lecture attentive des Facta et dicta memorabilia nous en apprend plus, en dépit de son titre, sur V. M. que sur la religion romaine. L’historien des mentalités religieuses en retiendra surtout ce qui, dans le témoignage de V. M., porte la marque de son temps: je veux dire ce qui définit la religiosité d’un Romain du début de l’Empire, attaché affectivement, émotionnellement, aux valeurs traditionnelles revivifiées par Auguste et aux croyances nouvelles implantées par le principat. V. M. a vu la splendeur des temples augustéens. M. cite Manilius; il aurait pu également citer Ovide, autre témoin contemporain. La dévotion de V. M. aux Césars doit être aussi celle de tout un peuple. Tibère, à qui le recueil est dédié, gouverne caelesti prudentia (1, 1 praef.). La décence, uerecundia, de César mourant n’est pas celle d’un homme, mais c’est ainsi que di immortales sedes suas repetunt (4, 5, 6). On rapprochera avec fruit ces témoignages, même flatteurs, du livre de I. Gradel, Emperor worship and Roman religion, Oxford 2002.

Nous voyons à l’œuvre une religiosité plus moderne, qui prend un tour à la fois plus affectif et plus éthique. Les dieux ne sont plus seulement intéressés, comme jadis, à l’observation scrupuleuse du rituel, mais à l’observance des règles morales. Les exigences des philosophes ont infléchi la religion commune. Quant à l’émoticité, il faut sans doute tenir compte de plusieurs facteurs: les besoins affectifs qui assureront le succès des religions orientales, la personnalité de V. M., mais aussi le souci du mouere, dont l’orateur ne peut s’affranchir. La religion est une admirable source de pathétique.

Mais on sera plus prudent que M. et on ne se laissera pas abuser par la rhétorique de V. M.: il ne faut pas prendre les mots pour des divinités. Le langage religieux colore d’un pathos puissant le discours de l’orateur. Mais ne confondons pas religiosité authentique et habileté rhétorique. Une science plus solide de la religion romaine eût pu éviter à M. un certain nombre de méprises.

L’ouvrage est complété par deux index, locorum et général, et par une copieuse bibliographie de vingt pages. On regrettera de ne pas y trouver quelques grands classiques. Sur la divination, l’auteur cite bien sûr Thulin et MacBain, mais non la somme de Bouché-Leclercq et les travaux de R. Bloch. Sur les Roman Festivals, M. cite Warde Fowler, toujours utile, mais non Scullard (1981); pour les procès-verbaux des Arvales, Henzen, mais non la récente édition de J. Scheid, Rome, 1998; pour la topographie romaine, Platner-Ashby, mais non le moderne LTUR. On appréciera la présentation soignée de l’ouvrage, où (si ce n’est les notes en fin de volume) tout est fait pour le confort du lecteur.

Paris

Jacqueline Champeaux


Such has been the progress of Martial studies over the last forty years that we now have published commentaries on nine of his fifteen books, with one more on the way, while, of the remaining five books, complete or partial commentaries have been written as doctoral theses on three, with a fourth on the way. Only one book (2) appears to be unclaimed.

G. Galán Vioque’s Book 7 is a welcome addition to the series. It is a substantial volume. The text of the epigrams “basically follows the edition by D. R. Shackleton Bailey ... (1992)», but with some differences, listed on pp. 18–19:
almost all are changes of punctuation, and none is particularly significant. No apparatus criticus accompanies the printed text, but textual matters are discussed in the commentary.

At 54.1 G. suggests that me sonnia (β) might be a corruption of insomnia, but fails to comment on the extraordinary hiatus this would produce (de me insomni narras). However, a lack of metrical understanding is suggested by G.’s reference, on 44.1, to ‘lengthening of the short vowel in hiatus ... found only five times in Martial’. In fact, none of the five examples involves hiatus (unless you count 3.3.4, which may be spurious).

The brief introduction contains a discussion of the dating of the book. This does not refer to C. Henriksson’s consideration of Book 9 in his 1998 commentary, nor to Leary’s on Book 14 (1996; his commentary on Book 13 came out in 2001 – presumably too late for G.). G. settles for publication in December 92, as did Friedlaender. The second section of the introduction deals concisely with the subject-matter and ‘ordering’ of the poems in the book. G. does not point out the unusual placing of the three Lucan epigrams, 21–23, in immediate succession. The position of 7.97, near the end of the book, is significant. The third section considers the transmission of the text. At the end of the book are a lengthy bibliography, and lavish indices (the Index Locorum takes up 48 pages.)

In the commentary, G. provides a vast amount of comparative material, and is particularly thorough on linguistic matters. The discussion of each poem starts with an introduction, to which is appended a bibliography, before the line-by-line commentary begins. The system is rather cumbersome, and sometimes results in the same work being fully cited twice, or even three times. A peculiarity of the citations is that a work is sometimes referred to by the title of its Spanish translation: it is odd to come across, for example, J. B. Hofmann’s ‘Latin famili- 

ar’, or Reynolds’ and Wilson’s ‘Copistas y filólogos’.

It is regrettable (though understandable, granted that his own text has been translated from the Spanish by another hand) that G. does not provide a translation of the poems: not only is this the readiest help for the reader, but it also forces the commentator to make up his mind about the meaning of the Latin. G. sometimes fails to say which of two or more interpretations he prefers – for example, at 51.4 prona; 64.4 tara; 65.2 tribus ... foris (here the second explanation is useless, and in any case the different fora imply different legal processes). At 95.10 we are offered too many explanations, leaving us confused – and how can «sniffing with cold» recall «the growling of dogs»? G.’s explanation of the puzzling 7.19 is disappointing: if only he would tell us what he thinks, and properly explain the last sentence. It seems most unlikely that a «literary metaphor» is involved, and Oppermann’s theory is ruled out by the fact that Martial would never claim to be superior to Caullius (which also rules out G.’s interpretation of nec ... sumuem noor at 99.7 as «iur- 

a maior, a case of litotes»). The ending seems to depend on the paradox that the fragment is holier than the whole ship was simply because it has survived the ages.

G. is not very helpful with topographical matters. He generally cites Platter- 

Ashby’s Topographical Dictionary of Rome (1929), rather than Richardson’s (1992), but the Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae (1993–9) does not even appear in the bibliography.

The discussion of 7.73, on the houses of Maximus, is unsatisfactory, starting with a confusion between villae and domus, of which only the latter are relevant here. A map – even one as rudimentary as that provided by F. van Haeperen (AntCl 67, 1998, 234) – would be invaluable. One must ask, however, whether topographical exactitude need be
expected when Maximus is a fictitious character. G. must be mistaken in identifying _nomen ... Iouem_ (l. 4) with the temple of Iuppiter Custos, since, as this was next to the temple of the Capitoline Triad (_aeterem ... Iouem_), the view of the two could not be different. Martial must be referring to the Capitolium Vetus (see 5.22,4) – hence Shackleton Bailey’s reference to the Quirinal. G. is equally confused about Narnia (7.93). He absurdly misquotes the Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites, «nothing is known of its exact location», despite making the obvious identification with the modern Narni (the Encyclopedia actually says that «nothing is known for certain about the topography of the ancient town»). He says that the town is «famous for its aqueduct», but he means what the Encyclopedia describes as «one of the greatest of all Roman bridges» (see G.’s note on _ponte_, l. 8). Had he looked at a map, he would have been better able to explain _circuit_ (l. 2). He does not explain _accepit ... ugo_ (l. 2). Shackleton Bailey’s ‘double’ can hardly be right: the OLD says «precipitous on both sides». G.’s reference to «Mount Tivoli» at p. 116 suggests that he does not know the place. On 7.17, despite citing articles which discuss the matter, G. does not explain that Julius Martialis’s house was almost certainly not on the Janiculum proper, but on Monte Mario. The commentary on 7.56 makes no reference to archaeology: G. quotes Sargeaunt’s reference to «a lofty building on the Palatine completed in Domitian’s reign which had a dome to its», but Sargeaunt was writing in 1925, before the excavation of Domitian’s palace. We now know (as I pointed out in ClRev 46, 1996, 37–8) that this «did not have one conspicuous ‘domed roof’». At 7.95,13 we wonder why a Cilician should be clipping an African goat: presumably the geographical oddity is part of the joke.

In matters of ‘Vida cotidiana’ (as the title of Carcopino’s outdated and misleading book appears here), G. does not always help as he ought.

What we want to know about the _lorica_ addressed at 7.2,1 is whether any such breastplate, or a picture of one, survives. The discussion of the dishes at 7.20 is unsatisfactory: the note on _glandulæae_ is not helpful; we are not told how _ucae ... ollares_ are preserved (though Coleman on Statius, Siluæ 4.9.42 explains it); _cirri_ means ‘the threads left sticking to the shell after the mollusc has been removed’, why should Santra want to snatch them? The suggestion that _ad pedes_ refers to a slave who stood there to pick up scraps of food is implausible: that was in any case the job of the _anecta_ (l. 7). At 7.25,3 _fel_ is described as a ‘culinary metaphor’, but none would cook with it (though it had medicinal uses). At 7.33.3 _amictu_ refers, not to the «cloak or tunic», but to the toga. In the introduction to the poem, G. quotes Quintilian 11.3.143, but this shows, not that «it was now the fashion to wear the toga down to the ankles», but that it no longer was – which is Martial’s point. Juvenal 3.171–2 indicates only that wearing the toga had fallen into disuse outside Rome. At 7.36 Martial is asking, not for a toga, but for a _paenula_ (cf. 5.26). At 7.61.5 G. does not explain what the «pillars» are, but I did on 1.117.11. Nor does he say why the _lagona_ are _catenatae_ – presumably to avoid theft. The suggestion that at 7.48 Martial «presents himself once more as a defender of the poor against the rich» is far-fetched: what we really need are proper explanations of the phrases _pro mensis_ and _ambulante cena_. It seems that, instead of placing the dishes on small tables in front of the diners, as was usual, the slaves dash to and fro with them.

The vexed subject of the _sportula_ is not well handled by G. 7.20 surely has nothing to do with it: Suet., Dom. 7.1 states that Domitian did away with the _sportula publica, revocata rectarum cenarum consuetudine_. At 7.86,9 G. calls the _sportula_ a ‘daily payment’, but there is no reason to suppose that any client received it every day. Henriksén’s note on 9.83,4 is much clearer.

G. is frank about sexual content, but not always convincing. On 7.18.9–10 we need an explanation of why farting should be said to be helpful to sex. At p. 210 the phrase _θηγεῖ_ refers to bodily hair (including the beard), not to long hair on the head. At p. 244 _λιπαζέως_ means not _scortari_, but _fellare_ – see Kay on 11.38,12. At p. 245 the explanation of _aluta_ in the Index Expurgatorius of Martial is absurd, but we still need to know why the slave is wearing it. G. explains _caldis ... aquis_ as «the swimming pool», but it is more likely to refer to the _solium_. At p. 247, G. says that «mention of the slave’s circumcision is irrele-
vants, but, after indaeum this must be wrong. Martial’s slave has not even got a foreskin. For Martial just to say ‘your slave has a loin-cloth; mine hasn’t’ would be feeble in the extreme. The veiled accusation of Lesbianism is far from certain. At p. 332 it is not clear to me that G. realises that I was joking when I cited the Index Expurgatorius on 1,234. On p. 361, 1,104 is hardly evidence of exhibitionism: the only witness is a lamp. 7,82 must surely be about a Jew:

Menophili penem tam grandis fibula vestit
ut sit comoedis omnibus una satis.

Pace Sullivan, there seems to be no evidence for any slave circumcised ‘on the order of his master, who thus wished to satisfy his sexual instincts’. If the fibula is large enough to cover his whole penis, it cannot be the ordinary pin used for infibulatio: it must surely be the theta ... abeeva referred to at 11,73,1 (see Leary on 14,21). The idea that Martial is suggesting at 7,91,3-4 that Juvenal should offer Priapus sexual favours is absurd. The point is that the nuts have gone.

The question of the names is an important one in Martial. Some (including the reviewer) believe what he says, especially in the Preface to Book 1 – that he never uses real names in pejorative contexts, or even ‘cover’ names – while others are less trusting. G. is generally inclined to the former view, but he is not entirely consistent.

It is misleading to say, as he does on 7,59, that ‘the poet addresses a fictitious Titus, to whom he also refers in 7,10,7 and 1,17: much better to say (as he does on the next page of Caecilianus) a name frequently used for a fictional character’. The use of the name Paulus, discussed at length on 7,72, cannot possibly indicate a real person where there is any hint of serious criticism (e.g. 5,22). In the same poem, nothing is said about Polybius, named in 1,11: why does Martial use a Greek name here? Perhaps he was, as Shackleton Bailey puts it, ‘a noted ball-player’. 7,87 raises interesting questions. If Publius is a real person, as he surely is, then all the other people referred to must be real. The poem is much funnier if they are. Would Cronius be offended by the comparison with his monkey, or is this just a tease? There is no need to take the whole poem as addressed to Lausus. The criticism on the part of Lausus himself at 7,81 is hardly devastating, and there is no need to call him a ‘scandal-monger’ on 7,88. Shackleton Bailey says ‘evidently a eulogist’, though he sees the Lausus of 7,81 as ‘a carper: his theory that ‘the name is probably random in both places, though Lausus of the preceding epigram should be real’, is implausible, as is G.‘s note on p. 477.

The commentary on 7,11 requires correction. G. refers to the use of the poem to support the theory that Martial ‘published’ re-editions of his work: he should refute the argument. His idea that emendare might mean ‘cut out the obscene parts’ is nonsense: the word probus indicates Pudens’ approval, and with his love of boys he was unlikely to have been shocked. The suggestion that the end is an aprosdoketon, showing that what Pudens wants is a more valuable copy of Martial’s work, is equally mistaken. Granted Martial’s friendship with Pudens, the poem means what it says.

At p. 130 G. states that I take 7,15 ‘as a reference to a statue’, referring to CI Rev 46, 1996, 37, where I say the opposite.

On 7,32 G. should mention the fact that Cicero’s friend Atticus was childless, so that this man could not be a direct descendant. The idea that fracta ... aure might refer to ‘the inability of trainers to keep a secret’ is bizarre, as is the conjecture voc. For the fracta auris see the famous bronze statue of a boxer in the Museo Nazionale in Rome: his ears are squashed flat and have cuts in them – see N. Himmelman, Herrscher und Athlet: Die Bronzen vom Quirinal, 1989.

7,34 is mystifying, and G. does not clear it up. If Charinus’s one good act was to build good baths, why does Martial avoid them? The beginning and ending do not cohere, and there are too many elements of comparison. In addition, Domitian did not build public baths.
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Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.
At 7.14, Martial is said to be "censuring the hypocrisy of those who are ashamed to buy his work", but the verb in line 1 is not pudet but piget - "if you cannot be bothered". Martial is playfully teasing Pompeius Auctus.

«There is no inconsistency between the criticisms proffered passim by Martial with regard to mythological epic ... and his praise of Silius, since he is praising the poet as a possible patron» (7,63): Kay rightly points out that Silius did not in any case write "mythological epic", but historical epic. In the same poem, comae in 1.4 cannot possibly mean silvae, or else sera would be nonsensical. On line 11 we are told that Apollo «with the nine Muses ... travelled the earth on the back of Pegasus» - a wonderful notion.

At 7,74 G. says that Mercury is probably addressed ... as god in charge of leading souls into the underworlds, but he certainly does not want Carpus and Norbana to die. On line 4, G. does not refer to Hermes's abduction of Aphrodite, and possible abduction of Ganymede: see Henriksén on 9,23,8.

At 7,77 there is no reason to suppose that Tucca wants to sell Martial's poems 'as if they were by him'.

At 7,78,1-2 the modest dinner eaten by Papyllus is not «offered to Martial», but served up for Papyllus himself at home.

The summary of 7,85 ruins the point.

On 7,86 G. cites H. Lucas's article as if he agreed that birthday celebrations took place on the Kalends of each month, but this is convincingly refuted by Henriksén on 9,32.

Some notes are entirely unnecessary: examples are those on quondam (19,3); ille (20,22); and potens (39,2).

Perhaps in southern Spain an explanation of an icicle is really required (37,5).

There are a considerable number of errors in English, Latin and Greek. Many are typographical, but some are more serious.

References to books are sometimes awry; e.g. Degani, Inscriptiones latinae (p. 8, n. 62) for Degrassi, Inscriptiones Italicae; E. Norden, Agnosthos Theos (passim); the article on Martial 2,14 at AJPh 117, 1996, 121-141, cited on p. 157, is by Richard E. Prior, not by J. Hall (who wrote the preceding article); A. Wotschitzky's article, cited on p. 166, was published in 1955, not 1995; JRS 105 (1985) on p. 210 should read JHS; the Diss. Yale 1987 by Eve D'Ambra (not "D'ambrina") referred to at p. 378 was published in 1993 as Private lives, imperial virtues: the frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome. At p. 140 the quotation from P. T. Eden's article in Mnemosyne 52, 1999, 581 is rendered nonsensical by the omission of most of the last sentence. It should also be made clear that its first word, "its", refers to the word ἱπποδήμου. Slips in Latin include, on p. 73, convertere for converti. G.'s note on 7,22,3 reads «Haec: i.e. haec sacra», but the verbs are singular: their subject is lex (= dies), as implied by G.'s note on cum te terris ... dedisset. At 26,2 molestum appears, for molestus, not only twice in the commentary, but in the text on p. 28. On p. 270 in the quotation from Cic., Tusc. 5,188, certatetem should be custatem. On p. 321, in the quotation from Val. Max. 4,7,3 comae should be comes. At 7,61,1, even if institor could ever mean «door-to-door salesman» (which is doubtful), it certainly does not mean it here, but 'shopkeeper'. The line 7,69,5 is puzzling, but whatever it may mean emiseris cannot possibly be "an equivalent use to immeriteret". At Petr. 28,9, quoted on p. 468, the pica maris is not an "owl" but a magpie. Errors in Greek include the strange reference on p. 131 to Hylas as Ὄλυς. On p. 468 G. does not provide the obvious explanation of lagalopex as λαγος + ὀλωπης.

The primary aim of a commentator must be to help his readers to understand and appreciate the work of his author. It is only too easy for the first of these to lead to an over-accumulation of comparative material, to an extent that may hinder the second: the wood may easily be lost sight of for the trees. A lighter approach is particularly required by an author who himself wrote:
mea carmina, Sexte,
graminis placeant, ut sine grammaricis

(10,21,5–6). It is a pity that G. was not able to do his author more justice. The inexorable demands of the doctoral thesis are partly to blame, but the possibility of transcending these has been demonstrated by Henriksén’s commentary on Book 9.

Royal Holloway, University of London

Peter Howell


The Greeks of the Archaic period were heavily indebted to the great cultures of Egypt and the Near East. Al Mina in North Syria and Naukratis in the Egyptian Delta have in common that they were important gateways for cultural and economic exchanges. What these two important sites also share is a rather unfortunate excavation history. Both were investigated by archaeologists of renown but at a relatively early stage of archaeological research: Naukratis was excavated between 1884 and 1904 by Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, E. A. Gardner and D. G. Hogarth, successively, and Al Mina was dug in 1936/37 by Sir Leonard Woolley. Both sites were published soon after excavation, but in a way that is tantalizingly scanty according to modern standards. Stratigraphical information was not properly recorded, hampering – inter alia – the establishment of a detailed, absolute chronology. The focus of preservation and publication was on imported Greek finewares, at the expense of other categories of finds. Material from both sites has since become dispersed over museum and university collections throughout the world, and much of it still awaits publication. All this has complicated tremendously the study of both sites, although this has not prevented later scholars from reinvestigating the excavation reports and archaeological material.¹ This applies especially to Al Mina, which has been the subject of a long-running debate centred on the nature of the site and its supposedly Greek origins.² In comparison to the importance attributed to Al Mina and Greek interactions with the Levant, the true significance of Naukratis and the Egyptian connection has remained somewhat underexposed. This situation, however, has now changed. One important contribution is a series of surveys and excavations of Naukratis and its environs between 1977 and 1983 by W. D. E. Coulson, A. Leonard and others.³ Another significant contribution is A. Möller’s recent monograph – the subject of this review.

M.’s book is the translated and revised version of her doctoral thesis submitted at the Freie Universität Berlin in 1990. It focuses on Naukratis but, as the subtitle