

Coleman 2006

Coleman, Kathleen M.

2006

M. Valerii Martialis *Liber spectaculorum* / ed. with introd., transl. and commentary by Kathleen M.

Coleman

Oxford University Press

p.101

11 (9)

Praestit exhibitus tota tibi, Caesar, harena
quae non promisit proelia rhinoceros.
o quam terribiles exarsit pronus in iras!
quantus erat taurus, cui pila taurus erat!

TK *cum praecedenti coniunxit W: cum sequenti coniunxit Vindob. 3* Tit. De
rhinoceroris pugna prima T: ad Caesarem *Vindob. 3: om. Bonon.* 2 non TK:
noua *Shackleton Bailey (1978)* promisit *T Bonon. Vindob. 3: premisit W: promisti*
Scrivenerius 4 quantus erat taurus *T: quantus erat cornu K*

The rhinoceros displayed all around the arena, Caesar, has delivered combat
that it did not promise. Launching itself headlong it flared up into such a
terrible rage! What a great bull that was, for which a bull was but a toy!

Introduction: This is the first appearance of a rhinoceros in the extant
collection (cf. *Spect. 26*). It belied its initially placid appearance by putting
on a great show of ferocity, in which it succeeded in tossing a bull as though it
were a straw dummy. The rarity of this animal, and the image of one on a
widely disseminated series of quadrantes minted under Domitian, is a power-
ful argument for dating these poems (though probably not the entire collec-
tion) to the reign of Domitian. For the controversy, see General Introduction,
Section 6, with a reproduction of the obverse of the coin at Pl. 4a.

Of the five extant species of rhinoceros, three are native to tropical Asia,
and two to eastern and southern Africa. The Sumatran Rhinoceros (*Dicerorhinus sumatrensis*) lived out of reach of the Romans, and so did the Javan
Rhinoceros (*Rhinoceros sondaicus*, a species of the genus *Rhinoceros*). The
Indian Rhinoceros (*Rhinoceros unicornis*, the other species of the genus
Rhinoceros) is characterized by a single horn and thickly folded skin resem-
bling armour-plating. The African rhinoceros has two horns, the front gen-
erally longer than the rear, and the same thickly folded skin. It is represented
by two species, the White Rhinoceros and the Black Rhinoceros; these desig-
nations are something of a misnomer, because both species are grey. In any

erally longer than the rear, and the same thickly folded skin. It is represented
by two species, the White Rhinoceros and the Black Rhinoceros; these desig-
nations are something of a misnomer, because both species are grey. In any
case, their skin takes on the colour of the local soil, since they frequently
wallow in mud in order to cool off, trap and suffocate the ticks on their
bodies, and keep their skin in good condition.

The White Rhinoceros (*Ceratotherium simum*), also known as the Square-
lipped Rhinoceros (hence the designation ‘White’, a distortion of the Dutch
wijd, ‘wide’), is characterized by its long head held low, its square muzzle, and
a pronounced hump on the back of its neck which comprises the muscles

required to support the enormous head; it can stand up to 20 cm taller than the Black Rhinoceros and weigh up to twice as much. The Black or Hook-lipped Rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis*) has a shorter head, which it holds erect and more or less horizontal when in motion; it has a pointed muzzle and no hump. Though it may be rash to put too much credence in an image so tiny, the specimen on Domitian's coin is probably a White Rhinoceros, because of its heavy muzzle and long head; the absence of a hump does not tell against this identification, because when the animal is in motion with its head down, the hump is not visible. Whatever the species, the die-master made a mistake with the hindlegs, which have a pronounced 'elbow', like those of a bear, instead of being graviportal (pillar-like, to bear the load of the colossal body, as in an elephant). The tail, however, is acutely observed: whereas there is plenty of room to depict it hanging down, it is shown curling into the air in a spirited fashion, replicating exactly the tendency of the rhinoceros to swing its natural flywhisk, both while stationary and in motion.¹

The earliest depiction of a rhinoceros to have survived from the Graeco-Roman world is on a Hellenistic frieze from one of the rock tombs at Tel Mareshah (ancient Maris(s)a) south-west of Jerusalem: see Peters-Thiersch (1905: 23–6 pl. X). The rhinoceros (labelled *ρινόκερως*) has two horns, but it bears more resemblance to a pig than to a rhinoceros. Its two horns demonstrate that the artist was working from a description of an African species. The frieze depicts animals associated with Egypt, including an elephant (labelled *ελέφας*) that is standing in front of the rhinoceros. Likewise, the rhinoceros that was displayed in the grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus in 275/274 BC is described as *Αιθιοπικός* (Athen. 5. 201 c), and hence must have been one of the African species: see Rice (1983: 98).

The first rhinoceros seen at Rome was exhibited at Pompey's games in 55 BC: Plin. *NH* 8. 71 'isdem ludis [Pompei Magni] et rhinoceros unius in nare cornus, qualis saepe, uisus.' From its single horn it has been taken to belong to the Indian species, *R. indicus unicornis*: see Jennison (1937: 34). But in the rest of his details Pliny has been shown to be copying Agatharchides' description of the species to be found in the 'Troglodyte' country, i.e. Eritrea and northern

or the species to be found in the Troglodyte country, i.e. Eritrea and northern

¹ For photographs of a Black Rhinoceros cantering with its tail waving and the weight-bearing hindleg clearly 'graviportal', and a White Rhinoceros striding on stiff legs with lowered head (no visible hump) and its tail curled over its rump, see Nowak (1999: 1035–6). When alarmed, however, the rhinoceros holds its tail erect, indicating its readiness to flee. For a photograph of a Black Rhinoceros with erect tail advancing upon a rather implausible plastic rhino, behind which the naturalist Bernhard Grzimek is hiding (rhinoceroses have notoriously poor eyesight), see Grzimek (1990: 632). As with the mating-habits of the bull (*Spect.* 6, Introduction, above), my research on the rhinoceros owes much to the guidance of Farish A. Jenkins, Jr., and to the assistance of Sydney Fingold and Mary Sears in the library of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University.

Somalia, in which no mention is made of a second horn: see Agatharchides, *De mari Erythraeo* 72 Burstein = *Geographi Graeci Minores* 158–9 Mueller. Gowers (1950: 64) attributes Agatharchides' omission to the fact that the rear horn of the White Rhinoceros can be as negligible as a 'mere excrescence'; Pliny has drawn an inference from Agatharchides and turned it into a statement of fact.

It has been suggested that the animals for Pompey's games were supplied by Ptolemy Auletes, whom Pompey had helped back onto his throne in the same year (55 bc). Hence an African provenance for them is most likely: Gowers (1950: 67). Dio must have been unaware of Pompey's rhinoceros, since he ascribes the first appearance at Rome of both a rhinoceros and a hippopotamus to Octavian's triumph over Cleopatra in 29 bc, in which they were among a number of exotic animals slaughtered (51. 22. 5). Once again, as observed by Gowers (1950: 68), the occasion suggests an African provenance for the rhinoceros. Augustus displayed one in the Saepta, presumably after the enclosure had been completed in 26 bc (Suet. *Aug.* 43. 4); hence this creature cannot have been the same as the one killed in his triumph three years earlier (*pace* Steier, *RE* xvi/2. 1787 s.v. *Nashorn*). The last rhinoceros to be displayed in Augustus' reign won an encounter with an elephant in AD 8 (Dio 55. 33. 4). Thereafter there is no attested appearance until the Flavian era.

Four epigrams by Martial deal directly or indirectly with a rhinoceros: *Spect.* 11, 26, *Epigr.* 14. 52, 53. The first of the pair in the *Apophoreta* describes a flask of cattle-horn of such superior quality that it could be mistaken for rhinoceros-horn (14. 52 *Gutus corneus*): 'Gestauit modo fronte me iuuen-
cus: | uerum rhinocerota me putabas.' In accordance with the general principle of arrangement in the *Apophoreta*, its companion piece describes a more valuable version of the same item, i.e. a real rhinoceros horn (14. 53 *Rhinoceros*):² 'Nuper in Ausonia domini spectatus harena | hic erit ille tibi cui
pila taurus erat.' This epigram is an example of the type containing a riddle, to which the *lemma* supplies the answer. The last hemiepex is the same as the last hemiepex at *Spect.* 11. 4 'quantus erat taurus, cui pila taurus erat!' It has therefore been argued that the two epigrams should be contemporary, i.e.

pila taurus erat.' This epigram is an example of the type containing a riddle, to which the *lemma* supplies the answer. The last hemiepex is the same as the last hemiepex at *Spect.* 11. 4 'quantus erat taurus, cui pila taurus erat!' It has therefore been judged to have been included in a 'second edition' of the *Liber spectacularorum*: see Friedländer (1886: i. 137). But this phrase has almost

² Hence Leary inverts the order in his edition (1996), in order to match the alternation between expensive and inexpensive versions of the same item. This seems preferable to the solution proposed by Shackleton Bailey (1978: 295–6 and 1993: ad loc.), who keeps the order as transmitted. He suggests that the *lemma* to 14. 53 should be *idem*, rather than *Rhinoceros*, on the basis that both horns are really made of cattle-horn, and the recipient of the second item is merely tricked into thinking that it is made of rhinoceros horn.

the sound of a contemporary cliché about the rhinoceros, just like the formulaic address to Memphis to stop boasting about the pyramids, and it seems perfectly possible for Martial to use the same expression years apart: cf. *Spect.* 1. 1–2 ‘Barbara pyramidum sileat miracula Memphis, | Assyrius iactet nec Babylonica labor’, *Epigr.* 8. 36. 1–2 ‘Regia pyramidum, Caesar, miracula ride; | iam tacet Eoum barbara Memphis opus’, Weinreich (1928: 9). The far more compelling reason for assigning this poem to the reign of Domitian is the numismatic evidence discussed in the General Introduction, Section 6.

Rhinoceroses are occasionally depicted in Roman art, sometimes in association with the Nile. In the Nile mosaic from Palestrina a jaunty beast labelled *rhinoceros* is depicted perched on a rock in the middle of the river. The date and workmanship of this mosaic are hotly debated, theories ranging from a Hellenistic attribution in the second century BC to a date in the reign of Hadrian or later. But the beast is indisputably the African species, having two horns, and it testifies to a lively curiosity in Italy about the fauna of Egypt and Ethiopia: see Meyboom (1995: 241–2 = ch. 3 n. 65, identifying this example as a White Rhinoceros, because of the position of the head, carried low), Steinmeyer-Schareika (1978: pl. 58), Toynbee (1973: pl. 51). A rhinoceros with two horns—the front resembling a scimitar, the rear merely residual—appears in the middle register on the extreme right of the Orpheus mosaic in black and white from the former church of S. Elisabetta (now the Facoltà di Scienze) in Perugia, which is probably to be dated to the early second century: cf. Pl. 19, Blake (1936: 159), Gaggiotti *et al.* (1980: 87–8). Another rhinoceros, two-horned, with the pointed muzzle of the Black Rhinoceros, is depicted being captured in a marshy landscape on the mosaic of the Great Hunt from the fourth-century villa near Piazza Armerina in Sicily (Pl. 20); the moist environment suggests that the Romans knew the rhinoceros’ need to wallow regularly in mud.

On the same scale as the numismatic images discussed in the General Introduction, Section 6, rhinoceroses are occasionally engraved on gems and cameos. A carnelian in the Thorvaldsen Museum in Copenhagen shows an African rhinoceros carrying a wreath on its pair of horns and a cornucopia on its back: see Fossing (1929: no. 1321). In the Antikensammlung in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz there is a red jasper with a composite scene of a man in a tunic brandishing a whip at a rhinoceros that has already tossed something into the air and is now pointing its horn at a small animal on the ground (perhaps a dog), so that the context seems to be a performance in which a rhinoceros under the supervision of its *magister* is giving an impressive demonstration of its skill with its horn: see Furtwängler (1896: pl. 61, no. 8490).

Rhinoceros need to wallow regularly in mud.

On the same scale as the numismatic images discussed in the General Introduction, Section 6, rhinoceroses are occasionally engraved on gems and cameos. A carnelian in the Thorvaldsen Museum in Copenhagen shows an African rhinoceros carrying a wreath on its pair of horns and a cornucopia on its back: see Fossing (1929: no. 1321). In the Antikensammlung in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz there is a red jasper with a composite scene of a man in a tunic brandishing a whip at a rhinoceros that has already tossed something into the air and is now pointing its horn at a small animal on the ground (perhaps a dog), so that the context seems to be a performance in which a rhinoceros under the supervision of its *magister* is giving an impressive demonstration of its skill with its horn: see Furtwängler (1896: pl. 61, no. 8490).



PL. 19. Perugia, mosaic from a Roman bath, depicting Orpheus enchanting the animals, including a rhinoceros (middle row, right). Probably early second century AD. Beneath the former church of S. Elisabetta, now the Dipartimento di Chimica of the Facoltà di Scienze Matematiche, Fisiche e Naturali, Università degli studi di Perugia

One intriguing representation of a rhinoceros has been specifically associated with the events commemorated in the *Liber spectaculorum*. This is a portion of the frieze from the architrave of the Templum Divi Vespasiani in the Forum Romanum that is now on display in the Tabularium on the Capitoline (Pl. 21). It depicts a series of cultic instruments and vessels, including an *urceus* decorated in two registers: in the upper register a *bestiar-ius*

including an *urceus* decorated in two registers: in the upper register a *bestiar-ius* dressed in a short tunic is levelling a spear at a lion and a leopard; in the lower register a rhinoceros with two horns and lowered head is confronting a bull. It has been suggested that the lower register depicts the contest described here and in *Spect.* 26, and that the upper register depicts Carpophorus killing a lion and leopard, an exploit described in *Spect.* 17; although the details would not be visible from ground level, it was important for the decoration to constitute a record of aspects of Vespasian's reign, and by choosing these



Pl. 20. Piazza Armerina, corridor of Great Hunt, mosaic: detail of the capture of a bison on dry ground (left) and a rhinoceros in a marsh (right). Probably first third of fourth century AD

themes Titus would in a sense be crediting Vespasian with the inaugural ceremony that he failed to see in his lifetime (General Introduction, Section 7): see Rodríguez Almeida (1994: 197–203). This is an intriguing theory, although it is perhaps unlikely that the temple decoration would commemorate events that did not, in fact (however unfairly), occur under Vespasian; nor is it at all clear that Titus was responsible for the decoration of the temple, which was probably largely constructed under Domitian: see *LTUR* v. 124–5 s.v. *Vespasianus, Divus, Templum* (S. De Angeli). But whether or not this poem and its companion (*Spect. 26*) are indeed part of a Domitianic component in the collection (see General Introduction, Section 6), perhaps we should see the decoration not as a record of events being projected back into Vespasian's reign, but rather as free invention inspired by a remarkable animal

ponent in the collection (see General Introduction, Section 6), perhaps we should see the decoration not as a record of events being projected back into Vespasian's reign, but rather as free invention inspired by a remarkable animal recently seen in action in the Flavian amphitheatre.³

³ The first rhinoceros to reach Europe after the Roman period did not arrive until 1515, presented to Afonso Albuquerque, governor of the Portuguese Indies, by Muzaffar II, sultan of the kingdom of Gujarat, in whose park at Champaner in the foothills of Pavagadh (now a World Heritage site) it was being kept. Thence it was transported to Lisbon to be presented to King

Detailed discussion: Rodríguez Almeida (1994: 197–203)

1. **Praestitit:** there is a neat play here on the two senses of the verb *praesto*, ‘to provide’ and ‘to discharge (an obligation)’: the rhinoceros eventually delivered what had patently *not* been manifested in its initial behaviour. For the distinction between these two senses of *praestare* see Holford-Strevens (2003: 106 n. 45).

exhibitus: in its technical sense of putting on ritual events, *exhibere* is commonly used with phrases denoting spectacles as its object, e.g. *Spect.* 24. 1–2 ‘Quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse theatro | dicitur, exhibuit, Caesar, harena tibi’, Suet. *Claud.* 21. 4 ‘gladiatoria munera … exhibuit’, *CIL* x. 3759. 13 ‘diem … ludorum plenissime exhibuit.’ By an extension of this usage, the men or beasts provided for the spectacles can function as the object: cf. Suet. *Aug.* 43. 3 ‘adulescentulum Lycium honeste natum exhibuit’, *Nero* 12. 1 ‘exhibuit autem ad ferrum etiam quadringentos senatores’, *Dig.* 48. 19. 31 (Modestinus, on prisoners *damnati ad bestias*) ‘ut digne populo Romano exhiberi possint’, *TLL* v/2. 1430. 62–78 (Meyer).

tota…harena: cf. *Spect.* 22. 1–2 ‘per totam…stimulatus harenam | …taurus’, Juv. 8. 205–6 ‘nudum ad spectacula uoltum | erigit et tota fugit agnoscendus harena.’

agnoscendus harena.’

2. **non:** the negative appears to contradict the rhinoceros’ anticipated behaviour at its second appearance in the arena: cf. *Spect.* 26. 3 ‘desperabantur promissi proelia Martis’ (with n.). Hence for *non* Shackleton Bailey (1978: 273) conjectured *noua* (‘novel’), on the basis that the rhinoceros was rarely seen at Rome, although he reverts to the paradox in his Teubner and Loeb editions. In defence of *non*, Watt (1984: 130) quotes *Epigr.* 8. 49(50). 9 (on Domitian’s provision of a *cena recta* instead of the *sportula*) ‘grandia pollicitus quanto maiora dedisti!’, i.e. in its aggressive behaviour the rhinoceros both lived up to expectations and exceeded them. But Martial may simply mean that initially the rhinoceros seemed deceptively docile. It is consonant with

Manuel I. On Trinity Sunday, two weeks after its arrival, it was pitted against an elephant from the royal stables, a richly symbolic occasion that evoked the exotic displays of the Colosseum. Just as in Martial’s description, the placid demeanour of the rhinoceros gradually became more menacing as it lowered its head and, snorting vigorously, advanced with slow deliberation upon its opponent, which was so terrified that it charged through a wall in the royal courtyard in order to escape. Such was the excitement that the assembled spectators, even though cheated of the promise of bloodshed, nevertheless greeted the victory of the rhinoceros with immense enthusiasm. After this spectacular début, however, the poor beast was tragically drowned in a shipwreck near La Spezia early the following year on a voyage to Italy to be presented to Pope Leo X, whose affection for his tame elephant Hanno was famous throughout Europe. For fascinating detail about the sultan’s park and the circumstances of the donation see Dames (1918: 123–5), and for an evocative account of the rhinoceros’ short-lived career see Bedini (1997: 111–36).



PL. 21. (a) Section of frieze from the architrave of the Templum Divi Vespasiani, Rome. (b) Detail of *urceus* showing (upper register) a *bestiarius* (left) confronting a lion (right), and (lower register) a rhinoceros with head lowered (left) confronting a bull (right). Before AD 87

the manner of the White Rhinoceros that it should not appear menacing at first, but then suddenly manifest aggressive behaviour (l. 3, 'exarsit'): see Gowers (1950: 69). Rather than a contradiction, we may have confirmation here that the manuscripts have transmitted the epigrams in the order in which they were originally intended to be read, and that 26. 3 deliberately refers back to our epigram, in which the apparently docile nature of the rhinoceros is confounded.

The appearance and demeanour of a person or an animal 'promise' particular behaviour: cf. Ov. *Am.* 3. 2. 83 'risit et argutis quiddam promisit ocellis', *Met.* 3. 457 (Narcissus, to his reflection) 'spem mihi nescio quam uultu promittis amico', Juv. 2. 11–12 'hispida membra quidem et durae per bracchia saetae | promittunt atrocem animum', *TLL* x/2. 1872. 65–1873. 11 (Delhey). Contrast *Spect.* 23. 2 for the technical sense of *promittere* in the context of *munera*.

proelia: of twelve instances of this word in Martial, five describe animals fighting with each other: cf. (in addition to our passage) *Spect.* 26. 3 (also of the display of ferocity by the rhinoceros) 'desperabantur promissi proelia Martis', *Epigr.* 4. 74. 1–2 (mocking the pugnacity of normally mild deer) 'Aspicis inbelles temptent quam fortia dammae | proelia?', 5. 65. 8 (a litany of beast-fights in the arena) 'dat maiora nouis proelia mane dies', 6. 38. 8 (mocking the belligerence of a frisky calf) 'sic uitulus molli proelia fronte cupit.' It is used again in the *Liber spectaculorum* of the sea-battle in Augustus' *stagnum*: cf. 34. 7 'dumque parat saevis ratibus fera proelia Nereus'. In conjunction with *praestitit* (see on 1, above) it captures the intensity with which the rhinoceros launches its long-awaited attack upon its adversary.

3. **o quam:** exclamatory *quam* in both independent and dependent

which the rhinoceros launches its long-awaited attack upon its adversary.

3. **o quam:** exclamatory *quam* in both independent and dependent clauses is commonly combined with an adjective or an adverb: see H–Sz 589. When reinforced by *o* it is a strong expression of emotions such as pleasure, horror, or admiration (all of which seem to be combined here). The high style of reinforcing an exclamatory clause with *o* is mainly confined to poetry, but it is also found in emotional passages of prose: cf. Nep. *Phoc.* 4. 3 'o quam indigna perpetreris, Phocion!', *TLL* ix/2. 7. 62–83 (Wieland). On Martial's fondness for reinforcing exclamations with *o* see on *Spect.* 16. 4 'o quantum... ingenium'.

exarsit... in iras: the simple form of the verb, combined with *in* and the accusative, denotes intention or result: cf. Virg. *A.* 2. 347 'ardere in proelia', 12. 71 'ardet in arma', *Liv.* 40. 35. 7 (soldiers) 'in perniciosam... seditionem arsuri'. It can occur in a transferred sense to describe an outbreak of emotion: cf. Virg. *A.* 7. 445 'Allecto... arsit in iras', Ov. *Met.* 5. 41 'ardescit uulgas in iras' (note the inceptive form of the verb). The compound form here matches the charged atmosphere (cf. 1 'tota... harena').

Words for abstracts and masses frequently appear in the plural in both poetry and prose (e.g. *irae*, *niues*). This occurs even when there is no metrical constraint (such as is imposed here by the need to avoid hiatus in front of *exarsit*): see N–W i. 636–7, Maas (1900–2: 490), Norden (1903: 399–400), Landgraf (1905–6: 73–4). Sometimes the occurrence of such a plural in prose echoes a precedent in verse, but the rubric ‘poetic plural’ can disguise subtle effects in this usage: cf. Leumann (1959: 145 = 1980: 157–8), ‘emphatisch-expressiv’. Setting aside the issue of potential hiatus here, the plural may denote a sudden burst of rage: cf. Plaut. *MG* 582–3 (the slave Sceledrus is speaking) ‘nam iam aliquo aufugiam et me occultabo aliquot dies, | dum haec consilescent turbae atque irae leniunt’, Landgraf (1905–6: 74), Löfstedt (1942: 50).

For *irae* of animals cf. (of lions) *Lucr.* 3. 298 ‘nec capere irarum fluctus in pectore possunt’, (of a snake) *Virg. A.* 2. 381 ‘attollentem iras’ and *Ov. Met.* 2. 175 ‘sumpsit . . . nouas feruoribus iras’.

pronus: the rhinoceros has lowered its head to charge. *pronus* describes the posture of people or animals straining forwards, usually in combat (as here) or in flight: cf. *Ov. Met.* 9. 44–5 (Achelous wrestling with Hercules) ‘totoque ego pectore pronus | et digitos digitis et frontem fronte premebam’, *Rem.* 201 ‘nunc leporem pronum catulo sectare sagaci’, *TLL* x/2. 1932. 74–1933. 20 (Schröder). In any case, the White Rhinoceros carries its head low: cf. Gowers (1950: 62), ‘when travelling or standing at ease the muzzle nearly touches the ground.’ Granted, the die-master was constrained by the circular shape of the coin; but the rhinoceros on Domitian’s quadrans (Pl. 4a) is portrayed in more or less the position that the animal adopts when ready to charge, and for which it must have been famous among spectators in the amphitheatre.

4. **taurus . . . taurus:** Martial puns on the designation of the rhinoceros as *bos Aegyptius*: cf. *Fest.* p. 332 Lindsay ‘rhinocerotem quidam esse aiunt bouem Aegyptium’, *Paus.* 9. 21. 2 *ταύρους τοὺς . . . Αἴθιοπικούς*. When encountering exotic fauna for the first time, the Greeks and Romans naturally used familiar

4. **taurus . . . taurus:** Martial puns on the designation of the rhinoceros as *bos Aegyptius*: cf. *Fest.* p. 332 Lindsay ‘rhinocerotem quidam esse aiunt bouem Aegyptium’, *Paus.* 9. 21. 2 *ταύρους τοὺς . . . Αἴθιοπικούς*. When encountering exotic fauna for the first time, the Greeks and Romans naturally used familiar domestic animals as their frame of reference; frequently the domestic nomenclature is combined with an epithet designating the area with which the animal was popularly associated: cf. Latin *Luca bos* for the elephant, first seen by the Romans in the army of Pyrrhus in Lucania. The etymology of ‘hippopotamus’ illustrates the survival in English of the first of these tendencies, and in German of both (*Nilpferd*).⁴ The first rhinoceros mentioned in classical literature is disguised as a donkey: cf. *Ctesias* fr. 14 p. 363 Baehr,

⁴ Afrikaans, deviating from the Dutch *nijlpaard* but illustrating the same etymological tendency, evokes a different domestic animal and a different aquatic context with *seekoei* (lit. ‘sea-cow’).

quoted by Ael. NA 4. 52 ὅνοις . . . τοὺς Ἰνδοῖς . . . τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ κέρας. This ultimately accounts for the confusion of the elder Pliny, who treats the rhinoceros as three different animals, one of which he call *asinus Indicus* (NH 11. 128): see *RE* xvi/2. 1783 s.v. Nashorn (Steier).

Black Rhinoceros, the more aggressive of the African species, have been known to attack lion, buffalo, and even elephant, especially when defending their young or competing for access to water. The White Rhinoceros, which is even bigger, would be capable of the same feats if sufficiently provoked. The rhinoceros' mode of attack is to spike its victim upon its front horn and toss it backwards into the air. Hence the aptness of Martial's analogy: the rhinoceros treats the bull as a bull would treat a dummy thrown into the arena to provoke it. Della Corte (ad loc.) diminishes the rhinoceros' feat by supposing that the *taurus* that it tossed was not a real animal but a dummy the size and shape of a bull.

pila is the term applied to a stuffed ball and, by transference, to other stuffed items designed to be thrown into the air. In the context of the arena *pila* is associated with the provocation of a bull: cf. *Spect.* 22. 2 'sustulerat raptas taurus in astra pilas', 26. 6 'iactat ut impositas taurus in astra pilas', *Epigr.* 2. 43. 5–6 (describing the speaker's own shabby toga in comparison with Candidus' *haute couture* item) 'quae passa est furias et cornua tauri, | noluerit dici quam pila prima suam', *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 2. 150. 40 'pilae ταυράριοι, ταυροκαθάπται'. From Martial's description of a torn toga it appears that the *pila* was hung with strips of material (2. 43. 5–6, cit. in the previous sentence). The fluttering of these strips presumably had a maddening effect, like the *mappa* in Seneca's *exempla* of responses to provocation (our 'red rag to a bull'): cf. *Ira* 3 (= *Dial.* 5). 30. 1 'taurum color rubicundus excitat, ad umbram aspis exsurgit, ursos leonesque mappa proritat.' Cicero alludes to 'straw men' which, when thrown, provoked danger (*Pro C. Cornel. ad Ascon.* p. 55 Kiessling–Schoell): 'uidet homines faeneos in medium ad temptandum periculum projectos.' Asconius' comment on this passage (ad loc.) explicitly associates this technique with a spectacle involving bulls: 'simulacra effigie hominum ex faeno fieri solebant, quibus obiectis ad specta-

alludes to 'straw men' which, when thrown, provoked danger (*Pro C. Cornel. ad Ascon.* p. 55 Kiessling–Schoell): 'uidet homines faeneos in medium ad temptandum periculum projectos.' Asconius' comment on this passage (ad loc.) explicitly associates this technique with a spectacle involving bulls: 'simulacra effigie hominum ex faeno fieri solebant, quibus obiectis ad spectaculum praebendum tauri irritarentur.' Hence we should probably envisage *pilae* as stuffed objects, usually in human shapes (presumably life-size) and hung with rags: see *TLL* x/1. 2132. 40–6 (Ebbeler), *D–S* iv/1. 475–8 s.v. *Pila* (G. Lafaye), *SG* ii. 87, *OLD* s.v. *pila* 1b.