

---

# Martial on Ovid on Ovid: Mart. 11.104, The *Remedia Amoris*, and Saturnalian Poetics\*

CÉDRIC SCHEIDEGGER LÄMMLÉ

ABSTRACT: This article reexamines the interactions of Martial's epigram 11.104 with Ovidian poetry. While previous interpretations have been primarily concerned with Martial's manifest allusion to the *Ars amatoria* in this epigram, its hitherto neglected relations to Ovid's *Remedia amoris* are here taken into consideration. The case is made that Martial systematically alludes to motifs from *Ars amatoria* as well as *Amores* in order to confront them with their respective reworkings in the *Remedia amoris*. Thus, Martial's epigram gives an exemplary reading of the *Remedia amoris* as an *inversion* of Ovid's former works. Ultimately, this engagement with Ovid's *Remedia amoris* stands in the service of Martial's Saturnalian poetics.

A number of scholarly publications have been devoted to Martial's poetic affinities to Ovid,<sup>1</sup> and epigram 11.104—"presumably Martial's

---

\* This article emerges from a paper given at the Joint Research Seminar in Latin Studies of the Universities of Freiburg and Basel (Nov. 2010), organized by Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer (Basel) and Wolfgang Kofler (Freiburg/Innsbruck). Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer read drafts of the article, as did Farouk F. Grewing (Vienna), Stephen E. Hinds (Seattle), and Rebecca Lämmle (Basel), from whose insightful comments I have profited a great deal. I am sincerely grateful to all of the above as well as to *CW*'s anonymous referees and its editors, both incoming and outgoing: Robin Mitchell-Boyask, Lee T. Percy, and Matthew S. Santirocco. All remaining errors are my own.

<sup>1</sup> A. Zingerle, *Martial's Ovid-Studien. Untersuchungen* (Innsbruck 1877); E. Wagner, *De M. Valerio Martiale poetarum Augusteae aetatis imitatore* (Regimonti 1880); E. Siedschlag, "Ovidisches bei Martial," *RFIC* 100 (1972) 156–61; G. B. A. Fletcher, "On Martial," *Latomus* 42 (1983) 404–11; J. P. Sullivan, *Martial, The Unexpected Classic, A Literary and Historical Study* (Cambridge and New York 1991) 105–107; R. A. Pitcher, "Martial's Debt to Ovid," in F. Grewing, ed., *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation* (Stuttgart 1998) 59–76; H. Szelest, "Ovid und Martial," in W. Schubert, ed., *Ovid, Werk und Wirkung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Teil II (Frankfurt 1999) 861–64; C. A. Williams, "Ovid, Martial, and Poetic Immortality:

most ‘Ovidian’ piece”—<sup>2</sup> has always been cited as a prime example. At times Ovid’s presence in 11.104 seemed too obvious to deserve discussion. In his 1877 work *Martial’s Ovid-Studien*, Anton Zingerle pointed to the fact that in this epigram Martial was engaging with Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* and lapidarily stated that Martial’s “open allusion” was “already registered in commentaries.”<sup>3</sup>

It was not until 1997 that the complexity of Martial’s Ovidianness in 11.104 was recognized, when Stephen Hinds showed that the allusion stood in the service of a deliberately tendentious reading of Ovid’s *Ars amatoria*.<sup>4</sup> Hinds’s analysis, however, together with all subsequent interpretations of 11.104, has centered on the epigram’s relation to the *Ars amatoria*. Parting from this exegetical *koine*, I will argue for the co-presence of at least three Ovidian works in 11.104: the *Amores*, the *Ars amatoria* and, above all, the *Remedia amoris*.<sup>5</sup> The epigrammatist systematically confronts motifs from the *Amores* and the *Ars amatoria* with their reuses and reversals in *Remedia amoris* 357–450. This engagement

---

Traces of *Amores* 1.15 in the *Epigrams*,” *Arethusa* 35 (2002) 417–35; S. Casali, “Il popolo dotto, il popolo corrotto. Ricezioni dell’*Ars* (Marziale, Giovenale, la seconda Sulpicia),” in L. Landolfi and P. Monella, eds., *Arte perennat amor. Riflessioni sull’interstualità ovidiana, L’Ars amatoria* (Bologna 2005) 19–36; C. A. Williams, “Identified Quotations and Literary Models: The Example of Mart. 2.41,” in R. R. Nauta, H.-J. Van Dam and J. J. L. Smolenaars, eds., *Flavian Poetry* (Leiden/Boston 2006) 329–48; M. Janka, “*Paelignus, puto, dixerat poeta* (Mart. 2.41.2): Martial’s Intertextual Dialogue with Ovid’s Erotodidactic Poems,” in R. Gibson, S. Green and A. Sharrock, eds., *The Art of Love, Bimillennial Essays on Ovid’s Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris* (Oxford 2006) 279–97; S. E. Hinds, “Martial’s Ovid / Ovid’s Martial,” *JRS* 97 (2007) 113–54; C. Cenni, *Ovidio e Marziale, Tra poesia e retorica* (Ph.D. diss., University of Bologna, 2009); D. Šterbenc Erker, “Transformationen des poetologischen Programms: Ovid und die Epigramme Martials,” in P. L. Gatti and N. Mundt, eds., *Undique mutabant atque undique mutabantur* (Göttingen 2012) 102–26.

<sup>2</sup> Janka (above, n.1) 292; cf. Casali (above, n.1) 51 (“Marziale ovidianissimamente si rivolge alla ‘moglie’”).

<sup>3</sup> Zingerle (above, n.1) 20 (“*offene Anspielung bereits in Commentaren vermerkt*”, my emphasis). For interpretations of 11.104 see Pitcher (above, n.1) 74–75; S. E. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext, Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge 1998) 129–35; N. Holzberg, *Martial und das antike Epigramm* (Darmstadt 2002) 115–19; Janka (above, n.1) 292–96; D. Lavigne, “Embodied Poetics in Martial 11,” *TAPA* 138/2 (2008) 275–311; Cenni (above, n.1) 108–15.

<sup>4</sup> Hinds (above, n.3) 133–35.

<sup>5</sup> This approach is indebted to Hinds’ 2007 article (above, n.1), which highlights Martial’s role as a reader of Ovid’s *opera omnia* (e.g., 121). However, Hinds did not revisit poem 11.104 (118–19).

with Ovidian poetry can be interpreted as both an epitome of Martial's Saturnalian poetics and as a Saturnalian appropriation of Ovid's poetry.

### I. Ovid on Ovid's Obscene Precepts<sup>6</sup>

At the center of his *Remedia amoris* (357–450), Ovid enters into a delicate field of teaching: how can a pupil who is convalescent from amorous suffering, but is not yet cured, sleep with his *domina* without being, once more, entangled in Amor's net? The lesson's concern is sex without love and thus an objectionable subject matter. Ovid shows himself to be aware of this as he hesitates to pursue his lecture: *pudor est mihi dicere* (359). With this (of course, disingenuous) assertion of his own pudency, Ovid interrupts his teachings in order to respond to recent criticism: he has been accused of his works' licentiousness. In his response, Ovid does not disavow the accusation. On the contrary, in an elaborate excursus he demonstrates that the criticized contents were, as a matter of fact, prompted by his obedience and devotion to poetic decorum. Wittily, obscene writing is explained as a hyper-dogmatic application of poetic doctrine such as it was proclaimed in Horace's *Ars poetica*.<sup>7</sup> Ovid's poetics finds its most striking expression in the confrontation of Andromache with the hetaera Thais in *Remedia amoris*:

quis ferat *Andromaches* peragentem Thaida partes?  
 peccet, in *Andromache* Thaida quisquis agat.  
Thais in arte mea est; lascivia libera nostra est;  
 nil mihi cum vitta; Thais in arte mea est.

(*Rem.* 383–386)

Who could tolerate Thais playing the part of an Andromache? And whoever plays Andromache like a Thais commits a sin. Thais is the subject of my art, my licentiousness is unrestrained. I have nothing to do with hairbands, Thais is the subject of my art.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In this section, I present a revised version of the argument in C. Scheidegger Lämmle, "Medio Veneris in usu. L'obscénité et sa critique," in L. Chappuis-Sandoz, ed., *Au-delà de l'épigramme d'amour, Métamorphoses et renouvellements d'un genre latin dans l'Antiquité et à la Renaissance* (Paris 2011) 101-107.

<sup>7</sup> On the poetological excursus in *Remedia amoris* in its relation to Hor. *Ars* 73–87, see R. K. Gibson, *Excess and Restraint, Propertius, Horace, and Ovid's Ars amatoria* (London 2007) 126–42; Scheidegger Lämmle (above, n.6) 90–94.

<sup>8</sup> Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own.

In their opposition, Thais and Andromache do not only epitomize erotic versus nonerotic subject matter but also grand versus humble literary styles and genres. Obviously, Andromache is a figure firmly rooted in the epic tradition exemplified by Homer and Vergil in the preceding lines (*Rem.* 365–368, 373–374, 381–382).<sup>9</sup> Using theatrical terms in 383–384, however, Ovid also draws attention to her post-Trojan suffering shown on the tragic stage.<sup>10</sup> Thais, on the other hand, is a notorious Athenian hetaera, alleged lover of Alexander the Great and (a little later) Ptolemy Soter; her life too is fit for enactment on stage, but clearly her dramatic career is confined to comedy.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, Thaidas appear in other, more open literary forms like epigram and anecdote.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Moreover, her name makes her the virtual incarnation of Vergil's epic program (ἀνὴρ + μάχη ≈ *arma uirumque*): As a poem's *incipit* was used as an alternative title in antiquity (R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Bibliographie* [Frankfurt 1977] 217–21; J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores, Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes, Volume II: A Commentary on Book One* [Leeds 1989] 11 on *Ov. Am.* 1.1) puns on Vergil's *arma uirumque* are unsurprisingly frequent. See also S. E. Hinds, "Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius," in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, Mass., and London 2000) 234, n.14.

<sup>10</sup> For Andromache as a tragic heroine, see Eur. *Andr.*, *Tr.*; Soph. *Hermione*, *TrGF* IV *fr.* 202–203 (p. 192–195); Andron. *Hermiona*, *TRF<sup>3</sup>* p. 4; Pac. *Hermiona*, *TRF<sup>3</sup>* *fr.* 1–24, p. 109–113 (= *fr.* 119–142 Schierl); Enn. *Andromacha aechmalotis*, *TRF<sup>3</sup>* *fr.* 1–13, p. 26–30 (= 74–111 Joc.); Acc. *Astyanax*, 265–286 Dangel. The title *Andromache* is attested for three plays: a tragedy by Sophocles (*TrGF* IV 10 *fr.* 125; the testimony is of dubious value: see Radt in *TrGF* IV, 155), a tragedy by Antiphon (*TrGF* I 55 *fr.* 1), and an *atellana* by Novius (*CRF<sup>3</sup>* 308).

<sup>11</sup> For the "historical" Thais, see D.S. 17.72.2; Curt. 5.7.3–5; Plu. *Alex.* 38; Ath. 13.576d–e (= Clitarch., *FGrH* 137 F 11). For Thais as comic figure, see Men., *PCG* VI.2 *fr.* 163–69 (pp. 122–27); Hipparch.Com., *PCG* V *fr.* 3 (p. 607); Afran., *CRF<sup>3</sup>* *fr.* 1–2 (pp. 247–48); Ter. *Eu.* K. Fiehn ("Thais," *RE* V A.1 [1934] 1184–85 gives further references. See also P. A. Iversen, "Menander's *Thais*: 'hac primum iuuenum lascivos lusit amores'," *CQ* 61 (2011) 186–91; A. Traill, "Menander's *Thais* and the Roman poets," *Phoenix* 55 (2001) 284–303 on the influence of Menander's *Thais* on Roman poetry; E. Gavoille, "La comédie de l'amour dans l'*Ars* et les *Remedia amoris*," in I. Jouteur, ed., *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne* (Nancy 2009) 67–88 on the presence of comedy in *Ars* and *Remedia*.

<sup>12</sup> See *AP* 5.161, arguably attributable to Asclepiades (see Sens 2011, xcix, 267–77); later evidence (unsurprisingly) suggests that the name Thais was frequent in erotic contexts: Luc. *DMeretr.* 1, 3, 2; Alciph. 4.6, 4.7, 4.14; Aristaenet. 2.16. Ath. 13.585d mentions *apophthegnata* by a hetaera of that name. In Latin literature, Thais is mentioned as a typical Greek hetaera (e.g., Prop. 2.6.1–6; *Ov. Ars* 3.603–604), often with reference to her status as a figure in (Menandrian) comedy (*Var. Men.* *fr.* 301–302 Astbury; Prop. 4.5.41–44; *Juv.* 3.93–96; 6.O25–26). Martial mentions Menander's *Thais* in his *Apophoreta* (14.187), while the name Thais appears eight times in his *Epigrams*, almost invariably in the context of misogynous abuse (*Mart.* 3.8; 3.11; 4.12; 4.50; 4.84; 5.43; 6.93; 11.101).

Unsurprisingly, it is Thais, not Andromache, whom Ovid appropriates as the poster girl of his elegiac writing: His claim that “Thais is present in my *Art*”, on the one hand, is a comment on his *Art of Love*, the work he purports to be defending against unjust criticism; on the other hand, it is the announcement of his poetic program for the future. Thais embodies Ovidian love elegy and its lascivious poetics. Her emblematic status is emphasized by the *versus reciproci* 385–386 and the fourfold repetition of her name.

The poetological sophistry by which Ovid credits his poetry’s wantonness to the exigencies of artistic decorum occupies fourteen distichs. Only then can Ovid return to his promised subject matter of sex without love (399). His precepts are simple and straightforward: before getting involved with his *domina*, Ovid’s trainee is exhorted to sleep with *any* other woman (401–404). Then, he is to make love to his *domina* in the position that least suits her (406–410); he is to open all bedroom windows and contemplate her genitalia in broad daylight (411–412); and after orgasm, when man is prone to postcoital tristesse, he is to observe all details and imprint them on his memory (413–418): the sight of her genitalia (again!), the dirty sheets on the bed (429–432), and maybe even a glimpse of the woman relieving herself (437–438). This mnemotechnics of loathing is followed by Ovid’s advice to court (at least) two women at any one time. As love and lust are split between two objects, Amor’s power will be curtailed, and man will regain control over the situation. With five distichs, this is the most extensive of all recommendations (441–450).

Ovid’s critics will have rubbed their eyes in disbelief, since this passage is without any doubt among the most objectionable that Ovid has ever written. To be sure, he has abstained from primary obscenities and thus respected linguistic decency. But even so, Ovid has departed from the norms of elegiac writing and moved toward the register and typical motifs of satire and epigram.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> C. Brunelle, “Ovid’s Satirical Remedies,” in R. Ancona and E. Greene, eds., *Gendered Dynamic in Latin Love Elegy* (Baltimore 2005) 148–55. On sexual language in the different poetic genres, see J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London 1982) 218–25; T. Schmitz, “*Cetera quis nescit*: Verschwiegene Obszönität in der Liebesdichtung Ovids,” *Poetica* 30 (1998) 318–29. See also A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus, Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, rev. ed. (New York and Oxford 1992) 164–209.

The lesson on antierotic sexuality is interrupted by an extensive poetological excursus (359–398) and resumed only after a break of forty verses, a discontinuity stressed by Ovid himself.<sup>14</sup> Yet, it has been shown that Ovid's excursus and the surrounding practical guide to sex without love are closely interrelated.<sup>15</sup> Also the vignette of virtuous Andromache and lascivious Thais (*Rem.* 385–386) interacts with Ovid's indecent teachings in *Remedia amoris* 399–450 and proves crucial for their understanding. To appreciate this interaction, we need to go back to Ovid's *Ars amatoria*. Somewhat surprisingly, Andromache, who in *Remedia amoris* 383–386 is almost banned from the realm of Ovidian poetry, is a prominent figure in his *Ars amatoria*.<sup>16</sup>

In the *Ars amatoria*, Andromache's portrayal is determined by debasement and sexualization.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, she figures precisely in those passages of the *Ars amatoria* that have most likely earned Ovid the accusation of indecency to which he responds in *Remedia amoris* 361–398. When she first enters onto the stage of Ovidian erotodidaxis in *Ars amatoria* 2, her excessive size is mentioned as a defect in her appearance: *omnibus Andromache uisa est spatiosior aequo: / unus, qui modicam*

---

<sup>14</sup> In 397 he ostensibly concludes the excursus in which he has “responded to envy up to this point” (*hactenus*), while in 399 the didactic formula *ergo ubi* in 399 marks a new beginning.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. E. Woytek, “*In medio et mihi Caesar erit. . .*”: Vergilimitationen im Zentrum von Ovids *Remedia amoris*,” *WS* 113 (2000) 181–213; Scheidegger Lämmle (above, n.6) 87–90.

<sup>16</sup> She appears five times in the *Ars* (2.645–46, 707–11; 3.107–10, 517–23, 777–78), and is the only figure to be featured in both the erotic catalogues at the ends of *Ars* 2 and 3. As A. Barchiesi (“Women on Top: Livia and Andromache,” in R. Gibson, St. Green and A. Sharrock, eds., *The Art of Love. Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris* [Oxford 2006] 108) observes, she is thus much more present than Thais who is mentioned only once in the *Ars* (3.604).

<sup>17</sup> She is twice adduced as a positive exemplum (2.707–11; 3.777–778) while the other instances show her in a negative light. Barchiesi (above, n.16) 108 suggests that the sequence of positive and negative passages can be read as a didactic mini-narrative: “It almost looks as if she serves as a model for the reader and the pupil of the *Ars*; she begins as a resisting reader and ends up as a transformed pupil.” The degradation and sexualization of Andromache, however, pervades all passages and is even present where she is most drastically dismissed as an erotic role model: In *Ars* 3.517–523, Ovid deems all “sad women” unattractive and states that he would not believe that Andromache and Tecmessa had ever slept with their husbands had they not given birth (*cogar credere partu*, 3.521): the existence of children as the only (and still not convincing) indication of someone's sexual activity is a typical insult of scoptic epigram. In Andromache's case, however, it is particularly (and, I think, deliberately) hurtful as her post-Trojan fate was determined by enslavement and sexploitation.

*diceret, Hector erat* (“Everybody thought that Andromache was too tall: Hector was the only one to call her medium-sized,” *Ars* 2.645–646). In accord with Ovid’s doctrine, her lover Hector glosses over her imperfection. Yet her disproportion is highlighted as Ovid describes her as *spatiosior*, a strikingly inappropriate adjective for a woman. We might even wonder whether *spatiosa*, in accord with traditions of scoptic poetry, qualifies her genitals.<sup>18</sup> If not here, Andromache’s private parts attract the *erotodidaskalos*’ attention towards the end of *Ars amatoria* 2 when he moves on to teach his pupils how to sleep with their girls. The muse of Ovidian poetry is told to wait in front of the closed bedroom doors (2.704), and her exclusion might give the impression of decorous reticency on the author’s part. Far from it. *Inter alia*, Ovid encourages his students to manually stimulate their mistresses “down there” (*in partibus illis*, 2.707). This is what Hector used to do with his Andromache:

inuenient digiti, quod agant in partibus illis,  
 in quibus occulte spicula tingit Amor.  
 fecit in Andromache prius hoc fortissimus Hector,  
 nec solum bellis utilis ille fuit.

(*Ars* 2.707–710)

The fingers will know what to do in those parts where Amor secretly plunges his arrows. This is what brave Hector did with his Andromache in days of old; war was not his only talent.

From Homer onwards, the marriage of Hector and Andromache was considered a prime example of marital truthfulness and devotion. In Ovid, their exemplarity is narrowed down to the realm of sex. At the end

---

<sup>18</sup> We have no clear attestation of *spatiosus* in a scoptic context. However, as *spatiosus* can designate “that which provides a large space” (e.g. *aditus complures et spatiosos*, *Vitr.* 5.3.5; *loca . . . quam maxime spatiosa*, *Quint. Inst.* 11.18; a meaning not well-defined in *OLD* s.v.), a sexual *sous-entendu* is conceivable, possibly, along the lines of *Carm. Priap.* 18 (Priapus loquitur): *Commoditas haec est in nostro maxima pene, / laxa quod esse mihi femina nulla potest* (with an etymologizing pun on *commoditas*; cf. *Ars* 2.646: *unus, qui modicam diceret, Hector erat*). Derision of a woman’s “loose vagina” is frequent in scoptic epigram, especially in invectives against aged women; see K. Prinz, *Martial und die griechische Epigrammatik, 1. Teil* (Vienna and Leipzig 1911) 74–77; F. J. Brecht, *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms* (Leipzig 1930), 56; V. Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum* (Munich 1962) 88–91; Adams (above, n.13) 95–96, 172–74; Richlin (above, n.13) 67–69, 109–16. See also *AP* 5.204 (Mel.); *Mart.* 3.93.26–27; 11.21; *Priap.* 12.10–15, 46.5; and *Rufinus Epigr.* 21 Page (= *AP* 5.60) with R. Höschle, *Verrückt nach Frauen, Der Epigrammatiker Rufin* (Tübingen 2006) 113–19.

of *Ars amatoria* 3, Hector and Andromache again figure prominently in an erotically charged catalogue. Again, Ovid lectures on proper sexual conduct, but this time his advice is addressed to the female readership: A woman should have sex only in the *one* position that shows her in the best possible light. Moral decency gives way to purely formal decorum. The Apollonian imperative of self-knowledge, as voiced by the god in *Ars amatoria* 2.497–510, is the prerequisite for a woman’s correct behavior:

nota sibi sit quaeque: modos a corpore certos  
 sumite: non omnes una figura decet.  
 quae facie praesignis erit, resupina iaceto:  
 spectentur tergo, quis sua terga placent.  
 Milanion umeris Atalantes crura ferebat:  
 si bona sunt, hoc sunt accipienda modo.  
 parua uehatur equo: quod erat longissima, numquam  
 Thebais Hectoreo nupta resedit equo.

(*Ars* 3.771–778)

Every woman must know herself: Choose the technique according to your body. One single position does not suit all women. She who has a remarkable face should lie on her back; those who like their backs should be seen from behind. Milanion carried Atalante’s legs on his shoulders; if the legs are beautiful, this is the way to take them. A small woman should ride astraddle: because she was gigantic, the Theban bride has never straddled her Hectorean horse.

Andromache is cited as a natural practitioner of Ovidian teachings as she never straddled her husband. Cowgirl position is the preserve of short women. Even if Ovid here refrains from depicting Andromache riding Hector and shows it only *ex negativo*, his text is deliberately suggestive: Is it possible to picture her “not-riding” her husband? As Alessandro Barchiesi has shown, Ovid thus playfully questions Homer’s depiction of Hector as “Tamer of the Horses,” while his description of Andromache as *longissima Thebais* evokes Callimachean *Stilkampf* where conflicting aesthetic principles are represented by slender and large women respectively.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Barchiesi (above, n.16) 108–109 with n.27 (“indeed a threatening definition for a post-Callimachean and anti-Antimachean poet”); Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.9–12 Pf. with A. Harder, *Callimachus: Aetia, vol. 2: Commentary* (Oxford 2012), 32–44. On the motif in Latin literature, see Catul. 86; *Ov. Am.* 2.4 with J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores, Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes, Volume III: A Commentary on Book Two* (Leeds

In the *Remedia amoris*, Andromache appears as a paragon of morality and is opposed to the promiscuous hetaera Thais (383–384). In light of her roles in the *Ars amatoria*, we need to reevaluate this antithesis: Is Andromache really that different from the Athenian prostitute? Indeed, it is only a small step from *Thebais* to *Thais*.<sup>20</sup> If Hector's overly tall wife is shortened by a single syllable, she becomes identical to the hetaera whose antagonist she should be according to the *Remedia amoris*. Moreover, their interchangeability is highlighted in the only instance of the *Ars amatoria* where Thais is mentioned (*Ars* 3.601–610). Here, Ovid precisely shows the lascivious lover pretending to be a married *matrona*.<sup>21</sup>

It is noteworthy that this comparison with *Thais* in *Remedia amoris* 383–384 is the only instance in the *Remedia amoris* where Andromache is mentioned. Here, her name appears twice in a single distich. In its immediate context, Ovid touches on the subject of the least lustful, most loveless sexual practices. Among other things, he advises his readers to have sex only in the least fitting *figura Veneris: et pudet, et dicam: uenerem quoque iunge figura, / qua minime iungi quamque decere putas* (“I am ashamed and yet I will say it: choose the very position for intercourse which you think will least fit your girl,” *Rem.* 407–408).

This is one of the instances in the *Remedia amoris* where Ovid directly engages with his *Ars amatoria* and inverts its doctrines.<sup>22</sup> There, he advocated choosing only the most appealing sex position, praising Andromache for her compliance with this rule. Here, he inverts it and negates the desirability of “decorous” intercourse. As Andromache's name precedes the revised sex advice in the *Remedia amoris*, the reader is prompted to think back to her role in the related passage in the *Ars amatoria*, and the negation of the *Ars amatoria* is negated once more in

---

1998) 78–80; A. M. Keith, “*Corpus eroticum*: Elegiac poetics and elegiac *puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*,” *CW* 88 (1994) 33–35. On Antimachus' epic entitled *Thebais*, see V. J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon, Text and Commentary* (Leiden 1996) 20–26, 64–76 (on the ancient reception of Antimachus).

<sup>20</sup> Barchiesi (above, n.16) 109.

<sup>21</sup> Gibson (above, n.7) 36–37 with n.97.

<sup>22</sup> With Ovid's assertion that he will expound the rules of lovemaking in spite of his *pudor* (compare *Rem.* 359–60, 407 with *Ars* 2.704; 3.769–70) and with the technical term *figura* (compare *Rem.* 407–408 with *Ars* 2.679; 3.772), the *Remedia* clearly evokes the respective endings of *Ars* 2 and 3; Gibson (above, n.7) 142. K. Prinz (“Untersuchungen zu Ovids *Remedia amoris*,” *WS* 36 [1914] 47) counts 42 precepts in the *Remedia amoris*, 16 of which can be traced back to the *Ars*. See also I. Frings, *Das Spiel mit eigenen Texten, Wiederholung und Selbstzitat bei Ovid* (Munich 2005) 126–40.

the *Remedia amoris*. To spell out what the text suggests: Andromache shall not *not* ride her husband. This reading fits in with the results of recent studies which have established that *Remedia amoris* 389–420 is pervaded by allusions to Vergil’s *Georgics* and especially his teaching on husbandry and the mating of livestock—that is, of cattle and of horses.<sup>23</sup>

## II. The Erotics of Antierotic Teachings

In epigram 11.104 Martial retraces the Ovidian movement from *Ars amatoria* to *Remedia amoris* as he engages with Ovid’s lesson on antierotic sexuality in *Remedia amoris* 357–450. Martial’s epigram, written *ex persona poetae*, is a letter of complaint to his wife:<sup>24</sup>

Uxor, vade foras aut moribus utere nostris:  
     non sum ego nec Curius nec Numa nec Tattius.  
 me iucunda iuvant tractae per pocula noctes:  
     tu properas pota surgere tristis aqua.  
 tu tenebris gaudes: me ludere teste lucerna      5  
     et iuvat admissa rumpere luce latus.  
 fascia te tunicaeque obscuraque pallia celant:  
     at mihi nulla satis nuda puella iacet.  
 basia me capiunt blandas imitata columbas:  
     tu mihi das aviae qualia mane soles.      10  
 nec motu dignaris opus nec voce iuvare  
     nec digitis, tamquam tura merumque pares:  
 masturbabantur Phrygii post ostia servi,  
     Hectoreo quotiens sederat uxor equo,  
 et quamvis Ithaco stertente pudica solebat      15  
     illic Penelope semper habere manum.  
 pedicare negas: dabat hoc Cornelia Graccho,  
     Julia Pompeio, Porcia, Brute, tibi;

<sup>23</sup> Woytek (above, n.15) 208–13; Scheidegger Lämmle (above, n.6) 108–20. This sexualization of Andromache is especially striking in the context of Ovid’s assertion that Homeric epic provides no space for sexual licence (*Rem. 374: deliciis illic quis locus esse potest?*). Remember that Andromache’s most conspicuous characteristic in the *Ars* is her inordinate size.

<sup>24</sup> For wife read “wife,” i.e., an extension of the poet’s persona which need not (and indeed does not) correspond to extra-literary reality; see J. P. Sullivan, “Martial’s Sexual Attitudes,” *Philologus* 123 (1979) 292–93; Sullivan (above, n.1) 25–26; Williams, *Poetic Immortality* (above, n.1) 453 with n.39. Note however the neo-historical approach to Martial’s marital status taken by P. Watson, “Martial’s Marriage. A New Approach,” *RhM* 146 (2003) 38–48.



(*numquam* vs. *quotiens*). But Martial goes a step further and adds that there were slaves masturbating at the sight and/or sounds (14–15).<sup>27</sup>

In a compelling analysis, Hinds has shown that this detail of the slaves watching from behind the doorposts was an ingenious adaptation of *Ars amatoria* 2, where Ovid had asked the Muse to wait at the closed door (2.704: *ad clausas fores*) as he was moving on to explicitly sexual teachings. Just like Ovid's Muse, Martial's slaves stand *behind* the door; unlike her, however, they keep watching and listening. The motif of voyeurism as well as the change of personnel, from the shy Muse to the shameless slaves, is emblematic of epigram's debasing appropriation of Ovidian elegy.<sup>28</sup> Martial's epigram thus amalgamates the final scenes of books 2 and 3 of *Ars amatoria*, both of which show Hector and Andromache *in eroticis*, and spells out the sexual suggestiveness of the *Ars amatoria*. The evocative power of Ovid's negation gives way to Martial's matter-of-fact statement.

Our interpretation of *Remedia amoris* 357–450, however, suggests a different reading of epigram 11.104. In the *Remedia amoris* Ovid himself plays with the status of Andromache's riding. She has never ridden Hector, has she? At the very least, the fact that *Ars amatoria*'s teachings are negated in the *Remedia amoris* destabilizes the negation of Andromache's ride, which forms part of these teachings. As a reader well versed in Ovidian poetry, Martial will have understood and appreciated Ovid's maneuvers in *Remedia amoris* 357–450. As a writer, he reenacts and intensifies them. Rather than a parody or *Kontrastimitation*, his epigram can be considered a commentary expounding Ovid's erotic insinuations.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> CW's referee suggests that the slaves' excitation is aural rather than visual as *post ostia* seems to preclude any direct view. An iconographical parallel, however, is provided by the Warren Cup where a slave boy observes the lovemaking of a couple from behind a half-closed door; see J. R. Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking. Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art 100 B.C.–A.D. 250* (Berkeley 1998) 66 with fig. 21 and, more generally on the presence of servants in erotic iconography, 96–98. On the slaves' presence in the aristocratic *cubicula*, see also A. M. Riggsby, "'Private' and 'Public' in Roman Culture. The Case of the Cubiculum," *JRA* 10 (1997) 36–56, esp. 44–46. On the relation between erotic literature and contemporary image production, see M. Myerowitz, "The Domestication of Desire: Ovid's *Parva Tabella* and the Theater of Love," in A. Richlin, ed., *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (New York 1992) 131–57.

<sup>28</sup> Hinds (above, n.3) 134–35; Richlin (above, n.13) 159–60.

<sup>29</sup> For a similar intertextual maneuver in Martial 11, see Hinds (above, n.1) 121–22 on Mart. 11.47 as "an allusive recapitulation" of the movement from *Ars* to *Rem*. (see Mart. 11.47.3; Ov. *Ars*. 1.67 and *Rem*. 613–14).

The copresence of *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* in 11.104, however, goes way beyond the exemplum of Andromache. In verses 5–8, Martial emphatically declares that he fancies intercourse in well-lit surroundings; furthermore, he is attracted to full nudity. Here, Martial elaborates on two elegiac motifs, both of which are present in the *Ars amatoria* as well as in the *Remedia amoris*. The objection to inhibiting clothes (*fascia, tunicae, pallia*) can be traced back to *Ars amatoria* 3.271–274, where Ovid teaches his female readership to conceal physical flaws with pieces of clothing such as *fascia*. In contrast, the lovesick male reader of *Remedia amoris* is told to get rid of a woman's *fascia* as quickly as possible (*Rem.* 337–338). Similarly, the question of lighting in the bedroom arises first in the *Amores* and is then developed in both didactic works. In *Amores* 1.5, Ovid has retreated to his bedroom at midday to take a nap when suddenly his mistress appears.<sup>50</sup> As it turns out, the dim light apt for the poet's siesta also suits her epiphany:

pars adaperata fuit, pars altera clausa fenestrae;  
 quale fere siluae lumen habere solent,  
 qualia sublucent fugiente crepuscula Phoebus,  
 aut ubi nox abiit, nec tamen orta dies.  
 illa uerecundis lux est praebenda puellis,  
 qua timidus latebras speret habere pudor.  
 ecce, Corinna uenit. . . .

(*Am.* 1.5, 3–9)

Part of the window was open, part of it was closed; there was the same light that you find in the woods; it was like the twilight when Phoebus is about to leave or when the night is gone but the day has not yet risen. This is the light which must be allowed to shy girls so that they count on the shadows to hide their embarrassment. And behold! Along came Corinna. . . .

---

<sup>50</sup> In this poem, Ovid heavily engages with Prop. 2.15 where the poet speaks of his sexual exploits. See McKeown (above, n.9) 103–105. A striking feature of Propertius' elegy, however, is not shared by *Am.* 1.5: In his narration of the night spent with Cynthia, Propertius puts much emphasis on nudity; although he tells us that things only got wild when the lights went off (4: *sublato lumine*), he somewhat incongruously advocates the importance of the visual in sexual encounters. In verses 9–22, Propertius inserts a proper excursus elaborating on the theme of nudity: to be naked, unsurprisingly, is an essential factor for intercourse and the lovers' eye should appreciate nakedness (12, 23). On Prop. 2.15, see J. Connolly, "Asymptotes of Pleasure: Thoughts on the Nature of Roman Erotic Elegy," *Arethusa* 33/1 (2000) 77–83. As observed by Janka (above, n.1) 295 n.47, Prop. 2.15 offers a suggestive parallel to Mart. 11.104.

Ovid's description of the lighting conditions in his bedroom ends on a prescriptive note: the reader is told that this kind of lighting is *indispensable* to accommodate lady visitors (*est praebenda*). Indeed, Ovid imparts the same piece of advice to his male pupils in his capacity as *praeceptor amoris* (*Ars* 2.619–620) and consequently warns his female readership about broad daylight (*Ars* 3.807–808).<sup>31</sup> In the *Remedia amoris*, however, he advocates the exact opposite. Now, sex in harshly lit surroundings is recommended: *tunc etiam iubeo totas aperire fenestras, turpiaque admissis membra notare die* (“then I ask you to open all the windows and to observe, by the admitted daylight, all unseemly parts,” *Rem.* 411–412). Good lighting, in the *Remedia amoris*, is a prerequisite for the pupil's mnemonic efforts: He is urged to detect and memorize all potentially repugnant details: *tunc animo signa, quaecumque in corpore menda est, / luminaque in utrius illius usque tene* (“then imprint on your mind whatever is flawed in her body, and be sure to keep your eyes on her defects,” *Rem.* 417–18).

Here we observe another contrast to the attitudes voiced by Martial: Ovid's disciple must be specifically asked not to avert his gaze (*lumina usque tene*), while Martial, in contrast, boasts that he just cannot get enough of a naked girl: *nulla satis nuda puella* (11.104.8). Indeed, Martial shows himself attracted to everything that Ovid had dismissed from the realm of his *Ars amatoria*. Instead, Martial complies with the sex guide outlined in the *Remedia amoris*, irrespective of the fact that there Ovid aims at repugnant sexual practices as a means to knock love out of his students' heads. The epigrammatist's persona thus epitomizes the genre's attraction to, and interest in, grotesque sexuality.<sup>32</sup> On the other

---

<sup>31</sup> These passages are emblematic of the dynamic relations Ovid establishes between his works: Here, the *Ars amatoria* can be understood as an elaboration on, and didactic exploitation of themes present in the *Amores*. See Frings (above, n.22) 101–25.

<sup>32</sup> In his sexual fanfaronade, Martial resembles the ever-salacious god Priapus who indiscriminately lusts for just about anyone; see J. P. Hallett, “*Nec castrare velis meos libellos*. Sexual and Poetic *lusus* in Catullus, Martial, and the *Carmina Priapea*,” in C. Klodt, ed., *Satura lanx: Festschrift für W. A. Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim 1996) 321–44; S. Lorenz, *Erotik und Panegyrik, Martials epigrammatische Kaiser* (Tübingen 2002) 34–40. The theme of grotesque sexuality is especially prominent in book 11, which is informed by Saturnalian transgressiveness: *Mart.* 11.2; 11.6; 11.15; 11.16; 11.17; 11.20. See Kay (above, n.26) 57–59 (on *Mart.* 11.2); Sullivan (above, n.24) 289; Sullivan (above, n.1) 46–48 66–69, 219; A. L. Spisak, “Martial's *Theatrum* of Power Pornography,” *SyllClass* 5 (1995) 84–85; Hinds (above, n.3) 134–35; Lavigne (above, n.3) 289; V. Rimell, *Martial's Rome, Empire and the Ideology of Epigram* (Cambridge 2008) 162–64.

hand, Martial provides a reading of the *Remedia amoris* that explicates and amplifies the sexual irreverence already present in Ovid.

### III. Martial, Lais, and Thais

Towards the end of epigram 11.104, Martial seeks to reconcile his wife's high morality with his own base desires, proposing an unorthodox compromise: chaste throughout the day, she could satisfy his needs by night. Interestingly, Martial evokes the two opposing roles by citing two exempla: *si te delectat gravitas, Lucretia toto / sis licet usque die: Laida nocte volo* ("if grave manners please you, you may be Lucretia all day: at night I want Lais," 11.104, 23–24).

The antithesis of chaste Lucretia and lascivious Lais dovetails with traditions of erotic epigram where a poet/lover spends due care to evaluate his potential lovers before he commits to any one of them.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, it specifically recalls Ovid's *Remedia amoris* with the opposition of Andromache and Thais at its center. In both Martial and Ovid, a mythico-historical matron renowned for pudency is sharply contrasted to a shameless prostitute. Furthermore, in both cases the comparison is of dubious value; just as a reader of Ovid's *Ars amatoria* must be astonished to find Andromache cited as an embodiment of moral integrity in the *Remedia amoris*, so a reader of Martial's epigrams will not fully believe in Lucretia's respectability.

In epigram 11.16, one of the programmatic opening poems to the eleventh book, Martial has already explored the relations between his poetry and stern Roman morality. At the outset of the epigram, he bans all austere readers from the world of his poetry (*potes abire*, 1), but we learn soon enough that even the most dignified representatives of

---

<sup>53</sup> For the motif of a *synkrisis* between lascivious and chaste women, see Hor. *S.* 1.2; Phld. *Epigr.* 6 Sider (=21 Gow/Page; *AP* 11.34); *Epigr.* 11 Sider (=16 Gow/Page; *AP* 12.173). *Epigr.* 6 is particularly interesting as it plays on the impossibility of distinguishing both types. At first, Philodemus seems to dismiss a prostitute (πορνή) in order to marry a young maid (παρθενική); at a second glance, however, a reader will notice that the maid's attributes are virtually the same as those given to the prostitute. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (*The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams, vol. II: Commentary and Indexes* [Cambridge 1968] 391) remark: "It looks as though Philodemus is saying in effect 'I will give up champagne, cigars, and chorus-girls and content myself with claret, Turkish cigarettes, and a young wife.'" For the motif in the wider context of Greek epigram, see Brecht (above, n.18) 52, 57–58.

Roman propriety succumb to the priapic ecstasy of Martial's Saturnalian verse.<sup>34</sup> Among them, we find Lucretia who only feigns her disapproval of obscene poetry but returns to the book as soon as her chaperone recedes.<sup>35</sup> Lucretia's moral standing then is not beyond dispute—quite like Andromache's in Ovid.

But if Martial's pairing of Lucretia and Lais in 11.104 is indeed modeled on the Ovidian antithesis of Andromache and Thais, how can we account for the shift in personnel? Andromache is cast as one of the erotic exempla and could not very well be cited as a symbol of pudency at the same time, while Lucretia better suits the context of Martial's Saturnalian epigrams where good old Rome is ever-present. But why Lais, not Thais? Of course, Lais is a frequent name for prostitutes and has no less scandalous a ring to it than Thais—a hetaera from Corinth by the name of Lais is variously remembered as one of the most successful practitioners of her trade. Just like Thais, Lais is mentioned in comedy and frequently cited as a paradigm for female allure.<sup>36</sup> Thus, Martial's mentioning of Lais aptly balances Lucretia.

In the light of the epigram's interactions with *Remedia amoris* 357–450, however, it is worthwhile to reassess the *lectio* of some late manuscripts according to which Martial's hetaera in 11.104 was called Thais.<sup>37</sup> As we have seen, Ovid named the hetaera four times in *Reme-*

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Spisak (above, n.32) 83–85; Lavigne (above, n.3) 291–93.

<sup>35</sup> As noted by Lavigne (above, n.3) 294, Martial thus rewrites the traditional story of Lucretia who had maintained her impeccable lifestyle also in the *absence* of a male guardian. According to Livy, her virtue was proven when Collatinus returned unexpectedly (Liv. 1.57: *necopinato viri adventu*). Moreover, he returned *at night* (*nocte sera*), a detail that contrasts with Mart. 11.104 where Lucretia-ness is emphatically confined to daytime (*Lucretia toto / sis licet usque die*, 21–22).

<sup>36</sup> For Lais in ancient literature, see F. Geyer, "Lais," *RE* XII.1 (1924) 513–16 and the extensive account in K. Holzinger, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos* (Vienna 1940), 50–65 (on Ar. *Pl.* 179).

<sup>37</sup> The current editions of Martial give no alternative reading for 11.104.22. However, F. W. Schneidewin (*M. Val. Martialis libri*, 2 vols. [Grimae 1842]), who—like all subsequent editors—prints *Laida*, cites six mss. (from the 15th century) as well as five *incunabula* (printed between 1471–1501) which all read *Thaïda*. Among them are such influential texts as D. Calderini's *commentarii* (first printed in 1474) and the *Aldina* edition from 1501, so that the reading *Thaïda* is indispensable for an understanding of the epigram's posthumanist reception. A. Viti ("Per la storia del testo di Marziale nel secolo XV. I *Commentarii* in *M. Valerium Martialem* di Domizio Calderini," *Eikasmos* 15 [2004] 423) lapidarily counts the reading *Thaïda* among those instances where the commentator was misled by an erroneous humanist conjecture. We have, however, no indication in the mss. that the *lectio Thaïda* originates in conjectural criticism. Accordingly, we cannot preclude

*dia amoris* (*Thaida . . . Thaida . . . Thais . . . Thais*, 385–386) and cast her as the ultimate embodiment of his poetry. If the concluding words of Martial’s epigram were indeed *Thaida nocte uolo* (22), then he would not be craving just another attractive girl but rather be expressing his aspiration to continue Ovid’s poetic legacy. The dénouement of 11.104 would turn out to be a final homage to the poet whom Martial has been recasting throughout the epigram as his predecessor in risqué verse. Moreover, the reading *Thaida* connects our epigram with a pair of preceding poems in book 11. Both in 11.100 and 101, Martial addresses a certain Flaccus and exploits the theme of overly “subtle” women where epigrammatic invective and Callimachean poetics converge.<sup>58</sup> In 11.100, Martial asserts that he “does not want a slender girlfriend” (*habere amicam nolo, Flacce, subtilem*) and describes his anti-ideal in extreme imagery: arms so thin that finger rings can encircle them, bones so protruding that everyone coming close runs the risk of getting hurt. In the epigram immediately following, Martial again addresses Flaccus, who probably does not share Martial’s loathing for skinny women; at least Flaccus is acquainted with a thin girl: *Thaida tam tenuem potuisti, Flacce, videre? / tu, puto, quod non est, Flacce, videre potes* (“Could you see Thais, Flaccus, so thin as she is? I think, Flaccus, you can see what isn’t there,” 11.101)

Her name is Thais. Unlike our Lais/Thais in 11.104, however, she does not inspire Martial with sexual desire. Even if Martial describes her thinness in moderate terms, the juxtaposition of this epigram with the drastic 11.101 suggests that Flaccus’ Thais shares the repellent characteristics of the *amica* so emphatically dismissed by the poet.

Despite the sharp contrast between the skinny girls in 11.100–101 and the desirable hetaera in 11.104, the connection between these three poems should not be easily dismissed. Since we have observed that Martial in 11.104 shows himself attracted to sexual practices rejected by Ovid as undesirable, the contradiction between 11.100–101 (*amicam nolo*) and 11.104 (*Thaida/Laida uolo*) is no reason to rule out a

---

that it goes back to textual witnesses lost today. Moreover, as a confusion of both names, whose interchangeability was even exploited in epigrammatic jokes (see Mart. 3.11), could easily occur in the ms. tradition.

<sup>58</sup> On the motif of small/disproportionate people in Mart. and the epigrammatic tradition, see Brecht (above, n.18) 89–93. For a metapoetic reading, see F. Grewing, “Karneval in Rom: Metapoetische Quisquilien in Martials *Epigrammen*,” *WS* 123 (2010) 149–55, 161–63; for the Callimachean backdrop, see n.19, above.

connection between them. On the contrary, the discourse on tallness and smallness determines Ovid's presentation of Andromache. Her sex life in *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* is dictated by her size: Ovid derides the excessively tall (or excessively loose?)<sup>39</sup> Andromache, then reduces her to the demonym Thebais, and finally exploits her metonymical relations to the hetaera Thais.

Thus, the reading *Thais* in 11.104.22 not only connects a sequence of epigrams (11.100, 101, 104) and contributes to the overall architecture of Martial's poetry book (*concatenatio*), but a sequential reading of these epigrams also reveals another level of sophistication in Martial's engagement with Ovid. The interplay between *Lais/Thais* in 11.104 and *Thais tam tenuis* in 11.101 highlights the intra-Ovidian allusions and mut(il)ations and can ultimately be read as a gloss on Ovidian poetry. If we leave these complex Ovidian allusions aside, it is also worthwhile to read 11.104 against the backdrop of 11.100–101. As we have seen, Martial somewhat indelicately tells his wife that he cannot see enough of naked women (11.104.8). The statement is ironically undermined if the final words of the epigram refer back to the almost incorporeal *Thais* of 11.101. It is hardly surprising then that Martial counts on strong light if his hetaera is so tiny that she can hardly be perceived at all.

#### IV. Enough Is Enough: Encounters Between Elegy and Epigram

So far, our reading shows that both Ovid's *Ars amatoria* and his *Remedia amoris* or, to be more precise, the transition from the former to the latter, occupies a privileged place in Martial's epigram. Building on these observations, I will now turn to the presence of Ovid's *Amores* in 11.104.

In 11.104.8, Martial informs us of his fascination with naked bodies: *at mihi nulla satis nuda puella iacet*. The wording of the verse is slightly irregular: what is qualified by the word *satis*? Does it apply to *nuda*, but then, what does it mean to be "sufficiently naked"? Or does it imply that *one* naked girl is not enough, but two or more would do the trick?<sup>40</sup>

<sup>39</sup> See my comments on *Ars* 2.645–646 in section I above.

<sup>40</sup> The adjective *nudus* can refer to partial nudeness, sometimes specified by an accusative or ablative of respect (OLD s.v. 1c; e.g. *Juv.* 6.122: *nuda papillis*), but *Mart.* 11.104.8 is the only attestation for *nudus* directly qualified by the adverb *satis* (or *parum/nimum*).

In a recent article, Markus Janka has pointed to the strangeness of this phrase, suggesting that it “skilfully echoes” Propertius 1.2.26: *uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est* (“if a girl pleases a man she is sufficiently well-groomed”).<sup>41</sup> This passage, however, does not sufficiently explain Martial’s wording. A pair of Propertian elegies from book 2 and an elegy from Ovid’s *Amores*, however, show striking similarities to this verse.

In elegy 2.22, Propertius assumes the role of a boastful lover who tells of his recent amorous adventures. He disingenuously deplores that he has met several girls at the same time (1–2). Later, we are told that—in spite of the large number of sexual partners and, accordingly, of sexual encounters—Propertius is still a great performer in bed (21–24). Moreover, he does not refrain from comparing his own manly exploits to those of Zeus, Achilles, and Hector (!), all of whom performed great deeds in bed *and* beyond (25–34). Finally, he realizes that his complaints were imprudent:

aspice uti caelo modo sol modo luna ministret:  
 sic etiam nobis una puella parum est.  
 altera me cupidis teneat foueatque lacertis,  
 altera si quando non sinit esse locum;  
 aut si forte irata meo sit facta ministro,  
 ut sciat esse aliam, quae uelit esse mea!  
 nam melius duo defendunt retinacula nauim,  
 tutius et geminos anxia mater alit.

(2.22, 35–42)

Look how the sun and the moon do their duty in the sky in turns. Similarly, for me one single girl just is not enough. There shall always be another one to hold me in desirous arms when my girl will not give me space: or if by chance she is made angry by my attention to her, let her be aware that there are others who would love to be my girl! For two cables keep a ship at anchor safer, and an anxious mother can be less worried if she has twins.

Contrary to his initial complaints, Propertius now emphatically rejects the alternative: *nobis una puella parum* (“one lover is just not enough”). *Parum* is the antonym of *satis* and has the same grammatical properties. Returning to Martial’s epigram, we can now see a close parallel between Propertius’ phrase and Martial’s: *nobis una puella parum* (Prop. 2.22.36)

<sup>41</sup> Janka (above, n.1) 295 n.47.

/ *mihi* nulla satis *nuda* puella (Mart. 11.104.8). And indeed, comparable idioms recur in related elegies. In 2.25 for example, Propertius appears to have reconverted to monogamy and declares that he pities men who entertain many love affairs (39–46). In his newly gained wisdom, Propertius knows that one woman (*una*) can cause quite enough (*satis*) pain and suffering: *cum satis una tuis insomnia portet ocellis, / una sat est cuius femina multa mala* (“As already one single woman can bring enough sleeplessness to your eyes, one will be enough trouble for any man,” Prop. 2.25.47–48).

In *Amores* 2.10 Ovid follows these Propertian models, or rather integrates them into a single elegy. The elegist complains about his latest amorous mishap: he had thought it impossible to fall in love with two girls, yet this is just what happened (*Am.* 2.10.4): *ecce, duas uno tempore turpis amo* (“Now look what a wretch I am, loving two girls at one and the same time”). In accord with Propertius 2.25, Ovid feels miserable: *quid geminas, Erycina, meos sine fine dolores? / non erat in curas una puella satis?* (“Why do you double my suffering, Erycina, with no end in sight? Was not one girl enough to cause sorrow?” *Ov. Am.* 2.10, 11–12). But his suffering is not really *sine fine*, since just one couplet later he realizes that there are advantages to his situation after all, and that it is better to have two girls than to have none at all, being unaffected by love (15: *sine amore*). In Ovid’s reappraisal of promiscuity, *satis* again figures prominently: *me mea disperdat nullo prohibente puella—/ si satis una potest, si minus una, duae!* (“My girl may weary me out with no one standing in the way! If one girl can do enough for me, it’s fine, if not, two will!” *Am.* 2.10.21–22).

As we have seen, the word *satis* is slightly out of place in Martial’s epigram and thus attracts the reader’s attention. As it is applied (in one way or another) to a *puella* in an erotic context, it is evocative of elegies such as *Amores* 2.10 and its Propertian predecessors.<sup>42</sup> For our understanding of Martial, Ovid’s elegy is of special relevance. If we examine *Amores* 2.10 more closely, we find a number of thematic and lexical parallels to Martial 11.104: Martial’s *tractae per pocula noctes* (11.104.4) are reminiscent of Ovid’s lascivious nights (*saepe ego lasciue consumpsi tempora noctis, Am.* 2.10.27). Martial’s drunken nights contrast with his wife’s sobriety

---

<sup>42</sup> Rimell (above, n.32) 175–76 notices the frequent use of the word *satis* throughout book 11 and explains it in light of Martial’s allusions to Catull. 7.1–2 (*quaeris, quot mihi basiationes / tuae, Lesbia, sint satis superque*).

in the morning (5); conversely, Ovid—in spite of his activities by night—is himself a morning person (*utilis et forti corpore mane fui*, 28). And while Martial draws a line between himself and his wife’s chastity with emphatic *at mihi* (19), Ovid uses *at mihi* to contrast his own sexual fulfillment with his enemies’ celibacy (19) and later to oppose his desired death during intercourse to other, more profane deaths (35).<sup>45</sup>

Given the relative shortness of both texts, this adds up to a dense web of interrelations. And again, Martial’s allusions to *Amores* 2.10 enter into a dialogue with Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* 357–440: as we have seen, the Ovid of *Amores* 2.10 shows himself entangled in the dilemma of being in love with two women. In the *Remedia amoris* passage, Ovid advocates entertaining two lovers as a means to thwart Amor’s power:

hortor et, ut pariter binas habeatis amicas  
 (fortior est, plures siquis habere potest):  
secta bipertito cum mens discurrit utroque,  
 alterius uires subtrahit alter amor.  
 grandia per multos tenuantur flumina riuos,  
 saevaque diducto stipite flamma perit.  
non satis una tenet ceratas ancora puppes,  
nec satis est liquidis unicus hamus aquis:  
 qui sibi iam pridem solacia bina parauit,  
 iam pridem summa uictor in arce fuit.

(*Rem.* 441–450)

I would recommend, then, that you keep two girls at any one time (hell of a man if anyone is able to keep even more!). If your attention is cut in half and goes in opposite directions, one affair will keep the other’s strength in check. Great rivers are reduced through many channels and the fiercest fire will go out once you remove the firewood. One anchor alone does not hold your well-caulked ship enough; one single hook is not is enough for these clear waters. Whoever has procured for himself a twofold consolation in time, has long since emerged as the victor in the fortress.

---

<sup>45</sup> A number of minor lexical parallels can be identified: Martial’s *rumpere latus* (7) can be traced back to Ovid’s *abrumpat* (19), *lateri* (25) and possibly *rumpunt* (29); this is the reading of pSç; see J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores, Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes, Vol. I: Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool 1987), 177 with his commentary in McKeown, *Amores* 2 (above, n.19) 216. Martial’s *pota aqua* (5) is prefigured in Ovid’s *aquas* (14) and *aequora . . . bibat* (34). Furthermore, *mane* is present both in Martial (11) and Ovid (28) as are *motu* and *opus* (Mart. 12; Ov. 35–36), *tu mihi* (Mart. 11; Ov. 1), and *iacere* (Mart. 9: *iacet*; Ov. 15: *iacerem*).

This *Remedia amoris* passage clearly reworks *Amores* 2.10 and, more indirectly, its Propertian model texts. This is most noticeable in the nautical simile of 447–448 which leads us back to the *phaselos* in *Amores* 2.10.9 and to the *navis* in Propertius 2.22.41–42.<sup>44</sup> It is no coincidence that these verses are marked by the anaphora of *non/nec satis*. Obviously, the *Remedia amoris* inverts the former text's motifs. In *Amores* 2.10, Ovid had complained that his sufferings were doubled; according to the *Remedia amoris*, amorous suffering is cut in half. And while Ovid in the *Amores* takes solace from the fact that he is not deprived of love (*sine amore*), the Ovid of *Remedia amoris* advocates promiscuity in order to liberate man from love. At the same time, *Amores* 2.10 (with its Propertian models) is one of only a few Latin elegies where the poet unequivocally speaks of the consummation of sexual desire.<sup>45</sup> These poems demarcate an area of Roman love elegy where the elegists engage with and adopt traditions of erotic epigram.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> McKeown (above, n.19) 204.

<sup>45</sup> See Connolly (above, n.30) on the centrality of elegiac poetics in elegy which precludes emphasis on sexual fulfilment (here 93): “[ . . . ]he basic elements of elegiac narrative structure are the delay and deferral of erotic consummation, the evasion of physical figuration in favor of references to myth, the absence of clear character definition, and the disavowal of representations of sexual activity.” On the presence of sexuality in Ovidian elegy, see Schmitz (above, n.13); G. Bretzigheimer, *Ovids Amores, Poetik in der Erotik* (Tübingen 2001), 39–41.

<sup>46</sup> A number of *topoi* from erotic epigram can be discerned (the list is not conclusive): (a.) The poet's lust for more than one girl: e.g. Call. *Epigr.* 31 Pf. (= *AP* 12.102); Mel. *Epigr.* 116 Gow/Page (= *AP* 12.92); Phld. *Epigr.* 11 Sider (*AP* 12.173). (b.) The suffering brought about by multiple love affairs: e.g. *AP* 12.88–90 (= anon. 19; 2; 1 Gow/Page); Polystr. *Epigr.* 1 Gow/Page (= *AP* 12.91; note ἀρκεῖω in verse 5 which resembles *satis* in Prop. and Ov.). (c.) The motif of *renuntiatio amoris*: e.g. Mel. *Epigr.* 7, 70, 72 Gow/Page (= *AP* 5.179, 175, 184), Phld. *Epigr.* 5 Sider (= 18 Gow/Page = *AP* 5.112). (d.) Conversely, the disadvantages of a life without love: e.g. Mimm. fr. 1 West; Alph. *Epigr.* 11 Gow/Page (= *AP* 12.18.1–2). (e.) The theme of “sleeping alone” (μονοκοιτεῖν): e.g. Call. *Epigr.* 63 Pf. (= *Epigr.* 1 Gow/Page = *AP* 5.23); Mel. *Epigr.* 79 Gow/Page (= *AP* 12.127); 113 (= *AP* 12.49); 117 (= *AP* 12.125). CW's referee observes that the Catullan echoes in book 11 (see above, n.42) might point to Catullus' role in shaping the ambiguous relation of elegy and epigram, thus emphasizing the convergence of epigrammatic and elegiac poetics in Martial 11. For a recent discussion of the relations between elegy and epigram, see the contributions in A. Keith, ed., *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome* (Cambridge 2011).

## V. A Saturnalian Poetics

My interpretation of epigram 11.104 suggests that Martial gives special prominence to the *Remedia amoris* and, more precisely, to one specific passage (357–440). It is hardly surprising that Martial would be attracted to this text where a *faux-naïf* Ovid apologizes for his work's obscenity, yet pushes it to new extremes. At the same time, it is striking how Martial confronts the *Remedia amoris* passage with Ovid's earlier works. Martial prompts us to revisit those passages in Ovid's previous works which were later remodeled in the *Remedia amoris*, as he retraces Ovid's reworking of Ovid and thus shows that in *Remedia amoris* 357–440, Ovid's motivic variations are motivic inversions. Ultimately, Martial's Ovidian readings draw attention to the topos of *inversion*. I believe this can be explained in light of the Saturnalia, which both structurally and thematically informs Martial's epigrammatic writing.<sup>47</sup>

The eleventh book of his *Epigrammata* especially revolves around the Saturnalia. Martial pointedly personifies his own poetry to illustrate its affinities with this festival.<sup>48</sup> He envisages his own verse as a Roman man engaging in the festivities and shouting the traditional cry of the festival (11.2.5): *io Saturnalia!*<sup>49</sup> In 11.15, moreover, Martial's poetry book (*hic libellus*, 3) appears as a drunken reveler: irreverent, with a smiling face and a frank tongue, heavily perfumed, flirting with boys and girls alike.

The festivities in honor of Saturnus, traditionally celebrated for three (and later five or seven) days in December,<sup>50</sup> were originally rooted in the

---

<sup>47</sup> E. Lefèvre, "Saturnalien und Palliata," *Poetica* 20 (1988) 35–38, 43–46 (generally on Saturnalian literature); M. Citroni, "Marziale e la Letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell'intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri)," *ICS* 14 (1989) 202–26; S. Döpp, "Saturnalien und lateinische Literatur," in S. Döpp, ed., *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen* (Trier 1993) 152–53, 165–66; Sullivan (above, n.1) 66–69; R. R. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons, Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Leiden 2002) 166–89; Rimell (above, n.32) 140–80; F. Grewing, "Mundus inversus: Fiktion und Wirklichkeit in Martials Büchern XIII und XIV," *Prometheus* 25 (1999) 278–81; Grewing (above, n.38) 140, 149, 164–66; Šterbenc Erker (above, n.1) 112–14.

<sup>48</sup> C. A. Williams, "Sit nequior omnibus libellis: Text, Poet and Reader in the Epigrams," *Philologus* 146/1 (2002) 165.

<sup>49</sup> For the cry "Io Saturnalia", see Liv. 22.1.19; Macr. 1.10.18.

<sup>50</sup> G. Wissowa, "Saturnus," in W. H. Roscher, ed., *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 4 (Leipzig 1910) 437; G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* V.4 (Munich 1912) 207, n.7.

agricultural cycle.<sup>51</sup> Due to its calendrical position, however, the festival evolved into a more general celebration of the turn of the year, and the rites would accordingly have been adapted and reinterpreted.<sup>52</sup> In religious festivals marking special junctions in the course of the year (*Jahresfugen*), everyday life and its routines are often rejected and replaced by a markedly different order so that the subsequent reestablishment of the old routine can be experienced as an emphatic new beginning.<sup>53</sup>

The statue of Saturnus was released from the bands by which he was bound throughout the year. The sacrifice was offered by a priest with uncovered head (*capite aperto*), while Roman sacrificial rites usually prescribed offerings by veiled priests. Schools were closed and courts adjourned their business; citizens changed their usual toga for a light *synthesis* and a felt-cap (*pilleus*); the ban on gambling was suspended; lavish (and boozy) banquets and feasts were given; and gifts were exchanged that carefully considered and offset the differences between poor and rich. More importantly, the social boundaries between citizens, freedmen, and slaves were overcome: At the festive *convivia* slaves were served by their masters, or at least they were allowed to dine in their masters' company, and one of the celebrants was chosen by lot as the Saturnalian king to exert an arbitrary reign over his *convivae*.

---

<sup>51</sup> Originally, they may have marked the moment when the corn silos were opened and inspected for the first time; see H. S. Versnel, "Saturn and the Saturnalia: The Question of Origin," in H. Sancini-Weerdenburg, R. J. van der Speek, H. C. Teitler and H. T. Wallinga, eds., *De Agricultura, In memoriam Pieter Willem de Neeve* (Amsterdam 1993) 98–120; H. S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion II: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual* (Leiden 1993) 164–90. Alternatively, the agricultural relevance of the Saturnalia is explained with view to the etymological relation of Saturnus to *serere* ("to sow"). For ancient etymologies, see Wissowa, *Saturnus* (above, n.50) 427–28. Wissowa, *Religion* (above, n.50) 204 explains the Saturnalia as a celebration of the winter sowing.

<sup>52</sup> Wissowa, *Religion* (above, n.50) 207; Versnel, *Saturn* (above, n.51) 116. According to L. Deubner ("Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der römischen Religion," in O. Deubner, ed., *Kleine Schriften zur klassischen Altertumskunde* [Königstein 1982] 119–20) the Saturnalia was primarily a New Year festival.

<sup>53</sup> F. Graf, "Römische Aitia und ihre Riten: das Beispiel von Saturnalia und Parilia," *MH* 49 (1992): 16–17. The Roman Saturnalia, consisting of both public rites and extensive private celebrations, is paradigmatic in this respect: M. P. Nilsson (*Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen* [Leipzig 1906] 35–40) draws on the model of the Saturnalia to describe this type of festival in the Greek world; accordingly he coins the term "*saturnalienartige Feste*." Surveys of the festival and its elements are offered by Wissowa, *The Saturnus* (above, n.50) 436–40; Wissowa, *Religion* (above, n.50) 205–207; M. P. Nilsson, "Saturnalia," *RE* II A.1 (1921) 201–11; Versnel, *Inconsistencies* (above, n.51) 146–63. .

Drawing on the work of the cultural anthropologist Victor Turner, Fritz Graf has integrated the diverse data into a single perspective, arguing that rituals such as the Saturnalia can be understood as complex semiotic systems that

are founded on a simple binary mechanism which guarantees that the signs can be readily understood. To convey the message that a specific order has come to an end, dis-order is acted out. As this message is important to the community, the ritual will ensure that the message is heard and understood by sending it redundantly in different codes.<sup>54</sup>

The different and disparate elements of the Saturnalia can then be understood as challenges to binary logic within different codes. In numerous areas of life, the normal rules and routines are either suspended or completely reversed. Nauta has termed these two variants “weak” and “strong inversion” respectively.<sup>55</sup>

In epigram 11.104, various Saturnalian themes are present: Martial’s fondness for boozy nights and dismissal of his wife’s sobriety, his overly frank self-depiction as an erotomaniac, and the slaves’ unorthodox participation in their masters’ bedroom activities are all reminiscent of elements of the festival.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, the poem can be argued to encode the Saturnalian movement of *inversion* in the cultural codes regulating marriage and sexuality: The role opposition of *meretrix* and *matrona*, fundamental to Roman concepts of sexuality, is deconstructed.<sup>57</sup> A wife is threatened with divorce because of her adherence to good mores (and

---

<sup>54</sup> Graf (above, n.53) 17: “Diese Systeme basieren zumeist auf einem simplem binären Mechanismus, der eine leichte Wahrnehmung der Zeichen gewährleistet: um die Mitteilung zu machen, dass eine bestimmte Ordnung zu Ende sei, wird Unordnung gespielt. Die Botschaften der Rituale sind ausserdem für die Gemeinschaft wichtig: das Ritual stellt also sicher, dass sie auch ankommen, indem dieselbe Botschaft redundant in verschiedenen Codes geschickt wird.”

<sup>55</sup> R. Nauta, “Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis* as Saturnalian Literature,” *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987) 84.

<sup>56</sup> On alcohol and Saturnalian *convivia*, see Wissowa, *Religion* (above, n.50) 207; Versnel, *Inconsistencies* (above, n.51) 147–48 with Hor. *S.* 2.3.5. On the slaves’ participation in the Saturnalian celebrations, see Nauta (above, n.55) 86–87; Versnel, *Inconsistencies* (above, n.51) 149–50 with Macr. 1.7.26. Martial’s obscene self-description finds an intriguing parallel in Luc. *Sat.* 3, where a symposiast is forced to “shout out shameful things about himself” (αἰσχρόν τι περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀναβοῆσαι).

<sup>57</sup> Watson (above, n.50) rejects this Saturnalian reading and proposes instead to read the conflation of the roles of *meretrices* and *matronae* as a sign of changing attitudes towards marriage.

not for her lack of the same); Andromache and Penelope, commonly cited as examples of virtue and seemliness, engage in libidinous sexual practices; and anal intercourse is reclaimed as a wifely duty, duly fulfilled by eminent Roman *matronae*.<sup>58</sup>

If we now return to Martial's engagement with Ovidian poetry, we can identify two aspects in which the Ovidian intertexts add to the Saturnalian atmosphere of 11.104. First, Martial draws on the erotic *anti*-ideals formulated in the *Remedia amoris* and reformulates them as his own *ideals*, thus highlighting his inversion of sexual mores and traditional values; and, second, he confronts the *Remedia amoris* with Ovid's former works, highlighting moments of Ovidian self-inversion and thus recasting Ovid as a proto-Saturnalian writer.

Towards the end of his poetic career, Ovid wrote a second apology for his work's licentiousness (*Tristia* 2). The elegiac letter addressed to Augustus clearly develops themes from *Remedia amoris* 357–98;<sup>59</sup> the confident, optimistic tone of the *Remedia amoris*, however, has given way to bitterness and disillusionment. Repeatedly, Ovid complains that he is the only one to incur punishment because of his playfulness. Among other things, he compares his licentious writing to the diverse amusements of the Saturnalia and their respective literary depictions (*Tristia* 2.471–96), observing that unlike himself, the Saturnalian revelers and poets all go unpunished:<sup>60</sup>

talia luduntur fumoso mense Decembri,  
 quae damno nulli composuisse fuit.  
 his ego deceptus non tristia carmina feci,  
 sed tristis nostros poena secuta iocos.  
 nempe–nec inuideo–tot de scribentibus unum,  
 quem sua perdidit Musa, repertus ego.

(Tr. 2.491–496)

Such are the jests of the smoky month of December; and no one has ever incurred harm for rendering them in literature. Deceived by this, I, too, have written songs that were not sad, but my jests were followed

<sup>58</sup> On this motif, especially in the context of Saturnalian inversion, see Lavigne (above, n.3) 294–306.

<sup>59</sup> A. Barchiesi, "Teaching Augustus through Allusion," in A. Barchiesi, ed., *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets* (London 2001) 96–100.

<sup>60</sup> On the passage, see J. Ingleheart, *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2* (Oxford 2010), 366–68.

by severe punishment. I am not envious, but out of so many authors I am the only one that can be found who was ruined by his own Muse.

Martial, who is demonstrably familiar with these lines,<sup>61</sup> in 11.104—towards the end of his last book written in Rome—arguably sets the scene for his quasi-exile in Spain.<sup>62</sup> At the same time, he “corrects” the past by taking up the licentiousness of Ovid’s work and incorporating it into the framework of his own Saturnalian poetics. Ovid’s resentful distinction between himself and *the many* engaging in Saturnalian literature is overcome, and Ovid is reappropriated as a Saturnalian poet. The exile from Tomis then is posthumously granted the festive *licentia* which, during his lifetime, he had invoked in vain.

UNIVERSITY OF BASEL  
cedric.scheidegger@unibas.ch

---

<sup>61</sup> The *iunctura fumoso Decembri* is paralleled in Mart. 5.30.5; see Wagner (above, n.1) 48 (the parallel has long been noted by commentators).

<sup>62</sup> I am grateful to *CW*’s referee for drawing my attention to this aspect. On the presence of Ovid’s exilic oeuvre in Martial, esp. book 11, see Casali (above, n.1) 30–36; Hinds (above, n.3) 132–34 on the Ovidian overtones of Martial’s retreat to Spain. For the vexed chronology of book 10 (possibly a second edition), 11 and 12 (possibly a posthumous edition), compare the classical account in L. Friedländer, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri, Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen, Erster Band* (Leipzig 1886) 62–67 with the fresh approach taken by Holzberg (above, n.3) 140–51.