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](#)

Concessive Particles in Martial

Emory B. Lease

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 01 / February 1898, pp 30 - 31

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025282, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025282

How to cite this article:

Emory B. Lease (1898). Concessive Particles in Martial. The Classical Review, 12, pp 30-31
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025282

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CONCESSIVE PARTICLES IN MARTIAL.

MARTIAL'S usage of the particles of concession has been sadly neglected by the grammarians, Schmalz, *Handb. d. Alterthumswiss.* II.² § 263, refers to the usage of Juvenal, but not one word does he say in regard to Martial. Draeger, *Hist. Synt. d. Lat. Spr.* II.² § 566 foll., Kuehner, *Ausf. Gram.* II., p. 960, Landgraf (*Reisig, Vorles.* III. Anm. 427b), all omit Martial in their lists of the writers of the Silver Age. Martial, following the usual practice of the poets, does not by any means make use of all of the available particles of concession but is partial to only two or three of them. *Etsi*, which is very rare in poetry, avoided entirely by Horace and Tibullus, only employed twice by Propertius and twice by Vergil, is not used at all by Martial. *Etiamsi*, *tametsi* and *tamenetsi*, as one would expect, are not found in Martial, *quamquam* rarely a favourite with the poets, did not meet with favour either with Propertius or Martial, not being used at all by either of these poets. Martial employs *ut* with this force but once: II. 41. 4: *verum ut dixerit*; his favourite particles are *licet*, *quamvis* and *cum*.

Licet always appears in Martial with the subjunctive and, with but one exception, always with a primary tense. This word, though having a concessive force, was still felt to be a verb, and so a few examples of *licebit* are to be found. Draeger cites no example of such a usage; Haase, in a note to Reisig III, § 262 only Ovid, *Amor.* 2, 11, 53; Wagener (*Neue Formenlehre* II.³ p. 973) cites only Hor. *Epod.* 15, 19; S, 2, 2, 59; Lucan 7, 855; 8, 629; Claudian, in *Rufin.* 1, 196; Martial uses *licet* 54 times:

- I. 60, 1 *licet intres*.
 II. 1, 8 *sis licet*.
 23, 1 *licet rogetes*.
 70, 4 „ *abluas*.
 III. 6, 5 „ *dederit*.
 30, 5 „ *dicas*.
 81, 5 *sis licet*.
 IV. 16, 6 *defendat Regulus ipse licet*.
 54, 8 *lautior sis licet*.
 (10) V. 19, 7 *sit licet unum*.
 28, 3 *licet vincas*.
 39, 8 *licet fuissem*, a sequence extremely rare (cf. Juv. XIII. 56).
 51, 6 *fidiculae licet cogant*.
 60, 1 *allatres licet et lacessas*.
 65, 13 *saepe* „ *numeretur*.

- VI. 23, 3 *licet manibus blandis instes*.
 49, 10 „ *hoc velis negare*.
 51, 3 „ *usque votes mittasque rogesque*.
 52, 5 *sis licet placata*.
 (20) 64, 29 *sit placidus licet*.
 VII. 51, 13 *nolis licet*.
 97, 5 *instent licet premantque curae*.
 VIII. 8, 1 *des licet*.
 28, 15 *licet sint aemula dona*.
 44, 2 *cooperis licet*.
 54, 1 *licet tribuas*.
 59, 12 *ardeat licet*.
 IX. Praef. 1 *licet nolis*.
 3, 3 „ *fiat*.
 (30) 37, 10 *sit lusca licet*.
 38, 1 *licet ludas*.
 91, 3 „ *essent*.
 X. 12, 12 *redeas tu licet* (= *etiamsi*).
 68, 11 *licet ediscas referasque*.
 XI. 16, 6 *sis gravior licet*.
 8 „ *Patavina* „
 52, 17 *relegas licet*.
 98, 17 *sedeas tu licet*.
 104, 22 *Lucretia sis licet*.
 (40) XII. 14, 6 *nec sint saxa licet*.
 29, 3 *Tu licet observes teneasque*.
 82, 2 *tu* „ *velis*.
 8 *sint* „ *sordidiora*.
 XIII. 2, 1 *Nasutus sit usque licet*.
 3, 5 *haec licet disticha mittas*.
 86 *iste licet pungat*.
 88 *sint lauta licet*.
 XIV. 7 *licet haec membrana vocetur*.
 8 *nondum legerit hos licet*.
 (50) 28 *sit licet et ventus*.
 70 *licet rodas*.
 55 *caedas licet usque*.
 130 *Ingrediare viam caelo licet*.
 208 *Currant verba licet*.

Martial uses *licebit* also 6 times:

- II. 81 *sit licebit*.
 IV. 55, 28 *rideas licebit*.
 VIII. 21, 11 *stent licebit*.
 VIII. 64, 5 *sit vultus tibi levior licebit*.
 X. 100, 5 *habeas pedem licebit*.
 XIII. 54 *Cerretana mihi fiat licebit*.

Quamvis (a) occurs 15 times, is used only with the subjunctive and always with primary tenses:

- VII. 7, 1 *quamvis teneat*.
 19, 5 „ *cesserit*.
 69, 8 „ *sit*.

VIII. Praef. 10 *quamvis* scripta sint.

IX. 38, 5 „ sint.

51, 4 „ sit.

XI. 23, 5 „ futuam.

43, 9 „ iaceret.

108, 1 „ possis.

XII. 29, 15 „ caleant.

77, 11 „ caverit.

XIII. 73 „ esset.

81 „ gerat.

XIV. 95 „ rubeam.

120 „ dicant.

Quamvis (b) with a participle (rare in Classical Latin, Kühner *Ausf. Gram.* II. p. 960, Anm. 3) occurs 5 times :

V. 15, 5 *quamvis* reverentia.

65, 1 „ obstante.

VI. 58, 5 „ lassa.

XI. 69, 11 „ rapta

104, 15 „ stertente.

Quamvis (c) with an adjective occurs 3 times :

I. 62, 2 *quamvis* tristior.V. 52, 7 *quamvis* ingentia.

X. 11, 8 „ plurima.

It will be noticed that Martial employs *quamvis* both with the comparative and with the superlative. *Cum* is used as a concessive particle 9 times and chiefly in the earlier books :

III. 27, 1 *venias cum saepe vocatus.*IV. 6, 3 *cum sis improbius.*13, 10 *cum fuerit, non videatur anus.*19, 1 *cum sit pupa.*2 „ „ *anus.*64, 23 „ „ *tam prope Mulvius.*73, 1 „ *extremas duceret horas.*

(this may also be taken as temporal)

VIII. 20 *cum facias versus ducenos.*XIV. 1, 4 „ *videat tam prope lacus.**Quantumvis* and *quamlibet* do not occur.

It is thus seen that the reigning concessive particle in Martial is *licet*, (54 times) and that next to this he prefers *quamvis* (15 times).

EMORY B. LEASE.

NOTE ON HOMER, *ILIAD* XIV. 139 ff.

Ἀτρείδῃ, νῦν δὴ πού Ἀχιλλῆος ὀλοὸν κῆρ
γῆθῆει ἐν στήθεσσι, φόνον καὶ φύζαν Ἀχαιῶν
δερκομένῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐ οἱ ἐνὶ φρένες οὐδ' ἥβαιαι.

So speaks Poseidon in the guise of an old man whose sympathies are on the side of Agamemnon. Hence there is no possible objection to the tone of ὀλοόν, but only to the abnormal foot, a tribrach, which it produces in the fifth place in the verse.

At first sight one might imagine that ὀλοόν had taken the place of an original λάσιον, as we find :—

B 851 Παφλαγόνων δ' ἡγέετο Πυλαιμένεος
λάσιον κῆρ

Π 554 ὥρσε Μενoitιάδew Πατροκλῆος λάσιον
κῆρ

and in reference to Achilles himself there is the well known passage :—

A 188 ἐν δὲ οἱ ἦτορ
στήθεσσιν λαίοισι δiάνδιχα μερμήριξεν

but apart from the doubt as to the suitability of λάσιον here, where the necessity for an

uncomplimentary term is fairly apparent, and it is certain, if only from Π 554, that λάσιον is not such, it is impossible to understand why λάσιον should ever have been displaced by ὀλοόν. I believe the true restoration is this :—

Ἀτρείδῃ, νῦν δὴ πού Ἀχιλλῆ' οὐλόμενον κῆρ
γῆθῆει ἐν στήθεσσι, φόνον καὶ φύζαν Ἀχαιῶν
δερκομένῳ.

Here Ἀχιλλῆ' represents Ἀχιλλῆι and the removal of this elided ι would be quite a sufficient motive to induce the later Greeks to substitute ὀλοόν for what they would consider, erroneously of course, the synonymous οὐλόμενον—inserting the commoner for the rarer form.

The expression as restored has its exact counterpart in :—

N 494 ὥς Αἰνεία θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γεγῆθει,

where there was no inducement to tamper with the dative Αἰνεία. It is a singular additional confirmation of Ἀχιλλῆι in our