Roman citizens and half by the allies (Liv. 42. 27. 3), but later these proportions were changed to two-thirds freedmen and one-third allies (Liv. 42. 31. 6–7, 43. 12. 9).

From the last examples cited we may conclude that, when the need for rowers was not too great, the Romans preferred to use rowers of free status. However, when the demands on their manpower were more pressing, as in the Second Punic War, they seem to have used slave rowers without compunction. Our sources do not regard this—unlike the use of slaves as legionaries—as anything extraordinary. Scipio's actions after the capture of New Carthage show in particular that the Romans were willing to impress forcibly slaves who had recently been captured for service on the benches, even when there existed no pressing emergency to force them to do so. Thus it seems, contrary to the opinions cited at the beginning of this article, that the "galley slave" was, at least for a time, a very real part of ancient naval warfare.

JAN M. LIBOUREL

TEXAS TECH. UNIVERSITY

THE DATE OF THE *CIRIS*

In *Classical Quarterly*, XXI (1971), 233–50, R. O. A. M. Lyne argues (1) that the reference to the *Ciris* in the Life of Virgil by Donatus does not belong to the original Suetonian version, and (2) that the author appears to have been familiar with the works of Statius. The poem therefore, in his opinion, dates from the second century after Christ. Dr. Lyne has at least shown that a second-century date is possible, and I should like to add to his arguments a consideration of the evidence of the long introductory passage which precedes the narrative part of the poem. In my opinion, it provides support for a second-century dating and even, if my rather speculative suggestion is accepted, points to the actual year in which the poem was written.

The author appears to be a young man who has recently completed the usual course in grammar and rhetoric and is now studying philosophy in Athens. The first two lines ("etsi me vario iactatum laudis amore / irritaque expertum fallacis praemia vulgi") have been interpreted to mean that he had had experience of public life. I take them to mean no more than that he had finished his rhetorical studies. The populace did not confer the rewards of office in the post-Augustan period (I assume that the poem is post-Augustan), whereas praise and popularity could be won by declaiming. A course of philosophy would naturally be undertaken before rather than after entry on a career, and the addressee Messalla, who is evidently a contemporary (44–45), is still a *iuvenis* (36). But whatever the age of the author, his situation suits the mid-second century better perhaps than any other post-Augustan date, for that was a period when, as we know from Aulus Gellius, there were a number of Romans studying philosophy in Athens.

The author describes himself as enjoying the shade of the *Cecropius hortulus* (3–4). This is commonly, and no doubt rightly, taken to mean the garden of Epicurus, and lines 16–17 and 39, with their Lucretian echoes, also suggest Epicureanism. At the same time the author is not exclusive in his devotion to Epicureanism. "Si mihi iam summas sapientia panderet arces / quattuor antiquis †heredibus est data consors" is the text of 14–15 as printed by F. R. D. Goodyear in the new Oxford *Appendix Vergiliana*. It is corrupt, and no wholly satisfactory solution has been proposed. If the first three words of line 15 are correct, they presumably refer to the διάδοχοι, the heads of the four schools, Academic, Peripatetic, Epicurean, and Stoic; and the gist of the passage seems to be that wisdom is shared equally among them.[1] This attitude is in

1. Cicero uses *heres* in connection with philosophical schools: "illa vetus Academia atque eius heres Aristus" (*Brut.* 332); "cum Speusippum . . . Plato philosophiae quasi heredem reliquisset" (*Acad. post.* 1. 17). These passages do not provide complete support for *heres* without a genitive. But it is worth noting that *diadochus* can be used by itself, with no genitive, for the head of a school. See *IG*² II–III. 1099 (A.D. 121).

keeping with the spirit of the Antonine age, for in 176 Marcus Aurelius officially recognized the four schools, allotting them handsome salaries from state funds (Dio Cass. 72. 31. 3; Lucian *Eun.* 3; Philostr. *VS* 566).

The author claims that he would like to honor Messalla with a poem more in keeping with his own interests, a poem "on the nature of things" (39). This imaginary poem he compares (21–26) to the *peplos* offered to Athena at the Panathenaea, which was woven for the occasion and was attached to the mast of a vehicle in the form of a ship which made its way to the foot of the Acropolis. He breaks off to exclaim, in words which suggest that he had himself witnessed the ceremony, "felix illa dies, felix et dicitur annus, / felices qui talem annum videre diemque" (27–28), then proceeds to describe the scenes depicted on the *peplos* (29–30).

In the year 138/9 in all probability, Herodes Atticus served as president of the Panathenaea and organized the festival with unusual lavishness.[2] Two features were remembered a century or so later when Philostratus wrote his life of Herodes: the beauty of the *peplos*, and the fact that the "ship" was not, as hitherto, drawn by oxen, but was propelled by some underground mechanism. *κἀκεῖνα περὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων τούτων ἤκουον· πέπλον μὲν ἀνῆφθαι τῆς νεὼς ἡδίω γραφῆς ξὺν οὐρίῳ τῷ κόλπῳ, δραμεῖν δὲ τὴν ναῦν οὐχ ὑποζυγίων ἀγόντων, ἀλλ' ὑπογείοις μηχαναῖς ἐπολισθάνουσαν.*[3] My suggestion is that the author of the *Ciris* was present on this very occasion and that his lines about the *peplos* were inspired by what he had seen. In the lines "cum levis alterno Zephyrus concrebruit Euro / et prono gravidum provexit pondere currum" (25–26), I see a reference to Herodes' device for propelling the ship. Philostratus' *ξὺν οὐρίῳ τῷ κόλπῳ* shows that the *peplos* was fitted up so as to catch the wind and give the impression that the ship was propelled by it. It seems from the *Ciris* that it was a gusty day, and as the ship moved through the city from the Dipylon Gate it seemed to the onlooker that the wind was alternating between east and west. Line 26 is translated by Fairclough[4] "and bears onward the car, heavy with its overhanging weight," and by Haury[5] "et pousse le char dont le mât ploie en avant sous le faix." A different interpretation gives, in my opinion, a better sense. I suggest that *pronus* does not here mean leaning forward or leaning down, in a literal sense, but conveys, as it does elsewhere, the idea of swift motion. Compare, for example, Silius Italicus' line (17. 44), which is particularly relevant to our passage: "fertur prona ratis (ventos impellere credas)."[6] I take the author to mean that the ship moved swiftly and easily (compare Philostratus' *ἐπολισθάνουσαν*), as it would not have done if it had been drawn by animals.

So we can imagine the young Roman student finishing his poem and writing his prologue after the festival in the summer of 139. He took the opportunity to introduce an indirect compliment to Herodes, the organizer of the festival, who had very likely entertained him in one of his country houses in Attica, as he entertained Gellius and other Roman students (Gell. 1. 2. 1; 18. 10. 1). As Herodes knew Latin and was in Rome for some years from 140,[7] he would be able to recognize and appreciate the compliment.

It remains to ask whether in style and subject matter the poem is compatible with the proposed dating. The question is hard to answer, as there is so little with which to compare it in this poetically barren period. We can at any rate say that the pedantic disquisition on the Scyllas (54–91) might well have been made, in prose, by one of the grammarians whom we meet in the pages of Gellius; and the shameless lifting of lines from Virgil and the reminiscences of other earlier poets might indicate an age in which there was no strong living tradition of poetry. There were of course poets then; we meet several of them in Gellius (5. 4. 1; 6. 7. 1; 9. 10. 1; 15. 10. 9;

2. For the date, see P. Graindor, *Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo, 1930), pp. 65, 67.

3. Philostr. *VS* 550. This is not the place to discuss the nature of the mechanism and whether it was really underground.

4. Loeb Virgil, vol. II.

5. *La Ciris* (Bordeaux, 1957).

6. See also Lucr. 6. 560 "quo venti prona premit vis"; Virg. *Georg.* 1. 203 "atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alveus amni"; Sil. Ital. 6. 687–88 "pronaque Lutatius aura / captivas puppes ad litora victor agebat."

7. See Graindor, *Hérode Atticus*, pp. 51, 67.

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 ἦρχεν, i.e., was proconsul:[1] section 100 states that ὁ σοφιστής, οὗ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην, ἦρχεν, 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*² A 59–73), a family which produces consuls in A.D. 124 and 152.[2]

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.[3] 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,[4] 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^e 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*², vol. I, p. 13, insists on this restriction of the *cognomen*. His view is borne out by the "G" volume of *PIR*² (vol. IV.1, p. 33); by *RE*, I (1894), 254 and VII (1910), 1372; by A. Degrassi, *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 Popillius Priscus on epigraphical grounds (*IBM* 493, *IG* 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*² 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*¹ 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*² I 141

Venuleius Apronianus *cos.* 123 *procos.* 138–39 *RE*, 2^e Reihe, VIII.1 (1955), 821

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