

19. 7; 19. 11. 3–4). We remember too that Marcus Aurelius wrote some hexameters when he was studying under Fronto (Fronto *Ad M. Caes.* 1. 9. 4 Van den Hout). We do not, it is true, know of any *epyllion* like the *Ciris* being composed in this period, but it is reasonable to suppose that mythological narrative retained its attractions for young men still under the influence of their literary studies. In the fourth century when St. Augustine retired with his friends to Cassiciacum, one of the young men of the party was writing a poem on Pyramus and Thisbe (Aug. *De ord.* 1. 3. 8).

The Messalla who is the recipient of the

poem is addressed as *iuvenum doctissime* (36) and, if his name is correctly restored in the defective line 12, as of distinguished family. L. Valerius Messalla Thrasea Priscus, consul in 196, “second to none in lineage and intelligence” (Dio Cass. 78. 5. 5), would have been born too late to be addressed as *iuvenis* in the year 139, but a member of the same family of a generation earlier could well have been the addressee.

M. L. CLARKE

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES  
BANGOR

### GLABRIO, *ARCHON* OF ASIA\*

In Aelius Aristides' Fourth Sacred Discourse (50 Keil), the orator names a number of Roman officials with whom he dealt on the question of his immunity from a series of local offices and priesthoods. Two passages have been traditionally combined to indicate that a certain Glabrio ἤρχεν, i.e., was proconsul:<sup>1</sup> section 100 states that ὁ σοφιστής, οὗ μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην, ἤρχεν, which is assumed to look back to section 97, καὶ πάλιν ἦσαν ὑποσχέσεις, ὡς Γλαβρίωνος τοῦ πάνυ συγκαταστήσαντος τὸ πᾶν. ὁ δ' ἔτυχεν, οἶμαι, τότε ἐπιδημῶν.

There is thus a *prima facie* case for including

a Glabrio in the proconsular *fasti* of Asia; but further identification of this Glabrio proves difficult. The *cognomen* is employed in the second century only, it appears, by the Acilii (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 59–73), a family which produces consuls in A.D. 124 and 152.<sup>2</sup>

But on independent grounds, the incidents recounted in sections 94–104 of the Discourse can be shown to have occurred toward the end of the decade 140–50.<sup>3</sup> Since appointments to the proconsulate of Asia appear not to vary greatly from a fifteen-year interval after the consulate in firmly attested cases during this period,<sup>4</sup> both men are excluded from a

\* The following works are referred to in the notes by the author's name only: Behr = C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam, 1968); Boulanger = A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère* (Paris, 1923); Bowersock = G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); Festugière = A. J. Festugière, “Sur les Discours sacrés d'Aelius Aristide,” *REG*, LXXXII (1969), 117–53.

1. The identification of the two passages was made by W. H. Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques de l'empire romain* (Paris, 1872), No. 140; it is accepted by Keil (p. 450, n. on line 6), and by Boulanger, p. 486.

2. E. Groag, *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, vol. I, p. 13, insists on this restriction of the *cognomen*. His view is borne out by the “G” volume of *PIR*<sup>2</sup> (vol. IV.1, p. 33); by *RE*, I (1894), 254 and VII (1910), 1372; by A. Degraffi, *I fasti consolari dell'Impero Romano* (Rome, 1952); by P. Lambrechts, *La Composition du sénat romain de l'accession au trône d'Hadrien à la mort de Commode* (Antwerp, 1936); and by G. Barbieri, *L'Albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino* (Rome, 1952). In none of these is Glabrio associated with any other family.

3. Dates in the *Sacred Discourses* rest on the details of Aristides' horoscope, analyzed by Behr, p. 1, n. 2, and more recently in *AJP*, XC (1969), 75–77. The date January 118 is corrected in the later article to November 117; this accords

closely with Boulanger's date of December 117 (p. 468). The *subscriptio* to *Or.* 37 states that that speech was given when Aristides was thirty-five years and one month old (p. 312K) under one Severus; if this Severus is the official named in *Sacred Discourses* 4. 71, the proconsular year involved is 152–53. Hence Pollio, who precedes Severus, is placed in 151–52. As 150–51 and 149–50 are firmly assigned to Mummius Sisenna and Popilius Priscus on epigraphical grounds (*IBM* 493, *JG* XII.3. 325), Glabrio's tenure of office should be in 148–49. These dates may be adjusted by a year or so, but are in general confirmed by other evidence. Severus, from Upper Phrygia, should be the consul of ca. 138 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 573), and hence proconsul in the early 150's on the pattern observed in n. 4. Similar evidence tells us that a Macrinus was proconsul in Aristides' fifty-third year (*Or.* 22, *subscriptio*, p. 31K), hence in 170–71; this fits the known career of M. Nonius Macrinus (*PIR*<sup>1</sup> N 108).

4. Firm cases are:

Pompeius Falco cos. 108 *procos.* 123–24 *RE*, XXI.2 (1952), 2270

Alexander Berenicianus cos. 116 *procos.* 132–33 *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 141

Venuleius Apronianus cos. 123 *procos.* 138–39 *RE*, 2<sup>o</sup> Reihe, VIII.1 (1955), 821

Mummius Sisenna cos. 133 *procos.* 150–51 *RE*, XVI.1 (1933), 528

proconsulate in the late 140's. Besides, it is highly likely that both held proconsulates in Africa.<sup>5</sup>

With whom should Aristides' Glabrio then be identified? The *cursum* of the younger man, provided by *ILS* 1072, includes a position as *legatus* (sc. *proconsulis*) *Asiae* immediately prior to the consulate. Since this position would therefore be held shortly before 152, that is, in a year consistent with the chronology in Aristides, Groag suggested that it was to this Glabrio as legate that Aristides alluded, asserting "neque negandum est uocabulum ἄρχων etiam de legato proconsulis usurpari posse."<sup>6</sup>

The elegance of this as a prosopographical solution is undeniable, and it has persuaded some eminent authorities.<sup>7</sup> But it does not suit Aristides' narrative very well; the logic of his account would appear to require a proconsul in the events of sections 100–104 no less than in other stages of the immunity dispute.

More important, is the underlying linguistic premise correct? ἄρχων is employed by Aristides for other proconsuls whose status has never been questioned, and conversely, two *legati* are described with the traditional term *πρεσβευτής*, in one case with a brief account of his duties.<sup>8</sup>

In the official language of government, ἄρχων translates *magistratus*, as in the bilingual *IG* XIV. 951, and it refers primarily to an official acting under his own auspices.<sup>9</sup> In literary sources comparable to Aristides, the verb may be applied to a number of *praesides provinciarum*, but always with the implication that they are officials in effective control of

their jurisdiction.<sup>10</sup> An apparent exception in Dio Cassius (60. 33. 6), where the verb ἄρχω is applied to Iunius Chilo, procurator of Bithynia, in fact confirms the usage; Chilo, who minted coins in his own right, was probably acting governor in his province.<sup>11</sup>

Groag's hypothesis, that ἄρχω may be applied to a *legatus proconsulis*, must therefore be rejected. Another solution to the problem of Glabrio, emendation, has been proposed by Behr.<sup>12</sup> Glabrio is removed altogether from the proconsular *fasti* of Asia by means of two substantial alterations to the text, the replacement in section 100 of ὁ σοφιστής by ὁ Φῆστος (who is then equated with the honorand of *CIL* II. 6084<sup>13</sup>) and the substitution in section 97 of <ἐδηλώθη ὡς ἀφίει ἡμᾶς ὁ Φῆστος ὁ> πρὶν ἡγεμῶν for περὶ ἡμῶν, which Behr finds difficult to interpret.

The correction of ὁ σοφιστής rests on the assumption that "sophist" is uniformly a pejorative term in Aristides, an assumption judged by Festugière in a major review to be "radicalement faux."<sup>14</sup> Behr's interpretation of Aristides' use of a common word requires substantial discussion, and more documentation than he provides. Aristides, if he did use "sophist" purely pejoratively, was in Behr's own words "in perverse disregard" of contemporary usage. How often can Aristides' expressions be shown to be in violent disagreement with the language, not of contemporary speech as reflected in inscriptions and papyri, but of the literary texts of such authors as Dio Chrysostom and Philostratus, who share the same rhetorical and intellectual traditions?<sup>15</sup>

5. R. Syme, *REA*, LXVII (1965), 345.

6. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 73 fin. (vol. I, p. 13).

7. E.g., D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), p. 1587; W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius*, I (Prague, 1936), 361 (reversing an earlier opinion in II [Prague, 1933], 49); and tentatively, Bowersock, p. 37.

8. Proconsuls: 49. 38K (Albus), 50. 71 (Severus), 50. 94 (Pollio). Legates: 50. 86 (of Severus, with explanation), 50. 96 (of Pollio).

9. Cf. Gellius 13. 15. 4, and Dio's distinction in 36. 36. 3 between ἀρχοντες and ὑπάρχοντες.

10. The uses of ἀρχω are discussed at greater length by the author in a monograph, *The Terminology of Roman Government in Greek Sources*, to be published by the American Society of Papyrologists. Examples of ἀρχων for *praesides provinciarum* include, e.g., proconsuls of Achaia (Philostr. *VA* 4. 33), *legati Caesaris* in Syria (Lucian *Pereg.* 12), and equestrian governors of Egypt (Lucian *Apol.* 12) and Mauretania (Dio 60.9. 5).

11. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 744; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres*, I (Paris, 1960), 52; F. Millar, *Historia*, XIII (1964), 180–87.

12. Pp. 65, n. 17; 106, n. 39; 275, n. 70.

13. The equation rests on extensive restoration of that inscription, and is thus hypothetical even if *Festus* is accepted as a reading. Behr goes too far in entering the full name in his list of proconsuls, p. 134.

14. P. 148.

15. The writer's view of both *archon* and *sophistes* rests on the assumption that where simple common words have clear accepted meanings, variation from such general usage by a given author is a conscious, motivated decision. If variation is not justified by the author himself, a commentator who would assign such variation to him must be prepared to provide not only examples, but some indication of the author's reasons.

The substantial alteration of the text in section 97 rests on three assumptions: first, that *μικρῷ πρόσθεν* must refer only to the preceding episode in the narrative and not to some preliminaries to that episode; second, that a reference to a proconsul and his activities is required in the section by the logic of the narrative; and third, that *περὶ ἡμῶν* is unintelligible and covers a corruption. Each can be shown to be false.

It would require an analysis of each occurrence of *μικρῷ πρόσθεν* in Aristides to demonstrate that it must of necessity refer only to the immediately preceding narrative. Yet even so careful an analysis could probably not prove definitively that an allusion twenty-one, rather than fourteen, lines earlier in the text was absolutely excluded. The whole proceedings before Pollio, including dreams and prophecies, could be understood as “the preceding episode” without contradicting either logic or Aristides’ methods of indicating intervals.<sup>16</sup>

With regard to the second point, a reference to a proconsul is called for in section 97 only to explain Behr’s own restoration of the name *Festus*. In fact, an allusion to the exemption provided by a proconsul earlier certainly in time, but not yet named in Aristides’ reversed chronological framework, would be inconsistent with the orator’s practice. The effect of working backwards in time would be lessened if prior events were alluded to in earlier sections; and no such allusions are made to earlier decisions in the cases discussed before Severus or Quadratus.

The third assumption is more serious. Keil’s *apparatus criticus* indicates that he considered the phrase *καιροῦ γενομένου περὶ ἡμῶν* probably corrupt, without suggesting a reason. Festugière has, however, provided an accept-

able version of the received text, “une occasion lui ayant été offerte à mon sujet par ceux qui assistaient.”<sup>17</sup> If there is a corruption, it is to be found not in *περὶ ἡμῶν*, which makes good sense, but in the construction *γενομένου ὑπό*. Is this in fact acceptable Greek, and can it be translated as “lui ayant été offerte par?” Whatever the answer, there is no need to introduce *ἡγεμῶν* instead of *ἡμῶν* at this point.

The grounds for emending the text, and hence for eliminating Glabrio as proconsul, are thus not compelling. It may perhaps be valuable at this stage to summarize Aristides’ narrative in sections 94 to 100, with reference to the role of Glabrio. In the proconsulate of Pollio, probably A.D. 151–52 (see note 3), Aristides was nominated for a position as tax collector, and this nomination was accepted by Pollio’s legate (94–96). Aristides, who had no desire to take the post, dreamed *inter alia* that “the distinguished Glabrio”<sup>18</sup> (at that time present in the province) would help to settle the question in his favor (97). Aristides’ case came before Pollio, who overruled the decision of his legate (98); Aristides does not tell us how, if at all, Glabrio influenced Pollio’s judgment. After Pollio’s intervention, both the legate and a local Smyrnean official<sup>19</sup> became friends of Aristides, thus fulfilling a prophecy of the gods (99). A few years before,<sup>20</sup> a similar case had come before the “sophist I mentioned before” (100), that is, according to the traditional interpretation, Glabrio. This is as clear a narrative as any in the *Sacred Discourses*. It remains to identify Glabrio, and consider why he should have been present in Asia during Pollio’s proconsulate.

M’. Acilius Glabrio, *consul ordinarius* in 152, and hence in office presumably from January to March of that year, is virtually excluded

16. Note, e.g., the question of the interpretation of *χρόνον ὕστερον* (49. 38) in G. W. Bowersock, “The Proconsulate of Albus,” *HSCP*, LXXII (1968), 289–94.

17. P. 147.

18. Behr’s translation of *ὁ πᾶν* as *consul ordinarius* is rightly criticized by Festugière, p. 147 (on 97. 4). The one thing a *consul ordinarius* surely could not be was resident in Asia.

19. This official is also called *ἀρχων*, and Behr may be correct in seeing here a source of confusion, p. 66, n. 17. *ἀρχων* does not appear to have been a precise title in Smyrna, but *ἀρχω* was well attested as a term for the local magistrates,

as in the bilingual text from Smyrna, *IGR* IV. 1404, where *magistratus harum civitatum* is expressed by *αἱ . . . ἀρχαὶ . . . τῶν πόλεων*, or a sentence in the *Digest* (27. 1. 15. 9), *ἐὰν ὁ πόλεως ἀρχων, τοῦτ’ ἐστὶ ὁ στρατηγός*. Such magistrates were supreme in their own jurisdiction, and could be contrasted with *ἀντάρχοντες* (e.g., *AJA*, XVIII [1914], 329), as a proconsul could be contrasted with his legate. Aristides may cause confusion by placing the two levels of government in such close proximity, but he is not going beyond the attested uses of the word *ἀρχω*.

20. See n. 3 for the reasons Glabrio is not placed in the preceding year.

from being present in Asia in any capacity in the proconsular year 151–52, simply because of the time involved in the journey to and from Rome; but Pollio is assigned to that year with some degree of certainty (see note 3). It is almost certain, on the other hand, that a “distinguished” Glabrio would be an Acilius (see note 2). Although it is prosopographically tidy to have only one Acilius Glabrio reach the consulate in each generation, as in Groag’s stemma (*PIR*<sup>2</sup>, vol. I, p. 12), it remains a possibility that other members of the family achieved high office.

Syme (see note 5) observed that the consul of 152 held a legateship in Africa extraordinarily early in his career, and suggested that the reason was that he served as his father’s legate. It is also extraordinary for one man to be *legatus proconsulis* in both Africa and Asia, and the suggestion might be made that the consul of 152 was attending some other relative when he accepted such a post in Asia.<sup>21</sup> The most plausible relative would be an uncle, a younger brother of the consul of 124. Such a man might have held the *fascēs* in the early 130’s, when the *fasti* are far from full; this in turn would lead to a proconsulate in the

late 140’s on the patterns observed in note 4. (Aristides’ chronology would place this in 148–49). For his nephew to have attended him in that year fits the observed facts of the younger man’s career. It should be observed that there is at least one Acilius Glabrio, possibly a *legatus Lusitaniae* (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 61), with whom the uncle might be identified.

In 152 this man was, on Aristides’ evidence, once again present in Asia; for what purpose we cannot know, but the fact that at least two other members of the family are honored at Ephesus, although they are not known to have held any post in the province (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 64, 69), suggests that they had private interests there. Herodes Atticus and *Κοδρατίων* (Quadratus, Philostr. *VS* 2. 6. 576) provide parallels for a consular sophist, and sophistic interests might provide a further explanation for our Glabrio’s presence in Asia and interest in Aristides.<sup>22</sup>

One must be cautious in the creation of whole new persons; but there is perhaps better justification for a second Glabrio than for drastic emendation or the ignoring of strong linguistic patterns.<sup>23</sup>

H. J. MASON

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

21. Syme, *REA*, LXVII (1965), 345, stresses the fact that legateship with relatives was still a common pattern. Lucian *Demon*. 30 records an example from Asia at about this date.

22. If Quadratus in Aristides is identified with Philostratus’ consular sophist (see Bowersock, pp. 84–85), then the special role of Roman intellectuals in high office in furthering Aristides’ case becomes an important theme in the Fourth Sacred Discourse. The argument loses much of its force if Behr’s emendation in 100 is accepted.

23. Festugière (p. 149) and Boulanger (p. 486) accept the existence of a Glabrio other than the consul of 152, but refuse to attempt an identification. Yet the recognition that the Pollio in Aristides is not the consul of 176, and the creation of a new Vitrasius Pollio, rest on basically similar evidence. The only important difference is that, in the case of Pollio, the other evidence for his career, as *legatus Lugdunensis*, is rather more substantial than in the case of Glabrio (see Syme, *REA*, LXI [1959], 311).

## FULGENTIUS ON THE CRETAN *HECATOMPHONIA*

In *Sermones Antiqui* 5 (p. 112–13 Helm) of Fulgentius the following corrupt passage is to be found:

[Quid sint neferendi sues.] Diofontus Lacedaemonius, qui de sacris deorum scripsit, ait apud Athenas Marti solere sacrificare sacrum quod ecatonpefoneuma appellatur; si quis enim centum hostes interfecisset, Marti de homine sacrificabat apud insulam Blennon, quod sacrificatum est a duobus Cretensibus et uno Locro, id est Timne Cortiniensi, . . . Proculo Locro, sicut Solocrates

scribit. Sed posteaquam hoc Atheniensibus displicuit, coeperunt offerre porcum castratum quem neferendum uocabant, id est quasi sine renibus.

From Stephanus of Byzantium, *s.v.* *Βιέννος*, it is clear that the context of the sacrifice is Cretan; for in that entry of the *Ἑθνικά* we find:

πόλις Κρήτης. οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ Βιέννου τοῦ τῶν Κουρήτων ἑνός, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸν Ἀρη γενομένης βίας, ὃν ἐνταῦθα <δεδεσθαι> φασὶν ὑπὸ Ὡτου καὶ Ἐφιάλτου