

unt (de Tarquinio Superbo, qui regnum vertit in tyrannidem, a maioribus expulso hic significari plane intelligitur). Et facilius *dominum* in principio *parentes* in *parentem* traxit, ut legit Plutarchus, qui *dominum* et *parentem* coniunxit et igitur hanc iuncturam, propter lecturæ lapsus et aliquam sensus similitudinem (*dominus parens* sicut *dominus mitis* vel *clemens*), in πράους δεσπότης vertit. Conferri potest hic locus de Flavio Josepho desumptus (BJ 6,350: ῥίψασι δὲ τὰ ὄπλα καὶ παραδοῦσι τὰ σόματα χαρίζομαι τὸ ζῆν, ὥσπερ ἐν οἰκίᾳ / πράος δεσπότης τὰ μὲν ἀνήκεστα κολάσας, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ σώζων ἐμαυτῷ), ubi, in sua oratione contra Hebraeos seditiosos, πράος δεσπότης se ipsum appellat Titus, ad laudem suae clementiae versus hostes arma deponentes.

Clavarii

Sergius Audano

MARTIAL 6,40

Keywords: Martial, Epigram

In this brief poem, Martial contrasts his love for two women, Lycoris and Glyceria, one of whom he fancies now and the other he fancied in the past:

*femina praeferrī potuit tibi nulla, Lycori:
praeferrī Glyceriae femina nulla potest.
haec erit hoc quod tu: tu non potes esse quod haec est.
tempora quid faciunt! hanc volo, te volui.*

The language of the whole poem is based on the contrast and repetition of the same verbs and nouns in a slightly different way, firstly with *femina praeferrī potuit ... nulla ~ praeferrī ... femina nulla potest*, then with *haec erit hoc quod tu ~ tu ... esse quod haec est*, and finally with the brief *volo ~ volui*. The arrangement is broken only by the exclamation *tempora quid faciunt*. All this is recognised already by commentators.¹

Yet there is, it seems, still another overlooked form of repetition, reversal, and juxtaposition exactly appropriate to the patterns described above – namely, the telestichs *it ~ it*, the first being written top-bottom and the second being written bottom-top in reverse form. The sense of the verbs (‘she goes’ ~ ‘she goes’) is entirely appropriate to the subject matter of the poem, with Martial pondering two women whom he cannot have and who are, therefore, both ‘gone’. A crude sense may even lie behind the verb *ire* here, as elsewhere in love poetry: the women now go to other lovers’ beds (compare e. g. Mart. 12,75,1 *festinat Polytimus ad puellas*, Catull. 8,16 *quis nunc te adibit?*).² These telestichs, which not only frame the text but also em-

1) See L. G. H. Hall, Martial, Epigrams 6,40, RhM 160, 2017, 424–425.

2) See J. N. Adams, The Latin Sexual Vocabulary, London 1982, 175–176.

phaise the meaning of the whole composition,³ serve as another example of the playful sophistication of this compact little epigram.⁴

Oxford

Konstantine Panegyres

UNA IUNCTURA SENECA NEL *DE IRA DEI* DI LATTANZIO

Keywords: Lactantius, *De ira Dei*, Seneca, *De providentia*

In *De ira Dei* 10.1, a proposito delle teorie che negano che il cosmo sia opera della provvidenza divina, Lattanzio scrive:

*Qui nolunt divina providentia factum esse mundum, aut principii
inter se temere coeuntibus dicunt esse concretum aut repente natura
extitisse ...*

3) According to the detailed study of the epigrammatic material in G. Barbieri, *Una nuova epigrafe d'Ostia e ricerche sugli acrostici*, MGR 4, 1975, 301–403, at 332, names or short phrases are the types of things usually written in telestichs in Greek and Latin epigrams, often in such a way as to refer to the name dedicatory or dedicatee of the epigram, or to express some phrase essential to the overall statement of the composition. Examples of the latter effect include an epigram by the imitator of Martial, Flavius Felix, in Anth. Lat. 214 Reise (= 205 Shackleton Bailey), fifth century AD, where the telestich *VOTA SERENANS* shows the author making clear how his patron, Thrasamund, carried out his obligations, and the inscription from the baths in Ain Bessem (Algeria), AE 1937:31, of the imperial age, where the acrostic *BENE LAVATE* gives an instruction to users of the baths. Some other examples of telestichs framing a whole composition include: CLE 1623 (= CIL 8.20249+20250), date uncertain, *MEMORIUS*; CLE 1977 (= CIL 8.20277), 299 AD, *SIMAE MATR(I)*; CLE 1616 (= CIL 8.14365), fourth century AD, *MARTI INVICTO CILONIUS*; ILCV 779 (= ILS 9351 = CLE 2.3.1916), fourth century AD, *SAMMACIS*; Anth. Lat. 120 Reise (= 109 Shackleton Bailey), fifth century AD, *ME-LANIAE*.

4) See C. Luz, *Technopaïgnia: Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung*, Leiden / Boston 2010, 76: “Das ‘Epigramm mit Akrostichon ermöglicht ein Spiel mit der formalen Gestaltung und physischen Erscheinung des Gedichts und bietet sich deshalb als poetische Form für einen Dichter an, der eine außergewöhnliche und geistreiche Komposition anstrebt.”