sit tibi cassis et hasta,
quare non habeas aegida. 'Caesar **habet**.'

176 *German mask*

> I, a mask of the red Batavian, am the joke of the potter. The face you mock, the boy fears.
>
> 177 *Hercules in Corinthian bronze*
>
> The infant strangles two snakes without looking at them. Already the Hydra might fear his tender hands.
>
> 178 *Hercules in clay*
>
> I am fragile, but I warn you, do not scorn the figurine. Alcides is not ashamed to bear my name.
>
> 179 *Minerva in silver*
>
> Tell me, fierce virgin, since you have helm and spear, why you don't have the aegis. "Caesar has it."

The verbal similarities in these four distichs create a tightly structured unit, and Martial further centers this sequence around Domitian's most preferred deities, Minerva and Hercules. Literary sources highlight Domitian's insistence that Minerva personally protected him, and Martial suggests that he even went so far as to keep a small statue of the goddess in his bedroom on the Palatine.[103] His dedication towards the goddess is also apparent in the archaeological record: he built a Temple to Minerva in his imperial forum, and the remains from this forum suggest that the goddess was a crucial thematic element of the larger art program.[104] Regarding Hercules,

---

[103] Martial alludes to this in epigram 5.5, but the emperor's fondness for Minerva is well documented in other historical sources. In addition to building the Forum Transitorium, which is centered around a Temple to Minerva, Domitian also held the rites of the *Quinquatrus* (birthday celebration for Minerva) at his residence in the Alban hills. Notably, Suetonius even refers to Minerva appearing to Domitian in a dream only to abandon him before his death; for more on this anecdote, see Hekster 2010.

[104] D'Ambra 1993 is a seminal work on the themes within the visual program of the Forum Transitorium. Meneghini and Valenzani 2007 provide important updated archaeological information about the forum.

Domitian frequently depicted himself and his brother in the guise of the god.[105] Archaeologists have recovered a statue of Hercules in Domitian's Aula Regia on the Palatine,[106] and, as I have discussed above, the equestrian statue of Domitian at Misenum features the infant Hercules on the cuirass.

Though it no longer survives, a famed bronze equestrian statue of Domitian in the Roman Forum offers visual parallels to Martial's Saturnalian art sequence. For the components of this statue, we must rely on Statius' description in *Silvae* 1.1, which uses imagery similar to that found in this micro-sequence in Martial.[107] While the statue was dedicated in 91 CE—several years after the publication of the *Apophoreta*—the commonalities between the two texts point to a larger imperial iconography. The statue honors the emperor's victory over Germany, and at the feet of the horse lays a German captive with hair crushed under hoof (*vacuae pro caespite terrae | aerea captivi crinem terit ungula Rheni*, *Silv*. 1.1.50-1). In his left hand Domitian carries a statue of Minerva, the virgin goddess, with Medusa's head (*laevam Tritonia virgo | non gravat et sectae praetendit colla Medusae*, 1.1.37-8). Scholars have interpreted this vivid image in Statius as Minerva with aegis and Gorgoneion.[108] Statius is likely indebted to Martial's panegyric imagery at moments in *Silvae* 1.1, but the convergence of Minerva and military victory over the Rhine in both texts show a stable iconography that had been developing for several years before the equestrian statue's dedication.

---

[105] See Tuck 2005: 232 for Domitian as Hercules in surviving statuary. See also Tuck 2016: 124-26.
[106] Tuck 2016: 111. Hercules also represented Titus, and Tuck indicates that this statue may have Titus in mind, however Domitian equally drew a connection between himself and Hercules.
[107] Tuck 2016: 115-16 for description and bibliography.
[108] A footnote to the Loeb edition of this text suggests that the Gorgoneion on the aegis is more probable than Minerva carrying the head of Medusa.

As noted above, the descriptions of the gods in Martial's art sequence form a chiastic structure: the bronze and clay Hercules statues are surrounded by the terracotta German mask and silver statue of Minerva. Prioux connects the mask and Minerva distichs as two of the fundamental images in the larger sequence that pertain to Domitian's military victories (the other would be the golden victory statue at the beginning of the section). Likewise, the two images are core components in Statius' description of Domitian's equestrian statue. This later literary comparandum strengthens the idea that Minerva and the mask work together as a unit both formally and thematically. Furthermore, the two distichs describe objects that both have important apotropaic functions; I will return to this shortly in my analysis of the silver Minerva.

The bronze and clay Hercules statues are clearly a pair of alternating gifts, both rich and poor, which focus on the different values associated with metal and clay. The clay statue uses defensive language typical of low-cost items (*moneo, ne sperne*),[109] thus expressing self-awareness of its worth in the eyes of the gift recipient. As a pair of Saturnalian objects, the two statues also present a humorous reversal of size and status. In this case, the expensive material depicts the infant Hercules, while the (presumably, not explicitly named) adult Hercules is made of a cheaper substance. The defensive tone of the clay Hercules, then, appears doubly comical since it not only expresses self-consciousness about its cheap material but also an awareness that it must compete against a child.

Beyond their iconographic significance for the emperor, these two statues are also thematically important within the artwork sequence due to their refashioning of moments in Vergil's *Aeneid*.[110] Augustan imagery was certainly a significant factor in Flavian self-

---

[109] Leary 1996: 240.

[110] Several scholars have also noted the verbal allusions to Vergil's *Aeneid*, including Wagner 1880, Friedländer 1886, Leary 1996, and Hinds 2007. These two poems, along with the

fashioning, and so it is not surprising that Martial would use Vergilian texts as models in panegyric of Domitian. But he also employs these specific Vergilian references to Hercules (and Minerva) to highlight the dual nature of the Saturnalia as a space for social role reversals and the panegyric of the ultimate patron, the emperor. The dense network of imagery in 14.176-79 allude primarily to *Aeneid* Book 8 and the establishment of the Hercules cult and creation of arms for Aeneas. The exemplary nature of this book's pastoral epic depiction of early Rome fits neatly with the Golden Age Saturnian origins of the holiday,[111] and in the context of the emperor, references to Hercules and early Rome characterize Domitian as a similar bringer of civilization and peace.

The two Hercules statues allude to key moments in the Hercules narrative of *Aeneid* Book 8. First, the ekphrastic language for the bronze baby Hercules compresses the prayer of the Salii and Potitii at the Ara Maxima. At this point in the epic, a chorus of young and old men sing praises of the deeds of Hercules, beginning with his destruction of the snakes and continuing through his twelve labors, including slaying the Hydra:[112]

> hic iuuenum chorus, ille senum, qui carmine laudes
> Herculeas et facta ferunt: ut prima nouercae
> monstra manu geminosque premens eliserit anguis,
> . . .
> nec te ullae facies, non terruit ipse Typhoeus
> arduus arma tenens; non te rationis egentem
> Lernaeus turba capitum circumstetit anguis.
> salue, uera Iouis proles, decus addite diuis,
> et nos et tua dexter adi pede sacra secundo.'

subsequent distich for a silver Minerva statuette, form a unit of "deflationary epic" in Hinds' words. In order, the three distichs represent discrete moments that occur over the course of *Aeneid* Book 8.

[111] Versnel 1993 has discussed the importance of the Golden Age to Saturnian imagery and thus to the celebration of the Saturnalia.

[112] Another thematic connection: Evander's aetiology of the festival at the Ara Maxima leads into a banquet setting, just like the public banquet which begins the Saturnalia festivities in Rome.

(*Aen*. 8.287-9, 298-302)

> One band of youths, the other of old men—and these in song extol the glories and deeds of Hercules: how first he strangled in his grip the twin serpents, the monsters of his stepmother. . . no, not Typhoeus himself, towering aloft in arms; your wits did not fail you when Lernaean snake encompassed you with its swarm of heads. Hail, true seed of Jove, to the gods an added glory! Graciously with favouring foot visit us and your rites!"[113]

Friedländer has noted a verbal correspondence between the bronze Hercules statue strangling twin snakes in the *Apophoreta* (***elidit geminos*** *infans nec* ***respicit anguis***, 14.177.1) and two lines about twin snakes in *Aeneid* Book 8.[114] The first pertains to Hercules crushing the twin snakes which Juno has sent to kill him (*monstra manu* ***geminos****que premens* ***eliserit anguis***, 8.289), while the second refers to Cleopatra's death (*necdum etiam* ***geminos*** *a tergo* ***respicit anguis***, 8.697). This double allusion to Hercules and Cleopatra, foils of one another, heightens the ambiguity of Martial's Saturnalian gift tag while also pointing to the antithetical nature of the two figures. Because we are reading a gift tag for a Hercules statue, we are primed to see the allusion to Vergil's Hercules first. The overarching panegyric nature of the artwork sequence also encourages the reader to make a positive association between the statue and the cult hero in the *Aeneid*. Furthermore, Martial's contemporary reader would associate both lines about Hercules with Domitian due to his self-fashioning as a Hercules figure and as an emperor ushering in a return to Augustan values. Lurking in the background, though, is the second allusion to Cleopatra, which is in fact more pronounced in terms of the line positioning of *geminos* and *respicit anguis*. The dual images of twin snakes in Book 8 directly compares the

---

[113] Translation by Fairclough 1918.
[114] Friedländer 1886 notes the verbal correspondence, as does Leary 1996: 239. Spaeth Jr. 1930: 27 also notes the double allusion but does not expand on the thematic importance of these lines beyond highlighting how Martial is indebted to Vergil throughout his corpus.

Roman cult hero, Hercules, and military enemy, Cleopatra,[115] and in so doing suggests the opposition between Augustus and Antony. Martial's carefully crafted double allusion may serve two purposes. Only the learned reader would catch the reference to both lines of the *Aeneid*, making this distich a prime example of Saturnalian play and a fitting image for the ambiguous nature of the overall holiday. Because Domitian can be readily associated with the panegyric aspect of this distich, though, the ambiguous reading of the text as pointing to both hero and enemy also calls into question the nature of Domitian's role as emperor. He wants to be seen as an Augustus figure and openly portrays himself as Hercules, but the distich's double allusion surreptitiously asks whether he is really more of an Antony or Cleopatra.

There is also another layer to this allusion: the verb *elidere* occurs in Vergil's narrative of Hercules and Cacus (*et angit inhaerens | elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur*, *Aen*. 8.260-1). While the verbal parallels are weaker between this line and Martial's distich on the bronze Hercules, Cacus as another foil for Hercules still fits thematically with Martial's Saturnalian text. As a monstrous "other" figure in the *Aeneid*, Cacus is also a fitting parallel to the German mask, which frightens people with the personage of a Roman enemy that has been defeated by the Hercules-esque emperor, Domitian. Indeed, Vergil's description of Cacus as semi-human (8.194) marks him as uncivilized and others him (and in this case we may think also of the clay hunchback which rounds out the artwork sequence).[116] Martial's distich on the German mask, meanwhile, highlights its apotropaic function, since it frightens boys (*haec timet ora puer*, 14.176.2), and the distich immediately following it describes the baby Hercules frightening the

[115] Gransden 1976 notes the contrast.
[116] For Martial this is a point of humor, and we find a similar parodying of the Hercules and Cacus episode in Propertius 4.9, though intriguingly Hercules is the figure who receives a humorous treatment through his intrusion upon the Bona Dea ritual.

Hydra by crushing the twin snakes (*iam poterat teneras Hydra timere manus*, 14.177.2). This movement from a frightening other to the death of monstrous snakes crushed by Hercules (*elidit*), which in turn frightens another monster (Hydra), follows the framework of the Hercules and Cacus episode in the *Aeneid* in which a frightening monster is vanquished by the bringer of civilization.[117] It is also worth considering the role that material plays in this parallel: the clay mask denotes antiquity and rusticity, while the bronze statuette triumphs and ushers in a new age in Latium.

The clay Hercules distich (*Sum fragilis: sed tu, moneo, ne sperne sigillum: | non pudet Alciden nomen habere meum*, 14.178.1-2) continues Martial's allusions to *Aeneid* Book 8, and in this epigram the poet turns to Evander's advice for Aeneas after leading him around the site of future Rome and to his own home on the Palatine:

> ut uentum ad sedes, 'haec' inquit 'limina uictor
> Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.
> aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
> finge deo, rebusque ueni non asper egenis.' (*Aen*. 8.362-365)

> When they reached his dwelling, [Evander] said: "Victorious Alcides stooped to enter this threshold; this palace had space for him. Dare, my guest, to scorn riches and make yourself, too, worthy of deity, and come not disdainful of our poverty."

Hinds has already given a compelling analysis of Martial's allusion to this portion of the *Aeneid*, suggesting along the same lines as Leary before him that the allusion functions as a guide for the reader of the gift tag to accept an item of little worth in the same way that Hercules accepted the humble circumstances of Evander's Rome and his act of hospitality.[118] But Hinds goes further,

---

[117] Hercules in his role as religious founder in Rome appears in a specifically Saturnalian role in Macrobius. In this case, Macrobius offers an alternate aetiology for the founding of the Saturnalia rites and suggests that Hercules left people behind, perhaps to guard his altar, and that these people named themselves Saturnians and established the Saturnalia. It is a fanciful description, but it highlights a deep connection between Hercules and the Saturnalia.
[118] Hinds 2007: 145-46, Leary 1996: 241.

noting how Martial uses the lexical connection between the clay Hercules (*Hercules fictilis*) and *finge* (*Aen*. 8.365) to "heighten the imagery of modelling and self-fashioning".[119] This is not the only instance in which Martial plays with clay etymologies; he does the same a few distichs later with the clay hunchback (*sigillum gibberi* ***fictile***) made from earth (*ebrius haec* ***fecit*** *terris*, 14.182.1). In addition to connecting *fictilis* and *facio* in this distich, Martial also puns on the material, *lutum*, by stating that Prometheus plays with this Saturnalian clay (*Saturnalicio* ***lusit*** *et ipse* ***luto***, 14.182.2).[120] Taken together, these two distichs show Martial's awareness of the etymological debate on the term *fictilis*, and the added pun rounds out the sequence with typical holiday levity.

But the allusion to Evander's advice also provides an opportunity for more serious moralizing. Again, Hinds has noted a connection to the same portion of the *Aeneid* in Seneca's *Moral Epistles* 31.11, which quotes Vergil's *et te quoque dignum | finge deo* in a larger discussion on avoiding enticements of the physical world and seeking a virtuous life instead. In quoting the *Aeneid*, Seneca tells Lucilius that a man from any station, whether slave, freedman, or knight, is able to reach heaven through his behavior (*Quid est enim eques Romanus aut libertinus aut servus? nomina ex ambitione aut iniuria nata. Subsilire in caelum ex angulo licet*, 31.11). Finally, Seneca remarks, "This moulding will not be done in gold or silver; an image that is to be in the likeness of god cannot be fashioned of such materials; remember that the gods, when they were propitious to men, were moulded in clay" (*Finges autem non auro vel argento: non potest ex hac materia imago deo exprimi similis; cogita illos, cum propitii essent, fictiles fuisse*, 31.11).[121] The language of precious and humble materials returns us to the ever popular

[119] Hinds 2007: 146.
[120] Leary 1996: 246 notes a possible pun between the two words.
[121] Translation by Hinds 2007.

discussion of luxury in Roman authors, and we might compare Seneca's statement with that of Cato the Elder in Livy's record of his speech on the *Lex Oppia*. There, too, Cato contrasts precious Greek ornaments admired by all to the old clay antefixes of Roman temples, which men now laugh at but from whom Cato hopes for continued favor (*antefixa fictilia deorum Romanorum ridentes, ego hos malo propitios deos et ita spero futuros*, *AUC* 34.4.5). Seneca invokes this Catonian moralizing in his epistle, and Martial, too, has the clay Hercules voice the same desires. The clay Hercules represents in its humble nature old-fashioned *Romanitas*, and if the reader keeps both Seneca and Cato in mind, he should reject the bronze Hercules in preference for the clay one.

Seneca features the same quotation from *Aeneid* Book 8 yet again, strikingly, in an epistle about the Saturnalia and luxury. He begins his letter by remarking that it is the month of December and that the whole city is preparing for the festivities, but he cautions Lucilius to not give in to excess and license. Instead, Lucilius should attempt to eat meager fare and live like the men of old. Seneca continues:

> Incipe ergo, mi Lucili, sequi horum consuetudinem et aliquos dies destina quibus secedas a tuis rebus minimoque te facias familiarem; incipe cum paupertate habere commercium;
>
> aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
> finge deo.
>
> Nemo alius est deo dignus quam qui opes contempsit; quarum possessionem tibi non interdico, sed efficere volo ut illas intrepide possideas; quod uno consequeris modo, si te etiam sine illis beate victurum persuaseris tibi, si illas tamquam exituras semper aspexeris. (*Moral Epistle* 18.12.5-13.1)
>
> So begin, my dear Lucilius, to follow the custom of these men, and set apart certain days on which you shall withdraw from your business and make yourself at home with the scantiest fare. Establish business relations with poverty.
>
> Dare, o my friend, to scorn the sight of wealth,
> And mould thyself to kinship with thy god.

> For he alone is in kinship with god who has scorned wealth. Of course, I do not forbid you to possess it, but I would have you reach the point at which you possess it dauntlessly; this can be accomplished only by persuading yourself that you can live happily without it as well as with it, and by regarding riches always as likely to elude you.[122]

If Seneca's *Moral Epistle* 31 strengthens the intertextual reading of humility and hospitality in Martial's distich, then *Moral Epistle* 18 establishes further commentary for the clay Hercules distich as part of a larger Saturnalian text. These epistles are simultaneously in tension and alignment with the themes of Martial's *Apophoreta*. In both letters, Seneca encourages humility and restraint—the opposite of typical Saturnalian festivity with the usual banqueting and license that is fittingly displayed through Martial's lavish list of gifts. The gift exchange aspect of the holiday can also be read within a broader Vergilian hospitality context that is picked up by both Seneca and Martial. Martial structures the epigrams in the *Apophoreta* through alternating rich and poor gifts (with some deviations), and this disparity in value does not exactly lead to a sense of reciprocity. Martial's allusion to Evander's advice about appropriate guest-host relations in the *Aeneid* highlights the tension of patron and client or master and slave gift exchange, since one can hardly equal the monetary potential of the other. Similarly, Seneca's advice to Lucilius in both epistles is to avoid the desire for wealth and the attendant disdain of poverty. That Seneca specifically associates this advice with the Saturnalia is notable for our reading of Martial, since it reveals existing anxieties that Romans had about the holiday and their ability to perform an ideally reciprocal action in an unequal relationship.

Seneca offers this advice to Lucilius as a senior to a junior, thus modelling the same relationship between Evander and Aeneas. But when put into the mouth of the clay Hercules, we

[122] Translation adapted from Gummmere 1917.

could read this statement as a beseechment from a client to a patron. Martial has flipped the script. Furthermore, since the clay Hercules is part of the larger panegyric artwork sequence, Martial could be suggesting the relationship between the ultimate patron, Domitian, and the poet-client. On the one hand, the bronze Hercules symbolizes the emperor's predestined strength and deification; the clay Hercules gently chastises the emperor and reminds him of his mortality.[123] But it also could be viewed from a self-referential perspective: Domitian should scorn the expensive Hercules statue that has made an underhanded comment about his leadership and instead accept the clay statue that offers old-fashioned moral advice. In this case, Martial's role as the craftsman of this sequence is made even more ambiguous: is he the proper court poet or is he subversive? He could very well be both.

There is one final Vergilian moment in this micro-sequence, and this pertains to Minerva's aegis. In 14.179 the poet asks a silver Minerva statue why she no longer has her aegis, to which she responds that Domitian has it (*Dic mihi, virgo ferox, cum sit tibi cassis et hasta, | quare non habeas aegida. 'Caesar habet.'*, 14.179.1-2). After the two poems on Hercules the reader has *Aeneid* Book 8 clearly in mind, and significantly Minerva's armor makes an appearance in this text. Following Evander's Tour of Rome, Venus beseeches Vulcan to make armor for Aeneas, and as he goes to his workshop we see the Cyclopes working on various projects, including Minerva's aegis:

> parte alia Marti currumque rotasque uolucris
> instabant, quibus ille uiros, quibus excitat urbes;
> aegidaque horriferam, turbatae Palladis arma,
> certatim squamis serpentum auroque polibant
> conexosque anguis ipsamque in pectore diuae
> Gorgona desecto uertentem lumina collo.

[123] In a way, this pair is akin to the role played by slaves and soldiers in the triumphal procession (something that is present from the beginning of the sequence and the awarding of the Golden Victory to Domitian).

> ‘tollite cuncta’ inquit ‘coeptosque auferte labores,
> Aetnaei Cyclopes, et huc aduertite mentem:
> arma acri facienda uiro. nunc uiribus usus,
> nunc manibus rapidis, omni nunc arte magistra.
> praecipitate moras.’ (*Aen*. 8.433-443)

> Elsewhere they were hurrying on for Mars a chariot and flying wheels, with which he stirs up men and cities; and eagerly with golden scales of serpents they were burnishing the awful aegis, armour of wrathful Pallas, the interwoven snakes, and on the breast of the goddess the Gorgon herself with neck severed and eyes revolving. “Away with all!” he cries. “Remove the tasks you have begun, Cyclopes of Aetna, and turn your thoughts to this! Arms for a brave warrior you must make. Now you have need of strength, now of swift hands, now of all your masterful skill. Throw off delay!”[124]

The image of Vulcan’s workshop in the *Aeneid* invokes the original shield scene in the *Iliad*, which, when considered in relation to Martial’s other distichs, highlights the poet’s role as craftsman.[125] On the aegis the craftsmen place interwoven snakes comparable to those the infant Hercules strangles. And, of course, the aegis is precisely what the silver Minerva lacks in Martial’s distich.

The Minerva statuette of the *Apophoreta* also continues the Saturnalian inversions present throughout this sequence. As I have noted before, the German mask and the Silver Minerva are chiastically connected through apotropaic themes. In the case of the Silver Minerva this is entirely implicit within the distich itself. Martial jokingly asks why Minerva is no longer equipped with her aegis, to which she responds that Domitian now possesses it. Minerva’s aegis, particularly by the time of the Roman Empire, would have been synonymous with the Gorgoneion, the face of Medusa which Minerva used to ward off her enemies in battle. This is

[124] Translation by Fairclough 1918.
[125] I should note that in Greek representations of Minerva, the Gorgon head alternately appears on her shield and on her aegis. The two seem to be somewhat conflated in the *Aeneid* passage: her aegis is the object present in the workshop, but the entire passage is about Aeneas’ shield (and Aeneas is paralleled to Augustus, and for us, Domitian).

the link back to the German mask: two faces, one explicit, the other implicit, both inducing fear in whoever looks upon them.

Furthermore, the clay German mask invokes the power of the Gorgon head to turn those who look upon it to stone. In this case the German has looked upon Domitian, and for that he has been turned into an (albeit terracotta) statue. In the end we find that Domitian and his aegis have won: the German mask is reduced to a laughable object. Yet, in the image of Minerva without her aegis we may still spot some humor, a twisting, subtle subversion of Domitian. Minerva is turned into a joke, she becomes laughable herself, and since she is Domitian's patron goddess, this slight inversion invites the reader to laugh indirectly at him.

Overall, the artwork poems grapple with social status in a highly ornate fashion, and in a way that exemplifies the Saturnalia. The poet dons a mask of an anonymous potter, and he uses the clay imagery of the mask and the hunchback to comment on the status of his poetry. But these low-status items allow for a total inversion of the social order. The artworks presented in this section were mostly famous pieces and likely were placed on public display as part of the Flavian cultural reform. However, I hope to have shown that this is not standard panegyric of the emperor, but instead is Saturnalian license disguised as panegyric. This explains in part Martial's epigram 1.4, addressed to Domitian himself, that the pages of his epigrams are licentious (*lasciva*) but Martial's life is still upright (*proba*).

In looking at the prevalence of imperial iconography in the artwork section, we may further retroactively see the same iconography in the tableware sequence. For instance, the central poem with which I began this chapter about the *calathus* (14.107) has a hint of imperial imagery lurking within an otherwise symposiastic and convivial setting. Bacchus' reigning over the tigers is part of a larger image of the god triumphing over the east. On the one hand, this

could be positively associated with the Flavian victory in Judaea at the beginning of Vespasian's reign, yet an evocation of the east and drunkenness could also establish a negative connection to someone like Mark Antony. This imperial iconography binds the artwork and tableware sequences together, and as the reader traverses the entirety of the *Apophoreta*, she should re-evaluate how much potential panegyric and subversion can be found in the rest of the distichs. The seemingly humble nature of the individual gifts in the *Apophoreta* might cause one to under-value their literary potential, and the nature of the Saturnalia also creates a topsy-turvy atmosphere that makes it difficult to discern sincerity with play; yet these facets of the distichs perhaps provide a cover for the poet's or reader's thoughts about the political world of Flavian Rome.

CHAPTER 3

MARTIAL'S SELF-REFERENTIAL USE OF THE ARTIST AND CRAFTSMAN IN THE *EPIGRAMS*

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters I have discussed the different literary uses of clay and clay objects in Martial's epigrams, particularly in the *Apophoreta*. As Chapter 2 has shown, Martial invests his Saturnalian objects with a consciousness by assigning speaking roles to them; one may recall the German terracotta mask (14.176) that identifies itself as a joke of the potter (*sum figuli lusus*). The poet uses these speaking objects and their assertions of value to create a network of allusions that establish the Saturnalian identity of his epigrams, and Martial's continued deployment of these objects throughout his corpus reinforces this image. While art and craft objects have a clear metapoetic function for Martial's epigrams, he also highlights the role of artists in the creation of these pieces. In the *Apophoreta*, for instance, he begins the section on tableware with references to both Mentor and Mys in 14.93 and 14.95 respectively. He also uses generalizing terms such as *figulus* (potter) for the anonymous artisans who furnished Rome with goods of all sorts, as seen in 14.176. Even the mythical Prometheus appears as an artist in distich 14.182 on a clay hunchback.

This chapter takes the artist as the starting point for a metapoetic interpretation of art and craft imagery in Martial. The poet mentions famous artists throughout the corpus, though there is a greater prevalence in the middle books of the twelve-book series. The earliest instances are the naming of Mentor and Mys in the *Apophoreta*, and Martial does not return to the topic of famous artists until Book 3 with two epigrams about works of art by Phidias (3.35) and Mentor (3.40). These are, intriguingly, both ekphrastic distichs like those from the *Apophoreta*. By Book 4,

though, Martial begins to employ the names of artists in longer epigrams on a variety of themes, and the number of references increases in successive books, reaching a peak in Book 9, a book which is also known for its extensive panegyric of the emperor Domitian and thus a text that treats lofty themes that might more readily accommodate references to famous artists. After this book, published in 94 or 95 CE,[1] the number of references to artists begins to decline, and by Book 12 Martial does not name a single famous artist.[2]

With the exception of Rabirius, the architect who designed Domitian's Palatine residence,[3] Martial focuses on canonical Greek artists such as the painter Apelles and the sculptors Lysippus, Myron, Polyclitus, Praxiteles, and Scopas.[4] In highlighting primarily Greek artists, the poet parallels his literary predecessors and contemporaries in their discussions of great art. Martial's catalogues of artists in epigrams 8.50 and 4.39, the latter of which I examine later in this chapter, are similar to the catalogue of artists in Propertius' *Elegy* 3.9 and the listings of canonical artists in prose texts such as Pliny the Elder's chapters on art in the *Natural History* or Quintilian's discussion of art in Book 12 of his *Institutio Oratoria*. The emphasis placed on Greek artists also follows general trends of art consumption in Rome. As I discussed in Chapter 1, Rome saw an influx of wealth from the east beginning in the second century BCE, and with

---

[1] Friedländer 1886 dates Book 9 to 94 CE, but Sullivan 1991 suggests a spring 95 CE date.
[2] The number of references to famous artists runs as follows: Book 1 (0), Book 2 (0), Book 3 (2), Book 4 (4), Book 5 (0), Book 6 (3), Book 7 (3), Book 8 (5), Book 9 (6), Book 10 (4), Book 11 (2), Book 12 (0). The number of epigrams in which these names appears runs as follows: Book 1 (0), Book 2 (0), Book 3 (2), Book 4 (1), Book 5 (0), Book 6 (3), Book 7 (2), Book 8 (2), Book 9 (5), Book 10 (3), Book 11 (2), Book 12 (0).
[3] Martial refers to Rabirius' architectural skill in building the Palatine residence in epigram 7.56.
[4] The following is a list of references to named artists in the epigrams (compiled from the index of Shackleton Bailey 1993): Apelles: 7.84, 11.9; Langon: 9.50; Lysippus: 9.43, 44; Mentor: 3.40, 4.39, 8.50, 11.11, 14.93; Myron: 4.39, 6.92, 8.50; Mys: 8.34, 8.50, 14.95; Phidias: 9.44, 3.35, 4.39, 6.13, 6.73, 7.56, 9.24, 10.87, 10.89; Polyclitus: 8.50, 9.59, 10.89; Praxiteles: 4.39; Rabirius: 7.56, 10.71; Scopas: 4.39.

this came widespread Roman exposure to Greek art. From the late Republic on, Greek art connoisseurship was synonymous with the Roman intellectual elite; we see this most clearly in the texts of Pliny the Elder and Quintilian, who attempt a systematic evaluation of Greek art. Martial operates within this framework in his references to Greek artists, as Macdonald has shown,[5] but even within this system he still interjects an individual interpretation of art that ultimately speaks to his conception of his writing.

For Martial the literary depiction of the artist is fundamentally entwined with the portrayal of the object in his poetry. In the four earliest instances of named artists in his epigrams (two distichs in the *Apophoreta* and two distichs in *Epigrams* Book 3) the art object takes precedence as the subject of each poem, while the artist exists as part of the description of each piece. It is also noteworthy that in the sequence on artwork in the *Apophoreta* Martial never mentions the name of the Greek artist responsible for the pieces to which he refers, though we know that several of the pieces, such as the Apollo Sauroctonos (14.172), can be traced to specific artists. In these cases the artist is subsumed within the history of the object and is not given a space for their own biography within the epigrams.[6]

Instead, beyond the reference to the mythical Prometheus, only once in the artwork sequence does Martial mention an actual artist of a work: the anonymous potter of the German mask (14.176). The mask gives full credit to the potter, even seeming to boast that "I am the joke of the potter". The contrast between Martial's prominent placement of the *figulus* and the near absence of famous artists in the *Apophoreta* speaks to the nature of Saturnalian epigram as a low

[5] Macdonald 2017.
[6] Strikingly, this is not the case for the subsequent section on literary gifts (14.183-196). The name of the writer is prominently positioned in each distich.

genre. But it also shows the reader how Martial conceives of his own role as the creator of these joking epigrams.

With this Saturnalian potter in the background, this chapter looks at Martial's second and only other use of the word *figulus* and how this compares to Martial's other uses of named Greek artists in his epigrams. I focus on two poems in particular: epigrams 4.46 and 4.39, which deal in turn with cheap Saturnalian gifts and silverware masquerading as genuine Greek artwork. Friedländer proposed that Book 4 was published in December 88 CE, though more recently scholars have suggested an early 89 CE date. Moreno Soldevila maintains that the book was intended for the Saturnalia, even if the dating is in the spring of the following year.[7] Thus these two epigrams, one explicitly about the Saturnalia, the other not, are valuable pieces for further understanding Martial's conception of his role as a Saturnalian poet and how depictions of artists figure into this self-representation.

3.2 Epigram 4.46, the Anonymous Potter, and the Saturnalian Feast

In epigram 4.46 Martial satirizes a certain Sabellus for taking pride in paltry Saturnalian gifts.[8] This poem is one of several epigrams in Book 4 that mock boastfulness, and it is also one of several that pertain to the Saturnalia.[9] The Saturnalian theme is a fundamental component of

[7] Friedländer 1886: 55-56. Moreno Soldevila 2006: 1-2 provides an overview of scholarship on the dating of Book 4. Epigram 4.11 poses difficulties for a Saturnalian publication because it pertains to the revolt of Antonius Saturninus. Martial may have added this poem in January 89 CE after the revolt to a book that was originally intended for the Saturnalia.

[8] See Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019: 530-31 for an overview of Martial's epigrams on Sabellus. He is a fictional character that Martial mocks for his bad poetry and his sexuality. The use of Sabellus in epigrams about bad poetry ironically recalls Horace's naming of himself as Sabellus in *Epistle* 1.16. Given that the epigram currently under discussion has a metapoetic undercurrent, Martial may intend a similar connection to Horace here.

[9] Epigrams on boastfulness: 4.37, 4.39, 4.46, 4.61. Epigrams pertaining to the Saturnalia: 4.18, 4.46, 4.88.

Martial's poetry,[10] and the many allusions to items from the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* in epigram 4.46 make it a significant poem for Martial's larger authorial self-representation as a Saturnalian poet, far more so than scholars have previously recognized. This epigram presents the reader with a dense web of programmatic imagery:

Saturnalia divitem Sabellum
fecerunt: merito tumet Sabellus,
nec quemquam putat esse praedicatque
inter causidicos beatiorem.
hos fastus animosque dat Sabello
farris semodius fabaeque fresae,
et turis piperisque tres selibrae,
et Lucanica ventre cum Falisco,
et nigri Syra defruti lagona,
et ficus Libyca gelata testa
cum bulbis cocleisque caseoque.
Piceno quoque venit a cliente
parcae cistula non capax olivae,
et crasso figuli polita caelo
septenaria synthesis Sagunti,
Hispanae luteum rotae toreuma,
et lato variata mappa clavo.
Saturnalia fructuosiora
annis non habuit decem Sabellus.

> The Saturnalia has made Sabellus a rich man. Sabellus may deservedly be puffed up and think and declare that none among the advocates is more blessed. This arrogance and pride is infused into Sabellus by half a peck of flour and ground beans, three half-pounds of frankincense and pepper, a Lucanian sausage with a Faliscan paunch, a Syrian flask of black grape syrup and jellied figs in a Libyan jar, along with onions, snails, and cheese. Also a little box too small to hold a few olives came from a client in Picenum, and a seven-piece set of Saguntine tableware polished with a potter's dull chisel, the muddy embossed work of a Spanish wheel, and a napkin set off with a broad stripe. The past ten years Sabellus has not had a more productive Saturnalia.

The majority of the items listed in 4.46 find parallels in Martial's earlier *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. The catalogue format of Sabellus' gifts also encourages readers to return to and recollect the

[10] See Citroni 1989 for the number of books published for the Saturnalia.

contents and organization of the earlier distichs, and for the careful reader these items form an intricate pattern that conveys much more than a satirical list of cheap foods. Of course, while these foods may have literary value, they are still cheap, and Martial signifies this by selecting examples from the first half of the *Xenia* in a long sequence pertaining to the *gustatio* (appetizers) of a Roman dinner party.[11] Sabellus' gifts and their *Xenia* antecedents are decidedly not valuable and rare items like the fowl (13.51-78), fish (13.79-91), and wine (13.106-125) of the latter half of the work. However, as I have shown in Chapter 2, even the cheap gifts of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* are rich in symbolism through their interaction with one another as part of a collection, and Martial's invocation of cheap items in 4.46 expands on the internal allusions and connections within the *Xenia* itself. The foods of 4.46 are thus doubly symbolic: they refer to the *Xenia* distichs about cheap foods, which in turn operate within the larger epigrammatic, panegyric, and Saturnalian frameworks of the *Xenia*. The allusions Martial offers through the catalogue of food in 4.46 are fundamental to the meaning of this epigram, and I will analyze these in the coming pages.

One of Sabellus' gifts, though, recalls an item not from the *Xenia* but the *Apophoreta*: the Saguntine tableware. This item is especially important to how Martial characterizes artisans within his poetry, and so I will begin my analysis of the epigram with this. In lines 14-16 material, object, and artist all converge in a programmatic image of Martial's poetry. Here Martial describes a seven-piece set of clay tableware made by an anonymous potter from Saguntum. The *figulus* (potter) in 4.46 is a somewhat elusive but pivotal figure in Martial's poetry, particularly his Saturnalian poetry. The word occurs only twice in his epigrammatic corpus: in 4.46 and, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, in *Apophoreta* distich 14.176. I

[11] Leary 2001: 10. *Xenia* 13.6-60 are all foods served as part of the Roman *gustatio*.

have discussed the anonymous potter in the *Apophoreta* in the previous chapter; he appears at the center of the artwork sequence and thus occupies a privileged position for Martial's conception of Saturnalian poetry. When the potter reappears in epigram 4.46 (and notably in this poem alone, which also pertains to the Saturnalia), the reader should imagine a direct relationship between the two poems.

Just as the potter in the *Apophoreta* is part of a larger imperial panegyric and Saturnalian context, the potter of 4.46 is an important component in the larger self-referential and metapoetic nature of the epigram. Significantly, instead of making a clay mask, this potter makes a set (*synthesis*) of clay tableware. Tableware is symbolic of the convivial setting of the Saturnalia, as shown through the central position of the tableware sequence in the *Apophoreta*. The *synthesis* here, though, literally enables the Saturnalian banquet through its intended use of food distribution. Without tableware there could be no banquet. Similarly, the potter's role in creating the *synthesis* places him in the privileged position of facilitating the Saturnalian banquet, and it is through this lens that we may align the potter with the poet himself. While the potter's creation allows for a banquet, the poet creates his own Saturnalia through the act of writing and publishing the text (here, I am thinking specifically of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*), and the Saturnalia can be re-enacted in any re-reading of the poetry.[12] Furthermore, the distribution of the poetry book could be likened to the distribution of goods such as the Saturnalian tableware.

The anonymous potter of 4.46 may also be a stand-in for the poet due to the specific location mentioned: the potter is from Saguntum. We know from Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* 35.160-62 that Saguntum was one of the premier pottery centers of the early empire, and this certainly influences Martial's use of Saguntine pottery throughout his epigrams. But

[12] For this line of thought, see Stroup 2006.

Saguntine pottery also has programmatic significance for the Spanish poet, and we see this reflected in the repeated invocation of the pottery in the *Apophoreta*, epigram 4.46, and the later-published epigram 8.6, the latter of which has the poet saying outright that he prefers Saguntine pottery to whatever tableware Euctus owns (*ficta Saguntino cymbia malo luto*, 8.6.2). In 8.6 the poet expresses an autobiographical preference, and the epigram allows the reader to reflect back on Martial's earlier uses of Saguntine pottery and re-evaluate their apparent worth. In this way, we can view the Saguntine pottery alongside other quality Spanish goods that Martial catalogues in his epigrams such as Galician gold (14.95, 4.39, 10.37), and we may even compare these items to the poet's positive representation of his homeland in the programmatic epigram 1.49. Of course, the emphasis on provenance of Saturnalian gifts is part of Martial's larger interest in imperial consumption,[13] but Saguntum is unique for the poet. The link between 14.108, 4.46, and 8.6 alongside the appearance of the anonymous potter in 14.176 and 4.46 suggest that the potter from Saguntum in epigram 4.46 has a symbolism beyond Martial's standard interest in the origins of luxury (or non-luxury) goods.

The geographic specificity in 4.46 also reveals that the seven-piece set has a quality that the irony of the passage initially denies. Tableware for the Saturnalia might be made of any number of materials (silver, glass, clay), which Martial highlights throughout the *Apophoreta*, but in keeping with the cheap gift theme of 4.46, Martial describes the tableware as "muddy" (*luteum*). This would seem to define the paltry value of the pottery, but it is somewhat deceptive given what we know from Pliny about Saguntine clay production. We also know from Chapter 1 that Martial's other uses of *lutum* in his poetry suggest that being "muddy" can be a positive

[13] Macdonald 2017 examines the consumption and appropriation of art in the *Apophoreta*, but this core idea applies to any type of gift or food for the holiday.

programmatic image about the epigrammatic genre.[14] So, far from being cheap through its muddy nature, as Martial would have us initially believe in the description of the Saguntine tableware in 4.46, the muddy pottery can have prestige and poetic pride attached to it.

This pottery is also paradoxically polished or finished (*polita*) with a dull chisel (*crasso . . . caelo*). Initially a humorous image, the contradiction between refinement and crude tools can be read through the same layers of cultural and metapoetic interpretation outlined above. On one level the pottery can unironically be polished (*polita*) given its prestigious provenance.[15] But Martial also plays with the contradiction of tableware that is "polished" by a "dull chisel" on a metapoetic level. *Politus* and *crassus* are both poetically meaningful descriptors that together make a statement about the nature of Martial's epigrams. They are finely wrought pieces that describe the quotidian and even dirty parts of life. Martial's poetry is decidedly not part of a high genre; yet that does not take away from the craftsmanship of each piece. The metaphor of the tableware finished with a crude chisel aptly expresses this.

The metapoetic value of this image is further strengthened by earlier poetic uses of *crassus* and *politus*. Catullus 1.1-2 is the obvious example for literary polish (*Cui dono lepidum novum libellum | arido modo pumice expolitum?*). In this programmatic opening Catullus sets up the neoteric and Callimachean ideals for his poetry, namely that it is refined, charming, and polished. Catullus is one of Martial's primary poetic models, and so Martial undoubtedly has him

[14] Stanley 2014: 212-13 discusses Martial's praise of Saguntine pottery and the high quality of the product. I have also discussed Martial's positive programmatic associations with mud in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

[15] Against what Moreno Soldevila 2006: 347 suggests, namely that *polita* must refer to a finished product rather than a comment as to the finish of the piece, since *crassus* and *politus* portray opposite properties.

in mind in any statement about his own literary values.[16] However, the use of *crassus* for the tool that refines the tableware undercuts the parallel to Catullan poetics in a similar manner to Ovid's own transformation of Catullus' poetics in the opening of the *Tristia*, and this contrast between Martial's epigrams and the poetry of his epigrammatic predecessor allows Martial to define his poetry as something distinct within the genre.[17] *Crassus* is the opposite of *tenuis*,[18] and thus it positions Martial's epigram against Callimachean poetic ideals.[19] The opening of Callimachus' *Aetia* establishes a preference for poetry that is λεπτός, and his *Hymn to Apollo* further describes the detriment of a muddy river compared to a clear-flowing stream.[20] Additionally, the antonym of λεπτός is παχύς, itself the Greek equivalent of *crassus*. Thus, as a word that connotes something thick and dense, *crassus* is markedly anti-Callimachean and by extension un-neoteric. The lexical valence of *crassus* as thick and dense also readily describes the clay material in addition to the potter's tool, and in this sense *crassus* adds to the characterization of the tableware as muddy (*luteum*) in establishing a metaphor for Martial's epigrammatic values.

Since *crassus* refers to the chisel in 4.46, we must also consider the connotation of a blunt or dull tool. In this case Horace's *Satire* 2.2 offers an intriguing image that illuminates Martial's use of the adjective:[21]

> Quae virtus et quanta, boni, sit vivere parvo
> (nec meus hic sermo est, sed quae praecepit Ofellus

---

[16] Martial also refers clearly to Catullus 1 in epigram 8.72, which describes his own book as not yet polished before being sent off to a friend. For Martial's indebtedness to and use of Catullus, see Swann 1994.
[17] Ovid similarly adjusts Catullus 1.1-2 in the opening to his *Tristia*, for which see Roman 2001, Hinds 2007.
[18] *TLL* s.v. 'crassus' 4.0.1103.58.
[19] This is all the more apparent in epigram 4.23, which compares Callimachus as an epigrammatist to a certain Bruttianus. Callimachus cedes to Bruttianus, who ultimately wins the palm for his epigrams.
[20] Kahane 1994.
[21] *Crassa Minerva* also appears in *Priapea* 3.1.

rusticus, abnormis sapiens crassaque Minerva),
discite, non inter lances mensasque nitentis,
cum stupet insanis acies fulgoribus et cum 5
acclinis falsis animus meliora recusat,
verum hic impransi mecum disquirite. (*Serm.* 2.2.1-7)

> What and how great, my friends, is the virtue of frugal living—now this is no talk of mine, but is the teaching of Ofellus, a peasant, a philosopher unschooled and of rough mother-wit—learn, I say, not amid the tables' shining dishes, when the eye is dazed by senseless splendor, and the mind, turning to vanities, rejects the better part; but here, before we dine, let us discuss the point together.[22]

In this satire Horace discusses the virtues of a simple life, which were taught to him in his youth by a neighboring farmer. The farmer, Ofellus, in addition to being a *rusticus* (rustic peasant), possesses a similarly rustic wisdom imagined metonymically as a "dull Minerva" (*crassa Minerva*). Muecke's commentary on the poem ties this phrase to the Ciceronian *pinguis Minerva* (thick Minerva) of *De Amicitia*.[23] Both adjectives are fitting for the larger metapoetics of epigram 4.46: *pinguis* as connotating fattiness or richness, particularly of soil, easily parallels the clay imagery in 4.46,[24] while Horace's *crassa Minerva* adds a new layer of meaning to Martial's *crassum caelum*. As an intertextual moment for 4.46, Ofellus' rustic and simple country life provides a positive backdrop for the Saguntine tableware polished with a potter's dull chisel. Also significant is the implication that the *caelum* as a tool may be assimilated with Minerva as metonym for wisdom. Taking the tool and the goddess together allows for a reading of Minerva (*i.e.* wisdom) as the poet's (Horace through the voice of Ofellus) tool in the shaping of poetry.[25]

---

[22] Fairclough 1926.
[23] Muecke 1993: 117. The reference is to *De Amicitia* 19; Cicero jokingly contrasts the speaker with sophists (*Agamus igitur pingui, ut aiunt, Minerva*). The formulation *crassa Minerva* also occurs in *Priapea* 3.1.10 (*crassa Minerva mea est*). For more on this epigram, see O'Connor 2019: 547.
[24] For the fecundity of soil see Chapter 1.
[25] This connection between Minerva and craft tools also occurs at *Fasti* 3.817-34 in Ovid's description of the *Quinquatrus*, a festival celebrating Minerva's birthday. Included in the

Conversely, the chisel in 4.46 symbolizes the knowledge of the poet (envisioned as a potter). The blunt chisel, therefore, is a type of rustic or simple country wisdom that shapes—and here I think of the term *polita*—the poem vis-à-vis the tableware. Finally, the image of tableware in line 4 of *Satire* 2.2 (*non inter lances mensasque nitentis*) only furthers the connection between Horace and Martial's poems.

It should also be noted that just as Horace uses Ofellus to establish the philosophical ideas expounded throughout *Satire* 2.2, this notion of rustic or simple wisdom in epigram 4.46 is facilitated by the name of Martial's satiric target, Sabellus. Martial mentions Sabellus at several points throughout his poetry, but the use of the name here is quite distinct through the sound similarity to Ofellus. Both names have Italic roots: Ofellus is an Oscan name, while the Sabelli were known to Romans as speakers of Oscan.[26] This adds to the geographic points of importance in the poem, though in an oblique way. The Saguntine potter characterizes Martial as the poet, but the target of satirization is firmly Italic, and Oscan at that.

So far, I have discussed Martial's poetry within the Callimachean and neoteric spheres as well as Horace's *Satires*, but Martial also contrasts his epigrams with other Augustan poets, specifically Vergil and Ovid through the blunt instrument (*caelum*) used by the anonymous potter. The *caelum* is a chisel, and epigram 4.46 is the only instance in Latin in which it specifically applies to a potter's tool.[27] The noun is cognate with *caelatum* (embossed, engraved), and thus it is part of the Latin vocabulary that is equivalent to τορεύω (to engrave), which finds its counterpart in Martial's *toreuma* in line 16 of the epigram (*et crasso figuli polita caelo* |

---

catalogue of tradespeople that worship Minerva is one who uses the chisel (*quique moves caelum*, 3.831).

[26] *OCD* s.v. 'Sabelli'.

[27] *TLL* s.v. 'caelum'.

septenaria synthesis Sagunti, | Hispanae luteum rotae toreuma, 4.46.14-16). This interchangeable use of Latin and Greek is typical of Martial's epigrams,[28] and highlights the Greek origins of the genre. But the use of *caelum* and its cognates in particular has Latin literary precedent within Augustan poetry.

For instance, the adjective *caelatum* is found primarily in an epic context, and Vergil and Ovid both use the term frequently in the *Aeneid* and *Metamorphoses* to describe metal objects, especially shields.[29] However, two instances in Vergil and Ovid describe non-metallic items as embossed, and these items are helpful comparanda for Martial's embossed clay objects. In *Eclogue* 3 Vergil writes of embossed beechwood cups made by Alcimedon, while Ovid also describes wooden cups—a recollection of Vergil's imagery—in the Baucis and Philemon story within the *Metamorphoses*. First, *Eclogue* 3:

> uerum, id quod multo tute ipse fatebere maius
> (insanire libet quoniam tibi), pocula ponam
> fagina, caelatum diuini opus Alcimedontis,
> lenta quibus torno facili superaddita uitis
> diffusos hedera uestit pallente corymbos.
> in medio duo signa, Conon et—quis fuit alter,
> descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem,
> tempora quae messor, quae curvus arator haberet?
> necdum illis labra admovi, sed condita servo. (*Ecl*. 3.35-43)

> But (and here is what even you will admit is far more), seeing that you are bent on folly, I will stake a pair of beech-wood cups, the embossed work of divine Alcimedon. On them a pliant vine, laid on with an easy lathe, is entwined with spreading clusters of pale ivy. In the middle are two figures, Conon and—who was the other, who marked out with his rod the whole heavens for man, what seasons the reaper should claim and what the stooping ploughman? Not yet have I touched them with my lips but keep them safely stored.[30]

[28] For Martial's indebtedness to Greek epigram, see Sullivan 1991: Chapter 3.
[29] Faber 1995 notes the use of *caelatum* as part of the metal motif in epic.
[30] Translation adapted from Fairclough 1916.

Vergil's description of the beechwood cups recalls the ivy-wreathed bowl from Theocritus' *Idyll* 1 and in this way comments on the pastoral genre in which Vergil writes. Of special importance in this image is the engraver's lathe (*tornus*). Faber traces the history of the *tornus* in ancient literature, concluding that Vergil draws from a long Greek poetic tradition in his use of the tool and that it thus becomes a programmatic image of pastoral poetry.[31] Moreover, Vergil is not the only Latin poet to use the *tornus* image: Propertius 2.34(b), Horace's *Ars Poetica*, and Apuleius' *Florida* are also pertinent instances for the metaliterary use of the lathe. In the interpretation of the beechwood cup ekphrasis, Faber ultimately states that the *tornus* "functions not merely as a metaphor for poetic composition in general, but as a positive programmatic statement of Vergilian pastoral" and that additionally "by means of the word *caelatum* in *Eclogue* 3.37, [Vergil] subtly develops the tension between epic and pastoral modes which forms one of the themes of that poem".[32] This dual characterization of cups as embossed (*caelatum*) through the use of a specific tool (*tornus*) is found in Martial's poem as well, though in a reversal of Greek and Latin terminology. The embossed clay cups of 4.46 are described as *toreuma*, a Greek loan word, that are fashioned with a Latin tool, *caelum*. We do not have a completely neat parallel here since *toreuma* is not cognate with the Greek loan work *tornus*, though the sound similarity is notable. However, we could perhaps look to the *rota* (wheel) in line 4.46.16 as Martial's attempt at comparing the cups to their Vergilian predecessors. Thus Vergil's *caelatum* becomes Martial's *toreuma*, and the *tornus* becomes both *caelum* and *rota*, which together function like a lathe.[33] By reading Martial's cups within this framework, we can see that far from only adding to

[31] Faber 2000 notes that the poet as craftsman appears as early as Homer, *Od*. 17.382-85. For more, see Murray 1981. For the *tornus* specifically, see Petersmann 1992.
[32] Faber 2000: 379, 415.
[33] The circular nature of the *tornus* and the *rota* may also have epic connections, specifically in the Iliadic shield ekphrasis.

the satirization of Sabellus' pride in cheap gifts, the cups also function as a positive statement about Saturnalian epigram.

The second example of non-metallic embossed works in Augustan poetry is Ovid's description of Baucis and Philemon's tableware in *Metamorphoses* Book 8.

> ponitur hic bicolor sincerae baca Minervae
> conditaque in liquida corna autumnalia faece
> intibaque et radix et lactis massa coacti
> ovaque non acri leviter versata favilla,
> omnia fictilibus. post haec caelatus eodem
> sistitur argento crater fabricataque fago
> pocula, qua cava sunt, flaventibus inlita ceris;
> parva mora est, epulasque foci misere calentes,
> nec longae rursus referuntur vina senectae
> dantque locum mensis paulum seducta secundis (*Met*. 8.664-73)

> Next she placed on the board some olives, green and ripe, truthful Minerva's berries, and some autumnal cornel-cherries pickled in the lees of wine; endives and radishes, cream cheese and eggs, lightly roasted in the warm ashes, all served in earthen dishes. After these viands, an embossed mixing-bowl made of silver equally as much as the rest was set on together with cups of beechwood coated on the inside with yellow wax. A moment and the hearth sent its steaming viands on, and wine of no great age was brought out, which was then pushed aside to give a small space for the second course. . .[34]

I have included this longer quote because of the importance of the surrounding imagery; not only does Ovid describe humble earthenware and wooden cups but also the entire meal that accompanies them. The humble foods do not directly correspond to Sabellus' Saturnalian gifts, but the atmosphere is the same, albeit with a different tone from Martial's mockery of Sabellus. Hollis argues that the primary contrast here is between the luxury of Ovid's contemporaries compared to the frugality of ancient times, while Cazzaniga thinks it is a contrast between Ovidian and Homeric epic.[35] Considering that Ovid does play with the mock-epic genre

[34] Translation adapted from Miller 1916.
[35] Hollis 1970: 121, with a reference to Cazzaniga 1963. Another important feature described by Hollis is the theme of hospitality in this passage. This pattern is found in Eumaeus' acceptance of

throughout the *Metamorphoses*, I believe there could be room for both interpretations, especially when considering the earlier beechwood cups of Vergil's *Eclogues*. But the contrast in grand displays of wealth and humble clay cups is an important feature of Martial's epigrams, specifically in his depiction of clay throughout his corpus and particularly in the *Apophoreta*. The gentle humor of the Baucis and Philemon episode can help us better understand the depiction of clay cups in Martial, for they show a positive yet still laughable image of frugality.

Finally, Ovid's statement that the tableware is "made of silver equally as much as the rest"[36] functions not only as a joke but also as a comment on the production of embossed works, namely embossed earthenware's mimicry of silver. *Caelatura* and *toreuma* refer to an array of techniques in metalwork and other materials. At their core, each term refers to working with an embossing tool (Greek *toreus* and Latin *caelum*), but in time they came to refer to any aspect of decorating precious metals.[37] Chasing (embossing from the front), repoussé (embossing from the back), and engraving are all described by *caelatum* and *toreuma*.[38] But the terms do not only refer to metals, and clay or wooden items may also be described as embossed. For clay wares such as those in 4.46 and in the *Metamorphoses* passage above, what appears as embossed is actually achieved through a process of stamps and molds as well as work on a potter's wheel. Van Oyen discusses how this ultimately replicates the look of silverware, and thus items which we call *terra sigillata* due to the mold and stamp technique are referred to as embossed works in

---

Odysseus as well as in Callimachus' *Hecale*. It is also the same pattern as the Herakles and Molorchus episode in Callimachus (which appears later in Martial's epigrams 9.43 and 9.44).

[36] Translation by Hollis 1970.

[37] For an overview, see Stern 2012: 81.

[38] For an in-depth look at the embossing process, see Oliver 2004.

antiquity.[39] So the use of *caelatum* or *toreuma* for any non-metallic works really speaks to their ability to mimic the more expensive materials in pattern and form.

This is important for the examples of embossed works in Ovid and Martial because it speaks to their contemporary surroundings. Ovid may contrast present luxury with ancient frugality, as Hollis states, but his depiction of a *caelatus crater* that is not silver speaks wholly to the fashions of his time. Likewise, Martial repeatedly uses the word *toreuma* to refer to non-metallic objects; epigram 4.46 is far from the only instance in his books.[40] In his repeated use of the word *toreuma*, Martial speaks to issues of conspicuous consumption in his own time.

In fact, we can turn to a similar use of *toreuma* in Martial's *Apophoreta* to better understand the embossed clay tableware of 4.46. Distich 14.102 presents Surrentine cups as "the smooth embossed works of the Surrentine wheel":

102 *Calices Surrentini*

Accipe non vili calices de pulvere natos,
sed Surrentinae leve toreuma rotae.

102 *Surrentine cups*

Accept these cups not born from cheap dust but the
smooth embossed work of the Surrentine wheel.

I have discussed this poem in Chapter 2, though there I focused on the material (*pulvis*) and its connection to other earthenware gifts in the *Apophoreta*. However, this distich also parallels the image of the Saguntine clay cups of 4.46, which are embossed works made on a potter's wheel

[39] Van Oyen 1994: 12.
[40] *Toreuma* of non-metallic and "cheap" objects in Martial's epigrams: 4.46, 14.94, 12.74, 14.102.

(*Hispanae luteum rotae toreuma*).[41] Unlike the Saguntine cups, which from the outset appear to be cheap through their appearance as "muddy", the Surrentine cups assert their value through a denial of being made of "cheap dust". They claim a special importance through their provenance (a famous pottery center) as well as their finish (they are smoothed, *leve*), and this, in turn, clarifies the use of *polita* to describe the finish of the Saguntine cups, since both cups are made with the same tools, namely the potter's wheel (*rota*). By taking these two poems together, we can also see fully how *terra sigillata* mimics higher-end tableware. Just like precious metals, the clay cups can also be smooth and polished; and we know from the material record that these really were very smooth pieces.

Martial envisions high-end pottery in both of these poems, but he still maintains a sense of irony about the value of the pieces. The Saguntine cups are still "muddy" and made with a "dull chisel". The Surrentine cups have to compete with more costly gifts and thus must boast of their fine quality. If we take these as metapoetic objects, then it is possible to discern Martial's pride and anxiety about his own art form. Epigram is a low genre, which certainly could not compete with prestigious epic. Yet we see repeatedly throughout the *Epigrams* Martial doing just that. He, too, describes his poetry as the embodiment of ordinary life, but he also consistently positions himself against epic and tragedy and boasts of the quality of his work.[42] Perhaps we can also see in his frequent use of *toreuma*, to which I will return to in the next section of this chapter, a way to bridge the low and high genres through their corresponding clay and silver embossed works.

---

[41] 14.102 should also remind the reader of Martial's source material for quality clay wares in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*: Surrentum, like Saguntum, was listed as a privileged center for pottery production.

[42] For these themes, we can turn to epigrams 4.49, 10.4, and 14.1 as rejections of high genres.

While Martial does fashion his clay cup image around his poetic predecessors, the cups along with the rest of the items in the catalogue ultimately recall his own earlier Saturnalian poetry. There is an immediate correspondence between the Saguntine cups and the Surrentine cups of the *Apophoreta*, but we may also read this image metaphorically. In this case, the word *synthesis* is important, which at line 15 Martial uses to denote the collection of clay tableware. This is one meaning of the word, itself a Greek loan word that literally indicates a mixture of things, yet, the *synthesis* is also the standard dinner suit worn during the Saturnalian banquet as well as other convivial occasions. Martial notably begins his *Apophoreta* with the dinner suit (*Synthesibus dum gaudet eques dominusque senator*, 14.1.1), and so under the framework of the *incipit* naming tradition, we could readily call the *Apophoreta* itself a *synthesis*, both in terms of the dinner suit and the collection of poetry.[43] Martial therefore transforms the poetic collection into a literal collection of tableware through the use of this programmatic Saturnalian word.[44]

This transformation is made all the more potent by the item which follows the tableware in the gift catalogue of 4.46: a napkin with a broad stripe (*et lato variata mappa clavo*, 4.46.17). Moreno Soldevila notes that the napkin with its gaudy border is reminiscent of a Roman senatorial toga.[45] Given that this striped napkin like a toga so closely follows the *synthesis*, it makes sense that it, too, should have a similar Martialian intertext, and in fact we can turn to the introduction of the *Xenia* for this. Barchiesi shows that the opening of the *Xenia*, which begins with a toga (*Ne toga cordylis et paenula desit olivis*, 13.1.1), corresponds to the beginning of the *Apophoreta* and that this "no toga for tuna" represents both the casual dinner suits for the

[43] Hinds 2007: 141 n. 84 makes this point.
[44] Hinds 2007: 144 also points out the metamorphic nature of the *synthesis*, though his discussion pertains to allusions to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.
[45] Moreno Soldevila 2006: 349. In his *Satyricon* Petronius also describes a broad-striped napkin (*laticlaviam . . . mappam*, 32.2) owned by Trimalchio, a satirical figure comparable to Sabellus.

Saturnalia as well as a metaliterary reference to bad poetry used as wrappings for cheap food.[46] Similarly, the *mappa* of 4.46 is a very literal item for a Saturnalian dinner guest to convey leftovers home with him. The combination of the tableware collection and the napkin thus appropriately literalize the introductions of Martial's two earliest Saturnalian collections by changing the metaphorical garments of *synthesis* and toga into containers for food. By extension, the food itself can be seen as further Saturnalian epigrams, or specifically the distichs in the early collections.

Finally, through the metaphor of tableware and napkins as poetic collections, we may further note the potential meaning of the "seven-piece set of tableware" (*septenaria synthesis*) at 4.46.15. This epigram is part of Martial's fourth book of epigrams, but these were not his first published collections. Instead, if we count the *Liber Spectaculorum*, *Xenia*, and *Apophoreta* in the chronology of Martial's books, then by the point that he published Book 4 he had effectively produced seven books of poetry.[47] So not only does this tableware function as a metaliterary expression of Martial's Saturnalian poetry but also of his entire corpus. Because he places the tableware in such a strong Saturnalian setting, both through the theme of the poem as well as the allusions, it seems that Martial would qualify himself and his poetry as, above all, Saturnalian.[48]

---

[46] Barchiesi 2005: 327-28.

[47] Of course, the publication history of the *Liber Spectaculorum* is challenging; it could have potentially been published in a larger collection, which may not allow for the numbered reading here. Coleman 2006: xlv-lxiv discusses whether the book refers to Titus or Domitian and the difficulty in dating the text. At the very least, we can say that this text was published before Book 4.

[48] The seven-piece set of 4.46 also suggests the large-scale production capabilities of a city such as Saguntum and implies replication and sequencing within the context of both pottery and poetry. I will return to this idea later in the chapter. The question of what Martial considers part of the corpus is also intriguing. In this reading he envisions his earlier publications as part of a unified corpus of material, though scholars generally view 1-12 as their own mega-text and unified work. Likewise, some scholars such as Pitcher 1985 believe that the *Xenia* and

This also returns us to the image of the anonymous potter of 4.46; the potter is introduced in 4.46 in the possessive form (*et crasso figuli polita caelo | septenaria synthesis Sagunti*), thus establishing some level of ownership in the process of making the pottery. We can read this statement metapoetically as: the seven-piece set of poetic collections polished with the crude poetic wit of the poet from Saguntum (i.e. Spain).

The clay tableware and napkin stand out from the rest of the items in 4.46 because they are not foods but are still associated with the convivial setting. However, in order to more fully understand the metaliterary significance of these two gifts, we have to look at the earlier foods in the gift catalogue. These, too, have pointed allusions to Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* and continue the self-referential nature of this seemingly mocking poem. Some prominent facets of the tableware image also appear with the foods: for instance, the importance of the provenance of a gift. Sabellus receives meats from Lucania and Falisci (line 8), a Syrian jar with sweet wine (9), Libyan figs (10), and Picene olives (12-13). Sometimes these do not precisely correspond to the foods in the *Xenia*, but the alterations Martial makes can tell us about his conception of his Saturnalian poetry, just as we see through the transformation of the *synthesis* and toga.[49]

Generally, though, the food items in 4.46 correspond to foods in the first half of the *Xenia*. This signifies their cheap nature, as Martial moves to more rarified foods and more expensive items in the latter portions of the book. But even these early *Xenia* distichs are part of a larger unity within the Saturnalian collection. It is not enough to look only at the corresponding distichs in interpreting the allusions in 4.46; we must also be aware of the allusions these distichs make to one another. It is helpful, then, to think of the food catalogue in 4.46 as a code. The

---

Apophoreta were published after Book 4. This seems unlikely given the network of allusions in epigram 4.46 to items in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*.

[49] The *Xenia* describes Chian and Syrian, not Libyan, figs (13.23, 13.28).

reader must recollect the earlier depictions of the foodstuffs as well as maintain an awareness of their thematic significance within the book as a whole.

Many of the food items in 4.46 obliquely treat themes of unity, closure, and ring structures within the *Xenia* through direct and indirect references to the first and last distichs of the collection. The earliest items alluded to in 4.46 are frankincense and pepper (*turis piperisque tres selibrae*, 4.46.7), which correspond to distichs 13.4 and 13.5:[50]

4 *Tus*

Serus ut aetheriae Germanicus imperet aulae
utque diu terris, da pia tura Iovi.

5 *Piper*

Cerea quae patulo lucet ficedula lumbo,
cum tibi sorte datur, si sapis, adde piper.

4 *Incense*

So that Germanicus may rule the heavenly palace
late in time and long rule the earth, give pious
incense to Jupiter.

5 *Pepper*

When a waxen figpecker which shines with its
broad loins is given to you by lot, if you are wise,
add pepper.

The positioning of incense and pepper alongside one another in 4.46 immediately recalls their proximity at opening of the *Xenia*, but even more intriguing is the panegyric of Domitian in these

[50] Manuscripts contain three epigrams at the beginning of the *Xenia*, and so the start of the catalogue is the incense of 13.4. For an overview of the placement of the first three epigrams, see Leary 2001.

first two distichs of the collection.[51] The invocation of the emperor in 13.4 would seem inappropriate in the satirical context of 4.46, and so this is smoothed over by changing the lofty offering to Jupiter for Domitian's continued health and success in the *Xenia* into a cheap little gift to a regular citizen, Sabellus, in 4.46. Martial diminishes the gift even further through the quantity given: only a half peck (*selibrae*)—hardly the amount that would be offered to the emperor. By making the incense and pepper even smaller than their original quantities in the distichs of the *Xenia* (which are already miniscule in the two-line format), Martial can invoke the beginning of the Saturnalian collection while not undermining the aggrandizement of the emperor in the *Xenia*.

These initial distichs on pepper and incense also find their partners at the end of the book. Leary highlights the chiastic structure: the incense connects to the unguent of 13.126 and rose garland of 13.127, while the pepper connects to the condiments in 13.101-105.[52] The rose garland, to which I will return momentarily, closes the book with another panegyric of Domitian.[53] The reader of 4.46 would ideally remember first the incense and pepper in the *Xenia* and then their larger thematic implications, namely the panegyric elements of the *Xenia* and the unity of the entire collection.

This is especially important for the very next item in the gift catalogue. Line 8 lists a Lucanian sausage and Faliscan paunch (the latter has no corresponding imagery in the *Xenia* or

---

[51] The panegyric also exists in the chosen gifts of incense and pepper; pepper is particularly relevant to the Flavian household. Peppers would have been displayed in the *Horrea Piperataria* near the *Templum Pacis* and today located under the site of the Basilica of Constantine. The two items also appear in the opening of Martial's epigram 3.2, and the image of wrapping incense and pepper in paper goes back to Horace's *Epistle* 2.1.269. So through the incense and pepper Martial evokes projects undertaken by the imperial household and also draws from his literary predecessors.

[52] Leary 2001: 11 discusses these correspondences.

[53] For bibliography on this panegyric: Barchiesi 2005, Roman 2001.

the entirety of Martial's poetic corpus, for that matter).[54] The sausage, however, draws from distich 13.35:

35 *Lucanicae*

Filia Picenae venio Lucanica porcae:
pultibus hinc niveis grata corona datur.

35 *Lucanian sausages*

I come, a Lucanian sausage, daughter of a Picene sow; hence is given a pleasing crown for snowy-white porridge.

The sausage announces its presence in the collection and describes itself as a *corona* (crown) for a bowl of snowy white porridge. The crown imagery literally expresses the standard shape of the Lucanian sausage, but it has much greater thematic importance in the context of epigrammatic collections, specifically Saturnalian collections. For one, the garland or crown is common in banquet settings, so the sausage crown gestures towards the convivial aspect of the Saturnalia and the Lucanian sausage's importance at this event.[55] But even more importantly, the description of the sausage as a crown atop the porridge makes it the low-brow precursor to the final poem of the collection: the garland of winter roses (13.127) dedicated to the emperor.

127 *Coronae roseae*

Dat festinatas, Caesar, tibi bruma coronas:
quondam veris erat, nunc tua facta rosa est.

---

[54] The two meat products occur side by side in Varro's *De Lingua Latina* 5.111 under a discussion of regional names for foods (*quod fartum intestinum crassundiis, Lucan<ic>am dicunt, quod milites a Lucanis didicerint, ut quod Faleriis Faliscum ventrem*). The two sausages then reappear in Statius' *Silvae* 4.9.35 (*non Lucanica, non graves Falisci*), a clear allusion to Martial 4.46. For Statius' allusions to Martial in this poem, see Colton 1977.

[55] Of course, garlands were specifically worn during the Greek symposium rather than the Roman convivium, however throughout the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* Martial alternates between Roman and Greek banquet practices. Blake 2008: 117-17 also notes the symposiastic imagery in this epigram.

127 *Rose garlands*

Winter gives to you, Caesar, hasty garlands:
The rose, which was once spring's, now is made yours.

The adjective *niveis* in line 2 of the sausage distich allows for this connection: the porridge is literally snowy-white, a reminder of the season, and thus parallel to the winter (*bruma*) that gives a garland to the emperor. In turn, the sausage could have the color of the rose garland if we imagine the meat as pinkish in hue.

The garland of roses symbolizes the larger epigrammatic tradition of ascribing floral arrangements to the composition of a collection.[56] Meleager's *Garland* as well as the *Garland of Philip* immediately come to mind as sources for later epigrammatic crown and garland imagery, though Meleager's garland begins rather than ends his collection. Martial's rose garland also transforms Horace's *Ode* 1.38.[57] Martial draws on the convivial nature of Horace's ode by placing the rose garland after a long sequence on wines, but he adds a further layer of meaning through the panegyric nature of the rose garland; ultimately, it is a gift to the emperor, whose power allows for roses to bloom even in winter.[58] In addition to the twist on Horace's poetry and the imperial imagery, Martial further imbues the rose garland with vocabulary representative of his poetics. Barchiesi has aptly shown that the word *festinatas* in 13.127 evokes Martial's

[56] Bibliography on the garland of roses in Martial and its connection to earlier garland imagery: Roman 2001: 133-34, Grewing 1997, Lorenz 2002, Blake 2011: 363. Fowler 1995: 55 discusses the metapoetic angle of the final poems of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. Prioux 2008 discusses the garland/crown metaphor in Meleager. Prioux reminds us that the garland image draws attention to the poetry as a collection as well as to ring composition of the piece; this is perhaps why Martial obliquely refers to it in 4.46.
[57] Roman 2001, Leary 2001: 194.
[58] Roman 2001: 134 states "whereas the context of Horace's poem can be described as convivial, in Martial the expectation of a convivial context is used as a foil to mark the intrusion of imperial discourse."

insistence that his poetry is hastily written.[59] The final distich of the *Xenia*, then, marks the convergence of several core themes throughout the collection. It represents the Saturnalian banquet, the imperial context (which begins with the incense given to Domitian), the larger metapoetic discourse, and Martial's evocation of his predecessors.

The sausage crown of 13.35 is a remarkable image when read in conjunction with this final rose garland. It functions as the comic Saturnalian inversion of standard panegyric; the roses for the emperor turn into a cheap sausage, the snowy winter months are a simple white porridge. In a convivial reading the sausage is similarly absurd: a face with pale complexion adorned with a meat crown. But the panegyric connection necessitates a re-reading of the text, and this is where 4.46 comes into play. The insistent parallels to the *Xenia* in epigram 4.46 encourage the reader to return to the text in search of potential codes and hidden meanings. The sausage crown, likewise, only draws a new meaning once the collection is completed with epigram 13.127; through epigram 4.46 Martial enables the second- or third-time reader of the *Xenia* to see the sausage crown as the comic inversion of the rose garland.

Similarly important to the comic allusions of the sausage crown is its description as "pleasing" (*grata*). I have already highlighted how Martial's interchangeable use of Greek and Latin terminology is indicative of his poetic ideals in the three lines about the clay tableware. In the same way, the *grata corona* in the distich from the *Xenia* Latinizes the introduction of Meleager's *Garland* as both a garland (στέφανος) and a gift (χάρις).[60] The semantic range of χάρις as pertaining to pleasure lexically matches the Latin *gratus*, and the proximity of the

[59] Barchiesi 2005: 325.
[60] Meleager's preface = *Anth. Graec*. 4.1. The lines important to this analysis run: Μοῦσα φίλα, τίνι τάνδε φέρεις πάγκαρπον ἀοιδάν, | ἢ τίς ὁ καὶ τεύξας ὑμνοθετᾶν **στέφανον**; | ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος· ἀριζάλῳ δὲ Διοκλεῖ | μναμόσυνον ταύταν ἐξεπόνησε **χάριν**.

στέφανος and χάρις and equal line positioning make this an attractive image for Martial to translate into his own poetry as *grata corona*.

The sausage crown may also be an allusion to the pleasing garland (*grata corona*) of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 3.68.[61] At this point in the text, Ovid speaks of the seasons of life and how youth, which he equates to spring, quickly fades into old age.[62] The poet states that "These plants, now withering, I saw as violet-beds; from this thorn was a pleasing garland given me" (*Hos ego, qui canent, frutices violaria vidi: | hac mihi de spina grata corona data est*, *Ars Am.* 3.67-68). The image of youth's brevity in Ovid would remind the reader of the *Xenia* of the temporary nature of the Saturnalia; just as the seasons change and youth wilts and fades, so, too, will the festivities reach an end. The holiday cannot be extended forever, though, intriguingly, in both Martial and Ovid the temporal brevity of the Saturnalia and of youth is extended indefinitely through the publication of the poetry. This is part of a larger theme within the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, as Martial comments on the brevity of the holiday elsewhere, most pertinently in concluding the Saturnalian meal with breakfast treats at 14.223.[63]

Though Martial only uses the word *Lucanica* in 4.46, it alludes to the *Xenia* distich and all of the attendant literary associations because of its presence within the catalogue of Sabellus' gifts which almost entirely lists items that correspond to poems in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. Above all, by mentioning the Lucanian sausage right after the incense and pepper in 4.46,

---

[61] Ovid describes a rose garland once more at *Fasti* 5.341-44, though it does not have an exact lexical correspondence. Importantly, though, this is part of Ovid's description of the Floralia, which does have a strong resonance with the wantonness of Martial's poetry.
[62] Gibson 2003 connects the image of the barren thornbush to reminders of youth's brevity and the image of the garland to wilting beauty.
[63] Grewing 2010: 134ff. analyzes the metapoetic nature of this final distich.

Martial invokes the unity of the earlier Saturnalian collection through their common oblique gestures towards the closing image in the *Xenia*.

The incense and Lucanian sausage both suggest that Martial is creating a *Xenia* in miniature through his chosen references in 4.46. Additionally, the olives which round out the food items of the gift catalogue also highlight the completion of the Saturnalian collection and, literally, the Saturnalian feast. Sabellus receives a box too small for even a few olives from a Picene client (*Piceno quoque venit a cliente | parcae cistula non capax olivae*, 4.46.12-13). This box alludes to distich 13.36:

36 *Cistella olivarum*

Haec quae Picenis venit subducta trapetis
inchoat atque eadem finit oliva dapes.

36 *Small box of olives*

These olives, that came taken from Picene presses,
begin meals and also finish them.

Epigram 4.46 not only invokes this box of olives but also the description itself. The *Xenia* olives are from Picenum; Sabellus' client is from the same town.[64] More playful, however, is the ordering of the olives as the last food in the gift catalogue, since in 13.36 Martial notes that the olives start and finish meals, an observation that also functions as a statement about the unity of the collection and the earlier allusions in 4.46 to the first and last distichs of the *Xenia*. Furthermore, the olives look ahead to the metaliterary importance of the tableware and napkin, items which allude to the beginnings of Martial's two Saturnalian gift collections.

[64] It is also worth noting that the Lucanian sausage from 13.35 is also from Picenum. Picenum is associated with Picus, the pre-Roman king of Latium, son of Saturn, so there is also a potential Saturnalian importance to this city. See *OCD* s.v. 'Picus'.

This brings us to another facet of 4.46: the interconnected nature of the gift catalogue itself. Martial creates connections between the foods in 4.46 through the imagery in their corresponding *Xenia* distichs. For instance, the *far* which begins the food catalogue at 4.46.6 is used to make *puls*, the porridge from the distich about Lucanian sausage. Likewise, the Picene olives in 4.46.12-13 connect to both the Lucanian sausage and the olives of the *Xenia* through their place of origin. This combination of *far* at the beginning of the catalogue, sausage in the middle, and olives at the end create a unified group of three within 4.46 that gains meaning through the *Xenia* references. While not a ring composition in the strict sense, this group of three does highlight the *corona* from the *Xenia* by locating the sausage at the center in 4.46 with its corresponding food items surrounding it.

The interconnectedness of the gift catalogue also extends beyond Saturnalian texts. Not only does Martial refer to the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* in his food catalogue, but he also connects imagery in 4.46 to other epigrams in Book 4. Notably, the *lagona* (flask) in line 9 corresponds to two poems in Book 4, and these seem to have a similarly clear resonance with 4.46 as the images of *lagonae* in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. These earlier collections mention *lagonae* twice, at 13.120 and 14.116:

120 *Spoletinum*

De Spoletinis quae sunt cariosa lagonis
malueris quam si musta Falerna bibas.

116 *Lagona nivaria*

Spoletina bibis vel Marsis condita cellis:
quo tibi decoctae nobile frigus aquae?

120 *Spoletine wine*

> You would prefer crusted wines from Spoletine
> flasks to drinking Falernian must.
>
> 116 *Flasks for snow*
>
> You drink Spoletine or wine laid down in Marsian
> cellars. What use to you is the noble chill of ice
> water?

The former pertains to Spoletine wine while the latter describes the *lagona* that carries Spoletine wine.[65] The two distichs taken together show that the wine and the container are intertwined as gifts: to one recipient the wine is the primary gift, while to another the *lagona* is a gift in itself. The *lagona* in 4.46, however, carries not Spoletine but Syrian *defrutum*, a type of very sweet must made from boiled grape juice.[66] This connects loosely to the *musta* of 13.120 and the *decoctae aquae* of 14.116, since the *defrutum* and *mustum* would both be sweet, and the water is cooked just as the grape juice is. While there is a difference in color between the *defrutum*, which is described as dark (*nigri*), and Spoletine wine, which has a golden color, both are notably low quality.[67] The transformation of the contents of the *lagona* from Spoletine wine to Syrian must expresses, like the Lucanian sausage, the process of recollection and refashioning within Martial's epigrammatic collections.

Martial pushes this image further through the inclusion of a *lagona* three times in Book 4 in epigrams 4.43, 4.46, and 4.69. In 4.43 and 4.69 the *lagona* contains poison: first Martial says that he will drink poison from a *lagona* if caught in a lie (4.43), while later he cautiously declines a drink from Papylus' *lagona* due to rumors that Papylus has used it to poison his late wives

---

[65] For a further description of *lagona* in the archaeological record: Hilgers 1969: 61-65.
[66] Moreno Soldevila 2006: 344-45.
[67] Leary 1999: 39 on Spoletine wine.

(4.69).[68] On the one hand, these two instances of poison enhance the inferior quality of the Syrian *defrutum* of 4.46 through their proximity to the epigram.[69] However, these epigrams, which precede and follow our primary poem, also reflect the larger theme of deceit found throughout Book 4 onto the catalogue of 4.46.

I have highlighted the most prominent gifts within 4.46, but there are several others worth mentioning in passing. For instance, the lack of specificity of the cheese in in line 4.46.11 contrasts with the four types of cheese described in *Xenia* distichs 30-33. This signals the cheap quality of Sabellus' cheese; it is not even good enough to have a designated provenance. Some items only find oblique references in the earlier texts: the snails of 4.46.11 are nowhere found in the *Xenia*, but they do appear in *Apophoreta* distich 121 on snail spoons (*coclearia*). Sabellus thus receives the small food item without the accompanying silverware with which to eat it. Ultimately, both the snails and cheese show a continued refashioning of the earlier Saturnalian poetry for the purposes of the satirical portrayal of Sabellus in 4.46.

The analysis of these components of 4.46 show that in addition to deriding Sabellus for his cheap gifts, Martial expresses pride in his genre by deploying a specific set of images in the poem. Through the arrangement of the gifts in 4.46, Martial also creates new meaning for the earlier poems and thus encourages the reader to view the act of reading epigrammatic collections as a recursive process that continually transforms the text.

---

[68] According to Moreno Soldevila 2006: 322-23, the poison in epigram 4.43 is intended to make Martial sterile rather than kill him. Moreno Soldevila bases this on the larger theme of emasculation in the epigram.

[69] Moreno Soldevila 2006: 345 suggests that the wine's color also associates it with poisons: "it must be borne in mind that *niger* usually collocates with poisons (OLD *s.v.* 6) and that bad wines are often compared to them."

3.3 Epigram 4.39 and Named Artists

Martial engages with a similar theme of a boastful owner of cheap goods in epigram 4.39. In this poem, Martial describes how Charinus showcases his supposedly prestigious silverware—a collection of works from the great canonical Greek sculptors as well as more recent pieces—even though the items are not truly valuable. In the humor of the poem, Martial not only judges Charinus' collection but also his moral worth: the punchline of 4.39 suggests that the silverware is impure due to its lack of authenticity as well as Charinus' sexual immorality.[70]

Argenti genus omne comparasti,
et solus veteres Myronos artes,
solus Praxitelus manum Scopaeque,
solus Phidiaci toreuma caeli,
solus Mentoreos habes labores.
nec desunt tibi vera Gratiana
nec quae Callaico linuntur auro
nec mensis anaglypta de paternis.
argentum tamen inter omne miror
quare non habeas, Charine, purum.

> You have collected every type of silver. You alone have Myron's antique artifacts, Praxiteles' and Scopas' handiwork, the embossed works of Phidias' chisel, and Mentor's labors. Neither do you lack authentic Gratiana, or dishes inlaid with Galician gold, or bas-relief pieces from ancestral tables. But amongst all this silver I wonder why you have nothing pure, Charinus.

As in epigram 4.46, Martial here offers a web of allusions in the catalogue of Charinus' collection. This poem is structured chiastically: lines 1 and 9-10 introduce the topic and deliver the punchline of the poem and mirror one another with the position of *argenti*/*argentum*. The center of the poem is also neatly divided between the anaphora of *solus* in lines 2-5 and the anaphora of *nec* in 6-8. With these two lists Martial also divides the types of art and artists

[70] Moreno Soldevila 2006 highlights the sexual innuendo in 4.39, as does Sullivan 1991: 247. Sullivan states, "The surface meaning of 'unadorned' [of the *argentum . . . purum*] yields the hidden suggestion that Charinus' propensity for oral sex leaves none of it untainted."

Charinus claims to possess. The first sequence includes canonical Greek artists while the latter lists general categories of tableware. Martial uses these two sequences of artwork to develop a systematic set of allusions that have moral importance both for the act of art connoisseurship in Rome as well as the sexual overtones within the poem.

The first catalogue in lines 2-5 includes famed Greek artists Myron, Praxiteles, Scopas, Phidias, and Mentor. For the ancient reader there is one obvious issue with this list: all of the artists with the exception of Mentor largely worked on full-scale statuary, not tableware, and were known for working in materials other than silver as their primary medium. Scopas worked largely in marble, as did Praxiteles (mostly marble, some bronze); Myron worked in bronze.[71] Phidias, who takes on special importance in this catalogue, was known for his colossal statues, specifically the Athena Parthenos and the Olympian Zeus, which were composed of multiple materials including precious metals, jewels, and ivory. Mentor is the only artist in 4.39 who was known for his miniature art and silverware, but even his name signifies forgery and fakes throughout Martial's epigrams.[72] Any reader with a basic knowledge of this initial list of Greek artists, therefore, would suspect from the outset of the poem that Charinus' silverware is not authentic, and the final reference to Mentor verifies that suspicion. So even before the reader reaches the punchline of the epigram, he knows that something is wrong with Charinus' collection despite all of his boasting.

This first catalogue of artists also plays with the theme of art connoisseurship in Rome through the invocation of famous names.[73] The list derives from canonical lists of artists found in

---

[71] Praxiteles also worked in bronze, though he is primarily known for marble. Myron is famous for a bronze cow, which later became a popular piece for ekphrastic epigrams (*AP* 9.713-42). For more scholarship on Myron's cow, see Squire 2010.
[72] As I have detailed in Chapter 2. See Henriksén 2012 for further discussion.
[73] See Macdonald 2017 for Martial's treatment of art connoisseurship.

art historical treatises, such as those in Pliny the Elder and Quintilian.[74] The catalogue format also parallels poems such as Propertius 3.9, which itself uses a list of canonical artists in a poem directed to the literary patron Maecenas. Horace's *Ode* 4.8 also treats this theme, and he speaks overtly about the connection between artwork and poetry as gifts to a patron. These earlier poems are part of a larger literary *topos*, which Martial evokes through his catalogue of artists, but unlike his predecessors he does not explicitly connect this list of artists to poetry or his own poetic patronage.

However, if we pair this poem with epigram 4.46, then we open the possibility of reading these artworks as metapoetic references.[75] The two epigrams both fall into the category of satirical portrait of a boastful owner, and in this way form a cycle with other poems in Book 4 including 4.37 and 4.61.[76] These two epigrams are further connected through a single image: the embossed works which Charinus and Sabellus both own. In the poem at hand Charinus owns silver works embossed by Phidias' chisel (*Phidiaci toreuma caeli*, 4.39.4). Likewise, Sabellus in 4.46 owns clay embossed works that have been finished with a potter's chisel (*et crasso* ***figuli*** *polita* ***caelo*** | *septenaria synthesis Sagunti,* | *Hispanae luteum rotae* ***toreuma***, 4.46.14-16). The common use of *toreuma* is an essential element for the interpretation of these two poems, and I will return to this point later in the chapter. Given that the *toreuma* in 4.46 frames the potter as poet, as I have shown in the previous section, the Phidian *toreuma* in this epigram should have a similarly important metapoetic and self-referential function. In order to determine precisely what

[74] Darab 2014: 290 is a useful source for the broader implications of the catalogue of artists. He specifically discusses how the artist anecdotes in Pliny the Elder serve as *exempla* that allegorize ethical values.
[75] This is a moment where re-reading becomes essential, for it is only through the knowledge of both poems that the reader could understand the metapoetic angle of each poem.
[76] I take the idea of cycles and webs from Lorenz 2004; see also Fitzgerald 2007: 107. Moreno Soldevila 2006: 340 discusses the theme of boastfulness.

this function is, though, we must first consider the thematic importance of Phidias throughout Martial's epigrams.

The image of Phidias in 4.39 is important for further connecting the epigram to 4.46, but the artist's prevalence within Martial's corpus is also notable. He is the most frequently named artist in the epigrams; variants of Phidias' name occur nine times, while the second most commonly named artist, Mentor, occurs six times.[77] In over half of the appearances, including 4.39, Martial uses Phidias as a stock example for embossed work.[78] His exemplarity in embossed work seems to be primarily a matter of technique rather than material, since, as I note above, he is remembered for large-scale statuary that uses numerous precious metals and stones. Through his famous technical ability rather than the scale of his work, Phidias presents a compelling case for artistic technique as stand-in for poetic technique in Martial. Furthermore, this emphasis on technique enables Martial to contrast Phidias' art with pieces in a variety of media that could also be considered embossed or engraved. Overall, the image of Phidias is part of a larger commentary on Martial's valuation of his poetry through his depiction of material goods.

Among the nine appearances of Phidias and Phidian artwork in the epigrams, a few poems characterize Phidias as emblematic of specifically small-scale embossed work. Epigram 3.35, the first instance in the corpus, is a distich similar to those in the *Apophoreta* and describes embossed fish that seems to swim when submerged in water: "You see fish, the famous embossed work of Phidias' art. Give them water and they will swim." (*Artis Phidiacae toreuma clarum | pisces aspicis: adde aquam, natabunt.*, 3.35.1-2). It is unclear exactly what this object

[77] Phidias in the *Epigrams*: 3.35, 4.39, 6.13, 6.73, 7.56, 9.24, 9.44, 10.87, 10.89. Mentor in the *Epigrams*: 3.40, 4.39, 8.50, 9.59, 11.11, 14.93.
[78] He appears with embossed works also at 3.35, 4.39, 10.87. See Lucci 2015: 48-53 for Phidias throughout the *Epigrams*.

is. Late antique manuscripts of Book 3 suggest that this is a mechanical fish that moves when water is applied to it, but to me it seems more likely that this is a cup or bowl of some sort with fish embossed in the interior.[79] In large part, it seems likely that this is a piece of tableware because of its close correspondence to epigram 3.40(41) about a bowl in which Mentor has engraved a lizard: "A lizard fashioned by the hand of Mentor, lives set into the bowl, and the silver inspires fear." (*Inserta phialae Mentoris manu ducta | lacerta vivit et timetur argentum*, 3.40.1-2).[80] Both epigrams play on the Hellenistic *topos* of exceptional realism in artwork.[81] The realism of both pieces, of course, is deceptive; they are exemplary precisely because we know that the fish and the lizard are not animate, however much they may trick the eye. This deception returns us to the theme of fraudulent artwork in epigram 4.39, though of a different sort. A savvy guest will question Charinus' silver because he knows that it is improbable that the art came from famed Greek artists. But for someone unversed in art connoisseurship, these pieces may very well deceive just like the fish and the lizard. Finally, the proximity of Phidias and Mentor in 4.39 parallels the proximity of the two distichs in Book 3. It seems likely that a reader of 4.39 would recollect the distichs from the previous book.

The combination of epigrams 3.35 on Phidias and 3.40 on Mentor fosters a further connection in the first catalogue of 4.39 to the artist Myron, whose work was a popular subject in Hellenistic epigram on deceptive realism. In this case, several epigrams from the *Palatine Anthology* are ekphrastic depictions of Myron's bronze cow statue.[82] The cow does not appear in Martial's epigrams, but the artist Myron does reappear in epigram 6.92 under a similar

---

[79] Fusi 2006: 287-89 describes the mechanical fish proposition.
[80] This lizard also recollects the distich on Apollo Sauroctonos in the *Apophoreta*.
[81] For full commentary on these poems, see Fusi 2006.
[82] See Squire 2010 for Myron in Hellenistic ekphrastic epigrams. 36 epigrams from antiquity describe the bronze cow sculpture.

framework of deceptive artwork.[83] Like the distichs on the fish and the lizard, this three-line epigram describes a realistic snake Myron has embossed into a bowl: "A snake is engraved on your wine bowl by Myron's art, Annianus, and you drink Vatican wine. You drink poison." (*Caelatus tibi cum sit, Anniane, | serpens in patera Myronos arte, | Vaticana bibis: bibis venenum*, 6.92). The poem jokingly assimilates the poisonous snake with Annianus' cheap wine. As Lucci notes, this poem treats the theme of fraud, specifically the fraudulent owner, and he compares this to Euctus' fake cups in epigram 8.6.[84] For Lucci the imagery in 6.92 is a matter of real versus poetic dissimulation, a point which is also essential to epigram 4.39. Of course, 6.92 is not available for the initial reader of 4.39, but it does reveal the continuation of these themes across Martial's corpus.

Martial uses Phidias as a point of comparison, no matter the costliness of the artwork or whether the object of comparison is a piece of art at all, as we shall see shortly.[85] For instance, in the final line of 9.44, the second poem in a diptych about a Hercules Epitrapezios statuette, Martial states that this is a work by Lysippus, though he supposed the statue to be the work of Phidias (Λυσίππου *lego, Phidiae putavi*, 9.44.6).[86] The structure of this line clearly contrasts Lysippus and Phidias, but more importantly the poet reveals how the viewer might create comparisons between artists and, by extension, expectations about the provenance of quality art.[87] The poem as a whole depicts Martial asking the statue about its creator, with the joke

---

[83] Fusi 2006 notes connection between 6.92, 3.35, and 3.40.
[84] Lucci 2015: 119.
[85] Some epigrams create comparisons between Phidias and others through words such as *digna* and *meruisse*. In 6.73.7-8 a statue of Priapus compares itself to Phidias' work: *Sed mihi perpetua numquam moritura cupresso | Phidiaca rigeat mentula digna manu*. Similarly, in 10.89.1-2: *Iuno labor, Polyclite, tuus et gloria felix, | Phidiacae cuperent quam meruisse manus*. Epigram 7.56 also compares Rabirius' architecture with the Temple of Zeus that holds a Phidian statue.
[86] See McNelis 2008 for full analysis of the Hercules Epitrapezios epigrams.
[87] For further commentary on epigrams 9.43-44, see Henriksén 2012: 187-201.

residing in the poet's ignorance.[88] However, the mistaken authorship in the final line of 9.44 potentially undercuts the flattery of the Hercules Epitrapezios in this poetic diptych. If the sheer number of Phidias references in the epigrams denotes him as the pinnacle of artistry, then it would be a disappointment to realize this statue was in fact not Phidian after all, but instead the work of Lysippus. If this is the case, then the comparison between the two artists is perhaps not so positive. Additionally, Martial's choice of stock examples of artistic quality reveals the potential to over-value artwork. If anything of remarkable quality could be Phidian, or could vie with Phidias, then that opens the possibility of fraud and deception. This takes us right back to the themes already outlined in the preceding pages.

Phidias' superior artistry allows for comparisons to any number of artists and artworks, from the easy parallel to other sculptors such as Lysippus (9.44) to the more oblique parallel to the architect Rabirius (7.56). But what specifically defines Phidias' exemplarity is his technique with a chisel (*caelum*) that allows him to create extreme realism in sculpture. This is the primary aspect of his appearance in epigram 4.39, and it is also what connects this poem with 4.46. The *caelum* appears twice more in relation to Phidias, including at 6.13.1-2 to describe Julia's beauty (*Quis te Phidiaco formatam, Iulia, caelo, | vel quis Palladiae non putet artis opus?*). The subject of Julia's charming features, which undoubtedly would include a pale complexion, gestures towards Phidias' work in ivory.[89] This, then, is an accurate portrayal of Phidias' artistic output, rather than the silver about which Charinus boasts.

[88] Henriksén 2012: 197-99 suggests that the overall joke of this poem is Martial's ignorance about the artwork and ensuing conversation with the statue itself to determine its provenance while not appearing foolish in front of his patron.
[89] Epigram 9.24 also refers to ivory, though this time in reference to a marble bust of Domitian.

More significantly, the third instance of Phidias' chisel occurs at 10.87.15-16 (*mirator veterum senex avorum | donet Phidiaci toreuma caeli*) and repeats the formulation from 4.39. In doing so, 10.87 offers another moment of self-reference and intratextuality within the *Epigrams*. As with epigram 4.46, this poem relies on allusions to earlier epigrams in Martial's corpus to create meaning about the role of the poet and the definition of his poetry. The epigram itself celebrates the October birthday of Restitutus,[90] and in the introduction of this topic Martial banishes cheap Saturnalian gifts, instead requesting more expensive gifts for his friend and patron.[91] In listing cheap gifts Martial recalls earlier Saturnalian poems:

absit cereus aridi clientis,
et vani triplices brevesque mappae
expectent gelidi iocos Decembris.
certent muneribus beatiores:
Agrippae tumidus negotiator
Cadmi municipes ferat lacernas;
pugnorum reus ebriaeque noctis
cenatoria mittat advocato; . . . (*Epigr*. 10.87.5-12)

> No shriveled client's wax taper, if you please; let idle three-leaved tablets and exiguous napkins await the jollities of chill December. Let the richer sort vie with their gifts. Let Agrippa's puffed-up tradesman bring cloaks, fellow townspeople of Cadmus. Let one arraigned for fisticuffs and a drunken night send dinner suits to his advocate.

Line 6 reuses a line from the Saturnalian-themed epigram 7.72 (*Nec vani triplices brevesque mappae*, 7.72.2), while the chill December (*gelidi . . . Decembris*) of line 7 recalls the same from 4.19, an epigram about a cloak as Saturnalian gift. Within this Saturnalian image, we may very well look for parallels to 4.46, and we do find some common vocabulary, albeit in reference to the birthday gift-givers. Just as Martial calls upon richer acquaintances (*beatiores*) to celebrate

[90] This is part of a cycle on birthdays in Book 10, including epigrams about Martial's own birthday.
[91] Harrison 2001: 309 points to Martial's security in his reputation as an important feature of 10.87.

Restitutus' birthday, Sabellus considers himself to be rich from his small gifts (*beatiorem*, 4.46.4). Similarly, the puffed-up tradesman (*tumidus negotiator*) resonates with Sabellus' own puffed-up nature (*merito tumet Sabellus*, 4.46.2). The demarcation of the low-quality Saturnalian gifts and the rich friends of Restitutus that Martial creates in 10.87 would appear to be genuine on an initial reading, but the bleeding together of terms found in earlier Saturnalian poems calls into question the wealth of these friends. If Sabellus pridefully considered himself wealthy, when in fact he was not, then perhaps these rich friends in 10.87 only appear to be, or consider themselves to be, wealthy as well.

This simulation of wealth leads to the further allusion to 4.49 and Phidias' engraved art:

> . . . mirator veterum senex avorum
> donet Phidiaci toreuma caeli;
> venator leporem, colonus haedum,
> piscator ferat aequorum rapinas.
> si mittit sua quisque, quid poetam
> missurum tibi, Restitute, credis? (*Epigr.* 10.87.15-20)
>
> Let the aged admirer of our antique forefathers present embossed work of Phidias' chisel. Let the hunter bring a hare, the farmer a kid, the fisherman the plunder of the sea. If each one sends his special gifts, what do you think a poet will send you, Restitutus?

The same description is used, as I have shown, in 4.39 about Charinus' silverware, and yet the entire joke of that epigram is that Charinus' silverware is impure, both from his sexual endeavors and from the fraudulent nature of the pieces. This undercurrent must be present in the reappearance of the line in 10.87, and it calls into question the value of the gifts given to Restitutus in the same way that the earlier resonance with Sabellus does.

Notably, Martial ends this seemingly sincere, yet disingenuous, poem with a statement about his own birthday gift to Restitutus. If Restitutus cannot trust the value of the gifts or the credibility of the friends earlier in the poem, should he trust Martial's poetry either? The nature

of Book 10 is worth highlighting here. From the outset of the book Martial states that this is a second revised edition; the first was published in 95 or 96 CE just before Domitian's assassination, but now there is a new emperor, and the praise of Domitian no longer would be fitting for a poet trying to maintain his credibility and the good graces of the ultimate patron in Rome.[92] As Rimell notes about this republication, "[it is] a fault line in Martial's twelve-book epic tome which teaches us to keep looking backwards and forwards, to (re)read *everything* differently".[93] The appearance of Phidias' embossed works in 10.87, then, should be a call for readers to return to Charinus' silver in Book 4. Not only that, but the closing remark about Martial's poetry as a gift can be further assimilated into a rereading of 4.39, in this case, with how the objects in the earlier epigram function as stand-ins for Martial's poetry.

Martial's use of Phidias throughout the epigrams consistently highlights the pitfalls of art connoisseurship in Rome and questions the veracity of privileged and valuable pieces. This in turn extends to Martial's portrayal of his own poetry and the shape-shifting nature of the epigrammatic corpus. As with famous art pieces, even the apparently sincere moments and autobiographical sketches of the poet should be treated skeptically.

One final example connects Phidias to the sexual undercurrent of epigram 4.39 and offers a continuation of Martial's exploration of the comparative value of certain art pieces over others. Phidias' artistry becomes a point of comparison for a number of art objects and even living people, and in this vein epigram 6.73 compares Phidias' work with a Priapus statue. Speaking in the first person, the statue announces that an unlearned farmer has not made him; instead a

---

[92] For more on Martial's self-image in Book 10, see Moreno Soldevila 2017. This article examines how Martial deals with being perceived as a fraud in Book 10, and we find that this is exactly the point of contention in his reuse of the phrase from 4.39 in 10.87. For the nature of Book 10 generally, see Fearnley 2003.
[93] Rimell 2008: 65.

steward has (*Non rudis indocta fecit me falce colonus: | dispensatoris nobile cernis opus*, 6.73.1-2).[94] Furthermore, this Priapus statue is worthy of being made even by Phidias (*sed mihi perpetua numquam moritura cupresso | Phidiaca rigeat mentula digna manu*, 6.73.7-8). The programmatic language (*rudis*, *indocta*) at the opening of the poem shows Martial again offering a metapoetic angle to a description of seemingly cheap art, as we have seen in epigram 4.46. The latter statement about the statue's worthiness of even the most exemplary artist also creates a deflationary moment similar to what Hinds describes in the art sequence of the *Apophoreta*.[95] In that case, the clay Hercules statuette of 14.178 invokes Evander's moralizing advice to Aeneas, thus rendering an epic image within a two-line description of a cheap gift. In the case of the Priapus statue, however, the grand art of Phidias is humorously transformed into a simple wooden garden statue. For a further point of connection between the Hercules and Priapus statues, we can look at the common use of *moneo* in lines 14.178.1 (*Sum fragilis: sed tu, moneo, ne sperne sigillum*) and 6.73.9 (*vicini, moneo, sanctum celebrate Priapum*). Both statues concede their humble nature and use it as a reason for the viewer to take them seriously as pieces that are invested with the ability to convey the same moralizing (in the case of Hercules) and same artistic virtuosity (in the case of Priapus) as their more epic and grandiose counterparts. Both can vie with the great poetic and artistic masters Vergil and Phidias.

But despite this aggrandizing display, the Priapus statue is still a depiction of a god known primarily for his comically large phallus, and this presents a commonality with, or perhaps an inversion of, epigram 4.39. Charinus boasts of his valuable silverware, and he claims to own something made by Phidias. However, in the end his silverware is as impure as he is, and

[94] This statue is apparently made with a sickle (*falx*), an unlikely tool for artwork. We may compare this to the *caelum* of the Saguntine potter in epigram 4.46.
[95] Hinds 2007: 146.

in part because of him, since his sexually impure lips touch the collection of silverware. In turn, the Priapus statue is sexually charged to begin with, but it claims to be as good as something made by Phidias. Charinus' silverware is fraudulent; the Priapus statue, however, does not conceal its origins but instead celebrates them and associates them with high art. This could be seen as another parallel between disparate pieces such as the one Martial establishes between 4.39 and 4.46.

Before turning to the second portion of the catalogue of Charinus' silver, it is worth mentioning one further poem, this time in the *Priapea*, that connects with epigram 4.39:

> Insulsissima quid puella rides?
> non me Praxiteles Scopasve fecit,
> non sum Phidiaca manu politus;
> sed lignum rude vilicus dolavit
> et dixit mihi 'tu Priapus esto'.
> spectas me tamen et subinde rides:
> nimirum tibi salsa res videtur
> adstans inguinibus columna nostris. (*Priapea* 10)
>
> Why the laughter, witless female?
> neither Phidias nor Scopas
> nor Praxiteles produced me,
> but some bailiff hacked a log and
> told me: 'thou shalt be Priapus.'
> nonetheless, you look and laugh incessantly?
> it must strike you as suggestive
> that my crotch supports this column.[96]

Not only does Phidias appear in *Priapea* 10, but so do Scopas and Praxiteles. This poem and Martial's epigram 4.39 are the only instances in extant Latin that use this specific triad of artists. Unlike epigram 6.73, this poem makes no pretense about the Priapus statue being made by the likes of famous Greek artists; the statue, again speaking in first person, acknowledges its simple, lowly nature. But this poem does share some thematic elements with 4.39, specifically the lack

[96] Translation by Michalopoulos 2018.

of artistic taste of the viewer. This *insulsissima puella* might be read as analogous to Charinus and his own lack of art knowledge as expressed through his possession of clearly fraudulent works. A comparison between the Priapus statue and Charinus' silver also highlights Martial's joke about Charinus' masculinity and sexual mores since Priapus is a phallic god. We cannot be sure of the chronological relationship between *Priapea* 10 and Martial 4.39, but the common tone, invocations of Greek artists, and sexual themes suggest that the two poems can be treated as in dialogue with one another. *Priapea* 10, regardless of whether it comes before or after Martial, elucidates the sexual innuendo within 4.39 and gives us more to work with in regard to Scopas and Praxiteles, who only appear in this one epigram in Martial's corpus.

The first sequence of artists in 4.39 treats themes of fraud and deception, which is only fully realized through a holistic consideration of Martial's use of Greek artists throughout his epigrams. The second sequence in this poem, however, provides the moralizing foundation of the epigram. The intertextual elements of the second sequence reveal the poet to be the true art connoisseur, while Charinus simply feigns knowledge. Likewise, through the intertextual references in this sequence, Martial creates a relationship between Charinus' silver and his own poetry. This, in turn, sets up further dialogue between 4.39 and 4.46.

The second sequence includes only three items: Gratian silver plate, Galician gold plate, and ancient embossed works (*nec desunt tibi vera Gratiana* | *nec quae Callaico linuntur auro* | *nec mensis anaglypta de paternis*, 4.39.6-8). Two of these items, the Gratian plate and *anaglypta*, are only found once elsewhere in extant Latin in Pliny the Elder's section on silver objects in *Natural History* Book 33.139-40:

> Vasa ex argento mire inconstantia humani ingenii variat nullum genus officinae diu probando. nunc Furniana, nunc Clodiana, nunc Gratiana—etenim tabernas mensis adoptamus—, nunc anaglypta asperitatemque exciso circa liniarum picturas quaerimus, iam vero et mensas repositoriis inponimus ad sustinenda opsonia,

> interradimus alia, ut quam plurimum lima perdiderit. vasa cocinaria ex argento fieri Calvus orator quiritat; at nos carrucas argento caelare invenimus, nostraque aetate Poppaea coniunx Neronis principis soleas delicatioribus iumentis suis ex auro quoque induere iussit. (*NH* 33.139-40)
>
> Fashions in silver plate vary wondrously due to the fickleness of the human mind, no kind of workmanship remaining long in favor. At one time Furnian plate is in demand, at another Clodian, at another Gratian—for we make even the factories feel at home at our tables—at another time the demand is for embossed plate and rough surfaces, where the metal has been cut out along the painted lines of the designs, while now we even fit removable shelves on our sideboards to carry the viands, and other pieces of plate we decorate with filigree, so that the file may have wasted as much silver as possible. The orator Calvus complainingly cries that cooking-pots are made of silver; but it is we who invented decorating carriages with chased silver, and it was in our day that the emperor Nero's wife Poppaea had the idea of even having her favorite mules shod with gold.[97]

The close proximity of *Gratiana* and *anaglypta* in both Martial and Pliny almost guarantees that Martial has this specific passage in mind in his evaluation of Charinus' silver,[98] and in that case Pliny's moralizing on the extravagance of the Roman art consumer shapes the speaker's perception of Charinus in 4.39. This perception rests on Pliny's discussion of *inconstantia* (fickleness) as the motivator for the changing fashions in silver plate and the attendant *luxuria* (luxury) attached to these items.[99] Martial could, and does, negatively ascribe fickleness to Charinus, who appears in numerous poems across the twelve books of epigrams.[100] For instance, Martial portrays Charinus as a fickle person who routinely updates his will to include different friends in epigram 5.39. The reference to Pliny's moralizing on fickleness works as a continuation of the already explicit satirical mocking of Charinus in epigram 4.39.

---

[97] Adapted from Rackham 1952.
[98] Sarah Blake 2011 has shown other instances of Martial's coopting of Plinian imagery.
[99] Pliny lists this passage in the index to his *Natural History* as "luxury in silver plate" (*de luxuria in vasis argenteis*), which he then contrasts with the frugality of the ancients (*frugalitatis antiquae in argento exempla*). For more on the structure of these passages, see Isager 2013: 67-73. I have also discussed this contrast in Chapter 1.
[100] Charinus appears in epigrams 1.77, 4.39, 5.39, 6.37, 7.34, 8.61, 11.59, 12.89.

Pliny directs his moralizing at the Roman public and his contemporaries. In 4.39 Martial, too, is concerned with rapidly changing trends in the art market, and this is shown at the outset of the poem through Charinus' desire to collect and boast of his silverware to guests. He has every sort of silverware (*Argenti genus omne comparasti*, 4.39.1), and no one's collection can compare. This initial statement shows Charinus' attention not only to famous Greek artists but also to recent trends in Rome, which are split nicely between the first and second sequences of the poem; he is the embodiment of Pliny's Roman public in the above passage from the *Natural History* who allow this abundance of silver into their homes. However, Martial reveals himself to be the true art expert through his reference to Pliny the Elder (and thus positions himself as a Pliny figure against Charinus' representation of the Roman public). Unlike Charinus, who assigns famous Greek artists to his collection, however improbable, Martial shows himself to be intimately familiar with the history of art detailed at length by Pliny the Elder, and he appears highly knowledgeable of the individual names and their artistic output. Martial is able to call Charinus' bluff.

Pliny's derisive statement that the Romans even accept the workshops (*tabernae*) at their tables is also a key intertextual element for epigram 4.39 as well as Martial's poetry at large.[101] The *taberna* reflects the populace and commoners and is at odds with Pliny's elite social circle. The Latin word *taberna* also has a dual connotation of the shops that sell silverware (or any wares for that matter) as well as the inns and bars that would employ common wares, so both production and usage could be components of Pliny's disdain.[102] The overall image of the

[101] I discuss *taberna* imagery in Martial's poetry in Chapter 1.
[102] In addition to *taberna*, Latin words such as *caupona* and *popina* describe taverns that sell food and drink. From the context of the above passage, Pliny primarily has a workshop in mind in his use of *taberna*, but he plays with the larger semantic range of *taberna* to express his elitist attitude towards silverware.

common crowd who both buy and use mass-produced wares creates an additional layer to the sexual innuendo of 4.39. If silverware such as Charinus' *Gratiana* has come from the common *taberna*, then Charinus must be using popular silverware—popular, that is, both in fashion and in broad public consumption. This latter association adds to the final punchline that Charinus' mouth and silverware are impure.

From an economic perspective, the prevalence of *tabernae* in Pliny and Martial's time marked a shift in the production and consumption of goods within the city. By the imperial period, Rome was fully a consumer city; Romans no longer relied on the production of goods on their farms (something Pliny seems to yearn for implicitly in his discussion of silverware) but instead participated in the exchange of goods and services from across the empire. A "*taberna* economy" arose from this increased exchange.[103] *Tabernae* were remarkably similar in layout, yet they produced and sold a large variety of goods. Often the owner of the shop would purchase raw materials in bulk to produce their own specialized goods. In turn, an artisan owner of a shop would ideally sell goods in bulk to a merchant to better increase their revenue beyond what they were capable of earning in their town or city.[104] This process could highlight the use of both *officina* and *taberna* in Pliny's description of silverware: Pliny envisions large-scale production of goods that are then sold in smaller shops throughout the city, though the individual *taberna* was quite capable of producing its own goods outside of the *officina*.

The *taberna* economy also nicely melds with Martial's Saturnalian focus on mass consumption of goods. Macdonald envisions Martial's *Apophoreta* as a bazaar-like literary tour of Rome, and she argues for a literary representation of the Sigillaria marketplace, a space to

[103] I have taken this term from Mayer 2012.
[104] For both the raw materials and involvement of merchants, see Mayer 2012: Chapter 3.

which Romans would go to buy small gifts for the holiday. However, Martial's goods could also easily be purchased at a *taberna* beyond the specific context of the Saturnalia. Even further, Martial's fixation on the consumption of goods is made possible because of the prevalence of the *tabernae* in imperial Rome and the easy access to goods that they facilitated. So the *taberna* in the *Natural History* silverware passage can be a point of moral concern for Pliny, and thus a barb for Martial to satirize Charinus, but the *taberna* economy is also a driving force for the larger poetic themes of Martial's epigrams.

Martial uses the term *taberna* twice in his poetry to describe the bookshops that sell his works, and through these epigrams we can see how important the shops which Pliny criticizes are to Martial's literary identity.[105] In a way his text is analogous to the *Gratiana* and other silverware produced and used in the *taberna*. Epigram 1.3 is programmatic in both placement and theme:[106]

Argiletanas mavis habitare tabernas,
  cum tibi, parve liber, scrinia nostra vacent.
nescis, heu, nescis dominae fastidia Romae:
  crede mihi, nimium Martia turba sapit.
maiores nusquam rhonchi: iuvenesque senesque
  et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent.
audieris cum grande sophos, dum basia iactas,
  ibis ab excusso missus in astra sago.
sed tu, ne totiens domini patiare lituras
  neve notet lusus tristis harundo tuos,
aetherias, lascive, cupis volitare per auras:
  i, fuge; sed poteras tutior esse domi. (*Epigr*. 1.3)

> You prefer to dwell in the Argiletan shops, little book, while my bookshelves lay empty for you. You do not know, alas, you do not know the disgust of mistress Rome: believe me, the martial crowd understands too much. Nowhere are there

[105] Epigrams 1.3 and 1.117 call the bookshops *tabernae*.
[106] For analysis of this poem within the context of Martial's inheritance of Augustan poetics, see Rimell 2008: 63-65. Rimell emphasizes the breakdown of public and private spheres in 1.3 (esp. on page 206). This same breakdown can be seen in Pliny the Elder's moralizing of the tableware that comes from the *taberna* and now resides on dinner tables.

> greater sneers: the youths, old men, and boys have noses like a rhino. When you have heard a great "well done!", while you throw kisses, you will go sent from a shaken cloak into the stars. But that you do not endure entirely the rewriting of the master nor let his sad pen mark your games, you desire to fly through the heavenly breezes, lascivious one: very well, flee! But you might have been safer at home.

Martial's focus on the public reception of his books reveals how publication can open one up to criticism.[107] Martial cannot control the reader's interpretation of his books; at one moment they may applaud the book, and at another the book may have to flee the city. Tellingly, Martial uses the verb *sapit* (taste) in describing the public's understanding of literature, thus transforming poetry into foodstuffs. This takes us back to Charinus' silverware, itself a receptable for food and drink. Like Martial's poetry, purchased in a *taberna*, Charinus' silverware is subject to rebukes and mockery. These items, too, cannot choose how they may be received by the viewer. A Charinus might boast of their prestigious lineage; a Martial may reveal them to be forgeries.

This gets at an issue that Sullivan touches on in his analysis of epigram 1.3: he notes that the bookshops reduced the likelihood of plagiarism or forgery, a constant issue for Martial, and one which he frequently expresses in his poetry. The poetry may indeed be protected from forgery through the publication and dispersal of an authoritative text through the bookseller. But if Charinus' silver, itself gesturing towards Pliny's derision of *tabernae*, is anything to go by in a discussion of the commodification and mass consumption of goods, then forgery still poses a threat for Martial's poetry. Perhaps this is why he directs his readers to specific booksellers in the Argiletum. The irony, of course, is that the reader must already possess the text in order to be directed to the approved vendors.

One final item remains to be discussed in epigram 4.39: the Galician gold plate (*Callaico. . . auro*, 4.39.7). Martial refers to this specific type of gold in one other poem, distich 14.95 in

---

[107] Sullivan 1991: 15 analyzes this aspect of epigram 1.3.

the tableware sequence of the *Apophoreta* (*Quamvis Callaïco rubeam generosa metallo, | glorior arte magis: nam Myos iste labor*). Martial attributes these golden cups to the famed artist Mys, and this follows soon after a distich about Mentor.[108] These distichs both play with the themes of prestige through provenance and potential forgery, so we see that in returning to Galician gold in the second sequence of 4.39, Martial continues to create a network with other epigrams about fraudulent art. This also creates a tighter connection between the two sequences of silverware since an oblique reference to Mys functions alongside the famed Greek artists of the first sequence of 4.39.

3.4 Conclusion

In the preceding sections I have given a wide-ranging analysis of the imagery in epigrams 4.46 and 4.39. The two epigrams are connected through theme and tone; they both offer a satirical portrait of boastful Romans who take pride in their belongings. In a sense, consumption and ownership are essential features of Charinus and Sabellus' identities. Martial depicts these men not as proud in their personal qualities or familial identities but rather as proud in how the objects they own confer a degree of wealth or the appearance of wealth on them. These are men who fashion an identity around objects, and this is something worth thinking about in relation to Martial's own poetic identity. As a Saturnalian poet Martial is known for two intricately composed books about objects: food stuffs in the *Xenia* and gifts in the *Apophoreta*. In later epigrams he returns to the connection between his poetry and physical objects, for instance in emphasizing book production.[109] His books are meant to be held by the reader; they are made of parchment; they are durable, except of course, when they are not (as we see from the joke that

[108] I have discussed this sequence in Chapter 2 as well as the introduction of this chapter.
[109] We can think here of the programmatic epigram 1.2 which describes the book as something to be held and carried with the reader.

the pages may as well be wrappings for leftover food in 13.1). Martial's poetic identity, then, resides in the physical world, and his pride in poetry can take a similar form as Charinus and Sabellus' pride in their belongings.

But Martial also grapples with the inherent value of the epigrammatic genre through his metapoetic descriptions of objects. The two poems discussed in this chapter are about art objects with seemingly disparate values, but Martial also links these specifically through the common use of *toreuma*. This word, which describes a wide range of techniques, can signify Martial's own shape-shifting persona throughout his epigrams. Phidias' technique in metalwork (*Phidiaci toreuma caeli*, 4.39.4) is fundamentally different from the faux-embossments of clay bowls (*Hispanae luteum rotae toreuma*, 4.46.16), and yet Martial portrays both as *toreumata*. Initially, it may seem that the difference in value and reception of the two are explicit: precious metals are, of course, more monetarily valuable than clay. Phidias, of course, has more prestige than an anonymous Spanish potter.

But Martial complicates this easy evaluation of worth by creating a comparison between silver and clay wares in two satirical epigrams, one of which deals with the recurring theme of fraud in Martial's epigrams. Charinus' embossed silver, Martial implies, is not in fact made by Phidias. It is likely made by an anonymous *taberna* owner not unlike the *figulus* in epigram 4.46. In this way, the two pieces must be evaluated from a moral perspective. The clay wares are certainly cheaper than silver, but at least there is no pretension as to their provenance. However, we also know that *terra sigillata* mimicked silver embossed works and, in doing so, vied for a greater reputation amongst consumers. From this perspective, Martial's comparison of the "Phidian" embossed silver and the "embossed" clay (it would likely have been stamped or carved as *caelum* implies) asks the reader to consider which sort of pretension is better. Given

that the clay wares form a thorough metapoetic reference to Martial's earlier poetry, it seems that perhaps the pretension of the clay wares is more palatable. From this metapoetic framework we can read the Saguntine clay tableware as taking the common stuff of epigram (clay) and decorating it, refining it, with the stuff of higher genres (embossed details). The tableware signifies an elevation, even if humorous, of a low genre. This must be better than a piece that asserts a false value, and in poetic terms, a high genre poem that really has no worth.

CHAPTER 4

JUVENALIAN INTERACTIONS WITH CRAFT IMAGERY IN MARTIAL

4.1 Reading Martial After the Flavians

Although he published his *Satires* after Domitian's death,[1] Juvenal offers a useful lens for interpreting craft imagery in Flavian texts, particularly in Martial. The similarity of satire and epigram as low-status genres makes these poets an easy pair for intertextual studies, and numerous scholars remark on this formal relationship.[2] The two poets also apparently knew one another and judging from the three epigrams Martial addresses to a Juvenal (7.24, 7.91, 12.18), they appear to have had a close, friendly relationship. Epigram 12.18, with its various intertextual connections to Juvenal's work and metapoetic statements about Martial's own writing, makes clear that Martial refers to the poet Juvenal, and through this poem we may retroactively read the two epigrams from Book 7 as likely addressed to the same individual.[3] In 12.18 Martial writes to Juvenal from his retirement in Bilbilis:

> Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
> Clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura,
> Aut collem dominae teris Dianae;
> Dum per limina te potentiorum
> Sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque
> Maior Caelius et minor fatigant:
> Me multos repetita post Decembres
> Accepit mea rusticumque fecit
> Auro Bilbilis et superba ferro. . . (*Epigr.* 12.18.1-9)

[1] Recent scholarship has suggested a much earlier publication date for Juvenal's first book of *Satires*. Kelly 2018, following Uden 2015, proposes a publication of 100-101 CE, nearly ten years before the traditional dating of the first book. Geue 2018 also discusses the scholarly debate around the publication date.

[2] Kelly 2018 gives an overview of this scholarship. Colton has published numerous articles on Juvenal's use of Martial in his Satires. Bramble 1982 writes of the two together in the *Cambridge History of Latin Literature*.

[3] Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019 for an overview of the three epigrams and citations for the common nature of the name. Kelly 2018 also provides overview of this subject.

> While you perhaps, Juvenal, wander restlessly in the noisy Subura or tread Lady Diana's hill, while your sweating gown fans you as you cross the thresholds of the powerful and the Greater and Lesser Caelian tire out the wanderer: my Bilbilis, proud of her gold and iron, revisited after many Decembers, has received and made me a rustic.

Juvenal now must endure the daily labors of the client, wandering around the Subura and Aventine and wearing away the doorsteps of his patrons as Martial once did in epigrams such as 3.36. Martial, on the other hand, has been made a rustic in Bilbilis (*accepit mea rusticumque fecit | auro Bilbilis et superba ferro*, 12.18.8-9); he is content to sleep late in the day and enjoy the simple pleasures of country life. Kelly highlights how this final epigram to Juvenal in Book 12 gives Martial's blessing to the younger poet's literary pursuits, and he uses Uden's proposed earlier publication date for *Satires* Book 1 to suggest that Martial here congratulates Juvenal on his recent publication.[4] The poem overall depicts Juvenal as assuming the epigrammatist's former role in Rome, while Martial enjoys his long-earned retirement after many Decembers (i.e. many successful publication of his epigrams) in Rome.

Throughout the epigram Martial chooses thematically important images for his entire oeuvre, including the symbols of patronage now part of Juvenal's daily/literary life such as the client's toga and the morning *salutatio*. The topographical elements in this epigram (the Subura and Aventine) are synonymous with Martial's Rome, and the temporal element (December) highlights Martial's literary persona as a Saturnalian poet, but these are now Juvenal's spaces as well. Intertextual readings also emphasize the similarity between images here and in Juvenal's first book of satires: Rimell notes the stock theme of countryside vs. city within this epigram and Juvenal's *Satire* 3, while Kelly points to lexical parallels between this text and *Satire* 1.[5]

---

[4] Kelly 2018: 178-79.
[5] Rimell 2008: 194-96, Kelly 2018: 174-75.

An intertextual reading of Martial Book 12 and Juvenal Book 1 thus shows an extended and pointed conversation between the two poets, and we can take this back further to the epigrams in Book 7 addressed to Juvenal. Epigram 7.91 contains another programmatic image for Martial, who in this poem sends Juvenal Saturnalian nuts from his little farm:

> De nostro, facunde, tibi, Iuvenalis, agello
> Saturnalicias mittimus, ecce, nuces.
> Cetera lascivis donavit poma puellis
> Mentula custodis luxuriosa dei. (*Epigr.* 7.91)

> Eloquent Juvenal, I send you, see, Saturnalian nuts from my little bit of land. The rest of its produce the lustful cock of its guardian has bestowed on wanton girls.

Nuts are a typical Saturnalian present and generally symbolize trivial or worthless things;[6] at first glance this seems like an absurd present to send to a respectable (implied by *facundus*) and dear friend of Martial's. However, Saturnalian nuts are metonyms for Martial's poetry,[7] so that this is not such a trivial gift between two poets. The placement of the Saturnalian nuts in line 2 parallels an earlier line addressed to the poet Varro in Book 5 (*Saturnalicias perdere, Varro, nuces*, 5.30.8).[8] This is the last line of the epigram and describes Varro losing Saturnalian nuts, both of which, in turn, recall the final line of the opening epigram of Martial's *Apophoreta* (*'lude,' inquis, 'nucibus'. Perdere nolo nuces*, 14.1.12). Varro, a contemporary of Martial's, apparently wrote in the higher genres of tragedy and lyric,[9] both of which Martial highlights in the same epigram through references to exemplary authors Sophocles (5.30.1) and Horace (5.30.2),[10] but as Martial makes clear, these are not fitting genres for the Saturnalia and Varro ought to abstain

[6] Galán Vioque 2002: 484 for an overview of this image.
[7] See the analysis in Chapter 2 of the verbal similarity between *nuces* and *nugae*.
[8] Howell 1995 notes the similarity.
[9] Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019.
[10] See Howell 1995 commentary for more.

from his usual writing. As we know, Martial disavows these genres also in the opening of the *Apophoreta*: why should he write of Thebes, Troy, and Mycenae during the Saturnalia (*vis scribam Thebas Troiamve malasve Mycenas?*,14.1.11)? Instead, he does not want to lose his nuts, i.e. his epigrams. Varro is the opposite, however, for as a tragic and lyric poet it is more suitable (*commodius*, 5.30.7) for him to lose Saturnalian nuts/epigrams and retain his customary genres.

Epigram 7.91 picks up on these earlier epigrams in a significant way. As someone who previously worries about losing his Saturnalian nuts, Martial now happily sends them to Juvenal. This becomes a meaningful Saturnalian gift both through the metapoetic representation of Martial's poetry and because he gives it away to the man who we know will become his literary successor. 7.91 can be read perhaps along the same lines as Kelly's interpretation that in 12.18 Martial "passes the baton" to Juvenal at the end of his epigrammatic corpus. While epigram 12.18 opens the possibility of an initial publication of Juvenal's poetry around 100 CE, 7.91 shows that Juvenal is active in literary circles under Domitian and maybe even had his own poetry to offer Martial in reciprocity.

These epigrams express a clear relationship between the two poets, but the Saturnalian nuts also bring us to a common feature of epigram and satire: food. While food appears throughout Martial's epigrams as a symbol of patronage in Rome, food is also a core component for the very term *satire*. Ancient writers propose several etymologies for satire, two of which are related to food: the *lanx satura* (full dish) and the *farcimen* (stuffed meat). Modern scholarship favors the *lanx satura* etymology as an apt representation for the varied qualities of the genre.[11]

[11] Gowers 1993: 110ff. provides an overview of the etymologies. Diomedes, the 4th cent. CE grammarian, gives four possible etymologies: 1. satyrs, 2. *lanx satura*, 3. *farcimen* (stuffing), 4. *lex per saturam*.

As Gowers has shown, Juvenal uses descriptions of food throughout his corpus to express his larger poetic program.

In this chapter, however, I will focus on the *lanx* portion of the *lanx satura*. Food is a necessary component of a banquet, but it requires something to be served on or in. Because of this essential connection between food and tableware, Juvenal's satires become a fitting space for tableware to take on programmatic and thematic significance. This is nowhere more evident than Juvenal's *Satire* 5, in which Juvenal uses tableware allusions to simultaneously gesture towards an idealized patron-client relationship and reveal the patron Virro to be a fraud.

Juvenal uses various poetic predecessors in his discussions of tableware, but the most prominent is none other than Martial, in part perhaps from their friendship but also because of the similarity in their chosen genres. At the forefront of Juvenal's allusions is also Martial's Saturnalian poetry, which bears a sound similarity with *satur-* (to be full).[12] Given these correspondences between the two poets, analysis of Juvenal's poetry adds nuance to an understanding of Martial's metapoetic and self-referential imagery.

4.2 A Martialian Banquet in Juvenal *Satire* 5

The final poem in Juvenal's first book, *Satire* 5, describes an exemplary topic for the genre itself: the banquet. In this satire the poet expresses indignation at the vast inequity of the Roman *cena* (dinner) through the images of foods given to the host Virro and guest Trebius. To illustrate the absurd difference between Virro and Trebius, Juvenal moves chronologically through the standard Roman dinner, describing in detail the various foods presented to each man, from the first round of drinks (5.24-60) to the elaborate series of fish and meat dishes (5.80-124)

[12] *Saturnalia* derives from *Saturnus*, which in turn ancient etymology related to *sator*. See Maltby 1991 s.v. 'Saturnus'.

and final apple dessert (5.149-155). Throughout the satire, he repeatedly berates Trebius for desiring an invitation to such a wretched dinner and scorns Virro for his excessive displays of wealth. Juvenal ultimately concludes that in debasing himself for a nice meal (which he does not even get!), Trebius reduces his status from freeborn to slave.

Many of the items in Virro's *cena* find antecedents in Martial's epigrams, and the contrasting perspectives between the two authors allow for a greater understanding of Juvenal's depiction of the guest and host in *Satire* 5. Likewise, Juvenal's deployment of Martialian imagery in this satire comments on Martial's poetry on patronage and social life in Rome. As with Martial's epigram 4.46, which looks back to his earlier Saturnalian poetry through the list of Sabellus' gifts, the various foods and tableware in *Satire* 5 create a road map for interpreting the imagery of Juvenal's poetic predecessor. Some items are of especial importance to the present study: the Saguntine *lagona* (5.29), for instance, combines programmatic images from Martial's epigrams, while the descriptions of wines given to Trebius and Virro gain meaning when compared with the wine list from Martial's *Xenia*.

While the food and tableware may be the same as those in Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, Virro's dinner is quite different from Martial's Saturnalian *cena* that celebrates the reciprocal giving of gifts. Even before the dinner has begun, Trebius must vie with a crowd of other clients (*tota salutatrix . . . turba*) to secure a dinner invitation, yet the jockeying for a good meal does not end there. Trebius finds himself in the low status section of the banquet, surrounded by freedmen engaged in a wine-induced fight:

> Qualis cena tamen! vinum quod sucida nolit
> lana pati: de conviva Corybanta videbis.
> iurgia proludunt, sed mox et pocula torques
> saucius et rubra deterges vulnera mappa,
> inter vos quotiens libertorumque cohortem
> pugna Saguntina fervet commissa lagona. (*Sat*. 5.24-29)

> But what a dinner! You get wine that fresh wool wouldn't absorb; you'll see the guests turned into Corybants. Insults open the hostilities, but once you're hit it won't be long before you're hurling cups too, and mopping your wounds with a reddened napkin. That's what happens once battle with the Saguntine crockery starts up and rages between you guests and the squad of freedmen.[13]

This food fight, amusingly labeled a *pugna* between Trebius and a cohort of Virro's freedmen, parodies epic battle scenes. Braund notes several epic parallels in the vocabulary of this passage,[14] yet this mock epic is replete not with shields and spears but instead with tableware (*pocula* and *lagona*) hurled as weapons. Juvenal even gives the napkin (*mappa*) new use as a medical implement: what once would wipe spilled wine now wipes blood from a wound.[15] While the *pocula*, *mappa*, and *Saguntina lagona* are all unexpected epic material, they do correspond to programmatic imagery in Martial's epigrams. Similarly, the manipulation of high genres is a frequent occurrence in Martial's poetry, not least in his Saturnalian texts that refashion imagery from Vergil and Ovid.

Saguntine clay is an immediately recognizable Martialian image, and this lone instance of Saguntine pottery in Juvenal's *Satires* makes it a pointed reference. On the one hand, Martial's earliest usage of Saguntine cups in the *Apophoreta* gives a rationale for Juvenal's use of Saguntine ware as weapons. In 14.108 Martial states that the Saguntine cups do not cause servants anxiety because of their durable nature (*Quae non sollicitus teneat servetque minister,* | *sume Saguntino pocula facta luto*). This durable nature, therefore, makes them useful weapons. But as I have shown in Chapters 2 and 3, Martial refers to Saguntine clay three times (14.108,

---

[13] Translations of Juvenal by Braund 2004.
[14] Braund 1996: 281: *proludere, torquere, saucius, vulnera, cohortem,* and *pugna commissa* all are typical epic vocabulary.
[15] This actually reflects the purpose of *sucida lana* earlier in the description. Pliny *NH* 29.30 discusses poor quality wine as a disinfectant for wounds.

4.46, 8.6), with each instance building upon the earlier epigrams to create a self-referential statement about the epigrammatic genre. These three instances also occur within the contexts of Roman patronage and convivial settings: the *Apophoreta* alternates rich and poor gifts given between patrons and clients (or masters and slaves), epigram 4.46 describes Saguntine wares gifted to a certain Sabellus during the Saturnalia, and epigram 8.6 describes Martial's preference for Saguntine clay over the precious dining wares used during a dinner hosted by Euctus. In each of these epigrams, Martial depicts Saguntine ware as cheap, associating it with the client, and through Martial we can see how this is fitting material for the poorly treated client Trebius in *Satire* 5. Considering the undercurrent of poetic pride Martial expresses through Saguntine cups, it also seems that Trebius would be better served by maintaining Martial's mindset about this pottery. After all, Virro's expensive cups, as we will see, may end up being as fraudulent as Euctus' in epigram 8.6.

While Juvenal strengthens his satiric depiction of the long-suffering client by drawing from Martial's own programmatic imagery of patronage, the Saguntine cups also provide a further allusive link for Juvenal by connecting this parodic battle to earlier epic battle scenes, specifically battles begun at banquets. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Nestor gives an extended account of the battle between Lapiths and Centaurs, which begins at a banquet celebrating the wedding of Pirithous. Juvenal's satire offers a few moments of verbal correspondence to this battle, such as his early representation of Virro's clients as a *turba*. The Centaurs likewise crowd the festive banquet (*festaque confusa resonabat regia turba*, *Met*. 12.214). But the parallels between the passages exist more so in the general imagery of tableware turned into weapons. As the battle in the *Metamorphoses* picks up steam, Nestor recounts:

> vina dabant animos, et prima pocula pugna
> missa volant fragilesque cadi curvique lebetes,

res epulis quondam, tum bello et caedibus aptae. (*Met*. 12.242-4)

> Wine gave them courage, and in the first onslaught wine-cups and brittle flasks went flying through the air, and deep rounded basins, utensils once meant for use of feasting, but now for war and slaughter.[16]

Juvenal incorporates both *pocula* and *pugna* in his battle imagery, but the more specific tableware terminology (*cadus* and *lebes* in Ovid vs. *lagona* in Juvenal) differs between the authors. Notably, the contrast in adjectives suggests the differing status of each occasion as well as the guests. Ovid describes the wine cups as fragile (*fragilesque cadi*), denoting a certain preciosity of object and material. This would fit with the prestige of a royal marriage ceremony. Meanwhile, Juvenal's Saguntine *lagona* are sturdy items likely lower in value than the cups at a king's wedding celebration. Of course, we can only infer this through the earlier depictions of Saguntine cups in Martial's *Apophoreta*. This contrast sharpens the humor of Juvenal's satire: he transforms an epic battle scene, already presented comically by Ovid as a battle at a banquet, to a fight not between great mythological figures but instead the clients and freedmen of a Trimalchio-esque figure who are forced to battle with cheap implements.

Juvenal further alludes to Ovid's Centauromachy through the description of the dinner guests as Corybants. He tells Trebius, "you will see Corybants [made] from dinner guests" (*de conviva Corybanta videbis*, *Sat.* 5.25). While not directly related to the Lapiths and Centaurs, this statement does express the core theme of Ovid's epic: metamorphosis of an individual into another, wilder creature. Corybants figure in ancient literature as symbols of madness, whether mad themselves or inducing madness in others.[17] Beyond their association with Cybele, the

---

[16] Translation by Miller 1916.

[17] Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 on Horace *Ode* 1.16 argues that the Corybants induce madness in others; Mayer 1994 disagrees, pointing to Juvenal *Satire* 5 as evidence for Corybants being mad themselves. Dodds 1960 in his commentary on Euripides' *Bacchae* further discusses a Corybantic rite to cure madness that included use of the kettledrum.

Corybants remain somewhat obscure to modern scholars and were syncretized with Curetes as early as the fifth century BCE in Greece. The cult of Cybele arrived in Rome in the third century BCE, but in spite of this early introduction into the religious life of the city, the cult maintained a distinctly eastern image. The retention of a foreign identity is crucial to Juvenal's imagery and serves to "other" the cohort of freedmen now maddened from cheap wine and engaged in battle with Trebius. Like the Centaurs in the *Metamorphoses*, these dinner guests transform into wild creatures that disrupt the civilized banquet.[18]

Beyond the generic and verbal similarities between *Satire* 5 and Ovid's Centauromachy, Juvenal uses Martial as an intermediary to reinforce the connection between the two texts. The Saguntine *lagona* points the reader to Martial's previous descriptions of this tableware, and in epigram 8.6 he describes how he prefers Saguntine cups over the fraudulent antiques Euctus parades about at his dinners.[19] Martial then lists Euctus' claim of various epic pedigrees for his supposedly ancient cups, though as Patricia Watson points out, Euctus' explanations of provenance often misremember key epic moments, thus revealing the true value of the cups.[20] One such story in the catalogue of 8.6 is the Centauromachy (*hoc cratere ferox commisit proelia Rhoetus | cum Lapithis: pugna debile cernis opus*, 8.6.7-8). Here is a direct allusion to Ovid's text; however, there it is not Rhoetus who hurls a crater during the battle, but Theseus (*forte fuit iuxta signis exstantibus asper | antiquus crater; quem vastum vastior ipse | sustulit Aegides adversaque misit in ora*, *Met*. 12.235-7).[21] Right after Euctus' misremembering of Ovid's text, he next mentions a cup belonging to Nestor. Scholars have shown that Ovid plays with Nestor's

[18] Braund 1996 notes the contrast between the civilized *conviva* and wild *Corybas*.
[19] For full discussion of epigram 8.6, see Chapter 2.
[20] Watson 1998.
[21] Watson 1998: 35.

memory of events in the long narrative of Book 12, and so Martial perhaps picks this element up in the organization of his catalogue. For Juvenal, though, this connection speaks to poetic valuations of genre, since he does not refer to a *crater* but rather to Saguntine cups, which exist in Martial's domain. In choosing 8.6 as an intertext for *Satire* 5, Juvenal further develops the opposition of high and low genres. Trebius' Saguntine *lagona* is engaged in a parodic epic battle; Martial's programmatic image for epigram thus fights within and against the epic context of this scene.

Juvenal's use of the *lagona* is also thematically significant. Martial never refers to a specifically Saguntine flask (*lagona*); instead, he describes Saguntine cups (*pocula*), a tableware set (*synthesis*), and drinking bowls (*cymbia*). *Lagonae* do have a metapoetic function in Martial, though, as I have discussed in Chapter 1. A *lagona* is a small container that one might buy from a vendor on the street, as in epigram 7.61 about Domitian's legislation banning shops from taking up space on the streets (*nulla catenatis pila est praecincta lagonis*, 7.61.5), and it can also be taken to dinner parties as one's personal cup. In epigram 7.20 Martial ridicules Santra for greedily taking as many leftovers as he can manage from a dinner party including the dregs of wine from others cups that he pours into his own *lagona* (*mixto lagonam replet ad pedes vino*, 7.20.19). Likewise, the *lagona* as a personal flask in Martial has associations with poison. Twice in Book 4 Martial refers to poison filled *lagonae*: epigram 4.43 briefly refers to the flask of Pontia, a well-known poisoner,[22] and in 4.69 Martial suggests that Papylus has been poisoning his wives with his *lagona*. In this regard, the Saguntine *lagona* is a doubly fitting weapon for Trebius and the freedmen since it is made of durable Saguntine clay and is already connected to poison as a weapon.

[22] Moreno Soldevila 2006: 323 on Pontia.

The personal nature of the *lagona* makes this a good piece of tableware for brandishing in a fight, but to return to a metapoetic reading of this object, the diminutive size of a flask in Martial is also suggestive of the little book of poetry, another transportable and personally owned object. For example, Martial compares his *libelli* to a *lagona* in epigram 10.45:

> Si quid lene mei dicunt et dulce libelli,
> Si quid honorificum pagina blanda sonat,
> Hoc tu pingue putas et costam rodere mavis,
> Ilia Laurentis cum tibi demus apri.
> Vaticana bibas, si delectaris aceto:
> Non facit ad stomachum nostra lagona tuum. (*Epigr*. 10.45)

> If my little books say something smooth and agreeable, if a flattering page has a complimentary sound to it, you think this greasy fare and prefer to gnaw a rib when I give you loin of Laurentine boar. Drink Vatican if you like vinegar; my flask doesn't suit your stomach.

The positioning of *libelli* and *lagona* at the end of the first and last lines of the poem connect the two, and the further description of the flask as Martial's (*nostra lagona*) aligns with the many instances in which he refers to his own books as *nostri libelli* or *nostri libri*.[23] In this epigram, Martial envisions his poetry as rich food and good wine in a *lagona*, and he tells those who don't like it to drink a wine as bad as vinegar.[24] The emphatic *nostra lagona* ties the worth of the object with its contents: it could carry a poison such as the one in Pontia's flask (4.43) or it could carry a wine presumably as smooth and sweet (*lene* and *dulce*) as Martial's poetry.

---

[23] Epigrams with *nostr- libr-* or *nostr- libell-* include 1.3 1.4, 1.29, 1.52, 1.53, 3.99, 4.29, 4.31, 4.49, 4.72, 5.5, 5.10, 5.15, 5.36, 5.63, 6.60, 7.51, 7.52, 7.77, 9.81, 10.33, 10.104, 11.16, 11.17, 11.94.

[24] Martial portrays Vatican as an inferior wine in four epigrams (1.18, 6.92, 10.45, 12.48). Epigram 6.92 is an interesting point of comparison for 10.45 because in the former Martial jokes that someone who drinks Vatican wine from a bowl embossed with a snake and made by the famed Myron in fact drinks poison. This is both a comment on the embossed snake as well as the quality of the wine, which is an incongruous wine to drink from a bowl made by a famous artist.

This complicates the image of the Saguntine *lagona* in Juvenal's satire, since the programmatic significance of the material for Martial suggests that it is an item that should not immediately cause Trebius shame. However, Virro gives Trebius a wine that is not even good enough for medical use (*vinum quod sucida nolit | lana pati*, *Sat*. 5.24-5) so that Trebius' Saguntine flask has been filled with something even worse than the Vatican wine Martial wishes upon his judgemental readers. Within the larger satirical portrait of patronage, this incongruity highlights the harm done by haughty patrons. The lowly status of a client is emblematic of both the epigrammatic and satiric genres, so Juvenal's invocation of Martialian poetics in the form of the Saguntine flask emphasizes that the predicament of the client lies in what one does with what one has been given within the patronage system. One could resist the humiliations, as Martial does through his biting epigrams and his ultimate retirement, or one can subject himself, like Trebius, to the arrogant patron all for the sake of a free meal and in the process give up the respectability of being a citizen.

Juvenal provides a further example of Trebius' degradation after an excursus on Virro's expensive tableware, and, as with the Saguntine flask, he draws from Martial's epigrams. Virro does not trust Trebius with his gem-encrusted goblets, so Trebius instead uses cups named after the Beneventan cobbler and Neronian *delator* Vatinius:

> tu Beneuentani sutoris nomen habentem
> siccabis calicem nasorum quattuor ac iam
> quassatum et rupto poscentem sulpura uitro. (*Sat*. 5.46-48)

> But you will drain a vessel named after the shoemaker at Beneventum with its four nozzles. It's already cracked and looking for sulphur matches in exchange for its broken glass.

Juvenal does not name Vatinius outright, but the description is enough for the Roman reader to pick up on the referent, who seems to have been a popular subject on cups.[25] Vatinian cups also appear several times in Martial's epigrams. The first instance, which I have also discussed in Chapter 2, occurs in distich 14.96 of the *Apophoreta*:

96 *Calices Vatinii*

Vilia sutoris calicem monimenta Vatini
accipe; sed nasus longior ille fuit.

96 *Vatinian cups*

Accept a cup, a cheap memorial of cobbler
Vatinius, but *that* nose was longer.

The item's position as a cheap gift in the alternating structure of the Saturnalian text reinforces the disparity between Virro and Trebius, but Juvenal inverts the intended recipient. Throughout the *Apophoreta* Martial describes items that patrons and clients might give to one another, and the frequent entreaties for the "poor" gifts to be humbly received suggests that they are given to patrons by clients. Yet, in *Satire* 5, Virro disdainfully gives this item to his client. Not only does Virro return this item to a client, but he gives a broken cup, which recalls Martial's epigram 10.3:

Vernaculorum dicta, sordidum dentem,
Et foeda linguae probra circulatricis,
Quae sulphurato nolit empta ramento
Vatiniorum proxeneta fractorum,
Poeta quidam clancularius spargit
Et volt videri nostra. . . (*Epigr.* 10.3.1-6)

Quips of home-bred slaves, vulgar abuse, and the ugly railings of a hawker's tongue, such as a dealer in broken Vatinians would not want to buy for a sulphur match—these a certain skulker of a poet scatters abroad and wishes people to think them mine. . .

[25] Whitehouse 1999.

Through this intertext we find that the Vatinian cup Trebius must use, though it is looking to be sold for sulphur matches, is in fact one that not even a dealer would buy due to its poor condition.[26] It is worse than an item that Martial already portrays negatively. Moreover, epigram 10.3 addresses a common theme in Martial: plagiarism. This is part of a larger cycle on plagiarism in Book 10, a book which Martial revised after Domitian's assassination so that he might distance himself from the court of the now former emperor.[27] As with the Saguntine *lagona*, the Vatinian cups in 10.3 have a metapoetic valence. This time, however, they represent poor material being passed off as Martial's work and from which he is eager to disassociate himself. The added historical detail of Vatinius ingratiating himself towards Nero suggests that the false Martial poetry described as broken Vatinian cups may link him to Domitian in an undesirable way. According to Martial, the installment of Nerva as emperor is the impetus for his revision of Book 10, and the book revels in Rome's liberty under a new emperor. The republication seems like a conceit for Martial enacting the idea that he must minimize his connection to Domitian, but it is notable that this is the only book he revises.[28]

The issue of liberty under a ruler is one that crops up in *Satire* 5 as well. In contrast to the Vatinian cups, Virro drinks wine that was bottled during the time of the Social War as well as Alban and Setine wines enjoyed by Thrasea and Helvidius:

> ipse capillato diffusum consule potat
> calcataque madet bellis socialibus uva,
> cardiaco numquam cyathum missurus amico.
> cras bibet Albanis aliquid de montibus aut de
> Setinis, cuius patriam titulumque senectus
> delevit multa veteris fuligine testae,
> quale coronati Thrasea Helvidiusque bibebant
> Brutorum et Cassi natalibus. (*Sat*. 5.30-37)

[26] Courtney 1980 (reprint 2013): 203-04 notes the reference to Martial.
[27] Nisbet 2020: 62-63, 66.
[28] Lorenz 2002 suggests that the republication is feigned.

> Himself downs a wine bottled when consuls had long hair and gets drunk on a grape trodden during the Social War, but he'll never send even a spoonful to a friend who's suffering from indigestion. Tomorrow he will be drinking something from the hills of Alba or Setia. Old age has obliterated its origin and label with layers of smoke on the ancient jar. It's the sort of wine that Thrasea and Helvidius used to drink, wearing garlands, on the birthdays of Cassius and the Bruti.

Thrasea and Helvidius Priscus were members of the opposition during Nero's rule, and later Helvidius was put to death by Vespasian.[29] As exemplary figures of *libertas*, the two also fittingly drink wine while celebrating Brutus and Cassius the tyrant-slayers. Virro, however, is more of a Nero than a Thrasea or Helvidius, and so, Courtney notes, he "defiles their favourite wine by drinking it". Juvenal invokes these historical figures during Virro's dinner party to create a grotesque image of Roman patronage. Virro poses as a revolutionary while simultaneously forcing Trebius to play the Vatinius to his Nero. And, worse, unlike Martial, Trebius is unable to issue a rebuke of this man and the inferior position he (Trebius) now occupies.

Compared to Trebius' Saguntine flask and Vatinian cup, Virro uses an elaborate and expensive *phiala*, which is made of gold and decorated with amber, beryl, and jasper (though this last is ambiguously placed later in the description):

> . . . Ipse capaces
> Heliadum crustas et inaequales berullo
> Virro tenet phialas: tibi non committitur aurum,
> vel, si quando datur, custos adfixus ibidem,
> qui numeret gemmas, ungues observet acutos.
> da veniam: praeclara illi laudatur iaspis.
> nam Virro, ut multi, gemmas ad pocula transfert
> a digitis, quas in vaginae fronte solebat
> ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus Iarbae. (*Sat.* 5.37-45)

> Virro himself holds capacious goblets encrusted with amber and rough with beryl. His gold isn't entrusted to you, or if it is, a guard is stationed on the spot to count

[29] Courtney 1980 (reprint 2013): 202.

> the jewels and keep a watch on your sharp fingernails. Don't blame him: his splendid jasper is much admired. The fact is that Virro, like many people, shifts his jewels from his fingers to his cups—jewels that might have been set on the scabbard-front of the young man who was preferred to jealous Iarbas.

Martial's *Apophoreta* once again provides a fitting intertext for this tableware. Juvenal characterizes Virro as the type of wealthy man who in his luxury and excess has moved the gems from his rings (already a sign of loosening morals in Pliny the Elder) to his cups.[30] This cup made with gems originally intended for jewelry finds its antecedent in Martial 14.109, in which a golden *calix* is encrusted with gems meant for fingers.[31] More importantly, though: this distich immediately follows the distich on Saguntine cups mentioned earlier:

> 108 *Calices saguntini*
>
> Quae non sollicitus teneat servetque minister,
> Sume Saguntino pocula facta luto.
>
> 109 *Calices gemmati*
>
> Gemmatum Scythicis ut luceat ignibus aurum,
> Aspice. Quot digitos exuit iste calix!

> 108 *Saguntine cups*
>
> Take cups made of Saguntine clay which your servant may hold and keep without anxiety.
>
> 109 *Jewelled cups*
>
> See how the jewelled gold is alight with Scythian fires. How many fingers has this cup despoiled!

[30] Pliny the Elder *NH* 33.23-24 discusses the placement of jewels in gold rings as an indicator of wealth and luxury. As Isager 2013: 60 notes: "The whole section is permeated by an ironical moral attitude."
[31] Noted also by Braund 1996.

This pair of distichs offers a neat parallel to Trebius and Virro's drinking ware in the *cena* of *Satire* 5, especially since the *Apophoreta* is composed of alternating rich and poor gifts. The disparate value of each cup is made morally ambiguous, however, by the description of the jewelled cup stripping (*exuit*) fingers of their gems. This verb, with its suggestion of force, creates an image of theft or conquest that differentiates the moral worth of this cup from the sturdy Saguntine clay that does not even cause a slave anxiety to hold.[32] Juvenal inverts this image in lines 40-41: a guard (perhaps enslaved?) protects the jewelled cup from Trebius' presumed thieving fingernails. If we take Martial and Juvenal's imagery together, we may note an intriguing statement about the anxiety of wealth. The jewelled cup has become a luxury item only by stealing from other luxury items, but once it contains the expensive jewels, it must be on guard for others like it who want the very items it stole. The two poets portray two conflicting aspects of ostentatious wealth. In Martial's distich wealth comes from brazen theft; wealth is the mark of a conqueror, but, as Juvenal makes clear, ostentatious wealth is also the object of jealousy. The conqueror can ultimately be conquered without adequate protection. This militaristic attitude is ultimately foregrounded by imagery earlier in the satire, in which Trebius engages in a mock battle with Virro's rowdy freedman. A battle with cups and flasks could potentially turn into the conquest of more precious tableware.

Juvenal highlights the anxiety of the patron within this uneven banquet setting by suggesting that Trebius might have ulterior motives at the banquet (i.e. stealing jewels from Virro). But he also offers a coded moral critique of the patron through the connotations of the gems themselves. In this case, Pliny the Elder's moralizing descriptions of gems in *Natural History* Book 37 give context for the symbolism of the gems on Virro's cup. Two of the gems,

[32] Leary 1996: 171 notes the "connotation of forceful removal" attached to this verb.

amber and beryl, Pliny subjects to claims of luxury and effeminacy as well as fraud and deceit. I have already shown in previous chapters that forgery is an important aspect of Martial's portrayal of precious objects throughout his epigrams, and by reading Virro's cup in tandem with Pliny's text, we see that this is likewise an issue for Juvenal in *Satire* 5.

Natural History Book 37 describes a variety of gemstones, their appearance, their origins, and their uses. For Pliny, gemstones are the pinnacle of nature's beauty and for this reason have become part of the luxury consumption he sees in contemporary Rome. He begins this book with a broad historical sweep of gemstones owned by famed and disreputable men (Polycrates, Pyrrhus, Pompey, Nero, among others) before describing the most popular gems of present day. Myrrhine ware and rock crystal rank first in the catalogue, followed by amber, emeralds, and beryl. As a model for Juvenal's use of gems as symbols for ostentatious wealth, this hierarchy immediately conveys that the patron Virro is a fashionable man who follows the trends of his time, since his cups are encrusted with two of the most popular gems. However, perhaps because these items are so popular, they can be subject to fraud, as is the case for beryl.

In *Natural History* 37.76 Pliny first connects beryls to emeralds but remarks that beryls are found primarily in India, thus imbuing them with a sense of eastern luxury. After describing various colors and types of beryls, Pliny goes on to write of Indian preferences for the display of beryls and the best ways to achieve brilliance in light and color. Indians recognize, he notes, that beryl stands best on its own rather than embedded in gold, because it better reflects light in an elongated prismatic form. This is also the reason that beryl is cut into a hexagonal shape: the color of the beryl becomes dull when placed on an even surface (*poliuntur omnes sexangula figura artificum ingeniis, quoniam hebes unitate surda color repercussu angulorum excitetur*, *NH* 37.76). Juvenal picks up this image of the hexagonally-shaped beryl in his use of the

adjective *inaequales* to describe the surface of Virro's cup, but the fact that beryl has been embedded into the cup in the first place goes against the preferences of the Indians who source the beryl to Rome. While it is unlikely that Pliny would depict the Indians as a positive moral exemplum for the use of gemstones since there is no sense of utility in their use of beryl—they are, in fact, excessively fond (*mire gaudent*, 37.78) of the gemstone as a stand-alone piece—he does present them as a knowledgeable source for achieving the greatest visual effect. Virro's beryl, meanwhile, is both typical in the method of carving yet Romanized in presentation. He becomes a stock example of Roman luxury consuming goods from across the empire and transforming them in the process.

After describing the attributes and proper presentation of beryl, Pliny concludes his remarks with a simple statement that Indians often counterfeit beryls by adding color to plain rock crystal (*Indi et alias quidem gemmas crystallum tinguendo adulterare invenerunt, sed praecipue berullos*, *NH* 37.79). The popularity of the gemstone drives this fraudulent production; we must remember that beryl is listed within the most fashionable gems of Pliny's time. And while Pliny writes this matter-of-factly, the statement opens up the possibility of fraud within Juvenal's satire. Virro is an indulgent man in touch with the fashions of his time, and like the typical connoisseur he is eager to show off his possessions, such as the gem-encrusted gold cup. But Juvenal does not bestow any sense of knowledge about luxury items on Virro, and even if Virro did express knowledge about his possessions, we know from Martial's epigrams that this hardly guarantees authenticity. Instead, the beryl on Virro's cup can be read as a code for fraud in just the same way that the names Mentor and Phidias (and also the Vatinian cups) suggest fraud and forgery in Martial's epigrams.

References to beryl are relatively rare in extant Latin, making Pliny's account a likely component in Juvenal's imagery.[33] However, Juvenal may also have had two further prominent instances in mind in his description of the beryl on Virro's cup. Two fragments from Maecenas' poetry and Augustus' communication with his friend associate the celebrated literary patron with beryl.[34] In the opening to a poem addressed to a Flaccus, who scholars agree is Horace, Maecenas writes:

> Lucentes, mea vita, nec smaragdos
> beryllos neque, Flacce mi, nitentes
> <nec> percandida margarita quaero
> nec quos Tunnica lima perpolivit
> anellos nec iaspios lapillos. (Courtney fr. 2)

> Neither shining emeralds, my life, nor, my Flaccus, gleaming beryls, nor resplendent pearls do I seek, nor the little rings polished by Thynian file, nor jaspery stonelets.[35]

In turn, a fragment of a letter from Augustus to Maecenas picks up the luxurious imagery deployed by his friend:

> Vale meli gentium, †meculle, ebur ex Etruria, lasar Arretinum, adamas supernas, Tiberinum margaritum, Cilneorum zmaragde, iaspi figulorum, berulle Porsenae, carbunculum habeas, ἵνα συντέμω πάντα, μάλαγμα moecharum.
>
> Farewell sweetheart of the world, sweetie, ivory from Etruria, silphium from Arezzo, diamond from up north, Tiberine pearl, the Cilnian's emerald, jasper of the potters, beryl of Porsenna, carbuncle . . . hope you get one!—to sum it all up, you emollient of adulteresses.

---

[33] Accounting for both Latin spellings for the gem (*beryllus* and *berullus*), beryl only occurs twelve times in Latin sources. Further, it occurs in only eight texts (*beryllus*: Maecenas *carm*. 2.2; Propertius 4.7; *Eleg. In Maecenatem* 1.19; Curtius Rufus 9.1.30; Pliny *NH* 1.37a.28; Justinian 31.1.87.2.4, 39.4.16.7.7. *berullus*: Pliny NH 37.76, 37.79, 37.157; Augustus *Epist.* 32.3; Juvenal *Sat*. 5.38.).

[34] Petrain 2005 discusses the metapoetic use of gemstones in Augustan writers. Beryl is also associated with Maecenas in the *Elegiae in Maecenatem* originally assigned to the *Appendix Vergiliana*.

[35] Translations from Petrain 2005.

Both fragments offer a catalogue of gems gathered from the far reaches of the empire and connoting preciosity. A metapoetic intention in Maecenas' imagery appears possible due to his address to Horace, though whether Maecenas contrasts the gems with poetry or with a lifestyle (perhaps the simple life of the poet) is not clear. But, as Petrain points out, the addition of Augustus' voice in this conversation does open up a metapoetic valence in Maecenas' poetry by offering a learned commentary on Maecenas' deep indebtedness to Hellenistic poetic ideals.[36] Furthermore, Augustus' letter expresses the Roman assimilation of exotic wealth: Maecenas is the radiant jewel of his Etruscan lineage, a precious gem amongst humble potters from Italian stock. This is striking since Etruscans by the Augustan period were stereotypically portrayed as maintaining a luxurious lifestyle. The delicate imagery of the gemstones in both passages also depicts the decadent and potentially effeminate lifestyle for which Maecenas has been remembered. These several elements (exotic, decadent, delicate) provide a useful framework for moral critique in Juvenal, and this is all the more so since the fragments describe not only beryl but also jasper, the third jewel upon Virro's cups (line 42).

The jeweled cup should invest Virro with the same positive role as Maecenas, beloved patron of the arts, but the staging of Virro's dinner, an event which delights in denying equal treatment to the clients, reveals him to be the opposite. Through Virro Juvenal presents us with the negative exemplum of *amicitia* and the patron-client relationship; he does not want a friendship with his clients but would rather enslave them through their desire for a meal, as Juvenal notes in the end of the satire. The fragments of Maecenas and Augustus also offer two

[36] Petrain 2005: 349: "In Maecenas the link between gems and stylistic qualities is potential, a connection that seems suggested by the poem's florid style and sensuous subject, but that is not explicitly drawn by the fragment itself . . . Augustus makes the metapoetic undertones of his friend's poem overt by thematizing the issue of style (and its parody)."

forms of *amicitia*: the literary patronage between Maecenas and Horace and the friendship between Augustus and Maecenas. Both are unequal—the patron and poet, the emperor and a citizen—but both give a glimpse of an idealized relationship. Juvenal, meanwhile, operates within a genre that revels not in ideals but in the grotesque deficiencies of Roman social structures. Virro and his cup are ultimately the distorted inverse of Maecenas and Augustus.

Beryl is associated with potential fraud (in Pliny) and *amicitia* (between Augustus and Maecenas) and generally with preciosity and exotic luxury (in all three examples). But this is not the only gem on Virro's cup; Juvenal also describes the cup as encrusted with amber (*Heliadum crustas . . . phialas*). Amber, like beryl, is a potent symbol for fraud as well as effeminacy, and for this we must again turn to Pliny's book on gems.

Pliny discusses amber third amongst the most popular minerals in Rome in a long discussion that runs for 24 sections (*NH* 37.30-53).[37] His description of amber begins with a bold declaration that ancient sources misunderstand the origin and source of amber, and Pliny denigrates the Greeks for their fabulous stories about the mineral:

> Occasio est vanitatis Graecorum detegendae: legentes modo aequo perpetiantur animo, cum hoc quoque intersit vitae scire, non quidquid illi prodidere mirandum. (*NH* 37.31)
>
> Here is an opportunity for exposing the falsehoods of the Greeks. I only ask my readers to endure these with patience since it is important for mankind just to know that not all that the Greeks have recounted deserves to be admired.

The intention of Pliny's excursus on amber is to prove that Greek ideas about the mineral are false and that the Romans have better knowledge about these matters.[38] What Pliny finds particularly ridiculous in these stories are the various mythological aetiologies for the mineral,

[37] For discussion of this passage see Darab 2012: 151-54.
[38] Darab 2012: 154.

such as the story of Phaethon's sisters, the Heliades, crying tears of amber in mourning for their fallen brother. His critique of Greek *vanitas* is harsh and even laughable, given how many Greek sources Pliny uses in the composition of his own text.[39] But the introduction of aetiological falsehood in the *Natural History* aligns with the general depiction of deceit both in Martial's disavowal of epic and tragic genres and Juvenal's parody of these genres, and this factors into the interpretation of Virro as a fraud.

The story of Phaethon's sisters is clearly false, says Pliny, but it is the predominant amber myth that appears in numerous Greek poets (*NH* 37.31). The aetiology also happens to appear in the description of amber in *Satire* 5, and the use of the name *Heliades* for amber gives Virro's cup an epic pedigree.[40] But, as we have seen in Martial, so too here an epic pedigree is a telltale sign of forgery. Martial picks up the same type of moralizing about *vanitas* in epigrams such as 8.6 about Euctus and his fraudulent cups, and Virro's amber described as *Heliades* is open to the same suspicion.

In its wondrous nature, amber art can be deceitful, and in epigram 4.59 Martial describes an almost improbable occurrence of a viper embedded in amber:

> Flentibus Heliadum ramis dum vipera repit,
> fluxit in obstantem sucina gutta feram:
> quae dum miratur pingui se rore teneri,
> concreto riguit vincta repente gelu.
> ne tibi regali placeas, Cleopatra, sepulchro, 5
> vipera si tumulo nobiliore iacet. (*Epigr*. 4.59)

> While a viper crawled among the weeping branches of the Heliads, a drop of amber flowed onto the creature in its path. As it marveled to find itself stuck fast in the viscous liquid, it stiffened, bound of a sudden by congealed ice. Be not proud, Cleopatra, of your royal sepulcher, if a viper lies in a nobler tomb.

---

[39] Howley 2018: 135-42 includes a discussion of Aulus Gellius reacting to Pliny's readings of Greek texts and their apparent *vanitas*. This is a notable feature of the *Natural History* that Gellius comically twists in his own text.
[40] Braund 1996.

This is the first of only two instances of *Heliades* in the epigrams (4.59, 9.12) and is also one of two epigrams in Book 4 on amber tombs (4.32, 4.59). For Rimell, amber as a material that moves from liquid to solid is indicative of the transformative qualities of Martial's poetics and represents the gem-like quality of the genre.[41] Watson, meanwhile, suggests that, if Martial describes a real piece of art, this piece of amber has been hollowed out in order to create the illusion of a viper naturally sealed within it.[42] There is no way to prove whether this was an actual object the poet observed, but Martial's story about the viper crawling along a branch only to be caught in amazement at a drop of amber and subsequently entombed within it creates a sense of amazement for the reader about something that defies belief. Watson's proposal of an additional visual illusion is also attractive for the literary discussion of wonder and belief in art. Furthermore, the story of the viper is reminiscent of the lizard crawling on a branch in the Apollo Sauroctonos statue (*Ad te reptanti, puer insidiose, lacertae | parce: cupit digitis illa perire tuis*, 14.172). In this distich, the lizard gives itself over to the god, and the speaker of the poem entreats Apollo for clemency. The distich is part of a larger network of Augustan iconography in the *Apophoreta*, and the final apostrophe to Cleopatra in epigram 4.59 ties the amber to this Augustus-Apollo distich (*ne tibi regali placeas, Cleopatra, sepulchro, | vipera si tumulo nobiliore iacet*, 4.59.5-6). Cleopatra, rather than only dying from the asp bite, could in fact be the viper/lizard creeping to its death at the hands of Augustus/Apollo.

This imperial iconography does not readily correlate to the amber on Virro's cup in *Satire* 5—the single *Heliadum* in each text is not a decisive connection—but in the final gem, jasper, Juvenal does include an allusion to the primary Augustan epic text, the *Aeneid*. Juvenal delays

[41] Rimell 2008: 82-89.
[42] Watson 2001.

the description of jasper in the larger portrayal of Virro's cups; once he tells Trebius that Virro worries someone might steal the gems from his cups, he concludes that the jasper is much admired (*praeclara illi laudatur iaspis*, 5.42). The worry over Virro's jasper makes sense, since the gems apparently are like those that used to adorn the scabbard of Aeneas, who Juvenal invokes through his amatory rival Iarbas (*quas in vaginae fronte solebat | ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus Iarbae*, 5.44.5). Morford argues that the epic pedigree of the host's cup—a pedigree that connects him with Aeneas—highlights Virro's unattainable position.[43] A connection to Aeneas is too bold-faced for any guest of Virro's to fall for, and so Juvenal does pull back a little with the use of *quas . . . solebat*, which implies an affinity rather than a direct lineage for the jasper.[44] But, like Euctus' cups, the allusion to Aeneas misremembers the precise imagery: Aeneas' jasper was not on his scabbard but instead on his sword (*atque illi stellatus iaspide fulua | ensis erat*, *Aen*. 4.261-2).[45]

The larger context in which Aeneas' jasper encrusted sword appears shapes how the reader views Virro, and conversely, how the reader might view Aeneas. Juvenal has chosen a reference to *Aeneid* Book 4, a moment in Aeneas' journey that portrays a failed guest-host relationship. At the point that Vergil describes Aeneas' sword, Mercury has been sent by Jupiter to tell Aeneas that he must continue his search for a new home and leave Carthage. He sees Aeneas amid the construction at Carthage, building towers and houses (*Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta novantem | conspicit*, *Aen*. 4.260-1). Aeneas is adorned with the jasper bejewelled sword and a lavish cloak Dido has gifted him (*atque illi stellatus iaspide fulua | ensis erat Tyrioque ardebat murice laena | demissa ex umeris, dives quae munera Dido | fecerat, et tenui telas*

[43] Morford 1977.
[44] Courtney 1980 (reprint 2013): 203.
[45] Ibid.

discreverat auro, *Aen*. 4.261-4). We know the rest of this story: Aeneas will leave Carthage, and Dido will commit suicide. This is not a story that exemplifies positive guest-host relations, and the tragic end to Aeneas' time in Carthage imbues Virro's cups in *Satire* 5 with a similar foreboding of transgression and broken promises.

The amatory background for the allusion also recalls Cleopatra's relationship with Mark Antony, which brings us back to the viper encased in amber. Aeneas is luxurious in his adornments and is thoroughly un-Roman as he helps to build Carthage, and Dido is central to this inversion of the Roman hero. But Dido and Cleopatra are both doomed to die, thus leading to Roman supremacy. Martial's ekphrastic poem on the viper shows Rome subsuming luxury from across the world for its own admiration while the viper/Cleopatra is entombed within, and Virro's cups have similarly stripped gems from the fingers and weapons of others to adorn themselves. Virro would have himself seen as an Aeneas/Augustus figure with his jasper, but as we have seen with the reference to Thrasea and Helvidius, he is really more of an Antony or a Carthaginian Aeneas.

In this section of *Satire* 5 Juvenal has Virro repeatedly associate himself with upstanding moral models while in fact revealing that he is the opposite. An epic pedigree that associates him with Aeneas would seem to be a positive until the reader realizes that this is the Carthaginian version of Rome's founding father. In the same way, Juvenal provides verbal resonances that recall models whom Virro fails to follow. I have discussed the idealized relationship between Augustus and Maecenas in relation to the jewels on Virro's cup, and we find further links between Maecenas and Horace sprinkled throughout the list of wines and gems. In *Ode* 4.11 Horace describes preparations for a birthday celebration in honor of Maecenas at which he will serve Alban wine (*Est mihi nonum superantis annum* | *plenus Albani cadus*, 4.11.1-2), the same

wine Virro conspicuously withholds from his guests in *Satire* 5. Later in the ode Horace also offers a gnome that includes Phaethon, the brother for whom the Heliades cry amber tears:

> terret ambustus Phaethon avaras
> spes, et exemplum grave praebet ales
> Pegasus terrenum equitem gravatus
> Bellerophonte,
> semper ut te digna sequare et ultra
> quam licet sperare nefas putando
> disparem vites. . . (*Ode* 4.11.25-31)

> Phaethon, who was shot down in flames, frightens off dreams of avarice, and the winged Pegasus, who disdained the weight of his earthly rider, Bellerophon, provides a weighty moral: you should always strive for what is appropriate to yourself; you should avoid an unequal partner, regarding it as wrong to direct your hopes beyond what is permissible.[46]

This is a fitting gnome for the characters of Juvenal's *Satire* 5.[47] Striving for the appropriate and finding an equal partner is exactly what Virro fails to heed; he even derives pleasure from creating the most unequal relationship. The wine that Virro drinks and the gems on his cup should remind him of Horace's moral advice at the birthday of Maecenas, but there is apparently no morality at Virro's dinner. The invocations of proper models whom Virro disregards serve to double Trebius' humiliation. He is not only made inferior through his status as client and through his poor treatment throughout the dinner, but he is made to feel this by a man whose moral worth as well as the authenticity of his status the reader should question.

Finally, the allusion to Aeneas' jasper brings the reader full circle with the battle imagery that begins the wine section. Trebius uses cups and flasks as weapons; Virro converts epic weapons into drinking wares. This circularity also ties the tableware section of *Satire* 5 together

---

[46] Translation by Rudd 2004.
[47] Importantly, Juvenal draws directly from examples in Horace, Maecenas, and Augustus (mentioned here and earlier in the section on beryl). The representation of Maecenas as the ideal patron didn't solidify until the Neronian period (Byrne 2000).

through the matching structure of Martial's Saturnalian distichs, the strongest antecedents for Juvenal's depiction of Virro and Trebius. In *Satire* 5 Juvenal moves from a Saguntine flask (5.29) to Virro's gem encrusted *phiala* with stones taken from fingers (5.37ff) back to Trebius' Vatinian cup (5.46-7). The descriptions of these items parallels the descriptions of tableware in two pairs of gifts from Martial's *Apophoreta*, 14.95-96 and 14.108-109 (which I have also cited earlier):

95 *Phiala aurea caelata*

Quamvis Callaïco rubeam generosa metallo,
Glorior arte magis: nam Myos iste labor.

96 *Calices Vatinii*

Vilia sutoris calicem monimenta Vatini
accipe; sed nasus longior ille fuit.

95 A chased gold bowl

Although I am noble and ruddy with Galician metal,
I glory more in my workmanship, for this is the work of Mys.

96 Vatinian cups

Accept a cup, a cheap memoral of cobbler Vatinius;
but *that* nose was longer.

108 *Calices Saguntini*

Quae non sollicitus teneat servetque minister,
Sume Saguntino pocula facta luto.

109 *Calices gemmati*

Gemmatum Scythicis ut luceat ignibus aurum,
Aspice. Quot digitos exuit iste calix!

108 *Saguntine cups*

> Take cups made of Saguntine mud which your
> servant may hold and keep without anxiety.
>
> 109 *Jewelled cups*
>
> See how the jewelled gold is alight with Scythian fires.
> How many fingers has this cup despoiled!

Virro's gem encrusted, golden *phiala* corresponds to both 14.95 and 14.109, while Trebius' Saguntine flask and Vatinian cups parallel individual distichs next to the expensive tableware. Juvenal's allusions to these two pairs of distichs creates a chiastic structure within Martial's text, with the expensive items (golden *phiala* and jewelled cups) surrounding the cheap items (Vatinian and Saguntine cups). The focus on two sets of distichs, one rich, one poor, highlights the reciprocity that is absent from *Satire* 5, and the chiastic structure reveals how the wealthy patron completely subsumes the dinner party. Furthermore, the two imperatives in the "poor" gift distichs (*accipe*, *sume*) express the changing demands on patrons and clients. In the *Apophoreta* these imperatives beseech the patron to accept a cheap gift, but when the patron gives these items back to the client in *Satire* 5, the client has no choice; he indeed faces a demand from his patron. Juvenal transforms these tightly structured Martialian poems on patronage and reciprocity into a grotesque inequality. By using the same imagery as Martial's Saturnalian text, he also expresses how easily the same institution can be idealized and perverted depending on the poetic situation.

4.3 Conclusion

The above analysis focuses on the initial drinks at Virro's dinner party, and Juvenal will go on to describe in detail the various foods each man eats. These, too, allude to imagery in Martial's epigrams, which in turn Martial selects from his Augustan predecessors. I hope to have shown here that, while scholarship on this satire typically shows how the foods at Virro's

banquet highlight the inequality between patron and client, issues of social disparity are equally addressed, in this first sequence, by the tableware.

Moreover, because Juvenal pulls from programmatic, self-referential imagery for Martial in the form of the tableware, he allows readers to assess Martial's authorial persona from a distance. The Saguntine flask, for example, creates a direct connection between Trebius and Martial as clients, and from there a reader might reevaluate the agency of the suffering client persona that Martial established throughout his career. Is Martial a model for Trebius to follow, or does Trebius represent a form of the poet early in his career before he has thrown off the role of abused and degraded client?

These questions are even more marked in Juvenal's poetry because he is able to speak openly about Domitian in a way that Martial's early epigrams never could. Martial does leave room for a subversive reading of his text, as I have shown in Chapter 2, but he never openly denigrates the emperor until after his death. So Juvenal's use of Martial's early patronage imagery gives his early poetry renewed force without the constraints Martial faced under Domitian. For all of the inequality between Virro and Trebius, Juvenal's incorporation of Martial's tableware in *Satire* 5 creates a reciprocal dynamic in which the reader interprets Juvenal's figures through the lens of Martial's epigrams and can likewise find new meaning for the imagery in the epigrams using a more free-speaking framework.

CONCLUSION

CRAFTS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

In this dissertation I have examined the scope of what types of objects we consider for metapoetic discussion by focusing on craft imagery in the literature of Flavian Rome. This period, spanning from 69 to 96 CE, sees a flourishing of literary activity as well as large scale renovation of the physical landscape of Rome. In this regard, it provides an ideal environment for Roman writers to use arts and crafts in their discussions of social and literary identity, from Pliny the Elder's chapters on art, which offer a moralistic interpretation of crafts fitting for the ideological program of the new imperial family, to Martial and Juvenal's use of individual objects that highlight the social disparities of Domitianic Rome. Each author also deploys craft imagery in a manner that highlights their individual genre, and through this they convey that arts and crafts of any financial value can fulfill a metaliterary function. Literary representations of crafts therefore end up having a dual significance for discussions about the nature of writing and for individual authorial engagement with the social and political world.

Martial in particular uses the material world of crafts in the development of his authorial persona; this has been the focus of the present study. Martial deploys words for mud (*lutum*) and dust (*pulvis*) throughout his *Epigrams* and describes a variety of low-status craft objects to comment on the nature of the epigrammatic genre and his role as a poet in Rome. But what determines a "low-status" craft? As I have shown in Chapters 2 and 3, to some degree this depends on the material used: objects made from precious metals are more highly regarded than those made from clay. Likewise, we might consider the issue of scale: a monumental art piece is more impressive than a small statuette. We may also consider an object's function: a decorative piece like a statue will be valued differently than cups and bowls. Of course, there are always

exceptions to this framework—a small, ornately fashioned gem or intricately woven garment could be valued the same as a larger statue—and this wiggle room in what is considered valuable is an important aspect for Martial when he describes objects.

A central component of this dissertation has been Martial's repeated contrasts between clay and metal objects. The series of distichs in the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, for example, initially establishes a binary between rich and poor, patron and client. Yet, as I have shown in the previous chapters, the poet overturns the structural representation of value between expensive and cheap Saturnalia gifts through the intertextual and allusive nature of the individual epigrams. This plays into the topsy-turvy nature of the holiday, but it also encourages the reader to reconsider the value of low-status objects, particularly in a metaliterary framework.

The *Apophoreta* also establishes early in Martial's published collections the importance of clay objects for his epigrams. The clay gifts in the tableware and artwork sequences in the *Apophoreta* share a core set of terminology: adjectives such as *fictilis* (earthen) or *ruber* (red) and materials such as *pulvis* (dust). But one word returns with greater frequency than the rest in Martial's *Epigrams*: *lutum* (mud). In epigram 14.182 about a clay hunchback, Martial playfully connects *lutum* and *ludere* (to play, joke), suggesting that, for Martial, *lutum* is fundamentally related to jokes. Mud is thus a programmatic material fitting for the humorous aspects of Martial's Saturnalian epigram, and this will become significant in his use of the term in subsequent poetry collections. One notable instance is epigram 4.46 (analyzed in Chapter 3), which has the added significance of describing Saguntine mud, a further self-referential moment for the Spanish poet.

Martial's frequent use of *lutum* throughout the *Epigrams* creates an image of his poetry as muddy (*lutulentus*). Yet, for any imperial Roman writer, poetic muddiness immediately would

call to mind Horace's characterization of his predecessor Lucilius' satire as *lutulentus*. Horace uses this pejoratively of Lucilius' poetry, and, because of this, it is difficult for Martial to assign the same label to his poetry outright without also giving the appearance of denigration of his genre. As I have explained in Chapter 1, Martial is able to suggest the muddiness of his epigrams without explicitly calling them *lutulentus* through his use of other programmatic imagery such as the combination of dusty and rain-soaked books in *Epigrams* Book 3 (3.5, 3.100). When taken together, the combination of rain and dust implies muddiness. This implicit reference to mud is important for Martial because the muddiness of his poetry is not a bad thing; it is a point of pride for his poetic persona.

Beyond *lutum*, Martial also uses clay objects generally to symbolize his genre and the poet's place in Roman society. One final epigram is worth considering for this dual literary and social interpretative framework. In epigram 5.59 Martial explains to his patron and fellow poet Lucius Arruntius Stella that he sends earthenware rather than silver and gold so that Stella is free from the burden of costly reciprocity:

> Quod non argentum, quod non tibi mittimus aurum,
> hoc facimus causa, Stella diserte, tua.
> quisquis magna dedit, voluit sibi magna remitti;
> fictilibus nostris exoneratus eris.
>
> If I send you no silver, if I send you no gold, I do so for your sake, eloquent Stella. Whoever gives much, wants much in return. My earthenware will take a load off your shoulders.

Scholars generally read this poem literally.[1] In the patron-client relationship one expects reciprocal favors, and so here Martial commits to the persona of the poor client poet who can

[1] See Nauta 2002: 79-79 for a literal interpretation based on expectations in patronage relationships. Sullivan 1991: 16 uses this poem to show that Stella wanted to encourage writers like himself by financially supporting them. Rimell 2008: 101 reads this as expressing financial

only afford to provide clay wares, but he cheekily passes it off as a net positive for Stella, who can return a similarly meager gift in the future.[2] However, this poem has a clear metapoetic angle to it, which is apparent when read alongside the various examples throughout this study that reveal Martial's consistent development of clay as a symbol for epigram. In 4.46, for instance, Martial embeds a self-referential reading of his poetry through the seven-piece set of Saguntine wares gifted to Sabellus during the Saturnalia. Now in the above epigram from Book 5, Martial explicitly claims clay wares as his own (*fictilibus nostris*), and later, in Book 8 he will humorously remind us of this when he states that he prefers clay to Euctus' tableware (8.6).

The brevity of 5.59 and the straightforward naming of materials mark this epigram as a frank statement about what type of poetry Martial writes, and as a poet himself, Stella is a fitting reader to understand Martial's metaliterary use of silver, gold, and clay and their attendant social and moral connotations.[3] For one, Stella would understand that silver and gold are precious materials that traditionally indicate the quality of one's verse. In contrast to these materials, Martial's gift of clay could initially be a deprecating recognition of his chosen genre's status. Silver and gold are also commonly associated with epic (consider the Shield of Achilles), a genre Martial repeatedly disavows. Martial further keys the reader into the symbolic use of materials for genres through the adjective *magna* (great), which denotes size. Martial will not give Stella a large work such as an epic poem, and he shows that he does not expect anything great in return. When read metapoetically, this statement works in Martial's favor, since he presumably does not

---

anxieties in the patronage system; Rimell 2008:105-06 n. 31 considers how this poem likens Martial's poetry to cheap material gifts.

[2] Nauta 2002:78-79.

[3] See Moreno Soldevila et al. 2019: 567-68 for general biographical details about Stella and his appearances throughout Martial's *Epigrams.*

want a lengthy work given in return.[4] Rather than a large work, Martial instead gives Stella a small (*parva*) four-line epigram. The only thing smaller would be a distich, and Martial has given plenty of those in the form of his *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*.

While silver and gold denote preciosity, as I have addressed in Chapter 1, they also have negative associations with luxury and excess. Earthenware, on the other hand, represents positive old-fashioned Roman morality. Read in this light, Martial's gift may be cheap, but it is also unproblematic. The final image of Stella being unburdened (*exoneratus*) by Martial's tableware plays into the moral simplicity of clay. On a literal level, gold and silver could physically weigh more than clay, and from a financial standpoint Martial's statement also conveys the sentiment that more money brings more problems: in this case, the expectation of greater reciprocity. But by giving Stella earthenware, Martial also frees him of the moral burden of luxury items.

Martial returns to this image once again in epigram 9.55, when he worries that giving gifts of thrushes to Stella and Flaccus would encourage the large burdensome crowd (*ingens onerosaque turba*, 9.55.3) to expect gifts as well. He opts instead to give his friends nothing at all. Here, it is Martial who is burdened by social obligation, and so we come full circle in terms of reciprocity. His use of *turba* in this epigram is also marked, since he previously has used this term to describe the crowd of epigrams in the opening sequence of his *Xenia* (*Omnis in hoc gracili Xeniorum turba libello*, 13.3.1). The crowd of *xenia* in 13.3 refers both to the distichs in the collection and to the foodstuffs they represent, and the burdensome crowd expecting thrushes in 9.55 seems to want their fill of the similar crowd of food. Likewise, the thrushes for Stella and Flaccus in 9.55 find their counterpart in the *Xenia* distich 13.51:

51 *Turdorum decuria*

[4] Rimell 2008: 106 compares 5.59 with 5.73 to Theodorus. Martial worries that in giving his poetry to friends, he will receive poetry back that he does not in fact want to read.

Texta rosis fortasse tibi vel divite nardo,
at mihi de turdis facta corona placet.

51 *Decade of thrushes*

Perhaps you may like a garland woven of roses or rich
nard, but I like one made of thrushes.

This resonance between 9.55 and 13.51 functions in the same way as the coded metapoetic gifts of 4.46 discussed in Chapter 3. Instead of invoking the sausage crown that stands in for a rose garland in 13.35, Martial alludes to the garland of thrushes that he prefers over a garland of roses. Along with the sausage of 4.46 and the earthenware of 5.59, we may add the thrushes to Martial's metapoetic arsenal: his desire to gift Stella and Flaccus thrushes should be taken as a desire to give them poetry (potentially as much as a "garland", i.e. epigrammatic collection). Yet, the expectations of the crowd lead him to give nothing at all (*nec Stellae turdos nec tibi, Flacce, dabo*, 9.55.8). Could this be a comment about the pressures upon the now famous poet to please everyone—leading him to abstain from writing at all?

In 5.59 Martial does not seem to express this same anxiety and instead portrays his poetry/earthenware as a light gift that positively affects Stella by releasing him from obligation. And in the simplicity of this epigram Martial gives the clearest statement that craft imagery is part of his epigrammatic identity, an identity which emphasizes his poverty as a client, his popularity with the masses, and the positive aspects of writing in a typically minor genre. Martial's earthenware is a valuable gift after all.

In these depictions of earthenware, Martial also expands our conception of how low-status arts and crafts and the materials from which they are made can be used to positively frame one's literary identity. For Martial, this imagery is based in the social and material world around him, and in this regard, we should consider his muddy poetics as a Flavian innovation on earlier

Roman models. The fact that Juvenal picks this up in his own poetry, as I have discussed in Chapter 4, shows that Martial's metapoetic imagery was recognized by those around him and shaped their own poetry. Finally, it is fitting to end with Martial's statement in epigram 10.4.8-10: "Read this, of which life can say: 'It's mine.' You won't find Centaurs here or Gorgons or Harpies: my page tastes of humanity" (*hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'Meum est.' | non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque | invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit*). As an epigrammatist, Martial emphasizes that his poetry does not speak on lofty themes but instead describes ordinary life, and clay crafts, in their humility, their cheapness, their messiness, are likewise valuable to Martial for the very reason that they, too, represent the realities of his Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

List of Abbreviations:

AJA *American Journal of Archaeology*

AJP *Americal Journal of Philology*

JRS *Journal of Roman Studies*

ClAnt *Classical Antiquity*

CP *Classical Philology*

CQ *Classical Quarterly*

CW *Classical World*

G&R *Greece & Rome*

ICS *Illinois Classical Studies*

JRS *Journal of Roman Studies*

OCD *Oxford Classical Dictionary*

OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary*

TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*

TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

Adams, J. N. 1987. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.

Allison, Penelope. 1999. "Labels for ladles: Interpreting the material culture of Roman households." *The Archaeology of Household Activities*. Allison, P. ed. New York: Routledge. 57-77.

Anderson, William S. 1970. "*Lascivia* vs. *ira*: Martial and Juvenal." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 3: 1-34.

---------. 1984. "Rustic Urbanity: Roman Satirists in and out of Rome." *The Classical Outlook* 61.4: 111-117.

Andrews, Margaret. 2015. *Matron, Meretrix, Madonna: An Archaeology and Urban History of the Subura Valley and Cispian Hill in Rome From the Republic Through the Early Middle Ages*. University of Pennsylvania. Dissertation.

Badian, E. 1988. "The Clever and the Wise: Two Roman *Cognomina* in Context." *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, *Suppl. 51*: 6-12.

Barber, Elizabeth. 2007. “Weaving the Social Fabric.” *Ancient Textiles: Production, Crafts and Society.* Carole Gillis, C. and Marie-Louise B. Nosch, M.-L. eds. Oxbow. 173-178.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2005. “The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus.” *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Gutzwiller, K. ed. Oxford.

Baruffaldi, Laura. 2005. “La IV Satira di Giovenale: il rombo di Domiziano e il silenzio del potere.” *Modelli Letterari e Ideologia nell’età Flavia*. Gasti, F. and Mazzoli, G. eds. Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri. 185-203.

Beagon, Mary. 2005. *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal:* Natural History *Book 7*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Becker, Andrew Sprague. 1995. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Becker, Hilary. 2016. “*Luxuria prolapsa est*: Etruscan Wealth and Decadence.” *A Companion to the Etruscans*. Bell, S. and Carpino, A. A. eds. John Wiley & Sons. 293-304.

Beekes, R. S. P., Lucien van Beek. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Bellandi, F. 1995. “L’immagine di Mecenate protettore delle lettere.” *Atene e Roma* 40: 78-101.

Berg, Deena. 1996. “The Mystery Gourmet of Horace’s *Satires* 2.” *CJ* 91.2: 141-151.

Blake, Sarah. 2008. *Writing Materials: Things in the Literature of Flavian Rome*. University of Southern California. Dissertation.

---------. 2011. “Martial’s Natural History: The *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* and Pliny’s Encyclopedia.” *Arethusa* 44.3: 353-377.

---------. 2014. “Text, Book, and Textbook: Martial’s Experiments in the Codex.” *Ramus* 43: 67-93.

Bloomer, W. M. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Blümner, Hugo. 1887. *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*. Leipzig.

Bond, Sarah. 2016. *Trade and Taboo: Disreputable Professions in the Roman Mediterranean*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Borthwick, E. K. 1988. “Odysseus and the Return of the Swallow.” *G&R* 35: 14-22.

Boyle, A. J. and Dominik, W. J. 2003. *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Brill.

Bramble, J. C. 1982. “Martial and Juvenal.” *Latin Literature*. Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. V. eds. Vol 2. Cambridge. 597-623.

Braund, Susanna Morton. 1996. *Juvenal Satires Book 1*. Cambridge.

---------, trans. 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---------. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cities: Statius, Thebes, and Rome.” *Phoenix* 60: 259-273.

Brelich, A. 1976. *Tre variazioni romane sul tema delle origini*. Rome.

Burford, Alison. 1972. *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*. New York: Cornell University Press. Reprint 1974.

Byre, Calvin. 1992. “Narration, Description, and Theme in the Shield of Achilles.” *CJ* 88: 33-42.

Byrne, S. 2000. “Poets and Maecenas: The Making of a Patron.” *JAC* 15: 1-12.

Cairns, Francis. 1979. *Tibullus, A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. New York: Cambridge.

Calandra, Elena. 2003. “A Mensa con Marziale: il Vasellame da Tavola negli *Apophoreta*.” *Athenaeum* 91: 191-199.

Canobbio, A. 1994. “Sulla Cronologia del V Libro di Marziale.” *Athenaeum* 82.2: 540-550.

Carey, Sorcha. 2003. *Pliny’s Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the* Natural History. Oxford.

Carson, Keiran, Desmond. 2018. *A Commentary on the Prose Preface and Epigrams 1-20 of Martial Book 12*. Durham University. Dissertation.

Cazzaniga, Ignazio. 1963. “Il *Deipnon Adeipnon* nella Baucis ovidiana: ricerca di tecnica stilistica.” *La Parola del Passato* 18: 23-35.

Citroni, Mario. 1975. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus. Introduzione, testo, apparato critico e commento*. Florence.

---------. 1989. “Marziale e la Letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell’intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri).” *ICS* 14: 201-226.

Clarke, John R. 2003. *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: Visual Representations and Non-elite Viewers in Italy, 100 BC – AD 315*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clayton, Barbara. 2003. *Penelopean Poetics: Reweaving the Feminine in Homer’s* Odyssey. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Coleman, Kathleen M. 1988. *Statius:* Silvae *IV*. Oxford: Clarendon.

---------. 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.

Coleman, Robert. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.

Colton, Robert E. 1977. “Echoes of Catullus and Martial in Statius, *Silvae* 4, 9.” *L’Antiquité Classique* 46.2: 544-556.

Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000–264 BC)*. New York: Routledge. 119–27.

Cornish, F. W, J. P. Postgate, and J. W. Mackail, trans. 1913. *Catullus. Tibullus. Pervigilium Veneris*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. Berkeley. Reprint 2013.

Dalby, Andrew. 2000. *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and indulgence in the Roman world*. London: Routledge.

D’Ambra, Eve.1993. *Private Lives, Imperial Virtues: The Frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome*. Princeton.

D’Ambra, Eve and Guy Métraux. 2006. *The Art of Citizens, Soldiers and Freedmen in the Roman World*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Damon, Cynthia. 2011. “Pliny on Apion.” *Pliny the Elder: Themes and Contexts*. Gibson, R. K. and Morello, R. eds. Brill: 131-146.

Daniels, Craig. 2000. *Martial: Misogynist*. Dalhousie. Master’s Thesis.

Darab, Ágnes. 2012. “*CORINTHIUM AES* VERSUS *ELECTRUM*: The Anecdote as an Expression of Roman Identity in Pliny the Elder’s Naturalis Historia.” *Hermes* 140.2: 149-159.

---------. 2014. “Natura, Ars, Historia: Anecdotic History of Art in Pliny the Elder’s *Naturalis Historia* Part II.” *Hermes* 142.3: 279-297.

Day, J. W. 2007. “Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram.” *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Bing, P. and Bruss, J. eds. Brill. 29-47.

de Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.

Derks, Ton. 2009. “Ethnic identity in the Roman frontier. The epigraphy of Batavi and other Lower Rhine tribes.” *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*. Derks, T. and Roymans, N. eds. Amsterdam University Press. 239-282.

Deroux, Carl. 1983. “Domitian, the Kingfish and the Prodigies: A Reading of Juvenal’s Fourth Satire.” *Studies in Latin literature and Roman History* 3: 283-298.

Dodds, E. R. 1960. *Euripides Bacchae (Second Edition)*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Donahue, John F. 2003. “Toward a Typology of Roman Public Feasting.” *AJP* 124: 423-441.

Doody, Aude. 2011. “The Science and Aesthetics of Naming in the *Natural History*.” *Pliny the Elder: Themes and Contexts*. Gibson, R. and Morello, R. eds. Leiden: Brill. 113-130.

Dumézil, Georges. 1951. “Propertiana.” *Latomus* 10.3: 289-302.

Dyson, Stephen and Richard Prior. 1995. “Horace, Martial, and Rome: Two Poetic Outsiders Read the Ancient City.” *Arethusa* 28: 245-263.

Eckerman, Christopher. 2015. “Muses, Metaphor, and Metapoetics in Catullus 61.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 108: 173-194.

Eichholz, D. E., trans. 1962. *Pliny. Natural History Books 36-37*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Faber, Riemer. 1995. “Vergil Eclogue 3.37, Theocritus 1 and Hellenistic Ekphrasis.” *AJP* 116.3: 411-417.

---------. 2000. “The Literary Metaphor of the Chisel (*Tornus*) in Eclogue 3.38.” *Hermes* 128: 375-379.

Fagan, Garrett G. 2001. “The Genesis of the Roman Public Bath: Recent Approaches and Future Directions.” *AJA* 105.3: 403-426.

---------. 2011. “Socializing at the Baths.” *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Peachin, M. ed. Oxford. 358-373.

Fairclough, H. Rushton, trans. 1916. *Virgil. Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid: Books 1-6.* Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---------. 1918. *Virgil. Aeneid: Books 7-12. Appendix Vergiliana.* Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---------. 1926. *Horace. Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Farney, Gary D. 2007. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. New York: Cambridge.

Feldherr, Andrew. 2014. “Viewing Myth and History on the Shield of Aeneas.” *ClAnt* 33.2: 281-318.

Fearnley, Hannah. 2003. “Reading the Imperial Revolution: Martial, *Epigrams 10*.” *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Boyle, A. J. and Dominik, W. J. eds. Leiden: Brill.

Fitzgerald, William. 2007. *Martial: The World of the Epigram*. Chicago.

Flintoff, Thomas E. S. 1990. “Juvenal’s Fourth *Satire*.” *Roman Poetry and Drama, Greek Epic, Comedy, Rhetoric*. 121-137.

Fowler, D. P. 1995. “Martial and the Book.” *Ramus* 24: 31-58.

Fox, Matthew. 2015. “Plutarch’s Numa and the Rhetoric of Aetiology.” *Fame and Infamy: Essays on Characterization in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*. Ash, R., Mossman, J. and Titchener, F. B. eds. Oxford.

Friedländer, Ludwig. 1886. *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Leipzig.

Frazel, Thomas. 2005. “*Furtum* and the Description of Stolen Objects in Cicero *In Verrem* 2.4.” *AJP* 126: 363-376.

Fusi, A. 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber tertius. Introduzione, editizione critica, traduzione e commento.* Hildesheim.

Gaisser, Julia. 1983. “*Amor*, *Rura*, and *Militia* in Three Elegies of Tibullus: 1.1, 1.5 and 1.10.” *Latomus* 42: 58-72.

Galán Vioque, G. 2002. *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary, translated by J. J. Zoltowski*. Leiden.

Galinsky, G. Karl. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ganiban, Randall T. 2007. *Statius and Virgil: The* Thebaid *and the Reinterpretation of the* Aeneid. Cambridge.

Garthwaite, John. 1990. “Martial, Book 6, on Domitian’s Moral Censorship.” *Prudentia* 22: 13-22.

---------. 1993. “The Panegyrics of Domitian in Martial Book 9.” *Ramus* 22: 78-102.

---------. 1998. “Patronage and Poetic Immortality in Martial, Book 9.” *Mnemosyne* 51.2: 161-175.

---------. 2001. “Reevaluating Epigrammatic Cycles in Martial Book 2.” *Ramus* 30: 46-55.

---------. 2009. “*Ludimus Innocui*: Interpreting Martial’s Imperial Epigrams.” *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. Dominik, W. J., Garthwaite, J. and Roche, P. A. eds. Leiden: Brill. 405-428.

Geue, Tom. 2018. “Forgetting the Juvenalien in Our Midst: Literary Amnesia in the *Satires*.” *Roman Literature Under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions,* AD *96-138*. König, A. and Whitton, C. eds. Cambridge. 366-384.

Gibson, Roy K. 2003. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge.

Giroldini, Renato. 2005. “Et puer hoc dignus nomine eras: *un motive encomiastico per Domiziano in Marziale e Silio Italico*.” *Modelli Letterari e Ideologia Nell’Età Flavia*. Gasti, F. and Mazzoli, G. eds. Ibis, Como: Pavia. 163-184.

Gowers, Emily. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford.

---------. 2012. *Horace: Satires Book 1*. Cambridge.

Granger, Frank, trans. 1931. *Vitruvius. On Architecture, Volume I: Books 1-5.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gransden, K. W. 1976. *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII*. New York: Cambridge. Reprint 2003.

Grewing, Farouk F. 1997. *Martial, Buch VI: ein Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

---------. 2010. “Karneval in Rom: Metapoetische Quisquilien in Martials Epigrammen.” *Wiener Studien* 123: 131-166.

Grewing, Farouk F. ed. 1998. *Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Guittard, Charles. 2003. “Les Saturnales à Rome: du Mythe de l’âge d’or au banquet de décembre.” *Pallas* 61: 219-236.

Gummere, Richard M. 1917. *Seneca. Epistles Volume I: Epistles 1-65*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hagenow, Gerd. 1972. “Kosmetische Extravaganzen (Martial Epigramm III. 74).” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 115: 48-59.

Hardie, Alex. 1998. “Juvenal, Domitian, and the Accession of Hadrian (*Satire* 4).” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 42: 117-144.

Harrison, George W. M. 2001. “Martial on *Sportula* and the Saturnalia.” *Mouseion* 1.3: 295-312.

Harrison, S. J. 2017. *Horace. Odes. Book II*. Cambridge.

Hartnett, Jeremy. 2018. *The Roman Street: Urban Life and Society in Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Rome*. Cambridge.

Heckster, Olivier. 2010. “Reverse Epiphanies: Roman Emperors Deserted by Gods.” *Mnemosyne* 63.4: 601-615.

Heilmann, Willibald. 1967. “Zur Komposition der Vierten Satire und des Ersten Satirenbuches Juvenals.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 110.4: 358-370.

Henriksén, Christer. 2006. “Martial’s modes of mourning. Sepulchral epitaphs in the *Epigrams*.” *Flavian Poetry*. Nauta, Van Dam, Smolenaars, eds. Leiden: Brill. 349-367.

---------. 2012. *A Commentary on Martial,* Epigrams *Book 9*. Oxford.

---------. 2018. “Inside Epigram: Intratextuality in Martial’s *Epigrams*, Book 10.” *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Harrison, S. J. et al. eds. De Gruyter. 397-406.

Henriksén, Christer, ed. 2019. *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*. Wiley Blackwell.

Hernández Pérez, Ricardo. 2017. “Dos supuestos testimonios del vino de Saguntum en Juvenal y en Frontón.” *Emerita, Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* 85: 141-152.

Heuzé, Philippe. 1994. “Réflexions sur le thème du masque dans la peinture romaine.” *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*. Siegmar Döpp, S. ed. Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier. 123-143.

Hilgers, W. 1969. *Lateinische Gefässnamen. Bezeichnungen Funktion und Form römischer Gefässe nach den antiken Schriftquellen.* Rheinland-Verlag.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

---------. 2007. “Martial’s Ovid / Ovid’s Martial.” *JRS* 97: 113–54.

Hofmann, Walter. 1983. “Martial und Domitian.” *Philologus* 127: 238-246.

Hollis, A. H. 1970. *Ovid* Metamorphoses *Book VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Holzberg, Niklas. 1988. *Martial*. Heidelberg.

---------. 2002. *Martial und das antike Epigramm*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Howell, P. 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.

---------. 1995. *Martial Epigrams V: Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.

Howley, Joseph A. 2018. *Aulus Gellius and Roman Reading Culture: Text, Presence, and Imperial Knowledge in the* Noctes Atticae. Cambridge.

Hubbard, Thomas. 1992. “Nature and Art in the Shield of Achilles.” *Arion* 2:16-41.

---------. 1995. “Intertextual Hermeneutics in Vergil’s Fourth and Fifth Eclogues.” *CJ* 91: 11-23.

Isager, Jacob. 2013. *Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Taylor and Francis.

Jahn, Otto. 1854. "Über ein Vasenbild, welches eine Töpferei vorstellt." *Berichte der koeniglich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 6: 27-48.

Johnson, S. 1942. "A Note on Martial VI, 82, 4-6." *CJ* 38: 31-35.

Jones, Brian W. 1992. *The Emperor Domitian*. New York: Routledge.

Kahane, Ahuvia. 1994. "Callimachus, Apollonius, and the Poetics of Mud." *TAPA* 124: 121-133.

Kelly, Gavin. 2018. "From Martial to Juvenal (*Epigrams* 12.18)." *Roman Literature Under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions, AD 96-138*. König, A. and Whitton, C. eds. Cambridge. 160-179.

König, A. and Whitton, C. eds. 2018. *Roman Literature Under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions,* AD *96-138*. Cambridge.

Larsen, Mik. 2015. *The Representation of Poverty in the Roman Empire*. University of California, Los Angeles. Dissertation.

Lausberg, Marion. 1982. *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. Muenchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Leary, T. J. 1996. *Martial Book XIV: The Apophoreta*. London: Duckworth.

---------. 1997. "Martial 14.100: *Panaca*." *CQ* 47: 322-323.

---------. 1999. "Martial's Christmas Winelist." *G&R* 46: 34-41.

---------. 2001. *Martial Book XIII: The Xenia. Text with Introduction and Commentary*. London.

---------. 2019. "Martial's Early Works: The *Liber Spectaculorum*, *Xenia*, and *Apophoreta*." *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*. Henriksén, Christer, ed. Wiley Blackwell. 505-519.

Lehmann, K. 1945. "A Roman Poet Visits a Museum." *Hesperia* 14.3: 259–69.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. 1776. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. McCormick, Edward Allen, trans. 1984. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Livingstone, Niall and Gideon Nisbet. 2008. "Epigram from Greece to Rome." *G&R: New Surveys in the Classics, Volume 38: Epigram*: 99-117.

Lorenz, Sven. 2002. *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

---------. 2003. "Martial, Herkules und Domitian: Büsten, Statuetten und Statuen im *Epigrammaton Liber Nonus*." *Mnemosyne* 56.5: 566-584.

---------. 2004. “Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial’s *Epigrammaton Liber Quartus*.” *AJP* 125.2: 255-278.

---------. 2019. “Micro to Macro: Martial’s Twelve Books of Epigrams.” *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*. Henriksén, Christer, ed. Wiley Blackwell. 521-539.

Lucci, Joseph M. 2015. *Hidden in Plain Sight: Martial and the Greek Epigrammatic Tradition*. University of Pennsylvania. Dissertation.

Macdonald, Carolyn. 2017. “Take-Away Art: Ekphrasis and Appropriation in Martial’s *Apophoreta* 170-82.” *ClAnt* 36.2: 288-316.

Maltby, Robert. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Ltd.

---------. 2002. *Tibullus:* Elegies*: Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Ltd.

Manuwald, Gesine and Astrid Voigt eds. 2013. *Flavian Epic Interactions*. De Gruyter.

Marks, Raymond. 2013. “The *Thebaid* and the fall of Saguntum in *Punica* 2.” *Flavian Epic Interactions*. Manuwald, Gesine and Astrid Voigt eds. De Gruyter. 297-310.

Maslakov, G. 1984. “Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the *exempla* Tradition.” *ANRW* II.32.1: 437-96.

Mattiaci, S. 2014. “Prometeo ebbro e i suoi monstra (a proposito di Mart. 14.182 e Phaedr. 4.16).” *Lexis* 32: 315-330.

Mayer, Emanuel. 2012. *The Ancient Middle Classes: Urban Life and Aesthetics in the Roman Empire, 100 BCE – 250 CE*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mayer, Roland. 1994. *Horace:* Epistles *Book I*. Cambridge.

McDermott, William and Anne Orentzel. 1977. “Silius Italicus and Domitian.” *AJP* 98: 24-34.

McGuire Jr., Donald T. 1985. *History as Epic: Silius Italicus and the Second Punic War*. Cornell. Dissertation.

McNelis, Charles. 2008. “*Ut Sculptura Poesis*: Statius, Martial, and the Hercules *Epitrapezios* of Novius Vindex.” *AJP* 129.2: 255-276.

Mellor, Ronald. 2003. “The New Aristocracy of Power.” *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Boyle, A.J and Dominik, W.J. eds. Brill. 69-102.

Meneghini, R. and Valenzani. 2007. *I fori imperiali: gli scavi del commune di Roma (1991-2007)*. Rome: Viviani.

Merli, Elena. 2014. “Martial Between Rome and Bilbilis.” *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Rose, R. and Sluiter, I. eds. 327-347.

Michalopoulos, Charilaos N. 2018. “Disease, Bodily Malfunction, and Laughter in the *Priapea*.” *ICS* 43.2: 420-437.

Miller, Frank Justus, trans. 1916. *Ovid. Metamorphoses, Volume II: Books 9-15*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Moreno Soldevila, Rosario. 2006. *Martial, Book IV: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

---------. 2017. “Retouching a Self-portrait (Or How to Adapt One’s Image in Times of Political Change): The Case of Martial in the Light of Pliny the Younger.” *Political Communication in the Roman World*. Rosillo-López, C. ed. Brill. 253-278.

Moreno Soldevila, Rosario, Alberto Marina Castillo, and Juan Fernández Valverde. 2019. *A Prosopography to Martial’s Epigrams*. De Gruyter.

Morgan, Llewelyn. 1997. “*Achilleae Comae*: Hair and Heroism According to Domitian.” *CQ* 47: 209-214.

Morford, Mark. 1977. “Juvenal’s Fifth Satire.” *AJP* 98.3: 219-245.

Muecke, Frances. 1993. *Horace: Satires II*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips.

Murphy, Trevor. 2004. *Pliny the Elder’s Natural History: The Empire in the Encyclopedia*. Oxford.

Murray, Penelope. 1981. “Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece.” *JHS* 101: 87-100.

Muscettola, Stefania Adamo. 2000. “The sculptural evidence.” *The sacellum of the Augustales at Miseno*. Miniero, Paola ed. Electa Napoli. 29-46.

Mynors, R. A. B. 1990. *Virgil* Georgics. Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint 1994.

Nauta, Ruurd. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden: Brill.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*. Oxford.

Nisbet, Gideon. 2020. “Martial’s Poetics of Plagiarism.” *AJP* 141: 55-81.

O’Connor, Eugene. 2019. “*Carminis Incompti Lusus*: The *Carmina Priapea*.” *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*. Henriksén, Christer ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 541-556.

Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oliver Jr., Andrew. 2004. “The Changing Fashions of Roman Silver.” *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 63: 2-27.

Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Hildesheim. Reprint 1964.

Parkes, Ruth. 2012. *Statius,* Thebaid *4*. Oxford.

Peña, J. Theodore and Myles McCallum. 2009. "The Production and Distribution of Pottery at Pompeii: A Review of the Evidence; Part 2, the Material Basis for Production and Distribution." *AJA* 113.2: 165-201.

Perrin, Bernadotte, trans. 1914. *Plutarch. Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Peter, Hermann. 1883. *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Petersmann, H. 1992. "Lateinisch *tornare*: Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung." *Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme: Festschrift für Klaus Heger zum 65. Geburtstag*. Heidelberger Orientverlag. 529-535.

Petrain, David. 2005. "Gems, Metapoetics, and Value: Greek and Roman Responses to a Third-Century Discourse on Precious Stones." *TAPA* 135.2: 329-357.

Pitcher, Roger A. 1985. "The Dating of Martial Books XIII and XIV." *Hermes* 113.3: 330-339.

Pollard, Elizabeth Ann. 2009. "Pliny's *Natural History* and the Flavian *Templum Pacis*: Botanical Imperialism in First-Century C. E. Rome." *Journal of World History* 20.3: 309-338.

Prioux, E. 2008. *Petits musées en vers: épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques*. Paris.

Prowse, K. R. 1964. "Numa and the Pythagoreans: A Curious Incident." *G&R* 11: 36-42.

Pryce, T. Davies. 1942. "Roman Decorated Red-Glazed Ware of the Late First Century B.C. and the Early First Century A.D." *JRS* 32: 14-26.

Putnam, Michael. 2005. "Virgil and Tibullus 1.1." *CP* 100.2: 123-141.

Rackham, H., trans. 1940. *Pliny. Natural History, Volume III: Books 8-11*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---------. 1942. *Pliny. Natural History, Volume II: Books 3-7*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---------. 1952. *Pliny. Natural History Books 33-35*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rebeggiani, Stefano. 2013. "Reading the Republican Forum: Virgil's *Aeneid*, the Dioscuri, and the Battle of Lake Regillus." *CP* 108: 53-69.

Reinhardt, T. and Winterbottom, M. eds. 2006. *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria Book 2*. Oxford.

Reitz, Christiane. 2013. “Does mass matter? The epic catalogue of troops as narrative and metapoetic device.” *Flavian Epic Interactions*. Manuwald, Gesine and Astrid Voigt eds. De Gruyter. 229-243.

Richardson Jr. L. 2002. “Trimalchio and the Sibyl at Cumae.” *CW* 96: 77-78.

Richlin, Amy. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford.

Ridley, Ronald T. 2017. “Lars Porsenna and the Early Roman Republic.” *Antichthon* 51: 33-58.

Rimell, Victoria. 2005. “The Poor Man’s Feast: Juvenal.” *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Freudenburg, K. ed. Cambridge. 81-94.

---------. 2008. *Martial’s Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.

Roller, Matthew B. 2004. “Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia.” *CP* 99: 1-56.

Roman, Luke. 2001. “The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial’s Epigrams,” *JRS* 91: 113–45.

---------. 2010. “Martial and the City of Rome.” *JRS* 100: 88-117.

Rosivach, Vincent J. 1995. “Seneca on the Fear of Poverty in the *Epistulae Morales*.” *L’Antiquité Classique* 64: 91-98.

Roymans, Nico. 2009. “Hercules and the construction of a Batavian identity in the context of the Roman empire.” *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition.* Ton Derks, T. and Roymans, N. eds. Amsterdam University Press. 219-238.

Rudd, Niall, trans. 2004. *Horace. Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Russell, Donald A., trans. 2002. *Quintilian. The Orator’s Education*. 5 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Saller, R.P. 1982. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. New York: Cambridge.

---------. 1983. “Martial on Patronage and Literature.” *CQ* 33: 246-257.

Schöffel, Christian. 2002. *Martial, Buch 8: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. *Palingenesia*, Bd. 77. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Scott, Kenneth. 1936. *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. Reprint 1975.

Seo, J. Mira. 2009. “Statius *Silvae* 4.9 and the Poetics of Saturnalian Exchange.” *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici*. *Callida Musa: Papers on Latin Literature: In Honor of R. Elaine Fantham*. 243-256.

---------. 2013. *Exemplary Traits: Reading Characterization in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

Shackleton Bailey, D., trans. 1993. *Martial. Epigrams.* 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Shea, Kathleen. 2019. “Ovid’s River Hymn.” *CW* 112.4: 309-333.

Smith, Christopher. 2007. “Pliny the Elder and Archaic Rome.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement* 100: 147-170.

Spaeth Jr., John William. 1930. “Martial and Vergil.” *TAPA* 61: 19-28.

Spentzou, E., and D. Fowler. 2002. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature.* Oxford.

Squire, Michael. 2010. “Making Myron’s Cow Moo? Ecphrastic Epigram and the Poetics of Simulation.” *AJP* 131.4: 589-634.

Stanley Jr., Farland H. 2014. “Observations on Martial’s imagery of Provincial Spain.” *Glotta* 90: 192-215.

Stephens, Susan A. 2015. *Callimachus: The Hymns*. Oxford.

Stern, E. Marianne. 2012. “*Audacis plebeia toreumata vitri*: A Glassblower’s Look at Martial 14.94.” *Mnemosyne* 65: 80-93.

Stewart, Roberta. 1994. “Domitian and Roman Religion: Juvenal, *Satires* Two and Four.” *TAPA* 124: 309-332.

Stroup, Sarah Culpepper. 2006. “Invaluable Collections: The Illusion of Poetic Presence in Martial’s *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*.” *Flavian Poetry*. Nauta, Van Dam, Smolenaars. eds. Leiden: Brill. 299-314.

Sullivan, J. P. 1991. *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swann, Bruce W. 1994. *Martial’s Catullus: The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. New York: Georg Olms Verlag Hildesheim.

Sweet, David. 1979. “Juvenal’s *Satire* 4: Poetic Uses of Indirection.” *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 12: 283-303.

Tanner, Jeremy. 2000. “Culture, Social Structure and the Status of Visual Artists in Classical Greece.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 45: 136-175.

Tennant, Peter and P. M. W. Tennant. 2000. “Poets and Poverty: The Case of Martial.” *Acta Classica* 43: 139-156.

Thomson, J. O. 1952. “Juvenal’s Big-Fish Satire.” *G&R* 62: 86-87.

Tipping, Ben. 2010. *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus’* Punica. New York: Oxford.

Toner, Jerry. 2015. “Barbers, Barbershops and Searching for Roman Popular Culture.” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 83: 91-109.

Trentin, Lisa. 2011. “Deformity in the Roman Imperial Court.” *G&R* 58.2: 195-208.

Tuck, Anthony. 2006. “Singing the Rug: Patterned Textiles and the Origins of Indo-European Metrical Poetry.” *AJA* 110.4: 539-550.

Tuck, Steven L. 2005. “The Origins of Roman Imperial Hunting Imagery: Domitian and the Redefinition of *Virtus* under the Principate.” *G&R* 52.2: 221-245.

---------. 2016. “Imperial Image-Making.” *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome*. Zissos, A. ed. Wiley Blackwell. 109-128.

Uden, James. 2015. *The Invisible Satirist: Juvenal and Second-Century Rome*. Oxford.

Van Oyen, Astrid. 1994. *How Things Make History: The Roman Empire and its Terra Sigillata Pottery*. Amsterdam University Press.

Vassileiou, A. 1984. “Crispinus et les conseillers du prince (Juvènal, *Satires*, IV).” *Latomus* 43: 27-68.

Versnel, H. S. 1993. *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion II: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*. Leiden: Brill.

Versluys, Miguel John. 2013. “Material Culture and Identity in the Late Roman Republic (c. 200-c. 20).” *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Roman Republic*, Evans, J. D. ed. Blackwell. 429-440.

Vessey, D. W. T. C. 1974. “Pliny, Martial and Silius Italicus.” *Hermes* 102: 109-116.

Wagenvoort, H. 1956. “Ludus Poeticus.” In *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*. Leiden: 30-42.

Wagner, Ernst. 1880. *De M. Valerio Martiale poetarum Augusteae aetatis imitatore*. Regimonti: ex officina Hartungiana.

Walker, Henry John, trans. 2004. *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*. Hacket Publishing.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. ed. 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. New York.

---------. 1990. “Pliny the Elder and Man’s Unnatural History.” *G&R* 37: 80-96.

Warden, P. Gregory. 2013. “The Importance of Being Elite: The Archaeology of Identity in Etruria (500-200).” *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Roman Republic*, Evans, J. D. ed. Blackwell. 354-368.

Watson, Patricia. 1998. “Ignorant Euctus: Wit and Literary Allusion in Martial 8.6.” *Mnemosyne* 51: 30-40.

---------. 2001. “Martial’s Snake in Amber: Ekphrasis or Poetic Fantasy?” *Latomus* 60.4: 938-943.

Watson, Lindsay and Patricia Watson. 2003. *Martial: Select Epigrams*. New York: Cambridge.

Wheeler, A. L., trans. 1924. *Ovid. Tristia. Ex Ponto*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Whitehouse, David. 1999. “Glass in the Epigrams of Martial.” *Journal of Glass Studies* 41: 73-81.

Williams, Frederick. 1978. *Callimachus Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Wiseman, T. P. 1963. “The Potteries of Vibienus and Rufrenus at Arretium.” *Mnemosyne* 16.3: 275-283.

Yona, Sergio. 2017. “Horace, Ofellus and Philodemus of Gadara in *Sermones* 2.2.” *Mnemosyne* 70: 613-630.

Zanda, Emanuela. 2011. “The Roman Response to Luxury.” *Fighting Hydra-Like Luxury: Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic*. Bloomsbury: 16-32.

Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Alan Shapiro, Trans. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.