than that of Cacus, Valerius' longer description contains dismal and lurid additions, especially the (dark) trees with their funereal connection in 178 and 184; the noise and vibration in 180; the severed arms with the gloves still on them in 181–2; the foul bones in 183; and the smashing in of the faces at 184–5.

Another obvious model is Ovid's version of Cacus' abode at *Fasti* 1.555–8.

> proque domo longis spelunca recessibus ingens,
> abdita, vix ipsis invenienda feris.
> ora super postes adfixaque bracchia pendent,
> squalidaque humanis ossibus albet humus.

In common with Valerius are *domo, spelunca…ingens*, affixed heads and *bracchia* at the entrance, and *ossibus*.[20] Again our poet's ecphrasis is lengthier and has sensational extras – in particular the trees and menacing overhang (178, 184); the din and trembling in 180; the specification of the brutal method of mutilation and the grisly touch of the gauntlets still on the arms at 181–2; the decay in 183; and the obliteration of the faces at 184–5.[21]

There is also foreshadowing in Valerius' references to Cacus (reinforcing the intimation of defeat by a superior stranger in the allusion to Polyphemus). Like Cacus, Amycus will behave in an uncivilised fashion and get his come-uppance at his cave, defeated and killed in a ferocious combat by a son of Jupiter who is travelling through on a mission. And there is further ingenuity and complexity. Ovid with his description was capping Virgil.[22] Here Valerius caps Virgil too, and also caps Ovid himself, and Apollonius and Homer at the same time. This is to out-Ovid Ovid.

McMaster University P. MURGATROYD
murgatro@mcmaster.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000451

[20] Korn (n. 18) and Campanini (n. 17) ad loc. have also noticed several of these similarities.

[21] I suspect that the absence of *ignis* from Amycus' cave in 179 sports with the fact that it is like Cacus' cavern but does not actually contain that fire-breathing son of Vulcan (so the connection with Neptune instead is brought out in the next line).

[22] See P. Murgatroyd, *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti (Leiden, 2005), 107ff.

MARTIAL'S DANDY BOOK

Martial, *Epigr*. 3. 2 is set out in edition after edition as follows:

> Cuius uis fieri, libelle, munus?
> Festina tibi uindicem parare,
> ne nigram cito raptus in culinam
> cordylas madida tegas papyro
> uel turis piperisue sis cucullus.
> Faustini fugis in sinum? sapisti.
> Cedro nunc licet ambules perunctus
> et frontis gemino decens honore
> pictis luxurieris umbilicis,
> et te purpura delicata uelet,
> et cocco rubeat superbus index.
> illo uindice nec Probum timeto.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000463 Published online by Cambridge University Press

With this punctuation, *licet* in line 7 is a main verb: 'Now you may walk', writes Shackleton Bailey, and other translators give 'kannst du', 'tu peux', 'puedes' and 'puoi'. That is to say, Martial's book may appear in a de luxe edition, and also outface the criticism of M. Valerius Probus,[1] acerbic as his tongue was and little as he may have loved current poetry.[2] In themselves, these two ideas are unobjectionable; but it should not take a Probus to observe that there is no connection between them, either in logic – for if so ferocious a critic does not like Martial's epigrams, he will like them no better cheap than dear – or in the structure of the poem, in which line 12, on this interpretation, is an asyndetic bolt from the blue, neither prepared for in advance nor integrated by retrospective understanding. Coherence would require line 12 to follow line 6: under Faustinus' patronage, the book will be such a success, let Probus say what he will, that an expensive edition will prove economic. But that would ruin the poem, bereft of its punchline; we must have missed Martial's point.

The clue lies in *ambules*: books do not walk, people do. Martial's *liber*, being masculine, is imagined to be a man. But what manner of man is *perunctus*; what manner of man *luxuriatur*; what manner of man is veiled by delicate purple? The answer to these questions is not difficult; it is the effeminate dandy – or the male prostitute to whom, as readers will remember, Horace likens his first book of epistles.[3] Disapprobation might be expected from fussy persons; one such was Probus, who not only emended away the description of marital intercourse at Virg. *Aen.* 8.406 and the uncoupling of eloquence and wisdom at Sall. *Cat*. 5. 4,[4] but objected to a comic matron's familiarity at Ter. *Phorm*. 1005.[5] If any contemporary might turn up his nose at titivation all too appropriate for the *improba* that Martial's book contained, it was surely he;[6] but Faustinus' patronage will draw his sting.

Licet is not a main verb, but a conjunction: 'even if you stroll about perfumed with cedar oil …, not even Probus can do you any harm now you have Faustinus as your protector.'[7] Let the dandy book offer never so much provocation, it has nothing to

[1] Both themes are discussed at length by Alessandro Fusi in his edition (Hildesheim, 2006), 113–28.

[2] For Probus' tongue, see Gell. 13.21.9; his poetical tastes were archaic and classical (see R.A. Kaster, *Suetonius De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* [Oxford, 1995], 256–9), sufficiently anticipating those of the Hadrianic and Antonine eras to suggest that he shared their distaste for the Silver authors, all the more so given their low esteem for his favoured *antiqui*. If (as an anonymous reader reminds me) Gallus could fear or affect to fear Viscus, Martial might well propose to take precautions against the pedant who so captiously criticised Virgil's imitation of the Nausicaa simile (see Gell. 9.9.12–17), even if he had no more inward respect for his judgement than creative writers generally have for critics.

[3] *Epist*. 1. 20; see E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 356–9. Martial's *decens honore* (l. 8), at once undercut by *pictis luxurieris umbilicis*, must as Kathleen Coleman suggests (pers. comm.) be taken as ironical.

[4] Reading respectively *infusum* for *infusus* (Servius + DS ad loc.) and *loquentiae* for *eloquentiae* (Gell. 1.15.18).

[5] See Donatus' rebuttal.

[6] The anonymous reader objects that Probus' intervention in Virgil reveals a concern rather for literary than for ethical *decorum*; given not granted that the distinction can be sharply drawn, it is harder so to classify the other two. Furthermore, it is no part of my case that the real-life Probus lived down to Martial's professed expectation.

[7] As Sven Lorenz (pers. comm.) notes, one would not put it past Martial to intend a hidden sense: 'you need not fear the attentions even of Probus, who despite his name (and his show of prudery) has the morals of his profession'; but that depends on a contemporary reputation that we do not know. On *sprechende* (and *lügende*) *Namen* in Martial see K.M. Coleman, *PACA* 14 (1978), 9–10; cf. S. Lorenz, *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser* (Tübingen, 2002), 93, n. 178; id., *AJPh* 125 (2004), 238, n. 36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000463 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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-STREVENS
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[ius] 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* 4[7] [trans. L.A. Magnus; New York, 1979], 350) states '[also] in Sueton., *Domit*., c.17 read Sigerus for Saturius'.

[3] *PIR*[1] S 500: '*Σιγηρός 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000463 Published online by Cambridge University Press