

MASSIS AMERINA NON PERVSTIS (STAT. SILV. 1.6.18): ANOTHER ITALIAN PASTRY?

ABSTRACT

This article proposes that untethering amerina at Stat. Silv. 1.6.18 from Pliny's mention of varieties of apples and pears called Amerina allows us to read the line as instead referring to a type of pastry originating in Umbrian Ameria, which is within ancient naming practices for pastries and fits better into the context of the catalogue in which the line occurs. In this case, the second half of the catalogue is closely akin to the crustulum et mulsum donative of wealthy Italian patrons in the early empire.

Keywords: Saturnalia; *Silvae*; pastry; Statius; Domitian; *massa*; imported goods; gastronomy

Amidst the opening festivities of Domitian's Saturnalian games on the Kalendae Decembres, a bountiful hail showers down on the crowd packing the seats of the Flavian Colosseum (Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.9–20):¹

vix Aurora novos movebat ortus,
iam bellaria linea pluebant:
hunc rorem veniens profudit Eurus.
quicquid nobile Ponticis nucetis,
fecundis cadit aut iugis Idymes;
quod ramis pia germinat Damascos,
et quod percoquit †aebosia† Caunos,
largis gratuitum cadit rapinis;
molles gaïoli lucuntulique
et massis Amerina non perustis
et mustaceus et latente palma
praegnantes caryotides cadebant.

9 movebat ζ vovebat *M* | 10 bellaria ζ vellaria *M* | 11 profudit *vulg.* profudi *M* | eurus *M* eous *M*¹
in marg. | 15 et quo percoquit aebosia caunos *M* quod ζ aestuosa *Imhof* | 16 cadit ζ cadet *M* | 17
luguntulique *M* | 18 perustis ζ perustus *MA* | 19 mustaceus ζ muscaceus *M* | 20 pregnantes ζ
pregnates *M* | cariotides ζ cariatides *MM*¹

¹ I print here a text and apparatus criticus derived from that of Marastoni's 1961 Teubner edition. I have condensed his reporting of individual manuscripts other than our earliest manuscript, M (Matritensis 3678), to the siglum ζ, following common practice (see B. Gibson, *Statius*, *Silvae* 5 [Oxford and New York, 2006], lii). Works repeatedly cited throughout are as follows: J. André, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* (Paris, 1961); G.E. Kreuz, *Besonderer Ort, poetischer Blick: Untersuchungen zu Räumen und Bildern in Statius' Silvae* (Göttingen, 2016); G. Lafaye, *Quelques notes sur les Silvae de Stace: premier livre* (Paris, 1896); G. Liberman, *Stace: Silves. Édition et commentaire critiques* (Paris, 2010); M. Malamud, 'That's entertainment! Dining with Domitian in Statius' *Silvae*', *Ramus* 30 (2001), 23–45; C.E. Newlands, *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire* (Cambridge, 2002); F. Thomas, 'Autour d'un passage de Plaute: *Mén.* 141 sqq.', in *Hommages à Léon Herrmann* (Brussels and Berchem, 1960), 705–14; F. Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum libri* (Leipzig, 1898).

Dawn was scarcely starting on her new rising as treats were already raining from the net:² this dew, a rising East Wind poured forth. Whatever falls noble from the fertile Pontic nut groves or hills of Palestine, what pious Damascus grows in her branches and what †Ibizan†³ *Caunus ripens*, falls freely given for bountiful plunder. Soft ‘gaioli’ and ‘lucuntuli’, and ‘Amerians’ of unscorched substance, and must-cake, and bulging nut-dates, their palm out of sight, kept falling.⁴

While the purpose of this article is to question a tacit assumption of all interpretations of line 18, to do so we must consider the catalogue’s brief entirety.⁵ The early contents of the edible bounty are easily identifiable, even if the text is still subject to dispute: hazelnuts,⁶ dates, prunes and dried figs. (Not, I would observe, unqualified ‘plums’ and ‘figs’, as English notes often misleadingly indicate;⁷ in December, there are fresh versions of neither to be had.⁸) With the possible exception of the figs,⁹ these all come from the East (cf. also *Eurus*, 1.6.11); some scholars have argued for imperializing overtones to be read therein.¹⁰

It is the second half of the short catalogue, consisting mostly of edibles from closer to home, that presents us with a series of problems. Where the nuts and fruits of the first half, periphrastically presented as riddles by the poet, were written to be solved, the very familiarity of the sweets offered up in more straightforward terms to Statius’ audience—*gaioli*, *lucuntuli*, *amerina*, *mustaceus*, *caryotides*—threatens to leave them as enigmas for us. Some, fortunately, have solutions. Most easily laid to rest is the *mustaceus*, as Cato has conveniently left us a recipe for this cake made of wheat flour and grape must mixed with cheese, anise and cumin, and baked with a laurel leaf pressed into the underside.¹¹ The *caryotides*, conversely, raise debate despite a certain familiarity: assuming (as all do) that *caryotides* and *caryotae* are the same, we know that they were the fruit borne by a type of palm tree,¹² possibly distinct from

² On the appearance and operation of the *linea dives*, see J.F. Killeen, ‘What was the *linea dives* (Martial, VIII, 78, 7)?’, *AJPh* 80 (1959), 185–8.

³ Translating the frequently proposed *Ebosea*. I do not assume that it is necessarily correct.

⁴ Several of the translations in this last sentence involve debated interpretations that I discuss below.

⁵ See Malamud (n. 1), 23–7 and S.T. Newmyer, *The Silvae of Statius: Structure and Theme* (Leiden, 1979), 111, briefly, on its structure.

⁶ For *nuces Ponticae* as one name for hazelnuts, see Plin. *HN* 15.88. Is it possible, however, that *nobile* hints at the Greek βασιλικόν, thus playfully suggesting walnuts (κάρυα βασιλικά) that simply have a Pontic origin? Pliny, again: *optimum quippe genus earum Persicum atque basilicon vocant, et haec fuere prima nomina* (‘In fact, they call the best kind of these nuts [i.e. walnuts] “Persian” and “royal”, and these were their original names’, *HN* 15.87).

⁷ e.g. D.R. Shackleton Bailey and C.A. Parrott, *Statius: Silvae* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2015²), 69 nn. 3–4; Newlands (n. 1), 241; A. Wasserstein, ‘An edition of Book I. of the *Silvae* by Publius Papinius Statius with notes, critical and explanatory’ (Diss., University of London, 1951), 222.

⁸ On ancient preservation methods, see André (n. 1), 87–93; for dried damson plums at the Saturnalia, see e.g. Mart. 5.18.3, 13.29; see also K.M. Coleman, *Statius: Silvae IV* (Oxford, 1988), 231–2.

⁹ Lafaye (n. 1), 65 argues for reading *cannos* in place of *Caunos* and accepting the emendation *Ebosia*; in this case, they would come from Spain.

¹⁰ Malamud (n. 1), 25 and Newlands (n. 1), 241.

¹¹ Cato, *Agr.* 121; for the laurel leaf, evidently a defining feature of the *mustaceus*, see also Cic. *Att.* 5.20.4 and Plin. *HN* 15.127.

¹² Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.27 *non scitis palmulas careotas Syrias parere in Iudaea, in Italia non posse?* (‘Are you unaware that Syrian palms bear *careotae* [or: that palms bear Syrian *careotae*] in Judaea, but cannot in Italy?’); Plin. *HN* 6.205 *palmetis caryotas ferentibus* (‘*caryotae*-bearing palm tree groves’), 13.44–5.

dates,¹³ that may have been common theatre snacks.¹⁴ But does *praegnantes* indicate that they were stuffed,¹⁵ especially plump,¹⁶ hidden in an outer shell,¹⁷ or something else? Furthermore, is there in fact no difference between *caryotides* and *caryotae*? Apart from Statius and Martial, the only other author to use the term is Dioscorides, who differentiates them from both unripe and ripe regular dates,¹⁸ but without further discussion. What was clear and familiar to Statius' contemporaries is opaque to us.

With *gaioli* and *lucuntuli*, we enter semi-transparent waters. *gaioli* are mentioned nowhere else, but, as the word appears to be a diminutive of Gaius, the universal assumption of modern commentators is that these are, essentially, the Roman equivalent of gingerbread men (minus the ginger)¹⁹ or possibly bird-shaped pastries instead (*gaius* meaning a jay).²⁰ We assume that we understand the name; we contextually extrapolate the foodstuff.²¹ Several authors, conversely, mention *lucuntuli*, or *lucunculi*, or the non-diminutive *lucuns*:²² they are unquestionably a type of pastry, and we even know

¹³ Lafaye (n. 1), 66–7, relying in part on a description of the modern *Caryota* genus of palms, asserts that *caryotides* were a fruit that grew on neither the date palm nor the coconut palm but on a distinct species. He proposes, based primarily on a recipe in Scribonius Largus (74) that calls for the pulp of fresh *caryotae* with the outer skin and inner veins removed, that *palma* refers to the inner pulp and *caryotis* to the outer hull. Vollmer (n. 1), 306 ad loc. disagrees. Pliny tells us that, of the various fruits produced by palm trees, *caryotae* are the fifth most famous, thanks to their exceptional honey-like juice (HN 13.44). He also mentions several slightly inferior fruits that are in the same category (*genus*) as *caryotae* but have different names (the dryer but very large *nicolaus*, the less attractive but sweet *adelphis* and the exceptionally juicy *pateta*, HN 13.45). F. Pesando, 'Tutti frutti su qualche periodo di raccolta e su qualche frutto esotico nell'antichità', *ArchClass* 67 (2016), 629–44, at 639–40 has recently argued that these fruits are included as subtypes of *caryota* owing to a Hellenistic extension of the species name's original meaning; Athenaeus (14.652a–b) and Plutarch (*Quaest. conv.* 723A–D), however, simply refer to the *nicolaus* as a type of date.

¹⁴ They are *notas* ... *theatris* (Mart. 11.31.10, with N.M. Kay, *Martial Book XI: A Commentary* [London, 1985], 139 ad loc.; André [n. 1], 84); this is the only other Latin use of *caryotis*, as opposed to *caryota*. Wrapped in gold leaf, *caryotae* seem also to have been a cheap gift given at the Kalends of January (Mart. 8.33.11–12, with T.J. Leary, *Martial: Book XIII. The Xenia* [London, 2001], 77–8 on Mart. 13.27; André [n. 1], 84).

¹⁵ Malamud (n. 1), 26; C. Briand-Ponsart, 'Les «lancers de cadeaux» (*missilia*) en Afrique du Nord romaine', *AntAfr* 43 (2007), 79–97, at 81.

¹⁶ Vollmer (n. 1), 306.

¹⁷ Lafaye (n. 1), 67.

¹⁸ At Diosc. 1.109.2, *καρυώτιδες* come at the end of his discussion of uses for the fruit of date palms; at Diosc. *Eup.* 2.51.6, they are given as an alternative ingredient to *φοινικοβάλανοι* ('dates'). However, at Diosc. *Eup.* 2.31.7, he also refers to *καρυωτοί*, the Greek equivalent of *caryotae*.

¹⁹ This theory of human-shaped pastry goes back at least as far as Calderini's annotations from 1476.

²⁰ *TLL* 6.2.1669.16, 6.2.1669.32–45. For discussion of our limited knowledge of Roman shaped or moulded pastries, with bibliography, see I. Simon, 'Un aspect des largesses impériales: les *sparsiones* de *missilia* à Rome (I^{er} siècle avant J.-C. - III^e siècle après J.-C.)', *RH* 310 (2008), 736–88, at 768 n. 30.

²¹ A. Souter, 'Vollmer's Statius' *Silvae*', *CR* 12 (1898), 314–15 proposed reviving an old reading *caseoli* instead, but this disrupts the pattern of precise types given in the second half of the catalogue. Some early commentators, such as Poliziano (who read here *gaioli lagunculique*), proposed that this line referred to coins.

²² Afran. *com.* 162 (although the spelling here is uncertain; see Thomas [n. 1], 708); Varro, *Sat. Men.* 417, and again at *Sat. Men.* 508, possibly parodying Lucilius (see F. Bücheler, 'Bemerkungen über die varronischen Satiren', *RhM* 14 [1859], 419–52, at 426); Apul. *Met.* 10.13; Paul. Fest. 106.27 Lindsay; Thomas (n. 1), 706–7 collects several additional probable references. See further below, with nn. 25–6.

from a stray reference preserved in Athenaeus that the recipe included cheese.²³ Their name, however, is more complicated, and its pairing with *gaioli* adds a further wrinkle. The word seems to be of Etruscan origin, given its *-uns* termination;²⁴ Gag  floats the tentative hypothesis that it could be connected with the noble or religious title *lucumo*.²⁵ What the Romans themselves thought is, perhaps, a different question: Titinius (fr. 166), for instance, seems to expand the word into *luculentaster*, suggesting ‘fancy cake’, from *luculentus*, although this apparent etymology may equally well be a figment of manuscript transmission.²⁶ Malamud, however, points out the similarity of *gaioli lucuntulique* to the generalizing ‘Gaius and Lucius’,²⁷ and despite the fanciful etymology of this resemblance, the apparent kinship between an Etruscan-originating *lucuntulus* and Lucius can be granted a firmer place in antiquity as well: the short fragment that we have of a late antique *Liber de praeonomibus*, which seems to draw its information from Republican sources such as Varro and Verrius Flaccus, preserves an imagined connection between the title *Lucumo* and the name Lucius.²⁸ Furthermore, the pairing of these two pastries in a single line links them in a way that occurs with no other foodstuff in the catalogue; they are meant to be read as a group. At the very least, whether or not we accept Malamud’s idea that ‘the food ... bears a punning resemblance to those who consume it’,²⁹ we can be fairly secure in believing that the second half of the catalogue opens with two pastries whose names and origins are drawn from close to home, Latium and Etruria.³⁰

The long-standing interpretation of our remaining line, *et massis amerina non perustis* (18), is that it refers to apples or pears from the Umbrian town of Ameria (modern Amelia), since Pliny preserves for us mention of a late-ripening variety of apples called *Amerina* (*HN* 15.58) and a late-ripening variety of pears called *Amerina* (*HN* 15.55). While there are several different subsidiary interpretations deriving from

²³ Ath. *Deipn.* 14.657d, who gives the ‘pastry scholar’ (πεμματολόγος) Chrysippus of Tyana as his source. For a further discussion of the probable recipe and its defining features, see Thomas (n. 1), 707–8.

²⁴ T. Georgescu, ‘Le latin à la cuisine: *lagana*, qui vulgo dicitur *lasagna*... Quelques noms de pâtisseries en latin vulgaire’, in P. Molinelli, P. Cuzzolin and C. Fedriani (edd.), *Latin vulgaire - Latin tardif X. Tome II: Sémantique - Lexique - Textes et contextes* (Bergamo, 2014), 557–66, at 559; Thomas (n. 1), 706.

²⁵ J. Gag , ‘Arruns de Clusium et l’appel aux Gaulois (?): à propos d’une tradition haruspicinale sur la vigne et l’olivier’, *RHR* 143 (1953), 170–208, at 206 n. 1. W.M. Lindsay, ‘Lucuns. Lucuntulus’, *ALL* 11 (1900), 332, however, thinks that the word is of Greek origin and argues for a derivation from ‘λυκόςεις (in the sense of λυκοειδής)’; this is by contrast with the favoured derivation at the time of his article, from γλυκοϋς. The quantity of the first syllable is in dispute: it sometimes is definitively short in Latin and sometimes is ambiguous, leading to Lindsay’s proposed etymology, but the Greek spelling (which Lindsay does not adduce) is λούκουντλοι. (It is unknowable whether there is any relevance to the word λούκα, preserved by Hesychius [A1269], meaning a porridge made of barley and attributed to the Kaukonēs.) On the syllable length, see also Thomas (n. 1), 708.

²⁶ On the hypothetical connection, see W. Heraeus, ‘Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen’, in W. Heraeus, *Kleine Schriften von Wilhelm Heraeus* (Heidelberg, 1937), 52–150, at 150 n. 1; Lindsay (n. 25), however, argues that the transmitted form *luculentaster* is a mistake for *lucuentaster*, in which case no such derivation is implied. But see Thomas (n. 1), 705–9 on the preference for keeping *lucul-* in this and similar passages.

²⁷ Malamud (n. 1), 25.

²⁸ *De praen.* 5 (*Lucii coeperunt adpellari ... ut quidam arbitrantur, a Lucumonibus Etruscis*, ‘Luciuses began to be called, as some think, from the Etruscan Lucumos’); see also G.D. Farney, ‘The name-changes of legendary Romans and the Etruscan-Latin bilingual inscriptions: strategies for Romanization’, *EtrStud* 13 (2010), 149–57.

²⁹ Malamud (n. 1), 25.

³⁰ Gaius is ‘quintessentially Roman’ (Farney [n. 28], 151).

this point, it is the underlying assumption that *amerina* refers to apples or pears—or, indeed, to fruits at all—that I wish to call into question.³¹ Our ‘decoded’ catalogue so far looks like this:

- 12 hazelnuts (or walnuts?)³² from the Black Sea
- 13 dates from Palestine
- 14 dried damsons from Damascus
- 15 dried figs from Caunus (in southwest Anatolia)
- 16 intermezzo: ‘a compliment to Domitian’s generosity’³³
- 17 Roman ‘little Gaius’ pastries and Etruscan cheese-pastries
- 18 *massis amerina non pervstis*
- 19 must-cakes
- 20 stuffed(?) nut-dates

For line 18 to refer to fresh fruits, as is the interpretation of a number of commentators, whether ripe or (odder still) unripe,³⁴ makes little sense within the flow of this catalogue. A few have, however, rejected this interpretation, pointing out that *massis* can hardly be reasonably understood, in its regular usage, to apply to the flesh of fresh fruit:³⁵ as Lafaye says, and Liberman re-emphasizes, ‘*massa* ne peut pas désigner autre chose qu’une agglomération de fruits empilés et serrés en masse compacte’.³⁶ If we must indeed take *amerina* to mean apples or pears, then we should certainly follow those interpretations which understand this line as referring in some fashion to dried fruit.

However, the key fact that seems to have eluded all commentators is that the term *amerina* should be just as immediately familiar to Statius’ audience as *gaioli*, *lucuntuli*, *mustaceus* and *caryotides*.³⁷ Unless dried Amerian fruit-clusters (*vel sim.*) were so common a Saturnalian *bellarium* that the unspecified epithet could evoke the same sense of instantaneous recognition as the other items in the catalogue’s second half,³⁸ then they have no place in this catalogue. While it is impossible to know whether this is the case, I would propose that the structure of the catalogue is itself a piece of evidence in suggesting that dried Amerian fruit-clusters do not, in fact, belong in line 18.

As lines 17 and 19 both feature pastries, if we did not have Pliny’s mention of *pira Amerina* and *mala Amerina*, the most obvious way for us (and I stress *us*, modern readers, without our ability to recognize instantly to what *amerina* refers) to interpret

³¹ With the exception of those who emend *massis* to *passis* and understand the line as referring to dried grapes rather than to apples or pears (a proposal of Heinsius, for which see Liberman [n. 1], 147), no one appears to have broken away from the Plinian route. However, Kreuz (n. 1), 186 n. 517 comes close to my argument while retaining a traditional interpretation of *amerina*; see below.

³² See n. 6 above.

³³ Newmyer (n. 5), 111.

³⁴ See nn. 58–9 below.

³⁵ As Liberman (n. 1), 147 observes, the *TLL*’s definition for this citation, *pulpa pomorum*, is in line with neither the heading *materia coacta rerum esculentarum* nor any of the word’s other usages.

³⁶ Lafaye (n. 1), 66; Liberman (n. 1), 147; see also Wasserstein (n. 7), 224.

³⁷ The approach of Kreuz (n. 1), 185–7 to *amerina* is particularly egregious: as he wants the entire catalogue to be a series of goods *ex oriente*—which is manifestly inaccurate given the clearly rustic Italian origins of the *mustaceus* if nothing else—he thus proposes that the local meaning of *amerina* must fade behind a transferred meaning of ‘late-ripening’.

³⁸ I am not disputing fruit itself as a common Saturnalia gift, nor its common function as a *secunda mensa*, but rather dried Amerian apples or pears in particular.

line 18 would be as referring to a type of pastry as well.³⁹ The result would be an unbroken string of local manufactured delicacies filling the second half of the catalogue, at least through line 19 (but possibly including line 20, depending on the implication of *praegnantes*), just as lines 13–15 proffer an unbroken string of imported dried fruits. Rome's imperial spread imports a bounty of edible wealth,⁴⁰ but traditional Italian rustic (or gourmet) ingenuity creates an edible and familiar bounty,⁴¹ closely akin to the popular Italian donative of wealthy patrons, *crustulum et mulsum*.⁴² Is it possible that this is, in fact, the way in which an ancient reader would have understood the line, and thus the catalogue? My goal here is to show that this is possible, and even plausible, although it must remain a speculative exercise; and it is, moreover, a logical way to make sense of all three confusing elements of line 18: the regional epithet *amerina*, the substance referred to by *massis*, and the degree of doneness indicated by *non perustis*. I shall address each of these in turn.

First, *amerina*. While our state of knowledge of ancient pastry is exceptionally paltry, we do have a reasonable collection of pastry *names* preserved.⁴³ It is therefore clear that calling a pastry after its place of origin has substantial precedent in antiquity: we can, for instance, compare the 'Canopics' (Κανωπικά) and 'Cappadocian' (Καππαδοκικόν) in Athenaeus' list of cakes drawn from Chrysippus of Tyana (Ath. *Deipn.* 14.647c),⁴⁴ conversely, the same list's 'Sabine pastry' (Σαβελλικόν κλοῦστρον) includes the word for pastry, showing that the other terms were not simply abbreviations.⁴⁵

³⁹ Kreuz (n. 1), 186–7 n. 517 draws the same conclusion about the progression of the catalogue, as well as also taking *massa* to mean 'dough' (see below), but he assumes that *amerina* must still refer to apples or pears and thus conjectures something along the lines of an apple dumpling, or 'eine derart primitive Form der Obstbäckerei'.

⁴⁰ Cf. Malamud (n. 1), 25: 'The audience, as they snatch their plunder, re-enact in the symbolic arena of the amphitheatre Rome's acquisition of the world's wealth.'

⁴¹ *Contra* J.F. Donahue, *The Roman Community at Table during the Principate* (Ann Arbor, 2017²), 19, who assumes that 'the small fancy cakes (*gaioli*)' and the treats that follow in the catalogue 'further underscore the theme of luxury', with emphasis throughout on 'the Eastern origins of these foods'.

⁴² For the *crustulum et mulsum*, which has Republican origins but was most popular in the first century C.E., see S. Mrozek, 'Crustulum et mulsum dans les villes italiennes', *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 294–300 and Donahue (n. 41), 11, 97–8, 102–3, 123; Donahue also gathers all the inscriptions that mention the *crustulum* donative.

⁴³ J. Solomon, 'Tracta: a versatile Roman pastry', *Hermes* 106 (1978), 539–56, at 539. Many of the names come from lists at Ath. *Deipn.* 3.109a–116a, 14.641e–649b and Poll. *Onom.* 6.11.72–82; André (n. 1), 213–18 collects a fairly comprehensive list of names and ingredients from other sources as well. Georgescu (n. 24), 558–9 sees three types of names for Roman pastries specifically: those deriving directly from Indo-European, those with dialectical/Italian origin and those borrowed from other languages, generally Greek (these are divided into early and late borrowings). Pliny discusses the derivation of various names given to bread at *HN* 18.105; these include gustatory context, quality, production method, ingredients and national origin.

⁴⁴ Perhaps also the 'Terentine' (Τερεντινον), although André (n. 1), 216 assumes that this is named after an inventor Terentius rather than after a location. *Canopica* are also mentioned at *Anth. Lat.* 190.48 Shackleton Bailey and in at least two papyri (*P.Oxy.* 1774, *SB* 8.9746; perhaps also *P.Oxy.* 738, if Κανωπικόν does not modify ἥπαρ). At Ath. *Deipn.* 4.130d, cakes are divided into Κρητικῶν καὶ ... Σαμιακῶν καὶ Ἀττικῶν ('Cretan and Samian-style and Attic'), each with their own type of container.

⁴⁵ A pun is created in the other direction at *Anth. Lat.* 190.32 Shackleton Bailey, where the pastry chef claims to be *urbe Placentinus*, as though the city of Placentia were named after *placenta*, 'cake'; D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 'Three pieces from the *Latin Anthology*', *HSPH* 84 (1980), 177–217, at 213 n. 13 notes the parallel jest at Plaut. *Capt.* 162.

Samiae, too, appear to be cakes of Samian origin.⁴⁶ The same, of course, is equally true of other regional manufactured foodstuffs in antiquity; Lucanian sausages, for instance, are simply *Lucanica*.⁴⁷

What of *massis*? *massa* is a loanword from the Greek μάζα, which does refer primarily to dough, or even bread, itself deriving from the verb μύσσω, ‘to knead’.⁴⁸ In Latin, however, the specific meaning of flour-and-water dough is limited to ecclesiastical, or at least late, Latin.⁴⁹ In the early days of its Latinate usage,⁵⁰ it has the general meaning of a coagulated and often still-malleable lump of material, and when applied specifically to edible material, it clearly means a homogeneous paste—our surviving references apart from this line are limited to cheese⁵¹ or spiced fig paste.⁵² Thus, if the *amerina* are in fact fruit, they should be fruit that is processed substantially more than commentators have allowed, even those who argue for *massis* referring to dried and compressed fruit: Columella’s fig *massa* (*Rust.* 12.15.3–5) consists of figs that have been dried, ground up and mixed with spices.⁵³ But there are two points to consider, beyond the plausible fact that many usages may simply not be attested.⁵⁴ First, pastries need not be

⁴⁶ André (n. 1), 215; the usage is at Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 3.5. A. King, ‘A graffito from La Graufesenque and “*samia vasa*”’, *Britannia* 11 (1980), 139–43, at 140–1 n. 4 argues for *samias* in Tertullian’s text as referring to Samian ware pottery instead, but the context (*et terram audimus lacte et melle manantem, non tamen ut de glebis credas te unquam placentas et samias coacturum*) strongly implies that *samiae*, like *placentae*, are something made with milk and honey. Similarly, Poll. *Onom.* 6.78 refers to οἱ Σάμιοι πλακοῦντες as famous; that this is their name is suggested both by the context of Pollux’s list and by their pairing with οἱ Φιλοξένιοι [*sc.* πλακοῦντες] (cf. Ath. *Deipn.* 1.5e).

⁴⁷ A. Dalby, ‘Goût d’empire’, *Kentron* 35 (2019), 155–66 argues for a ‘geography of the senses’ evoked in literature through the place name epithets applied to regional foodstuffs from across the empire; while he largely focusses on agricultural products, he does give some attention to manufactured regional specialities (for Lucanian sausages, see 159–60).

⁴⁸ R.S.P. Beekes, ‘Μάζα’, in R.S.P. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (online, 2010; consulted 12/12/2020, <https://dictionaries.brillonline.com/search#dictionary=greek&id=gr4310>) proposes the Indo-European root **meh₂ǵ-*.

⁴⁹ *TLL* 8.430.9–20. Kreuz (n. 1), 186 n. 517 does not appear to be aware that the straightforward meaning of ‘dough’ is only attested as a late usage for Latin; his assumption, therefore, that the *massa*-substance could be entirely *separate* from the substance of the *amerina* themselves is highly unlikely. *massis* ... *non perustis* is best construed as an ablative of quality.

⁵⁰ Georgescu (n. 24), 559 dates the word’s borrowing from Greek to the first century B.C.E.

⁵¹ Of our four surviving references, two specify that the *massa* is composed of coagulated milk (*lactis massa coacti*, ‘a mass of congealed milk’, Ov. *Met.* 8.666; *massam modo lactis alligati*, ‘a mass of just-curdled milk’, Mart. 8.64.9), while Martial’s *Velabrensi massa coacta foco* (‘a mass congealed on a Velabran hearth’, 11.52.10), referring to smoked cheese, helps to clarify that, at least here, *massa* does not simply mean something like ‘large portion’ but most likely refers to the actual substance (similarly, C. Schöffel, *Martial, Buch 8: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* [Stuttgart, 2002], 537 on Mart. 8.64.9). The final example, *Vestino de grege massa* (‘a mass from a Vestine flock’, Mart. 13.31.2), is more ambiguous (Shackleton Bailey and Parrott [n. 7], 185, for instance, translate *massa* here as ‘hunk’), but the usage is not so far from the other examples as to preclude referring to the substance of the cheese itself.

⁵² *TLL* 8.430.1–7. Columella’s usage at *Rust.* 12.34 (*sed mustum desub massa et limpidum sit*), included by the *TLL* in this list of edibles, is mysterious; J. André, *Columelle: De l’agriculture. Livre XII (De l’intendente)* (Paris, 1988), 68 n. 3 explains *desub massa* as defining the type of must used to produce *embamma* as ‘mèregoutte’, or the must that is produced before pressure is applied to the grapes. In this case, *massa* would refer to the mass of grapes that is pulped to make wine.

⁵³ Thus *massa* would be quite distinct from the *globus* of prunes and little figs packed into a collapsing cone at Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.27–8.

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. the probable meaning of *fossa* at Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.54, with Gibson (n. 1), 287 ad loc., elsewhere unattested.

made of flour-and-water dough (and indeed most were not, in antiquity),⁵⁵ and the coagulated and homogeneous substance that was the product of mixing and kneading should most assuredly be within the word's semantic range, certainly more than any unprocessed fresh or dried fruit. Second, the word's Greek origins clearly do not disappear, or *massa* would not reclaim its Greek meaning in later antiquity; and we must remember, furthermore, that Statius is the son of a Greek grammarian hailing from the Greekish city of Naples.⁵⁶

As for *non perustus*, while the verb is rarely preserved in cooking contexts (since one does not tend to intentionally burn food), we do find it once in Scribonius Largus (122) and once in Pliny (*HN* 24.110); the Plinian usage is especially informative, as it contrasts *peruro* with *torreo*, both intentional procedures, but the former implying an even more thorough scorching than *torreo* provides.⁵⁷ Interpretations thus far of Statius' *non perustus* have been forced to a greater or lesser degree, following from the need to understand *amerina* as referring to fruit. Of those who take *amerina* as referring to fresh fruit, Vollmer, for instance, imagines that, because Amerian apples and pears ripen with frost (Plin. *HN* 15.58), *non perustus* must mean that they are not yet fully ripe ('sie sind also jetzt noch nicht ganz reif');⁵⁸ a note in Shackleton Bailey's Loeb volume, conversely, suggests that he takes the phrase to mean that the fruits are fully ripe but have not become overly ripe or damaged by the elements, since they are 'picked in good time'.⁵⁹ On the other side, we have those commentators who take *amerina* as referring to dried fruit; in this case, *non perustus* is generally taken as meaning that the fruit still retains some moisture.⁶⁰ Once again, however, I propose that the context of pastry could give greater intelligibility to the phrase.⁶¹ Just as Pliny says of lozenges made from acacia gum, which can be toasted or burned still more thoroughly than that (*ab aliis torrentur, ab aliis peruruntur, HN* 24.110), the same is true of pastries, which are cooked to different degrees of doneness depending on the recipe. Indeed, Varro even claims that the word *crustulum* is partly derived from *uro*.⁶²

⁵⁵ In parallel terms, the *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* (2021) notes that $\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha$ was 'made of roasted barley-meal, mixed w. water, milk, wine or oil'.

⁵⁶ *quasi Graecam urbem* (Tac. *Ann.* 15.33). On Statius' father and Naples' Hellenism, see C. McNelis, 'Greek grammarians and Roman society during the early empire: Statius' father and his contemporaries', *CLAnt* 21 (2002), 67–94, at 73–4, with further bibliography. Gibson (n. 1), 346–7 points to a possible Graecism by Statius at *Silv.* 5.3.210; cf. also his predilection for the Greek *chelys* (A. Keith, 'Lyric resonances in Statius' *Achilleid*', in F. Bessone and M. Fucecchi [edd.], *The Literary Genres of the Flavian Age* [Berlin and Boston, 2017], 283–95, at 291). M. Leiwo, *Neapolitana: A Study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples* (Helsinki, 1995), 51–7 discusses linguistic variation in Neapolitan Greek owing to dialect and bilingualism.

⁵⁷ Scribonius Largus, conversely, uses *peruro* to mean 'become overly burned'.

⁵⁸ Vollmer (n. 1), 306. Newlands (n. 1), 241 points out the strangeness of unripe apples and pears even while accepting the explanation; Kreuz (n. 1), 186 n. 517, conversely, argues that unripe fruit is both improbable for the time of year and inappropriate for the panegyric context.

⁵⁹ Shackleton Bailey and Parrott (n. 7), 69 n. 6. J. Markland, *P. Papinii Statii libri quinque Silvarum* (Dresden and London, 1827 [1728]), 211 likewise follows the early commentator Gronovius in understanding *perustus* as meaning ripe but not dried.

⁶⁰ Lafaye (n. 1), 66; H. Frère, *Stace: Silves. Tome I (Livres I–III)* (Paris, 1944), 47 n. 3. Alternatively, Liberman (n. 1), 147 proposes emending *non perustus* to *sole tostis*, which seems quite a palaeographical stretch and in contravention of the *lectio difficilior* rule.

⁶¹ Kreuz (n. 1), 187 n. 517 proposes emending to *nuper ustis*, meaning 'freshly baked'; this would still be a possible emendation and meaning if we follow my slightly different line of thinking, but, as I discuss below, the emendation is unnecessary and may even obscure a structural feature of the catalogue.

⁶² Varro, *Ling.* 5.107 *crustulum ... quod ut corium et uritur* ('little crust ... because it is like a hard shell and is burned').

While we must again lament our limited knowledge of ancient pastry techniques, there are a few salutary modern parallels to consider. First is the hyper-local *tourteau fromagé* of Poitou-Charentes, the method for which requires the top of the cake to be completely carbonized: this would, *exempli gratia*, clearly be a *perustus* pastry. Second is the cooking instruction, *bis coctus*, enshrined in the name of biscuits and biscotti. Although the double baking has been lost from most modern recipes, and although the term itself did not originate in reference to pastries but rather in reference to bread that was baked twice for the sake of longer storage,⁶³ nevertheless this mode of preparation produces a hard-baked pastry that might once again be described as *perustus*, or might simply be *tostus*, as per Pliny's distinction.⁶⁴ Statius, however, stresses that our hypothetical Amerian pastries are *non perustis*; we must, therefore, imagine that they are definitely only *tostis*.⁶⁵ Whether the phrase is simply intended as a *litotes* or is, rather, a meaningful contrast with a different type of longer-baked *amerinum* is impossible to say,⁶⁶ but it is certainly important here to note the parallel with the textural epithet *molles* that is applied to *gaioli* (and perhaps *lucuntuli*) in the previous line. The first pastries are soft, while the *amerina* are harder, just not tooth-breakingly hard.⁶⁷

In light of this interpretation and the textural difference it helps to establish between the (probable) pastries mentioned in the first two lines of the catalogue's second half, it is worth noting a useful parallel with Statius' longer catalogue of Saturnalian foodstuffs in *Silv.* 4.9,⁶⁸ a poem that brings the Book 4 addendum to the *Silvae* to a close just as *Silv.* 1.6 brought the collection's first book to a close.⁶⁹ Here, we twice find a similar inversion of texture or density between sequentially mentioned related foods: *nec lenes alicae, nec asperum far? ... non lardum grave debilisve perna* ('no mild-tasting groats, no sharp-tasting emmer wheat? ... no heavy bacon or limp ham?'), *Stat. Silv.*

⁶³ *OED* s.v. 'biscuit'; *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (Florence, 1691³), 225.

⁶⁴ It is worth noting that the *cantucci* and *tozzetti* of Etruria and Umbria (home of Ameria) do still require a double baking. This style of biscuit, while likely not of ancient origin, was certainly already in existence prior to the late seventeenth century, as it is given as one definition of *cantuccio* in the third edition of the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (n. 63), 276.

⁶⁵ Kreuz (n. 1), 186–7 n. 517 aptly points out that it would be inappropriate to a panegyric context for *non perustis* simply to mean that the bakers had successfully avoided burning the pastry.

⁶⁶ For two different regional products, we may compare the hard-baked *copta Rhodiaca* (Mart. 14.70) with the soft ἐσχαρίτης Ῥοδιακός, μεθόριος ἄρτου καὶ πλακοῦντος ('Rhodian hearth-bread, between bread and cake', Poll. *Onom.* 6.78; cf. Ath. *Deipn.* 3.109d–e). Rhodes also produced a variety of *echinus* (Ath. *Deipn.* 14.647a–b), which was a cake endemic to the islands (νησιωτικὸς πλακοῦς, Poll. *Onom.* 6.78).

⁶⁷ Vollmer (n. 1), 306 supposes that *molles* is meant to draw a contrast between edible *gaioli* and the clay *sigillata* ('Thonfigürchen') that are common Saturnalia gifts, rather than that it indicates anything about the actual texture of the *gaioli*. However, cf. Mart. 14.69–70, where a Priapus of soft wheat flour (*siligineus*) is juxtaposed with a hard-baked *copta Rhodiaca*; thanks to Ana Lóio for drawing my attention to the parallel.

⁶⁸ I owe the inspiration for this paragraph to the anonymous reviewer for *CQ*. As R. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Leiden / Boston / Köln, 2002), 399 notes, Statius' list of foodstuffs in our present passage 'reads like a list of typical Saturnalian presents'.

⁶⁹ For the respective publication dates of the books of the *Silvae* and the concept that Books 1–3 are a unit, see Coleman (n. 8), xvi–xix and, differently, Nauta (n. 68), 285–90, 443–4; Book 5 of the *Silvae* is typically considered to have been published posthumously (see Coleman [n. 8], xxxi; Gibson [n. 1], xxviii–xxx). On the shared clausal nature of *Silvae* 1.6 and 4.9, see Newlands (n. 1), 257; J.M. Seo, 'Statius *Silvae* 4.9 and the poetics of Saturnalian exchange', *MD* 61 (2009), 243–56, at 253–4; E. Gowers, 'Lucan's (G)natal poem: Statius' *Silvae* 2.7, the *Culex*, and the aesthetics of miniaturization', *CLAnt* 40 (2021), 45–75, at 47.

4.9.31, 4.9.34).⁷⁰ The repeated pairing of foods with antithetical features in both poems is reminiscent of the structural antithesis that defines Martial's *Apophoreta*, with its alternation of expensive and cheap gifts;⁷¹ and while Fitzgerald sees this alternation as an expression of Martial's personal predilection for polarity as a rhetorical construct,⁷² Seo argues that questions of reciprocity and asymmetry are embedded in the gift exchange of the Saturnalia;⁷³ and Rimell, in turn, sees Martial's poetics as themselves *deriving from* 'the *mundus inversus* of carnival'.⁷⁴ It may be, therefore, that we should stretch that idea of asymmetricality (whether in gift exchanges or in poetic pairings) slightly further to reflect the principle of inversion and reversal that underlies the Saturnalia as a whole. Likewise, the larger structural contrast, in the mini-catalogue of *Silv.* 1.6, of foreign vs local and my proposed dissection of the catalogue's second half into hyper-local origins resemble Roman's argument that Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* juxtapose 'food-items and gift-objects [that] are designated by geographical province' to create a reflection of Rome's status as the centre of global consumption; he likewise proposes that '*denominazione d'origine controllata* was very much part of the idiom of the urban consumer in Rome'.⁷⁵ While Roman's arguments are directed at Martial's own poetics, the similarity with what we find here in Statius suggests the possibility either that such an overt juxtaposition and blending of cultures had become a mark of the Saturnalia (just as the blending of social classes was at its roots)⁷⁶ or that Statius was picking up on Martial's Saturnalian programmatics in his own two Saturnalian compositions,⁷⁷ although without diminishing the force of the complementary local reading that I proposed above.

⁷⁰ The manuscripts read *leves* rather than *lenes* at 4.9.31, which would make the comparison one of actual texture rather than mouthfeel; *graves* occurs again at 4.9.35 in the manuscripts, but Coleman (n. 8), 234 emends to *breves* (citing the apparently short and plump shape of Faliscan sausages).

⁷¹ Including the hard *copta Rhodiaca* and the soft *Priapus siligineus*; see n. 67 above.

⁷² W. Fitzgerald, *Martial: The World of the Epigram* (Chicago, 2007), 110.

⁷³ Seo (n. 69). B.L. Ullman, '*Apophoreta* in Petronius and Martial', *CPh* 36 (1941), 345–55, at 348 likewise notes the prevalence of pairing in Petronius' *apophoreta* game at *Sat.* 56.

⁷⁴ V. Rimell, *Martial's Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram* (Cambridge, 2008), 141.

⁷⁵ L. Roman, 'Martial and the city of Rome', *JRS* 100 (2010), 88–117, at 94–5. On Rome's global consumerism in Martial's Saturnalian poetry, see also S. Blake, 'Martial's natural history: the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* and Pliny's encyclopedia', *Arethusa* 44 (2011), 353–77; Rimell (n. 74), 144–5. For Statius' own showcasing of regional foods in a Saturnalian context, we may observe his inclusion at *Silv.* 4.9.35 of Lucanian sausages (see page 299 above) and a second type of sausage, *Falisci* (elsewhere called *Falisci ventres*, Mart. 4.46.8, Varro, *Lang.* 5.111), which likewise took their name from their Falerian origin (Varro, *Lang.* 5.111). Newlands (n. 1), 244–5 also makes the case for an ethos of global consumerism in *Silvae* 1.6.

⁷⁶ The riddling first half vs transparent second half is also Saturnalian: on the connection of riddles with the Saturnalia, see W.R. Johnson, 'Small wonders: the poetics of Martial, Book Fourteen', in W.W. Batstone and G. Tissol (edd.), *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (New York, 2005), 139–50, at 141–2; Blake (n. 75); U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser, 'Saturnalian riddles for Attic nights: intratextual feasting with Aulus Gellius', in S. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis and T.D. Papanghelis (edd.), *Intratextuality and Latin Literature* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), 431–47. On ludic poetry at the Saturnalia more generally, see M. Citroni, 'Marziale e la letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell'intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri)', *ICS* 14 (1989), 201–26.

⁷⁷ Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* were published between 83 and 85 C.E.; for the dating, see M. Citroni, 'Pubblicazione e dediche dei libri in Marziale', *Maia* 40 (1988), 3–39, at 11–12; T.J. Leary, *Martial Book IV: The Apophoreta* (London, 1996), 9–12; Leary (n. 14), 12–13; Nauta (n. 68), 441.

To return to the *amerina* themselves, while there is, of course, no evidence for such a pastry existing, we must remember that there is no evidence other than this poem for *gaioli*, either. For those who find my reasoning too fanciful, let my arguments at least help us lay to rest the idea that *massis amerina non perustis* refers to fresh fruit. In either case, too, as I have argued above, the familiarity of the names in the second half of the catalogue is critical, and to be contrasted with the imported imperial bounty of the first half:⁷⁸ local snacks from Latium, Etruria and Umbria; a cake that at least forms part of every Roman wedding (Juv. 6.202–3; cf. *Anth. Lat.* 190.49 Shackleton Bailey), if not other banquets as well; and a snack that, while of imported origin, is so common in Rome as to be *notas ... theatris* (Mart. 11.31.10). The catalogue ends where it began, with imported goods, but it has digested this one into that which is thoroughly Roman.⁷⁹ Without recognizing the importance inherent in the regional denomination *amerina*, and perhaps even the element of local human labour necessary to produce these treats, we cannot fully grasp the implications of the catalogue's second half. These items are not, as Malamud proposed, representative of those who consume them; rather, I would argue, they serve as a reminder of the sweet rewards to be reaped from peacetime *labor* when they do not fall free from heaven,⁸⁰ set in distinct contrast with the *largis gratuitum ... rapinis* (*Silv.* 1.6.16) that can be reaped as the fruits of empire.

Columbia University

DARCY A. KRASNE
dk3009@columbia.edu

⁷⁸ Cf. Newlands (n. 1), 241.

⁷⁹ It may be that we should compare the fictionality of Roman acquisition and assimilation visible in Martial's epigram on the British *bascauda*, which Rome has evidently adopted as a local product: *barbara de pictis veni bascauda Britannis, | sed me iam mavult dicere Roma suam* ('A barbarian basket, I came from the tattooed Britons, but now Rome prefers to say that I am her own', Mart. 13.99). Cf. Mart. 13.42–3.

⁸⁰ For pastry—or dough involving butter—as the product of peacetime, see E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table* (Oxford, 1993), 17; Plin. *HN* 18.105–6.