

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Tunica Retiarii

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 08 / November 1904, pp 395 - 398

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990693, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990693

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1904). Tunica Retiarii. The Classical Review, 18, pp 395-398 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990693

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

animantum tanta pestilentia consecuta est, ut auium pecudum ac bestiarum corruptione aeris dissolutarum putrefacta passim cadauera uitium corruptionis augerent. At uero quanta fuerit hominum lues, ego ipse, dum refero, perhorresco.'

He adds some impossible estimates of the number of human beings who died: 80,000 in Numidia, more than 200,000 on the coast between Carthage and Utica, (Obsequens gives 800,000!) which suggest that there were other causes of pestilence at work beside the locusts, though it must be remembered that the destruction of the crops would act as a predisposing cause for the malignant influence of the stench on the human frame. The good priest goes on to remark that by the grace of God in Christian times no such calamity has happened, though the inroads of locusts have been frequent enough.

Before I go on to the modern parallel, I may remark that owing to the meagreness of our authorities for the events of these years we have no means of discovering how the destruction of the African crops affected the supply of corn at Rome. K. W. Nitzsch, in his monograph on the Gracchi (1847, p. 393) went so far as to suggest that the difficulties occasioned by it gave C. Gracchus a good pretext for his *lex frumentaria*. It is in any case a fact which should not be left out of consideration in judging of Gracchus' policy; we can hardly avoid the conclusion that there were difficulties of supply in the following year, which was the one in which Gracchus was canvassing for the tribunate, (124 B.C.), and no man whose paramount interest it was to carry the plebs with him during the next year or two could afford to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the aediles.

I now turn to the modern parallel, which I found in the autobiography of Sir John Barrow (1847, p. 151), who was in the suite of Lord Macartney, in the short interval between 1796, when the Cape first came into our hands, and the peace of Amiens in 1802, when it was restored to the Dutch. Barrow

was a careful and accurate observer, and travelled for several months in the country as far as the Orange river. He writes as follows:

'Of the multitudes of the incomplete insect or larva of the locust, which at this time infected this part of Africa, no adequate idea can possibly be conceived without having been an eye-witness. For the distance of ten miles on each side of the Sea-cow river, and 80 or 90 miles in length, an area of sixteen or eighteen hundred square miles, the whole surface of the ground as far as we could see might literally be said to be, or to have been, covered by them. They had completely destroyed every green herb and every blade of grass: and had not the insulated reeds of the river afforded subsistence for our cattle, our journey must have ended for want of food. . . . The present year was the third of their continuance in this part of the colony. Their last departure, with its result, is described as rather singular, and it was confirmed by the inhabitants of the lower part of the colony. All the full-fledged insects were driven by a tempestuous north-west wind into the sea, and afterwards thrown back upon the beach, where they formed a bank three or four feet high, between the mouths of the Bosjesman's River and the Beeka, a distance of nearly fifty miles; and our present company assured me that when this mass became putrid, the stench was sensibly felt in several parts of Sneeuwberg.'

The Sneeuwberg range is about 150 miles as the crow flies from the mouth of the Bushman river; the stench must have been quite enough, we might imagine, at the coast, to be the contributory cause of a pestilence, but Barrow does not mention one, and the population was doubtless sparse as compared with that of the Roman province. However this may be, the most curious features of Orosius' account, the heaping up of the dead locusts on the shore, and the stench thereby occasioned, are entirely confirmed by Barrow's narrative: I must leave it to scientific men to say whether this would be a sufficient cause of pestilence. The story is a good example of the way in which exaggeration and marvel may gather in course of time round a perfectly authentic historical fact.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

TUNICA RETIARI.

JUVENAL in his Second satire, which is directed like the Timarchea of Aeschines against *impudicitia* or effeminacy in grown men, has a story of one Gracchus who *nupsit*

cornicini. Twenty-six verses, 117—142, are occupied with this anecdote and with declamation appropriate to the case; then follow these:

uicit et hoc monstrum tunicati fuscina
 Gracchi,
 lustratque fuga mediam gladiator ha-
 renam
 et Capitolinis generosior et Marcellis 145
 et Catuli Paulique minoribus et Fabiis
 et
 omnibus ad podium spectantibus, his
 licet ipsum
 admoueat cuius tunc munere retia misit.

The words appear to mean that fighting as a retiarius was a worse abomination in Gracchus than was the scandal recorded above. Why was it? Some, like Nettle-ship Journ. Phil. xvi p. 64, impeach the satirist's topsy-turvy notions of propriety, and descant on the 'perversity of judgment' to which a nobleman turned gladiator seems more prodigious than a man turned woman: 'after mentioning a case of unnatural vice, he goes on *uicit et hoc monstrum tunicati fuscina Gracchi*'. Others, like Mr Friedlaender ad loc., explain that Gracchus' crowning offence was his effrontery: 'Gracchus hat die Ungeheuerlichkeit seiner widernatürlichen Vermählung noch dadurch überboten, dass er öffentlich als Gladiator aufgetreten ist, und zwar als retiarius, die in der blossen tunica ohne Rüstung erschienen (daher tunicati 143) und deren Gesicht durch kein Visir verdeckt war'. But the impeachment and the explanation alike miss the main point. This is a satire against effeminacy: where is the effeminacy of fighting as a retiarius? Mr Weidner expels the six verses as interpolated. '143—148 sind ein fremdartiger Zusatz, der dem Inhalt der ganzen Satire widerstrebt. Diese handelt nur von der *effeminata libido* der stoischen Heuchler und der geckenhaften Aristokratie. Das Auftreten des Gracchus aber in der Arena bekundet keine unnatürliche Verweichlichung des Körpers und des Charakters, sondern im Gegenteil eine gewisse Stärke, Kraft und Mut, nur dass diese an sich guten Eigenschaften einem unwürdigen Zwecke dienen. Das Auftreten des Mannes ist seiner Ehre und seines Standes unwürdig, aber er selbst wird darum nicht zum Weibe.'

In the Eighth satire Gracchus again appears as a retiarius, and again inspires a mysterious loathing. Juvenal inveighs against noblemen who act in mimes, and then proceeds:

haec ultra quid erit nisi ludus? et
 illic
 dedecus urbis habes, nec murmillonis
 in armis 200

nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem aut
 falce supina,
 damnat enim tales habitus: mouet
 ecce tridentem.
 nec galea faciem abscondit, sed damnat
 et odit:
 postquam uibrata pendentia retia
 dextra
 nequiquam effudit, nudum ad spectacula
 uoltum 205
 erigit et tota fugit agnoscendus harena.
 credamus tunicae, de faucibus aurea
 cum se
 porrigat et longo iactetur spira galero.
 ergo ignominiam grauiorem pertulit
 omni
 uulnere cum Graccho iussus pugnare
 secutor. 210

I do not now enquire whether u. 207 should be punctuated *credamus tunicae, de faucibus* with most editors or *credamus, tunicae de faucibus* with L. Kiaer: I only ask, what is it that the spectators are bidden to *believe*, and to believe on the grounds assigned? That the gladiator under their eyes is Gracchus? But they *know* that it is Gracchus: his face is bare and upturned and recognisable, as we were told in 205 sq. That Gracchus has really and truly turned retiarius? But if they were not convinced of this by seeing him cast his *retia* in 204 sq., nothing will convince them; certainly not his *tunica* nor his *spira* nor his *galerus*. And what, in any case, is the drift of 209 sq.? Why is the secutor, bred and trained to encounter retiarii, so direly humiliated at encountering Gracchus? Because his fellow-gladiator was once a noble? Are common soldiers degraded by association with gentleman-rankers? Did the schoolmasters of Corinth hang their heads for shame when Dionysius of Syracuse adopted their profession? Was Charles V regarded as contaminating the cloister because he had put off the imperial crown and descended from the throne of Spain and the Netherlands? 'Eine geschmacklose Uebertreibung' says Mr Friedlaender. *Geschmacklos* indeed, but it is the very reverse of an *Uebertreibung*; it is a flat contradiction of truth and likelihood. Mankind in the first century was yet mankind; and a secutor pitted against a ci-devant aristocrat would be rather flattered than otherwise, if that were the only circumstance which marked the case. *ergo* must point to some other circumstance.

Here then are two passages in Juvenal not yet elucidated: in both the difficulty

centres round a *retiarus*, and in both the *retiarus* is explicitly described as *tunicatus*.

A. Chabouillet in a paper on *retiarii* in the *Revue Archéologique* for 1851, pp. 397–420, quotes from Festus and Isidore their definitions of the term and on p. 401 proceeds ‘Les textes qui précèdent décrivent le mode de combattre et les armes du rétiaire, mais ils ne parlent pas de son costume. Juvénal s’est fort heureusement chargé de ce soin.’ And it seems to be a common opinion that this is what Juvenal has done. Smith, *Dict. of Antiqu.* ‘the *retiarus* was dressed in a short tunic,’ Seyffert, *Lexicon der klass. Alterth.*, Eng. trans. ‘the *retiarus* had nothing on but a short tunic and a girdle,’ Mayor at *Iuu.* viii 207 ‘the *retiarus* wore the tunic alone,’ Friedlaender at ii 143 ‘*retiarus*, die in der blossen tunica ohne Rüstung erschienen.’ Juvenal is so famous and indeed so hackneyed an author that these two passages are the first to start up before the mind when *retiarii* are mentioned. But outside Juvenal, so far as I am aware, there is only a single place in Latin literature where the *retiarus* and the *tunica* are found in company, Suet. *Calig.* 30. And if you turn from the literature to the monuments you find that the *retiarus*, as usually depicted, has no *tunica*, only a subligaculum. The *retiarus tunicatus* does indeed appear,—there are two or three in *Bullet. Napol. nuov. ser. tom. i tav. vii.*—but he is a rarity. The truth is stated by Mr Friedlaender *Sitteng.* ii 527: ‘sie trugen eine tunica oder auch ein blosses subligaculum, welches letzere auf den monumenta gewöhnlich ist.’

Suetonius writes ‘*retiarii tunicati quinque numero gregatim dimicantes sine certamine ullo totidem secutoribus succubuerant; cum occidi iuberentur, unus resumpta fuscina omnes uictores interemit: hanc ut crudelissimam caedem et defleuit edicto et eos qui spectare sustinuissent execratus est.*’ The point of this anecdote, adduced as an example of Caligula’s ‘*saeuitia ingenii*,’ is obscure: I should not even venture to infer from it that *retiarii tunicati* were a despised class of gladiators. For all enlightenment of our darkness we are thrown back on Juvenal; and fortunately the passages of Juvenal assigning a *tunica* to a *retiarus* are now not two but three.

For the Oxford fragment of the Sixth satire, denouncing the presence of the *cinædus* in the household, contains these verses:

purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lan-
ista,

in cuius numero longe migrare iubetur
psellus ab euphono: quid quod nec retia
turpi

iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem 10
munimenta umeri pulsata hastamque
tridentem

qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima
ludi

accipit has animas aliusque in carcere
neruos.

I have already made one attempt to translate the words ‘*nec retia turpi iunguntur tunicae*’ (*C.R.* xiii p. 266) and one attempt to amend them (*C.R.* xv p. 263–4)¹; but both attempts I made under the old false impression that *retiarii* commonly wore tunics, and both are consequently wrong. What Juvenal says is this: the *retiarus subligatus*, ‘qui nudus pugnare solet,’ refuses to associate with the *retiarus tunicatus*. And why? Because the latter is *turpis*, that is, as the whole context proves, *impudicus* and in particular *ore impurus*.

The three passages of Juvenal are all cleared up by the one assumption that the *tunica*, in a *retiarus*, was popularly supposed to indicate *impudicitia*. In sat. ii Gracchus, degraded by the mock-marriage of u. 117, was worse degraded by the *tunica* of u. 143, because this signified nothing short of prostitution: conversely in *Cic. Phil.* ii 44 M. Antonius, who was ‘*primo uulgare scortum*,’ rose a step in respectability when ‘*Curio interuenit, qui eum a meretricio quaestu abduxit et, tamquam stolam dedisset, in matrimonio stabili et certo collocauit.*’ In sat. viii 207 the words *credamus tunicae* mean ‘*credamus tunicae id quod tunicae credi solet, scilicet impudicum esse qui ea uestitus pugnet.*’ The popular notion that all *retiarii tunicati* were effeminate was probably no better founded than the imputations cast by Voltaire and fifty others on the whole Society of Jesus, or the ill name which has at times attached itself to certain regiments in the army; but in the case of Gracchus there was corroborative evidence: he attired himself ‘*elegantius quam necesse est probo*’ and decorated his person with an *aurea spira*. *ergo* ignominiam grauiorem pertulit omni uulnere cum Graccho iussu pugnare secutor.

¹ My conjecture *turpi <et>*, like Mr Buecheler’s otherwise attractive proposal *regna et Cocytum* at ii 149, is upset by the observation of L. Kiaer (de sermone *Iuu.*, Hauniae 1875, p. 14) that Juvenal does not admit elision at this point in the verse.

I formerly quoted (C.R. xv p. 264) a corrupt passage of Seneca which I can now correct. nat. quaest. vii 31 3 'cotidie comminiscimur, per quae uirilitati fiat iniuria, ut traducatur, quia non potest exui: alius genitalia excidit, alius in obscenam partem ludi fugit et locatus ad mortem infame *armaturae genus* etiam, in quo morbum suum exerceat, legit': *armatur egenus* MSS. Seneca means that the man becomes a *retiarius tunicatus*. And since it thus clearly appears that certain gladiators were generally credited with manners which sank them even lower than the technical *infamia* of their profession, I think we can now emend Petron. 9 as follows: quibus ego

auditis intentaui in oculos Ascyli manus et 'quid dicis,' inquam, 'muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius nec spiritus purus est?' inhorrescere se finxit Ascylos, mox sublati fortius manibus longe maiore nisu clamauit: 'non taces,' inquit, 'gladiator obscene, quem de *ruma* harena dimisit?' *ruina* MSS. '*rumam* ueteres *mammam* dixerunt' says Nonius p. 167, quoting from Varro '*rumam*, id est prisco uocabulo *mammam*, a quo *subrumi* etiamnunc dicuntur agni.' *subrumus* was not the only compound of *ruma* which remained in use; and Ascylos, retorting the charge of 'spiritus impurus,' selects the old word for a plain reason.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SOME NOTES UPON ROMAN BRITAIN.

I.—THE DATE OF THE ROMAN COLONY AT LINCOLN.

THE name of the city is sufficient proof that it was a colony; and we have a 'civis Lindensis' recorded *C.I.L.* vii. 189. The date of the colony has hitherto been left uncertain; yet there is evidence enough to fix it within narrow limits. In the inscription from Moguntiacum, which is not earlier than 43 A.D. (*C.I.R.* 1033 'Fortunam Superam Honori Aquilae Leg. XXII Pr. P. F. M. Minicius M. fil. Quir. Lindo Mar[tialis trib. leg. eius?]), Grotefend, Hübner, and Kubitschek suppose that the reference is to Lindus in Rhodes. They do not argue the question; but all the probabilities are against them. Lindus was 'contributa' with the city of Rhodes, which itself had no Roman rights; and if a Roman citizen did happen to be also a burgess of Lindus, he would rather have named Rhodes as his domicile; also he would probably have been of Greek extraction, having got the 'civitas' by personal grant, and his name belies this. It would be unusual and strange that an officer in a legion permanently posted in the West should be drawn from the East: there seems to be no parallel. On every ground we must refer the inscription to the colony of Roman citizens at Lindum. The mention of the tribe Quirina then becomes significant; for in that tribe the Flavian emperors enrolled all their foundations, and there is no later emperor who could have done so. Hence the colony

was founded between 69 and 96 A.D. But further: the reference to 'senum coloniae' which Tacitus puts into the mouth of Calgacus (*Ag.* 32, 4) in 83, or (as most authorities think) 84 A.D. is probably not rhetorical but literally accurate. What colony after Camulodunum justified the plural? Not Glevum, which was founded by Nerva (*C.I.L.* vi. 3346); and not Deva, which, if it ever became a colony, could not have done so (pace Hübneri dixerim) in the first century, while it was the headquarters of the army in Britain. Agricola's water-works there in 79 (cf. Mr. Haverfield in *Antiquary* 36, p. 7) were for the camp only. If Tacitus is accurate, only Lindum is left, and 83 is the latest date. As for the earliest: we know from Tacitus that in 71-73 Cerialis 'permanently conquered' (so Furneaux translates) part of the territory of the Brigantes, and it is generally believed, with good reason, that in consequence the Legio IX Hispana was advanced from Lindum to new quarters at Eburacum. The government had opened new lead-mines thirty miles north-west of York by the year 81 (*C.I.L.* vii. 1207). And the traces of the legion at York are too numerous to belong entirely to the brief interval between 108—the year of the only dated inscription (*C.I.L.* vii. 241)—and its destruction. Again, the Legio II Adiutrix, which came from Germany with Cerialis, was at Lindum during part of its brief sojourn, as two inscriptions show. This must have been during Cerialis' campaigns, when Lindum