3) Valerius Flaccus (diss., 1934), 67, maintained that ‘er am Anfang nicht genau hätte sagen können, wo er am Ende sein würde.’
4) Venini claims that Valerius’ poem exhibits ‘un’ unita di tipo postclassico che ... comporta anche sbalzi, frammentarietà e disuguaglianze’, art. cit., 620. She sums up his style as ‘lambiccato e immaginoso, risente della nuova poetica barocca’, BStudLat 2 (1972), 10.
5) Die Buchzahl der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus, Philologus 103 (1959), 297 ff. Schetter is supported by Elfrieda Frank, CB 43 (1967), 38 f., who points out correspondences between the first and second halves of the poem. Adamietz, op. cit., 111 ff., suggests how Valerius could have brought the poem to a close in the latter part of Book 8.
7) Ibid.
8) E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II (1982), 10. While number and pattern have certainly become an overworked deus ex machina in recent classical scholarship, the evidence for mathematical considerations in Vergil is too overwhelming to be dismissed.
9) Latin Prose Prefaces (1964), 104, cites as examples Lucan, Statius, Germanicus and Manilius.
10) A. Grüneberg, De Valerio Flacco Imitatore (1893), e.g. 48 ff.
11) Studio su Valerio Flacco (1955), 85 ff.
14) The identity of the addressee is till a vexed question, linked with the debate concerning the date of composition of the proem. For a convenient summary of the arguments, see M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism I (1976), 502 f.
15) I.e. 6 × 7, as Brown remarks, explaining the implications of these figures, op. cit., 19 fn. 1.
16) Brown, op. cit., 93, observes that while this isolated example may be coincidental, Apollonius begins Orpheus’ incantatory song at 1. 496, ‘perhaps the only perfect (by definition) number known, at the time, beside 6 and 28.’

MARTIAL, DE SPECTACULIS 8:
GLADIATOR OR CRIMINAL?

Daedale, Lucano cum sic lacereris ab ursu,
quam cupieres pinnas nunc habuisse tuas!

Two plausible suggestions have been put forward regarding this puzzling identification with Daedalus in Martial, De Spectaculis 8, which have gone beyond the usual assumption that the epigram merely points to another aberration of myth presented as spectacle in the Flavian amphitheatre’). W. O. Moeller has concluded, largely from the reference to pinnas, a term sometimes associated with gladiators, that the Daedalus here was a former gladiator turned bestiarius who had taken a stage name

U. Carratello is of the opinion that Daedalus was a punished criminal "trained to undergo real torment and death". This latter solution is patterned after arguments of U. Paoli for other, definitely known, trained criminals in Martial such as the Scaevola who in 1.21, 8.30, and 10.25 burns off his own hand; in this latter attempt at identification, however, neither Carratello nor Paoli has offered any concrete evidence to support the conclusion that Daedalus was a criminal. Because either of these two solutions to this little mystery is possible, it is naturally desirable that one of them be verified. I propose therefore to present and examine the evidence within the De Spectaculis itself, something that has yet to be done, to determine whether Daedalus was a bestiarius or a criminal.

The position of the poem serves as the most valuable clue to the realities contained within it, for the preceding epigram, which contains a wealth of specific information, reveals several distinct parallels to the Daedalus-epigram. In 7 "Laureolus" is crucified and mangled by a bear; he also is spoken of in terms of a mythological figure (7.1-4):

```
qualiter in Scythica religatus rupe Prometheus
adsiduam nimio pectore pavit avem,
nuda Caledonio sic viscera praebuit urso
non falsa pendens in cruce Laureolus.
```

The victim's stage name refers to the eponymous character in a mime of Catullus performed during the reign of Caligula which depicted the crucifixion of a leader of a robbers' band. Later in the poem (7.8-10) Martial enumerates the possible crimes of "Laureolus", all of which, like those of Prometheus, were in fact crimes against authority, causing the poet to declare that the present victim vicerat antiquae sceleratus crimina famae (7.11). Martial thereby concludes that the fabled punishment of the mythical Prometheus has become a reality for the Laureolus who is his modern counterpart. However, the audience knows that in truth the punishment of the man in the arena is far more severe than that found in mythology, for "Laureolus", both in fiction and in present fact, never escapes but Prometheus was eventually released.

The Prometheus-epigram clearly has a great deal in common with the Daedalus-epigram: both refer to a mythological character guilty of a crime against authority and both contrast antiqua fama with modern reality. Although in the myths both Prometheus and Daedalus eventually succeed in escaping their plights, their namesakes do not. Both epigrams not only describe the laceration of the victims by a bear, contrary to the myths, but these are the only two poems in De Spectaculis that specify the geographical origin of the bears. We know from Martial's account that the modern Prometheus was a criminal condemned to die; the parallels within 7 and 8, coupled with the latter's position immediately after the Prometheus-epigram, logically impel us to the conclusion that Daedalus was a criminal.