

artfully constructed image of the good aristocrat in his province, and of the best of emperors in Rome'.<sup>8</sup> Noreña has suggested that Book 10 was published by Pliny in his lifetime with the aim of enhancing the image of both himself and Trajan; he adduces as a parallel the publication of the *Panegyricus*, which 'suggests that Pliny was quite willing to employ "official" texts in the service of his own public self-representation, and it is not unreasonable to see Book 10 in the same light'.<sup>9</sup> Gibson and Morello have taken the literary approach even further in evaluating Book 10 as 'the crowning resolution of sub-narratives and themes which have been developed throughout the earlier nine-book collection' and presenting Pliny 'on the Black Sea as not only a new and better prose Ovid, but a new and better Cicero'.<sup>10</sup> The transposition of *Ep.* 10.98–99, if indeed deliberate, supports these arguments in three ways. First, the chronological displacement of the pair of letters indicates the deliberate action of an editor. Second, the movement of these letters in order to exploit the metaphor of the covered sewer and to reinforce the correctness of Trajan's decision indicates a strong desire to enhance the reputation of the emperor. This then leads to a final point related to the editorship of the book. Would a friend or acquaintance of Pliny have been invested enough in these considerations to deliberately move this letter? Perhaps not. But it appears altogether plausible that Pliny himself, deeply moved by the affair of the Christians and perhaps still unsettled by Trajan's contradictory instruction, would have recognized the allusive value of *Ep.* 10.98. If so, this is further evidence of Pliny's own hand in editing Book 10 of his *Letters*.

McMaster University

MARTIN BECKMANN

[beckmam@mcmaster.ca](mailto:beckmam@mcmaster.ca)

doi:10.1017/S000983882200009X

## ANTHOLOGIA LATINA 109.8 SHB: A NEW READING FOR YOU\*

### ABSTRACT

*This note addresses briefly the difficulties associated with the personalities named in the epigram Anth. Lat. 109.8 ShB and their roles before suggesting that tibi should be read rather than mihi in line 8.*

**Keywords:** *Latin Anthology*; acrostich; telestich; prosopography; textual criticism

reinforced his argument that Book 10 was designed to burnish the image of both Pliny and Trajan and to reflect on themes raised in the first nine books: G. Woolf, 'Pliny/Trajan and the poetics of Empire', *CPh* 110 (2012), 132–51.

<sup>8</sup> Woolf (n. 7 [2006]), 103.

<sup>9</sup> C.F. Noreña, 'The social economy of Pliny's correspondence with Trajan', *AJPh* 128 (2007), 239–77, at 269. A similar interpretation is advanced by P. Stadter, 'Pliny and the ideology of Empire: the correspondence with Trajan', *Prometheus* 32 (2006), 61–76.

<sup>10</sup> R.K. Gibson and R. Morello, *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 2012), 251 and 263.

\* I am grateful for their comments to Dr N.M. Kay and the anonymous *CQ* reader.

*Anth. Lat.* 109 ShB (120 R):<sup>1</sup>

*Aliter (De balneis)*

Fausta nouum domini condens Fortuna lauacrum  
 Inuitat fessos huc properare uiaE.  
 Laude operis fundi capiet sua gaudia praesuL  
 Ospes dulciflua dum recreatur aquA.  
 Condentis monstrant uersus primordia nomeN 5  
 Auctoremque facit littera summa legI.  
 Lustrent pontiugi Cumani litoris antraA;  
 Indigenae placeant plus mihi deliciaE.

2 uiae *Heinsius*: uitę *A*: uiros *Salmasius*

4 ospes *Müller*: hospis *A*

5 uersus *Riese*: uersos *A*: uerso *Stowasser*: uersa *Zurli*

6 auctoremque *A*: actoremque *Kay* summa *Courtney*: prima *A*

This epigram is the second in a series of six or seven on baths.<sup>2</sup> It contains the acrostich FILOCALI and the telestich MELANIAE.<sup>3</sup> The identities and roles of these people have occasioned much debate. Prosopographical arguments have been advanced for their being historical figures from North Africa (where most of the poems in the *Latin Anthology* were written or assembled), and the meanings of *condens* (lines 1 and 5) and *auctor* (line 6) have attracted scrutiny.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, questions remain.

For instance, when arguing as to their identities, Cameron proposes that, while the so-called Elder Melania, the bath's *condens* (in the sense of 'founder') financed/built the baths,<sup>5</sup> the famous calligrapher Furius Dionysius Filocalus, *condens* in the sense of 'literary composer', 'engraved (and possibly composed) the poem'.<sup>6</sup> In arguing for different meanings for *condens* in lines 1 and 5, however, Cameron does not note that *dominus* in line 1 is masculine and so cannot apply to Melania. Instead, it seems likely that lines 1–2 refer to the same person as the one referred to in line 5, whom we know for definite is Filocalus (as shown by *uersus primordia*).<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile, line 6 refers to Melania (note *littera summa*). It is possible that lines 3–4 do as well,

<sup>1</sup> The text given here is based on that of N.M. Kay, *Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina. Text, Translation and Commentary* (London, 2006), who has preserved the numbering in D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina 1.1. Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina* (Stuttgart, 1982). Also given is the numbering of A. Riese's Teubner text (Leipzig, 1894). On this epigram, see too L. Zurli, *Unius poetae sylloge* (Hildesheim, 2007), 82–5 and 150, and I. Bergasa and É. Wolff, *Épigrammes latines de l'Afrique Vandale* (Paris, 2016), 30–1. See also L. Müller, 'Zu Meyer's Anthologie', *RhM* 20 (1865), 633–7 (on line 4), J.M. Stowasser, 'Lexicale Vermutungen zur lateinischen Anthologie I', *WS* 31 (1909), 279–92, at 281 (on line 5), and (on line 6) E. Courtney, 'Observations on the *Latin Anthology*', *Hermathena* 129 (1980), 37–50, at 41–2, and id., *Musa Lapidaria* (Atlanta, 1995), 266; cf. J. Evans-Grubbs and E. Courtney, 'An identification in the *Latin Anthology*', *CPh* 82 (1987), 237–9, at 238 and Alan Cameron, 'Filocalus and Melania', *CPh* 87 (1992), 140–4, at 140.

<sup>2</sup> See Kay (n. 1), 173 and cf. 191.

<sup>3</sup> For which, see Kay (n. 1), 177–8. Also Evans-Grubbs and Courtney (n. 1), 238 and Cameron (n. 1), 140.

<sup>4</sup> Evans-Grubbs and Courtney (n. 1), 237–9, Cameron (n. 1), 141–4; cf. D.E. Trout, *Damasus of Rome* (Oxford, 2015), 49.

<sup>5</sup> Regarding the Elder Melania, see Cameron (n. 1), 141. She was the grandmother of the Younger Melania, for whom see Evans-Grubbs and Courtney (n. 1), 238–9.

<sup>6</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 141–2. He refers to *OLD* s.v. *condo* 10 and 14.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Kay (n. 1), 178. *Versus* is a collective singular, as at Prop. 2.34.93 *Cynthia ... uersu laudata Properti*.

since this makes for a neat alternation in the ordering of lines: Filocalus (1–2) Melania (3–4) Filocalus (5) Melania (6); but it is also possible that they refer to Filocalus, that is, he is both the *dominus* and *condens* in line 1 and the *fundi ... praesul* in line 3. In this case, either Melania is the *auctor* of the epigram, which raises questions about women poets and their position/influence,<sup>8</sup> or *auctor* carries an unusual sense: though the *auctor* of a building is usually the person responsible for its erection, might the baths have been Melania's idea although Filocalus executed it?<sup>9</sup>

Whatever the correct identifications and the respective functions of the *condens* and the *auctor*, however, questions arise as to whom *mihi* in line 8 refers. Kay suggests, in addressing it,<sup>10</sup> that it must be to 'the protagonist of the epigram and founder/owner of the baths, Filocalus, who effectively recommends his reader/clients to enjoy the local facilities and shun fancy foreign establishments'. The word sits oddly, however, since there is nothing to explain the first person here.

A possibility is that one should instead read *tibi*. This would do away with the difficulty of identifying the first-person *mihi* with the third-person references earlier in the poem; arguably, it would make the subjunctive *placeant* easier; and, in view of the contrast between *fessos ... uiae* (line 2) and *pontiuagi* (line 7), it would achieve a more pointed ending to the epigram. Also, if the poem were originally written up in or engraved on the walls of baths, as seems likely,<sup>11</sup> *tibi* would resonate with each bather as he read it.<sup>12</sup> Compare Mart. 11.80.7, where *tibi* has replaced *mihi* (that is, the opposite to the case here): *quod si deorum munere hoc mihi* [Gilbert: *tibi* βγ] *detur*.<sup>13</sup> Compare also the confusion at Mart. 12.2(3).4 *dat patrios amnes quos mihi* [β: *tibi* γ] *terra potens*.<sup>14</sup>

Before the possibility of *tibi* can be accepted, however, there is a further consideration to be met: it would appear that the current epigram is closely related to that immediately following it, *Anth. Lat.* 110 ShB (121 R), where the first line (*quisquis Cumani lustravit litoris antra*) recalls line 7 *lustrent pontiuagi Cumani litoris antra*.<sup>15</sup> Might *balnea nostra* in line 4 lend any support to *mihi* in *Anth. Lat.* 109 ShB (120 R)?<sup>16</sup> This is possible;<sup>17</sup> but, instead of being a poetic plural referring to Filocalus/the bath's proprietor, and especially if this epigram too was displayed on the walls of the baths,<sup>18</sup> *nostra* could be an expression of local pride and identity: *our* baths are better than the foreign ones, overseas at Baiae—as anyone knows who has experienced both (lines 1–2). One cannot therefore insist that *mihi* is supported by *nostra*.

<sup>8</sup> Courtney (n. 1 [1980]), 41 observes that there is no known work by any poetess in the *Latin Anthology*. See too the arguments in Kay (n. 1), 184.

<sup>9</sup> Courtney (n. 1 [1980]), 41–2. Courtney is, of course, thinking of the Younger Melania; but his reasoning here applies also to the Elder.

<sup>10</sup> Kay (n. 1), 179; cf. Bergasa and Wolff (n. 1), 30–1.

<sup>11</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 140–1.

<sup>12</sup> Engaging bathers thus means that, while the absence of any first-person words earlier in the poem is odd, the absence of any second-person words is not a difficulty.

<sup>13</sup> See N.M. Kay, *Martial Book XI. A Commentary* (London, 1985), ad loc.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. too e.g. Mart. 9.42.6 (*me* γ and *te* β) and 12.60.5 (*meis* β and *tuis* γ). Note also Lindsay's apparatus criticus at Mart. 13.48.2 *mittere*, where he suggests that the abbreviation *mī* lies behind *mihi* T and *tibi* R.

<sup>15</sup> It seems possible, given *hic lauet* at both *Anth. Lat.* 110.3 ShB (121.3 R) and *Anth. Lat.* 108.7 ShB (119.7 R), that *Anth. Lat.* 108–10 ShB (119–21 R) form an integral group.

<sup>16</sup> Given the connection between *Anth. Lat.* 109 ShB and *Anth. Lat.* 110 ShB (120 and 121 R), should *hospes* at *Anth. Lat.* 110.2 ShB (121.2 R) be written as *ospes*?

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kay (n. 1), 179.

<sup>18</sup> See Cameron (n. 1), 143 and n. 14.

The case therefore remains for reading *tibi* instead of *mihi* at *Anth. Lat.* 109.8 ShB (120.8 R).

*London*

T.J. LEARY

[timlaoghaire@hotmail.com](mailto:timlaoghaire@hotmail.com)

doi:10.1017/S0009838822000040