

vanish into Tartarus as their husbands stand helplessly by. These intimations of death confer on *marmareo* . . . *thalamo* the aspect not only of a luxurious boudoir but also of a marble tomb.³¹ Dido's palace is once again portrayed—briefly, subtly, but unambiguously—as a house of the dead. In 4. 80–82 all the same elements are present. Because the context causes *sola* to suggest *sole*, *sola domo maeret vacua* in 4. 82 conveys the same sinister connotation as *marmareo referunt thalamo* in 4. 392. The phrase *stratisque relictis incubat* in 4. 82–83 is paralleled in 4. 391–92, where *membra* . . . *stratis* . . . *reponunt* is as appropriate to laying out for burial (cf. 6. 220) as it is to putting to bed.³² There is even an echo, in 4. 81, of the same passage from the *Georgics* recalled at 4. 390–91. For the unusual rhythm of this line, Austin cites three parallels: two concern sleep (*Aeneid* 2. 9, 5. 856), but the third describes the sleep of death falling over Eurydice's eyes in *Georgics* 4. 496: *conditque natantia lumina somnus*.

CLIFFORD WEBER
Kenyon College

31. Ibid. Dido herself comes to view her bedchamber as her tomb, and thus her bridal bed as her deathbed: *lectumque iugalem / quo perii*, as she says to her sister in lines 496–97. At the conclusion of this speech also, Vergil employs diction suggestive of death (499): “haec effata silet, pallor simul occupat ora.”

32. Here too we may speak of tragic foreshadowing, insofar as this detail anticipates Dido's actions in the hour of her death: cf. 4. 650 *incubuitque toro* and 659 *os impressa toro*. There is tragic irony here as well: the nature of the *strata* is soon to change, and so is the import of *relicta*.

THE PROMOTION OF HADRIAN OF TYRE AND THE DEATH OF HERODES ATTICUS

Three inscriptions honoring M. Aurelius, Cn. Claudius Severus, and M. Vetulenus Civica Barbarus testify that Herodes Atticus was alive when Marcus and the imperial court visited Athens in late 176 while returning from the war against the rebel Avidius Cassius.¹ It is clear that Herodes died shortly afterwards, aged ἀμφὶ τὰ ἑξ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα (Philostr. *VS* 565), since this frequently attested man does not appear again in epigraphical or other sources.² Herodes, then, lived probably from 101 to 177. However, 102–78 or even 103–79 cannot be ruled out, and it has recently been held that the last dating must be correct.³ I suggest in this note that this security is illusory.

A *terminus ante quem* for Herodes' death is offered by the promotion of Herodes' pupil, the sophist Hadrian of Tyre, from the imperial chair of rhetoric at Athens to the chair at Rome, since while Hadrian was yet in Athens he spoke Herodes' funeral oration (*VS* 586). Hadrian ascended the Athenian chair in 176. The appointment was made by Marcus, while he was still in the East, on the basis of Hadrian's reputation; and on his arrival at Athens the emperor made sure of Hadrian's abilities by commanding a display of declamation (*VS* 588–

1. W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim, 1983), pp. 159–60; vol. 2, nos. 96, 187–88; on the presence of Severus, note Philostr. *VS* 588.

2. Cf. K. Münscher, “Herodes (13),” *RE* 8 (1913): 954; Ameling, *Herodes*, 2:2, n. 13.

3. Ameling, *Herodes*, 2:2, n. 13.

89). The date of Hadrian's appointment to the chair at Rome is less clear. It has usually been taken to be 178, after M. Naechster's argument that Marcus would have made the appointment himself before departing to campaign against the Marcomanni in the late summer of that year.⁴ That notion is not inevitable. It has been challenged in an important paper by I. Avotins, who argued that Hadrian's posting could not have been made until the early 180s.⁵ The acceptance of Avotins' arguments by Ameling has led him to believe that the date of Herodes' death (and Hadrian's epicedium) can be placed as late as reasonably possible (179); Herodes would thus have been praetor (133) and consul (143) *anno suo*.⁶

Avotins advanced three reasons for his contention that the earlier dating of Hadrian's promotion (178) "cannot be right." His first and main argument is, I believe, untenable; the other two are inconclusive. Avotins argued principally from the fact that when Hadrian went to Rome the Athenians wanted "to send an embassy on behalf of Chrestus [of Byzantium] to request for him the chair at Athens ἐκ βασιλέως" (*VS* 591). Since Hadrian delivered Herodes' funeral speech whilst in occupation of the Athenian chair, the embassy to the emperor concerning his replacement could not have been devised, as Avotins pointed out, before 177. Further, since Commodus was co-emperor with Marcus from about the summer of that year (cf. *PIR*² A 1482), and since the embassy was to be sent to one emperor only, Avotins concluded that "the proposed embassy must be placed after the death of Marcus in March 180"; for Philostratus would have pictured the Athenians proposing to address both emperors, had there been two.

In 178 (or 177) the city of Smyrna was devastated by an earthquake.⁷ The sophist Aelius Aristides was moved to compose his *Monody for Smyrna* (*Or.* 18) immediately, the next day to send his *Letter to the Emperors concerning Smyrna* (*Or.* 19; cf. *Or.* 21. 2), and later, while the city was being rebuilt with the help of imperial funds, to write his *Palinode for Smyrna* (*Or.* 20). The *Letter* is addressed to Marcus and Commodus as σεβαστοί. It is praised by Philostratus (*VS* 582), who carelessly refers to it as a μονωδία (the identification is assured by the slightly inaccurate quotation of 19. 3). As far as Philostratus is concerned, the *Letter* is addressed to only one βασιλεύς: "he lamented Smyrna to Marcus, in such a way that . . . the emperor even shed tears over the pages." If Philostratus failed to recognize the co-regency of Marcus and Commodus here, he may easily have done so in reporting the proposed embassy about Hadrian's replacement. Nothing prevents the thought that the embassy was planned in 178.

Avotins' second and third points may be taken together. The second is based on the prefaces to Pollux' *Onomasticon*. Commodus, the addressee, is not called κύριος, a term reserved for the emperor, until Book 3. It is not until Book 8 that Pollux mentions his teaching duties in the Athenian chair. Avotins suggested that if Book 3 was dedicated in 177, Book 8 might be placed in the early 180s,

4. *De Pollucis et Phrynichi Controversiis* (Leipzig, 1908), p. 41.

5. "The Holders of the Chairs of Rhetoric at Athens," *HSCP* 79 (1975): 320–21. The discussion in J. A. Hall, *Lucian's Satire* (New York, 1981), pp. 396–401, is marred by unawareness of Avotins.

6. Ameling, *Herodes*, 2:2.

7. C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Leiden, 1968), p. 112, n. 68, argues for the earlier date, against the *communis opinio*.

which would be the date of Pollux' assumption of the Athenian chair. Avotins' third point was that Pollux was appointed solely by Commodus; and if it is assumed, as it might be, that he followed Hadrian at Athens directly, Hadrian would again have stayed in the Athenian job until Marcus was dead.

There is no doubt that Pollux was appointed by Commodus alone (*VS* 593, where Marcus is not mentioned). However, it cannot be taken as certain that Pollux "rather than, e.g., Pausanias [of Caesarea]" followed Hadrian at Athens: "[t]his assumption rests chiefly on the observation that the succession of the known chair holders in Philostratus is, to our knowledge, never out of chronological order."⁸ That observation may be true; but (*a*) in general we cannot assume that all the incumbents of the Athenian (or Roman) chair were identical with Philostratus' sophists and were therefore recorded by him (indeed at *VS* 566—cf. 591—he states that not all the Athenian chairholders were worthy of mention); and (*b*) in particular it is in fact likely that Pausanias, who was of roughly the same generation as Pollux, did precede him in the Athenian chair. Pausanias went on from Athens to occupy the Roman chair for a long time, and he died in possession of it (*VS* 594), just as Pollux appears to have died while holding the Athenian chair (*VS* 593). Pollux seems to have died younger than Pausanias (Pollux ἐξ ὀκτὼ καὶ πεντήκοντα ἔτη; Pausanias γηράσκων ἤδη), and to have died before him (a more usual implication of the order of the *Lives*). Nothing impedes the thought that he was born a little after Pausanias, or that he held the Athenian chair during Pausanias' tenure at Rome. The argument from the prefaces of the *Onomasticon* does not invalidate these suggestions, since we cannot be certain about the date or rate of publication of the work.

Avotins' assertion about Hadrian may be right, but much stronger arguments are required to prove it. In the meantime 178 remains a plausible date for Hadrian's call to Rome, 177 (or 178) a safer bet for Herodes' demise. Hadrian (promoted on his deathbed at 80 to *ab epistulis Graecis*, *VS* 590) will have been replaced by Pausanias at Rome, and Pausanias by Pollux at Athens, about 186/87. This last date allows Hadrian to be an acceptable five or six years younger than his teacher, Herodes, but does not extend publication of Pollux' *Onomasticon* beyond due probability.

SIMON SWAIN
All Souls College,
Oxford

8. Avotins, "Holders," p. 321, n. 33.