

CP 10. Priapus' Humorous *Doctrina**

George C. Paraskeviotis
University of Cyprus
paraskeviotis.giorgos@ucy.ac.cy

SUMMARY

This paper re-examines CP 10 where the phallic god Priapus vigorously apologises for his roughly carved form to some anonymous girl, who comes in his garden and laughs at him. The investigation is based on the most common humour theories of the antiquity (i.e. superiority and incongruity theory), which are used in order to trace further humorous elements other than the sexual humour which runs through the CP and especially CP 10. These elements show that the country god Priapus is not only the funny *hortorum custos* but also an erudite character whose *doctrina* can cause further laugh and humour, reflecting thereby the *doctrina* that characterises the entire collection.

KEY WORDS

Priapus, Humour, Superiority Theory, Incongruity Theory, Sexual Humour, *Doctrina*.

The *Corpus Priapeorum* is a collection of eighty literary pieces (i.e. epigrams¹) which are attributed to some anonymous single author² of the first century A.D.³. This author employs various subjects concerning Priapus such as the god's sexual threats to the interlopers in his garden (CP 11, 13, 15, 22, 23, 28, 35 and 44)⁴, his comparison to the Olympians (CP 9, 20, 36, 39, 53 and 75), his complaints concerning the weather or other problems (CP 26, 33, 47,

* I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the anonymous readers of *Minerva* for their constructive suggestions, comments and criticisms which significantly improved the first draft of this paper.

¹ HOOPER (1999) 16-19.

² Cf. BUCHHEIT (1962) who rightly argued that the epigrams of the CP were created and artfully arranged by a single author. See also KLOSS (2003) and HOLZBERG (2005).

³ For the date of the CP see PARKER (1988) 36-37, RICHLIN (1992) 141-143, GOLDBERG (1992) 35-36, TRÄNKLE (1999), CANO-VELÁZQUEZ (2000) 30-31, HOLZBERG (2002) 51-53, KLOSS (2003) 480-485, CITRONI (2008), CALLEBAT (2012) XXXII and MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 27-29.

⁴ The list is not exhaustive, given that there are also epigrams which deal with characters, either male or female, who intentionally come to the garden in order to be raped by the god (CP 25, 40, 45, 48, 51, 64, 66 and 73).

55, 61 and 63) and finally his humble wooden origin (CP 6, 10, 25 and 56)⁵. These subjects stress the humorous side of Priapus, since they deal with a god who is a fun figure that causes laugh and humour not only to the reader but also to the characters of the text. CP 10 is a notable example, given that here Priapus vigorously apologises for his roughly carved form, thereby causing laugh not only to the reader but also to a girl who comes to laugh at him:

Insulsissima quid puella rides?
 non me Praxiteles Scopasve fecit,
 non sum Phidiaca manu politus;
 sed lignum rude vilicus dolavit
 et dixit mihi 'tu Priapus esto'.
 spectas me tamen et subinde rides:
 nimirum tibi salsa res videtur
 adstans inguinibus columna nostris.

[CP 10]

The laugh which is caused by the humble and wooden form of Priapus is a conventional subject which has an eminent place in Greek and Roman Priapic poetry⁶. However, while laugh and sexual humour are more than obvious in the collection, the verb *ridere* is found only twice throughout the *Corpus Priapeorum*; and these two cases are emphatically found in CP 10 (cf. *rides?* 10,1 and *rides* 10,6)⁷, something which can show that humour has an eminent role in this epigram, which in that sense should also have a much more significant humorous tone that is not only related to the sexual humour on which scholars usually concentrate their interest⁸.

Before examining the verses under consideration in order to trace humorous elements, we should first refer briefly to the humour theories on which my

⁵ For the subject of the wooden statue of Priapus in Latin poetry, cf. e.g. HOR. *Sat.* 1,8. See also O'CONNOR (1989) 182-185.

⁶ Cf. BUCHHEIT (1962) 61. See also GOLDBERG (1992) 96-97 with examples.

⁷ Here, it should be mentioned that the verb *ridere* is also found with the preposition *de-* (*deridere*) in CP 56 (cf. *Derides quoque, fur, et impudicum / ostendis digitum mihi minanti?* CP 56,1-2) which also begins with Priapus' angry apostrophe and direct question towards some character (*i.e.* thief) who entered his garden. However, here the meaning of the verb *deridere* is "to mock" rather than "to laugh" at someone (*i.e.* Priapus). Cf. TLL s.v. *derideo* 5,1,629,63-65. See also CALLEBAT (2012) 242.

⁸ O'CONNOR (1989) 111-112, GOLDBERG (1992) 100-101, RICHLIN (1992) 124-125, OBERMAYER (1998) 208-209, CALLEBAT (2012) 101-102 and MICHALOPOULOS (2014).

interpretation is based. My intention is not to give here an exhaustive survey on all the humour theories which are currently more than one hundred in several research areas⁹. However, these various theories tend to overlap each other and they can be divided into three main categories: superiority theory, relief/release theory and incongruity theory¹⁰. All the humour theories which have come down to us from antiquity belong to the superiority category, according to which laugh comes from what is ugly and/or bad¹¹. Plato first argues that the ridiculous is a vice (for instance, the lack of self-knowledge) while the amusement is malice, given that laugh is caused by the faults of the others¹², stressing that the pleasure caused by laugh is combined with the pain caused by malice¹³. Moreover, Aristotle suggests that the laughable is something ugly but not painful¹⁴ stressing that humour should not be a feature of the vulgar clowns but of the educated men¹⁵. Aristotle's views on humour are followed by Cicero¹⁶ who argues that the laughable is something ugly which is censored in no ugly way¹⁷. The relief/release theory underlines the physiological and psychological features found in laughter and humour¹⁸ by regarding something humorous as a source of psychic energy which is released through the laughter and is focused mostly on the recipient of humour¹⁹; and in that sense, it is closely associ-

⁹ E.g. biology, psychology, cognitive science, anthropology, linguistics and literary criticism. See PLAZA (2006) 6-7, n. 10, with bibliography on the humour theories, and more recently MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 36-37, n. 4, with further bibliography on humour.

¹⁰ PLAZA (2006) 6-13. See also MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 36-37.

¹¹ PLAZA (2006) 7.

¹² PLAT. *Phlb.* 48-50.

¹³ Cf. also PLAT. *R.* 388e: ἄλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ φιλογέλωτάς γε δεῖ εἶναι. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὅταν τις ἐφιῆ ἰσχυρῶ γέλωτι, ἰσχυρὰν καὶ μεταβολὴν ζητεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον, where the philosopher claims that the guards of the state should avoid humour, because of its tendency to cause violent reactions, something which again stresses the ambivalent nature of humour.

¹⁴ ARIST. *Po.* 5,1449a.

¹⁵ ARIST. *EN.* 4,8.

¹⁶ CIC. *De orat.* 2,235-290. See also *Orat.* 87-89.

¹⁷ Cf. CIC. *De orat.* 2,236: *haec enim ridentur vel sola vel maxime, quae notant et designant turpitudinem aliquam non turpiter.* For Cicero's views on humour see CORBEIL (1996) 14-56.

¹⁸ Here, it should be mentioned that laugh (*i.e.* a physical action) and humour (*i.e.* a psychological feature) tend to be examined together and sometimes even unfortunately to be treated synonymously. Yet, this paper is only a literary study and for that reason it will also treat those terms synonymously. See also PLAZA (2006) 6.

¹⁹ Cf. PLAZA (2006) 9-10 with n. 18, who nicely observes that the sexual humour, which is found in the *Corpus Priapeorum* and is conventionally associated with the superiority theory, has also fea-

ated with psychology and is mostly used by psychologists (namely the Freudians)²⁰ who also use this theory in literary criticism, something that can explain why the relief/release theory is entirely excluded from this investigation of CP 10. Finally, the incongruity theory is based on a mismatch (*i.e.* incongruity) between two or more constituent elements regarding an event, idea, object, social expectation etc.²¹. This theory is also traced in Aristotle who argues that a character can violate the expectations that he created to the audience causing in that way laugh and humour²²; and similarly Cicero also claims that a character's sayings constitute the most common humorous source when they go against the expectations of the audience²³. Therefore, it is clear that these three humour theories were congruent to each other, something which also shows that the blending between them can significantly reinforce the humorous effect within a literary text.

CP 10 begins with Priapus' angry apostrophe and direct question towards a girl who is characterised as "stupid"²⁴, since she is laughing at him (*Insulsissima quid puella rides?*). This characterisation is further reinforced through the superlative degree of the adjective *insulsa* which is intentionally used by the god to lay special emphasis on his invective²⁵. It is quite clear that the girl first laughs at the ugly/bad figure of Priapus given that the answer of the god is actually an explanation of his roughly carved form. The god emphatically replies that he is not created by Praxiteles, Scopas or Phidias; instead he is only a wooden figure that has been carved by some anonymous *vilicus*. In other words, Priapus explains to the laughing girl that he is not an elegant marble (*i.e.* Praxiteles and Scopas²⁶) or a golden (*i.e.* Phidias²⁷) statue but a rude wooden

tures of the relief/release theory, since the Roman humourists use humour in order to express violent sexual and aggressive instincts.

²⁰ The relief/release theory received its most famous formulation by FREUD (1905) who has possibly influenced by SPENCER (1860) 395-402. See also PLAZA (2006) 9.

²¹ PLAZA (2006) 10. See also MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 37-38.

²² ARIST. *Rh.* 3,2.

²³ CIC. *De Or.* 2,255: *Sed scitis esse notissimum ridiculi genus, cum aliud exspectamus, aliud dicitur.*

²⁴ OLD s.v. *insulsus* 2a.

²⁵ Cf. also CP 51,25-26: *quibus relictis in mihi laboratum / locum venitis, improbissimi fures*, with CALLEBAT (2012) 230. See also GOLDBERG (2012) 97.

²⁶ Praxiteles and Scopas were among the most celebrated sculptors in antiquity that sculpted mostly marble, although they were also skilled in other materials. Cf. PLIN. *Nat.* 54,69: *Praxiteles quoque, qui marmore felicior, ideo et clarior fuit, fecit tamen et ex aere pulcherrima opera*, with CORSO (2004) 114 and 159-160 (for Praxiteles) and OCD s.v. *Scopas* (for Scopas) with further bibliography.

figure, something which shows *doctrina* on the statuary that is incongruously uttered by an uneducated and uncultivated god²⁸ causing in that way laugh and humour²⁹. The explanation concludes with the rude material used for the creation of Priapus (*lignum rude*) which is only mentioned through the entirely unknown rustic “sculptor” (*vilicus*), who is famous neither for his art nor for the material he uses in order to create his sculptures.

Nonetheless, *vilicus* is the only crucial character (given that he is the creator of the wooden statue of Priapus)³⁰ in the collection (after Priapus)³¹ whose words are in direct speech, although they are actually quoted by the phallic god (*et dixit mihi 'tu Priapus esto'*)³². Scholars have already noticed the verbal echo between *tu Priapus esto* and *tu aureus esto* which may recall Vergil's *Eclogue* 7 where Corydon's and Thyrsis' contest occurs; and especially it may also recall Thyrsis' overambitious effort to rival Corydon's earlier promise for a marble statue to Diana by stressing that the statue of Priapus is already made by marble and it

²⁷ Phidias was also a famous sculptor whose recognition in the ancient world was based mostly on the two enormous chryselephantine (gold and ivory) sculptures (Athena Parthenos and Zeus Olympios). Cf. PLIN. *Nat.* 54,49: *Minoribus simulacris signisque innumera prope artificum multitudo nobilitata est, ante omnes tamen Phidias Atheniensis Iove Olympio facto ex ebore quidem et auro, sed et ex aere signa fecit.* See also SOUPIOS (2013) 77 with n. 18.

²⁸ Cf. also CP 53,5-6: *tu quoque, dive minor, maiorum exempla secutus, / quamvis pauca damus, consule poma boni*; CP 63,9-12: *huc adde, quod me terribilem fuste / manus sine arte rusticae dolaverunt, / interque cunctos ultimum deos numen / cucurbitarum ligneus vocor custos*; and CP 68,1-2: *Rusticus indocte si quid dixisse videbor, / da veniam: libros non lego, poma lego.* In the Greek and Roman literature, Priapus is conventionally described as a minor country god who is similar in status to Pan and is worshipped by sailors, fishermen and mostly countrymen, having as main duty to guard gardens, orchards and vineyards where his wooden statue (which is often carved by cheap fig wood) is usually found. See e.g. LLOYD-JONES (1991) 63 and HOOPER (1999) 1-2. In view of that, this country god is regularly far from cultivated and sophisticated gods such as Apollo or Athena except for the CP, where Priapus is indeed an erudite character in emphatic contrast to his announcements about his *rusticitas* (cf. CP 63,9-12 and 68,1-2).

²⁹ See also STEWART (2003) 75-76 who nicely observes that Priapus is conventionally associated with obscenity that constitutes a feature which is in emphatic contrast to fine art statues and especially to sculptors such as the famous Phidias.

³⁰ Furthermore, there is the Homeric Penelope, whose words are also quoted in direct speech (cf. CP 68,33-36). For Penelope's 'female'/female speech in the CP see MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 193-218.

³¹ Priapus speaks in direct speech in CP 3,1-8 [*pace* PLANTADE-VALLAT (2005) 286 who argue that the narrative voice of this epigram belongs to some polyphonic narrator rather than to Priapus], 5,3-4, 45,5-8 and 72,3-4.

³² *Priapus* puts words into the mouth of other characters in CP 15,4-6 (a thief), 24,3-4 (a thief), 30,1-2 (an interloper), 37,8-12 (a worshiper who has dedicated a votive tablet to Priapus), 43,3-4 (a girl) and 72,1-2 (the owner or manager of the garden).

will later become golden³³, given that the fertility of the flock will increase³⁴. However, this intertextual verbal echo is inconsistently uttered by the uneducated *vilicus* and is also incongruously reproduced by the uncultivated phallic god, something which can confirm that the *vilicus* (at least³⁵) and the god are familiar with the Vergilian collection. Furthermore, Priapus' explanation constitutes a short catalogue with proper names (*Praxiteles*, *Scopas*, *Phidiaca manu* [synecdochically given] and *vilicus* in descending mode³⁶ to stress the rustic "sculptor" of the last verse)³⁷, which is a conventional feature first found in oral, epic (mostly Homeric) and later in written poetry³⁸ whose use shows great erudition that is humorously incongruous with the unsophisticated phallic god.

Furthermore, the god's explanation of his roughly carved form is actually useless, given that the girl continues laughing (*spectas me tamen et subinde rides*). Priapus understands that the *insulsissima puella* is not laughing at his wooden form, but on his rigid phallus (cf. *columna*)³⁹, something which is also confirmed by him (*nimirum tibi salsa res uidetur / adstans inguinibus columna nostris*). In other words, the joke is once again associated with the girl (cf. *CP* 10,1), who laughs at Priapus' genitals either in humorous sense which shows that she is prudish, or in lecherous sense which shows that she is lascivious⁴⁰ and eager for sex⁴¹ (*salsa*

³³ For the golden statues of Priapus see HERTER (1932) 166.

³⁴ Cf. GOLDBERG (1992) 99 and CALLEBAT (2012) 101. See also MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 138 with n. 111. Pace PÖSCHL (1964) 117 n. 29 who mentions the observation made by one of his class students according to which Thyrsis' *tu ... aureus esto* could not refer to the statue of Priapus but rather only to his phallus, something which is in emphatic contrast with the earlier vocative *Priape* (cf. *Ecl.* 7,33) which clearly refers to the statue of Priapus and with Thyrsis' reply which is used in order to rival the earlier quatrain that deals with Corydon's promise for a marble statue to Diana.

³⁵ Here, it should be mentioned that Priapus could only reproduce *vilicus*' words (*tu Priapus esto*). However, the phallic god's explanation of his wooden origin to some girl who comes to laugh at him (*Praxiteles Scopasve* [marble], *Phidiaca manu* [gold] and *lignum rude* [wood]) could also be an altered order of the material used for the creation of Priapus in the Vergilian verses under consideration. Cf. VERG. *Ecl.* 7,33-36: *Sinum lactis et haec te liba, Priape, quotannis / expectare sat est: custos es pauperis horti* (wood). / *Nunc te marmoreum* (marble) *pro tempore fecimus; at tu, / si fetura gregem suppleuerit, aureus* (gold) *esto*. Cf. COLEMAN (1977) 216-217, CLAUSEN (1994) 225-226 and CUCCHIARELLI (2012) 392 who suggest that the statue of Priapus in a humble garden (cf. *custos es pauperis horti*) should be a roughly carved figure made by wood.

³⁶ For the descending mode in catalogues see KYRIAKIDIS (2007) 25-28 and 41-44.

³⁷ Cf. MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 135ff. For catalogues in the *CP* see MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 103-191.

³⁸ KYRIAKIDIS (2007) XI.

³⁹ OLD s.v. *columna* 6.

⁴⁰ O'CONNOR (1989) 111-112.

res [i.e. “salty and tasty thing”] may be an oblique reference to fellatio or irrumation⁴²). The laugh which is caused by the sexual organs, in the sense that they are unclean and especially that the oral-genital contact is actually a filthy action which causes a bad-smelling (*os impurum*), constitutes a typical feature in Roman sexual humour⁴³; but, it is also a feature that is entirely related to male and not to female humourists⁴⁴ such as the *insulsissima puella*, something that creates yet another humorous incongruity.

Moreover, it has been noticed that CP 10 may contain poetological meta-language⁴⁵. More specifically, the verbs *fecit* (CP 10,2) and *dolavit* (CP 10,4) are associated not only with the carving of the wooden statue but also figuratively with the creation of the poem. Furthermore, *salsa res* (CP 10,7) can mean a “notable thing”⁴⁶ but also metaliterally a “notable material (of speech, writing etc.), matter or subject”⁴⁷, since *sal* / *salsus* / *insulsus* are typical neoteric catchwords that are usually found in the Catullan collection⁴⁸. Moreover, the epithet *rudis* (“roughly fashioned”)⁴⁹ in the phrase *lignum rude* (CP 10,4), from which Priapus is made, is often used in literary criticism; and in that sense, the *rudis* material (i.e. statue/poem) with *non sum ... manu politus* (CP 10,3) that refers to a frivolous elaboration by the poet/sculptor recall similar poetological references in the

⁴¹ This suggestion can further be reinforced with the term *puella* which can also be used pejoratively in order to denote a mistress or a prostitute (cf. OLD s.v. *puella* 3a and GOLDBERG [1992] 97 with further examples) who in that sense may enter the garden in order to be raped by the phallic god who in turn scornfully rejects her. Priapus' scornful refusal to rape the characters who sexually desire him can recall the invective against women which constitutes a significant subject that is also found into the *Corpus Priapeorum* (cf. RICHLIN [1992] 122). However, Priapus' invective is normally concerned with ugly young (cf. CP 32 and 46) and mostly old women (cf. CP 12 and 57) in contrast to the CP 10 where the *puella* (“a mistress or a prostitute”) should be beautiful something that can create yet another humorous incongruity.

⁴² Cf. GOLDBERG (1992) 100 and OBERMAYER (1998) 208-209 with n. 88. See also ADAMS (1982) 62 and 203-204 who nicely observes that *res* is used either for the sexual intercourse or for the male and female sexual organs.

⁴³ See also RICHLIN (1992) 26-27.

⁴⁴ RICHLIN (1992) 57.

⁴⁵ OBERMAYER (1998) 208-209, HÖSCHELE (2010) 304-305, PRIOUX (2008) and MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 138-143 with relative notes and further bibliography.

⁴⁶ OLD s.v. *res* 10.

⁴⁷ OLD s.v. *res* 9.

⁴⁸ CAT. 10,33: *insulsa*, 12,4: *salsum*, 13,5: *et uino et sale et omnibus cachinnis*, 14,16: *salse*, 16,7: [*sc. uersus*] *habent salem et leporem*, 37,6: *insulsi*, and 86,4: *mica salis*. For the neoteric catchwords *sal* / *salsus* see e.g. MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 140 n. 117 with further bibliography.

⁴⁹ OLD s.v. *rudis* 2. See also GOLDBERG (1992) 99.

collection⁵⁰, confirming in that way that *non sum ... politus* is also concerned with poetic elaboration⁵¹. Therefore, the *insulsissima puella* is not only a “stupid” girl but also an “uneducated” girl who cannot understand the metaliterary character of the priapic collection; instead, the uncultivated and uneducated god Priapus is familiar with metaliterary poetics, something which creates yet another emphatic incongruity that causes laugh and humour.

To sum up, *CP* 10 begins entertainingly with a girl who is laughing at the humble and wooden statue of Priapus (*i.e.* superiority theory); after that, Priapus’ explanation further reinforces the humorous tone of those lines, since the phallic god seems to be familiar with fine art artists (Praxiteles, Scopas, Phidias), earlier literary tradition (Vergil’s *Eclogues*), short catalogues with proper names (*Praxiteles, Scopas, Phidiaca manu, vilicus*) and poetological meta-language. These features should characterise a cultivated and erudite literary character with great *doctrina* and therefore are emphatically incongruous with the unsophisticated phallic god, generating in that way more laugh and humour (*i.e.* incongruity theory). Finally, the poem comes to its end amusingly with a sexual joke (*i.e.* superiority theory) which is also incongruously come from a female character (*i.e.* incongruity theory), reinforcing further its humorous effect.

In conclusion, *CP* 10 constitutes an entertaining literary creation whose humour is not only based on the typical sexual humour which runs through the entire collection. Instead, it is also based on the superiority and incongruity theory, which are combined with the sexual humour in order to stress that Priapus is not only the funny *hortorum custos*; but, he is also an erudite character whose *doctrina* that is characteristically evident in *CP* 10 can cause further laugh and humour. This can in turn explain also why the verb *ridere* is found only here in the entire collection, thereby reflecting the *doctrina* which characterises the *Corpus Priapeorum*.

⁵⁰ Cf. *CP* 1,1: *carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces*, and 2,3: *scripsi non nimium laboriose* where the author of the collection informs the reader that his poetry is *carminis incompti* and that his poems has been composed *non nimium laboriose*.

⁵¹ Cf. MICHALOPOULOS (2014) 141 with n. 124 who nicely observes that these references can also recall *CAT.* 1,1-2: *Cui dono lepidum novum labellum / arido modo pumice expoliturum?*, where *arida modo pumice expoliturum?* refers both to actual and literary polishing.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- ADAMS, J.N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- BUCHHEIT, V. (1962), *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum*, Munich, Beck.
- CANO, P.L.-J. VELÁZQUEZ (2000), *Carmina Priapea. A Priapo, dios del falo (texto revisado, traducción y notas)*, Barcelona, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- CALLEBAT, L. (2012), *Priapeés. Texte établi traduit et commenté. Étude métrique par J. Soubiran*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- CLAUSEN, W.V. (1994), *Virgil. Eclogues with an Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- CITRONI, M. (2008), "Le proème des Priapeés et le problème de datation du recueil", in F. BIVILLE-E. PLANTADE-D. VALLAT (eds.), *Les vers du plus nul des poètes...: Nouvelles recherches sur les Priapeés. Actes de la journée d'étude organisée le 7 novembre 2005 à l'Université Lumière-Lyon 2*, Lyon, Publications de la Maison de l'Orient, 35-51.
- COLEMAN, R. (1977), *Virgil. Eclogues*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- CORBELL, A. (1996), *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- CORSO, A. (2004), *The Art of Praxiteles I*, Rome, L'Erma de Bretschneider.
- CUCCHIARELLI, A. (2012), *Publio Virgilio Marone. Le Bucoliche. Introduzione e Commento. Traduzione di Alfonso Traina*, Rome, Carocci.
- FREUD, S. (1905), *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten*, Leipzig-Vienna, Deuticke.
- GOLDBERG, C. (1992), *Carmina Priapea. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Interpretation und Kommentar*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- HERTER, H. (1932), *De Priapo*, Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann.
- HÖSCHELE, R. (2010), *Die blütenlesende Muse. Poetik und Textualität antiker Epigrammsammlungen*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.
- HOLZBERG, N. (2002), *Martial und das antike Epigramm*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- HOLZBERG, N. (2005), "Impotence? It Happened to the Best of Them! A Linear Reading of the *Corpus Priapeorum*", *Hermes* 133, 368-381.
- HOOPER, R. (1999), *The Priapus Poems: Erotic Epigrams from Ancient Rome*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- KLOSS, G. (2003), "Überlegungen zur Verfasserschaft und Datierung der *Carmina Priapea*", *Hermes* 131, 464-485.
- KYRIAKIDIS, S. (2007), *Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry. Lucretius-Virgil-Ovid. Pierides. Studies in Greek and Latin Literature*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- LLOYD-JONES, H. (1991), *Greek in a Cold Climate*, London, Duckworth.
- MICHALOPOULOS, C.N. (2014), *Myth, Language and Gender in the Corpus Priapeorum*, Athens, Pedio [in Greek].
- OBERMAYER, H.P. (1998), *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche "Homosexualität" in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.
- O'CONNOR, E.M. (1989), *Symbolum Salacitatis: A Study of the God Priapus as a Literary Character*, Frankfurt am Main, Lang.
- PARKER, W.H. (1988), *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God, Introduced, Translated and Edited with Notes and Commentary*, London-Sidney, Croom Helm.
- PLANTADE, E.-D. VALLAT (2005), "Les Priapeés, de la parole au livre", *Revue de Philologie* 79, 279-307.
- PLAZA, M. (2006), *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire. Laughing and Lying*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- PÖSCHL, V. (1964), *Die Hirtendichtung Virgils*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- PRIOUX, É. (2008), “*At non longa bene est? Priape face à la tradition du discours critique alexandrine*”, in F. BIVILLE-E. PLANTADE-D. VALLAT (eds.), *Les vers du plus nul des poètes...: Nouvelles recherches sur les Priapées. Actes de la journée d'étude organisée le 7 novembre 2005 à l'Université Lumière-Lyon 2*, Lyon, Publications de la Maison de l'Orient, 157-180.
- RICHLIN, A. (1992), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- SOUPIOU, M.A. (2013), *The Greeks Who Made Us Who We Are. Eighteen Ancient Philosophers, Scientists, Poets and Others*, North Carolina, McFarland & Company.
- SPENCER, H. (1860), “The Physiology of Laughter”, *Macmillan's Magazine* 1, 395-402.
- STEWART, P. (2003), *Statues in Roman Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- TRÄNKLE, H. (1999), “Entstehungszeit und Verfässherschaft des *Corpus Priapeorum*”, *ZPE* 124, 145-156.