15. IDENTITY AND IRONY. MARTIAL'S TENTH BOOK, HORACE, AND THE TRADITION OF ROMAN SATIRE

Elena Merli

Although Martial strongly invokes the Latin epigrammatic tradition in his poetological statements—and thus in part actually constitutes this tradition—the intertextual references in his poetry point far beyond the genre of epigram. In his monograph on Martial, John Sullivan briefly discusses the role of satire and elegy in his view our poet's most important intertextual points of reference. According to Sullivan, Martial takes from satire his critical view of society and human behavior, and from elegy especially the element of self-representation. Even prior to Sullivan, of course, the question of Martial's relationship to satire was posed frequently, and the answers focused on the humorous and mimic elements; on the poet's description of "types" such as the parvenu, the hypocrite and the legacy-hunter; and on his criticism of Roman society and the system of *clientela*.[1]

To my mind, the limitation of this approach consists in the difficulty of adequately defining the object "satire". Scholarship has too often abstained from seeking precise, concrete lines and tendencies of development in this genre, and done so in good conscience on the grounds of satire's intrinsic *uarietas*.[2] As far as our topic is concerned, this fact has led to a kind of optical illusion: the relationship between Martial and Juvenal has moved to center stage, while Martial's much broader and more nuanced relationship to the various forms and stages of the satirical tradition has receded into the background.

Martial's epigrams do, in fact, draw strongly on satire. In this paper, I would like to attempt in particular to demonstrate the existence of a privileged relationship between Martial and Horace's works in hexameters. The most interesting and specific elements connecting Horace and Martial are not, however, primarily of a humorous or mimic character. The significant, if not exclusive attention that schol-

---

[1] Sullivan 1991, 103–6, 259–65. See also Mendell 1922; Duff 1937, 127–46; Szelest 1963; Laurens 1989, 229–51 and *passim*.

[2] However, see Freudenburg 2001.

ars have devoted to these aspects appears to be the result of Juvenal's presence obstructing the view: his satire together with the so-called satirical epigram of Lucillius have been simply projected backwards, thus creating the lens through which the relationship between Martial and Horace's *sermo* is generally viewed.

Two premises. The first: a highly relevant text of Horace's for Martial, his second epode, will be left aside completely here as it does not hold a place in the satirical tradition, despite showing strong correspondences with this tradition in terms of both themes and narrative technique. Furthermore, the *persona loquens* in the second epode is "the usurer Alphius", while in the hexametric texts that we will be examining, it is "the poet Horace". In other words, in the satires the situation is expressed through the poet's "I", while in the epode it is conveyed through an "other voice"—an important distinction for the rest of my analysis.

The second premise: in the following, I will deal with the subject of Horace's *sermo*—that is, his *Satires* and *Epistles*—without distinguishing sharply between these groups of works. Classifying the two as belonging to one and the same genre would of course be going too far, but nevertheless, with Horace, the *Satires* and *Epistles* are parts of an organic poetic development.[3] It is important that the later satirists recognized a *lato sensu* satirical potential in Horace's *Epistles* and that they made use of it in their own work: recall here Persius 6, which begins as an epistle; or the relationship of Juvenal 11 to Horace *Ep.* 1.5 (to Torquatus). Among modern authors, an example is Ludovico Ariosto, whose satires have the form and character of a letter.

What I would like to discuss here deals with the relationship between Horace and Martial as constituted in the tenth book of *Epigrams*, and especially with two closely related topics: the motif of the countryside and places distant from Rome on the one hand, and the depiction of chaotic life in the city on the other. The considerations that I put forward here can in no way deal exhaustively with the topic of Martial's relationship to Horace's hexameter poems: rather, I hope to contribute one piece to a mosaic that will slowly grow, change and take shape over time.

[3] According to Fraenkel 1957, 310.

1. *The poet and the countryside*

Martial's tenth book of *Epigrams*, which has come down to us only in a revised second version, is the last book the poet wrote in Rome. The choice of topics is strongly determined by his imminent return to Spain: seven epigrams deal with the return, and six either address friends who themselves are about to depart for vacation or embark on long journeys, or praise peaceful, pleasant country estates and seaside residences.[4]

Many more epigrams than in the previous books are devoted to this richly complex, but in itself coherent topic. Up to this point, for example, only two epigrams dealt with the poet's Iberian homeland (1.49, 4.55) except for brief allusions in other contexts.

The quantitative aspect is not, however, the most relevant difference between the tenth book and the earlier books in the constitution of the city/country or Rome/province antithesis. The descriptions of vacation spots and references to stays outside Rome merge here with the deep, unmistakable expression of weariness and the desire to flee from the *uita occupata* of the capital city. In epigram 12, for example, the poet addresses Domitius Apollinaris[5] who is just departing for Vercelli, and urges him to soak up the sun there to reap the envy of the *pallida turba* of city-dwellers upon his return. His bronzed skin will soon fade, however, robbed of its hue by Rome:

I precor et totos auida cute conbibe soles—
 o quam formonsus, dum peregrinus eris!
Et uenies albis non adgnoscendus amicis
 liuebitque tuis pallida turba genis. 10
Sed uia quem dederit rapiet cito Roma colorem,
 Niliaco redeas tu licet ore niger.

(Mart. 10.12.6–12)

Go, I beg, and let your greedy hide drink sunshine in full measure. How handsome you will be, so long as you stay abroad! And you will come back unrecognizable to your whey-faced friends; the pallid throng will

[4] Return home: 13, 37, 78, 92, 96, 103, 104. Friends who are leaving, and *uillae*: 12, 30, 44, 51, 58, 78; see also 93. A list of epigrams in the tenth book that are not set in the city can be found in Spisak 2001–2; the situation of Martial "between home and Rome" is touched on by Fearnley 2003.

[5] On the identification, see Nauta 2002a, 159–61 and 2005, 222–7.

envy your cheeks. But Rome will soon rob you of the color the road has given, though you return black-faced as a son of Nile.[6]

In epigram 30, the elegant description of Apollinaris' *uilla* begins with the observation that the owner seeks respite from the stress of Rome: a remark that is otherwise nowhere to be found in praises of patrons' *uillae* in the writings of either Martial or Statius. The choice of words in verses 1–4 describes the burdens of city life from whose cares *fessus* Apollinaris literally takes flight:

O temperatae dulce Formiae litus,
uos, cum seueri fugit oppidum Martis
et inquietas fessus exuit curas,
Apollinaris omnibus locis praefert.

(Mart. 10.30.1–4)

Temperate Formiae, sweet shore! When Apollinaris flees stern Mars' town and in weariness puts restless cares aside, he prefers you to all other places.

Epigram 51 can be mentioned in this context as well: life in the capital, as glamorous as it may be, holds no attraction for the *lassus* Faustinus, who yearns for the calm of his *uilla* in Anxur.[7] The two most detailed descriptions of *uillae* in the previous books (those of Faustinus in Baiae, 3.58, and of Iulius Martialis on the Ianiculum, 4.64) do not contain any such passages: Faustinus' *uilla* is not opposed to the city but to Bassus' *rus suburbanum*; and while Iulius' house is praised for its seclusion from the noise of city traffic in lines 18–24, this reflection does not lead to any statements about being tired or weary of life in Rome. Quite to the contrary, this text appears to place prime value on the advantageousness of being located close to the city yet distant from unpleasant city noise.[8] Furthermore, both texts underscore the mixed character of the *uillae*: they fuse rural calm and relaxation with a modicum of urban comfort. Thus Faustinus employs *pueri capillati* and a *eunuchus* in his villa (30–2), who obviously are devoted to commitments different from the urban ones; while the epigram for Iulius notes: *hoc rus, seu potius domus uocanda est*, "this country place, or perhaps it should rather be styled a city mansion"

[6] The translations of the Martial quotations are from Shackleton Bailey 1993.
[7] On the identification of this addressee, see Nauta 2002a, 68 with n. 98.
[8] The proximity to the city is seen in 6.43 as something positive: *nunc urbis uicina iuuant facilesque recessus* (on the country estate near Nomentum); see also some descriptions of *uillae suburbanae* in Plin. *Ep.* 1.24.3 and 2.17.2.

(25).[9] This kind of praise does not play a central role in the epigrams in the tenth book to country estates and seaside *uillae*, with the minor exception of the definition of a *uilla* in Anxur as a *litoranea domus* in epigram 58.

From my discussion the conclusion emerges that in the tenth book Martial transfers to his friends and patrons viewpoints and considerations that apply to his own situation as constituted and portrayed within the text. See, for example, epigram 58:

... nunc nos maxima Roma terit.
Hic mihi quando dies meus est? Iactamur in alto
urbis, et in sterili uita labore perit.

(Mart. 10.58.6–8)

... now mightiest Rome wears us out. When do I have a day to call my own here? I am tossed in the city's ocean and life goes to waste in fruitless toil.

(The *uilla* of Frontinus in Anxur represents the positive pole here.) The contrast between city and country is also emphasized in epigram 96, and evoked indirectly by the copresence of several other passages devoted exclusively to Martial's Spanish homeland (13, 103, 104), and epigrams in which he expresses in bitter, direct terms his weariness of the numerous, pointless obligations of *clientela* and his exhaustion with chaotic city life (see especially epigrams 70 and 74).

Countryside and province thus become the main focus of the book. However, they are not portrayed solely in themselves as in the epigrams dealing with vacation themes in Martial's other books,[10] but in the context of repeated and express juxtapositions where they form a positive antipode to draining city life. In not one of his other books are we met with such a marked antithesis,[11] surprisingly not even in the third book, where the subject is Martial's stay in Cispadana, which he explains as a reaction to an edict by Domitian that made the lives of the poorest people under the *clientes* even harder. Although the third book contains several epigrams concerning the Cispadane territory, nowhere does one find the landscape and peacefulness of Cispadana

[9] *Domus* usually designates the house in the city. Variations on the theme in 8.68 and 12.57.18–25, in which the *domus* of Sparsus is referred to as a *rus in urbe* (line 21). See also the end of 3.58, which, however, also contains a polemical nuance against the barren country estate of Bassus: *rus hoc uocari debet, an domus longe?*
[10] See for example 4.57, 5.71, 6.43.
[11] It otherwise only appears in 1.49, 1.55, 2.90.

forming a contrast to the stress of Rome. Not only is there a lack of direct, express comparison between the capital and the province; the epigrams located in Cispadana are in most cases sceptic in tone.[12] In the third book, the critical position taken on life in Rome does not lead to the counterimage of a healthy and positive province.

Epigram 4.25, which praises the small town of Aquileia and its surroundings, appears to be inspired by a critical attitude toward urban life (some of the epigrams in the fourth book refer to the situation in the previous book and the vacation in Cispadana). However, the text consists mainly of a long, detailed enumeration of mythological figures (such as Phaethon, Faunus, Cyllarus) and finds no words to describe the geographical location or to laud the rural calm. It proves to be an elegant exercise in style in which the contrast to life in Rome remains entirely implicit.

Since the motif of country life can be found in many literary genres, it is of course not enough to merely identify its presence in a text: rather, one must investigate how and to what ends it is being employed in each specific case. By looking at factors like the attitude of the "I" in the text or the combination of country life with other *topoi*, one can attempt to answer this central question.[13] For the time being, suffice it to say that the contrast between country and city plays a very minor role in the (Greek and Latin) tradition of epigram (I am referring, of course, to this relationship as it is textually enacted). In Latin, one may recall an epigram of pseudo-Seneca that contrasts villa life to a military or political career, epigram 41 Prato. In this text, the motif is the choice of a life, not an antithesis between city and country. The "I" possesses only a *rus paruum* and a *fenus paruum*, "a little country estate and a little interest", but he also has *quies*, "calm", and happily leaves to others the *operosa castra*, "military camps buzzing with activity", or the *sellae curules*, "curule chairs".

In the fourth century, Naucellius paints a very agreeable picture of his *uilla* in Spoleto, but still does not portray this property in polemical terms as an antithesis to life in Rome. Quite to the contrary: for the wealthy Naucellius, the *uilla* in Spoleto and the *domus* in the capital

[12] Landscape elements only appear in epigrams 67 and 93.8; the scommatic epigrams 16, 56, 57, 59, 91 and 99 should be situated in the context of Cispadana. See Citroni 1987.

[13] A very few mentions of rural life in Roman literature: Kier 1933; Vischer 1965; Leach 1988.

appear to have complemented each other.[14] The Latin genre of epigram thus offers only isolated and scarcely applicable parallels. In the Greek epigram tradition, a strong city-country antithesis is nowhere to be found at all, which is particularly striking in view of the much larger number of Greek than Latin epigrams that have survived the centuries.[15]

It is of relevance here that the specific form of contrast between city and country in Martial's tenth book can be found in satirical poetry, particularly in Horace's *sermo*. The genre of epigram—by nature anything but thematically rigid—expands further with Martial both in this case and others to encompass, assimilate and reshape ways of looking at the world and facets of reality that previously were typical of other genres.

In Horace's hexameter poems, the countryside is a "civilized" landscape: a place of simple, autonomous life—an explicit counterpoise to the *uita occupata* and the obligations of *clientela*.[16] In his *Satires*, this scenario is connected more closely to the writing of poetry (see 2.3 and 6), whereas in his *Epistles*, it is connected more to philosophical considerations. A short, only partial overview: *Satire* 2.6 laments the fruitless *officia* in the city and voices a longing for the Sabinum. An inventory of onerous duties ends with the exclamation:

> O rus quando ego te adspiciam? Quandoque licebit 60
> nunc ueterum libris nunc somno et inertibus horis
> ducere sollicitae iucunda obliuia uitae?
>
> (Hor. *S.* 2.6.60–2)

> O rural home: when shall I behold you! When shall I be able, now with books of the ancients, now with sleep and idle hours, to quaff sweet forgetfulness of life's care![17]

Of central importance here is the thought that people should be able to enjoy their own possessions, a motif that Martial transfers to the patrons Faustinus and Apollinaris in his tenth book. Epistle 1.10 praises

[14] For pseudo-Seneca, see also epigram 72 Prato; on Naucellius see *Epigrammata Bobiensia* 2–9.

[15] Elliger 1975, 376–98.

[16] Most studies on landscape in Horace are devoted to his lyric poetry, see especially Troxler-Keller 1964. On *Sabinum* see i.a. Leach 1993; Schmidt 1997. Observations on the relationship between city and country in the *Epistles* in Hirt 1985 (on 1.1); Ferri 1993, 15–33.

[17] The translations of the Horace quotations are from Fairclough 1926.

the autonomy of life in the country, where Horace "lives and rules" at a safe distance from the rich and powerful (the *reges*) and their friends: life on the Sabinum is not depicted here in isolation, but in the context of a clearly and fundamentally critical stance on life in Rome. Epistle 1.14 addresses the bailiff of the property, whom Horace envies because he can—in contrast to the poet himself—live in the country. Martial closes his description of Apollinaris' *uilla* (10.30) with similar reflections:

> Frui sed istis quando, Roma, permittis? 25
> Quot Formianos inputat dies annus
> negotiosis rebus urbis haerenti?
> O ianitores uilicique felices!
> dominis parantur ista, seruiunt uobis.
>
> (Mart. 10.30.25–9)

> But when does Rome allow him to enjoy all this? How many Formian days does the year chalk up for one involved in the city's busy affairs? Lucky janitors, lucky bailiffs! These delights are acquired for their owners, but it is you they serve.

The combination of the city-country antithesis with the topical servant-master contrast creates a specific connection between the two texts: and this connection is in its turn a clue of the relationship between the genres to which these texts belong and of their modes of representing reality. Martial's tenth book portrays the country as the antipode to the city without seeking a compromise between the two scenarios and ways of life. This attitude points much more strongly to the tradition of satire than to that of epigram.

A privileged relationship can be established between Martial and Horace's first book of *Epistles* in particular. Martial gives the biographical fact of his own return to Celtiberia literary form by referring to Horace's secluded life on the Sabinum and his longing for the countryside. Often, authors of antiquity (as well those of the modern age) select elements from their own lives and impart meaning to them through literary reminiscences. "The fact that literature talks about literature not only does not prevent it from talking about the world as well;"[18] the literary tradition and intertextual references are indeed decisive in portraying the world and in characterizing the "I".

[18] According to Compagnon 1998, 133. See also Citroni 1993, 275–92, especially 291–2. My interpretation does not intend to call into question the importance of the satirica *persona* in Roman literature as demonstrated by W.S. Anderson and S. Braund in particular. However, I believe that in its "pure form" the function of this element has been exhausted. Today the objective must be to bring complexity and tension into this picture, to replace the rigid idea of the mask with the flexible concept of the "role", and thus to reestablish a connection between the author *within* the text and the author *of* the text. Scholars have long advocated work in this direction (see Conte 1991, 90–1) and do so today with increased urgency: see also the works mentioned in note 32 below, and for more recent positions, Nauta 2002b and Gowers 2003.

Like Horace's first book of *Epistles*, Martial's tenth book depicts the poet as a weary man of advanced age.[19] Like Horace's first book of *Epistles*, it portrays the countryside more as a place of relaxation and calm than as a context that fosters poetic inspiration. In general, the countryside in both books is free of such poetic symbols as holy springs and meadows, and of any images of wild and sublime nature that evoke inspired poetry.[20] With Horace, such images appear almost exclusively in lyric poetry, while with Martial they are extremely rare. Even more important: Martial uses them much more frequently as a compliment to the poetry of powerful patrons than in relation to his own work.[21]

2. *The poet in the city*

Let us turn to the way that our two poets describe the urban *officia*. In this case as well, a privileged intertextual relationship can be identified. The prototype for the description of the *uita occupata* in the capital is a famous passage in Horace's epistle to Florus:

> Praeter cetera me Romaene poemata censes 65
> scribere posse inter tot curas totque labores?
> Hic sponsum uocat, hic auditum scripta relictis

[19] The stylization of the author as an old man in Martial's tenth book is mentioned in passing by Lorenz 2002, 230; he does not interpret it in relation to Horace and comes to other conclusions than I do.

[20] On the relationship between a specific type of landscape and the high genres, I can only mention the words of Maternus (that is, a tragic poet) in Tac. *Dial.* 12, *secedit animus in loca pura atque innocentia, fruiturque sedibus sacris*, and to the poetic symbols in Juv. 7.57–60: it deals with a *uatis egregius* and the genres of lyric and later of epic.

[21] For poetic symbols and poetry of patrons see e.g. 6.47.1–4 (Stella), 7.63.3–4 (Silius Italicus), 8.70.3–5 (Nerva); in 9.58 and 84 the characteristics of a literary landscape in fact refer to Martial's own poetry, but they function to my mind primarily as a compliment to the addressee in question (Sabina, Norbanus) and should be read less as poetological statements.—On the relationship between landscape character and genre in Horace, see also Leach 1993 and Mayer 1994, 47.

omnibus officiis; cubat hic in colle Quirini,
hic extremo in Auentino, uisendus uterque ...
(Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.65–9)

Besides all else, do you think I can write verses at Rome amid all my cares and all my toils? One calls me to be surety, another, to leave all my duties and listen to his writings. One lies sick on the Quirinal hill, another on the Aventine's far side, I must visit both.

Shortly thereafter, the text turns to the subject of chaotic street traffic (lines 72–6) amidst which it is entirely impossible to concentrate on writing poetry: *i nunc et uersus tecum meditare canoros*, "now go, and thoughtfully con melodious verses".

It is significant here that Horace portrays himself not as a common citizen suffering from the noise and obligations, but as a poet in the city. The result of the traffic and the *officia*, therefore, is the impossibility of devoting oneself effectively—undisturbed—to poetry. With Martial, the motif of noise and chaos appears frequently and forms a topos in his descriptions of city life.[22] For us, the crucial point is that he portrays himself in this context as a poet, and that he too complains of the *officia* because they keep him from writing verse. Such laments are particularly bitter in the tenth book (epigrams 58, 70).[23] One may take epigram 70 as an example: a certain Potitus criticizes the poet for his meager production and alleged laziness; Martial answers that it is a wonder if he is even able to finish one book a year since whole days are wasted on meaningless activities: *labantur toti cum mihi saepe dies*, "when whole days often slip away from me". A list of *officia* follows: the *salutatio*, the testimony, the time wasted at an official ceremony or even at the *recitatio* of a poet.

In the tenth book, Martial's topical lamentation on the *uita occupata* is combined with the motif of writing poetry. Here, the time lost in the *officia* is not simply taken from the *uiuere sibi* but is drained from poetry. The vivid, animated image of stressful everyday life in the capital city is thus depicted not from the outside, but by a figure who is a poet, says "I" in the text and casts himself as the self-portrait

[22] See 5.22 and 12.57; the motif also appears i.a. in Sen. *Ep.* 56 and 83.7.

[23] See also 11.24 and the brief mention in the prefatory letter to the twelfth book, where *urbanae occupationes* are the subject. Before this, the motif appears in only two epigrams in the first book, 70 and 108, which deal with the motif of the *salutatio*—an *officium* for which the poet has no time; in both epigrams there are no signs that he is weary of life in Rome, and the *salutatio* is not connected with the list of other irksome or tedious obligations.

of the author—a figure situated and formed within the image itself. In my view, it is precisely this figure of the poet in the city that constitutes the most important intertextual link between Martial's tenth book of *Epigrams* and Horace's *sermo*. The epigrammatic text constructs a first-person narrator who has the role of a poet in Roman society, who shares cultural interests with friends and patrons, and who tells the reader about his activities as a poet. It is a textual construction, which I will call "autobiographical figure", where "figure" has the double meaning of "Gestalt" and "tropos". Concrete biographical details incorporated into this "I" attain symbolic valence: the provincial origins, the relationships to a few close friends, the wearisomeness of urban life, and the desire to retire to the countryside. Horace's model influences not only the character of this "I", but also the selection of details and their function in the text.

I would now like to point out an important difference between the texts examined thus far and Juvenal's satire 3 in order to more precisely define Martial's relationship to the genre of satire. As is well known, Juvenal adopts Horace's image of urban life in this satire. Recall, for example, the image of Rome he paints in lines 235–46 and 254–60: it is impossible to get any sleep, the traffic in the narrow streets pits pedestrians against oncoming cattle and wagons, the surging masses are crushed together in chasm-like passageways, and a beam transported on a cart swings back and forth precariously.

The figure leaving the city behind in Juvenal's satire is Umbricius—that is, an "other voice":[24] Horace, in contrast, portrays an autobiographical figure who is exhausted by the *officia* and spends as much time as possible on the Sabinum. Martial tells of his vacations (in his third, fourth and sixth books)[25] and of his return to Spain (in the tenth and twelfth books). Furthermore, Juvenal's Umbricius is scarcely fleshed out as an individual at all: he himself and his everyday life and experiences are given only extremely limited space within the text, and the chaos of Rome is described more "from the outside" than through its specific effects on the situation of the narrator.

[24] Umbricius should not be understood as the *alter ego* of Juvenal, although he shares many views and positions with him. See Adamietz 1971, 10 and Braund 1988, 12–5.

[25] On the third book, see note 12 above; in the fourth book, see especially 57, in the sixth book, see especially 43.

Two general remarks: first, Juvenal is seldom portrayed as a figure involved in the action in his first three books of satire—his figure never plays a role in the scenes and situations that the text portrays. Second, in the last satirist's entire *corpus*, the idea that Rome's noise and chaos pose an obstacle to writing poetry or intellectual concentration is not mentioned a single time. It appears that the complex of motifs contained in the epistle to Florus is divided down the middle, with Martial describing the "I" as a poet in the city, and Juvenal describing the city itself, the latter producing an account that is equally tendentious but whose subjectivity takes other paths than first-person narrative. In contrast to Horace und Martial, Juvenal's oeuvre contains no figure of the poet and intellectual that can be read as a self-portrait: only in his programmatic first satire does the "I" refer to himself as a satirist[26] and not even in the seventh satire does the narrator portray himself as an individual, although the theme (the critical situation of intellectuals in Rome) would have offered this possibility.[27]

Against the background of the approach pursued thus far, an interpretation of the history of the genre of satire begins to emerge that I can only briefly sketch out here. One important tendency leads toward a gradually increasing selection and reduction of certain motifs (for example: *parrhesia*, irony, "autobiography").[28] What is relevant for us is the reduction and ultimate disappearance of the figure of the poet altogether: a figure who says "I" in the text, who has the same name as the historical author and relays episodes and details from the life of an intellectual in Roman society. With Lucilius and Horace, the nuanced and complex portrayal of such an "I" can be reconstructed. The satirists of the imperial age, on the contrary, tend to be observers of a picture in which they themselves seldom appear as active participants. With Persius, the portrayal of the "I" appears in the context of friendship and *sermo* in only two places: in the homage to the teacher Cornutus at the beginning of satire 5 and in the incipit of satire 6, which starts as an epistle to Caesius Bassus. These are two occurrences *in limine* of each satire, two places that differ unmistakably from the rest of Persius' work. In the early Juvenal, there is not a single case of an "I" depicted as an autobiographical figure.[29]

[26] Verses 15–8 of the first satire also contain a short "autobiographical" sketch. See Keane 2002.

[27] In the seventh satire, one encounters only a very general-sounding *nos* (v. 48) that applies to poets and their situation, and scholarship has frequently even perceived an ironic distance in the verses on their sad living conditions: for example, see Braund 1988, 34–43, 54–60. On Juvenal as an "impersonal poet" see Coffey 1976, 136; on the "Zurücktreten der Persönlichkeit" in Juvenal in comparison to Horace, see Wicke 1967, 92–8.

[28] Knoche 1982, 92 discusses the "Einschränkung der Themen" in Juvenal; see also Citroni 1991, 165.

With Lucilius, the element "poet in Roman society" combined with the quality of aggressiveness constituted one pole in the satirical genre, and it played a central role with Horace as well. This element experiences a drastic reduction in imperial satire, leaving behind a void (the autobiographical element, so to speak, which the genre of satire no longer claimed as its own). It is this space that Martial's epigram "occupies". Through insight into the strong internal differentiation and development of the genre between (to put it very schematically) the Augustan und Trajanic epochs, it becomes possible to define the relationship between Martial and the tradition of Roman satire both more precisely and from a new perspective.

In conclusion, the question arises as to the function of references to Horace's *sermo* in Martial. The intertextual variety found in Martial's work—the openness of his texts to models outside the epigrammatic tradition—bears witness to the poet's most ambitious goal, that of lifting the genre of epigram out of occasional poetry and entertainment and rooting it in the literary system.[30] To signal the literary status of his texts, the poet avails himself of complex strategies. Among them, he makes reference to more elevated genres such as satire, epistle and elegy, each of which possesses its own *lignée*, history and place within the literary system. It must be noted that while these genres are higher, they are not *too* high: a close allusion to epic or tragedy might have resulted in bathos, and thus in parody.[31]

The references to Horace emphasized in the preceding are connected to a central component of Martial's poetry: the portrayal and constitution in the text of his own figure as a poet and identity as an

[29] This simplified picture of Juvenal can and should be further differentiated with relation to 1.15–8 (see note 26 above) and to the conclusion of the third *Satire*.

[30] Martial's program of ennobling the epigram is demonstrated by such poetological statements as those in 4.49 and 10.4; 12.94.9 discusses the lower status of the epigram on the scale of the genres. See Citroni 1968.

[31] On the importance of an analysis that does not examine the genres in isolation but rather in the context of their interrelationships within the literary system, see Barchiesi 2002.

intellectual.[32] This component is particularly evident in Book 10, where the decision of returning to Spain represents a turning point, but it operates all over Martial's work: it becomes the clue of a relationship between Martial and Horace, whose textual enactment needs to be further investigated.

Not only does Martial attempt to establish the epigram as part of the literary system by making reference to higher texts; his strategy also entails constructing an identity and history as a poet by referring to the biographies of these same higher texts' authors—here I am thinking not only of Horace but also of Ovid. While the intertextual relationship to Catullus is manifest, rich in *motti* and quotes and thus serves in a sense as a trademark for the genre of epigram, Martial's relationship to Horace is less apparent: its effects, however, are far-reaching in the way that it shapes and orients the relationship between text and world.[33]

[32] See Greenblatt's 1980 concept of self-fashioning and its reception by the scholarly research on Latin poetry, for example in Hinds 1998, 123–44 and Oliensis 1998; whithout express reference to Greenblatt, see Krasser 1995. See also the works mentioned in note 18 above and the bibliography which is inspired by the so-called career criticism, like Cheney and De Armas 2002, even if Horace has not received yet enough attention in this.

[33] This article forms part of a larger research project I am completing on the epigrams of Martial and the Roman literary system. I wish to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) for generously funding this project.

16. THE UNITY OF MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

Lindsay C. Watson

In the first, theoretical section of his *Verstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigram* ("Desultory Remarks on the Epigram"), published in 1771,[1] G.E. Lessing posed the question "What is an epigram?" Rejecting Batteux's view that an epigram is a poem which expounds "an interesting thought, presented felicitously and in a few words",[2] a *breue uiuidumque carmen*, "a short and lively poem", to use Martial's phrase (12.61.1), Lessing arrived at a far more circumscribed position, one which reflected his perception that it is *form*, rather than subject matter, which defines an epigram:[3] an epigram, he stated, consists of two parts, an *Erwartung*, "set up", in which the reader's curiosity is aroused regarding some noteworthy or unusual phenomenon, and an *Aufschluss*, "conclusion", in which the author presents his own, often witty, comment on, or explanation of, the foregoing. The *Erwartung*, in Lessing's schema, corresponded to the monument or object upon which epigrams were originally engraved; the *Aufschluss* to the inscription, or epigram proper, carved upon the physical object, which by its verbal content satisfied the interest of the passer-by, aroused by the sight of the physical structure. Lessing was not the first to propose that an epigram typically exhibits a bipartite structure.[4] But what distinguished him from his predecessors is his insistence on the absolute centrality of this division to the functioning of an epigram. So wedded intellectually was Lessing to the dogma of the bipartite structure that he explicitly denied the label "epigram" to poems exhibiting only one of his two constituent parts, i.e. an *Erwartung* but no *Aufschluss*, or

[1] Lessing 1771, 67–103.
[2] Lessing 1771, 69.
[3] Lessing 1771, 69.
[4] He names as his predecessors in this regard Julius Caesar Scaliger, Vavasseur and Batteux: cf. Barwick 1959, 3, and for further proponents of bipartition, Weinreich 1926, 10–1.