was still alive, that polygamy was forbidden to Roman citizens. The same objection applies to a polygamous Ptolemy.

Settipani[23] points out that the name Thea Urania (=Astarte) was royal, being held by a wife of Phraates IV of Parthia. He notes a certain Uranius Antoninus, an Emesan high priest of Astarte and usurper of the mid-third century. He suggests that the name is in origin Emesan, and that Julia Urania was connected to the Emesan royal house; it may be noted that this dynasty also adopted the Julian *gentilicium*. On this theory, Urania is called 'queen' because that was her actual status. In theory, she could be a wife either of Juba II, very late in his life, or of Ptolemy. Of the two, Ptolemy seems more likely. We may suggest that Urania was Drusilla's mother.

While Ptolemy could have been in his late fifties in Caligula's reign, he is more likely to have been in his forties. In either case, he could easily have had a daughter at this time. Since he was close to the imperial court, it is quite likely that he would name such a daughter Drusilla. After his execution, his orphan daughter may well have been raised in Claudius' household, just as Selene had been raised by Octavia.

San Diego CHRIS BENNETT
cjbennett@sbcglobal.net

[23] Settipani (n. 16), 438–9, n. 11.

THE EXECUTION OF L. SALVIUS OTHO COCCEIANUS

By the time Martial published his sixth book of epigrams, the poetic treatment of noble or notable deaths from Roman history was an established theme in his work. Virtuous suicides were treated early on in the corpus: the self-inflicted death of Arria, wife of A. Caecina Paetus, was celebrated (1.13); so too that of Porcia, daughter of Cato Uticensis and wife of Brutus (1.42). In the second book, the theme was continued with the suicide of a certain Fannius (2.80).[1] To these examples the cognate topic of the unmerited deaths of historical figures may be added: Antony's murder of Cicero (treated twice: 3.66, 5.69), and the deaths of Pompey's sons (5.74).

For this reason, when the poet turns in Book 6 to the noble suicide of Otho, the ephemeral emperor of the year 69, the thematic context of the epigram is well established:

> Cum dubitaret adhuc belli ciuilis Enyo
> forsitan et posset uincere mollis Otho,
> damnauit multo staturum sanguine Martem
> et fodit certa pectora tota manu.
> Sit Cato, dum uiuit, sane uel Caesare maior:
> dum moritur, numquid maior Othone fuit? (6.32)

These are curious sentiments for a court poet to express under Domitian. Otho, the sources record, was survived by a nephew (the son of his brother L. Salvius Titianus Otho) who, *prima iuuenta* in the long year 69 (Tac. *Hist*. 2.48), lived to hold the consulship under the Flavian emperors, in *c.* 80.[2] L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus (PIR[1] S

[1] Probably not Fannius Caepio, notes F. Grewing, *Martial, Buch VI: Ein Kommentar* (Munich, 1997), 234, from where this catalogue is drawn, though we have omitted 1.21 from the present discussion because of the absence of a death in the Scaevola episode.

[2] R. Syme, 'The Ummidii', *Historia* 17 (1968), 81; G. W. Houston, 'Roman imperial adminis-

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

110) next appears in Suetonius' list of Domitian's consular victims. The biographer records that he was executed for celebrating his uncle's birthday (*quod Othonis imperatoris patrui sui diem natalem celebrauerat*: Suet. *Dom*. 10.3). When was his undoing?

The evidence surrounding Domitian's execution of the twelve consular victims on record is often scant, but it clearly reveals two separate periods of twelve to twenty-four months in which the vast majority (perhaps all) of the killings took place. It will be instructive to assemble this list and cite the evidence in brief.

Domitian's absence from Rome for large parts of 81–6, along with his generous distribution of iterated and suffect consulships contributed to a period of concord between senate and emperor in the early 80s.[3] However, on 22 September 87, an inscription records that the Arval Brothers gave sacrifice *ob detecta scelera nefariorum* (*CIL* 6.2065). A conspiracy against the emperor is the inference: the year 87 inaugurates the first of our two 'clusters' of senatorial executions.

T. Flavius Sabinus (PIR^2 F 355), cos 82, was probably executed in 87. The circumstances of the transgression, a herald announcing him as *imperator* instead of *consul* (Suet. *Dom*. 10.4), require his designation to a second consulship if we are to take the punishment to follow closely upon the crime.[4] Otherwise, we may assume his death in or just after 81.[5]

The death of M. Arrecinus Clemens (PIR^2 A 1072), cos II.85 (*AE* 1975, 71), has been placed in 87. He was *praefectus urbi* (*AE* 1947, 40) after his second consulship. But nothing indicates his survival after September 87.[6] Some have suggested exile instead of execution.[7]

C. Vettulenus Civica Cerealis (PIR^1 V 352) was killed while proconsul of Asia in 87/8 on a charge of *maiestas* (Tac. *Agr*. 42).[8] It has been speculated that the cause of the charge may have been an inappropriate or ineffectual response to the emergence of a 'false Nero' in Asia, *c.* 88.[9]

Two consular senators are recorded as perishing soon after Agricola's death, 23 August 93, as part of what has been called the 'philosophic opposition' to Domitian. This period marks the beginning of the second of the two periods of consular executions. Q. Iunius Arulenus Rusticus (PIR^2 J 730) was killed for his laudations of Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus (Suet. *Dom*. 10.3). The Younger Helvidius (PIR^2 H 60) died for his farce, which lampooned Domitian's separation from his wife (Suet. *Dom*. 10.3). Amid these trials, the quaestor Herrenius Senecio was also put to death (Tac. *Agr*. 2.1; Plin. *Ep*. 7.19.5; Dio 67.13.12).

M'. Acilius Glabrio (PIR^2 A 67) was exiled, then killed in 95, *quasi molitor rerum nouarum* (Suet. *Dom*. 10.2; Dio 67.14.3).

Sallustius Lucullus (PIR^1 S 63), governor of Britain between 85 and 96, was most likely executed in the period after Agricola's death, when Tacitus records Domitian

trative personnel during the principates of Vespasian and Titus (A.D. 69–81)', dissertation (Chapel Hill, 1971), 487, no. 442.

[3] W. Eck, 'Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu Konsuln und Senatoren des 1.–3. Jh. N. Chr.', *ZPE* 37 (1980), 55; R. Syme, *Roman Papers* (Oxford, 1977–91), 7.560.

[4] Syme (n. 3), 7.560.

[5] So B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian* (London, 1992), 46.

[6] Syme (n. 3), 5.613–5, 7.560.

[7] B. W. Jones and R. Develin, 'M. Arrecinus Clemens', *Antichthon* 10 (1976), 83.

[8] W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Munich, 1970), 86.

[9] Jones (n. 5), 183.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

executing senators (*Agr*. 45.1). The year 89 has also been suggested, but Suetonius would surely have noted a connection to Saturninus' revolt had there been one. Troop transfers from Britain to the Danube in the 90s may provide circumstantial evidence for the later of the two dates proposed.[10]

T. Flavius Clemens (PIR^2 F 240) was executed on a charge of 'atheism' after 1 May in the year 95 (Dio 67.4.1–2; Suet. *Dom*. 15.1).[11]

The death of Mettius Pompusianus (PIR^2 M 570), hitherto without a more precise date, may reasonably be placed in the mid 90s if his kinsmen are, as it seems, M. Mettius Modestus (PIR^2 M 565), suff. cos 82, who was exiled at this time (Plin. *Ep*. 1.5.5, 13), and M. Mettius Rufus (PIR^2 M 572), Prefect of Egypt until at least 91/2, whose name was erased from a number of papyri in this same period.[12] Pompusianus was put to death for three reasons, according to Suetonius (*Dom*. 10.3): for his reputed 'imperial nativity' (*quod habere imperatoriam genesim uulgo ferebatur*); because he was reported to have carried on his person a map of the world and some orations by kings drawn from Livy; and because he had given two of his slaves the names 'Mago' and 'Hannibal'.

Ser. Cornelius Scipio Salvidienus Orfitus (PIR^2 C 1445) was put to death in exile for plotting revolution (Suet. *Dom*. 10.2). Philostratus (*VA* 7.8) reports that, along with Verginius Rufus and Nerva, he was considered a suitable candidate for the purple: a reputation that would place him in extreme danger during sensitive periods such as the mid-90s.[13]

L. Aelius Lamia Plautius Aelianus (PIR^2 A 205) was killed for *ueteres et innoxios iocos* (Suet. *Dom*. 10.2), the occasion for which goes back to the year 70 (Dio 66.3.4). These witticisms could have been revived and used against Aelius during periods such as 87 or 93.[14]

Until now, no period has been consigned or conjectured for the execution of Cocceianus. However, the epigram for Otho's suicide may be enlisted here to provide a more accurate dating for his nephew's end and that of the *gens Saluia*.

Grewing's 1997 commentary re-examined the evidence for the publication date of Book 6.[15] Martial's treatment of Domitian's Dacian triumph of November 89 and Julia's death towards the end of that same year prompted him to revise Sullivan's proposal of late 91, and to reaffirm Friedländer's original contribution of summer or autumn 90.[16] The *terminus post quem* established by the evidence is beyond question, but Grewing's dating does suggest an uncharacteristically long break before Book 7's publication in December 92. Now, Citroni has demonstrated that up to seven of the books were released to coincide with the festival of the Saturnalia (4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, and possibly 10);[17] and Coleman—drawing upon this demonstration as well as the motif of marriage legislation and criticism of adultery present throughout Book 6—

[10] A. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1981), 82–3.
[11] L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostiensis* (Prague, 1982), 45.
[12] B. W. Jones, *Suetonius: Vespasian* (Bristol, 2000), 87.
[13] Jones (n. 5), 184. [14] Ibid., 184–5.
[15] Grewing (n. 1), 20–3.
[16] Dacian triumph: S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien* (Paris, 1894), 198–200. Julia's death: M. P. Vinson, 'Domitia Longina, Julia Titi, and the literary tradition', *Historia* 38 (1989), 431–50. Sullivan's date: J. P. Sullivan, *Martial: The Unexpected Classic* (Cambridge, 1991), 37.
[17] M. Citroni, 'Marziale e la letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell' intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri)', *ICS* 14 (1989), 201–26.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has posited the suggestion that Martial published this book to coincide with the festival of the Matronalia. That is, March 91.[18]

Martial was no fool: it would have been unthinkable for the court poet to praise Otho in this way if Cocceianus were already dead. That would too easily and obviously be construed as a censure of Domitian's execution of the ex-consul. Safe criticism required greater subtlety than this. The obvious conclusion is that Cocceianus had not yet been killed in March 91. This interpretation provides a valuable time-frame in which to place his execution. Five years and six months elapsed between the publication of Book 6 and Domitian's assassination on 18 September 96. This certainly constitutes a broad stroke but, while it is perfectly possible that Cocceianus was killed as a result of an isolated treason trial between March 91 and August 93, we can refine this dating with some caution but limited peril. Of the second 'cluster' of executions, beginning just after August 93, we may assume that a serious threat to Domitian's security—real or perceived—initiated a backlash, which was followed by a period marked by strained relations with some parts of the senate and heightened suspicion on the part of the emperor.

Cocceianus' crime was not one that would normally draw such a brutal response during periods of relative stability between senate and emperor. Moreover, we do not know if punishment followed his error immediately, or if Cocceianus was accused of an older (or invented) transgression. However, it would be reasonable to assume that more urgent threats and charges of greater substance were dealt with in or after August 93, and that Otho's nephew fell victim to an informer between that date and September 96. It was, after all, a period when we have seen that older and ostensibly more trivial charges were being revived for use against senators such as Aelius Lamia and Mettius Pompusianus.

Of course, Cocceianus real crime was his blood-relation to a former emperor. The sheer brevity of Otho's principate may have rendered his connection to the purple harmless enough under Vespasian and Titus: his progress to the consulship attests to his innocuity. However, during the mid-90s, when the relationship between Domitian and parts of the senate had become strained, Cocceianus' tenuous imperial heritage was evidently enough to draw attention and displeasure. The execution of any consular senator, let alone the last of a patrician family and one as well connected as Cocceianus seems to have been, is an event of the highest significance for our understanding of relations between senate and emperor in any period of the imperial age. With the evidence provided in Martial's sixth book of epigrams, we are now in a position to reconcile Cocceianus' fate with the political activity of Domitian's last years.

University of Otago P. A. ROCHE
p.a.roche@xtra.co.nz

[18] K. M. Coleman, *Gnomon* 74 (2002), 320.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press