

parable word is common knowledge. One can think of the notorious *nutricum tenuis* for *mamillarum tenuis* in Catullus 64.18.

Finally, if the word *argutus* in certain contexts has the Greek meaning of *λιγύς*, one can apply it to the various contexts we find in the dictionary: *ocelli* and *manus*—as finely wrought (and thereby expressive); a horse's head as finely wrought (and expressive), a sandal as finely wrought.

If under Greek influence, or independently, a Roman thought of *argutus* as something on the high, fine side, the high fine sounds of birds, saws, and pine trees in the wind would be reflected in shapes as fine and delicate.

The word *argutus* is used by Cicero in a visual context, thus indicating that it was more than a Neoteric invention (Cicero detested the Neoteric style), and that either the Greek *λιγύς* had influenced the Latin context among Greek speaking Romans or that *argutus* in Latin already lent itself to the visual context without influence from the Greek. It seems more likely, though, that especially in a poetic context, the Greek meaning came into play. Given Latin poets' fondness for deliberate ambiguity, we cannot rule out synaesthesia. The context of the poem at this point leads into *arguta* being taken as "delicate" but the usual meaning of the word seems to have described a sound. Catullus can thus take advantage of both the visual and audible aspects⁹).

Inceptive *Quoque* and the Introduction *Medias in res* in Classical and Early Medieval Latin Literature

By BERNARD FRISCHER, Los Angeles

In this article, the existence of a hitherto unnoticed use of the Latin adverb *quoque* at the very beginning of a work of poetry or prose is established (the so-called "inceptive" usage of *quoque*); three main types and five varieties of this usage are distinguished and exemplified; and the results are applied

⁹) F. Della Corte, "Arguta Solea," *Riv. di Fil.* 107 (1979) 30–34, sees the phrase as a reference to Aphrodite — based on Philostratos, *Epist.* 37.11. However, it is most unlikely that the word *ῥαβύζω* used by Philostratos means "strideva", see LSJ *s. v.*, and comparison to Aphrodite would disturb the Laodameia parallel. Aphrodite's problem may be a wet sandal.

to the analysis of three textual-critical and interpretative problems in classical and medieval Latin poetry that may be solvable once the presence of inceptive *quoque* is recognized.

Like the copulative conjunctions *καί*¹⁾ and *et*,²⁾ the adverb *quoque* may be used, in its normal postpositive location, at the very beginning of a work of poetry or prose. This unusual usage of *quoque*, which may be called "inceptive," is worth examining because it has escaped the notice of philologists;³⁾ it occurs far more frequently than inceptive *et*;⁴⁾ and it helps to solve a number of interesting textual and interpretative problems in classical and medieval poetry.

Quoque, like *καί*, is more often used inceptively in poetry than in prose. Lysias once began a speech with *καί*, and Livy started Book 31 with the words *Me quoque iuvat*. Such cases, however, are rare and, not surprisingly, were commented upon in antiquity.⁵⁾ Inceptive *καί* and *quoque* are most commonly found in epigrams, and it is likely that the literary origin of the inceptive copulative conjunction is to be found in this genre. Be that as it may, the *loci classici* in Latin occur in epic and didactic poetry: Virgil, *Georg.* 3. 1 (*Te quoque, magna Pales, et te memorande, canemus*); *Aen.* 7. 1 (*Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix*); Valerius Flaccus *Arg.* 7. 1 (*Te quoque Thessalico iam serus ab hospite vesper*); Martianus Capella *De Nupt. Phil. et Merc.* 4, *Praef.* 1 (*Haec quoque contortis stringens effamina nodis*). Here, too, should be included Horace's *Serm.* 2. 5,

¹⁾ Cf. Lysias, fr. 36a Thalheim; *AP* 6. 146 (Callimachus), 7. 123, 130 (Diogenes Laertius), 7. 263 (Anacreon), 7. 633 (Crinagoras); Apollonides vi, x (Gow-Page).

²⁾ Cf. F. Hand, *Tursellinus, Seu De Particulis Latinis Commentarii*, vol. 2 (Leipzig 1832) 494. My colleague Bengt Löfstedt has kindly drawn my attention to parallel inceptive uses of *enim* and *nam* in medieval Latin; see his article, "Zum spanischen Mittellatein," *Glotta* 54 (1976) 117-57, especially p 149, for examples and literature.

³⁾ For bibliography on *quoque* see Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, vol. 1 (Munich 1926⁵) 662 (par. 232), ed. M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann; M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, vol. 2 (Munich 1965) 485 (par. 258).

⁴⁾ In D. Schaller and E. Könsgen, *Initia Carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum* (Göttingen 1977), we find about 58 examples of inceptive *quoque* and c. 35 of inceptive *et*.

⁵⁾ On Lysias, cf. the scholion in Sakkélion, "Scholies de Démosthène et d'Eschine, d'après un manuscrit inédit de Patmos," *BCH* 1 (1877) 150; on Livy, cf. the comments *ad loc.* by W. Weissenborn-H. J. Müller and J. Briscoe.

an epic parody, which begins *Hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti*.

That these introductions troubled ancient readers is attested for two cases. Donatus comments on *Aen.* 7.1, *fortassis aliquis putet inproprie caput libri constituisse Vergilium ideo, quia dixit 'tu quoque,' cum ante hunc versum nullum nominasse videatur.*⁶⁾ Remigius of Auxerre, a ninth-century commentator on Martianus Capella, noted the same problem at the beginning of Book IV of the *De Nuptiis*, and he explained the propriety of *quoque* in the same way that Donatus did: the adverb links the beginning of the book in question to the previous book.⁷⁾

While this is certainly correct as far as it goes, it is not the full explanation of the matter. It is no accident that the Virgilian cases occur at the beginning of the second half of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. We know that in the structural schemes of both poems this position is strongly marked.⁸⁾ *Quoque* here not only links the passages backwards, it also propels the second parts of the works forwards. This paradoxical movement in two opposed directions may be easier to grasp if we consider the links backwards. In the

⁶⁾ P. 3 (H. Georgius).

⁷⁾ Cf. C. E. Lutz (ed.), *Remigii Autissiodorensis Commentum in Martianum Capellam, Libri iii-ix* (Leiden 1965) 9: "HAEC QUOQUE subaudis Dialectica. QUOQUE autem dicit, id est similiter, sicut et Grammatica quia QUOQUE hic similitudinis est. HAEC QUOQUE ADVENTIT id est similiter, sicut et Grammatica" (the subject of the previous book). Donatus, in the passage just cited, continues: "hoc aestimant qui interiecta nesciunt retrahere, ut quod ad tempus separatum est iungant. iste enim versus sublato medio de inferis tractatu Miseni exequis iungitur; ab his enim discedens carminis cursus ad easdem redit et facit integram narrationem, ut recte posuerit tu quoque . . ." (pp. 3-4 Georgius).

⁸⁾ On the *Georgics*, cf., e.g., W. Richter, *Vergil, Georgica* (Munich 1957) 92; B. Otis, *Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1963) 151-53; L. P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil* (Cambridge 1969) 74; and see my forthcoming article on the structure of the *Georgics* in the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. On the *Aeneid*, cf., e.g., B. Otis, op.cit., 215-18; K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid. A Critical Description* (London 1968) 66-67. On *Aen.* 7.1-36 as a bridge between Books 6 and 7 see E. Fraenkel, "Some Aspects of the Structure of Aeneid VII," *JRS* 35 (1945) 1-14, especially 1-3 (= *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, vol. 2 [Rome 1964] 145-71). R. Merkelbach, "Aeneia Nutrix," *RhM* 114 (1971) 349-51, stresses the funerary background of the second-person address in *Aen.* 7.1, but does not treat in any detail the problem of *quoque*. On the use of *Hoc/Te/Tu quoque* as a structural marker in *Aen.* 7, *Georg.* 3, and, possibly, *Hor. Sat.* 2.5 see E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 137 n. 2.

case of the *Aeneid*, the references are not, as one might imagine in view of the normal usage of *quoque* in Latin, to the very end of Book VI but to two passages fairly far removed from the end and from each other: 6.232–35 and 6.376–81. In the *Georgics*, the reference is to the invocations of various gods at the beginning of Books 1 (5–42) and 2 (1–8), passages that are quite far removed from the *quoque* of Book 3. The case of Horace, *Serm.* 2.5 is even more striking. The passage to which reference is made (Homer, *Od.* 11.90–149) is not even in the Horatian corpus. In these passages *quoque* undeniably sends the reader backwards, as it usually does, to link up the *quoque*-clause with a preceding idea; however, because the preceding idea is found at such a great distance from the *quoque*-clause, this linkage is not easy for the reader to make without pausing to reflect and even to hunt through relevant texts looking for a point of contact. This, then, is one aspect of what makes introducing a text with inceptive *quoque* so odd: just at the moment when the text should be beginning and moving decisively forwards, it seems to be resuming and pointing backwards.

Yet, the strategy of inceptive *quoque* has a compensating advantage: precisely by making the reader pause to think, it arouses his interest in the new subject heralded by the *quoque* and it sharpens his attention to the text by failing to satisfy his expectations of a straightforward exposition. More than this, inceptive *quoque*, by referring the reader backwards for the exposition that is missing in the text, propels him forwards faster and more economically, once the correct linkage is made. Thus in the *Georgics*, the invocation to Pales can be the shortest address to a god in the poem, and in Horace's satire, there is no exposition whatsoever. Finally, whether or not the reader can supply the proper link for the *quoque*-clause, inceptive *quoque* exemplifies the energetic, forward-moving introduction *medias in res*, which *ad eventum festinat et in medias res non secus ac notas auditorem rapit.*⁹⁾ This simultaneous backward and forward motion of inceptive *quoque* explains why its use in marking significant divisions within large works is so apt and so frequent. It also explains why *καί* and *quoque* are so often encountered in epigrams: the genre cannot tolerate much exposition and so favors introductions *medias in res*; and one of

⁹⁾ Horace, *AP* 148–49, on which see C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, vol. 2 (Cambridge 1971) 221–22.

the chief characteristics of literary epigrams is just the kind of allusiveness that inceptive *quoque* signals.¹⁰⁾

Rhetorically, the inceptive use of *quoque* may be understood as an example of the verbal figure anastrophe or the conceptual figure hysteron proteron.¹¹⁾ Normally Latin syntax requires a sequence of clauses *A, B quoque*. Inceptive *quoque* entails 1. the inversion of this order (*B quoque, A*), or else—as happens more frequently—the omission of the *A*-clause altogether. We may term this a hysteron proteron with a suppressed proteron. *A* may be omitted 2. for a formal reason—it was stated or implied in a contiguous, or even non-contiguous, but formally distinct passage in the same text (cf. *Aen.* 7.1–2, referring to *Aen.* 6.232–35 and 376–81)—or 3. for the substantive reason that it can be mentally supplied by the reader (cf. Horace, *Serm.* 2.5). These three ways of treating the proteron-clause correspond semantically to three degrees of textual indeterminacy, or *Appellstruktur*, to which the reader must respond.¹²⁾ In what follows, a number of varieties of these three main types will be distinguished and exemplified and then the results obtained will be applied to the illumination of some problematic passages. I should point out now that I will be discussing and categorizing most, but not all, of the examples of inceptive *quoque* known to me and that this study accordingly claims to be only heuristic; not exhaustive. A complete study—which I do not presently plan to undertake—must consider inceptive *quoque* in connection with all semantic usages of the word in all contexts, inceptive or not.

1. Type 1: *Simple Hysteron Proteron*

The lowest degree of indeterminacy is reached by the use of *quoque* in a hysteron proteron, since in an introduction of this kind

¹⁰⁾ On allusiveness in epigrams, see W. Ludwig, "Die Kunst der Variation im hellenistischen Liebesepigram," *Fondation Hardt Entretiens* 14 (1968) 297–334.

¹¹⁾ See H. Lausberg, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1967³) 108 (par. 220).

¹²⁾ On *Appellstruktur*, see W. Iser, *Die Appellstruktur der Texte, Konstanzer Universitätsreden* 28 (1970) 14–23. The first way of treating the proteron-clause exemplifies a *figura per transmutationem*, the second two ways illustrate the *figura per detractionem* (cf. H. Lausberg, op.cit. [supra n. 11] 32 [parr. 60–61]).

the subject linked to *B* is made explicit in the text in the very next clause. Thus, *quoque* puzzles the reader, if at all, for only a moment. This type seems to be quite rare. One example—though not a completely pure one—is Ovid *Trist.* 5.1:

Hunc quoque de Getico, nostri studiose, libellum
litore [B] praemissis quattuor adde meis [A].
Hic quoque talis erit, qualis fortuna poetae . . .

Here the clause *praemissis . . . meis* (interrupted by the verb *adde* from the *B*-clause) constitutes the proteron, and by the words *hunc quoque* (1) and *hic quoque* (3), Ovid makes explicit the close relationship of this book to the preceding four *libelli* of the *Tristia*. In *Amores* 2.1.1–3, where we find the similar anaphora of *hoc quoque* (1) and *hoc quoque* (3) with no proteron-clause in verses 1–2, the relationship of the book to its predecessor is no less close,¹³ but Ovid makes the point in a subtler way than in *Tristia* 5.1. Ovid's apparently heavy-handed approach in the *Tristia* is, of course, easily understood: by this point in his exile he is more set on importuning than on delighting his readers—*hic quoque talis erit, qualis fortuna poetae: | invenies toto carmine dulce nihil* (*Trist.* 5.1.3–4). Nothing is to be left to the reader's imagination: this is Ovid's fifth book of *tristia*; no wonder he promises *nihil dulce!*

2. Type 2

If in *Trist.* 5.1 Ovid had used the subtle strategy of *Am.* 2.1, a somewhat greater degree of immediacy and indeterminacy would have been detectable in his introduction since an implicit link to an earlier passage in the same work requires more of the reader's involvement in establishing the reference of the *B*-clause than does a hysteron proteron. Perhaps this is the reason that the rather dull Type 1 is much less frequently encountered than is Type 2, in which the *A*-clause is completely suppressed. Two varieties of Type 2 may be distinguished: Type 2a, in which *quoque* links an epigram to its immediate predecessor in the collection; and Type 2b, in which *quoque* links the beginning of one book to a subject treated in a preceding book of the same work.

¹³ See E. Reitzenstein, "Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores Ovids," *RhM* 84 (1935) 77.

3. *Type 2a*

The linkage by *quoque* of contiguous epigrams on a related theme is only securely attestable for later Latin poetry, although it is likely that the earliest preserved example is from Cicero's *Limon* (fr. 2, p. 65 Morel).¹⁴ Whereas neither Catullus nor Martial was apparently concerned to make such connections, Ausonius rather often joins the poems of his *Opuscula* with inceptive *quoque, etiam, et, and nec* (cf., e.g., *Commemoratio Professorum Burdigalensium* [hereafter = *CPB*): *praef.* 1, 2.1, 9.1, 13.1, 18.1, 21.1). Needless to say, the result is often tedious. In at least one case, however, inceptive *quoque* seems artistically defensible. In *CPB* 21, Ausonius begins:

Tu quoque in aevum, Crispe, futurum maesti venies commemoratus munere threni	3
qui primaevos fandique rudes elementorum prima docebas signa novorum:	5
creditus olim fervere mero ut Vergilii Flaccique locis	7
aemula ferres . . .	9

In praising Crispus as a poet who vies with Horace and Virgil, Ausonius himself writes a Virgilian-Horatian imitation, presumably in the manner of Crispus. It has long been noted that line 5 contains an allusion to Horace, *Epist.* 1.20.17; perhaps the adonius closing the three-line strophe is intended to recall Horace's Sapphics. To these Horatian characteristics may be added an allusion to Virgil, *Ec.* 7.4 (*ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo*) in line 25 (*ambo loqui faciles, ambo omnia carmina docti*) as well as the imitation of *Georg.* 3.1 (*Te quoque, Magna Pales, et te, memorande, canemus*) in lines 1–2 of Ausonius' poem (where the word *commemoratus* clinches the reference to Virgil). So, here, at any rate, Ausonius' inceptive use of the copulative conjunction has an appropriate literary motiva-

¹⁴ For other possible examples from the first century B.C., see below, under "7. Special Problems." The suggestion that Cicero's epigram on Terence was one in a series of poems about Latin poets was first made by F. Leo, "Die römische Poesie in der Sullanischen Zeit," *Hermes* 49 (1914) 194–95. For speculation that this use of *quoque* may have figured in Varro's *Imagines* see R. Merkelbach, op.cit. (supra n. 8) 350.

tion. The same cannot be said of most Ausonian and medieval examples.¹⁵⁾

4. *Type 2b*

Somewhat more demanding on the reader is the use of *quoque* at the beginning of a book to indicate the relationship of the new book's theme to that of a previous book in the same work. As noted above, this usage is particularly apt in introducing the second half of a work (cf. Virgil, *Georg.* and *Aen.*), but of course we also encounter it whenever poets wish to stress the relationship of two contiguous books, whatever their position in the work as a whole. Examples include: Ovid, *Am.* 2.1, *Fast.* 6.1; Valerius Flaccus, *Arg.* 7.1; Martianus Capella, *De Nuptiis Philol. et Mer.* 4 *praef.* 1. The commentators on Livy 31.1 also correctly connect the words *me quoque iuvat* to 30.45, where Livy describes the rejoicing in Italy at the end of the Second Punic War (cf. Weißenborn-Müller and Briscoe *ad loc.*).

5. *Type 3a*

A still greater degree of semantic indeterminacy occurs when *quoque* links the beginning of a poem to a passage in another, non-contiguous poem, as if the later passage were a continuation of the earlier. In this case, the reader must recognize the relevant text to which the later passage refers, if he is to make sense of the inceptive *quoque*. The only example of this usage known to me is Horace, *Serm.* 2.5.1 (*Hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti / responde . . .*), where Ulysses is shown continuing the conversation he had with Tiresias in *Odyssey* 11.90–149 by asking the seer how he may recoup his lost fortune. Pseudo-Acro, *ad loc.*, points out

¹⁵⁾ Cf. Ausonius, *Opuscula* 4.11, 4.16, 4.25; Alcuin, *Carm.* 51.3, 51.4, 89.18, 90.2, 99.9; Flodoardus, *De Triumphis Christi apud Italiam* 2.7; Aldhelmus, *Carm. Eccles.* 4.4, 4.8; Walahfridus Strabo, *De Cultura Hortorum* 22, *Carm.* 44.2; Hrabanus Maurus, *Epist.* 15; Heiricus Autissiodorensis, *Carm. e Collectaneis* 1.3; Wandalbertus Prumiensis, *Martyrologium* 11. *CLE* 1807 (= *L'Année Epigraphique* 1948. 41 [nr. 108]) presumably belongs in this category. The text runs: *Haec quoque praefectus construxit moenia Thomas*, and it is likely that Thomas, the prefect of Africa (c. 570–74; see *RE* VI A s.v. Thomas 15 [Stuttgart 1936] 324–25), was also responsible for other building in the town of Mascula and/or put the same inscription on other parts of the town's fortifications.

the anchor (in verse 42; cf. *Trist.* 5.6.2: *qui mihi portus eras*) relates the addressee to the *amicus* of 5.6. Who is this person, and why does Ovid in both poems address him as *tu quoque*?

This question must have exercised the emotions of Ovid's contemporary readers as much as it does our intellects. M. Davisson has recently studied the various ways Ovid uses to begin his exile poems; his goal right from the beginning is often to suggest a subtle criticism of his audience for some failure in helping his cause.¹⁹⁾ Unfortunately, Davisson did not discuss *Trist.* 5.6, but her analysis can be profitably applied here. The very indeterminacy of the person(s) signified in the suppressed *A*-clause and by the undefined *tu* of the *B*-clause must have aroused strong feelings of guilt in practically all of Ovid's friends enjoying life in Rome while he was languishing in Tomis. So, Ovid's *tu* refers not to one person but to a class—his friends and readers in Rome whose lack of success in bringing about his pardon and return strikes the poet as a sign either of their uncertain loyalty or of their laziness. Any readers who should be actively helping Ovid's cause are artfully trapped by the rhetoric of Ovid's *tu quoque* into realizing, like David before Nathan, "*tu (quoque) es ille vir*" (cf. *II Sam.* 12:1–7).²⁰⁾

7. Special Problems

- i) *Julius Caesar*, *FPL* 1, (p. 91 Morel): *Tu quoque, tu in summis, o dimidiate Menander*

Leo argued that the presence of *quoque* implies that this poem appeared in a collection of epigrams about poets. W. Schmid asserted, but did not argue, that *quoque* is present as an allusion emphasizing the poem's relationship to Cicero's epigram on Terence in the *Limon* (*FPL* 2, p. 66 Morel: *Tu quoque, qui solus lecto sermone, Terenti . . .*).²¹⁾ As mentioned earlier (cf. n. 14), Cicero's usage

¹⁹⁾ M. T. Davisson, "The Functions of Openings in Ovid's Exile Epistles," *CB* 58 (1981) 17–22.

²⁰⁾ For a survey of this strategy of accusation in ancient and modern European literature see V. Pöschl, "Die neuen Menanderpapyri und die Originalität des Plautus," *Sitzb. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss.* 1973. 4, 25–34.

²¹⁾ F. Leo, op.cit. (supra n. 14) 194–95; cf. also A. Rostagni, *Suetonio De Poetis e biografi minori* (Turin 1944) 42, 138; H. Fuchs *apud* W. Schmid, "Terenz als Menander Latinus," *RhM* 95 (1952) 253–54. W. Schmid, *ibid.*, p. 254, correctly calls the use of *quoque* "ein bewußtes παραποιεῖν." On the literary chitchat of Cicero and Caesar see, e.g., Cic. *Ad Att.* 353 (Shackleton Bailey).

probably corresponded to our Type 2a. Assuming we wish to delve into a question like this to which the answer can only be speculative, we should at least note in favor of Schmid's suggestion that a parallel to Caesar's use of what may be called the "allusive" inceptive *quoque* may be found, as we have seen, in Ausonius *CPB* 21, as well as in the following three imitations of Virgil *Aen.* 7.1: *Tu quoque litoribus famam, Caieta, dedistis* (*PLM* IV, p. 175). || *Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Caieta, manebis* (*PLM* IV, p. 171). || *Hic quoque Caietam sepelit . . .* (*PLM* IV, p. 165).

ii) *Martial* 4.82.1: *Hos quoque commenda Venuleio, Rufe, libellos . . .*

The poem seems to be the dedication of a book of epigrams, and *quoque* here appears to exemplify Type 2b. The scant scholarly literature on the poem in fact deals with the problem of what collection of poems 4.82 must have originally introduced.²²) Whatever the answer may be, the problem remains of how to interpret the poem in its present location toward the end of the fourth book. The answer is that this poem, along with such epigrams as 5.80, 7.26, and 11.106, is what might be called a "literary" literary dedication; i.e., like the literary epitaph, it belongs to the realm of imaginative fiction. Although for the (fictional?) character Rufus the *quoque* may fall into Type 2b, from the viewpoint of Martial's true audience the word falls into Type 3b. By demanding the reader's aid in specifying the meaning of the text, inceptive *quoque* sparks the reader's participation in the creative process. If he avoids falling into the trap of speculating on the identity of the *libelli* to which Martial refers, the reader may see that the poem is not a book dedication at all but a member of what (following Barwick)²³) may be called two "cycles" of poems in Martial: the cycle of the "literary" literary dedication, just mentioned; and the cycle of the Rufus-epigrams (3.100, 4.82, and 6.82), which, appropriately enough, also deal with literature and its readers.

In 3.100, Martial tells Rufus that the poems Martial has dispatched to him by messenger were justly destroyed in a rainstorm. In 4.82, Martial tells Rufus that his poems appear best after the reader drinks a moderate amount of wine; and that the reader should put aside half of the poems if there are too many to hold

²²) M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, II. Teil, *HdAW* VIII. 2 (Munich 1935⁴) 550; P. White, "The Presentation and Dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*," *JRS* 64 (1974) 47.

²³) K. Barwick, "Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleinen Gedichten des Catull," *Philologus* 102 (1958) 283–318. Barwick does not discuss the Rufus cycle.

his attention. The implication is that Martial's epigrams appear to be bad when the reader violates the mean between too much and too little reading and drinking. In 6.82, Martial ironically tells Rufus a story about a philistine who considers Martial a bad poet because he wears a bad *lacerna*. So, 4.82 falls into a group of poetological poems in which Martial as poet, or Martial's poetry, is, or can appear to be, bad.

This self-consciousness justifies Martial's use—invention?—of the form of the "literary" literary dedication because the subject of such dedications is normally poetics. Moreover, the poem is a playful study about the nature of reading, for it tells the reader Rufus to tell the reader Venuleius how to read two collections (*libelli*) of poems that, like the poems in the suppressed A-clause, are then not published as such for Martial's true readers to read. The last couplet of the poem tells how Martial's *libelli* can give increased pleasure by being made *divisum* (*divisum sic breve fiet opus* [4.82.8]). From Venuleius' point of view, *divisum* means "cut in half"; for Martial's true readers, *divisum* means "kept apart," "withheld." So, for his real readers, Martial's *opus* turns out to be quite *breve*—and quite pleasantly witty—indeed.

In 11.108 Martial, with entertaining illogicality, tells his readers that they cannot have the very *pauca disticha* they are reading as the encore they demand of the poet at the end of Book 11. Here, in 4.82, Martial, in an equal but opposite gesture, implicitly prepares his true readers for *libelli* that he refuses to make public and that he rightly compares to others (*quoque*) that he has supposedly already published but in reality has not. The inceptive *quoque* thus serves to alert Martial's readers to the imaginary status of the *libelli* that Martial is about to introduce.

iii) *Three Cases of Misunderstood Inceptive Quoque*

- a) Horace c. 1.28.21f.: Me quoque devexi rapidus comes Orionis/
Illyricis Notus obruit undis

Nisbet and Hubbard, like most earlier commentators, interpret *quoque* in verse 21 as adding "another instance of human mortality" to those cited in verses 17–20 (Nisbet-Hubbard, *ad loc.*). Nevertheless, discomfort with this view is detectable in their very next comment: "*quoque* in no way implies that Archytas was drowned." If, in verses 21–22 we hear someone saying "Notus made me, too, drown in the Illyrian waves;" if we have not just

before heard of anyone else killed by Notus on the Adriatic; and, if the speaker of these words has been addressing the dead Archytas, then one can well understand the need—though not the reason—for Nisbet and Hubbard's hasty disclaimer. The text offers no obvious *A*-clause for the *quoque*-clause.²⁴⁾

I will elsewhere consider the interpretative consequences of taking *quoque* as inceptive in *c.* 1.28.²⁵⁾ Here, I wish only to demonstrate the possibility that the word can indicate the beginning of a new text embedded within the ode, in which case it would exemplify type 3b. This can be done very easily, especially now that we have seen that Latin poets were quite aware of the existence of the inceptive use of *quoque*. The only logically possible supplement for the suppressed *A*-clause is "Just as Notus has drowned others on the Adriatic in the past" (not, as Nisbet and Hubbard suggest, "Just as other mortals have met their death in various ways"). Since this supplement does not follow from anything stated in verses 1–20, all spoken by the same person, it may be taken as an indication that a new speaker begins talking in verse 21. The speaker, I would suggest, is the talking epitaph on Archytas' tomb, which is "quoted" at this point in the ode as Archytas' only possible response to the anti-Pythagorean diatribe that Horace has been delivering in verses 1–20. Horace begins the epitaph with the words *Me quoque* since, as a common initial formula in Latin poetry, the words themselves—irrespective of their lack of logical connection with anything in the immediately preceding lines—must have served to signal a change of speaker. Such signalling was all the more necessary and useful because Horace apparently had at his disposal no graphic sign to indicate a change of speaker.²⁶⁾

b) Hrabanus Maurus *c.* LII (*MGH* II, p. 217): *Hic quoque, qui astat, cervices flectite vestras*

The editor, E. Duemmler, has indicated a lacuna before verse 1 of this altar *titulus*. Although he gives no explanation, Duemmler

²⁴⁾ The only possible *A*-clause is *exitio est avidum mare nautis* in verse 18. This is, however, quite far removed from *quoque* in 21, and the constructions in the two lines are not parallel.

²⁵⁾ See my article, "Horace and the Monuments: A New Interpretation of Horace's Archytas Ode (*c.* 1.28)," *HSCP* 88 (1984) 71–102.

²⁶⁾ See J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique. Structure et présentation* (Paris 1954) 294–303.

seems to feel that need for something to precede the transmitted first verse because of the parallel to which he refers in a note *ad loc.* (*viz.*, Hrab. Maur. c. XLIX. IV), where the words *vos quoque qui intrastis, cervices flectite vestras* come in the third line of an altar *titulus*. Duemmler seems not to have considered the possibility that *quoque* in c. LII. 1 can begin the poem. No lacuna need be postulated once we see that we have to do here with inceptive *quoque* Type 2a. In other *tituli*, Hrabanus must have told worshippers to bow at other altars in the church; now, *medias in res*, he tells them to bow here, too.

c) Incertus, *saec.* XI:

Tu quoque, qui sacri
succedis limina templi
has, per quas intras,
studiosius inspicere portas . . .

The text is the first four lines of an inscription at the Basilica S. Paolo fuori le mura (Rome) on a door commissioned by Pantaleone of Amalfi in 1069. It was heavily damaged in the fire of 1823, but was reconstructed in the 1960s. In an article about the reconstruction, H. Bloch²⁷⁾ has argued that the *disegno* of the door by Nicola Nicolai, published in 1815,²⁸⁾ is correct in every detail save one: this inscription should appear, not in the spot Bloch calls II. 5, just to the left of the central two panels of the door, but in the location he refers to as V. 5, just to the right of center. The latter spot is occupied in Nicolai's engraving by another inscription addressed to St. Paul, which begins:

†Paule beate, preces
D(omi)no ne fundere cesses
consule Malfigeno
p(ro) Pantaleone rogando,
ductus amore tui,
qui portas has tibi struxit.

²⁷⁾ H. Bloch, "L'ordine dei pannelli nella porta della Basilica di S. Paolo," *Rend. Pont. Accad. Arch.* 43 (1970-71) 267-81. For the most recent bibliography on the door see A. Thiery, *L'Art dans l'Italie méridionale*, vol. 5, aggiornamento di E. Bertaux sotto la direzione di Adriano Prandi (Rome 1978) 630 and 630 n. 12.

²⁸⁾ N. Nicolai, *Della Basilica di San Paolo* (Rome 1815) tables xi-xvii.

Bloch argues that since the fifty-four panels of the door are to be read from top to bottom and from left to right,²⁹⁾ the inscription to St. Paul should precede—i.e., be to the left of—the inscription to the visitor to the church because: 1. “è ovvio che il donatore prima si rivolge al Santo e dopo al visitatore della chiesa” (Bloch, p. 280); 2. “il ‘quoque’ . . . è sufficiente per provare che continua un pensiero già espresso” (Bloch, p. 280); and 3. “la preghiera a Paolo appartiene alla scena del martirio di s. Paolo [i.e., to the panel next to II. 5] (Bloch, p. 281).³⁰⁾

Against Bloch’s suggestion are the following points that support Nicolai’s otherwise perfectly reliable drawing of the door. 1. Bloch has not reckoned with the possibility that *quoque* here is inceptive, exemplifying my Type 3b. The reader would have to supply a missing *A*-clause such as “Like the worshippers who have come here before you . . .” 2. *Quoque* here cannot in any case link its address to the worshipper about to enter the church with the inscription to St. Paul. Paul is asked to worship to god on behalf of Pantaleone. The worshipper is not asked to pray to god for Pantaleone in the context of the *quoque*-clause (as would be necessary if Bloch is correct); rather, he is told *has, per quos intras, | studiosius inspice portas* (lines 3–4). This is obviously not something that St. Paul, too, can be told. 3. One may, in any case, doubt the correctness of Bloch’s view that the five groups of panels are to be read in the order of top to bottom, and left to right. The fourth—and last—group by this reading is the series of Old Testament prophets of Christ’s birth and passion, who would come later than the apostles and Christ himself, if Bloch is correct. Furthermore, the fifth group, which includes the two inscriptions, is exceptional, even in Bloch’s scheme, since it contains four, not twelve, panels

²⁹⁾ This is somewhat simplified since I omit the complicating details that 1. the panels form five groups, four of which are to be read from top to bottom and from left to right, as are the groups themselves with respect to one another; and 2. the second and fourth group begin in the two central panels III. 5 and IV. 5 respectively and do not include the extreme left and right panels on the bottom (I. 9 and VI. 9). The fifth group is composed of panels I. 5, II. 5, V. 5, and VI. 5 across the middle horizontal of the door. The two inscriptions discussed above in the text (panels II. 5 and V. 5) belong to this fifth group. For convenience, I shall use the system of denoting panels in ranks and files proposed by Bloch, op. cit. (supra n. 27) fig. 4 (p. 277).

³⁰⁾ Doubt about the position of the inscriptions was already expressed by F. J. Luttor, “Die Paulstür. Ein Meisterwerk der byzantinischen Kunst aus dem XI. Jahrhundert,” *Römische Quartalschrift* Suppl. 20 (1913) 315 n. 1.

on just one horizontal, not four, and since it is interrupted in the middle by two panels (III. 5 and IV. 5) belonging to two other groups. In view of these complications in the organization of the panels and groups, moving the address to St. Paul to the left, supposedly in order to be read before the address to the worshipper, would seem to be an unnecessary solution to a false problem.³¹⁾

³¹⁾ I wish to thank N. Horsfall for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article and the American Council of Learned Societies for a fellowship that enabled me to pursue research on this topic.