

Roman Literature under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian

Literary Interactions, AD 96–138

Edited by Alice König and
Christopher Whitton



ROMAN LITERATURE
UNDER NERVA, TRAJAN
AND HADRIAN

Literary Interactions, AD 96–138

EDITED BY

ALICE KÖNIG

University of St Andrews, Scotland

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON

University of Cambridge

for John Henderson

 CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2018

ROMAN LITERATURE UNDER NERVA, TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

This volume is the first holistic investigation of Roman literature and literary culture under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian (AD 96–138). With case studies from Frontinus, Juvenal, Martial, Pliny the Younger, Plutarch, Quintilian, Suetonius and Tacitus among others, the eighteen chapters offer not just innovative readings of literary (and some 'less literary') texts, but a collaborative enquiry into the networks and culture in which they are embedded. The book brings together established and novel methodologies to explore the connections, conversations and silences between these texts and their authors, both on and off the page. The scholarly dialogues that result not only shed fresh light on the dynamics of literary production and consumption in the 'High Roman Empire', but offer new provocations to students of intertextuality and interdiscursivity across classical literature. How can and should we read textual interactions in their social, literary and cultural contexts?

ALICE KÖNIG is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of St Andrews. Her research focuses on ancient technical literature and the history of science, and the relationship between politics, society and literature in the early principate. She is preparing a monograph on the author and statesman Sextus Julius Frontinus, and has published a series of articles on Vitruvius, Frontinus and Tacitus. She established the 'Literary Interactions' research project in 2011, and is co-editor also of its second volume (on cross-cultural interactions in the Roman Empire, AD 96–235).

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON is Senior Lecturer in Classical Literature at the University of Cambridge, and Fellow and Director of Studies in Classics at Emmanuel College. His publications include a commentary on Pliny *Epistles* 2 (Cambridge, 2013), and he is co-editor (with Roy Gibson) of *Oxford Readings in the Epistles of Pliny* (2016).

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	page x
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
Introduction	I
<i>Alice König and Christopher Whitton</i>	
PART I BRIDGING DIVIDES: LITERARY INTERACTIONS FROM QUINTILIAN TO JUVENAL	
1 Quintilian, Pliny, Tacitus	37
<i>Christopher Whitton</i>	
2 I Will Survive (You): Martial and Tacitus on Regime Change	63
<i>Victoria Rimell</i>	
3 Flavian Epic and Trajanic Historiography: Speaking into the Silence	86
<i>Emma Buckley</i>	
4 Pliny and Martial: Dupes and Non-Dupes in the Early Empire	108
<i>William Fitzgerald</i>	
5 Paradoxography and Marvels in Post-Domitianic Literature: 'An Extraordinary Affair, Even in the Hearing!'	126
<i>Rhiannon Ash</i>	
6 Pliny and Suetonius on Giving and Returning Imperial Power	146
<i>Paul Roche</i>	
7 From Martial to Juvenal (<i>Epigrams</i> 12.18)	160
<i>Gavin Kelly</i>	

PART II INTERACTIONS ON AND OFF THE PAGE

- | | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 8 | Amicable and Hostile Exchange in the Culture of Recitation
<i>Matthew Roller</i> | 183 |
| 9 | Images of Domitius Apollinaris in Pliny and Martial:
Intertextual Discourses as Aspects of Self-Definition and
Differentiation
<i>Sigrid Mratschek</i> | 208 |
| 10 | Reading Frontinus in Martial's <i>Epigrams</i>
<i>Alice König</i> | 233 |
| 11 | Saturninus the Helmsman, Pliny and Friends: Legal and
Literary Letter Collections
<i>Jill Harries</i> | 260 |
| 12 | Pliny <i>Epistles</i> 10 and Imperial Correspondence: The Empire
of Letters
<i>Myles Lavan</i> | 280 |
| 13 | Traditional <i>Exempla</i> and Nerva's New Modernity: Making
Fabricius Take the Cash
<i>Ruth Morello</i> | 302 |
| 14 | Extratextuality: Literary Interactions with Oral Culture and
Exemplary Ethics
<i>Rebecca Langlands</i> | 330 |
| PART III INTO THE SILENCE: THE LIMITS OF INTERACTION | | |
| 15 | The Regulus Connection: Displacing Lucan Between Martial
and Pliny
<i>Ilaria Marchesi</i> | 349 |
| 16 | Forgetting the Juvenalien in Our Midst: Literary Amnesia in
the <i>Satires</i>
<i>Tom Geue</i> | 366 |
| 17 | Childhood Education and the Boundaries of Interaction:
[Plutarch], Quintilian, Juvenal
<i>James Uden</i> | 385 |

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 18 | Pliny and Plutarch's Practical Ethics: A Newly Rediscovered
Dialogue
<i>Roy Gibson</i> | 402 |
| | ENVOI/VENIO
<i>John Henderson</i> | 422 |
| | <i>References</i> | 428 |
| | <i>Index Locorum</i> | 463 |
| | <i>General Index</i> | 468 |

Figure

- 9.1 Statue base of the Domitii: inscription of L. Domitius Apollinaris, Xanthos, AD 93–6.
Reproduced from Balland 1981, pl. XII, no. 49 with the kind permission of Mme Marie-Pierre Ciric and the publishing house of Klincksieck (Paris).

page 209

Contributors

RHIANNON ASH is Professor of Roman Historiography, Merton College, Oxford.

EMMA BUCKLEY is Senior Lecturer in Latin, University of St Andrews.

WILLIAM FITZGERALD is Professor of Latin Language and Literature, King's College London.

TOM GEUE is a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow in Classics, University of St Andrews.

ROY GIBSON is Professor of Latin, University of Manchester.

JILL HARRIES is Professor emeritus of Ancient History, University of St Andrews.

JOHN HENDERSON is Professor emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of King's College.

GAVIN KELLY is Professor of Latin Literature and Roman History, University of Edinburgh.

ALICE KÖNIG is Senior Lecturer in Latin and Classical Studies, University of St Andrews.

REBECCA LANGLANDS is Professor of Classics, University of Exeter.

MYLES LAVAN is Senior Lecturer in Ancient History, University of St Andrews.

ILARIA MARCHESI is Professor of Comparative Literature, Languages, and Linguistics, Hofstra University.

RUTH MORELLO is Lecturer in Classics, University of Manchester.

SIGRID MRATSCHEK is Professor of Ancient History, Rostock University.

VICTORIA RIMELL is Associate Professor of Latin, University of Warwick.

PAUL ROCHE is Senior Lecturer in Latin, University of Sydney.

MATTHEW ROLLER is Professor of Classics, Johns Hopkins University.

JAMES UDEN is Associate Professor of Classical Studies, Boston University.

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON is Senior Lecturer in Classical Literature, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of Emmanuel College.

List of Contributors

VICTORIA RIMELL is Associate Professor of Latin, University of Warwick.

PAUL ROCHE is Senior Lecturer in Latin, University of Sydney.

MATTHEW ROLLER is Professor of Classics, Johns Hopkins University.

JAMES UDEN is Associate Professor of Classical Studies, Boston University.

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON is Senior Lecturer in Classical Literature, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of Emmanuel College.

Preface

This volume arises out of a research project, 'Literary Interactions under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian', directed by Alice König and based at St Andrews since 2011. We explain more about it in the Introduction; here we have the pleasant task of recording some debts of gratitude, starting with the several institutes and funding bodies which have supported the project so far: the British Academy/Leverhulme Small Research Grants Scheme, the Institute of Classical Studies, the School of Classics (University of St Andrews), Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and Exeter University; the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, the Heinrich Schliemann-Institut für Altertumswissenschaften (University of Rostock) and the Rostocker Freunde der Altertumswissenschaften; and the Peter Paul Career Development Professorship (Boston University).

Now to people: several dozen scholars have taken part in the project so far, delivering and responding to workshop and conference papers and posting working papers online. Our warm thanks to all of these for contributing their expertise and energy, and building such rich, productive and (we trust) unfinished dialogues together. We are especially grateful to our seventeen fellow-contributors to this volume, both for their individual work and for joining enthusiastically in the spirit of communal endeavour that we hoped would mark it: our many interactions, literary and personal, have been rewarding indeed. For logistical support at the St Andrews and Rostock conferences in which this volume finds its origins, we thank Margaret Goudie, Josephine Kliebe and Anke Wegner; and we fondly recall the warm hospitality and unstinting support of Christiane Reitz. Sincere thanks too to Michael Sharp and his team at Cambridge University Press, to Ana Kotarcic for her efficient editorial work and to James Uden for suggesting the cover illustration. Finally, for

ready advice and unending patience, we thank Jason König and Michael Squire.

ARK and CLW, 31.1.17

PS John Henderson didn't know we would dedicate this volume to him when he agreed to contribute to it. It's a small but heartfelt token of thanks for many hours, and many years, of support as supervisor, mentor and friend.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations for ancient authors and titles follow LSJ, *OLD* or other standard conventions; those for journals are adapted from *L'Année philologique*.

<i>AE</i>	<i>L'Année épigraphique</i> , Paris 1888–.
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , Berlin 1972–.
<i>CEL</i>	P. Cugusi, ed., <i>Corpus epistularum Latinarum, papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum</i> , Florence 1992–2002.
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin 1863–.
<i>Coll. Leg.</i>	<i>Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum</i> .
<i>GL</i>	H. Keil, ed., <i>Grammatici Latini</i> , 7 vols., Leipzig 1855–80.
<i>IGR</i>	R. Cagnat, ed., <i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i> , 4 vols., Paris 1901–27.
<i>ILS</i>	H. Dessau, ed., <i>Inscriptiones Latinae selectae</i> , Berlin 1892–1916.
<i>LSJ</i>	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, <i>Greek–English lexicon</i> (with revised supplement), 9th edn, Oxford 1996.
<i>MAMA</i>	<i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua</i> , Manchester and London 1928–.
<i>OCD</i> ⁴	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidenow, eds., <i>Oxford classical dictionary</i> , 4th edn, Oxford 2012.
<i>OLD</i>	P. W. Glare, ed., <i>Oxford Latin dictionary</i> , Oxford 1982 (2nd edn, 2012).
<i>PIR</i> ²	<i>Prosopographia imperii Romani saec. I, II, III</i> , 2nd edn, Berlin 1933–2015.
<i>PL</i>	J.-P. Migne, ed., <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , Paris 1844–65.
<i>RP</i>	R. Syme, <i>Roman papers</i> (ed. E. Badian and A. R. Birley), 7 vols., Oxford 1979–91.
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Amsterdam and Leiden 1923–.
<i>TAM</i>	<i>Tituli Asiae Minoris</i> , Vienna and Bonn 1901–.
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> , Leipzig 1900–.

CHAPTER 9

Images of Domitius Apollinaris in Pliny and Martial
Intertextual Discourses as Aspects of Self-Definition
and Differentiation

Sigrid Mratschek

Poet and Epistolographer: Intertextuality and Self-Representation

Pictures are 'a direct shot into the brain'.¹ In discursive terms, their message is an interplay of intellect and sensory perception. Such is the case in a series of repeatedly shifting portraits of the prominent senator L. Domitius Apollinaris. Martial, a knight from the province of Hispania Tarraconensis, produced satirical snapshots of social networking with his patron Apollinaris. Pliny the Younger, a senator from northern Italy, was an 'engaged observer' of such relationships and the author of metadiscursive prose epistles *to* and *about* Apollinaris. In the interplay of intertextual discourse between these different genres, the character sketches of Apollinaris should be understood not as depictions of an empirical reality, but as self-conscious reflections of the ways in which their authors identify themselves and the world around them. In his interactions with Martial's poems and with Domitius Apollinaris as protagonist, using visions of the underworld as figures for the political atmosphere in Rome and competing to visualise the most beautiful *locus amoenus*, Pliny developed subtle performative strategies and ideas to reinvent himself as *littérateur* and politician. This chapter, then, is about some of the ways in which literary and social (or socio-literary) interactions of this triangular relationship impact dynamically on each other, on

I here express my gratitude for a wealth of stimulating ideas to Roy Gibson, who sent me a pre-publication copy of his and Ruth Morello's book, and to Chris Whitton, whose commentary on Pliny's Book 2 represents an enrichment of the entire collection of letters; also for much learnt from the relevant monographs by Ilaria Marchesi (2008) and Victoria Rimell (2008). Warm thanks for their comments are due to all who attended the Literary Interactions conference in June 2014, especially to Alice König (St Andrews) who brought her LINTH project to Rostock; also to Mme Marie-Pierre Ciric and the publishing house of Klincksieck (Paris) for kindly permitting the photograph of the inscription to be reproduced (Fig. 9.1). Translations from Martial are based on Shackleton Bailey 1993, those of Pliny on Walsh 2006.

¹ Apophthegm of the Saarbrücken behaviourist and marketing guru Werner Kroeber-Riel, cited after Gries 2006.



Fig. 9.1. Statue base of the Domitii: inscription of L. Domitius Apollinaris, Xanthos, AD 93–6. Reproduced with permission from Balland 1981, plate XII, no. 49.

and off the page: contrary to a common assumption – and of particular interest in times of regime change – they not only distort reality, but also create it.

The Focus of Networks: Domitius Apollinaris, Martial and Pliny the Younger

Our texts are silent on the protagonist's career,² but when studied in conjunction with new inscriptions they offer a kaleidoscope of insights into the networks of which he formed a part. A family statue gallery from the Letoon in Xanthos shows that Domitius Apollinaris had managed to upgrade his *nouitas* through alliance with the powerful figure Valerius Patruinus,³ subsequently being promoted to the rank of imperial legate of Lycia–Pamphylia (93–6).⁴ All that remains today of the gallery of six bronze statues is the 4.36-metre-long limestone base with its six inscriptions (Fig. 9.1).⁵ Those honoured here, apart from Apollinaris, the ἡγεμῶν,

² For the periods away from Rome there are no Martial epigrams.

³ Apollinaris had commanded two legions in the east under L. Valerius Patruinus (AD 83–9); see Syme 1991b: 588–602.

⁴ Balland 1981: 103–5. His governorship (ὁ δικαιοδότης) is further documented by an inscription from Tlos honouring his son (*IGR* III, 559 = *TAM* II, 570); see Syme 1991b: 588 n. 2 and *PIR* D 133.

⁵ Balland 1981: 130 on the wall dowel-holes for the bronzes and the find-site south of the Nymphaeum.

were his second wife Valeria Vet(t)illa, his father-in-law Valerius Patruinus, a son from his first marriage called Domitius Seneca, the latter's wife, Clodia Decmina, and a boy called Neratius. ⁶ Both Apollinaris and Pliny, who was about ten years younger, were among the successful *homines novi* whose careers prospered under Domitian. ⁷ Apollinaris' career began with the quaestorship *c.* 77 and the praetorship *c.* 83. In contrast to Pliny, whose political career reached its zenith only under Trajan, with the consulship (*suff.* 100) and the governorship of Pontus-Bithynia (*c.* 110–12), ⁸ Apollinaris ceases to be mentioned by contemporaries as a political actor from the point at which, aged 42, he attained a suffect consulship under Nerva (*suff.* 97).

What links existed between these two senators? Both Pliny and Domitius Apollinaris were natives of Italia Transpadana; both were patrons of Martial. Pliny's birthplace, Comum, was 50 miles as the crow flies from Vercellae, birthplace of Apollinaris. ⁹ Pliny's contacts with Vercellae find no mention in his letters. Little attention has been paid, so far, to the fact that the people of Vercellae, early in the second century, honoured Pliny for his munificence with an inscription (*CIL* v, 5667); he had it set up on his estate near Comum only 5½ miles south-east of where it was found. ¹⁰ Pliny's flamine mentioned in the inscription was probably held at Vercellae. ¹¹ It was thus no mere coincidence that intertextual discourses in Pliny's letters invoke Martial's poems about their mutual friend Apollinaris. As an author himself, Pliny competed with the poet in creating portraits of Apollinaris. Having a *patria* in common and a similar social background in this dynamic region beyond the Po – between 69 and 103 it produced most of the consuls and men of letters ¹² – could lead, as in the case of Pliny and Apollinaris, to solidarity and the forming of alliances, but also to rivalry.

⁶ On the individuals represented see Syme 1991b: 589–602.

⁷ On Apollinaris (born *c.* 52 or 53) and Pliny (born *c.* 62) see Syme 1991b: 558, 563.

⁸ As *legatus pro praetore provinciae Pontis et Bithyniae proconsulari potestate* (*CIL* v, 5262 = *ILS* 2927 from Comum; cf. *CIL* xi, 5272 from Hispellum), see the reconstruction by Alföldy 1999: 221–44, commented on by Gibson and Morello 2012: 270–3.

⁹ On Comum see Plin. *Ep.* 1.3.1 (*meae deliciae*) and 5.7.2 (*communis patria*). On Vercellae see below.

¹⁰ At the beginning of the second century, as the *cursus honorum* of *CIL* v, 5667 ended with the offices of *augur* in 103 (Plin. *Ep.* 4.8.1) and of *curator alvei Tiberis* in 104–6 (*Ep.* 5.14.2); see Birley 2000a: 16. According to a hypothesis of Mommsen (*CIL* v, p. 606), the inscription was set up on Pliny's estates near Comum. The archaeological site, Cantù, belonged to Comum in antiquity; see Andermahr 1998: 384. A dedicatory inscription of a *salvatorius* to Jupiter (*CIL* v, 5702) for L. Verginius Rufus, victor over Vindex, who owned a property adjacent to Pliny's land, was discovered not far away, at Brianza (*Ep.* 2.1.8 *utrique eadem regio, municipia finitima, agri etiam possessionesque coniunctae*).

¹¹ Andermahr 1998: 384. ¹² Mratschek 2003: 219–41.

The Patron (*Beneficium*)

Model Roles Redefined: Doctus Apollinaris vs Plinius Anxius

Both Domitius and Pliny were linked by the social bond of *amicitia* to Martial, who would send them his books of epigrams for circulation among the high society of Rome, while also immortalising his patrons in his poems. ¹³ Interaction among those involved generated a complex of social relationships founded ultimately on the principle of gift-exchange specific to the social anthropology of ancient cultures. ¹⁴ Of six Martial epigrams to Apollinaris, no fewer than four were dedicatory poems. ¹⁵ All without exception were presented as an apostrophe to a gift (*munus*) – a book-roll, a choliamb, a rose, or Saturnalian verses.

Gradually, by inference from these snapshots, Apollinaris comes to acquire a more distinct profile: once the uncontested *elegantiae arbiter* of his time, *doctus Apollinaris* (4.86) moved on to become an enthusiastic advocate of Martial's miniature art (7.26). The limping iamb is Martial's witness that he himself could not love his verse more than did his dedicatee Apollinaris. An image from love elegy (*amore . . . nugarum flagret*) ¹⁶ conveys the enthusiasm with which Apollinaris responded to the first poetry volume, and is also a ploy integral to Martial's self-fashioning as a poet in great demand. Contemplating Apollinaris, amateur of the fine arts, with a taste for Attic verse, dedicatee in 89 of the first four books of Martial's epigrams (4.86), no one would guess that this was the successful *homo novus*, recently returned from a six-year tour of duty in the east as commander of two legions under the governor P. Valerius Patruinus, the *XVI Flavia Firma* in Cappadocia and the *VI Ferrata* in Syria (83–9). ¹⁷ When Martial found him engrossed in his work and had to interrupt him in order to hand him the seventh book of epigrams, Apollinaris had only just taken up the

¹³ Mart. 5.15.3–4 . . . *gaudet honorato sed multus nomine lector, | cui uictura meo munere fama datur*. On circulation 7.97.10; 13 *O quae gloria! Quam frequens amator! | . . . uni mitteris, omnibus legeris*. E.g. Pliny (*Ep.* 3.21.2, 4) paid Martial travelling expenses (*uiaticum*) in recognition of his verse. See White 1978: 90–2.

¹⁴ Mauss 1990b: 157, Bourdieu 1993: 180–1, 192–3 and the current definitions in Satlow 2013: 4–11. See Roller in this volume on the language of gift-exchange in Pliny.

¹⁵ In Book 4 (4.86), Book 7 (7.26; 7.86) and Book 11 (11.15); see Nauta 2002: 161. In the gift – still the subject of dispute – of a wreath of roses (7.89) with a poem, or as a poem, there is a further dedication; see below.

¹⁶ Mart. 7.26.7–8 *Quanto mearum, scis, amore nugarum | flagret* [sc. Apollinaris]: *nec ipse plus amare te possum*. The metaphor of love's flame is from elegy, e.g. Ov. *Her.* 16.117 *ferus in molli pectore flagrat amor*.

¹⁷ Identified by Syme 1991b: 590–1 with the Ignotus of inscription *IGR* III, 558 = *TAM* II, 569. Friedländer's (1886) dating of Dec. 88 needs revision in the light of the epigraphic evidence.

important urban post of *praefectus aerarii militaris* (92–4), preceding Pliny in this.¹⁸ While observing all due respect for the business affairs of the new prefect of the *aerarium militare*, Martial did not neglect to point out that the recipient, as protagonist, was himself a ‘part of the poetic gift’.¹⁹

In Martial’s enigmatic rose poem (7.89), Apollinaris metamorphosed into a lover of erotic poetry, after his marriage in 92 to the wealthy Valeria Vettilla, daughter of Valerius Patruinus of Ticinum, under whom he had served in the army.²⁰ Attribute of the love goddess and of the Muses, the rose was also the subject of poetry.²¹ With the words *i, felix rosa*, Martial despatched to his patron a garland of roses and a poem that together were to ensure Venus would continue to favour Apollinaris well into old age.²² This quatrain, perpetuating the memory of Apollinaris festively crowned, was in a volume of poetry widely read in Italy and Gaul.²³ The sympotic setting recurred elsewhere: at night, the time ‘when the rose rules’, the Younger Pliny was likewise receptive to the light Muse.²⁴ On 17 December 96 Martial welcomed Domitius Apollinaris back from Asia Minor with a witty poem in the style of Catullus as a Saturnalian gift (11.15).²⁵ Humorously inverting Lucretius’ hymn to Venus as mother of the Roman people (*Aeneadum genetrix*), he here has the chaste priest-king Numa Pompilius proclaim the *mentula* to be ‘father to all humans’, the object being to enlighten the dignified ex-legate, in the final *pointe*, about the difference between erotic poetry and lifestyle.²⁶

¹⁸ Pliny may have been prefect of the *aerarium militare* for 94–6 (Syme 1991b: 591, 598), but 95–7, or a shorter term, are equally possible and perhaps preferable; see the meticulous revision of Pliny’s senatorial cursus (*CIL* v, 5262 = *ILS* 2927) by Whitton 2015a.

¹⁹ Mart. 7.26.3 *hoc quaecumque, cuius aliqua pars ipse est*.

²⁰ Mart. 7.89.1–2 *I, felix rosa, mollibusque sertis | nostri cinge comas Apollinaris*. Syme’s (1991b: 592) reasoning remains persuasive even without the wedding day as occasion for the poem; cf. Nauta 2002: 160–1.

²¹ E.g. the hymn to the soft rose, ῥόδον τέρεινον, Anacr. fr. 55 West, trans. Campbell 1988: 230, vv. 4–10: τὸδε γὰρ θεῶν δῆμα, | τὸδε καὶ βροτοῖσι χάριμα, | Χάρισιν τ’ ὀγαλίμ’ ἐν ὤραις, | πολυανθέων Ἐρωτῶν | ἀφροδισίων τ’ ἄθυμα. | τὸδε καὶ μέλητα μῦθοις | χαρίεν φυτόν τε Μουσῶν. See Rosenmeyer 1992: 88, 210–12, 222. Used as model in Rome since Gellius (kind advice from Martin West). Fitzgerald 2007: 149 too votes for the ‘rose as a poem or book’.

²² Mart. 7.89.3–4 *Quas [sc. comas] tu nectere candidas, sed olim, | sic te semper amet Venus, memento*.

²³ On the circulation in Vienne: Mart. 7.88 precedes the rose poem. See Fitzgerald 2007: 149.

²⁴ Mart. 10.20(19).19–20 = Plin. *Ep.* 3.21.5 *haec hora est tua [i.e. Musa], cum furit Lyaeus, | cum regnat rosa*.

²⁵ Mart. 11.15.11–12 *uersus . . . | Saturnalicios*. On the dating, see Syme 1991b: 598. The Saturnalia and the myth of Saturn the bringer of culture were attributed to Numa’s calendar of feasts (*Var. LL* 5.64; *Fest.* 432.20 L). See Versnel 1993: 136–227; Rimell 2008: 140–4.

²⁶ Mart. 11.15.9–14 *ex qua nascimur, omnium parentem | quam sanctus Numa mentulam uocabat. | . . . (14) mores non habet hic meos libellus*. See Williams 2002: 165–6; Sullivan 1979: 418–32 and 1991: 115–84. The allusion to Venus was previously ignored, e.g. *Lucr.* 1.1 (*Venus as Aeneadum genetrix*); 2.598–9 (on *tellus, natura rerum*) . . . *ferarum et nostri genetrix . . . corporis*; *Col.* 3.9 *benignissima rerum omnium parens natura*.

Whereas ‘the fractured, tightly sprung and metamorphic universe’ of Martial’s epigram corresponds to his ‘unstable and nervy perception of the world’ in his poetic reflections on the metropolis Rome, the heart and microcosm of a vast, complex empire,²⁷ the Younger Pliny, by contrast, in his collection of letters, presents a harmonious picture of the different life that was to follow under Trajan’s *initia felicissimi principatus*.²⁸ Pliny’s readers are intended to visualise the ‘aesthetics of existence’ as lived by the elites of Italy,²⁹ with their codes of behaviour and their sophisticated literary taste, and Pliny himself as an example, representing the ‘good’ aristocrat under ‘the best’ of all emperors.³⁰

At the same time, Pliny represented the ideal discerning *lector studiosus* who helped ensure that Martial achieved fame during his lifetime for his short satirical poems with their punchy endings.³¹ The basic principles of poetic composition employed by Martial, variation and juxtaposition,³² were also his own. Conforming to an epistolographic principle of his own, the pen portraits of their mutual friend Domitius Apollinaris were arranged not chronologically, but in accordance with intended strategies of reception aesthetics (*uarietas*).³³ Apollinaris appears *once* in each triad of the nine books of letters,³⁴ and in each letter one of the three criteria crucial for a senator’s social standing is placed under scrutiny: influence, effectiveness in public life, wealth. In his dual role of addressee and orator, Apollinaris provides a foil for the author’s self-positioning in the form of a climax. The epistolary format enabled Pliny to present his persona as a montage of pictures selected and arranged by himself. The structure and the topic sequence are reminiscent of Martial: Pliny first shows himself in the letters (*Ep.* 2.9, AD 101) playing the subordinate role of a suppliant (*suffragator*) addressing the all-powerful patron, Apollinaris; next as owner of

²⁷ Rimell 2008: 4–12.

²⁸ Plin. *Ep.* 10.2.2. Cf. Tac. *Agr.* 3.1 *et, quamquam primo statim beatissimi saeculi ortu Nerua Caesar res olim dissociabiles miscuerit – principatum et libertatem – augetque cotidie felicitatem temporum Nerua Traianus . . . On Felicitas and Securitas in Trajan’s coinage programme and in Pliny, see Seelentag 2004: 99–107.*

²⁹ The ‘aesthetics of existence’ concept was developed by Foucault 2005, no. 357: 904 and 1989: 60–2 in connection with the issue of status-appropriate patterns of behaviour with particular reference to the lifestyles of antiquity, e.g. exemplary self-development by the individual.

³⁰ On Pliny’s self-exemplification and idealisation in Book 10 by suppressing problems, see Woolf 2006: 95, 103–5; Stadter 2006: 69, 74–5; for further, different views of Book 10 see Harries and Lavan in this volume. Cf. A. König 2007: 177–205.

³¹ Mart. 1.2.4–5. See Fitzgerald 2007: 73–4; Rimell 2008: 10–11. ³² Rimell 2008: 6, 20.

³³ Plin. *Ep.* 1.1.1 *Collegi non seruato temporis ordine*, with Gibson and Morello 2012: 14, 20, 103. For the principle of *uarietas* see 9.2.2 (Ciceronian *uarietas* as unattainable exemplar), 2.5.7 (in style), 3.9.1 (in pleas), 4.14.3 and 9.22.2 (in lyric poetry), 5.6.13 (in landscape).

³⁴ Publication in triads, discussed by Syme 1958: 660–3 and Bodel 2015: 70–1, is not sustained: see Sherwin-White 1966: 27–41; Gibson and Morello 2012: 265–70.

a renowned villa in rivalry with Apollinaris (*Ep.* 5.6, AD 105); and at the discursive climax, finally – rather than where chronology would place it, near the beginning of the letters – the politicians Apollinaris and Pliny measure up to each other in a senatorial debate that had historically taken place in spring 97, ten years before (*Ep.* 9.13.13, c. 107). This is also the high point of Pliny's self-projection as a loyal supporter of Trajan and ideal senator for the new regime.³⁵

In *Epistles* 2.9 Domitius Apollinaris is introduced to us as an influential patron from whom the author is soliciting a recommendation for the candidature of Erucius Clarus for the military tribunate.³⁶ In the year following his suffect consulship (100), Pliny held no office. This enables him to adopt an astutely self-deprecating stance for the first encounter, that of a suppliant (*anxius et inquietus*), appealing on the model of Cicero's affective strategy to the addressee's emotions,³⁷ and deploying the *diligeris, coleris, frequentaris* tricolon to stylise Apollinaris into *the* charismatic political leader figure whom all naturally follow.³⁸ Under Trajan, with Domitius Apollinaris long since politically sidelined, this strategy can hardly have failed to achieve its object.

The Politician (*Negotium*)

Visions of the Underworld: Apollinaris vs Pliny, and the Senate of Rome

Two of Martial's longer epigrams (10.12 and 10.30) feature portraits of Apollinaris, the over-stressed ex-consul of the year 97, torn between *otium* and *negotium*. Thematically they correspond to two letters of Pliny the Younger: in the private space as owner of a villa (*Ep.* 5.6, AD 105) and in the public space as a speaker in the senate (9.13.13, c. 107). The *Fasti Ostienses* reveal that Domitius Apollinaris took up office on 1 July 97 and relinquished it on 1 September.³⁹ Martial claims not to be weighed down by sorrow as he

³⁵ Whitton 2012: 359.

³⁶ *Ep.* 2.9.2 *meo suffragio peruenit ad ius tribunatus petendi*. Cf. *Ep.* 2.9.1 (next n.), commentary by Whitton 2013: 140–7. Cf. Birley 2004: 92 on Erucius Clarus, who rose to supreme power during Trajan's Parthian war (*suff.* 117, 146 *praefectus urbi* and *cos. ord.* 11).

³⁷ *Ep.* 2.9.1 *Anxium me et inquietum habet petitio Sexti Eruci mei. Afficior cura et . . . quasi pro me altero passior; et alioqui meus pudor, mea existimatio, mea dignitas in discrimen adducitur . . . meo suffragio peruenit ad ius tribunatus petendi, quem nisi obrinet in senatu, uereor ne decepsse Caesarem uidear*. His models here are Cicero (*Ad fam.* 11.16–17) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 4.pr.); see Whitton 2013: 141–2 and in this volume, p. 57.

³⁸ Plin. *Ep.* 2.9.6 *ostende modo uelle te, nec deerunt qui, quod tu uelis, cupiant*.

³⁹ Vidman 1982: 45 and *AE* 1954, 220: in the pair following M. Annius Verus and L. Neratius Priscus. Syme 1991b: 588 n. 2 and Nauta 2002: 160 accordingly date the epigram to the second half of 97.

bids farewell to his friend, off to seek restoration after a gruelling summer in the capital (10.12.1–3):

Aemiliae gentes et Apollineas Vercellas
et Phaethontei qui petis arua Padi,
ne uiuam, nisi te, Domiti, dimitto libenter . . .

Domitius, now heading for the folk of the Aemilian Way and Apollo's Vercellae and the fields of Po, Phaethon's river, upon my oath I let you go gladly . . .

Here for the first and only time Martial uses the *gentilicium* Domitius for Apollinaris, and here we learn that the latter was a native of Vercellae, where there was an inscription dedicated to his daughter [*Domit*]ia [*Apollin*]aris [*filia*] [*Fa*]dilla too.⁴⁰ The epithet *Apollineae* applied to Vercellae is not sound evidence of a cult of Apollo,⁴¹ but a subtle allusion to the *cognomen* Apollinaris and Vercellae's poetically gifted son, who endowed his birthplace with reflected glory from the god of poetry.⁴² A second epithet alludes to Apollinaris' destination as *Phaethontei . . . arua Padi*, evoking the famous Ovidian scene of Phaethon's headlong plunge into the Po after driving his father's chariot too close to the burning radiance of the sun.⁴³ Martial's mythological *exemplum* depicting *hybris* and death⁴⁴ and the sun metaphor could be a coded warning to Apollinaris not to stray too near the centres of imperial power. The nape of his neck had already been 'singed' or 'rubbed raw' (*perusta colla*)⁴⁵ in summer 97 by the yoke of the suffect consulate, and by the end of October, following the adoption of Trajan, a further transfer of power was imminent. The opening poems of Book 10 (6 and 7) celebrate Trajan's return to Rome.⁴⁶

The imagery in which Martial clothes the imagined return of Apollinaris to Rome and the seat of power, depicting it as a 'descent to the underworld', Virgil's *pallida regna*, grows out of his intertextual evocation of Tibullus'

⁴⁰ Pais 1884, no. 899 = Roda 1985, no. 20. Alföldy 1999: 328, no. 6, corrects earlier readings.

⁴¹ See Nauta 2002: 160 n. 50 on the slender evidence of *Stat. Silv.* 1.4.58–9.

⁴² *Apollineas* (*Vercellas*) made Apollinaris' cognomen redundant, see Syme 1991b: 588. The play on his name was repeated four centuries later by Sidonius Apollinaris; see Mathisen 1991: 29–43 and Mratschek 2017: 317.

⁴³ *Ov. Met.* 2.319–26, esp. 319–20 and 323–4 *At Phaethon, rutilos flamma populante capillos, | uoluitur in praecipites . . . | Quem procul a patria diuerso maximus orbe | excipit Eridanus*.

⁴⁴ Ovid (*Met.* 2.323–8) styles his description of Phaethon's fall into the Eridanus (Po) as a funerary rite, with the river god rinsing his smoking face and nymphs interring his smouldering body in a hillock and dedicating a funerary inscription to him. On the *hybris*, see the epitaph (vv. 327–8): *Hic situs est Phaethon, currus auriga paterni; | quem si non tenuit, magnis tamen excidit ausis*.

⁴⁵ *Mart.* 10.12.5–6 . . . *ut messe uel una | urbano releues colla perusta iugo*. Note the stylistic device of *ambiguitas* in the participle *perustus*.

⁴⁶ Rimell 2008: 203. Trajan took over the *tribunicia potestas* on 28(?) October; see Kienast 2017: 116.

pallida turba, the crowd of shades flitting by dark waters.⁴⁷ Apollinaris, 'tanned like an Ethiopian' when he first returns from his holiday in the sunlit 'upper world' of Vercellae, grows pale like death itself on merging again with the *pallida turba*, the pallid, spectral army of his urban friends in Rome.⁴⁸ Like voracious Death (*rapax mors*) in Tibullus' hypotext, the capital has robbed Apollinaris of his healthy tan and transformed him into one of the bloodless denizens of Hades with whom he now socialises.⁴⁹ Martial's radical vision of the unhealthy pallid throng is 'a metonym for and epigrammatic entombing' not only of the *urbs*,⁵⁰ but in the *urbs*.

Metaphorical use of black-and-white contrasts, borrowed by Tibullus from the war context for application to the power struggles among the senate leadership cadres, was politically loaded.⁵¹ Visions of the underworld depicting autocratic rule generate a complex intertextual web from the Republic onward. Fearing the worst from the Caesarians, Cicero had already quoted Atticus' sarcastic description of them as *illam νεκρῶν*, that realm of the dead.⁵² Like Martial's underworld vision, the imperial palace of Domitian in Pliny's *Panegyricus* is presented as a place of terror, where the emperor sought out darkness and secrecy – *tenebras semper secretumque captantem*; his pallor was contagious.⁵³ Tacitus singles out as the nadir of misery under Domitian the pallor of senators (*denotandis tot hominibus palloribus*) compelled to look on impotently – and under the emperor's eye – as their colleagues were condemned.⁵⁴ Through the twist in the plot,

Martial creates an anti-propempticon, hailing the departure that allowed a senator, for the space of a summer month, to see the 'upper world' once more, and parodying the happy anticipation of reunion in Rome as a return to the realm of shades, to the Orcus-dwellers in their white togas.⁵⁵ It demonstrates Martial's acute awareness of how drastically politics had been transformed.⁵⁶ Was he thinking of his own departure, now that his panegyrics to Domitian would have made him *persona non grata* with Domitian's successors? Or did he fear political purges under the new regime as previously under Augustus, when unworthy senators had been termed 'Orcus-dwellers' and expelled from the senate?⁵⁷

Not until well on into Trajan's reign, in 106–8, were the last aftershocks of the denunciations of the Domitian era and the dark side of Nerva's rule reflected in the works of Pliny. Domitius Apollinaris was present in the senate in 97 as *consul designatus* under Nerva⁵⁸ when Pliny launched his memorable attack on Publicius Certus: in his (lost) speech *De Helvidi ultione* he had demanded revenge for the murder of the younger Helvidius, in which Certus, under Domitian, had been complicit.⁵⁹ *Maiestas* trials and factional rivalries in the senate had then brought death to no fewer than twelve men of consular rank.⁶⁰ Pliny's proud self-presentation as orator addressing the senate reveals that Apollinaris had backed the 'wrong' side.⁶¹ Like Fabricius Veiento, three times consul (*cos.* III 83), who had

⁴⁷ Tib. 1.10.37–8 *Illic percussisque genis ustoque capillo | errat ad obscuros pallida turba lacus*. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.244–5 (*regna . . . | pallida*); 10.761 (*pallida Tisiphone*); *Georg.* 1.277; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.48. See André 1949: 145; Heil 2004: 78–9.

⁴⁸ Mart. 10.12.9–11 *Et uenies albis non cognoscendus amicis | liuebitque tuis pallida turba genis*. . . . | *Niliaco redeas tu licet ore niger*. Note the colour display referring to the myth of Phaethon: Αἰθίοψ means 'burnt-face', i.e. Ethiopian, 'negro'. See LSJ s.v. and Balsdon 1979: 59, 217. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.235–6 and Plin. *Nat.* 2.189 on the sun-chariot of Phaethon that burnt the skin of the Ethiopians, turning it black. There is also the greenish discolouration of a corpse. Both were foreigners, cf. Mart. 10.12.8 (Apollinaris as *peregrinus*) and Ov. *Met.* 2.323 on the death of Phaethon (*procul a patria diuerso . . . orbe*).

⁴⁹ Mart. 10.12.11 *Sed uia quem dederit rapiet cito Roma colorem*. Cf. Tib. 1.10.33 (*atra . . . mors*); 1.3.65 (*rapax mors*).

⁵⁰ Rimell 2008: 12, 20–4. *Turba* is used fifty-nine times in Martial's corpus (ibid. 21 n. 10).

⁵¹ On Martial as a 'political poet', see Fearnley 2003: 613–35.

⁵² Cic. *Att.* 9.12(11).2 *Quam ille [sc. Mattius] haec non probare mihi quidem uisus est, quam illam νεκρῶν, ut tu appellas, timere! . . . Vitam in hac aliquod miseria rei publicae πολιτικόν opus efficere et nauare mihi liceat!*

⁵³ Plin. *Pan.* 48.4 *Obseruabantur foribus horror et minae et par metus admissis et exclusis*; on Domitian, 48.4 (*femineus pallor*) and 48.5 *tenebras semper secretumque captantem, nec umquam ex solitudine sua prodeuntem, nisi ui solitudinem faceret*. See Braund 1998: 64–5 (repr. in Rees 2012a: 96–7); C. Kelly 2015: 227.

⁵⁴ Tac. *Agr.* 45.2 *Praecipua sub Domitiano miseriarum pars erat uidere et aspici, cum suspiria nostra subscriberentur, cum denotandis tot hominum palloribus sufficeret saeuus ille uultus et rubor, quo se contra*

pudorem muniebat. On 'Martial and Tacitus on regime change', see Rimell in this volume; on the emperor as observer, Woodman 2014: 319.

⁵⁵ Compare Mart. 10.12.9 (*albis . . . amicis*), 1.55.14 (*urbanis albus in officiis*) and 10.19(18).4 *Eheu! Quam fatuae sunt tibi, Roma, togae!*

⁵⁶ Martial's Book 10 is presented as a second edition (10.2.1–4), 'after the death and the *damnatio memoriae* of Domitian' (Rimell 2008: 5); see also Rimell and König in this volume. This expurgated version is generally dated to the year 98 after Trajan's accession to the throne, but as with Tacitus' *Agricola* an earlier composition date under Nerva but after the adoption of Trajan, at the earliest at the end of October 97, is possible; see Syme 1958: 19; Fearnley 2003: 629. Of an anthology containing Books 10–11, the accompanying poem to Nerva (12.5) is preserved.

⁵⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 35.1 (on the *lectio senatus*) *et quidem indignissimi et post necem Caesaris per gratiam et praemium allecti, quos orciuus uulgus uocabat*. Cf. the ambiguity of Martial's *manibus* ('from my hands' and 'from the shades of the dead') in announcing Book 10 (1.2.1–2); see Rimell in this volume.

⁵⁸ Plin. *Ep.* 9.13.13 *Dicit Domitius Apollinaris, consul designatus*. Pliny's plea was delivered during the half-year from January to July 97, after Apollinaris' return and before his suffect consulship.

⁵⁹ Cf. *Ep.* 9.13.16 on the 'bloodstained flattery' (*cruenta adulatio*) of Certus. He had proposed the *sententia* of condemnation in the senate: see Sherwin-White 1966: 492. On Pliny's 'revenge', see Whitton 2012: 353–4.

⁶⁰ Suet. *Dom.* 10–11 (catalogue of those executed), esp. 10.2 *Complures senatores, in iis aliquot consulares, interemit*. Cf. 15.1, Tac. *Agr.* 45.1 (*tot consularium caedes*). But see Woodman 2014: 316 contra Syme 1958: 597.

⁶¹ Sherwin-White 1966: 157 implies that a late shadow was cast on the picture of friendship (Plin. *Ep.* 2.9; 5.6).

been closely associated with Domitian's reign of terror,⁶² Apollinaris had defended Publicius Certus.⁶³ The process of coming to terms with the past was intimately bound up with Rome's future. Pliny contrives to present the struggle between the old Domitianic order and the incoming power elite on the political stage of the senate in such a way as to show himself at the centre of the action. A friend from the ranks of the consulars took him aside and urged him to desist: Pliny had made himself 'conspicuous to future emperors'.⁶⁴ He was also warned against Certus' powerful friend, whose name none dared speak, with armies in the east at his disposal: M. Cornelius Nigrinus Curvator Maternus. Governor of Syria from 94 or 95 to 97 and hero of Domitian's Dacian wars, Cornelius Nigrinus was Trajan's rival for the imperial throne, and with the adoption of Trajan saw his political career terminated before the year was out⁶⁵ – as, evidently, did Domitius Apollinaris.

Commitment for the orphaned family of the younger Helvidius, which had its roots in the Stoic opposition,⁶⁶ and the explosiveness of the political situation *before* the election of Nerva's successor, required courage. How much courage becomes clear when Pliny stoically responded to his friend's warning during the tumultuous session of the senate with the words of Aeneas: *Omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi* ('I foresaw all this, and ran it through in my mind', Virg. *Aen.* 6.105). With his subtle allusion to the Sibyl's warning about descent into the kingdom of Death, Pliny defined not only his plea before the senate (*actio*) and its perils as his 'descent into the underworld', but along with it – as Ilaria Marchesi has persuasively shown – the entire self-aggrandising project to which his *Epistles* and his political career were devoted.⁶⁷ Pliny translated Martial's underworld metaphor into Virgilian verses with the aim of reminding the public of the time of terror endured under Domitian, while distancing

⁶² Ep. 4.22.4 *Cenabat Nerua cum paucis; Veiento proximus atque etiam in sinu recumbebat*. Junius Mauricus alludes to Veiento's adaptability and his *nequitia sanguinariaeque sententiae* (4.22.5–6); cf. Juv. 4.113 (Domitian's council).

⁶³ Ep. 9.13.13 *Iam censendi tempus. Dicit Domitius Apollinaris consul designatus, dicit Fabricius Veiento . . . Omnes Certum nondum a me nominatum ut nominatum defendunt*. On Veiento, see Syme 1958: 633; Balland 1981: 118. A certain Attica and her husband Fabricius Veiento, consul for three times, dedicated an inscription to the dea Nemetona in Mainz c. 83 (*CIL* XIIII, 7253 = *ILS* 1010).

⁶⁴ Ep. 9.13.10 *Notabilem te futuris principibus fecisti*.

⁶⁵ Ep. 9.13.11 *Nominat quendam, qui tunc ad orientem amplissimum et famosissimum exercitum non sine magnis dubiisque rumoribus obtinebat*. On identification and career (*AE* 1973, 283) see Alföldy and Halfmann 1973: 331–73, esp. pp. 361–6; cf. Griffin 2000: 90; Eck 2002a: 211–26.

⁶⁶ On Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus the Elder, see Syme 1958: 596–7, 1991b: 568–87; Penwill 2003: 347–53, 360–2.

⁶⁷ Marchesi 2008: 36–7. The allusion generated a dialogue between Book 1 and Book 9, see Hoffer 1999: 9–10; 67.

himself both from that past and from the *mali principes* of the future.⁶⁸ The atmosphere of danger underlined Pliny's heroism in avenging Helvidius and in his fearless championing of the *optimus princeps*, Trajan. Whereas Apollinaris, after his 'katabasis' into the centre of power, was sucked into the *pallida turba* in Rome and became assimilated – the suffect consulship of 97 is his last documented official position – Pliny for his part survived unscathed, although the 'thunderbolts' of the year 93/4 under Domitian had fallen perilously close.⁶⁹ He succeeded in declaring that at that point his career halted, a tendentious remark that represents Pliny's prefecture of the *aerarium militare* under Domitian as the 'longer route' to the top after his praetorship.⁷⁰

The process of editing his letter collection enabled Pliny to create his own account of the evolution of his *persona*.⁷¹ Reshaping the chronology of events, he retrospectively stylised his first encounter with Apollinaris and the outstanding success of his speech into a climax of the collection – and a pivotal moment in his career (*Ep.* 9.13.23):⁷² as a result Publicius Certus was supposed to be dismissed from office – at the *aerarium Saturni* – and, unlike his colleague there Bittius Proculus, failed to become a consul.⁷³ In reality, Certus died from disease, and Bittius Proculus did not become consul until 99, two years later.⁷⁴ By his smart move in attacking Publicius Certus, Pliny gained the *aerarium Saturni*, which led directly to a consulship. The addressee of the letter, not coincidentally, was a highly promising young orator, the 25-year-old Ummidius Quadratus, who revered Pliny as *rector* and *magister* in the art of rhetoric.⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Ep. 9.13.11 (on Cornelius Nigrinus) *'Esto' inquam, 'dum malis.'*

⁶⁹ Ep. 3.11.3 . . . *tot circa me iactis fulminibus quasi ambustus mihi quoque impendere idem exitum certis quibusdam notis augurarer*. This letter, indicating that Pliny supported the philosopher Artemidorus financially in spite of the latter's banishment from Rome, has striking structural similarities to that of the Certus affair. Whitton 2015a: 7–9, 20 distinguishes between the expulsion of the philosophers from the capital and from Italy by edict.

⁷⁰ *Pan.* 95.3–4 . . . *substiti, (4) . . . longius iter malui . . . inuisus pessimo [sc. principi] fui*. See Whitton 2015a: 17–20; for a different view Syme 1991b: 564–5 and Sherwin-White 1966: 75, contrary to Birley 2000a: 14–15 (appointment by Nerva).

⁷¹ Gibson and Morello 2012: 27–32, 250–1; Gibson 2015: 195–8.

⁷² Gibson and Morello 2012: 28; Whitton 2012: 355–6; Gibson 2003: 245 and 254: 'Praise of the self is a key mechanism for exercising control in advance over the reception of your deeds by society.'

⁷³ Ep. 9.13.23 *obtinui tamen, quod intenderam. Nam collega Certi consulatum, successorem Certus accepit. Pliny on Certus: 'Reddat praemium sub optimo principe, quod a pessimo accepit.'*

⁷⁴ Ep. 9.13.24 *sed non tamquam fortuitum, quod editis libris Certus intra paucissimos dies implicitus morbo decessit*. See Eck 1993: 449. Q. Fulvius Gillo Bittius Proculus was the stepfather of Pliny's wife.

⁷⁵ Ep. 6.11.2 *atque inter haec illud, quod et ipsi me ut rectorem, ut magistrum intuebantur et iis, qui audiebant, me aemulari, meis instare uestigiis uidebantur*. See Sherwin-White 1966: 362 and Syme 1968a: 84–98 (= *RP* II, 672–85) on Ummidius Quadratus Sertorius Severus, *cos. suff.* 118 under Hadrian.

An attentive reader leafing back through the collection will be able to identify an anonymous forensic speech full of pathos with the *De Helvidi ultione* mentioned in the second of Pliny's letters.⁷⁶ Pliny had composed it after the senatorial debate in the year 98, drawing on 'Cicero's palette' and portraying himself as a 'second Cicero' in his campaign against Catilina-Certus.⁷⁷ Arrianus Maturus received an advance copy and a note requesting his comments.⁷⁸ A letter to Velius Cerealis likewise referred to the plea on behalf of Helvidius, without naming a book title, and used the words *nostri metus* to reawaken old fears.⁷⁹ Pliny circulated it among friends initially, venturing only a decade later to disclose name and title of the speech and publish his plea. He revived it in Book 9 as a historical event documenting his loyalty to the persecuted family, and also, as a senator of consular rank, immortalised his self-comparison with Cicero.⁸⁰ Pliny's exhortation to continue along the path to immortality that has carried few out into the light of fame (*in lucem famamque*) after enticing many out of darkness of silence (*e tenebris et silentio*) can be read as his postscript for his friend Tacitus on the Certus affair.⁸¹

Martial's and Pliny's underworld scenarios thus differ structurally, even though they both play out on the political stage of the year 97. Martial, conjuring up the realm of the dead with his alternation from light to darkness, is out to create a graphic evocation of the quivering taut atmosphere of fear and uncertainty that gripped the Roman political scene before the adoption of Trajan. It is all the more fitting that he is rewriting his own epitaph in the virtual monument at the beginning of Book 10 (2.1–12), and that Rome has risen from the Styx under Trajan's new regime by reading on (72.10), as Victoria Rimell shows in her chapter in this volume on the 'art of survival'. In Pliny's case, by contrast, the author's voluntary descent into

⁷⁶ *Ep.* 1.2.1 (*librum*). See Gibson and Morello 2012: 27–8.

⁷⁷ *Ep.* 1.2.3–4 *erat enim* [sc. *materia*] *prope tota in contentione dicendi . . . Non tamen omnino Marci nostri ληκύθους fugimus . . .* Cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.14.3 (Rome, 13 Feb. 61 BC) on Crassus' praise for Cicero's merits due to suppression of the Catiline conspiracy: *Totum hunc locum, quem ego uarie meis orationibus . . . soleo pingere, de flamma, de ferro (nostri illas ληκύθους), ualde grauiter pertexuit.* On the *aemulatio* of Cicero, cf. Plin. *Ep.* 1.5.12.

⁷⁸ *Ep.* 1.2.1 *Hunc* [sc. *librum*] *rogo ex consuetudine tua et legas et emendes . . .* According to Sherwin-White 1966: 30, Book 1 was edited in 98/9. Cf. the reformulation of Cicero's themes in Book 10 identified by Woolf 2006: 102–4.

⁷⁹ *Ep.* 4.21.3 (c. 104/5) *Nam patrem illarum* [sc. *Heluidiarum sororum*] *defunctum quoque perseuerantissime diligo, ut actione mea librisque testatum est; Ep.* 4.21.5, referring to the only son of the Younger Helvidius: *Nosti in amore mollitiam animi mei, nosti metus.*

⁸⁰ *Ep.* 4.21.3. Sherwin-White 1966: 40–1 dates publication of Book 9 to 106–8. On self-stylisation as 'opponent of Domitian', see Ludolph 1997: 143, 154 and 166.

⁸¹ In the next letter, *Ep.* 9.14 *Pergamus modo itinere instituto, quod ut paucos in lucem famamque prouexit, ita multos e tenebris et silentio protulit.* Excellently interpreted by Whitton 2012: 356.

the underworld proves to be a means of establishing his authority, that of the politician and orator who has embarked on the path leading into the light of immortality.

The Owner of the Villa (*Otium*)

The Semiotics of Visualisation: Apollinaris' Formianum vs Pliny's Tusci

In the world of the Roman elites, no identifying mark is more revealing than their private villas. These are interrelated, reflecting the relationships of their owners, or their alterity.⁸² Interminable scholarly debate over whether Pliny's metaphorically dense villa descriptions are fictive or based on real villa architecture⁸³ has hitherto left one specific question unaddressed: why did Pliny choose to send *his* villa description, of the *Tusci*, to Domitius Apollinaris in particular, the dedicatee also of Martial's epigram about Apollinaris' villa in Formiae? The answer is simple: Pliny (*Ep.* 5.6) has shaped his own life design and his own villa near Tifernum Tiberinum,⁸⁴ which owed its superiority to dissociation, in conscious contrast to Domitius Apollinaris' lifestyle, represented in his coastal estate (Mart. 10.30). Pliny's summer residence was not by the sea but at the foot of the Apennines, six miles above Città di Castello.⁸⁵ In this context there is no mention of the fact that Pliny the Younger had inherited the Tuscan estate from the Elder, and that the tenants on his land, mostly reserved for viticulture, were paying him an annual total of over 400,000 sesterces in rent.⁸⁶

Literary letter writer and poet compete here to evoke this loveliest *locus amoenus*, the ekphrasis in prose competing with that in verse. This ingenious exchange between Martial and Pliny draws attention to the 'interactive' nature of literature and the poetic transformation of Pliny's epistle: being 'cultured' did not only mean being capable of reading both villa descriptions and understanding its allusions, but also responding creatively to it: author (Pliny and Martial), dedicatee (Apollinaris, Martial's 'empowered' reader) and audience (private friends and a larger reading public)

⁸² Elsner 1998: 44; Henderson 2002: 15–20, 2004: 67, 71; Gibson and Morello 2012: 218.

⁸³ For this reason, I refer here just to Bergmann 1995: 406–20, with copious bibliography.

⁸⁴ On Pliny's villas as focus for his autobiographical sketch, see Whitton 2013: 219.

⁸⁵ Gibson and Morello 2012: 228–33 ('Archaeology in Tuscany/Umbria'), esp. pp. 228–9; on Pliny's trip to Tifernum Tiberinum in summer 99, Seelentag 2004: 183–97.

⁸⁶ Plin. *Ep.* 10.8.5 *locatio, cum alioqui CCCC excedat . . .* Andermahr 1998: 38, with reservations. For a contrary view: Champlin 2001: 122–3; Gibson and Morello 2012: 202–3, 223–4.

should thus be seen as standing in an active relationship to one another.⁸⁷ Pliny's villa letter of summer 105, the time of his *cura aluei Tiberis*, is our last document referring to Apollinaris as a living person. It is not only the relationship between Pliny and Apollinaris that appears in a new light as a result of these literary interactions, but also the author's persona and the design of his letter collection. Comparison focused on the process of literary transformation is instructive.

Martial's poem (10.30.1–4) begins like a hymn with an invocation of the balmy climate and charming situation of Apollinaris' villa on the shore at Formiae, a place favoured by the senator above all others for his escapes from Trajan's Rome, the 'city of Mars'.⁸⁸ Pliny's letter (5.6.1), by contrast, leads off with Apollinaris asking about the unhealthy climate affecting Pliny's summer residence near the border between Etruria and Umbria. The letter writer measures the mild climate of Formiae (*temperatae Formiae*) against the remarkable clemency (*mira clementia*) of the summers at Tifernum Tiberinum.⁸⁹ Martial's lyrical evocation of a mobile yet tranquil sea (*uiua . . . quies ponti*), the gaily painted boat impelled gently forward on the breeze (*aura*), as if by the stirring of a girl's purple fan, has its counterpart in Pliny's depiction of the *forma pulcherrima* of the landscape, which resembles a vast amphitheatre.⁹⁰ With its expanse of 'bejewelled' wild-flower meadow (*prata florida et gemmea*) set between shade-giving hills and brooks tumbling down towards the Tiber, the air always refreshed by soft breezes (*aurae*), the scene carries clear and intended overtones of the Tempe valley, the classic *locus amoenus*, as described by the author's uncle, Pliny the Elder.⁹¹ A further intertextual allusion involving the 'Tuscan soil', said to require 'nine ploughings to tame it' into farmland, this too echoing

the *Natural history* (*Ep.* 5.6.10; *NH* 18.181), characterises the *doctus Apollinaris* as well-read.⁹² Roy Gibson and Ruth Morello suggest that this detail also symbolises the interactions between the two Plinys, in the same way as the villa, which the Younger erected on a site belonging to the Elder, but to his own design, in which he incorporated the original buildings.⁹³

Where Martial's villa poem seeks its effects acoustically during recitation of the choliambic by means of startling *pointes* in line-endings, Pliny creates 'a villa to behold'.⁹⁴ The words *magnam capies uoluptatem* (5.6.13) invite Apollinaris to enter, in an act of imaginative fantasy, into this classical *locus amoenus* and to allow the visually performative flow of poetic ekphrasis to make its impact on him. Pliny does not confine himself to visualising the villa for his addressee.⁹⁵ By an internal focalisation he constructs a picture within the picture, a bird's-eye view, directing Apollinaris' gaze down from the hilltop to the villa halfway down: *Neque enim terras tibi, sed formam aliquam ad eximiam pulchritudinem pictam uideberis cernere* ('You will have the impression not of gazing at the landscape, but at some painting of a scene of breathtaking beauty', *Ep.* 5.6.13).⁹⁶ In parallel with Roman painting, the focus has shifted from the gaze in the picture to the gaze observing the picture and observing the act of gazing.⁹⁷ Apollinaris as beholder initially stands outside the picture specially created for him, before being included – as a visitor – in a sightseeing tour through the villa complexes. This rhetorical device, blurring the distinction between description and villa, between reading and seeing, merges the descriptive act and the visual act into a single perception – a *Gesamtkunstwerk* from the pen of Pliny.⁹⁸ The *uarietas* of the landscape and the *dispositio* of the property coincide with the rhetorical requirements for the composition of his *Epistles*.⁹⁹

⁸⁷ Cf. Whitton on prose–prose intertextuality and Marchesi on the web of poetic intertexts in Pliny; see Roller on Pliny's recitations and Rimell on the reader's active involvement in Martial's epigrams, all of them in this volume.

⁸⁸ Mart. 10.30.1–4 *O temperatae dulce Formiae litus, | uos, cum seueri fugit oppidum Martis | et inquietas fessis exiit curas, | Apollinaris omnibus locis praefert*. On the poem, see Kreiling 2004: 131–5; Fabbrini 2007: 117–80. The image of the Rome of general Trajan as 'city of stern Mars' evokes memories of the foundation of the 'city of Mars' (*Mauortia . . . moenia*) by Romulus in Virgil (*Aen.* 1.276–7). Cf. König in this volume on the city–country contrast.

⁸⁹ Mart. 10.30.1; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.5.

⁹⁰ Mart. 10.30.11–15; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.7–11, esp. 7 *Regionis forma pulcherrima. Imaginare amphitheatrum aliquod inmensum . . . Lata et diffusa planities montibus cingitur, montes summa sui parte proceras memora et antiqua habent*. Cf. the satirically overdrawn 'amphitheatre of Orpheus' near Pliny's town house on the Esquiline hill (Mart. 10.20(19).6–10), below.

⁹¹ *Ep.* 5.6.11 *Prata florida et gemmea trifolium . . . alunt; cuncta enim perennibus riuis nutriuntur*. Cf. Plin. *NH* 4.31 *ultra uisum hominis atollentibus se dextra lacuque leniter conuexis iugis, intrus silua late uiridante, ac labitur Penius uiridis calculo, amoenus circa ripas gramine, canorus auium concentu*. On Pliny's appropriation of a poetic style, see Stat. *Silu.* 1.5.12 (*gemmantia*).

⁹² *Ep.* 5.6.10 *tantis glaebis tenacissimum solum . . . assurgit, ut nono demum sulco perdometur*. Cf. Plin. *NH* 18.181 *Spissius solum, sicut plerumque in Italia, quinto sulco seri melius est, in Tuscis uero nono*. See Gibson and Morello 2012: 224–5; a contrary view in Sherwin-White 1966: 265. Cf. Mart. 4.86.3 (*doctus . . . Apollinaris*).

⁹³ Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.41 *Amo enim, quae maxima ex parte ipse incohauit aut incohata percolui*. For interpretation, see Gibson and Morello 2012: 223.

⁹⁴ Chinn 2007: 265–80 and Whitton 2013: 220–1.

⁹⁵ Following rules on rhetoric from Horace (*Ars* 17) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 6.2.32; cf. 4.3.12) relating to visual effects (*enargeia, illustratio et perspicuitas*) used to eulogise a place.

⁹⁶ Lefèvre 2009: 232. ⁹⁷ Elsner 2007: 87.

⁹⁸ Referred to also by Barthes as 'reality effect'; see Chinn 2007: 270–1. The overall view presented has such suggestive power that Apollinaris' eyes can recover purely as a result of the depiction (n. 97), or that the reader, who 'in the letter crawls round in every corner' with Pliny, is enabled by the act of reading (*legenti*), as opposed to a physical tour of inspection (*uisenti*), to put down the letter temporarily for a rest (*Ep.* 5.6.40–41).

⁹⁹ *Ep.* 5.6.13 *ea uarietate, ea descriptione, quocumque inciderint oculi, reficiuntur*. See Gibson and Morello 2012: 216, 225–6.

Martial handles the idea of ekphrasis playfully (1–24), deploying ever new and limping punchlines to heighten the listeners' expectation right up to the peripeteia. He captures the carefree ease (*otium*) of the *Formianum* in two paradoxical images: fish are so abundant in the inshore waters that Apollinaris can cast for them while reclining on his couch;¹⁰⁰ and a medley of trained salt-water fish in fishponds obediently swim up at their master's bidding and await transfer to the day's menu.¹⁰¹ Familiar with this passage, Pliny refrains from quoting it in his letter. His preference is not the subjugation of nature, but a setting created by nature: not a fish-pool (*piscina*), but an abundance of game for the table, and a swimming-pool.¹⁰² If Formiae offers sea-angling from the couch, Pliny's alcove is as restful as a forest, but with a roof to keep the rain off.¹⁰³ To him, Martial's lines appear better suited to his villa by Lake Como, which has similarities to the sea,¹⁰⁴ than to the Tuscan villa.

Pliny's elaborate villa description (4–40) ends in a reflection on literary theory in which he discusses concept and length of ekphrasis (41–4), comparing his own practice with scene descriptions by renowned epic poets.¹⁰⁵ The well-read Apollinaris could appreciate why he invokes Homer, Virgil and Aratus as canonic models,¹⁰⁶ contending in accordance with the principle of *aptum* that 'what is extensive is not the letter which gives the description, but the villa which is described'.¹⁰⁷ The description of the shield in Homer (*Il.* 18.478–82) had stood ever since as the prototype for all subsequent ekphraseis, bringing, in Giuliani's words, 'nothing less than the world itself before the [observer's] eyes'.¹⁰⁸ Virgil's shield description

¹⁰⁰ Mart. 10.30.16–18 *Nec seta longo quaeris in mari praedam, | sed a cubili lectuloque iactatam | spectatus alte lineam trahit piscis.*

¹⁰¹ Mart. 10.30.19–24. Negatively connoted as *aquarium* by Sullivan 1991: 159. On archaeologically documented fishponds at Formiae, see Giuliani and Guaitoli 1972: 191–219; on fish-farming, Mielsch 1997: 23–32.

¹⁰² Mart. 10.30.21 *piscina rhombum pascit et lupos uernas.* Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.7 *Frequens ibi et uaria uenatio; 5.6.25 Si natare latius aut tepidius uelis, in area piscina est.* On the 'power over nature' in Martial vs Pliny's natural wonders, and *mirabilia* as 'a barometer' for reconstructing shifting cultural attitudes, see Ash in this volume.

¹⁰³ *Ep.* 5.6.39 (on the *cubiculum*) *Non secus ibi quam in nemore iaceas, imbrem tantum tamquam in nemore non sentias.*

¹⁰⁴ *Ep.* 9.7.4 (on his villa 'Comedy') *Ex hac ipse piscari hamumque de cubiculo ac paene etiam de lectulo ut e naucula iacere.* Reference kindly supplied by Chris Whitton (personal communication); see also Sherwin-White 1966: 486; Fabbrini 2007: 138–9.

¹⁰⁵ Chinn 2007: 268–70. The length breaches the epistolary principle of *brevitas*.

¹⁰⁶ The expression *miraris* identifies them as marvels, held in awe by observer or reader.

¹⁰⁷ *Ep.* 5.6.44 *non epistula quae describit, sed uilla quae describitur magna est.* On the principle of appropriateness (*aptum*), cf. Hor. *Ars* 14–23 and Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.1 (as *uirtus . . . maxime necessaria*).

¹⁰⁸ Giuliani 2003: 39.

(*Aen.* 8.626–731) was 'a work of art beyond reproducing in words', and to read Aratus' didactic poem on astronomy was comparable with beholding the constellations in the starry sky.¹⁰⁹ Pliny had endeavoured to set the whole villa before the eyes of Apollinaris.¹¹⁰

Pliny's celebrated letter about his *Tusci* (5.6) was designed as a response and a contrast piece to Martial's epigram on Apollinaris' villa in Formiae. In his *conclusio* (44–6), he refers the reader to the catalogue in Martial (10.30.5–10)¹¹¹ of ten suburban villas belonging to Apollinaris, and closes the circle by finally answering Apollinaris' opening question: *Habes causas cur ego Tuscos meos Tusculanis Tiburtinis Praenestinisque praeponomam* ('now you know why I prefer my Tuscan estate to any in Tusculum or Tibur or Praeneste', *Ep.* 5.6.45; cf. 1).¹¹² His quotation from Martial is a clear allusion to and rejection of Apollinaris' impressive line-up of villas. Pliny uses this rhetorical device to emphasise that he prefers his own provincial retreat to the numerous and fashionable resorts of his correspondent. In his letters as a whole he modestly compares Apollinaris' ten luxurious villas with the three locations where he had villas of his own, at Tifernum Tiberinum, on Lake Como, and by the sea at Laurentum, two of which are left unmentioned here.¹¹³

Pliny seems to have been rather more impressed by Martial's literary technique in evoking the landscapes of the prettiest country retreats for his readers visually, in conformity with Quintilian's rules of rhetoric, as if they were tourists, conveying the illusion of beholding the view from the heights of the Sabine and Alban Hills outside Rome, southwards down the entire coastline as far as the Gulf of Baiae:¹¹⁴ from the vantage point of the Tibur estate outside Rome, owned by Apollinaris' wife Valeria Vettilla (and her

¹⁰⁹ Virg. *Aen.* 8.625 *clipei non enarrabile textum.* Cf. Aratus' *Phaenomena* for connoisseurs.

¹¹⁰ *Ep.* 5.6.44 *Similiter nos, ut 'parua magnis', cum totam uillam oculis tuis subicere conamur.*

¹¹¹ In addition to his favourite villa at Formiae, Apollinaris owned nine other villas south of Rome, alluded to here by Pliny (*Ep.* 5.6.45). On their location, see below.

¹¹² With Sherwin-White 1966: 329–30 and Balland 1981: 120, I prefer the MS reading of *Tusculanis* to the *in Tuscano* conjectured by Mommsen. The cliché of the spurned villas at Tusculum, Tibur and Praeneste (*Ep.* 5.6.45) is a witty quotation from Martial's catalogue of Apollinaris' various villas (10.30.5–10). Pliny's emphatic *ego . . . meos* establishes the contrast with Apollinaris and his villas.

¹¹³ Apart from the *Tusci* and his *Laurentinum* (*Ep.* 2.17), Pliny owned at least three villas on Lake Como: cf. *Ep.* 9.7.1–2 (*Huius [i.e. lacus Larii] in litore plures uillae meae*) and 3.19.2 (accumulation of estates). See Andermahr 1998: 384; Sherwin-White 1966: 486.

¹¹⁴ Mart. 10.30.5–10 *Non ille sanctae dulce Tibur uxoris, | nec Tusculanos Algidosue secessus, | Praeneste nec sic Antiumque miratur; | non blanda Circe Dardanisue Caieta | desiderantur, nec Marica nec Liris, | nec in Lucrina lota Salmacis uena.* Stat. *Silu.* 4.4.15–18 confirms that these were the restorative retreats favoured for the heat of midsummer. See Sullivan 1991: 158; Fabbrini 2007: 124–31.

father),¹¹⁵ down over shade-giving oakwoods¹¹⁶ towards little harbours with foundation myths reaching back to Homer and Virgil,¹¹⁷ and the Lucrine Lake, celebrated like Formiae for its abundant fish and its oyster-beds.¹¹⁸ Pliny adopted this hilltop perspective (*ex monte*) for the panoramic view he shares with Apollinaris, overlooking the villa complex.¹¹⁹

Nevertheless, the idyllic setting of the villa at Formiae is deceptive; the splendour proves to be worthless for its owner. Martial shatters the illusion by announcing that Rome, the city of Mars, has debarred Apollinaris from enjoying its amenities:¹²⁰ the rooms stand empty, and the place's beauty (*amoenitas loci*) is being enjoyed by others. The poem's ending and climax are an ironic *makarismos* on the servants: *O ianitores uilicique felices! | Dominis parantur ista, seruiunt uobis* ('Lucky janitors, lucky bailiffs! These delights are acquired for their owners, but it is you they serve', 10.30.28–9).¹²¹ The beneficiaries of all this enviable luxury are not the owners but the staff. The paradox represents an inversion of the Roman social order. The real slave in this 'upside-down world' is Domitius Apollinaris, the senator, shackled by the affairs of the capital city (*negotiosis rebus urbis haerens*).¹²² The epigram is neither a 'compliment' on his political activity nor a 'homage' to his wealth and lifestyle.¹²³ Combining the literary technique of the peripeteia and the choliambic metre, humour and playful misdirection, Martial transforms his lyrical praise for Apollinaris' dream

¹¹⁵ Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.22–3 *seu mihi frigidum | Praeneste seu Tibur supinum*. Syme 1991b: 598 is in error when he writes that Apollinaris preferred his wife's estate at Tibur, only 20 miles from Rome, to the Formianum.

¹¹⁶ Algidum (Cava dell'Aglio), 1770 feet (540 m) up in the hills, and the cool Praeneste with its terraced temple to Fortuna Primigenia, were famed for their oak forests (Hor. *Carm.* 3.23.9–10, 4.4.58; Serv. ad *Aen.* 7.678); Tusculum was known for its salubrious climate (Cic. *RP* 1.1). Algidum was at the gap, Tusculum on the outer ring of the Alban hills, Praeneste 'at the foot of the (Sabine) hills' (Cato fr. 6 Peter).

¹¹⁷ Aetiologies in Mart. 10.30.8–9 (*non blanda Circe Dardanisque Caieta | . . . nec Marica nec Liris*): Circeii, where Elpenor's grave and Odysseus' drinking-cup were displayed (Plin. *NH* 15.119; Theophr. *H. plant.* 5.8.3), derives from Circe (Hom. *Od.* 10.133–574), Caieta from the wet-nurse of Aeneas and mother of the Latins (Virg. *Aen.* 7.1–2), Minturnae, at the mouth of the Liris, from the cult of the nymph and goddess Marica (*CIL* 1², 2438; Hor. *Carm.* 3.17.7–8).

¹¹⁸ Mart. 10.30.10 (*nec in Lucrina lota Salmacis uena*) alludes to the metamorphosis of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus in the Lucrine Lake (Ov. *Met.* 4.285–388; 15.319). On the abundance of fish, see Serv. ad *Georg.* 2.161; on the oyster cultures, Plin. *NH* 9.168.

¹¹⁹ Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.13 *Magnam capies uoluptatem, si hunc regionis situm ex monte prospexeris*.

¹²⁰ Mart. 10.30.25 *Fruis sed istis quando, Roma, permittis?* On Trajan's Rome as 'city of stern Mars', see above.

¹²¹ The choliamb with its final trochee or spondee emphasises the final word in each case, *fe-lices* and *uobis*.

¹²² Martial closes the loop by returning to the beginning of the poem (v. 3), where he had presented Apollinaris as 'wearied by restless cares'.

¹²³ Thus Nauta 2002: 161; Fabbrini 2007: 123, 132, 162, 165–6.

villa into a witty parody, challenging and entertaining both protagonist and audience through the unexpected anomalies of a *mundus inuersus*.

Intertextuality and 'Immortality': the Creation of Literary Authority

In their respective *conclusiones* (Mart. 10.30.25–30; Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.44–6), Martial's *Formianum* and Pliny's *Tusci* are seen to function as the social space for the creation of differing identities and for negotiating the Roman concept of *otium* and *negotium*. As a political metaphor, they are representative of the diverging aristocratic lifestyles of the author and the addressee, Pliny and Apollinaris.¹²⁴ In Martial's *Formianum* everything serves the *dolce far niente*; in complete contrast, the guided tour of Pliny's villa complex draws attention to the practical benefit (*usus a fronte*) behind the architectural show-side (*haec facies*).¹²⁵ Apollinaris' display of ostentatious affluence contrasts with the elegant restraint shown by Pliny in the design of his villa complex, aesthetically a blend of urbanism and nature.¹²⁶ Figures embedded in a triangular relationship such as Apollinaris and Marchesi's 'Regulus connection' act as catalysts for the literary interplay that mirrors the competitive ranking games performed on the changing cultural and political stage.¹²⁷

Pliny constructed literary production (*studia*) as a life-fulfilling activity and an intellectual world as an alternative to public life (*negotium*) in Rome. His central paean to inspiration-giving leisure (*otium*) is the conceptual link between villa and composition that prompts the writing of the letter; it contrasts sharply with Martial's open parading of Apollinaris' *negotium* as politician.¹²⁸ Martial ultimately unmasks his hymn to Apollinaris' favourite villa as mere illusion;¹²⁹ but Pliny closes his villa letter with a hymn to perfect *otium*. Apollinaris' villa remains untenanted, and Apollinaris himself becomes the victim of his political ambitions; but Pliny, following literary tradition, creates his country estate as a poetic place,¹³⁰ that is to say a

¹²⁴ Letters always foreground first-person focalisation. On Pliny's construction of the self, see Henderson 2002: xiii n. 7, 12–14.

¹²⁵ *Ep.* 5.6.29 *Haec facies, hic usus a fronte*.

¹²⁶ Pliny's anxiety to avoid ostentation, as an offence against social norms and good taste, shows in his efforts to play down the luxury. See Hoffer 1999: 29–44; Lefèvre 2009: 233.

¹²⁷ Compare Marchesi and Roller in this volume.

¹²⁸ Whitton 2013: 220; cf. *Ep.* 2.17: the Laurentinum as 'shrine of the Muses' (μουσεῖον).

¹²⁹ Mart. 10.30.26–7 *Quos Formianos inpusat dies annus | negotiosis rebus urbis haerenti?*

¹³⁰ Pliny here follows in the literary tradition of estate descriptions; cf. the famous depiction of the Sabine estate in Hor. *Epist.* 1.16. On the country estate as a place of poetic writing, see Harrison 2007b: 244–7; Schmidt 1977: 97–112; cf. Bowditch 2001: 239–46 on the construction of the *locus amoenus*, and Bergmann 1995: 420 on the villa as 'utopia – a "no place"'.

place where the ideal life that the author commends to the addressee and the reader becomes possible: 'Leisure (*otium*) there is more profound, more rich, and therefore more carefree'.¹³¹ Pliny prefers his *Tusci*, 150 miles from the capital, for him the ideal retreat, allowing him what Apollinaris lacked: freedom from dress conventions and from unwelcome intrusions. This was an advantage not enjoyed at his Laurentine villa, a little south of Ostia and within a day's travel from Rome.¹³² His self-positioning is focused on a 'disciplined and managed *otium*' that exercises body and mind equally, qualifying Pliny as a serious writer – and making him different from Apollinaris (*Ep.* 5.6.45–6): 'All around is peace and tranquillity, which aids the healing powers of the countryside (*salubritas regionis*),' he writes; 'even the sky is clearer there, and the air more limpid. There I feel both mentally and physically at my best, for my studies exercise my mind and hunting my body.'¹³³

Pliny's servants (*mei*), in contrast to those of Apollinaris, share the comforts of the villa – in the style of the ideal Roman *familia* – with the master of the house, who had been chosen as patron of Tifernum Tiberinum while he was still little more than a boy.¹³⁴ Instead of proclaiming the beatitude of the servants, the sole beneficiaries of Apollinaris' abandoned villa (*seruiunt uobis*), Pliny's letter closes with a plea to the gods: *Di modo in posterum hoc mihi gaudium, hanc gloriam loco seruent* ('I only pray that in the days to come the gods may preserve this joy for me, and this glory for the place', 5.6.46).¹³⁵ Chris Whitton¹³⁶ has pointed out that the author is here not so much celebrating his own immediate pleasure (*gaudium*) as inscribing his own immortality (*gloria*) in the cultural memory of future generations (*in posterum*); like Horace, he has erected a 'monument for eternity'.¹³⁷ This artwork, in which letter and architecture, visualisation and villa coalesce,¹³⁸ is signed (in letters cut from boxwood) with the initials of

¹³¹ *Ep.* 5.6.45 *altius ibi otium et pinguius eoque securius; nulla necessitas togae, nemo accersitor ex proximo*. See Ludolph 1997: 128–9.

¹³² The Tuscan villa was situated 150 miles (240 km) north-east of Rome, the Laurentinum 16.6 miles (25 km) south-west of Rome; see Champlin 2001: 125; Lefèvre 2009: 224; Syme 1991b: 580.

¹³³ Cf. Gibson and Morello 2012: 250; Spurrina's positive embracing of life into extreme old age supplies the role model. On *otium litteratum* as a 'social activity', see also Champlin 2001: 125–6. It is emphasised again in the closing letters (*Ep.* 9.36 and 9.40) about the *Tusci*.

¹³⁴ *Plin. Ep.* 5.6.46 *Mei quoque nusquam salubrius degunt; 4.1.4 Oppidum [sc. Tifernum Tiberinum] . . . quod me paene adhuc puerum patronum coopauit*. On Pliny's local roots, see Champlin 2001: 122–3.

¹³⁵ Note the paronomasia of the semantically unrelated verbs *seruiunt* (*Mart.* 10.30.29) and *seruent* (*Plin. Ep.* 5.6.46).

¹³⁶ Whitton 2013: 219; cf. Gibson and Morello 2012: 227; Bergmann 1995: 408.

¹³⁷ Pliny evokes the thought and language of *Hor. Carm.* 3.30.1 *Exegi monumentum aere perennius*.

¹³⁸ Whitton 2013: 219 and 2015: 111 on 'architecture'; Chinn 2007 *passim*.

dominus and *artifex*.¹³⁹ Designed as a reflection of and response to Martial's topsy-turvy world, as displayed in his poem on Apollinaris' Formianum, and as a counter-image to its *dominus*, ruled by political ambitions and his slaves, Pliny finally reveals his superior identity to his correspondent, fashioning himself as the master who commands respect, because he creates and controls both his dream villa and the aesthetics of his art.

Visuality and intertexts, underworld visions and villa description work together in Pliny's letters to generate a meaningful web of imagery setting processes of reinterpretation in motion. They provide tools for ethical and political self-definition (e.g. in Pliny's praise for inspiration-giving *otium*), for marking himself off from his social peers (e.g. when he distances himself from the Domitian era), or for the creation of literary authority with aspirations to immortality (*gloria*) for himself as creator of his work. When spaces bring these images together so as to construct literary self-projections, the author is enabled to create a new reality for himself beyond the real world, as Pliny does in reinventing himself in the public arena as an orator of Ciceronian stature and a fearless defender of the Domitianic regime's victims,¹⁴⁰ in the private sphere, in accordance with the ideal senatorial lifestyle, as both *dominus* and *artifex*.

Aeternitas: the Rivalry of two Artists

For posthumous glory, too, the writer of letters and the poet vied with one another. Martial often addresses the precious reader who brings him fame during his lifetime¹⁴¹ and later will confer immortality: 'Through him you will escape the sluggish waters of ungrateful Lethe and survive in the better part of yourself', prophesies the personification of Roma,¹⁴² who is made

¹³⁹ *Ep.* 5.6.35 *alibi ipsa buxus interuenit in formas mille discripta, litteras interdum, quae modo nomen domini dicunt, modo artificis*. Cf. below *Ep.* 7.33.2 (Tacitus as *optimus artifex*). On the artist's signature, see Squire 2013: 370; on the 'symbolic code', Bergmann 1995: 420. Similarly, the brick stamps bear the initials CPCS, the logo of the master of the house; cf. Gibson and Morello 2012: 229.

¹⁴⁰ Elsewhere, too, Pliny (*Ep.* 1.5.17) presented himself as a man who had let his actions speak louder than words in the resistance to Domitian (prosecution of Arulenus Rusticus): *Haec tibi scripti, quia aequum erat te pro amore mutuo non solum omnia mea facta dictaque, uerum etiam consilia cognoscere*. On this, see Ludolph 1997: 166. *Plin. Ep.* 3.11.3 *Atque haec feci, cum septem amicis meis aut occisis aut relegatis, occisis Senecione, Rustico, Heluidio, relegatis Maurico, Gratilla, Arria, Fannia . . .* On this, Gibson 2003: 247; Whitton 2015a: 6–9, 13–15.

¹⁴¹ *Mart.* 1.1.2 *toto notus in orbe Martialis; 1.1.4–5 cui, lector studiose, quod dedisti | uiuenti decus atque sentienti*. Cf. 5.13.3 *toto legor orbe frequens; 8.61.3 orbe cantor et legor toto; 6.64.6 meos, quos nouit fama, libellos*.

¹⁴² *Mart.* 10.2.7–8 *Pigra per hunc fugies ingratae flumina Lethes | et meliore tui parte superstes eris*. Note Rimell in this volume on survival strategies.

to play an instrumental role in the poet's interaction with the public and in his skilful self-promotion. In an echo of the art of Horace being seen as a 'monument for eternity', he constructs a morbid fantasy of a future, inexorably ageing Rome in the midst of impressive decaying monuments, a Rome in which his own historical present has become past, and nothing remains save his poems, which a visitor carries away to his distant home:¹⁴³ 'These are the only monuments that do not know how to die', asserts Martial, in an allusion to Ovid, as he contemplates quitting Rome.¹⁴⁴ His poetry and his poetic identity are tied to place and space. It will not only be Pliny's travel purse, but first and foremost his own flourishing poetic fame (*laeta . . . gloria uatis*) that he will take with him to his Spanish birthplace of Bilbilis, proclaiming to his fellow citizens there: 'For I am your ornament, your renown and your glory.'¹⁴⁵

'Nothing drives me more than a passionate desire for eternity', professed Pliny the Younger.¹⁴⁶ He came into contact with the idea of immortality when it fell to him at the age of 16, in the year 78, to dedicate to the *Aeternitas* of the goddess of Rome and the emperors Vespasian and Titus a temple of the ruler cult in Comum that his biological father had built after the Year of Four Emperors; the Flavians were the first to honour the ruling emperor as guarantor of the cosmic permanence of the Empire.¹⁴⁷ Pliny himself founded a temple for the ruler cult with a statue of Trajan in Tifernum Tiberinum, and while governor of Pontus–Bithynia strove zealously to add to the *aeternitas* and *gloria* of the emperor.¹⁴⁸ Like Martial, he declared his literary corpus to be the sole medium that is equivalent to a monument (*hoc uno monumento*) and can ensure immortality: 'All else is frail and fleeting as

¹⁴³ Mart. 8.3.5–8 *Et cum rupta situ Messalae saxa iacebunt | atque cum Licini marmora puluis erunt, | me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes | ad patrias sedes carmina nostra feret.* This referred to the marble tombs built for M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (*cos.* 31), patron of Tibullus, and for C. Iulius Licinus, Augustus' wealthy freedman, on the Via Salaria, see Mratschek 1993: 36, 268 no. 16 (Messalla); 7, 275 no. 37 (Licinus). Messalla's grave had been split by a fig tree (Mart. 10.2.9).

¹⁴⁴ Mart. 10.2.12 *solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori.* Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.77–8 (in exile at Tomis) *hoc satis in titulo est. Etenim maiora libelli | et disuturna magis sunt monumenta mihi.* Cf. the web of further allusions quoted by Rimell in this volume.

¹⁴⁵ Mart. 10.103.3–4 *ecquid laeta iuuat [sc. Augusta Bilbilis] uestri uos gloria uatis? | Nam decus et nomen famae uestra sumus.* Note the *pluralis maiestatis*. See Rimell 2008: 186 and 79, and for Martial in Spain see also now Kelly in this volume. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 3.21.2.

¹⁴⁶ *Ep.* 5.8.2 *Me autem nihil aequae ac disuturnitatis amor et cupido sollicitat, res homine dignissima.* Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 28 (*de meo quodam amore gloriae*).

¹⁴⁷ Pais 1884, nos. 745–6; see Alföldy 1999: 211–19. For *Aeternitas* in the coinage, see Seelentag 2004: 464–5.

¹⁴⁸ *Ep.* 10.8.1–4; 4.1.5 (*templum*), with Seelentag 2004: 183–5, 191–2; *Ep.* 10.41.1 (*opera non minus aeternitate tua quam gloria digna*); 10.41.5 *feres enim me ambitiosum pro tua gloria.* See Stadter 2006: 73.

men themselves, who die and are no more.'¹⁴⁹ Pliny, who compares the art of the literary portrait to visual portraiture and seeks to create an undying image (*immortalem . . . effigiem*) of himself and of his peers,¹⁵⁰ bequeaths to posterity a virtual autobiography, artfully composed from the pictures sketched in his letters. He knows that he cannot rely on his talent to guide him along the path to immortality, but can only achieve it through hard work, diligence and reverence for posterity.¹⁵¹ And so, in protreptic vein, he urges his readers to face life's choices resolved to strive for afterlife in the collective memory of generations to come, just as he himself continues to do – in interaction with Apollinaris, while yet pursuing a different path; Seneca and Sallust are his models (*Ep.* 9.3.2):¹⁵²

Ac mihi nisi praemium aeternitatis ante oculos, pingue illud altumque otium placeat. Etenim omnes homines arbitror oportere aut immortalitatem suam aut mortalitatem cogitare et illos quidem contendere, eniti, hos quiescere, remitti nec breuem uitam caducis laboribus fatigare . . .

If the reward of immortality were not in prospect, my choice would be for a life of idle and utter leisure. Indeed, I believe that all must opt for either immortality or mortality. Those who choose the first must strive and struggle, while those who opt for the second must live peacefully in relaxation, without wearying their short-lived existence with transient toil . . .

Self-perception and the perception of others could differ sharply. Martial's portrait of Pliny and Pliny's obituary for Martial, with the authorial 'I' reinventing himself and the other through their respective literary activities and in line with their self-perceptions, shed light on the discourses between the two about this literary aspiration. What greater thing can life bring than honour and fame forever?¹⁵³ Martial had dedicated only a single poem to Pliny, his patron. It included a witty parody depicting Pliny and his townhouse on the Esquiline Hill near the 'watery Orpheus': the audience listening raptly to the divinely inspired singer consists of the menagerie of animals, petrified into grimacing stone figures in the nymphaeum. Pliny

¹⁴⁹ In *Ep.* 2.10.4 (to Octavius) *Habe ante oculos mortalitatem, a qua asserere te hoc uno monumento [i.e. his poetry] potes; nam cetera fragilia et caduca non minus quam ipsi homines occidunt desinuntque.* See Höschel 2010: 46–7.

¹⁵⁰ *Ep.* 3.10.6 (on Vestricius Cottius) *sed tamen, ut sculptorem, ut pictorem . . . admoneretur, quid exprimeret, quid emendare deberet, ita me quoque formate, regite, qui non fragilem et caducam, sed immortalem . . . effigiem conor efficere.* See Leach 1990: 21–3; Whitton 2012: 345–6, 364 (also on the following points).

¹⁵¹ *Ep.* 9.14 *Posteris an aliqua cura nostri, nescio; nos certe meremur, ut sit aliqua, non dico ingenio (id enim superbum), sed studio et labore et reuerentia posterorum.*

¹⁵² Marchesi 2008: 232–6 uncovers the allusions to Seneca's *De breuitate uitae*, his *Letters to Lucilius* and Sallust (*Cat.* 2.9; 3.1); cf. Gibson and Morello 2012: 101–2, also Pausch 2004: 60–3.

¹⁵³ *Ep.* 3.21.6 *Tametsi quid homini potest dari maius quam gloria et laus et aeternitas?*

suppressed this unwelcome caricature of his *alter ego*. In his obituary to Martial (*Ep.* 3.21.5) he chose to cite only the second half of the poem (*Mart.* 10.20(19).12–21), which depicted him fulfilling his favourite roles: active by day as a high-flying orator at the Centumviral Court, emulating the manner of Cicero and the *gravitas* of Cato, but by night keeping company with the Muse as consumer and producer of light neoteric verse. Thus amputated, Martial's satirical epigram became an innocuous poem of Plinian style, the witty dedication a Plinian self-portrait, the eulogy to the deceased a panegyric to the living obituarist.¹⁵⁴ Could this be the reason why he expressed serious doubts about the high aspirations of Martial, relative to the genre he pursued, and about Martial's 'immortality' as a poet?¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ As Henderson 2001: 59–73 and 2002: 47–52 has brilliantly demonstrated with reference to 'Pliny's self-immortalisation'. See also Fitzgerald's nuanced reading in this volume, pp. 110–11.

¹⁵⁵ *Ep.* 3.21.6 '*At non erunt aeterna, quae scripsit [sc. Martialis]! Non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scripsit, tamquam essent futura.* For his own portrait, Pliny (*Ep.* 7.33.2) would have chosen Tacitus, 'the finest artist': *Nam, si esse nobis curae solet, ut facies nostra ab optimo quoque artifice exprimat, nonne debemus optare, ut operibus nostris similis tui scriptor praedicatorque contingat?* Cf. Pliny's favourable judgment on the *aeternitas* of Tacitus' writings (*Ep.* 6.16.2) and *historias . . . immortales* (*Ep.* 7.33.1); see Whitton 2012 *passim*, esp. p. 347.