cercle restreint des décideurs politiques, mais il faut y voir une nouvelle stratégie visant à réhabiliter sa persona politique, quelque peu effritée.

Bref, A. nous a donné ici un ouvrage d'une érudition solide et fascinante et, ce qui n'en est pas le moindre mérite, d'une lisibilité exemplaire: les deux premières parties constituent une introduction et un commentaire continu désormais indispensables à toute lecture des Part., alors que la troisième partie est une contribution originale et convaincante à l'étude de la place de la rhétorique dans la société romaine à l'époque de Ciceron.

Luxemburg

C. Loutsch: Arweiler, Die Partitiones oratoriae


Jens Leberl’s (L.’s) ‘Domitian und die Dichter’ presents a slightly revised version of the author’s 2002 Freiburg thesis. It sets out to answer the question «wie Domitian seine Herrschaft darstellte sowie welcher Mittel und welcher Personen er sich dabei bediente» and more specifically to look at «die Rolle der römischen Dichter M. Valerius Martialis und P. Papi nius Statius innerhalb der kaiserlichen Expression» (14). The topic of the relation between Domitian and the two foremost poets of his age has been a matter of controversy practically since the late 19th century; it has been discussed from very different angles and on the basis of very different assumptions, but it is not until recently that the subject has been made the subject of entire monographs in its own right. L.’s work, though, is the first to take the official ‘Expression’ as its starting-point and to consider the poets’ work against this background. It may be described, therefore, as being


2 The title of the book is consequently somewhat misleading, as L. does not address the possibility of other poets besides Martial and Statius writing for Domitian; see further below.

3 Important, even catalytic, for the modern study of Domitian and poetry is John Garthwaite’s Domitian and the Court Poets Martial and Statius, diss. Cornell University 1978 (somewhat provocative and now rather controversial) as well as subsequent papers on the subject by the same author; I would also mention Kathleen Coleman’s The Emperor Domitian and Literature, ANRW 32/1, 1986, 3087–3115, Niklas Holzberg’s Martial, Heidelberg 1988, and Martial und das antike Epigramm, Darmstadt 2002, in which he revises some of the views expressed in the former, and Ruurd Nauta’s Poetry for patrons. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian, Leiden etc. 2002.
ultimately a ‘realphilologisches’ work, and differs in this respect from other recent studies, which have rather tended to be purely literary.¹

L.s book opens with an ‘Einleitung’ (9–23), which defines the keyword ‘Expression’ as synonymous with ‘Herrschaftsdarstellung’ and ‘Ostentation’ (10),² states that the ‘Expression’ (henceforth ‘expression’ in English) is ‘alle Taten und Maßnahmen des Kaisers … durch die seine Imago in der Öffentlichkeit gestaltet wurde’, and establishes that this ‘Expression’ was more important and more massive during Domitian’s reign than during those of his predecessors (12). L. also gives a short but very sound critical assessment of the last century’s research into the reign of Domitian and the attitude of the poets towards the emperor (13–16).

The ‘Einleitung’ is followed by the main section of the book, which in practice falls into two parts, the former concentrating on the nature and means of Domitian’s expression and on the conditions for poetry as a potential instrument (ch. 2. ‘Domitians Herrschaftsdarstellung. Die ‘anderen’ Instrumente’, 25–86; 3. ‘Die Rezeption der Dichter’, 87–112; and 4. ‘Domitian als Patron der Dichter’, 113–142). This part provides the background for the latter, which deals in detail with the panegyrical writings of Statius and Martial (5. ‘Die Panegyrik des Statius’, 143–245; and 6. ‘Die Panegyrik des Martial’, 245–341). The book ends with a ‘Schlussbetrachtung’ (ch. 7, 342–353) and the above-mentioned ‘Appendix’ (354–377), which gives an account of, and to some extent polemizes against, the 2002 books of Lorenz and Holzberg. There is also an extensive and up-to-date bibliography (ch. 8, 378–379) and two indices (9.1. ‘Namen- und Sachregister’, 380–390, and 9.2. ‘Stellenregister’).

The first half of the book shows L. to be a ‘Realphilologe’ in a very positive sense. In order to provide a background to the subsequent study of Martial’s and Statius’ panegyrics, it takes an overall grasp on Domitianic expression. The level of detail is sometimes such as is not really necessary for the following discussion of the poets’ role, but it never burdens the account, which is thoroughly readable and instructive. I would single out two issues, though, as being of paramount importance, viz. the question of the main topics of Domitian’s expression and that of target groups; both, obviously, are of great significance when it comes to evaluating the works of the poets in the light of the expression.

¹ This is particularly true about two other German studies that appeared the very same year as L.’s thesis, Sven Lorenz’s Erotik und Panegyrik. Martials epigrammatische Kaiser, Tübingen 2002, and the book of his ‘Doktorvater’ Niklas Holzberg, mentioned in the preceding note. As L. explains in his ‘Appendix’ (354–377), Lorenz’s book could understandably not be taken into consideration in the revision of his own thesis, and I am uncertain if this has necessarily been to his disadvantage. There are some comprehensive concepts in the outlook of Lorenz (and Holzberg) that will need to be heeded by anyone working on Martial in the future – particularly the view of Martial’s 12 Books of Epigrams as a ‘dodecalogy’ and of the figure of Domitian as an ‘epigrammatic emperor’ devised in accordance with the rules of the genre – but, as L. points out, there are «erstaunlich wenig Berührungs punkte» between his and Lorenz’s work; actually, their difference in approach means that it would probably not have been very constructive to enter into a controversy over each disagreement, and L.’s ‘Appendix’ comes out as a very reasonable way to deal with the situation.

² For very good reasons, L. avoids using the word ‘Propaganda’; see p. 11.
As main topics in Domitian’s expression, L. singles out five: 1) the emperor’s military imago (45–49), 2) religious-cultic aspects (49–60), 3) the emperor’s position in political hierarchy (60–63), 4) the emperor as ἐπίφανεις (63–68), and 5) the thematization of Domitian’s own person (68–70). The target groups are four, viz. 1) the senatorial upper classes, 2) the military, 3) the plebs urbana (including the equestres) and 4) the provincials (in Italy and abroad) (42–43). It was naturally desirable that each aspect of the expression was perceptible to as many of these groups as possible, but L. frequently emphasizes that these groups were not equally important to Domitian; it is apparent that he chose to base his power on the military and the plebs to a higher degree than on the senate, and certain means were used to ensure that these groups were reached (e.g. by adjusting the iconographic complexity of coins, cf. L. 38 and 41).

The importance of the plebs and the military as support groups for the Domitianic regime becomes particularly evident in the proliferation of certain aspects of his imago, which the emperor must have realized would actually have a repelling effect on other groups. For instance, his image appeared more often on coins than had been the case under other emperors, the cult of his family was more firmly institutionalized, and far, I think, from aspring to actual divinity, he saw to it that he was manifestly and explicitly brought in connection with the traditional gods. These matters are duly noted by L., who established that Domitian «camouflierte … seine wirkliche Machtstellung nicht mehr, wie es Augustus und wohl noch Vespasian vorgemacht hatten» (74). But he would have strengthened his (already convincing) argument, I think, had he pointed out more clearly that an expression of this kind, which puts considerable emphasis on Domitian’s own person, while perhaps appealing to the masses, must actually have had the opposite effect on many members of the senatorial stratum. It may be considered as an expression that has consciously been allowed to have a partially negative effect, thus suggesting that Domitian regarded senatorial support as to some extent dispensable (and perhaps too difficult to attain) when it came to securing the favour of the plebs.

What chances were there for poetical communication to play an effective role in imperial expression? To answer this question, L. looks particularly at the possibilities of distributing poetical works and at the extent of their impact. The means available were, obviously, two, which each could function in both a private and a public context: oral recitation (L. 88–94) and the circulation and publication of poems in written form (94–103). Depending on the forum, the width of influence varied enormously, from insignificant (silent private reading) to rather massive (recitation before thousands of listeners in a theatre).

As for written publication, L. sides with Peter White, against Don Fowler and others, in his assumption that many (notably of Martial’s) poems must have circulated in the form of libelli prior to their inclusion in books proper (94–100). From a ‘realphilologisches’ point of view, the libellus-theory does seem very reasonable, and L. does a good job in advocating it. If, as I am inclined to think, such libelli existed, their role (in the present context) would have been restricted to the communication between the poets and the emperor; for the imperial expression, then, they would have been of no importance. The publication of books proper, though, was quite another matter. While the size of an original edition may not have been very extensive, there was theoretically an infinite possibility of making further copies, and a published book could easily be distributed to any corner of

---

1 E.g. Niklas Holzberg, who in his Martial und das antike Epigramm (supra, p. 692 n. 3), 128ff, principally agrees with Fowler.
2 L. (103) refers to Plin. epist. 4.7.2 for the opinion that 1000 copies was a large edition.
the empire. Not least important is that the ability to read was at its height in the Roman empire during the late first century. Education was no longer the sole privilege of the upper classes, and a new audience of middle (and perhaps some lower) class readers was available (see L. 166f), largely consisting of people that were also among Domitian’s most important target groups. Suetonius has left us a somewhat ambivalent account of Domitian’s cultural and literary interests, but L. (136f) produces more than one thing – the promotion of Quintilian, the restoration of public libraries, the institution of the agon Capitolinus and the Alban games – that suggests that he was an emperor who could be expected to take an interest in poetry as a means of diffusing his expression.

However, the conclusion he reaches is quite the opposite: «die Dichtung [war] als Instrument der Herrschaftsdarstellung für Domitian nicht sehr interessant». L. argues (111f) that it was only through public recitations that poetry could reach a sufficiently numerous audience with a sufficiently large element of plebs urbana. Such events, though, would have been primarily aimed at entertainment, and the panegyrical streak, even though it may have existed, too insignificant. As for published books, the contents of which could be substantially panegyrical, these still reached primarily a senatorial elite, not, at least not to a sufficient degree, the plebs and the military. This supposed lack of interest from the emperor also means that he did not regularly and actively appear as a patron of poets.

How, then, does this fit with the panegyrical elements in the poetry of Statius and Martial, which, particularly in the works of the latter, are conspicuously massive? In the second part of his book, L. examines, at considerable length, the works of these poets from the point of view of official imperial expression. Beginning with Statius, each Silva devoted to Domitian or his immediate surrounding is treated separately and sorted, according to its contents, under the headings ‘Die militärische Imago des Kaisers’ (Silv. 1.1), ‘Die sakrale Imago des Kaisers’ (4.2), ‘Der Kaiser als Euerget der stadträumische Bevölkerung’ (1.6 and 2.3), ‘Der Kaiser als Euerget der gesamten Reichsbevölkerung’ (4.3), ‘Der Erwerb von Status durch den Kaiser’ (4.1). The poem on the hair-offering of the emperor’s favourite Earinus (3.4) is treated as a ‘Sonderfall’ and discussed under a separate heading (‘Die an Domitians Umfeldadressierte Dichtung’).

Each of these poems is presented more or less in full, with Latin text and German translation and a thorough account of its contents. For those well acquainted with the subject, L.’s discussions of the poems may be a little too detailed, especially as he is seldom very original in his analysis. But he does generally not miss to pay due credit to the scholars on whose work he bases his own, and regardless of its lack of novelty, the section on the panegyric of Statius comes out as good introduction to his imperial poetry.

The same is essentially true also of the corresponding account of Martial. This, too, is made up of a series of chapters that point to a certain aspect of imperial expression, to a large extent the same as in the case of Statius. A puzzling difference, though, is the complete lack of translations for the poems of Martial, for which L. gives no explanation. Indeed, a Silva of a hundred verses may be heavier to get through than an epigram of eight.


2 The only points of difference are that for Martial, there is only one chapter about Domitian as ἐπηγέτης (as there really are no epigrams that focus on his projects outside the ager Romanus); a chapter about his ‘Zensorische Maßnahmen’ has been added, and the one on ‘Der Erwerb von Status durch den Kaiser’ (less relevant for Martial than for Statius) has been dropped.
but the epigrams are not necessarily easier to understand, and the want of translations more or less excludes a circle of readers – those with no or insufficient Latin – who could otherwise have profited from the book.

L.’s detailed analysis of the poems is on the whole quite good. It is very rarely possible to convict him of being incontestably wrong, and much of what he says is excellent, for instance his discussion of Statius’ much discussed statement in silv. 1.6.87 that Domitian forbade the crowd in the theatre to hail him as domi-nus (194–6). Some of his conclusions, though, are more debatable than others, and some are rather controversial.

I am very sceptical towards his reading of the poems in Book 7 that vent the desiderium populi for the emperor, absent at the Danube in the ‘Second Pannonian War’, as expressing an actual popular demand on the emperor to be in Rome, «denn in Abwesenheit war der Kaiser nicht in der Lage, seinen kommunikativen Pflichten nachzukommen» (L. 252). To me, the popular yearning for the emperor is primarily a topical revocatio and imitated, like much else in Martial’s large suite of poems on the Second Pannonian War, from Horace’s Odes 4 (L. does mention Hor. carm. 4.115, but does not put sufficient emphasis on it); there is no need, I think, to consider Martial’s speaker in, for instance, 7.5 as one who also takes upon himself to express any «Wünsche und auch Kritik gegenüber dem Kaiser» that the people might have. From the same point of view, L. interprets the famous 8.11, in which Martial speaks of Domitian’s ovatio on his return from the war as secretos … triumphos (line 7). L. argues that this ovatio would have been a disappointment to the plebs, who expected a justus triumphus: «Der Kaiser sollte nicht seinen Part im Wechselfspiel von Ehrenzeugen und Wohltaten vernachlässigen. Vor diesem Hintergrund klingt Mar-itals Zustimmung zu den secretos … triumphos … wie ein Lob mit zusammengebissenen Zähnen» (266). The final line of the poem, principis est virtus maxima, nosse suos, he suggests, means that ‘it is the greatest virtue of an emperor to know the true wishes of his subjects’, implying that Domitian, in setting a real triumph aside, did not. Not only does this seem to me to be ‘Herrscherkritik’ of a kind that L. elsewhere denies in Martial, but it also seems incongruent with L.’s overall view of his panegyrics (cf. 343, «Anlass, den dominianischen Principat abzulehnen, hatten sie [sc. Martial and Statius] nicht»). The Sec-ond Pannonian War was justified as being a defensive war, it was short (less than 8 months), it seems not to have been a decisive success nor a failure, but rather a partial vic-tory in the protracted struggle against the Sarmatians; Domitian probably made just the right decision in contenting himself with an ovatio, which, in terms of expression, would count not only towards his imago militaris, but also towards his modestia. And even if the plebs was unwilling to appreciate this, there seems to have been no want either of cer-e-mony or of entertainment; there were both sacrifices (Mart. 8.4) and a banquet (8.49) as well as public games (8.26, 30, 35, 78, and 80). Had Martial, for some reason, wanted to air popular criticism of the emperor, this was not really the occasion.

What, then, does L. have to say about the reaction of Statius and Martial to imperial expression, and what effect did this have on their respective relation to Domitian? L.’s overall answer to the first of these questions is that both poets

1 There are some minor flaws, like when L. says (247) that Martial alludes to Domitian’s ‘cognomen’ Germanicus for the first time in 14.170, which, in fact, he mentions explicitly already in 13.4; but such errors are generally of little consequence. Neither of great im-portance for the book as a whole are some of the interpretative lapses, as when he takes the word iubar in 8.65.4 to allude to Domitian as a star (261); I am very firmly convinced that the simile is between the emperor and the Sun.

conformed closely to the expression; if they digressed from it, it was only in order to surpass it.\(^1\) This means that he rejects – on very good grounds, in my opinion – the theories about hidden criticism of Domitian that was put forth by some scholars in the 80s, but which now seem to have had their day.

I fully concur with these conclusions, as well as with L.’s deduction that Martial and Statius were not on quite the same terms with Domitian himself. Neither poet had any particularly intimate relation to the court (i.e., they were not ‘court poets’; cf. 129–132), and the only type of imperial interaction that can be plausibly established for both is that which they had with Domitian’s courtiers, in Statius’ case principally Abascantus (the emperor’s \textit{ab epistulis}), in Martial’s Parthenius (the \textit{a cubiculo}). When it came to the emperor himself, whatever contact there was seems to have been very slight.

In the case of Martial (if we can trust his silence in the matter), there is nothing that suggests that he ever had any dealings with or appeared before Domitian. The only favour from the emperor seems to have been a renewal of his \textit{ius trium liberorum}, which had originally been conferred by Titus, and may have been confirmed by Domitian more or less automatically. Statius, however, had a better initial position than the epigrammatist; his father, a poet like his son, had attracted the attention of Vespasian with a poem about the Civil War, and was evidently also appointed to be the teacher of the young Domitian. It may even be that Statius’ villa at Alba, where he was the neighbour of the emperor, was originally a gift to his father from the emperor.\(^2\) He also seems to have got more, if not much, attention from the court than did Martial, and we can actually verify ‘live contact’ between him and the emperor; Statius was heard reciting by Domitian at the Alban games of AD 90 – in which he won the golden olive-wreath\(^3\) – and in the \textit{agon Capitolinus}, probably of the same year, in which he was defeated.\(^4\) He was also invited to a dinner in the palace (\textit{silv.} 4.2), if only as one of perhaps a thousand guests (each of whom cannot really have been picked by Domitian),\(^5\) even though he did probably not deliver anything on the occasion.\(^6\) There is also, of course, the fact that Statius says that he had written \textit{silv. 3.4} (on Earinus’ hair-offering) to the order of Earinus himself.\(^7\) The poem is as much imperial panegyric as it is an encomium of Earinus, and it has often been assumed (by the reviewer among others) that behind the \textit{desiderium} of Earinus stood Domitian himself. But L. has a good point, I think, when he warns against underestimating Earinus’ own role in the choice of Statius. In 94, he was not just any slave boy, but a young man probably be-

\(^{1}\) A plain instance is the poets’ reference to Domitian as \textit{deus}; presenting himself as a god was never part of the emperor’s expression, but the importance it attributed to his sacred \textit{imago} made it easy for the poets to take it one step further.

\(^{2}\) See, for instance, A. Hardie, Statius and the \textit{Silvae}, Liverpool 1983, 12–13. L. only mentions Statius’ father very briefly in a footnote (17, n. 47), which does not take sufficient notice of his potential importance in this matter.

\(^{3}\) With a poem about Domitian’s campaigns against the Chatti and the Dacians in 89, see K. M. Coleman, Statius, \textit{Silvae IV. Edited with an English translation and commentary}, Oxford 1988, xvii f and note on \textit{silv. 4.2.66}–7.

\(^{4}\) Hardie, op. cit., 62f. His participation in the \textit{agon} may, however, have been in 94; see J. Garthwaite, Statius’ retirement from Rome: \textit{Silvae} 3.5, \textit{Antichthon} 23, 1989, 81–91.

\(^{5}\) \textit{Silv. 4.2.13} says that Domitian bade senators and knights \textit{mille simul … discumbere mensis}, which, while certainly a poetic hyperbole, suggests a large number of guests; see L. 168.

\(^{6}\) The question whether or not he gave a recital at this banquet is, I think, too speculative to be meaningful in this context. On p. 132, L. seems to assume that Statius actually recited a poem (\textit{silv. 4.27}) at the banquet, while he, on p. 169, is more careful in his judgement. Ruurd Nauta, \textit{Poetry for Patrons} (supra, p. 692 n. 1), 336, thinks not.

\(^{7}\) L. speaks (319) also of Martial’s ‘Eairinus cycle’ in Book 9 as having been written to order; but this is, if not directly unlikely, far from established.
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between 16 and 18 years old; as an imperial freedman, he was an important figure, not least because he would reasonably have been quite close to the emperor himself. But he would naturally not have chosen Statius to praise his locks without the consent of Domitian.

All of this – the appearance on a guest list not reasonably put together by the emperor, a commission for a poem from a prominent freedman, the contact with Abascantus – suggests that Statius – like Martial – did not really get behind the circle of courtiers that surrounded the emperor. For Statius, there are also the interesting cases of the victory at Alba and the defeat in the *agon Capitolinus*. What does it mean that Statius was unsuccessful in the more important games and succeeded only in the lesser? Is this, too, a sign of a rather cool interest from the emperor? And what about those who emerged victorious? Here, I think, lies a problem about L.’s book. Is it possible to form an opinion about 'Domitian und die Dichter' and about 'Poesie als Medium der Herrschaftsdarstellung' under this emperor by looking only at Martial and Statius? Is it possible to say that poetry was «als Instrument der Herrschaftsdarstellung für Domitian nicht sehr interessant» (112), that Domitian’s practice «auf die Dichtung als von ihm gesteuertes Instrument der Herrschaftsdarstellung zu verzichten» is apparent «in der Feststellung, dass Martial und Statius differierende Anlässe und Gegenstände für die Panegyrik wählen» (340), that «Hofdichter» hat es in der domitianischen *aula* nicht gegeben and that the emperor «hatte keinen Bedarf an Herrschaftsdarstellung durch die Literatur» (344)? We know, of course, next to nothing about those who did win the poetry event of the *agon Capitolinus*, practically only the names of two of the winners, viz. a Collinus and the tragedian Scaevus Memor, and of another winner besides Statius in the Alban games, called Carus. We know, too, that some of the participants were quite young, and L. does admit that «die Jugend der Teilnehmer könnte ein Zeichen dafür sein, dass Domitian die Literatur im Allgemeinen und Nachwuchspoeten im Besonderen fördern wollte. Es soll hier zunächst offen bleiben, welche Rolle er diesen Talenten eventuell zudachte, ob sie direkt seine Herrschaft propagieren sollten oder er sich eher indirekten Ruhm durch einen prominenten und produktiven Literaturbetrieb in seinem Principat erhoffte. Jedenfalls wurde bei den Agonen offensichtlich topische Herrscherpanegyrik vorgetragen» (136).

But even if we do not know what happened to these poets once they had won the golden oak-wreath, suppose that they were the ones on whom Domitian decided to build his literary expression, that these poets were actually the ‘court-poets’ of the emperor, and that they, as such, produced nothing but massive panegyrics (like those, e.g., of Claudian some centuries later). Suppose, as seems plausible, that such works would have been got rid of in the very effective pro-

---

1 For Earinus’ age at the hair-offering, see my Martial, Book IX. A Commentary, vol. 1, Uppsala 1998, 90, n. 1.

2 Martial wrote a rather foreboding epigram for this Collinus (4.54). For Scaevus (four lines of whom have come down to us), see PIR', S. 188 and Mart. 11.9 (with N. Kay, Martial Book XI: A Commentary, London 1985, 87f). As these games were only held three times during Domitian's reign (86, 90 and 94), we actually lack the name of one winner only.

3 Mart. 9.23–24.

4 One Q. Sulpicius Maximus, who died at the age of 11, had participated in the Greek poetry event of the Capitoline games in 94; his epitaph is published in CIL 6.33976.
cess of damnatio memoriae that struck Domitian after his assassination; it would be small wonder that we do not know of them today. Speculative, of course, but not entirely implausible, and perhaps a reason to warn against taking Martial and Statius as the only poets at the emperor’s disposal for the literary propagation of his expression. The failure to address this problem is my only serious objection to L.’s work.

Another difficult question is why Statius and Martial kept writing panegyrics, why they continued trying to surpass official expression, and why, most clearly in the case of Martial, they raised the intensity as well of the volume of their praise over time, if there was no response at all from the emperor. For it is a fact that Statius’ imperial poetry is at its height in Silvae 4, and that there are two significant increases in Martial, the first in Book 4, the second (and most important) in book 8. L. (347ff) advocates the thesis that Martial in this way responds to critical events in Domitian’s reign (which supposedly also affected its character negatively), viz. the revolt of Saturninus in 89 and the indications of spiralling opposition in 93 (which, among other things, provoked the expulsion of philosophers from Rome). In Book 9, Martial again allows himself a more ‘relaxed’ and somewhat ironical attitude in his panegyrics, which in L.’s (316) opinion «verringern den Gesamteindruck der Panegyrik gegenüber Buch 8» and which he suggests may be due to the failure of an appropriate response from the emperor to his substantial panegyrical efforts in Book 8. He admits that the number of imperial poems could not really be lowered without making too much of a statement, but I think that there are panegyrics in Book 9 that seem serious enough for this argument to be unconvincing (witness 9.121). Perhaps, what Book 9 really shows is an epigrammatist secure enough to allow himself a broader panegyrical spectrum.

When it comes to the Silvae and particularly the Epigrams, it is difficult to draw any conclusion about their authors on the basis of what they say, and all the more so if one wants to argue on the basis of their silence. It is true that there are no indications of direct imperial patronage in the Epigrams, but I find it very hard to believe that Martial would not only have persisted in but even intensified his panegyrics through the entire reign of Domitian, if he did not get some kind of response from the court. L.’s argumentation for Domitian’s lack of interest in poetry when it came to propagating the image of his rule works well as long as he bases himself on historical and archaeological facts. When it comes to combining the poetry of the Silvae and the Epigrams with the concept of a ruler largely uninterested in supporting it personally, L. necessarily enters into the field of speculation and the case may become weaker, if not unlikely. The image that emerges from L.’s book is that of an emperor who has enclosed himself within a practically impenetrable circle of courtiers who administered every kind of contact with the ruler, and behind which neither Martial nor Statius ever got. And perhaps, this image is quite probable.

Uppsala

Christer Henriksén


Die sehr umfangreiche Registrierung der Dank verdienenden Helfer des Hrsg. (R.) schließt mit dem von bewundernswertem britischen Humor getragenem Satz: «Alf Önnerfors will be surprised to find himself thanked, but it was his