plagued earlier Loeb editions. ''Tis' makes its appearance twice in the translation of *Silv.* 3.4 (pp. 219, 223), and the phrase 'to mollify sex' (for *frangere sexum, Silv.* 3.4.74, with reference to castration) strains euphemism to the point of unintelligibility.

The notes that preface each book are generally useful. Not all poems merit a prefatory note. We are told that *Silv.* 4.9 is in hendecasyllables, but no mention is made of the fact that *Silv.* 1.6 and 2.7 are likewise in that metre.

There seems to be only one error. On p. 239, in the prefatory notes to Book 4, S.B. mistakenly says that it is *Silv.* 4.6 that is in Sapphic metre, instead of *Silv.* 4.7.

To this I would like to add two other places of questionable interpretation. On p. 388, the note in the appendix on *inemptas*, *Silv.* 1.6.94, specifying that 'the fare provided for the Emperor's guests was not bought in any market; it was produced on his own land', overlooks the characteristic of the emperor's Saturnalian show. As the opening lines emphasize (see *gratuitum*, 16), all the food is free for the spectators, and it represents the enormous diversity made possible by far flung imperial commerce. On pp. 393–4, *Venarum* to mean a topographical area for the transmitted *Denarumque* (*Silv.* 3.5.104) is surely wrong. On no external basis, S.B. conjectures a region around the Bay of Naples called *Venae*. He argues that *venarum lacus* is 'gibberish'. But it is not gibberish if taken with its adjoining adjective, *medicos*; the phrase 'venarumque lacus medicos' can be taken as a reference to pools that heal ailments of the veins. S.B. makes no reference to Laguna's attractive suggestion *Inarimesque*, genitive singular for the isle of Ischia, mentioned also in *Silv.* 2.2.76; indeed, he nowhere refers to this fine commentary on Book 3 (G. Laguna, *Estacio: Silvas III* [Madrid, 1992]). Although Laguna appears in Coleman's bibliography, there are three notable omissions: R. Thomas, 'Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices,* and Roman Poetry', *CQ* 33 (1983), 92–113; C. Newlands, '*Silvae* 3.1 and Statius' Poetic Temple', *CQ* 41 (1991), 438–52; O. Pederzani, *Il talamo, l'albero, e lo specchio* (Bari, 1995).

University of Wisconsin, Madison CAROLE E. NEWLANDS

A MARTIAL SELECTION

L. WATSON, P. WATSON (edd.): *Martial: Select Epigrams*. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.) Pp. xii + 374. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Paper, £17.95/US$26 (Cased, £47.50/US$70). ISBN: 0-521-55539-6 (0-521-55488-8 hbk).

Since the appearance of Mario Citroni's landmark edition of Book 1 in 1975, the individual books of Martial's epigrams have steadily been receiving scholarly commentary, with a noticeable spurt in the last three years (my own commentary on Book 2, Galán Vioque's on Book 7, Schöffel's on Book 8, Leary's on Book 13); now only the *Liber de spectaculis* and Books 3, 4, 10, and 12 remain without published full-length commentary. Older anthologies, such as that of Bridge and Lake (Oxford, 1908), were school editions, offering commentary on a corresponding level and studiously excluding epigrams deemed obscene. More recently, Uwe Walter's selection of ninety-eight epigrams (Paderborn, 1996) is on a higher level and hardly censors, but it explicitly associates itself with the tradition more of the *Lehrerkommentar* than of the *wissenschaftlicher Kommentar*. Patricia and Lindsay Watson have now provided a modern commentary in the best tradition of the

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.407 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cambridge series, simultaneously helpful to students (who are frequently given grammatical help) and of much use to scholars.

At the outset, the editors confront the obvious question: why offer commentary on selections rather than on one of the fifteen books which Martial published singly over the course of about twenty years, and which show all the signs of careful internal arrangement?

> We see it as our task to imbue readers with some of the enthusiasm which we entertain for Martial: and this purpose could best be served by selecting poems upon which we feel we have new and interesting things to say. We also see it as part of our brief to give a representative sample of Martial's *oeuvre*—something that a commentary on a single book might not do, given that these often have a specific and circumscribed emphasis. (p. vii)

To the latter point, one might reply that there are several books still lacking commentaries (e.g. 3, 10, or 12) which do provide a fair cross-section of Martial's techniques and themes; but the first argument is incontrovertible, and the Watsons have amply succeeded in attaining the goal they set themselves.

The editors present their eighty-seven selections (of which only eight overlap with Walter's) in thematically organized groups, providing a detailed table of contents which displays its own interesting structure. The anthology begins with self-referential pieces in which Martial writes about his own poetry and then moves to such topics as 'Martial and the city of Rome', 'women', 'sexual *mores*', and 'satirical epigrams' on figures like the parvenu, the legacy-hunter, and the doctor. The end comes, appropriately enough, with 'funerary epigrams', although—in a twist that would surely have amused Martial himself—the final three selections are poetic epitaphs for women which bawdily allude to the deceased's sexual practices. The poems are taken almost entirely from books which had not received detailed commentary when the editors began work on their project: 2–4, 6–10, 12. Regrettable is the absence of epigrams from the *Liber de spectaculis* as well as from the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, each of which, in its own peculiar specificity, is important to our understanding of Martial's poetic achievement.

The editors' introduction surveys the basic questions raised by this corpus, ranging from what we can know about Martial himself (including the complex relationship between first-person utterances and the historical figure) to the themes, structure, language, and metres of his poetry, to his relationship with poetic predecessors and with Domitian. The only major question not touched upon is the manuscript tradition; for this, one may consult the other existing commentaries, but the absence of any synthesizing discussion here does create certain problems (see below). That aside, these pages can be recommended as a sensible and sensitive introduction to Martial and his poetry.

The presentation of each poem begins with an English rendering that usually has the nature of a close paraphrase: this is extremely helpful for quickly gaining a sense of the epigram's content and internal logic. There follows a discussion situating the epigram in its cultural and literary contexts, with a brief list of further reading, followed by the lemmata. In general, the editors are eminently successful at unpacking the often dense allusiveness of Martial's language and at making these poems come alive to contemporary readers. Their commentary is especially satisfying on the point of *realia*. I was grateful for their guidance on—to cite only two of many examples—the various gifts enumerated in 7.53 and the catalogue of food items in 7.20 (worthy of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.407 Published online by Cambridge University Press

note is the passing joke on v. 7: 'The suggestion that these are red-gilled oysters. . . which have gone 'off'—hence *lividos*—is a red herring').

The treatment of 9.18, Martial's rhetorically charged request for the privilege of private access to the public water supply, may serve as a typical example. The lemmata are full of illuminating remarks—on v. 6 (*cum mihi vicino Marcia fonte sonet*) it is suggested that 'the sound of the water constantly running nearby must have been tantalising'—while the opening discussion succinctly lays out the larger questions. Among other things, the editors note that since we never find an epigram thanking the emperor for granting the request, many have assumed that Martial's petition was unsuccessful. 'This may be so', they reasonably observe, 'but it is equally possible that the request was granted and that a poem of thanks was included in the first edition of Book 10 but subsequently suppressed when this was revamped after Domitian's death' (p. 113). I would like to complicate matters further. Must we even assume that Martial would necessarily have published a poem of thanks if his petition had been granted? To be sure, that is the case with his successful request for the *ius trium liberorum* (2.91 and 2.92, both included in this anthology), but did he always do so? In short, are we to read this corpus as a consistently documented record of all important events in the poet's life? The point is hardly limited to this poem.

Appropriately enough, the editors sometimes point to alternative interpretations without arguing for one or the other, or note that certain aspects remain 'remarkably unclear' (on 7.37). Yet they do not shrink from occasionally arguing against an interpretation (e.g. Garthwaite's suggestion that in 6.7 Martial is criticizing Domitian's revival of the adultery legislation as a failure), or from simply stating that one interpretation is preferable to another (e.g. at 8.55.17, *pinguis* is 'fat', rather than Shackleton Bailey's 'buxom'; the Fronto and Flaccilla of 5.34 are Martial's parents, not the slave girl Erotion's). On only a very few occasions did I miss a reference to alternative explanations of a point that struck me as important. On p. 2, for example, the Watsons argue that such claims to fame in Book 1 as *toto notus in orbe* (1.1.2) rest on the basis of earlier, more or less private circulation of individual poems or small collections. But another frequently adduced explanation, obscured by the Watsons' footnote on the point, is that this and similarly confident utterances in Book 1 were published for the first time in a revised edition of Martial's works—perhaps the edition in codex format mentioned in 1.2—which came out years later.

The text printed is the editors' own, although they 'owe an enormous debt both to the OCT and to the Teubner text of Shackleton Bailey' (p. viii). They justify their individual editorial decisions succinctly and clearly, but because their introduction omits discussion of the manuscript tradition, the uninformed reader will not be aware that when the Watsons cite the readings of 'B' and 'C' (exceptionally at 12.32.17 they use the more common sigla B^A and C^A), they are not referring to individual MSS but to the archetypes of two out of the three families into which all of Martial's MSS can be grouped. In such comments as those on 9.73.3 ('*decepti regna*, the reading of B, is preferable to the blander *defuncti rura* of the other MSS') or 4.59.2 ('the MSS vacillate between *gutta* and *gemma*'), we see the misunderstandings that this might lead to. In each of these cases, as in many others, it is a question not of variants present in a single MS or randomly distributed, but rather of the reading of one entire family as opposed to that of the other two—a recurring type of divergence that has important implications explored in Lindsay's *Ancient Editions of Martial* (Oxford, 1903) and elsewhere.

To write a commentary on a collection of poems whose subject matter varies so widely is especially challenging, and a specialist in any given area will inevitably find

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.407 Published online by Cambridge University Press

something to question. The treatment of Martial's sexual language, for example, is generally accurate and helpful, but it does occasionally fall into some of the usual traps. The discussion of 6.64 confuses the categories 'effeminate' and 'pathic'; for the distinction between them, consider Sen. *Contr*. 2.1.6 (*incedentem ut feminis placeat femina mollius*) and see my *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford and New York, 1999), pp. 142–53. And, *pace* the editors, the Philaenis of 7.67 cannot be called a 'Lesbian'. The epigram imagines her sexually penetrating both males and females, and in a text which the Watsons aptly adduce as a parallel (Sen. *Epist*. 95), hypermasculine females strikingly similar to Philaenis are said to penetrate only males (*viros ineunt*): there is not even a mention of homosexual practices. See now the discussion of B. Brooten's *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago, 1996) in D. Halperin's *How To Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago, 2002).

What is lost in an anthology of Martial must be acknowledged. In a graduate seminar on Latin epigram which I recently taught, whose centerpiece consisted of an entire book of Martial followed by a selection from the Watsons' anthology, more than one student was struck by the ebbs and flows and cyclical patterns within Book 1 in subject matter, tone, poem-length, and meter: one spoke perceptively of a 'musical' quality. Even the Barwickian experience of extracting a 'cycle' out of its context, and then looking at that handful of poems together to explore how they vary a common theme, is not possible for readers of this anthology. Still, anyone seeking a richer understanding of any of the epigrams included in the Watsons' collection will benefit from their lively and sensitive commentary.

City University of New York CRAIG WILLIAMS

TACITUS' *DIALOGUS*

R. MAYER (ed.): *Tacitus:* Dialogus de oratoribus. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.) Pp. x + 227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Paper, £15.95 (Cased, £40). ISBN: 0-521-46996-1 (0-521-47040-4 hbk).

The *Dialogus* receives here its first significant commentary in English since Gudeman's lengthy edition of 1894 (his fuller second edition of 1914 is in German). Many developments welcome a fresh look, including the now accepted authorship of the work and the general consensus that it was composed early in the second century. The increasing scholarly interest in imperial declamation will also profit from a reliable guide to the treatise.

Mayer's volume follows the usual format of the green and yellow Cambridge series: full introduction, new text (without apparatus), commentary. The introduction succinctly covers the expected ground, but inevitable quibbles arise. Along with most modern scholars, M. sees the *Dialogus* as Tacitus' justification for abandoning oratory in favor of the writing of history (pp. 16–18); perhaps so, but there is no clear evidence for such a change of heart on Tacitus' part, and Maternus himself (or, indeed, Cicero) shows that the public orator can simultaneously be a significant literary figure in other genres. More fanciful is M.'s dating of this disenchantment to the aftermath of the trial of Marius Priscus in January 100, a suggestion that moves, like Tacitean innuendo, from hypothesis to fact in the space of one page (pp. 7–8). By contrast,

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.407 Published online by Cambridge University Press