

THE CLASSICAL WORLD

EDITOR

Jerry Clack
Department of Classics
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15282

EST. 1907

Entire contents © 1992 by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Inc. Vol. 86, No. 2.

The Classical World, formerly *The Classical Weekly*, is published September-October, November-December, January-February, March-April, May-June, July-August. Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Inc. Primary Editorial Office: Department of Classics, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA 15282; other subsidiary locations. All rights reserved. *The Classical World* is included in *Book Review Digest* and *Book Review Index*.

Second class postage paid at Pittsburgh, PA 15282 and at additional mailing office. Postmaster please send form 3579 to *The Classical World*, Department of Classics, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh PA 15282.

Library subscriptions: \$20.00.

Individual subscriptions: *In U.S.A.*: Rates are subject to membership fee of the appropriate regional association: CAAS, \$25.00; CANE, \$30.00; CAMWS, \$23.00; CAPN, \$20.00; CCA/SS, \$28.00. *In Canada, foreign and P.U.S. countries*: \$18.00. Canadian and foreign subscribers are requested to make payments by international postal money order or by U.S. dollar draft on banks with U.S. offices. Individual subscriptions run by the volume. Claims for missing issues should be made within two months (domestic) or three months (foreign) to the Circulation Manager. Single copies: \$3.00; the *Directory of College and University Classics*: \$20.00.

Inquiries should be directed to the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional organization. There is a complete list on the inside back cover.

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

All articles to be considered for publication should be sent to the Editor, Jerry Clack, Department of Classics, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh PA 15282. Every effort will be made to consider articles promptly. Copy must be typewritten in double or triple space.

All articles will be judged anonymously; accordingly, all identification of authorship should be omitted from typescripts.

Articles on a wide variety of topics are welcomed, but authors should bear in mind that extremely technical material, of limited scope, may be judged unsuitable for publication in *CW*, regardless of merit (e.g. textual notes on minor authors). We also remind authors that articles which require the printing of Greek cannot be accepted. Greek texts should be presented in translation; transliteration should be used for single words or brief phrases.

The criteria for acceptance of articles submitted are: originality, clarity, accuracy. Useful rules for the preparation of copy may be found at the end of *TAPA* 121 (1991). Authors are directed to conform to the style of *TAPA* in preparing footnotes.

It is expected that the *mss* submitted for consideration will be in publishable form.

OTHER REMARKS ON THE OTHER SULPICIA

These notes should be considered supplementary to Carol U. Merriam's article "The Other Sulpicia," *CW* 84 (1991) 303-5.¹

It is extremely likely that we possess an authentic fragment of the later Sulpicia (*PW* 115) in the form of a quotation of two iambic trimeters. Giorgio Valla of Piacenza (c. 1430-99),² while preparing his edition of Juvenal in Venice in 1486, made extensive use of a unique manuscript, now lost, which contained a collection of scholia under the name of Probus.³ The "Probus" that Valla had discovered, almost certainly in Milan before going to Venice,⁴ was probably a manuscript of Juvenal with a marginal commentary⁵ running only as far as 8.198. This manuscript was perhaps identical to the one described by the author (identified as Hildemar of Corbie, fl. 840) of a letter in occasionally faulty hexameters in the Munich MS (Monacensis 14420, 144r) who writes of having read Juvenal but being hampered by the lack of a commentary on the last two books (i.e. the commentary covered only on Books I-III, containing *Sat.* 1-8).⁶ These scholia under the name of Probus derive ultimately from a late antique commentary of around the end of the fourth century A.D.⁷ Valla described his Probus' commentary as "of an exceptional

¹ After completing this response, I learned that my colleagues Judith P. Hallett and Amy Richlin had written the following two papers, prompted in part by Merriam's article. They have been kind enough to show these to me.

² Possibly the cousin of the great Lorenzo Valla: see J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge 1908) II, 133.

³ Usually cited in the app. crit. as *Probus Vallae* (or *Pr.*). For "Probus" see the edition of Paul Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem Vetusiora* (Stuttgart 1931; repr. 1967) xx-xxiii and the table at xliii, who summarizes the earlier literature; also A. E. Housman, *Iuvenalis Saturae* (Cambridge 1931) x. For work subsequent to Wessner, see U. Knoche, *Handschriftliche Grundlage der Juvenalüberlieferung* (Philologus Supplementband 33.1 [1940]), esp. 160-63, and his edition, *D. Iunius Iuvenalis. Saturae* (Munich 1950); W. S. Anderson, "Valla, Juvenal and Probus," *Traditio* 21 (1965) 383-424; A. Bartalucci, "Il 'Probus' de Giorgio Valla e il 'commentum vetustum' a Giovenale," *SJFC* 45 (1973) 233-57; L. D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1983) 19, 202 and n.15. Anderson's conclusions that Valla possessed a considerable number of MSS and that his Probus was in the form of an independent commentary have been modified by James Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (Salem NH 1981) 179-80, 184-86. O. Jahn's suggestion that the name Probus was taken from the *Vita* of Persius in MSS that contained both satirists (a numerous class) and became attached to a set of scholia on Juvenal has found favor with Wessner, Bartalucci and Reynolds (xxiii, 248, and 202 n.15 respectively). U (Vaticanus Urbanus 661, s. xi) also contains a continuous commentary ascribed to Probus following the text of Juvenal (62r-134r).

⁴ Reynolds (note 3, above) 19 and 202, n.15.

⁵ Wessner (note 3, above) 264; Zetzel (note 3, above) 185 (contra Anderson).

⁶ A suggestion originating with G. Hight, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1954) 195, 307 n.25, 381 n.3; Giuseppe Billanovich, "Terenzio, Ildemaro, Petrarca," *JM* 17 (1974) 1-60 (with Tavola VI), esp. 52-58.

⁷ Besides the works in note 3, see G. B. Townend, "The Earliest Scholiast on Juvenal," *CQ* 22 (1977) 376-87, esp. 376-7 and n.1.

brevity" and bemoans having been hampered at several places by the age and rotten condition of the MS itself.⁸ The commentary, though close to the main tradition (*P*, *Q*, *S*) and contaminated by a separate MS (or perhaps more than one) which contained a complete commentary,⁹ contains many unique comments and quotations.¹⁰ At Juv. 6.537 on the word *cadurci*, Valla comments as follows:

membrum mulieris (inquit Probus) intelligitur, cum sit membri muliebris velamen. vel, ut alii, est instita, qua lectus intenditur, unde ait Sulpicia:

si me cadurci restituitis fasciis nudam Caleno concubantem proferat.

Sulpicia: si me *Buecheler*: Sulpicius ne *Valla*: Sulpicia ne me *Pithoeus* // 1 *cadurcis Valla*, corr. *Munker* / dissolutis *Buecheler*: destitutam *Pithoeus* // 2 nudam Caleno concubantem *Valla*, corr. *Pithoeus* / proferas *Munker*

"Probus says the female genital is to be understood [by *cadurcum*] since it is the covering of the female genital [i.e. the prepuce of the clitoris or the labia¹¹]. Or according to others, it is the strip on which a bed is spread.¹² So Sulpicia says: "If, when the straps for the mattress have been restored, (it) might reveal me naked sleeping with Calenus."

What can we say about this fragment? As to its author, the reference to Calenus allowed Pithoeus¹³ (Pierre Pithou of Troyes, 1539-96), the discoverer of the codex which still bears his name (*P*, Montepessulanus bibl. med. 125), correctly to identify the author as the Sulpicia

⁸ For Valla's comments, see Wessner (note 3, above) xx-xxi and Anderson (note 3, above) 405-6 (a fuller citation with translation). The MS was also seen by Ermolao Barbaro who described it as a "codicem exesum et ambustum aevo": Billanovich (note 6, above) 58. Anderson, 383, 406, suggests Valla may have subsequently destroyed the MS. For such practices, cf. G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (2 ed., Florence 1952; repr. 1988) 49-56.

⁹ Anderson (note 3, above) 408-20; Zetzel (note 3, above) 184-85 and 284 n.41.

¹⁰ Besides Sulpicia, Valla's Probus (ad Juv. 4.94) is our only source for the four surviving lines of Statius' *De Bello Germanico*: see C. Buechner, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig 1982) 166.

¹¹ Cf. *CGL* V.493.32 (s.v. *cadurcum*), 596.43 (*cardudium*) and 596.44 (*cadurda*) which must derive from Probus or share a common source. See Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Baltimore 1982) 65-66 (to which the latter citations should be added) and *TLL* s.v. *cadurcum*.

¹² I.e. the strips of cloth stretched across the frame of the bed which supported the mattresses and cushions. Cf. *GLK* VII.544.20: *cadurcum, fascem lecti*, which clearly derives from the same source as the interpretation of the *alii* that Valla reports and probably has its origin in a grammarian's citation of this passage. The meaning is not 'coverlet' as such (so *OLD*), but a mattress or duvet for a bed, made from the linen produced by the Cadurci, a tribe of Gallia Narbonensis (cf. Juv. 7.211 and the scholia) and hence the marriage bed (the sense it has in Juv. 6.537, the passage under discussion); correctly defined by E. Courtney, *A Commentary to the Satires of Juvenal* (London 1980) 331 ad loc. The sense that the glosses give to *cadurcum* belongs properly only to *fascia*: cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.134, Mart. 14.159.1, Porph. ad Hor. *Ep.* 11.12 (see note 26 below).

¹³ See Sandys (note 2, above) 11, 191-2.

of Martial 10.35, 38. Second, as to its source, it is necessary to be as clear as Valla allows us to be about what he is saying. Probus offers one explanation for the word *cadurcum*. However, Valla's *alii* does not necessarily refer to an alternative reading from another MS with scholia; still less does the plural imply that Valla had a number of MSS that attested this interpretation.¹⁴ It is more likely, given the full nature of the quotation, that the variant interpretation was included in the text of Probus itself.¹⁵ Third, as to the text, I have printed Buechner's text with its apparatus¹⁶ to show the amount of damage Valla transmitted and the labors of subsequent editors necessary for an accurate text. The substitution of *Sulpicius* for *Sulpicia* is an example (as well as a reminder of the ease with which women's names are elided). Further, it is clear that, his explicit statement to the contrary, Valla altered and added to the text of Probus considerably¹⁷ and that, like all ancient scholia, Probus contains much that is worthless: his explanation of the meaning of *cadurcum* in this passage of Juvenal is a case in point. However, where we can check him against known sources, Valla's Probus is, within the usual limits of textual corruption, fairly reliable in his quotations and "sometimes he alone has material which must go back to antiquity."¹⁸ While the possibility of later forgery under Sulpicia's name cannot be ruled out, the fact that the fragment is in trimeters is an indication of authenticity.¹⁹ The Bobbio hexameter satire, entitled *Sulpiciae Conquestio*, a fourth-century forgery which purports to be an attack by Sulpicia on Domitian, is at pains to mention not only her husband Calenus (62)

¹⁴ A point rightly emphasized by Zetzel (note 3, above) 185-86.

¹⁵ Cf. Valla on 7.80, where he specifies that Probus cites the interpretation of *alii*. For other examples, cf. Valla on 1.7, 33, 60; 3.38. For *alii* as variant readings (again not necessarily different MSS), see Anderson (note 3, above) 399-400.

¹⁶ Besides Wessner's edition (note 3, above) 108 n., the text is also conveniently cited in W. Kroll's *PW* article (Sulpicius 115, *PW* 4A. 880-82 [1932]); M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Munich 1935) 11.560. A. Baehrens, in the first ed. of *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig 1886) 370, printed the whole of the relevant section of Valla, but incorrectly cited Valla's *membri muliebris* as *membri mulieris*: see Anderson (note 3, above) 412 n. 41. I have altered Buechner's apparatus where it attributes the original reading *cadurcis* to "codd." as this is only an inference from the *alii* of Valla: see main text. Wessner's app. crit. is deliberately minimal (xiv) and the correction of Valla's *incenditur* (!) is attributed only to *ed.* (presumably Pithoeus). Baehrens (loc. cit.) suggested *lux* for *si*, and I. Lana, *La satira di Sulpicia* (Turin 1949) 29 n.1, would read *nox*. Both have the advantage of explaining the third person verb (presumably then an optative subjunctive), while Lana's *nox* is paleographically not too far from the *ne* of Valla. See also Ignazio Cazzaniga, "Il frammento di Sulpicia, Orazio, *Ep.* xii e Tertuliano, *Apol.* 46, 10," *RFIC* 95 (1967) 295-300, who would read *consubantem*, an unattested and inappropriate compound. Sulpicia's *consubantem* is built directly to the simplex *cubo*, rather than the usual *concupisco*.

¹⁷ Wessner (note 3, above) xxii; Anderson (note 3, above) 406.

¹⁸ Townend (note 7, above) 377 and n.1. For Valla's quotations, see S. Consoli, "Studi intorno agli scoli di Giovenale e di Persio," *RFIC* 50 (1922) 38-54; Bartalucci (note 3, above) 236-8.

¹⁹ Contra H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* vol. 11, *L'Époque impériale* (Paris 1956) 227: "Il est vraisemblable que Sulpicia s'exprimait en distiques élégiaques."

but also her trimeters (5).²⁰ That Sulpicia wrote trimeters is a fact not ascertainable from Martial (whose two epigrams are in hendecasyllables). It seems very likely, then, that we have miraculously, if partially, preserved two lines of the later Sulpicia. As with much of Sappho, this famous poet owes her preservation to the chance comment of a grammarian on a single word.

2) Though we lack a context for this fragment, we can sketch out some sort of picture of the character of her writing. To the sources mentioned by Merriam (Martial 10.35, 38; Ausonius *Cento Nuptialis*²¹) should be added Sidonius Apollinaris *Carm.* 9.261-2 (an *Epithalamium*), who, in a list of poets that he will not try to imitate, mentions: *non quod Sulpiciae iocus Thaliae / scripsit blandiloquum suo Caleno; and Fulgentius Myth.* 1.4 (p. 4.1 Helm), who refers to *Sulpicillae procacitas*²² and at 1.23 (p. 13.3 Helm) says that because of satire *Sulpicillae Ausonianae loquacitas deperit*.²³ What all of these have in common is an insistence on Sulpicia's open expression of desire, which is authenticated by the quotation. The fragment makes it likely that Martial's *o quae proelia, quas utrimque pugnas / felix lectulus et lucerna vidit* is a direct allusion to her poetry.²⁴

We have something remarkable in the later Sulpicia. The restrictions placed on women's voices, especially on the expression of desire, have

²⁰ For bibliography and discussion, see Merriam, *CW* 84 (1991) 303; Hallett, "Martial's Sulpicia and Propertius' Cynthia," p. 101 below; and Richlin, "Sulpicia the Satirist," pp. 125, 132-4 below. The text of E. Baehrens, *Poeti Latini Miores V* (Leipzig 1879) 93-97 and Lana's ed. of 1949 (note 16, above) have been superseded by Wolfgang Speyer's Teubner edition, *Epigrammata Bobiensia* (Leipzig 1963), and by the full text and translation in Harald Fuchs, "Das Kligelied der Sulpicia über die Gewaltherrschaft des Kaisers Domitian," in *Discordia Concors: Festschrift für Edgar Bonjour* (Basel 1968) 32-47 (Merriam's citation [p. 303 n. 9] should be emended), and in Anna Giordano-Rampioni, *Sulpiciae Conquestio* (*Ep. Bob.* 37) (Bologna 1982). Fuchs is perhaps too inclined to indicate lacunae. See, too, Speyer's comments in *Die literarische Fälschung in heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (Munich 1971) 149, 318. Doubts about the authenticity of the "Satire" began well before the 4th ed. of Jahn in 1911 (so Merriam, 303). The poems were long suspected of being a Renaissance forgery, but it was E. Baehrens in his *Habilitationschrift* of 1873 *De Sulpiciae quae vocatur satira* (Jena), who definitively argued that they were ancient forgeries, dating them to soon after Ausonius (cf. *PLM* V.91-93). See Reynolds (note 3, above) 405-6 and Fuchs 33 n.2 for a review of the bibliography.

²¹ Cited from S. Prete's Teubner ed., *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula* (Leipzig 1978) 168.10; also R. D. H. Green, ed., *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford 1991) 139.5-6.

²² The diminutive is contemptuous; not with L. G. Whitbread, *Fulgentius the Mythographer* (Columbus, OH 1971) 41 "someone like Sulpicia", 100 n.4 "some writer like Sulpicia."

²³ Fulgentius' references are confused and it is possible that he knows Sulpicia only from Ausonius. He refers to *Petroniana*. . . *Albucia* (Petr. frg. 6), a character otherwise unknown. This may indicate that he possessed a more complete text of Petronius than we have. However, he also mentions *Plautinae Sauraeae*, referring to the *Asinaria*, but substituting the name of the male Saurae, the offstage slave, for the matron Artemona, a mistake pointing to an intermediate source rather than any knowledge of the text of Plautus. See Richlin, "Sulpicia the Satirist," p. 137 below, for an analysis of this passage.

²⁴ A point made already by Kroll (note 16, above) 880. Likewise, since both Martial 10.35.13 and the *Sulpiciae Conquestio* (68) refer to Egeria, it is likely that her works contained some reference to this myth of exemplary Roman marriage.

always been formidable. What is astonishing, both to us and to the ancients, about Sulpicia is her outspokenness. She makes a bold and provocative proclamation of female desire and sexual satisfaction. The immediate context of the text cannot be known. We have a *si* clause without a stated subject containing a present subjunctive: either then the protasis to an optative subjunctive ("If only. . ."). The interpretation hinges on the meaning of *resistit*. Morel took it as a metaphor: *optat, ut sibi lectus genitalis nescio qua de causa turbatus resistatur*, "she hopes that the marriage bed, disturbed for some reason, might be restored to her," having in mind, perhaps, some sort of separation or quarrel of the lovers.²⁵ In his interpretation, the *fasciis carduci* function as a metonymy for "marriage." However, rather than Juvenal's (6.537) simple substitution of the vulgar *cadurcum* for *lectus genitalis* (and note, not in the sense of "marriage", but rather "sexual fidelity on the woman's part"), we have here a very precise indication of the "straps for the mattress." Equally, *resistit* need not be metaphorical but literal: "with the straps that hold up the mattress put back in place." The text itself then, whatever its immediate context, gives a remarkably vivid picture of the bed and its underpinnings rucked up by the intensity of her and her husband's lovemaking. The situation described is somewhat like that of Hor. *Epod.* 11.12: *tenta cubilia tectaque rumpit*,²⁶ though, of course, Horace's purpose is not to celebrate conjugal love but to rouse disgust at an old, sexually active woman.²⁷ Similar also is Cat. 6.10-11 where *tremulique quassa lecti / argutatio inambulatorie* "the shaken creaking and walking around of the quivering bed"²⁸ gives evidence that Flavius has just finished making love.²⁹

Not only does Sulpicia then usurp the masculine privilege of celebrating her love and her lover in poetry, she does so (to the extent that we are allowed to see) in masculine language. Her own terms, the references to nakedness, the bed, the use of *concu(m)bo*, are neither primary obscenities²⁹ nor coy euphemisms. She contrasts sharply, in this regard, with the carefully studied ambiguities of the earlier, un-

²⁵ W. Morel in the second ed. of *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig 1927; repr. 1963) 134, followed by Buechner in the third ed. (note 10, above) 166; so too Amy Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 232 n.4. However, Martial emphasizes the happiness of their fifteen-year marriage (see the following section and note 33 below). See now Richlin's "Sulpicia the Satirist," p. 126-9 below.

²⁶ Rightly seen by Cazzaniga (note 16, above) 295. Porphyry (ad. loc.) comments: *lectum dicit resistit sive fasciis subventum*.

²⁷ See Richlin, *Garden* (note 25, above) 11-13, and "Invective against Women in Roman Satire," *Arelhusa* 17 (1984) 67-80.

²⁸ For the bed giving evidence, cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.14.32, Prop. 2.29.35, Tib. 1.9.57; as witness to lovemaking: Ov. *Am.* 3.14.26, *Ars* 3.802, Juv. 9.77, Asclepiades *AP* 5.181.11-12 (bed), Philodemus *AP* 5.4 (bed and lamp), and cf. Marcus Argentarius *AP* 5.128 (lamp).

²⁹ For which see Richlin, *Garden* (note 25, above), esp. 1-31.

married Sulpicia (*PW* 114) of the circle of Tibullus.³⁰ The words attributed to her by Martial—*lusus*, *delicias*, *facetias* (10.35.9), *proelia*, *pugnās*, *felix lectulus* (10.38.6)—are all part of the erotic vocabulary well known from Catullus and the elegists. Sulpicia has appropriated masculine language and become a true *voleuse de langue*.³¹ However, she has escaped censure, indeed earned praise, by placing her desire in the context of marriage and fidelity. She conforms openly to the type of the *univira* (Martial 10.35.2) and so is allowed an open expression of sexuality. In this she bears close resemblance to Plautus' Alcmēna, whose descriptions of sensual pleasure in marriage are quite direct.³² In her celebration of marital love Sulpicia has the precedents of Calvus and Parthenius, who wrote elegies for their wives Quintillia and Arete.³³ Like them, Sulpicia refers to her husband Calenus, not by a Greek pseudonym (like those Catullus, the elegists, and the earlier Sulpicia had used) but by his Roman name.³⁴ The earlier editors of the *Sulpiciae Conquestio* assumed that as a woman poet her audience could be only women,³⁵ but Martial (10.35.1-4) is clear that Sulpicia speaks to both men and women who wish for a mutual and equal love.

3) Martial 10.38 is not, as Merriam maintains, written in the persona of Sulpicia. Rather, the poem is addressed to Calenus by the poet in his own voice as a friend.³⁶ The tense of the verbs and overall tone make it clear that this is a *consolatio* to Calenus for the death of

³⁰ For the earlier Sulpicia's language, see Matthew S. Santirocco, "Sulpicia Reconsidered," *CJ* 74 (1979) 229-39, and N. J. Lowe, "Sulpicia's Syntax," *CQ* 38 (1988) 193-205.

³¹ Claudine Herrmann, *Les Voleuses de langue* (Paris 1976). See Alicia Ostriker, "The Thieves of Language," *Signs* 8 (1982) 68-90; now in *The New Feminist Criticism*, ed. Elaine Showalter (New York 1985) 314-38.

³² *Amph.* 635-41, 735, 802-8, though her desire should still be moderate (840: *sedatum cupidinem*, in the description of the ideal wife). The point is rightly made by Erich Segal, *Roman Laughter* (2 ed.; Oxford 1987) 179-80.

³³ Quintillia: Cat. 96, Prop. 2.34.89-90; frgs. in Buechner (note 10, above) 112. Arete: *Suda* s.v. Parthenius; frg. 1 (Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.68); and see *CIG* 4.6857.

³⁴ Calenus (*PW* 2), from the city of Cales in Campania, was a common name among the Fufii (*PW* 8-11) and the Julii (*PW* 157).

³⁵ Altering the MS *Romanos* (line 8) to *Romanas*: see Speyer (note 20, above) ad 37.8 who adds "fort. recte."

³⁶ Contrast throughout Prop. 4.3 (written in the persona of the fictitious Arethusa) or the funeral conventions of 4.11 (written in the persona of the dead Cornelia to L. Aemilius Paullus). On this point, see the author's "Sulpicia, the *Auctor de Sulpicia* and the Authorship of 3.9 and 3.11 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*," *Helios* 1993 (forthcoming). For similar poems, celebrating a couple's love and fidelity (as distinct from the hopes of epithalamia), cf. Cat. 45 (which I interpret unironically), Tib. 2.2.11-16, Prop. 3.12, and Hor. *Odes* 2.12 (Maecenas and Terentia) for which see Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 299-303. For Martial, cf. e.g. 4.75, 7.69 (another woman poet), 9.30.

Sulpicia after fifteen years of marriage.³⁷ It is equally an encomium to him on his love and fidelity and bears comparison to Cat. 96.

4) The literary reputation of the later Sulpicia survived her death by several centuries, and it seems likely that her text did so as well (whereas the earlier Sulpicia completely disappeared from view). Kroll doubts that Ausonius, Sidonius and Fulgentius knew of Sulpicia (while the earlier Sulpicia completely disappeared from view). Kroll doubts that Ausonius, Sidonius and Fulgentius knew of Sulpicia except through Martial.³⁸ However, there is nothing intrinsically impossible about her text surviving to late antiquity. For example, Jerome (*Chron.* Ol. 184.4 = 41 B.C.) reports that the epigrams of Cornificia (*PW* 12, sister of the poet Q. Cornificius, *PW* 8) were still extant and well-known at his date. It is difficult to see how Sulpicia's literary reputation could have stood so high that her name was worth appropriation in the absence of a text. Further, the meters mentioned in the *Sulpiciae Conquestio* (4-6: hendecasyllabic, iambic, choliambic) are not merely a *praeteritio* to introduce hexameters, but are said to be references to her work (7-9). As noted before, that Sulpicia wrote trimeters cannot be deduced from Martial (his own choice of hendecasyllables for 10.35 and 38 may be a nod to another of her meters); and this, together with the reference to Egeria (see note 24, above), would seem to indicate that a text of Sulpicia was available to the author of the *Sulpiciae Conquestio*.³⁹

HOLT PARKER

University of Cincinnati
CW 86.2 (1992)

³⁷ So rightly Kroll (note 16, above) 880: "Als sie nach fünfzehnjähriger Ehe starb, befaßt sich Martial X. 35. 38 (J. 95 n. Chr.) mit dem Glück dieser Ehe und mit der Art, sie S. in ihren Gedichten davon Kunde gegeben hatte"; and Fuchs (note 20, above) 33 n.3.

³⁸ Kroll (note 16, above) 880; Bartalucci (note 3, above) 237 n.1; Fuchs (note 20, above) 34 n.3.

³⁹ Cazzaniga, "Apicio o Sulpicia? H. A. Spart. *Ael.* 5.9," *SIFC* 46 (1974) 252-55, would have Sulpicia rather than Apicius be the book Aelius Verus had by his bed. However, the books are chosen not to indicate Verus' lust but his frivolity.



A.C.L./N.J.C.L NATIONAL LATIN EXAM
P.O. Box 95
MT. VERNON, VA. 22121

1993

- The 16th National Latin Exam sponsored jointly by the American Classical League and the National Junior Classical League is open to all students enrolled in Latin I, II, III, IV and V.
- More than 77,000 students took the 1992 National Latin Exam.
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals has placed the ACL/NJCL National Latin Exam on the Advisory List of National Contests and Activities for 1992-1993.
- Gold and silver medals, ribbons and certificates are awarded to winners.
- An application for National Latin Exam Scholarships of \$1,000.00 each will be mailed to 1993 Gold Medal winners in Latin III, IV, or V who are high school seniors and plan to take at least one year of college Latin or Greek.
- Format: Introduction to Latin, Latin I, II, III-IV Prose, III-IV Poetry: 40 questions, categories include grammar, mythology, derivatives, literature, Roman life and history.
- Latin V: several Latin passages with 40 multiple choice questions on grammar, comprehension, historical background, classical literature, and literary devices.
- Cost: \$3.00 per student to be sent with the application.
- Applications are sent to ACL members and teachers who entered the 1992 exam by the ACL office at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
- DEADLINE for receipt of applications is January 10, 1993.
- Any requests for information should be sent to ACL/NJCL National Latin Exam, P.O. Box 95, Mount Vernon VA 22121, and must be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
- Application forms may be obtained from the American Classical League, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056.
- A packet containing four previous exams (1989-1992, all levels included) and a syllabus may be ordered by sending a \$5.00 check or money order (no purchase orders) payable to American Classical League, and sent to: American Classical League, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056.

N.L.E. COMMITTEE

Jane Hall, Chairman
3311 Westlyon Way
Alexandria VA 22309

Martha Abbott
Instructional Services
Fairfax County Public Schools
Annandale VA 22003

John Donohue
W.T. Woodson High School
Fairfax VA 22031

CONSULTANTS

Ruth Adams
Schreiber H.S.
Port Washington NY 11050

Tamara Bauer
Overland High School
Aurora CO 80012

Glenn Knudsig
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor MI 48109

Edith M.A. Kowch
Professor Emeritus
University of Detroit
Detroit MI 48221

James Minter
Columbia College Admissions
New York NY 10027

Betty Merrill
James Monrod High School
Fredericksburg VA 22401

Christine Sleeper
Herndon High School
Herndon VA 22070

SCHOLARSHIP CHAIRMAN:

Doris Kays
NEISD Annex XI
San Antonio TX 78217

CLASSICAL WORLD

CONTENTS

Holt Parker: Other Remarks on the Other Sulpicia . . .	89
Judith P. Hallett: Martial's Sulpicia and Propertius' Cynthia	99
Amy Richlin: Sulpicia the Satirist	125
CAAS: 1992-93 Committee Structure	141
Reviews	143
Books Received	185

SKIDMORE COLLEGE LIBRARY

DEC 1 1 1992

SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866



NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1992

VOLUME 86 NO. 2
WHOLE NO. 1490
ISSN 0009-8418