and sacrifice of Greek strangers will have come to Apion from Euripides.[4] Indeed, Josephus himself seems to have realized this. For, when he concludes his report of Apion's slander, he remarks, *huiusmodi ergo fabula . . . omni tragoedia plenissima est* (2.97).[5]

*University of Illinois, Urbana* HOWARD JACOBSON

[4] We need not doubt that Apion knew Euripides' plays, eminent scholar of Greek poetry that he was. And Euripides was, of course, the most popular of the Greek tragedians at the time.

[5] This entire section of the *Contra Apionem* survives only in Latin translation.

I am indebted to Professor L. H. Feldman, who read an early version of this note and made helpful suggestions.

## FIVE PROBLEMS IN MARTIAL (1.48.3–4; 4.52; 6.12; 9.61.15–18; 12.52)

### *(1) 1.48.3–4*

quodque magis mirum, uelocior exit ab hoste
nec nihil e tanta nobilitate refert.

The hare rushes out from the lion's mouth, inside which it plays in safety. Editors without exception print the couplet thus and acquiesce in the bizarre notion (which commentators strain to explain) that contact with nobility (here, of a lion) might be supposed somehow to enhance velocity (here, of a hare). But what might be thought to increase the hare's speed is not the lion's nobility, but its superior mobility. *mobilitate* is required here as surely as Scaliger's emendation of *nobilibus* to *mobilibus* is correct at M.14.46.1.

### *(2) 4.52*

Gestari iunctis nisi desinis, Hedyle, capris,
qui modo ficus erat, iam caprificus erit.

M.[1] thought that *fici*, anal sores, could be caused by bareback horseriding (M. 14.86.2): riding a team of goats might be thought to have an even more drastic effect. SB (1.72–3 n.*d*.) says that this epigram 'need not concern homosexuality'. The presence of a pun (here untranslatable) may indeed be the whole point of an epigram (e.g. M. 6.17), but here word-associations combine to disprove him. Goats, Roman as well as English, enjoy a reputation for lechery (cf. Horace, *Epod*. 10.23 *libidinosus . . . caper*); they are, moreover, smelly and hairy, like men such as Pannychus at M. 9.47.5; *gestor* (cf. Pliny *Epp.* 9.36.5 *non uehiculo, sed . . . equo gestor*) = 'to ride' (the sexual connotations of which are explained by Adams, 165–6); *iuncti* could imply 'two simultaneously' or 'two or more in succession'; and finally, *fici* are elsewhere in M. (6.49.10–11, and cf. 1.65 and 7.71.6) erroneously regarded as the necessary consequence of anal penetration.

Word-associations unambiguously point the reader to one conclusion only, and confirmation (if it were needed) is provided by M. 1.46 (ignoring Bentley's conjecture)

[1] Adams = J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982); M. = Martial; SB = D. R. Shackleton Bailey's Loeb edition (3 vols, Harvard, 1993), from which the text is taken.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and M. 9.57, both concerning the same individual, which leave no room for doubt that Hedylus, 'Sweety', was a gay young thing.

*(3) 6.12*

Iurat capillos esse, quos emit, suos
Fabulla: †numquid, Paule, peierat†?

The second verse lacks two syllables. Renaissance MSS supplied the stopgap *n.* <*illa*> *P.* and other supplements have been suggested: *n.* <*ergo*> *P.* by Munro, *n. P.* <*numquid*> by Grotius. None has much palaeographical probability.

I propose:

Fabulla: numquid, Paule, peierat <suos>?

This repeats the end-of-line rhythm of verse 1. From verse 1 *capillos esse* is to be understood. For the construction cf. Propertius 4.3.41 *peierat hiberni temporis esse moras.* 'Surely she's not falsely swearing that the hair is her very own?'—no, because she is its legal owner!

*(4) 9.61.15–18*

atque oluere lares comissatore Lyaeo
creuit et effuso laetior umbra mero;
hesternisque rubens †delecta† est herba coronis
atque suas potuit dicere nemo rosas.

The plane, planted by Julius Caesar in the courtyard of a house in south-western Spain, has thrived (it is now getting on for 140 years old) and is luxuriant. Underneath it fauns and their associates hold revel by night.

In verse 17 neither *delecta* nor its MSS variant *deiecta* makes evident sense. SB (*CPh* 73 [1978], 284) suggests *depicta*. But a simpler remedy is to hand in *detecta* ('I *pro* T', as W. M. Lindsay might have said in his *OCT* Martial apparatus, and as he in fact says at M. 10.26.2): '(often) the grass has been discovered (by the human residents on rising) blushing with yesternight's garlands, and no-one (of them) has been able to call the roses his own.'

*(5) 12.52*

Tempora Pieria solitus redimire corona
nec minus attonitis uox celebrata reis,
hic situs est, hic ille tuus, Sempronia, Rufus,
cuius et ipse tui flagrat amore cinis.
dulcis in Elysio narraris fabula campo,
et stupet ad raptus Tyndaris ipsa tuos:
[tu melior quae deserto raptore redisti,
illa uirum uoluit nec repetita sequi.]
ridet ut Iliacos audit Menelaus amores:
absoluit Phrygium uestra rapina Parim.
accipient olim cum te loca laeta piorum,
non erit in Stygia notior umbra domo.
non aliena uidet, sed amat Proserpina raptas:
iste tibi dominam conciliabit amor.

7–8 *seclusi* 9 ut *Castiglioni*: et $\beta\gamma$

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To the best of my knowledge, no overall interpretation of this epigram has ever been proposed.

It takes the form of a laudatory epitaph celebrating Rufus' poetic achievement (verse 1), which will enable his surviving lady-love, Sempronia, to outrival even the most famous example of abducted women (verse 12). Whatever happened, clearly no harm was done, and the mutual esteem of the pair remains as warm as ever (verses 3–4). And, as the references to Helen (verse 6), Menelaus (verse 9), Paris (verse 10), and Proserpina (verse 13) allow us to infer, whatever happened did so in the realm of literary fiction, Rufus' poetry: we are not dealing with a real-life scenario. Rufus did not abduct Sempronia (another reason, to be added to those given in SB 3.320, for excising verses 7–8, which give that impression); what he is most likely to have done is to have written a gallant poem (*De Raptu Semproniae*?) recounting her abduction, and in such a manner that Helen herself is amazed (verse 6), Menelaus is moved to laughter (at the comparative insignificance of his own misfortune?) (verse 9), and Paris is made to seem innocent of crime (verse 10). Sempronia herself (verse 5), as talked about, is only a *dulcis fabula*, 'a charming story'.

*Forest Hill, Oxford* P. T. EDEN

## WAS APULEIUS' SPEECH STENOGRAPHED? (*Florida* 9.13)

In the collection of fragments of speeches by Apuleius of Madauros that has come down to us as the *Florida*[1] some pieces have attracted the special attention of scholars. Among them is *Fl.* 9, in which Apuleius delivers a *tour de force* of oratorical display. The climax of the speech is a piece of flattering praise of a proconsul of Africa on his departure from office (9.30–40). This praise is reached by two preliminary sections that deal with different themes.

The first of these (9.1–13) is devoted to the speaker himself. In a clear instance of polemics, as in the earlier pieces *Fl.* 3, 4, and 7, he tries to gain the sympathy of the audience, by pointing to the difficult situation he finds himself in: expectations are high in the case of a man of great talents,[2] and so he cannot make the slightest error of language or style. Like a proconsul's texts (such as edicts), his words are unalterable.

The second part (9.14–29) develops a detailed, positive portrait of the sophist Hippias, focusing, rather surprisingly, on his various manual skills in making clothes and instruments. This forms an easy starting point for a second piece of self-praise of the speaker and his literary talents, now no longer veiled but as outright and open as possible (9.27–9).

There is an intriguing passage at the end of the first section (9.13). Having pictured the contrast between a proconsul's messenger (*praeco*), who runs around and makes

[1] For recent work on the *Florida*, see B. L. Hijmans Jr, 'Apuleius orator: "Pro se de Magia" and "Florida" ', *ANRW* 2.34.2 (1994), 1708–84; Gerald Sandy, *The Greek World of Apuleius*, Apuleius & the Second Sophistic (Leiden, 1997), *passim*; Stephen Harrison, *Apuleius: a Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000) 89–135. Both a new translation and a complete commentary on the *Florida* are in preparation. For the former, see Stephen Harrison, John Hilton, and Vincent Hunink, *Apuleius of Madauros, Rhetorical works (Apol., Fl., Soc.)* (Oxford, forthcoming); for the latter, see Vincent Hunink, *Apuleius of Madauros, Florida, Edited with a Commentary* (Amsterdam, 2001).

[2] The negative formulation as a self-defence, implying the rhetorical *topos* of the speaker's 'problems' and 'lack of skills', in fact constitutes a piece of self-praise. Apuleius takes pride in his linguistic skills elsewhere too; cf. notably *Fl.* 20.3–6 and *Apol.* 38.5–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press