

R. MORENO SOLDEVILA - J. FERNÁNDEZ VALVERDE - E. MONTERO CARTELLE, *Marco Valerio Marcial. Epigramas: Volumen II (libros 8-14)*. Introducción de Rosario Moreno Soldevila. Texto latino preparado por Juan Fernández Valverde. Traducción de Enrique Montero Cartelle, Madrid: CSIC, 2005, XI + 330 pp., ISBN 84-00-08301-6 (Vol. II), 84-00-08259-1 (Obra completa).

The book under review here is the second volume of a new critical edition, with Spanish translation, of Martial's *Epigrams*. It is truly astounding how many new bilingual texts of the *Epigrams* have appeared in the past twenty years; as ever so often, the poet's own origin probably accounts for the inflationary boom of translations into Spanish (one of which is even available online for download)¹. Therefore, one may wonder indeed if yet another edition was really called for.

For an assessment of the introductory section (Martial's life and works, including *Nachleben*; editorial principles; bibliography), I can refer the reader to Lorenz's review of the first volume (*ExClass* 9, 2005, 284-5).

I do not feel competent enough to evaluate in detail the stylistic merits of the translations by Montero Cartelle. The only idiosyncrasy that catches one's eye is the translator's decision to render (most) Grecisms (words, phrases, quotations) into French rather than Spanish, because "el griego en la Roma de Marcial tenía el prestigio de lengua de cultura y de gran tradición literaria, como ha ocurrido con el francés en España durante mucho tiempo" (vol. I, LXXVI). Martial, however, uses Greek in a variety of different contexts – surely not exclusively as a register of elevated or *recherché* language: Contrast, e.g., the Homeric allusion at 9.94.4, $\chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\alpha$ [...] $\chi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\alpha$

¹ For bibliographical details, cf. the review of volume I of the present edition by S. Lorenz, *ExClass* 9, 2005, 283-7 at 283.

(‘de l’airain [...] de l’or’, p. 77), which is loosely modeled on *Il.* 6.234–6, with 10.68.5, Κύριέ μου, μέλι μου, ψυχή μου (‘mon seigneur, mon miel, mon âme’, p. 110), which according to the note *ad loc.* is “al modo de las prostitutas” (p. 110 n. 186). Similarly, at 11.58.12 the Greek curse λαικάζειν is translated as ‘va te faire enculer’ (p. 152): compare Petron. 42.2, *laecasin*, and see Kay’s note (comm. Mart. 11), 199–200².

Like the English Loeb and the French Budé, this edition, too, contains short notes accompanying the text; these are meant to give basic information (proper names, historical data, a few literary parallels, etc.) and thus to offer an (at least preliminary) understanding of individual poems or passages. Their value lies especially in the relatively generous references to further secondary literature, so that readers other than Martialists, too, are able to fairly quickly track down the necessary particulars about issues that might otherwise remain arcane. Needless to say, for reasons of space, any such annotation inevitably has to be extremely restrictive, and sometimes even tendentious, in that it leans toward including only that which may corroborate the editor’s or translator’s decisions. However, for the time being, readers of Martial will gladly utilize these notes in addition to those by, say, Shackleton Bailey (Loeb 1993), until finally the whole corpus of *Epigrams* is covered by modern commentaries.

The Latin text by Fernández Valverde (FV), is based on Shackleton Bailey’s (SB’s) 1990 Teubneriana, which is praised as the most successful edition of Martial thus far (see vol. I, LXVI–LXXIV). Therefore, I was surprised to find a list of no less than 185 *loci* (105 of which in Books 8–14) where FV deviates from SB (vol. I, LXIX–LXXIV). The Teubneriana, as well as the Loeb, is notoriously rather ‘aggressive’ in textual matters, and full of editorial ingenuity, leaving little doubt in most cases about the possibility of an authoritative reconstruction of the ‘original’ text, with or without MSS. support. As is widely known, this has

² How diverse Martial’s use of Greek actually is can be seen from O. Weinreich’s brief discussion in his *Studien zu Martial*, Stuttgart 1928, 161–5; cf. also Lorenz, *ExClass* 9, 2005, 285.

evoked criticism from various sides³. But sometimes FV is even more confident than his model: whereas SB had obelized *saxorum* at 10.56.6, *filia* at 10.65.11, *solium* at 11.95.2 (in the Loeb), and *hinc* at 12.59.9, FV did not, and at 9.61.17 prints *deiecta* for SB's †*delecta*†. Matter-of-factly, in the 100+ instances of vol. II (including the passages just referred to), where the new text differs from SB's, it agrees either with Heraeus' old Teubneriana or with Lindsay's OCT, or with both, that is, it is 'based' as much on SB as on Lindsay and Heraeus (and others). Consequently, some may criticize FV's edition for a lack of originality, but this is precisely where the key problem lies: Martial's text has received loads of critical attention, most of which is recorded in the various editions, so that any 'new' text is inevitably an amalgamation of existing ones. However, what the present edition, in my opinion, abundantly documents is that it might perhaps be for the better to reconsider quite a few of SB's verdicts.

The critical apparatus is well produced and in most cases carefully reports as many alternative readings of the manuscripts, conjectures and discussions by modern editors or commentators as are necessary and useful for the reader to form his or her own critical judgment of the text. Naturally, the apparatus is in part fuller than that of the Teubneriana, because FV could take into consideration all those commentaries that postdate SB's edition. At the same time, however, it remains unclear to me why FV did, for the most part, include the editorial choices (or discussions thereof) of, say, Kay (Book 11) and Leary (Books 13 and 14), whereas Schöffel (Book 8) and Henriksén (Book 9) are virtually absent from the apparatus (but not from the notes)⁴.

³ Pace R.G.M. Nisbet's review (*CR* 43, 1992, 50-1): cf., e.g., W. Krenkel, *Gnomon* 65, 1993, 454-6; P. Parroni, *RPL* 16, 1993, 57-61; my comm. on Book 6, Göttingen 1997, 17; C. Schöffel's comm. on Book 8, Stuttgart 2002, 14; C. Henriksén's comm. on Book 9, Uppsala 1998-99, I, 35-6.

⁴ Henriksén appears only at 9.59.19, but cf. only his comm., 36-7. As for the first volume: I was a little irritated to find quite a few of my own discussions of passages from Book 6 misrepresented. Contrary to what FV reports in his apparatus, I do *not* agree with SB's text at 6.16.1 (*falce ... pene : pene ... falce*), 19.5 (*Carrhas : Cannas*), and 86.1 (*domitaeque :*

As for the extensive bibliography (vol. I, LXXVII-CXXIX), not all items listed in it have been exploited in full with regard to the constitution of the text: e.g., S. Lorenz's important assessment of the textual problems of Book 12 in his *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser* (Tübingen 2002), 234–41 (esp. 234–8).

The above remarks are not at all meant to diminish the merits of this new two-volume *Martial*. On the contrary: the interpretive notes will be a welcome tool for, not only uninitiated, readers; and FV's text once more will alert us to the fallacy of any 'ultimate' critical edition.

FAROUK F. GREWING
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
grewing@otherone.de

dominaeque): cf. my comm., 155, 170, and 554; also, I have expressed my doubts about 6.16.4 (*aut : et*), 21.10 (*parce tuo*; cf. additionally P. Watson, *Latomus* 58, 1999, 348–56), 24.1 (*Carisiano : Charisiano*), 47.4 (*veni : venis*), and 64.3 (*hirsuto : hirsuta*): cf. comm. *ad locc.*