

ANALECTA GELLIANA

pr. 6. Namque alii Musarum inscripserunt, alii Siluarum, ille Πέπλον, hic Ἀμαλθείας κέρας, alius Κηρία, partim Λειμώνας, quidam Lectionis suae, alius Antiquarum lectionum atque alius Ἀνθρῶν et item alius Εὐρημάτων.

κηρία Salmasius (1629): καίρια Salmasius (1640): KA|IBIA P: kaib^sia C

Not only was Gellius' preface received in the fifteenth century at the end of his work instead of the beginning, but it arrived almost or wholly without the Greek, which had to be patched up by guesswork; between *siluarum* and *quidam* early editors read 'ille κηρίον, alius κέρας ἀμαλθείας', the first two names in the similar passage, Plin. *N.H.* pr. 24. Salmasius, in the preface to his *Plinianae exercitationes*, printed a text 'ex vestigiis antiquae scripturae optimi exemplaris [sc. MS P = Paris, BN lat. 5765] partim etiam coniecturis nostris correctionem'; following κέρας he gave, in the right place but with the wrong accent, 'alius Κήρια'.¹ But when eleven years later he came to annotate Simplicius' commentary on Epictetus' Ἐγχειρίδιον, alerted by Simplicius' statement (taken from Arrian's own epistle dedicatory) συνέταξεν ὁ Ἀρριανός, τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ κινήτικώτατα τῶν ψυχῶν ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐκ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου λόγων, he remarked: 'Quidam et inscribere libros suos olim τὰ καίρια, quod maxime ad rem quam tractabant pertinentia eo opere persequerentur', citing Gellius with 'alius καίρια' and commenting 'Ita enim ex veteri codice ibi scribendum est, non ut vulgo editur, κήριον [sic]'.² Nevertheless, editors preferred his first thoughts to his second; Hertz, in his separate edition of Gellius' preface (Progr. Breslau, summer 1877) and in his *editio maior* (Berlin, 1883–5), gives three parallels:

Plin. *N.H.* pr. 24, 'Κηρίον inscribere quod uolebant intellegi fauom', where the Latin translation guarantees the reading;

Clem. Alex. 6.1.2.1 (pp. 422–3 Stählin–Früchtel–Treu) ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ λειμῶνι τὰ ἀνθη ποικίλως ἀνθοῦντα κὰν τῷ παραδείσῳ ['orchard'] ἢ τῶν ἀκροδρῶν φυτεία οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἕκαστον κεχώρισται τῶν ἀλλογενῶν (ἢ καὶ Λειμῶνάς τινες καὶ Ἐλικῶνας καὶ Κηρία καὶ Πέπλους συναγωγὰς φιλομαθεῖς ποικίλως ἐξανθισάμενοι συνεγράψαντο),³ where again the sense requires the honeycomb;⁴

Philost. *VS* 565 ἐπιστολαὶ δὲ πλείσται Ἡρώδου καὶ διαλέξεις καὶ ἐφημερίδες ἐγχειρίδιά τε καὶ καίρια τὴν ἀρχαίαν πολυμάθειαν ἐν βραχεὶ ἀπηριθμισμένα, where Hertz emends καίρια to κηρία.

Although at first sight it might seem attractive to make all four authors say the same thing, the independent corruption in two of them would remain to be accounted

¹ *Plinianae exercitationes in Caii Iulii Solini Polyhistora* (Paris, 1629), vol. i, sig. b2^v.

² *Notae et animadversiones in Epictetum et Simplicium* (Paris, 1640), pp. 4–5.

³ Clement continues τοῖς δ' ὡς ἔτυχεν ἐπὶ μνήμην ἐλθοῦσι καὶ μήτε τῇ τάξει μήτε τῇ φράσει διακεκαθαρμένοις, διεσπαρμένοις δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναμῆς, ἢ τῶν Στρωματέων ἡμῶν ὑποτύπῳσις λειμῶνος δίκην πεποικίλται, a sufficient reproach to those who believe in Gellius' protestations of modesty and haphazardness.

⁴ Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882), p. 94 n. 1, cites Macr. *Sat.* pr. 5; for literature as a source of honey, cf. Meleager, *A.P.* 4.1.10 = *HE* 3935, anon. *A.P.* 9.190.1 = *FGE* 1214.

for; in particular, the corruptions in Gellius' Greek, if not taken over from his own source, are generally such as were made by scribes ignorant of the language and even of the alphabet. In fact, the emendation to Philostratus may be rejected without a qualm: the passage from Simplicius (or Arrian) cited above demonstrates that *Καίρια* as a title would express a notion complementary to that of *Ἑγχειρίδια*, focusing on utility as occasion served as the other on readiness to hand. As for Gellius, even if we discount variation between singular and plural, there are only five other miscellany-titles, out of thirteen all told in Pliny and thirty in Gellius, common to both lists; there is therefore no reason to induce a sixth by emendation. In fact, there is no need whatever to emend either Gellius or Philostratus; rather, the two confirm each other.

Since Gellius' list includes not only Pliny's own *Historia naturalis*, but also Favorinus' *Παντοδαπή ἱστορία*, allusion to Herodes' works is quite conceivable, perhaps even in *Ἑγχειρίδια*, which is in Pliny, and much more so in *Καίρια*, which is not. To be sure, it has been suggested that *ἑγχειρίδιά τε καὶ καίρια* may be not Herodes' titles but Philostratus' descriptions;⁵ but if Herodes did not so call the works in question, what names did he give them and why does Philostratus not cite them by their titles? In any case, that would be no ground for doubting the transmitted text in Gellius: one man's description might perfectly well have been another's title.

2.30.6–10. Id autem ipsum quod dicimus [*sc. that the north wind blows from a higher point in the sky than the south*] ex illis quoque Homericis uersibus, si quis non incuriose legat, adminiculari potest. (7) nam de austri flatibus ita scripsit, *ἔνθα νότος μέγα κύμα ποτὶ σκαῖον ῥίον ὠθεῖ* [*Od.* 3.295], (8) contra autem de borea, quem aquilonem nos appellamus, alio dicit modo: *καὶ βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης μέγα κύμα κυλίνδων* [*Od.* 5.296]. (9) ab aquilonibus enim, qui alti supernique sunt, fluctus excitatos quasi per prona uolui dicit, ab austris enim, his qui humiliores sunt, maiore ui quadam propelli sursum atque subici. (10) id enim significat uerbum *ὠθεῖ*, sicut alio in loco *λάαν ἄνω ὠθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον* [*Od.* 11.596].

Hosius cites Theophrastus, *De uentis* 6.35, which makes a different point, and Plin. *N.H.* 2.128, 'austro maiores fluctus eduntur quam aquilone, quoniam ille inferus ex imo mari spirat, hic summo'; closer, however, is the pseudo-Plutarchean *De uita et poesi Homeri* 2.110 (lines 1179–86 Kindstrand):⁶

ἡπίστατο δὲ κακείνος ὅτι ὁ βόρειος πόλος ὑπὲρ γῆν ἔστι μετέωρος, ὡς καθ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐν τῷ κλίματι τούτῳ κατοικοῦντας, ὁ δὲ νότιος ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου βαθύς· ὅθεν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βορείου φησὶ “καὶ βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης μέγα κύμα κυλίνδων”, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ νοτίου “ἔνθα νότος μέγα κύμα ποτὶ σκαῖον ῥίον ὠθεῖ”, καὶ τῷ μὲν κυλίνδων τὴν ἄνωθεν ἐμπίπτουσαν φορὰν τοῦ ἀνέμου ἐμφαίνει, τῷ δὲ ὠθεῖ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ κοιλοτέρου πρὸς τὸ ἀναντες βίαν.

Similar doctrine is offered by Heraclitus, *Alleg. Hom.* 47.1–3 and by Porphyry on *Od.* 3.295.⁷ In all these passages the aim is to demonstrate that Homer was fully abreast of the natural sciences; in Gellius, however, Homer merely bears additional witness to a supposed fact adduced to explain why the sea becomes calm much sooner

⁵ Giuseppe Broccia, *Enchiridion: per la storia di una denominazione libraria* (Note e discussioni erudite 14; Rome, 1979), pp. 22–3, who also notes (p. 22 n. 39) that the *Suda* s.v. *Ἡρώδης* (H 545) apparently understood Philostratus' *καίρια* as *λόγους αὐτοσχεδίου*; if so, it was wrong. The sense is rather 'things to meet a speaker's need': cf. W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* (Subsidia epigraphica 11; Hildesheim, 1983), i.120–1 with n. 19.

⁶ As emended by Wytttenbach, edn. x.1146; condensed at *ΣΕ Od.* 5.295 (i.274 Dindorf).

⁷ *Quaestiones Homericae* on the *Odyssey*, ed. H. Schrader (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 36–7; cf. those on the *Iliad* (Leipzig, 1880–2), pp. 397–8. On the survival of the flat-earth conception that the south is lower than the north, see F. Buffière, 2nd edn. of Heraclitus, p. 119 n. 4; cf. e.g. Verg. *Georg.* 1.240–1.

after the north wind has ceased blowing than after the south. Whether this lends support to Ludwig Mercklin's assertion that the source is Nigidius, *De uentis*,⁸ which is cited at 2.22.31, *ego in medium relinquo*.

3.1.1. Hieme iam decedente apud balneas Titias in area subcalido sole cum Fauorino philosopho ambulabamus...

Titias *Lipsius*: sticias *VP*: stitias *R*: scithias *C* (Scythias *Londin. Add. 1691*): sticias, scitias, scicias, *similia fere* ς : Sittias *edd. uett. (nisi qui Scicias uel Scias scribunt)*

Justus Lipsius, *De amphitheatro* (Antwerp, 1584), p. 27, quoting (incompletely) *HA Maximus et Balbinus* 1.4, appended an asterisk to *de* in the phrase *de thermis Titianis* with the marginal note: 'Quae nescio an in Agellio restituendae sint, lib. III. cap. I. *Apud balneas Titias*, non autem *sittias*, vt libri. Nec tamen adfirmo.' Modern editors show no such hesitation in printing his conjecture; but modern commentators have given up the underlying equation of the *balneae Titiae* with Titus' baths, the *thermae Titianae*: thus Rolfe writes, 'Otherwise unknown. The Baths of Titus were *Thermae* and the adjective is *Titianae*.'

That Gellius writes *balneas* rather than *thermas* might be pure classicism, for *balneae* is used by Plautus and approved by Varro (*L.L.* 9.68), whereas *thermae* is Silver; but to defend *Titiae* in the sense of *Titianae* one would have to invoke the *curia Titia*, supposedly named after Titus Tatius (PF 503.21 Lindsay), and the *sodales Titii* (Tac. *A.1.54.1*), for whom Varro, however, appears to have given a different etymology (*L.L.* 5.85). Unless, then, Gellius was being exceptionally perverse in thus renaming a place of everyday resort, we cannot accept both Lipsius' conjecture and the sense it is intended to convey: we must either emend further, $\{s\}Titi\{as\}$ or $\{s\}Titi\langle an \rangle as$, or else (like Marache and Cavazza) reinterpret *Titias* as denoting baths owned or founded by a Titius whom we cannot identify,⁹ but if the name is corrupt and the baths are unknown, we have no compelling reason to posit a dittography of the *s* in *balneas* rather than (for instance) a two-letter transposition, *Stittias* for *Sittias*.¹⁰ Perhaps the obelus would be safest.

4.1.5. quid enim refert mea eiusque quicum loquor, quo genere penum dicam aut in quas extremas litteras declinem, si nemo id non nimis barbare fecerimus?

nemo] modo *C*, *Gottingensis philol.* 162, *Lion*, *C. F. W. Müller* fecerimus *P*: fecerim *VCR*, *Gott.*: fecerit ς

To justify *si nemo non fecerimus* as Latin for *si neuter nostrum fecerit*, J. F. Gronovius cited Plautus, *Miles* 1411 *iura te non nociturum esse homini de hac re nemini* and Hertz *CIL* viii.5370.3-4 = *CEL* 112.4 (of a father whose two sons died before him) *post tantos sumptus non fructus nemine* (the preceding senarius runs *in studiisq. misit et honores tribuit*); but *non...nemo* for *nemo* no more justifies *nemo...non* in that sense than $\text{o}\nu\kappa\text{...o}\nu\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is synonymous with $\text{o}\nu\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\text{...o}\nu$, and even if it did it would be out of place after *dicam* and *declinem*, for the hypothetical interlocutor has not used the word at all, barbarously or otherwise. Yet Hertz himself, in his separate edition of *N.A.* 4.1-4 (Progr. Breslau, winter 1868), had printed *si modo id non nimis barbare fecerim*, perfect in sense and syntax; and that, though Hertz did not know it, is the reading of *C* and of the fifteenth-century manuscript Göttingen, Niedersächsische

⁸ *JbCIPh*, Suppl.² 3 (1857-60), 677.

⁹ J. F. Gronovius invoked the butt of Mart. 11.51, no more a real person here than at 4.37.2, 7.55.5, or in the jurists.

¹⁰ For the luxurious P. Sittius see *RE* Sittius 2; but his son(?) the Catilinarian and Caesarian might also have left fine baths.

Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. philol. 162.¹¹ *Modo* had been conjectured by Albert Lion in his edition of 1824 and by C. F. W. Müller, *RhM*² 20 (1865), 156,¹² though neither accounted for the corruption (untimely repetition of the sequence *inem* combined with loss of a titulus, *declinemsimō* > *declinemsinemo*?); both accepted *fecerimus*, reported by J. F. Gronovius not only from P but from R, where Hertz detected *fecerim* with a question-mark¹³ above the *m* (so also C) that might be mistaken for ^o = *us*. No doubt P's *fecerimus* goes back to a similar error.

7.16.2. Nam cum esset uerbum 'deprecor' doctiuscule positum in Catulli carmine, quia id ignorabat, frigidissimos uersus esse dicebat omnium quidem iudicio uenustissimos, quos subscripsi (*sequitur carmen Catulli XCII*).

quidem *V*: quidem *C*, ζ *nonnulli*: quidem meo *Gott.*, *de Buxis*: in eo quidem meo *fere* ζ

Since Hertz, editors have followed V, but to translate is to refute: 'the most delightful verses, at least in everybody's opinion'. Why should Gellius distance himself from public opinion, when it is the ignorant dissenter who is in the wrong? Read *meo quidem* and all is well; 'what in my opinion, at any rate, are the most delightful of all his verses'.¹³ The varying position of *meo* (of which *in eo* is an emendation by a scribe who found *meo quidem meo* in his exemplar) may suggest marginal or interlinear insertion;¹⁴ but even if interpolated, it is a true emendation. On the other hand, V again omits a necessary word at §8, 'pleni sunt adeo libri ueterum (*C, fere* ζ: *om. V*) similis in hoc uerbo significationis'.

10.16.8. ... quoniam poetae ipsi quaedam κατὰ πρόληψιν historiae dicere ex sua persona concedi solet, quae facta ipse postea scire potuit ...

πρόληψιν, accepted by Gellius' editors, is the normal reading in those *recentiores* (including Pietro da Montagnana's correction in G) that contain Greek and reproduce this passage without gross corruption; but the medieval manuscripts establish the paradox *πρόληψιν*, which is indeed also the reading of Vat. lat. 1534 and after correction of Lamola's Vat. lat. 3453 (*πρόλη'ν'ψιν*). It should certainly be adopted: Latin regularly uses such derivatives of λαμβάνω in their Koine form -λημπτ-, -λημψ-, hypercorrected in the Renaissance to accord with Attic and Atticistic -ληπττ-, -ληψ-.¹⁵

15.2.3. Is in conuiuiis iuuenum, quae agitare Athenis hebdomadibus lunae sollemne nobis fuit ...

The normal meaning of *hebdomas*, in a chronological context, is a period of seven days, or a week; so it is used by Gellius himself, following Varro, at 3.10.7, and so

¹¹ Well described in *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im Preussischen Staate. I. Hannover. 1–3. Göttingen* (Berlin, 1893–4), i.35–6; it contains extracts of ever-increasing fullness from bks. 1–7 and a δ text of 9.1. cap.-14.1.22 'impari(litas)'. Bks. 6–7 take the same order as in VPR, MS Vat. lat. 1532, and the *Florilegium Gallicum*: 5.21.1 is followed by 6.1.1 on a new line ('VI' m^{2ms}), 6.20 by the heading 'Liber Sextus' and the mutilated text of 7.1.1, beginning 'In homines fecisse dicantur', 7.17 by 'Explicit liber sextus Incipit Septimus et primo capitula eiusdem' [sc. of bk. 9].

¹² Müller describes the text as given (from Hertz's *προέκδοσις* of 1853) as 'unmöglich'; cf. F. R. D. Goodyear, *CR*² 21 (1971), 389 = *Papers on Latin Literature* (London, 1992), p. 272..

¹³ Cf. P. K. Marshall, J. Martin, and R. H. Rouse, *Medieval Studies* 42 (1980), 367: 'this is surely right'.

¹⁴ C's reading reappears in London, British Library, MSS Burney 174, 175, 176, Add. 16981; BL Harley 2768 reads *omnium in eo meo quidem iudicio*.

¹⁵ See Wilhelm Schulze, *Orthographica* (Marburg, 1894; repr. Sussidi eruditi 14; Rome, 1958), pt. I; Ed. Fraenkel, *JHS* 38 (1948), 136 = *Kleine Beiträge zum klassischen Philologie* (Rome, 1964), ii.351.

later in expositions of the Easter computus, e.g. Augustine, *Ep.* 55.3.5 'tertia hebdomade lunae pascha celebratur, id est qui dies occurrit a quarta decima in uicesimam primam' (cf. §§5.9, 13.23). But why should young men at Athens have feasted the moon's quarters? The veneration of the new moon, three centuries later, by such Neoplatonists as Syrianus and Proclus (Marinus, *Vita Procli* 11), adduced by Jacobus Gronovius, is spectacularly irrelevant; Antonius Oiselius' interpretation, that the feasts were held in honour of Apollo on the seventh of each (lunar) month,¹⁶ makes far better sense, for these are young men, in whose feasting he especially delights and who in Plato's *Laws* – the main topic for discussion in this chapter – form his chorus. The use of *luna* for an Athenian month, notionally representing a lunation, is vindicated by Cic. *Fin.* 2.101: 'itemque omnibus mensibus uicesimo die lunae', translating Epicurus' ἐκάστου μηνὸς ταῖς εἰκάσι (fr. 217 Usener = D.L. 10.18). But what of *hebdomadibus*, which for Gronovius *filis* ruled that interpretation out of court?

At Theophrastus, *Characters* 16.10, the Superstitious Man venerates the Hermaphrodites ταῖς τετράσι...καὶ ταῖς ἑβδομάσι. Immisch Atticized to ἐβδόμαις and added φθίνοντος, Pasquali retains the transmitted text; our concern, however, is not with what Theophrastus wrote, but with the Koine usage found in his manuscripts. At Herodas 3.53 τὰς ἑβδόμας δ' (Terzaghi, τ pap.) ἄμεινον εἰκάδας τ' οἶδε the papyrus exhibits supralinear δα above the last two letters of ἑβδόμας; the resulting ἑβδομάδας is to be rejected on metrical grounds (for this poet rarely resolves *brevia*),¹⁷ but not (despite Mandilaras *in apparatu*) on semantic. In Harpocration s.v. ἑβδομενομένου (i.102.15–16 Dindorf) τὰς ἑβδομάδας καὶ τὰς δεκάτας (v.1. δεκάδας) Dobree conjectured ἑβδόμας,¹⁸ but the derivative entry at *EM* 308.40–1 supports ἑβδομάδας (and δεκάδας).¹⁹ Evidently the analogy of εἰκάς and τριακάς had generated a corresponding use of ἑβδομάς still current in Gellius' day.

19.12.2. Disseruit autem [Herodes Atticus] contra ἀπάθειαν Stoicorum lacessitus a quodam Stoico, tamquam minus sapienter et parum uiriliter dolorem ferret ex morte pueri quem amauerat.

The *puer* has been commonly identified with Vibullius Polydeucion or Polydeuces, of the three τρόφιμοι whom Herodes Atticus mourned over-ostentatiously the recipient of the most extravagant commemoration. One *terminus ante quem* for his death is provided by *IG* ii².3968, reporting games in his honour celebrated – not necessarily instituted – under the archon Dionysius, not independently datable although the name is stamped on tiles used in a rebuilding of Agrippa's Odeion; another by Herodes' exchange with the brothers Quintilii on his statues of the boys. However, the demonstration that their Greek mission belongs to the early 170s,²⁰ and not as used to be thought the late 140s, has induced lower datings for the boys' deaths, and therefore for Gellius' visit to Athens.²¹ This makes nonsense of Gellian chronology: Gellius, a young man among young men at Athens, went there c.147, before, not

¹⁶ Cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 770, Σ Ar. *Plut.* 1126.

¹⁷ See Cunningham's first edition (Oxford, 1971), p. 219.

¹⁸ *Adversaria*, i (Cambridge, 1831), p. 586.

¹⁹ Contrast ἑβδόμας and δεκάτας at Zonaras i.594 Tittmann.

²⁰ G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 98–100; J. H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civil and Cultural Policy in the East* (*Hesperia*, Suppl. 13; Princeton, NJ, 1970), pp. 66–72.

²¹ 170s: S. Follet, *REG* 90 (1977), 47–54; she would identify Gellius' Stoic with Demonax (51–2), who at Luc. *Demon.* 24 mocks Herodes' obsession with the dead Polydeucion (on her dating a topical allusion, but Lucian was not concerned with topicality: even Epictetus, d. c.135, is a butt at §55). 160s: W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus*, i.113–17, *Hermes* 112 (1984), 484–90.

after, enrolment as a judge.²² If Polydeucion died in the 160s, then either Gellius made a second visit, for which there is no other evidence, when he was no longer a student but a cultivated adult,²³ or Polydeucion was not the *puer* of 19.12, as indeed there is no proof that he was.

The later date, however, is also cried up as permitting Philostratus to observe approximate chronological order in recounting the deaths of Herodes' wife, daughters, and foster-sons.²⁴ Yet the context in which the boys are mentioned excludes any chronological inference: Herodes' grief for his wife and daughters contrasted with his dislike for his slow-witted son Bradua (*cos.* 185), to whom he left his wife's estate but not his own, ἀλλ' Ἀθηναίους ἀπάνθρωπα ἐδόκει ταῦτα, οὐκ ἐνθυμουμένοις τὸν Ἀχιλλέα καὶ τὸν Πολυδεύκην καὶ τὸν Μέμνονα, οὓς ἴσα γνησίοις ἐπένηθη τροφίμους ὄντας (*VS* 558). Public opinion, disgusted by Herodes' will, ignored the evidence that he had been capable of paternal feelings to those who deserved them.

From the resemblance between the cult of Polydeucion and that of Antinous one would most naturally infer that his death belonged in the later years of Hadrian or the earlier years of Pius. This inference has recently been refined by Hugo Meyer,²⁵ who dates the portrait-busts to the late 140s; he also assigns to the same period the rebuilding of the Odeion, and therefore the archonship of Dionysios.²⁶ Since Herodes' mother, who was born in the early 80s and is not credited in Philostratus' long biography with a ripe old age, was still alive to honour Polydeucion's memory,²⁷ the earlier date is more convenient; moreover, although there is no difficulty in believing that Herodes continued the grotesque extravagance all his life,²⁸ Philostratus does not say that Herodes was still erecting statues when the Quintilii criticized him: Κυντιλίων δέ, ὅποτε ἤρχον τῆς Ἑλλάδος, αἰτιωμένων αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν μειρακίων τούτων εἰκόσιν ὡς περιτταῖς, "τί δὲ ὑμῖν" ἔφη "διενήνοχεν, εἰ ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐμπαίζω λιθαρίοις;" (*VS* 559). The brothers need merely have seen statues long since erected, and Herodes' present, even if accurately reported, may perfectly well be timeless.²⁹

The case stands thus. At some time about A.D. 147, when Gellius was in Athens, Herodes Atticus lost, or had lost, a beloved boy; artistic evidence suggests that by that date he had set up a cult of Vibullius Polydeucion, based on that of Antinous. Games in his honour were instituted in or before the archonship of Dionysius, whose date, to judge by the rebuilding of Agrippa's Odeion, falls about the same time; statues of Polydeucion and two other boys were visible in the early 170s, when the Quintilii came to Athens. Nothing in Gellius compels identification of the *puer* of 19.12.2 with Polydeucion, but no other evidence forbids it.

Oxford

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS

²² L. A. Holford-Strevens, *Latomus* 36 (1977), 96–100, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), p. 12 and n. 26, cf. P. K. Marshall, *CPh* 58 (1963), 146–7; S. M. Beall, 'Civilis eruditio: Style and Content in the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius' (Ph.D. Diss., U. of Calif. at Berkeley, 1988), 12.

²³ At leisure either because it was his decury's free year (Suet. *Aug.* 32.3) or because he had earned the *ius trium liberum* (*Fr. Vat.* 197).

²⁴ Follet 50, cf. Ameling, *Boreas* 11 (1988), 65–6.

²⁵ *MDAI(A)* 100 (1985), 393–404, *Boreas* 12 (1989), 119–22, in answer to Ameling, *ibid.* 11 (1988), 62–70.

²⁶ Since Pausanias wrote his description of Attica before Herodes' Odeion had been begun (7.20.6), his silence on the rebuilding of Agrippa's at 1.8.6 may be similarly explained; but bk. 1 cannot be securely dated.

²⁷ Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* ii.171, nos. 174–5.

²⁸ Cf. Hermann Göring's even more grotesque cult of Carin von Fock.

²⁹ On Ameling's argument from the development of the curse-formula (*Herodes Atticus* ii.23–6), see Meyer, *Boreas* 12 (1989), 120.