

fear from the Great Curmudgeon himself. The full stop at the end of line 11 should accordingly give way to lighter punctuation.⁸ This gives not only better sense, but better coherence: as in 8. 8, a congeries of parallel subordinate clauses introduced by a single *licet* build up a tension discharged in the closing main clause.⁹

67 St Bernard's Road, Oxford, OX2 6EJ LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVS

aulus@gellius.demon.co.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838808000463

⁸ A comma was in fact placed by Vincentius Colesso in the Delphin edition of 1680; but his paraphrase 'Nunc fas est' demonstrates that he still took *licet* as a main verb. On the other hand, F. Petrovskij, in his Russian translation (Moscow, 1968), renders the verbs of ll. 7–11 as perfective futures in their idiomatic sense of '(even) if' and places a colon after l. 11.

⁹ E. Siedschlag, *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen* (Berlin, 1977), does not notice 8.8, though at p. 41 he lists epigrams of a similar structure but with repetition of the (monosyllabic) subordinator.

SIGERUS AND SATUR: A PROSOPOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON DIO 67.15.1 AND SUET. *DOM.* 17.2

In chapter 17.2 of Suetonius' *Domitianus*, there appears a detailed list of the assassins who ended the emperor's life on 18 September A.D. 96: Maximus, a freedman of the chief chamberlain Parthenius (*libertus Partheni*); Satur, a decurion of the chamberlains (*decurio cubiculariorum*); Clodianus, a *cornicularius*; and an unnamed gladiator (*quidam e gladiatorio ludo*). With regard to Suetonius' second individual, some manuscripts of *De vita Caesarum* record the form *Saturius*, but the more reliable ones have the form *Satur*.¹

In the nineteenth century, L. Friedländer identified the conspirator against Domitian called Sigerus mentioned by Dio (67.15.1) with the Satur[jius] of Suetonius.² Though he explicitly identified one with the other, it is unclear whether Friedländer wanted to emend the text of Suetonius *Dom.* 17.2 to Sigerus, or whether he merely thought the two names referred to the same individual. H. Dessau in the first edition of *PIR* adopted Friedländer's view that Satur and Sigerus were one and the same.³ S. Gsell seemed to believe that Friedländer had made a textual emendation of Suetonius.⁴ Dessau's identification in *PIR*¹ S 500 has been followed by many modern scholars in prosopographical studies, biographies and commentaries.⁵

¹ See M. Ihm, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera. Vol. I, De vita Caesarum libri VIII* (editio minor; Leipzig, 1908), 331; cf. the edition of C.L. Roth, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli quae supersunt omnia* (Leipzig, 1871), 251 (with apparatus in the introduction, 50), which has the form *Saturius*.

² L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1922), 116, n. 2: 'auch bei Suet. Dom. 17, 2 steckt in der Überlieferung *Satur decurio cubiculariorum* sicher Sigerus'. The English translation (L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* 4⁷ [trans. L.A. Magnus; New York, 1979], 350) states '[also] in Sueton., *Domit.*, c.17 read Sigerus for Saturius'.

³ *PIR*¹ S 500: 'Συγνήσις Dio, Zon.; Sigerius trad. ap. Mart. et Tertull.; Satur vel Saturius codices Suetonii; sed videtur idem significari'. See also *PIR*¹ S 157.

⁴ S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien* (Paris, 1894), 329, n. 3, cites Friedländer but states cautiously '[p]eut-être faut-il lire, non Saturius, mais Sigerius'.

⁵ See n. 21 below.

Though the identity of Satur and Sigerus has become widely accepted, I would like to argue that they were in fact two different individuals, and that the ancient evidence forces a rejection of Friedländer's thesis.

To begin with Sigerus, Martial, writing under Domitian, provides contemporary evidence for a senior imperial *libertus* with this name:

Condita cum tibi sit iam sexagensima messis
et facies multo splendeat alba pilo,
discurris tota vagus urbe, nec ulla cathedra est
cui non mane feras irrequietus 'have';
et sine te nulli fas est prodire tribuno,
nec caret officio consul uterque tuo;
et sacro decies repetis Palatia clivo
Sigerosque meros Partheniosque sonas.
haec faciant sane iuvenes: deformius, Afer,
omnino nihil est ardalione sene

(Mart. Ep. 4.78)⁶

Although you have seen your sixtieth harvest
and your face shines with many a white hair,
you run about all of the city wandering,
and there is no seat to which you do not give
a morning greeting in your restless way;
and without you it is not possible
for a tribune to proceed forth
nor are the consuls free from your attendance;
you visit the sacred Palatine hill countless times
and speak of nothing but Partheniuses and Sigeruses.
Of course young men do these things: but there is nothing, Afer,
uglier than an old busybody.

It is true enough that variant readings of *Sigeros* occur in the three major MSS groups of Martial (viz., α , β , and γ , which correspond to the A, B, C groups of W.M. Lindsay).⁷ The three main *lectiones variae* are *sigerosque* β ; *sigereosque* γ ; and *sigeriosque* G (a manuscript from the γ family).⁸ Although Tertullian does preserve the form *Sigeriis*,⁹ the usual reading in textual editions is *Sigeros*, with the authority of Friedländer, Heraeus, Lindsay, Postgate, Izaac and Shackleton Bailey.¹⁰

There is, however, one other difficulty. Some humanist editions of Martial and commentaries on the epigrams – particularly the commentary of the papal secretary

⁶ The text follows the edition of D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata* (Stuttgart, 1990), 144. For commentary on this epigram, see R. Moreno Soldevila, *Martial, Book IV: A Commentary* (Leiden, 2006), 497–502.

⁷ On the manuscript tradition of Martial, see L.D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 239–44; M. Citroni, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber primus, introduzione, testo, apparato critico e commento* (Florence, 1975), xlv–lxxiii. See also W.M. Lindsay, *The Ancient Editions of Martial* (Oxford, 1903).

⁸ See Shackleton Bailey (n. 6), 144.

⁹ *Apol.* 35.9: *unde qui armati palatium inrumpunt, omnibus tot Sigeriis atque Partheniis audaciores?*

¹⁰ L. Friedländer, *Epigrammaton libri* (Amsterdam, 1961 [orig. publ. Leipzig, 1886]), 379; W. Heraeus, *M. Valerii Martialis: Epigrammaton libri* (Leipzig, 1925); W.M. Lindsay, *M. Val. Martialis epigrammata*² (Oxford, 1929); J.P. Postgate, *Corpus poetarum Latinorum a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum*, vol. 2 (London, 1905), 460; H.J. Izaac, *Épigrammes*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1961), 142; and Shackleton Bailey (n. 6), 144. Cf. the first edition of D.F.G. Schneidewin, *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammaton libri* (Grimae, 1842), 193, who preferred the reading *Sigeriosque*.

Domitius Calderinus – have the reading *Saturios*.¹¹ A consultation of each relevant apparatus criticus in modern editions reveals that no other reliable manuscript from the three major groups can be adduced to support such a reading. I would conclude that Renaissance scholars had read Suet. *Dom.* 17.2 and then made their own emendations to the text of Martial. Domizio Calderini, for instance, certainly read Suetonius: he wrote unpublished commentaries on the *De vita Caesarum*.¹² Furthermore, this questionable reading found in a few early editions of the *Epigrams* may well have influenced Friedländer's own thinking on this question.¹³ Additional evidence in support of the reading *Sigeros* in Martial 4.78 is the Greek transliteration Σίγηρος appearing in the epitomes of Dio Cassius (67.15.1).¹⁴ According to Dio, Sigeros was a chamberlain of Domitian (ἐν τῇ προκοιτίᾳ), and is mentioned along with Parthenius, as in Martial's epigram. The form Sigerus is attested in ancient inscriptions.¹⁵ We can cite the following individuals:

- (1) Sigerus (*CIL* 6.26547), apparently a slave of the second century A.D.
- (2) Servilius Sigerus, probably a freedman of a [P]lotia Isaurica lib(erta) (*CIL* 6.25544)
- (3) Troelius Sigerus (*CIL* 6.27635), probably a freedman
- (4) M. Ulpius Sigerus, an imperial freedman¹⁶
- (5) P. Agilius Sigerus (*CIL* 6.11255).

Σίγηρος also occurs as a personal name in Greek inscriptions from Attica and Thrace in the second and third centuries A.D.¹⁷ The conclusion is clear: Sigerus is an epigraphically-attested Greek proper name; the *libertus* of Martial in question was presumably of Greek ethnic origin. It is even thought by some that the Sigerus of *AE* 1946.100 is Domitian's freedman.¹⁸ Martial places Sigerus next to Parthenius in importance and rank: Parthenius was Domitian's chief chamberlain (Suet. *Dom.* 16.2; Dio 67.15.1). Martial's evidence gives credence to the view that Sigerus was a senior *cubicularius* along with Parthenius.

¹¹ Moreno Soldevila (n. 6), 501; Schneidewin (n. 10), 193 (see apparatus), cites *Saturiosque* in the *lemmata* of Calderinus and also in the margin of a fifteenth-century Parisian codex (Bibliothecae Regiae nr. 8068, which is denoted by *p* in his apparatus).

¹² Reynolds (n. 7), 404; D.T. Benediktson, 'A survey of Suetonius scholarship', *CW* 86 (1992–3), 386. On Calderini's commentaries on Martial, see J.W. Spaeth, 'Martial and the pasquinade', *TAPhA* 70 (1939), 249.

¹³ On a related matter, Friedländer certainly thought that the variant readings in the *marginalia* of the sixteenth-century Parisian manuscript of *Colinaeus* went back to an old codex from the *α* manuscript group (G. Galán Vioque, *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary* [Boston, 2002], 13), but this opinion was later refuted by Lindsay (n. 10), xvi–xvii.

¹⁴ See the apparatus of U.P. Boissvain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum romanarum quae servuntur*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1955), 182.

¹⁵ See H. Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1996), 426; H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein Namenbuch*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1982), 774.

¹⁶ S. Panciera, *La Collezione epigrafica dei Musei capitolini* (Rome, 1987), 151.

¹⁷ Attica: P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (edd.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Volume II, Attica* (Oxford 1994), 397; Thrace: P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (edd.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Volume IV* (Oxford, 2005), 309.

¹⁸ See the commentary to *AE* 1946.100. The inscription mentions Sigerus' wife *Coete*. See also the Siger(i)os of *CIG* 3.4713, an imperial freedman and master of an Epaphroditus (Ἐπαφρόδιτος· Καίσαρος Σείγηριανός); for the possibility that this is the Sigerus of Domitian, see Stein, *RE* II.A.2 (1923), col. 2277, s.v. Sigerus.

We can now turn to Satur. The imperial assassin in Suetonius has a proper name preserved as Satur or Saturius.¹⁹ Despite the variant readings, the word was not regarded as corrupt by the two most respected modern editors of Suetonius. Nor have modern commentators on the *Domitianus* bothered to emend the text.²⁰ In contrast to this, modern prosopographers and historians have enthusiastically taken up Friedländer's thesis, and it is repeated quite frequently, though without critical comment, in modern works.²¹ Satur or Satur(i)us is a Latin proper name found in inscriptions, usually of slaves or freedmen.²² We can adduce the following examples of the name:

- (1) T. Aelius Aug(usti) lib(ertus) Saturus (*CIL* 6.8569), a procurator
- (2) Satur (*CIL* 6.23470)
- (3) P. Calvius Satur (*CIL* 6.14288), a freedman
- (4) Q. Caulius Q(uinti) l(ibertus) Satur minor (*CIL* 6.14616)
- (5) M. Suellius M(arci) l(ibertus) Saturus (*CIL* 6.10388)
- (6) A. Servilius A(uli) l(ibertus) Saturius (*CIL* 6.26414)
- (7) C. Cassius Saturus (*CIL* 6.14522), a *libertus*.

The fact that Satur(us) or Saturius is a perfectly appropriate name for a slave or freedman in the imperial *familia* militates against any radical emendation of Suetonius. Any such proposal to emend the text implies that the word is corrupt in surviving manuscripts of *De vita Caesarum*, or, less probably, that Suetonius made an error at *Dom.* 17.2. But the burden of proof must squarely be on those who would make such a change. I do not believe that any textual emendation is necessary. Both Sigerus and Satur appear as *cognomina* of freedmen. There is no compelling reason to identify the Greek freedman of Dio with an individual who has a Latin proper name attested in inscriptions. Satur is described by Suetonius as a *decurio cubiculariorum*, and the fact that both Satur and Sigerus were chamberlains was certainly one basis for their identification. However, we should note that there were vast numbers of chamberlains in the imperial household, and dozens of *decuriones cubiculariorum*, since all *cubicularii* were organised in groups of ten headed by a

¹⁹ Ihm (n. 1), 331; H. Ailloud, *Vies des douze Césars*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1957), 97. On the manuscript tradition of Suetonius, see Reynolds (n. 7), 399–405.

²⁰ See J.C. Janssen, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani* (Diss., University of Amsterdam, 1919), 80; G.W. Mooney, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de vita Caesarum Libri VII–VIII. Galba Otho. Vitellius. Divus Vespasianus. Divus Titus. Domitianus* (London, 1930), 180; and B.W. Jones, *Suetonius: Domitian* (London, 1996).

²¹ *PIR*¹ S 157; Stein, *RE* II.A.1 (1923), col. 192, s.v. Satur; Stein, *RE* II.A.2 (1923), col. 2277, s.v. Sigerus ('[Suetonius] nennt...einen Satur...womit ohne Zweifel S[igerus] gemeint ist'); Mooney (n. 20), 590 (Mooney's text generally follows Ihm's edition [see n. 1 above] but his commentary identifies Satur with Sigerus); G.W. Houston, *Roman Imperial Administrative Personnel during the Principates of Vespasian and Titus (A.D. 69–81)* (Diss., University of North Carolina, 1971), 599; Jones (n. 20), 134; B. Levick, 'Corbulo's daughter', *G&R* 49.2 (2002), 211, n. 64; J.D. Grainger, *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis AD 96–99* (London and New York, 2003), 2 and 4; even the late Paul Weaver equates Satur with Sigerus. See his unpublished *Repertorium Familiae Caesarum, IV. Flavii Augusti Liberti*, nos. 1002 and 1012. This work was unfinished when Weaver died, but has been edited by W. Eck and made available online (http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/altg/eck/05_Flavii.pdf).

²² H. Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen* (n. 15), vol. 1, 102. See also I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Rome, 1965), 18 and 233, who notes that the name occurs frequently in Latin inscriptions from Africa.

decurion.²³ While Suetonius places Satur amongst a group of obscure assassins, Dio (67.15.1) associates his Sigerus with Parthenius and Entellus, two high officers of Domitian's court: Parthenius was the emperor's *a cubiculo*²⁴ and Entellus was an *a libellis* (a chief secretary dealing with petitions).²⁵

Domitian died in a small palace conspiracy.²⁶ Dio mentions the guilt of the senior freedmen, the emperor's wife Domitia, and the praetorian prefects, Norbanus and T. Petronius Secundus (67.15.2). Suetonius speaks of a plot by his friends, *intimate freedmen*, and his wife.²⁷ But there is no particular reason to think that the chamberlain Satur was necessarily one of Domitian's *liberti intimi*; in contrast, Dio's Sigerus very probably was, given the way he is mentioned by Martial (*Ep.* 4.78). Above all, he is listed by Dio as a principal conspirator. We should not confuse the role that each individual is assigned by the sources: one was a chief conspirator who planned the murder (Sigerus) and the other was an assassin (Satur). Suetonius in fact mentions a young boy in charge of Domitian's household gods who witnessed the murder and later testified about the killing (*Dom.* 17.2). The implication is that the obscure murderers like Satur listed at *Dom.* 17.2 were publicly named as Domitian's assassins, perhaps to hide the guilt of the powerful court ministers and the praetorian prefects.²⁸ So it appears that the court plotters against Domitian recruited others to do the actual killing.²⁹ They then placed the elderly Nerva on the throne (Dio Cass. 67.15.5; *Eutr.* 8.1). In turn, he was able to protect them until the following year when a mutiny of the praetorian guard led by the new prefect Casperius Aelianus compelled the emperor to execute Parthenius and T. Petronius Secundus, two of the chief conspirators against Domitian.³⁰ That Suetonius never mentioned the senior freedman *Sigerus* in his account of the murder is perfectly explicable: he maintains almost total silence about the identities of the *amici* and *liberti intimi* who organised Domitian's assassination, most probably to avoid drawing attention to the scandalous mutiny of 97 that effectively ended Nerva's rule and forced the adoption of Trajan.³¹

²³ See Dar.-Sag. 1.2, s.v. *cubicularius*, 1577; M. Rostowzew, *RE* 4.2 (1901), col. 1737, s.v. *a cubiculo*.

²⁴ See *PIR*¹ P 101.

²⁵ Dio Cass. 67.15.1: 'Εντελλός...ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς βιβλία διέπων. See *PIR*² E 66.

²⁶ For modern accounts of the murder, see A. Garzetti, *Nerva* (Rome, 1950), 32–5; R. Syme, 'Domitian: the last years', *Chiron* 13 (1983), 133–6; Jones (n. 20), 193–6; and Grainger (n. 21), 1–27.

²⁷ *Dom.* 14.1: *tandem oppressus est [insidiis] <...> amicorum libertorumque intimorum simul et uxoris*. See Ihm (n. 1), 328, for the textual problems, neither of which changes the sense of the sentence.

²⁸ See Syme (n. 26), 136, whose statement that 'not all of the facts [sc. became] public' is surely correct, even though another suggestion is just as plausible: the new emperor Nerva carefully *controlled* those facts that became public in order to prevent embarrassment to himself and the plotters who had put him on the throne.

²⁹ See *Dom.* 17.1 and *Epit. de Caes.* 11.11, which state that the murderer Stephanus joined the plot because he had been charged with theft.

³⁰ Dio Cass. 68.3.3; *Epit. de Caes.* 12.7–8; Plin. *Pan.* 6.1–3. On the mutiny and succession of Trajan, see A. Berriman and M. Todd, 'A very Roman coup: the hidden war of imperial succession, A.D. 96–98', *Historia* 50 (2001): 312–31; W. Eck, 'An emperor is made: senatorial politics and Trajan's adoption by Nerva in 97', in G. Clark and T. Rajak (edd.), *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World. Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin* (Oxford, 2002), 211–26; and M. T. Griffin, 'Nerva to Trajan', in A. K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, and D. Rathbone (edd.), *CAH* XI² (Cambridge, 2000), 84–131.

³¹ See Jones (n. 20), 194: '[perhaps Suetonius] comparative reticence with regard to Parthenius is to be explained as an attempt to disguise Nerva's weakness as emperor, being forced to hand Parthenius over to the praetorians'.

To conclude, no compelling reasons exist to emend Suetonius or to identify Satur with Sigerus. I would suggest that Sigerus was a senior Greek *cubicularius*, probably second to Parthenius, who, along with Entellus (the *a libellis*), and other unnamed *amici*, initiated the conspiracy against Domitian and planned the assassination. He came under the protection of Nerva until the following year when the mutiny of the praetorians punished Domitian's killers (Dio Cass. 68.3.3). Satur, on the other hand, was a lower-grade and subordinate *cubicularius*, recruited by the original conspirators to carry out the murder itself. He may well have died in the immediate aftermath of the killing, as his fellow assassin Stephanus certainly did (Dio Cass. 67.17.2). The textual, onomastic, epigraphic, and historical evidence demonstrates that Satur and Sigerus were not identical. Generations of modern scholars have uncritically accepted a quite implausible conflation of the two figures without a serious analysis of their assertions. When such an analysis *is* made, we see that the prosopographical speculation of both Dessau and Friedländer should be firmly rejected.

University of Otago

ANDREW COLLINS
colan042@student.otago.ac.nz
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000475

AN UNNOTICED ACROSTIC IN APULEIUS *METAMORPHOSES* AND CICERO *DE DIVINATIONE* 2.111–12¹

The oracle of Apollo:

‘**M**ontis in excelsi scopulo, rex, siste puellam
Ornatum mundo funerei thalami.
Nec speres generum mortali stirpe creatum,
Sed saeuum atque ferum uipereumque malum,
Quod pinnis uolitans super aethera cuncta fatigat
Flammaque et ferro singula debilitat,
Quod tremit ipse Iouis quo numina terrificantur
Fluminaque horrescunt et Stygiae tenebrae.’ 5

(*Met.* 4.33)

The text is Professor Kenney's, the emphasis ours.² The acrostic is a slight variant of the type called 'gamma-acrostic' by Gareth Morgan, who cites Aratus, *Phaenomena* 783–7 as the best known example, where the first word of 783, λεπτῆς, is also spelled out by the initial letters of lines 783–7.³

¹ A version of this work was presented at the 'Works In Progress' colloquium, Department of Classics and Mediterranean Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago, May 2005.

² E.J. Kenney (ed.), *Apuleius: Cupid & Psyche* (Cambridge, 1990). We also abandon the conventional indentation of the pentameter, a convention which might well have contributed to this acrostic's going unnoticed.

³ G. Morgan, 'Nullam, Vare...Chance or choice in *Odes* 1.18?', *Philologus* 137 (1993), 142–5. The reader is also referred to D.P. Fowler, 'An acrostic in Vergil (*Aeneid* 7.601–4)', *CQ* 33 (1983), 29, and E. Courtney, 'Greek and Latin acrostichs', *Philologus* 134 (1990), 3–13 and their bibliographies.