

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, λεπτῆρ, 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.

A parody not in Greek hexameters but Latin elegiacs,⁴ this oracle may still shed light on a problematic passage in Cicero *de Divinatione* on the nature of acrostics:

non esse autem illud carmen furentis cum ipsum poema declarat (est enim magis artis et diligentiae quam incitationis et motus), tum vero ea, quae ἀχροστιχίς dicitur, cum deinceps ex primis versus litteris aliquid conecitur, ut in quibusdam Ennianis; Q. Ennius fecit. id certe magis est attentī animi quam furentis. (*Div.* 2.111.)⁵

acrostichis (acrosth- **AV**, -cis **P**) *codd.* || primis (ex -mi) versus **V** primi versus **A B F M P** primis versuum *codd. dett. apud Moserum, ita conī. Auratus* primis cuiusque versus *Christ* primis primi cuiusque versus *Müller* || Ennianis] epigrammatis *Rath* | *Q. Auratus* quae *codd., ut glossam del. Manutius* ||

The reading *primi versus ABFMP* suggests that *all* the letters of the first line form the acrostic. This is surely unthinkable; *primis versus* should be retained.⁶ Cicero then turns to the oracles:

atque in Sibyllinis ex primo versu cuiusque sententiae primis litteris [illius sententiae] carmen omne praetextitur. (*Div.* 2.111–12.)

atque] aeque *Gruter* || sententia **B** | illius sententiae *prava repetitio atque interpretatio praeced. loci* cuiusque sententiae *videntur, idcirco delenda putamus cod.* **P** *fide, qui* primis litteris illius sententiae *om.* ex primis versuum cuiusque sententiae litteris *Auratus praeunte libro Puteaneo* ex primis cuiusque versus litteris *Lambinus* || pertextitur *Davies*

There are, it seems, two forms of acrostic: the signature (e.g. Q. Ennius fecit) and the gamma-acrostic. Surely Cicero means the latter:

And in the Sibyllines, starting from the first line of each oracle, the whole poem is bordered by the first letters of that oracle. (*Div.* 2.112).⁷

Our oracle is, of course, a special case. As Apuleius himself notes, *Sed Apollo, quanquam Graecus et Ionicus, propter Milesiae conditorem sic Latina sorte respondit* (*Met.* 4.32). This is an extraordinary accommodation, rendering the acrostic a crucial guarantee of authenticity! Some still may be dissatisfied: Cicero does say *carmen omne*. Our colleagues M.C. Alexander and A.P. MacGregor suggest that the repetition of the initials *Q. F.* at the beginning of the remaining four lines of the oracle (5–8) might not be insignificant. If this is so, the oracle does not fall completely short of Cicero's definition.⁸

University of Illinois at Chicago

JEFFREY GORE

ALLAN KERSHAW

kershaw@uic.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838808000487

⁴ In his Penguin translation *Apuleius: The Golden Ass* (London, 1998), at 234 Kenney notes that there are two oracles in elegiacs in Heliodorus' *Ethiopica*. In neither of these is there an acrostic.

⁵ R. Giomini (ed.), *De Divinatione, De Fato, Timaeus* (Leipzig, 1975).

⁶ The best discussion is in A.S. Pease (ed. and comm.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione* (Urbana, 1920), ad locc. We are very grateful to J.T. Ramsey for his helpful discussion of this passage.

⁷ There is no need, we think, to seclude *illius sententiae* with Giomini, who is followed by C. Schäublin in his edition (Munich and Zurich, 1991).

⁸ That the author of *De Mundo* (Apuleius?) was familiar with *De Divinatione* is noted by S. Müller, *Das Verhältnis von Apuleius De Mundo zu seiner Vorlage* (Leipzig, 1939), 144–50 and by M.G. Bajoni, 'Aspetti linguistici e letterari del 'De Mundo' di Apuleio', *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994), 1785–1832. We thank *CQ*'s anonymous reader for this information.