

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*², 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.²¹ 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*² 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*² 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.²²

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.²³

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

τῶν παίδων Ποσειδῶνος, καὶ μέχρι καὶ νῦν τὰ καλούμενα
ἐκατομφόνια θύεται τῷ Ἀρεί.
δεδοσθαι add. Berkelius.

The corrupt references to Athens should therefore be eliminated.¹ For *apud Athenas* we have to substitute *apud Cretenses*; and for *Atheniensibus*, *Cretensibus*. From Stephanus we can correct the corrupt *Blennon* (or its variants in the manuscripts *blemnon* and *hlemnon*) to *Biennon*, the Cretan town. A Locrian is strangely out of place in a Cretan context; evidently a scribe wrote *Locro* because he imagined *Cortiniensi* to refer to Croton or Cortona in southern Italy. So, for *Locro* and *Locro*, put *Lyctio* and *Lyctio*. The individual whose name appears corruptly as *Timne* will be a Gortynian, and the two Cretans responsible for the sacrifice will therefore be a Lyctian and a Gortynian; the corrupt reference to them should be set out as follows: "...quod sacrificatum est a duobus Cretensibus, <uno Cortiniensi> et uno Lyctio, id est †Timne† Cortiniensi et Proculo Lyctio..."

What name lies behind *Timne* the Gortynian? A famous man of Gortyn in the first half of the fifth century B.C. was Entimus, friend and favorite of Artaxerxes.² The name Entimus is closely associated with the district of Gortyn as early as the seventh century B.C., for the Cretan colonists at Gela had been led in ca. 689 by an Entimus,³ and, so their pottery suggests, had originated in the Messarā plain.⁴ I suggest therefore in place of *Timne* *Cortiniensi*, *Entimo Cortiniensi*.

The name of the authority cited by Fulgentius as *Solicrates* can be corrected to *Sosicrates*. In discussing Midas in *Mitologiae* 2, Fulgentius cites a *Solicrates* of Cyzicus and he may be the person referred to here in Chapter 5 of the *Sermones Antiqui*. But since there

was also a *Sosicrates* who wrote extensively about Cretan customs in his *Κρητικά*,⁵ he may be the source of Fulgentius' account of the alleged human sacrifice at Biennos.⁶

A connection of human sacrifice with Lyctos is to be found in Servius, who states that Idomeneus, whom the *Aeneid* calls *Lyctius*, sacrificed his son on returning from Troy,⁷ but there is no allusion to *hecatomphonia* in this context. Dosiadas, who wrote about Crete, mentioned an alleged human sacrifice to Dionysus in Lesbos,⁸ presumably to compare it with a similar custom in Crete. He, too, may therefore have had something to say about the tradition of human sacrifice to Ares at Biennos.

As to *Diofontus Lacedemonius* in Fulgentius, a Laconian author or pseudepigraphist would have been interested in the custom at Biennos because there were Laconian colonists in Lyctos,⁹ and perhaps also because Proculus (or Procles) was a name belonging to the royal lines of the Spartan Heraclidae. *Diofontus* conceals *Deiphontes* or *Diophantus*. As *Diophantus* he may recur in Fulgentius at *Mitologiae* 1. 1, p. 15 Helm (= *FHG* IV, 397), where he is called *Lacedaemonum auctor* and is said to have written fourteen books of antiquities.

Aristomenes, the Messenian insurgent against Sparta, is alleged to have sacrificed ἐκατομφόνια to Zeus of Ithome. Pausanias (4. 19. 2-3), who mentions the story, is almost certainly following his Cretan source Rhianus here, and Rhianus may therefore have included a purported Cretan custom in his *Μεσσηνιακά*.¹⁰ The *hecatomphonia* must be distinguished from the ἐκατόμβαια, an annual sacrifice by the hundred cities of Laconia.¹¹

Agathocles of Babylon in the first book of

1. G. F. Unger, *Philologus*, XXV (1867), 4, tried most implausibly to connect *Blennon* in Fulgentius with the island of Belbina off Attica.

2. Athenaeus 48 D-F.

3. Thuc. 6. 4. 3.

4. J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery* (London, 1968), pp. 375 and 382.

5. *FGrHist* No. 461.

6. See C. Müller, *FHG* IV, 501 and A. Schaefer, *Philologus*, XXIII (1866), 562.

7. Serv. ad *Aen.* 3. 121 and see F. Jacoby on Anticleides 140 F 7.

8. *FGrHist* 458 F 7.

9. Arist. *Pol.* 1271b27-28.

10. See Schaefer, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 563-64. There is no need to suppose, with Schaefer, that *apud Athenas* in Fulgentius conceals *apud Ithomen* in Messenia (p. 562), even if "Diofontus" did compare the Biennian rite with the alleged sacrifice to Ithomatan Zeus by Aristomenes. On ἐκατομφόνια in general, see Stengel in *RE*, VII.2 (1912), 2790.

11. Strab. 8. 4. 11.

his *περὶ Κυζίκου* (472 F 1) mentioned an *ἀπόρρητος* θυσία of the Praisians in Crete. The allusion may be to human sacrifice, but that is not certain.¹² Agathocles notes that the Praisians revered the sow, because a sow had suckled the infant Zeus and by her grunting had concealed his cries; therefore they did not partake of sow's flesh, *καὶ οὐκ ἂν (φῃσι) τῶν κρεῶν δαΐσαντο*. We have seen that the Gortynians and Lyctians at Biennos, according to Fulgentius, sacrificed a castrated boar in place of a human being, when human sacrifice was abandoned there. The same substitution may have been thought to have been made by the Praisians—a boar, but not a sow, being regarded as a replacement of what had originally been, in local Eteocretan lore, a human male victim. Finally, one further connection of human sacrifice with Crete deserves to be noted: when Epimenides purified Athens after the Cylonian affair, two youths were sacrificed there, according to Diogenes Laertius (1. 110). None of the evidence about human sacrifice in Crete proves, however, that it was regularly practiced there, and nothing can be inferred from the assertion of Istros (334 F 48) in his *Συναγωγή τῶν Κρητικῶν θυσιῶν* that in olden time the Curetes sacrificed children to Kronos. They may have done so, but we do not know. Istros may simply have made a false inference from the existence of a war dance around a child.¹³

A corrected text of the passage in the *Sermones Antiqui* 5 can now be set out (I assume that the principal errors are due, not to Fulgentius, but to his copyists):

[Quid sint neferendi sues.] Diofantus Lacedaemonius, qui de sacris deorum scripsit, ait apud Cretenses Marti solere sacrificare sacrum quod ecatonpefoneuma appellatur; si quis enim centum hostes interfecisset, Marti de homine¹⁴ sacrificabat apud oppidum Biennon, quod (*sc.* sacrum) sacri-

ficatum est a duobus Cretensibus, <uno Cortiniensi> et uno Lyctio, id est Entimo Cortiniensi et Proculo Lyctio, sicut Sosicrates scribit. Sed posteaquam hoc Cretensibus displicuit, coeperunt offerre porcum castratum quem neferendum vocabant, id est quasi sine renibus.

Biennos or Biannos lay near the present Viáno. It was accessible from both Gortyn and Lyctos. Ares was worshipped there, as we see from Fulgentius and from Stephanus. From the latter we learn also of a cult of Zeus, but one of the cult titles in the article *s.v.* *Βίεννος* is corrupt in the anonymous quotation: “οἱ δὲ τιμὰς ἀποπέμπειν τῷ τε ἱμλίῳ† Διὶ καὶ Βιεννίῳ” A. B. Cook suggested *Τεμιλίῳ*¹⁵ without citing another instance of the title. Maass went further from the manuscripts in putting *Ἰδαίῳ*.¹⁶ I propose *Τερμιλίῳ*, for the Termilae of Lycia were anciently associated with Crete, whence they had been led by Sarpedon.¹⁷ Both epithets of Zeus at Biennos would thus be ethnics, and one of them very ancient indeed.

Stephanus connects the name of Biennos with the *βία* inflicted on Ares by Otus and Ephialtes. Homer (*Il.* 5. 385–90) knew the story and says that Otus and his brother were sons of Aloeus, but does not place the imprisonment of the war god in Crete. Stephanus regards Otus and Ephialtes as sons of Poseidon,¹⁸ not of Aloeus himself, in this agreeing with *Odyssey* 11. 305–320, where their mother is Iphimedia wife of Aloeus and their father Poseidon. The *μητρυνή* *Ἡερίβοια* who informs Hermes and so secures the release of Ares in *Iliad* 5. 389–91 cannot be the same person as the mother of Otus and Ephialtes, Iphimedia. If she was stepmother to the brothers, then Aloeus took a second wife,¹⁹ but in the context in the *Iliad* it remains possible, if not specially likely, that Eeriboea is stepmother to Hermes.

An inscription attests the existence of a

12. R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals* (London, 1962), p. 218.

13. See Jacoby on *FGrHist* 334 F 48 and the literature there cited.

14. *Marti de(o) homine(m)*, tentatively proposed by Helm, is not needed here after the previous *Marti*. For comparable uses of *sacrificare* with *de* see E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Darmstadt, 1962), p. 107.

15. *Zeus*, I (Cambridge, 1914), 623, n. 6.

16. *Jahresh. Oest. Inst.*, IX (1906), 139 ff.

17. Herod. 1. 173, 2–3.

18. There is a still valuable discussion of Otus and Ephialtes and their connection with Biennos by R. Pashley, *Travels in Crete*, I (London, 1837), 278–83. For a general account of the legend of the Aloids see Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. 7. 4 and J. G. Frazer *ad loc.*

19. See Leaf on *Il.* 5. 389.

ἱαρόν of Ares in Biennos,²⁰ and it is clear that his cult was firmly established there. With the cult belongs the story of his captivity by Otus and Ephialtes. The Otian plains in Crete²¹ can also be placed near Biennos; and from Fulgentius we now see that men of Gortyn and of

Lyctos considered the worship of Ares at Biennos so important that they came thither to sacrifice to him jointly.²²

G. HUXLEY

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

20. *Inscr. Cret.* I Biennos, 1. 11.

21. In connection with giants, Servius *ad Aen.* 3. 578 (I, 440 Thilo and Hagen) mentions *Otus in Creta secundum Sallustium, unde Otii campi*. For *Blevos* / *Blavvos* / *Vián(n)o(s)* as a surviving pre-Hellenic place name, see P. Faure, *Kadmos*, VI (1967), 53.

22. I am grateful to my colleagues Dr. A. B. Scott and Mr. James Grainger for helpful discussion of points in Latinity and paleography.

LUCRETIUS 2. 615

gallos attribuunt, quia, numen qui violarint
matris et ingrati genitoribus inventi sint, 615
significare volunt indignos esse putandos,
vivam progeniem qui in oras luminis edant.

These lines appear early in Lucretius' description of the procession of Magna Mater. There is much in the entire passage which perplexes readers and commentators, including the basic question whether the passage has any role at all to play in the context. The clause "ingrati genitoribus inventi sint" has proved intractable to all commentators whom I have been able to consult. I propose to offer an interpretation which may clarify its meaning and purpose.

One must first attempt to determine whether the meaning is to be construed literally or figuratively. A. K. Michels links the entire passage with Cicero's invective against Clodius and comments, in connection with lines 614–17, that "Cicero accuses Clodius of exactly these sins, for by desecrating the Megalesia and the shrine at Pessinus he has assaulted the *numen* of the goddess, and, by being adopted into a plebeian family, he has deserted his own."¹ D. J. Stewart suggests that "it might not be too farfetched to see the eunuchs (164) . . . as a code designation for Stoics and others of mentalist kidney who try to denature the physical world—their mother, too—with their

ethereal doctrines, and foolishly carry on pretending that there is a cosmic sympathy among all parts in Nature, as it were addressing her with pleas never to be answered (in any case Lucretius would not be above saying that the Stoics *indignos esse putandos*, / *vivam progeniem qui in oras luminis edant*, 617!)."²

Either interpretation may be valid, but it need not be, nor can it be proven. But, taken literally, Lucretius is unquestionably discussing the *galli*, the mutilated priests of Cybele; does he define them as one group or two?

Consensus is that there is only one group. Leonard and Smith,³ recapitulating Munro⁴ and Merrill,⁵ state "*et*: i.e., *id est*, for the clause *ingrati . . . sint* is merely explanatory of *numen . . . violarint Matris*." Bailey's⁶ note is the fullest: "*numen . . . inventi sint*: the reason Lucr. gives is not clear. *Matris* is certainly Cybele, as is shown by *numen*, but how had they violated her *numen*? By their ingratitude to their parents, says Munro, and the same idea seems to be suggested by 641–3. The good man will take up arms for his country and defend his parents; if he does not, he is not fit to have children himself. But Giussani is also probably right in seeing an allusion to the story of Attis, who spurned the love of Cybele, *violavit numen Matris*, and so was afflicted with

1. A. K. Michels, "Lucretius, Clodius and Magna Mater," *Mélanges Carcopino* (Paris, 1966), p. 678.

2. D. J. Stewart, "The Silence of Magna Mater," *HSCP*, LXXIV (1970), 81.

3. W. E. Leonard and S. B. Smith, *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Madison, 1942), p. 370.

4. H. A. J. Munro, *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*⁴ (Cambridge, 1893), II, 151.

5. W. A. Merrill, *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (New York, 1907), p. 440.

6. C. Bailey, *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford, 1947), II, 903–904.