



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Ronald Mellor The Dedications on the Capitoline Hill

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **8 • 1978**

Seite / Page **319–330**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1402/5751> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1978-8-p319-330-v5751.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

RONALD MELLOR

The Dedications on the Capitoline Hill*

For David Daube

I. The Problem

For more than a century scholars have studied a group of dedications set up in Rome by Greek cities and kings.¹ These inscriptions involve numerous difficulties: several survive only in Renaissance copies (and another has disappeared in our own century); most texts are fragmentary and were found in widely separated quarters of Rome; and there are serious problems in establishing their dates. When new fragments were discovered in 1886–1887, THEODOR MOMMSEN immediately perceived that all these texts formed part of a single group, and he suggested that they were originally placed on the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol in the time of L. Cornelius Sulla.²

In 1954 ATTILIO DEGRASSI collected these texts (including several previously unpublished fragments) with photographs and comprehensive bibliographies.³ His detailed treatment of the stones demonstrated that the texts were inscribed on travertine blocks of similar size with nearly identical moldings and considerable paleographic similarities. DEGRASSI concluded that these texts were not inscribed on the temple of Jupiter, but formed a large monument (at least 20 meters around) located near the Capitoline temple. Since travertine is not well attested for inscriptions before the first century and since the letter forms also seem to be from the first century, DEGRASSI follows MOMMSEN in placing this monument in the age of Sulla.⁴

But other scholars have not accepted the Sullan date for all these texts. In a series of numismatic and epigraphic studies, TH. REINACH demonstrated that the only known Mithridates who was called Philopator Philadelphus was king of Pontus from about 170 to 150 BC and thus the dedication which he set up in

* For suggestions and references, I am grateful to E. BADIAN, A. E. RAUBITSCHKE and the Editors of *Chiron*.

¹ TH. MOMMSEN, *Annali del Istituto* 30, 1858, 206; *CIL* I p. 170.

² *ZfN* 15, 1887, 212 (*Gesammelte Schriften* IV 74).

³ *BCAR* 74, 1954, 19 ff. (*Scritti Vari*, Rome 1962, I 415 ff.).

⁴ *Ibid.* 43 f.

Rome could hardly have a Sullan date.⁵ MOMMSEN, to preserve the Sullan date, hypothesized (with scant evidence) that a little known son of Mithridates Eupator may have assumed the epithets Philopator Philadelphus.⁶

But the crux of the problem lies in the strong, almost incontrovertible, physical evidence that these texts formed part of a single group. Thus MOMMSEN speculates about a Mithridates in order to justify a Sullan date for that text, while MAGIE is bound to an improbably early date for the freedom of Ephesus in keeping with his desire to date the entire series of texts to the early second century.⁷ The confusion engendered by such hypotheses is vividly illustrated in volume IX of the *Cambridge Ancient History* where ROSTOVITZ uses the Mithridates inscription in discussing Mithridates IV, while in another chapter ORMEROD refers the same text to a son of Eupator.⁸ No satisfactory solution for the dating of these texts has yet been suggested, but the issue remains important – not least because scholars, laboring under the apparent need to date all these texts to the same era, have produced historical hypotheses which have resulted in distortions of the historical record.

J. A. O. LARSEN, who believed the historical evidence demanded a date in the 160's for the Lycian and Mithridatic texts, suggested that the original monument was set up at that time.⁹ Some texts were inscribed then, while the remainder were added over the ensuing century. MARIA ELENA BERTOLDI has recently made a similar suggestion, and has also linked these texts with blocks of relief sculpture which were excavated near the inscriptions.¹⁰ She dates the sculpture on stylistic grounds to the middle of the second century and suggests that it formed part of the same monument as the inscriptions, but with some texts added at later dates. The connection with the sculpture is interesting, but hardly conclusive for dating the inscriptions.¹¹ A detailed technical examination of texts and sculpture has provided no evidence of such a connection, and other scholars have reached diffe-

⁵ In *Revue Numismatique* 1887, 97 f. (= REINACH, *Trois royaumes de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1888, 171 f.), he places the dedication in the second century, but here identifies the epithets Philopator Philadelphus with Mithridates Euergetes. Later REINACH, *Revue Numismatique* 1902, 52 ff. (= REINACH, *L'histoire par les monnaies*, Paris 1902, 127 ff.) published a silver tetradrachm of Mithridates IV and his wife/sister Laodice. He revised the Pontic genealogy to show Mithridates IV Philopator Philadelphus (169–150) as the brother of his predecessor Pharnaces and the father of his successor, Mithridates V Euergetes (150–121). This reconstruction is confirmed by the Delian dedication published by REINACH in 1910, *BCH* 34, 1910, 429 f. no. 1 (= *IDelos* 1555).

⁶ *ZfN* 15, 1887, 209 f. (= *GS* IV 71 f.).

⁷ D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, II 955 n. 67.

⁸ *CAH* IX, 221; 353.

⁹ *CP* 51, 1956, 158 f.

¹⁰ *Quaderni del Istituto di Topografia Antica* 5, 1968, 39 ff.

¹¹ Other scholars prefer to date the sculptures to the first century; cf. G.-CH. PICARD, *MEFR* 71, 1959, 269 f.

rent stylistic conclusions.¹² BERTOLDI also seems to ignore difficulties to which LARSEN, at least, was sensitive: the use of travertine and paleographic indications of a first century date. Though letter forms are a notoriously uncertain method of dating, DEGRASSI is the acknowledged master of Latin republican epigraphy, and his views cannot be ignored. LARSEN and BERTOLDI have made useful contributions in attempting to avoid a single date for all these texts, but their conclusions remain unconvincing.

I would like to suggest that these inscriptions were indeed documents from both the second and first centuries which were deposited on the Capitol but that later, in the time of Sulla, they were reinscribed on a single travertine monument standing near the temple of Fides. After a discussion of the most important of these texts and their historical context, we can better evaluate the utility and plausibility of this suggestion.

II. The Texts

DEGRASSI's excellent 1954 publication includes nearly all the relevant texts with photographs and comprehensive bibliographies, though his 1965 CIL volume provides better photographs.¹³ DEGRASSI's scrupulous account of the stones, letters and provenance remains basic and the physical descriptions here are drawn from his work.

1) Text seen on the Capitol in the 16th century, but now lost:¹⁴

[AB CO]MVNI RESTITVTEI IN MAIORVM LEIBERT[ATEM]
[LVCEI] ROMA(M) IOVEI CAPITOLINO ET POPVLO ROMANO V[IRTVTIS]
BENIVOLENTIAE BENEFICIQVE CAUSA ERGA LVCIOS AB COMVN[I]

Λυκίων τὸ κοινὸν κομισάμενον τὴν πάτριον δημ[ο-]
κρατίαν τὴν Ῥώμην Δι Καπετωλῷ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ[ι]
Ῥωμαίων ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας καὶ εὐεργεσίας
τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Λυκίων

During the third century when Ptolemaic power in the Aegean waned, the cities of Lycia banded together against the growing power of their hereditary

¹² C. F. GIULIANI, Quaderni 5, 1968, 54 ff.

¹³ BCAR 74, 1954, 19 ff.; CIL Auctarium, Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae: Imagines, Berlin 1965, 85-90 (hereafter CIL Imagines).

¹⁴ CIL I² 725; CIL VI 372; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 19 no. 1; DEGRASSI, Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Florence 1957-1963, no. 174 (hereafter DEGRASSI, ILL RP); L. MORETTI, Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae, Rome 1968, I no. 5 (hereafter MORETTI, IGUR).

enemy, Rhodes.¹⁵ The position of Lycia and its rugged coastline made it ideal for piracy, and the mercantile Rhodians strongly opposed this traditional occupation of the Lycians.¹⁶ The Lycians supported Antiochus III in his war against Rome and, despite intense diplomatic activity, they were handed over to Rhodes by the Roman commissioners at Apamea (188).¹⁷ The Lycians waged a long guerilla war against their Rhodian masters, especially after 177 when a changing political situation made it expedient for Rome to encourage this insurgency.¹⁸ Finally, after Pydna (168), Rome acted directly against Rhodes, and Lycia was given its freedom.¹⁹ On purely historical grounds, this is the most plausible date for the Lycians to have dedicated a statue of Roma to Jupiter and the *Populus Romanus*, and the phrases *in maiorum libertatem* and τὴν πατρίον δημοκρατίαν certainly seem to suggest such a time.²⁰

In the first century, the Lycian League strongly resisted Mithridates and, after his defeat, Lycian freedom was formally confirmed by Sulla.²¹ The Capitoline inscription could possibly be in response to Sulla's act, as MOMMSEN and DEGRASSI suggest. But the phrasing and tone of that text seem more suitable to 167, and by 83 we might expect some reference to the *amicitia* and *societas* which by then existed between Rome and the Lycians. LARSEN has suggested that the definite article in τὴν Ῥώμην indicates that this was the only statue of Roma in the area (or on the monument) when this text was set up. It may then have been the earliest dedication of the group.²²

2) Text now in the Capitoline Museum:²³

[--- POPVLVM R]OMANVM, COGNATVM, AMICVM, SOCIV[M]
[VIRTVTIS ET BENIVOLENT]IAEI BENEFICIQVE ERGA LVCIOS IN COMV[NE]

The conclusion of this fragmentary text indicates that it too was set up by the Lycian League,²⁴ though on a different occasion. While the first text speaks of the Romans restoring δημοκρατίαν, this text calls the Roman people the *amicus*

¹⁵ MAGIE, op. cit., I 524; II 1380 n. 32; L. MORETTI, Ricerche sulle leghe greche, Rome 1962, 190.

¹⁶ SCHMITT, Rom und Rhodos, Munich 1957, 88 f.

¹⁷ MAGIE, op. cit., I 17; II 754 n. 49. On Apamea, cf. Polybius 21, 24, 7 f.

¹⁸ Polybius 25, 5, 1 f.; Livy 41, 6, 12.

¹⁹ Polybius 30, 5, 12.

²⁰ LARSEN, CP 51, 1956, 158.

²¹ Appian Mithr. 61. For the *senatus consultum* which seems to renew or bestow such privileges on the Lycian city of Cormus, cf. TAM II 899 (= R. K. SHERK, Roman Documents from the Greek East, 1969, no. 19).

²² LARSEN, CP 51, 1956, 169 n. 30.

²³ CIL I² 726; CIL VI 30927; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 20 no. 2; DEGRASSI, ILLRP, no. 175; CIL Imagines 85.

²⁴ DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 20, suggests that it was set up by a single Lycian city.

and *socius* of the Lycians indicating a more developed political relationship.²⁵ Sulla inscribed the Lycians as friends of Rome and the most likely date for this text is after the defeat of Mithridates. But the Lycians were quite likely Roman *amici* before the Mithridatic war, and this inscription could possibly date from the aftermath of Aristonicus' revolt.

The text is inscribed on a travertine block with a molding about 12 cm. wide and one cm. deep along the top of the stone – an identical profile to those on several of the texts discussed below.²⁶

3) Text found on the Quirinal; now in the Vatican Museum:²⁷

POPVLVS LAODICENSIS AF LYCO
POPVLVM ROMANVM, QVEI SIBEI
SALVTEI FVIT, BENEFICI ERGO, QVAE SIBE[I]
BENIGNE FECIT.

Ὁ δῆμος ὁ Λαοδιζέων τῶν πρὸς
τῷ Λύκῳ τὸν δῆμον τὸν
S Ῥωμαίων γεγονότα ἐ[αυτῶι]
σωτήρα καὶ εὐεργέτην
N ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοί[ας]
AN τῆς εἰς ἑαυτόν.

The Laodiceans dedicated this statue of the Roman People in gratitude for Roman benefactions, but we do not know of any such specific benefactions. Laodicea, taken from the Seleucids after Magnesia, remained under Attalid control for much of the second century.²⁸ MAGIE dates this text (with others in the series) to the middle of the second century – an expression of gratitude for some Roman favor to Laodicea.²⁹ But there is no evidence of such a favor and the Laodiceans remained under Attalid dominion. MOMMSEN dates the text (with the entire series) to 83 BC. But during the Mithridatic wars, Laodicea surrendered a Roman praetor to the Pontic armies.³⁰ MOMMSEN suggests that the dedication expresses gratitude for Roman pardon of Laodicea's action³¹ – but we know of no evidence for

²⁵ E. BADIAN, *Foreign Clientelae*, Oxford 1958, 12 f., correctly cautions against regarding *amicitia* as a rigid, legal status. Though the concept was quite elastic, however, it usually did testify to closer political contacts with Rome.

²⁶ DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 20. A molding of 12–13 cm. can be found on texts 2, 3 and 4 as well as on the blocks containing texts 5, 6 and 7.

²⁷ CIL I² 728; CIL VI 374; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 21 no. 3; DEGRASSI, ILLRP, no. 177; CIL Imagines 87; MORETTI, IGUR, no. 6.

²⁸ MAGIE, op. cit., I 27; II 986 f. n. 23.

²⁹ Ibid. II 955.

³⁰ Appian, *Mithr.* 20; Strabo 12, 8, 16; Livy, *Periochae* 78.

³¹ ZfN 15, 1887, 213 (= GS IV 75).

such a pardon. There is an absence of evidence, and neither 160 or 83 is even an especially likely occasion for this dedication. More probable would be the period after Attalus' bequest of his dominions to the Roman People, whose image is here erected by the Laodiceans.³² The Greek cities of Asia were implacably opposed to Aristonicus' revolt and welcomed his suppression by Rome. The text might accurately reflect Laodicean feeling at that time. In addition, the clumsy Latin of the translation of the Greek formulae would be far more likely about 130 than in 83 after nearly a half century of direct Roman administration.

The dedication is inscribed on a travertine block 57 cm. high with a molding of about 13 cm. along the top, which accords with other texts in the series. The Roman letters to the left of the Greek text are the remnants of another inscription which has been effaced to make room for the present one. But we cannot tell whether this was an act of replacement, correction or restoration.

4) Text found on the Quirinal; now in the Vatican Museum:³³

POPVLVS EPHESIV[S POPVLVM ROMANVM]
 SALVTIS ERGO, QVOD O[PTINUIT MAIORVM]
 SOVOM LEIBERTATEM [- - -]
 LEGATEI HERACLITVS HE[- - F(ILIVS)]
 HERMOCRATES DEM[- F(ILIVS)]

The Ephesians seem to have erected this dedication in gratitude for the restoration of their freedom. Ephesus had been Antiochus' principal naval base in his war against Rome, and after his defeat the city was assigned to Rome's ally Eumenes.³⁴ Though there is evidence that Ephesus was free by the beginning of the first century BC, no grant of freedom is attested in the sources.³⁵ MAGIE has suggested that Ephesus was already free of Attalid control as early as the 160's, but his evidence is flimsy.³⁶ He believes that the independent action of the Ephe-

³² A statue of the *Populus Romanus* may have been indistinguishable from one of the goddess Roma, since a single statuette from Ephesus is specifically identified as ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ῥωμαίων; ἡγεμονίς Ῥώμῃ and *urbs Romana*. Cf. *Forschungen in Ephesos*, Vienna 1912, II no. 27-28. For further discussion of these texts, cf. R. MELLOR, *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ*. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World, *Hypomnemata* 42, Göttingen 1975, 25 f.; 152 f. Contra, cf. C. P. JONES, *Phoenix* 31, 1977, 79.

³³ CIL I² 727; CIL VI 373; DEGRASSI, *BCAR* 74, 1954, 23 no. 5; DEGRASSI, *ILLRP*, no. 176; CIL *Imagines* 86.

³⁴ Polybius 21, 46, 10.

³⁵ The treaty between Sardes and Ephesus (OGIS 437) is the earliest unmistakable evidence of Ephesian independence from the Attalids. On this treaty which should be dated to the early first century, cf. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore 1969, no. 47.

³⁶ MAGIE, *op. cit.*, II 955 n. 67; on the Ephesian ships, cf. Strabo 14, 1, 38.

sian ships against Aristonicus proves that the city had long been free. But in the political vacuum following the death of Attalus in 133, the Ephesians would obviously have seized control of the ships of the royal navy stationed there – especially since these ships were probably manned largely by Ephesians.³⁷ Opposition to Aristonicus was the immediate response of most Greek coastal cities, whether free or part of the Attalid dominions. Ephesus' naval assaults on him prove nothing about the status of that city in 133.

It is far more likely that freedom came to the Ephesians as the result of the testament of Attalus or by the action of the Roman commissioners who organized Asia in 129.³⁸ Ephesus, Sardes and other cities formerly under Attalid control have priests of Roma serving as eponymous magistrates early in the first century.³⁹ It is extremely likely that these cities adopted eponymous priests of Roma simultaneously, presumably during the years immediately after the death of Attalus.⁴⁰ I believe Ephesus remained Attalid until 133, shared Roman protection in 131 and beneficence in 129, and then established cults and priesthoods in honor of Roma. That too would have been a most appropriate time for the Ephesians to send their dedication to Rome.

Ephesus sided with Mithridates for a time and, like other Greek cities in Asia, conducted massacres of Roman businessmen.⁴¹ But in 86 the city revolted against Pontic rule and even killed Zenobius, a general of Mithridates.⁴² The Romans, however, well understood that the Ephesians were opportunistically following the tide of the war, and Ephesus became a subject city after the defeat of Mithridates. Though DEGRASSI effectively rebuts MAGIE's early date for this text, he does not argue persuasively for the post-Mithridatic date that he and MOMMSEN attribute to all these texts.⁴³ On historical grounds, both early and late dates seem far less likely than about 129 BC.

This dedication is on a travertine block which is of the same height with an identical molding as the text from Laodicea. The letters are, however, several times as large and there is no Greek text.

5) Found near St. Omobono at the foot of the Capitol; now in the Capitoline Museum:⁴⁴

³⁷ M. ROSTOVITZ, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 1941, II 807; III 1522 n. 79; R. B. McSHANE, *The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum*, Urbana 1964, 196 n. 71.

³⁸ H. BENGTON, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit II*, Munich 1944, 241 ff.

³⁹ Ephesus and Sardes: OGIS 437; Thyatira IGRR IV 1304; Apollonis: SEG XIX 710; Nysa: Syll.³ 781.

⁴⁰ MELLOR (cf. n. 32) 70 ff.

⁴¹ Appian, *Mithr.* 21; 23; 61.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 25; 46.

⁴³ DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 43 f.

⁴⁴ CIL I² 730; CIL VI 30 922; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 25 f. no. 8; DEGRASSI, ILLRP, no. 180; CIL Imagines 89; MORETTI, IGUR, no. 9.

[REX METRADATES PILOPATOR ET PIL]ADELPVS REGVS M[ETR]ADATI F(ILIVS)
 [POPVLVM ROMANVM AMICITIAI E]T SOCIETATIS ERGO [Q]VAE IAM
 [INTER IPSVM ET ROMANOS? OPTIN]ET. LEGATI COIRAVERVNT
 [NEMANES NEMANEI F(ILIVS), MA]HES MAHEI F(ILIVS)

[βασιλεὺς Μιθραδάτης Φιλ]οπάτωρ καὶ Φιλάδελφος
 [βασιλέως Μιθραδάτ]ου τὸν δῆμον τὸν
 [Ῥωμαίων φίλον καὶ] σύμμαχον αὐτοῦ
 [γενόμενον εὐνοίας] ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν
 [πρεσβευσάντων Ναυμά]νους τοῦ Ναυμάνους
 [Μάου τοῦ Μάου?]

MOMMSEN long ago suggested that the Mithridates Philopator Philadelphus who dedicated this statue of the Roman People on the Capitol was a son of Mithridates VI Eupator, and that Sulla had installed this Philopator on the throne of Paphlagonia.⁴⁵ MOMMSEN thus places this dedication in the Sullan era as an expression of the young Mithridates' gratitude. Unfortunately, there is no independent evidence for the existence of this son of Eupator and MOMMSEN's reconstruction is completely speculative.⁴⁶ But REINACH soon made such speculation unnecessary by demonstrating from numismatic evidence that Mithridates IV of Pontus was called Philopator Philadelphus, and fixed his reign from about 169 to 150.⁴⁷ It was during his reign, after the defeat of Perseus, that Rome's shadow stretched farther into Asia freeing the Lycians from Rhodes and the Senate received embassies from rival claimants to the Cappadocian throne bearing gold crowns dedicated to the goddess Roma.⁴⁸ It was this Mithridates who sent the statue and dedication to the Capitol.⁴⁹

DEGRASSI, though unwilling to rebut REINACH, cannot quite bring himself to abandon MOMMSEN's otherwise unknown Mithridates.⁵⁰ He retains a Sullan date

⁴⁵ MOMMSEN, *ZfN* 15, 1887, 209 f. (= GS IV 71 f.).

⁴⁶ LARSEN, CP 51, 1956, 157; DERASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 27; 42. A royal prince Mithridates was sent by his father to rule the Colchians soon after the conference at Dardanus, but Eupator immediately suspects his popularity with the Colchians and recalls him to Sinope and executes him. He can hardly be seen as the author of the Capitoline text. Cf. Appian, *Mithr.* 64; Memnon in JAKOBY, FGrHist 434 F 24; REINACH, *Mithridate Eupator Roi de Pont*, Paris 1890, 301. MOMMSEN's attempt to link the Ναυμάνης of this dedication with Νεμάνης, a general of Mithridates mentioned in Appian *Mithr.* 19, is hardly convincing since Memnon 22 calls him Μηνοφάνης.

⁴⁷ REINACH, *L'histoire par les monnaies*, Paris 1902, 127 ff.; followed by GEYER, RE 15 (1932) 2161 ff.; H. VOLKMANN, *Kl. Pauly* 3, 1355.

⁴⁸ Polybius 31, 32, 3; 32, 1, 1 f.; 32, 10, 4.

⁴⁹ Appian, *Mithr.* 10, states that Mithridates V Euergetes (c. 150–120) was the first king of Pontus to enter φιλία with the Romans; but Appian is not completely clear about the Pontic succession. Cf. REINACH, *L'histoire par les monnaies*, 132 f.

⁵⁰ BCAR 74, 1954, 44.

for this text on the basis of the obvious physical similarities between this text and other in the series (same height and molding) and the rarity of travertine before the first century. These observations are important, but in no way diminish the fact that REINACH has conclusively dated the only known Mithridates Philopator Philadelphus some eighty years before Sulla.

6) Found together with no. 5; now in the Capitoline Museum:⁵¹

‘Ο δ[ῆμος]ς ὁ Ταβηνῶν
φίλ[ος] καὶ σύμμαχος
‘Ρω[μαίων]v

Little is known of Tabae after the city's bitter, but futile, resistance to Cn. Manlius Vulso in 189. Tabae's great moment of glory in Roman eyes came during the Mithridatic wars when the city fought alongside the Romans against the king. Sulla granted the Tabaeans special privileges which were confirmed in 81 by the *senatus consultum* which also renewed the alliance between Rome and Tabae.⁵²

Most scholars agree that this text is best dated after the Mithridatic wars.⁵³ J. & L. ROBERT have suggested that this text is in some respect different from other dedications in the group: later letter forms; different formulas; and no Latin translation.⁵⁴ They suggest that it is somewhat later than the others, but DEGRASSI disputes any later date and places it on the same monument as the texts discussed above.⁵⁵

7) Found with no. 5 and 6 at the foot of the Capitol; now lost:⁵⁶

[R]EX ARIOB[ARZANES PHILOROMAEVS]
ET REGINA [ATHENAIS PHILOSTORGVS]

8) Found at St. Omobono at the foot of the Capitol; now in the Capitoline Museum:⁵⁷

[. ARIARAT]HES FILIEI EOR[VM]
[CVM] IOVEI OPTV[MO]
[ARI]OBARZANE MAXV[MO]

⁵¹ CIL I² 730; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 25 f. no. 9; MORETTI, IGUR, no. 10.

⁵² OGIS 442.

⁵³ Even LARSEN, CP 51, 1956, 158, places this text in the first century.

⁵⁴ La Carie II, Paris 1954, 97 n. 5; J & L ROBERT, Bull. épigr. 1958, 550.

⁵⁵ BCAR 75, 1955, 71 f.

⁵⁶ CIL I² 731; CIL VI 30924; DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954, 31 no. 14; DEGRASSI, ILLRP, no. 181; CIL Imagines 90; as corrected by E. BADIAN, JRS 58, 1968, 248 f.

⁵⁷ DEGRASSI, BCAR 74, 1954 31 no. 15; DEGRASSI, ILLRP, no. 181a; CIL Imagines 90; corrected by BADIAN, JRS 58, 1968, 247 ff.

Cappadocia had long been ruled by the Ariarathid dynasty, from the satrap Ariarathes who held out against Alexander the Great until the murder of the last member of the dynasty, Ariarathes VII, by Mithridates about 100.⁵⁸ When the Romans intervened to contain Pontic expansion, Cappadocia was offered its freedom. But the Cappadocian nobles preferred a king, and so elected one of their own number, Ariobarzanes, to the throne about 95. He continued to have difficulties with Mithridates who drove him from his kingdom, but Ariobarzanes was restored by the Roman legions after the peace of Dardanus.⁵⁹

Thus the period after Sulla's victory in Asia would be a reasonable occasion for Ariobarzanes to send a dedication to Rome. But it has been suggested on paleographic grounds that this dedication was inscribed somewhat later than others in the group, perhaps at the restoration of Ariobarzanes I by Pompey in 63 or at the accession of Ariobarzanes II the following year.⁶⁰

Of all the texts discussed, only these texts concerning Ariobarzanes demand on historical grounds to be dated in the first century. LARSEN concedes that this raises serious difficulties for the earlier dating of the other texts. Though he attempts to resolve the difficulty by emphasizing the paleographic indications that these texts are later, LARSEN concedes that the gap he posits – over seventy years – is far greater than paleographic specialists will allow.⁶¹ These texts, which seem physically related to the other texts, must be dated in the first century.⁶²

The other inscriptions belonging to the group are all quite fragmentary, and little use can be made of these texts in dating the monument.⁶³

III. Reinscription

MOMMSEN plausibly placed these dedications on or near the Capitoline temple of Jupiter. From the fifth century BC clients had honored the Roman people by placing crowns and dedications in Jupiter's precinct on the Capitol.⁶⁴ Jupiter was

⁵⁸ MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, I 203 f.

⁵⁹ Strabo 12, 2, 11; Appian, *Mithr.* 60. On Cappadocia, cf. E. BADIAN, *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford 1964, 162 ff.

⁶⁰ The text of no. 7 is now lost. G. GATTI, who saw it, wrote to MOMMSEN: «non è una differenza di grandissimo tempo, ma certo è sensibile la posteriorità dell'*Ariobarzanes* al *Metradati* f.» This single description of the lost inscription is quoted in MOMMSEN, *ZfN* 15, 1887, 213 (GS IV 74). BADIAN, *JRS* 58, 1968, 247 ff., provides a meticulous examination of these texts and a judicious survey of possible historical circumstances that stand behind them.

⁶¹ CP 51, 1956, 158.

⁶² No. 7 (described by GATTI) was a travertine fragment with an upper molding.

⁶³ Cf. DEGRASSI, *BCAR* 74, 1954, no. 4; 6–7; 10–13; 16–21.

⁶⁴ Livy 2, 22, 6.

for the Romans the guarantor of treaties and the good faith of the Romans, so treaties were kept on deposit in his temple.⁶⁵ Treaties between Rome and Greek cities expressly mention that a copy was to be placed in the temple of Jupiter, so the Greeks were fully aware of this political function of the god and his temple on the Capitol.⁶⁶ It was there that the Greeks sent dedications, gold crowns and statues to be erected in honor of the Roman people.⁶⁷ No other place would have seemed appropriate.

DEGRASSI, however, has shown that this group of dedications were part of a large independent monument with a perimeter of at least sixty feet.⁶⁸ Some of these texts were uncovered in excavations near S. Omobono in which fragments of the Capitoline temple of Fides were also found, and it seems probable that the monument stood near the temple on the south edge of the Area Capitolina from where stones might easily have tumbled to S. Omobono.⁶⁹

On July 6, 83 BC the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was destroyed by fire, probably an act of arson by opponents of the Marian faction then controlling Rome.⁷⁰ This fire would have damaged or destroyed dedications and statues deposited in, or alongside, the temple. On other occasions the Romans rearranged and moved the dedications and statues that cluttered the Capitol, and such a housecleaning would logically have followed the destruction of Jupiter's temple.⁷¹ Since Sulla's pacification of Asia was inspiring dedications similar to those received by Rome after earlier eastern wars, I would suggest that a new monument accommodated these new texts as well as reinscribed copies of old dedications damaged in the fire. The architrave of the Pantheon is striking evidence that the Romans reinscribed damaged inscriptions.⁷² Thus we can perhaps accept this travertine monument, built in the time of Sulla, bearing both new and old dedications. And with ruins and later massive new construction surrounding the temple of Jupiter, the monument was erected near another temple attesting the good faith of the Roman people, the temple of Fides.⁷³

If we accept the suggestion that some of these texts were re-engraved during the Sullan era, we can then accept both the physical similarities of these stones

⁶⁵ Polybius 2, 26, 1; cf. F. W. WALBANK, *Commentary on Polybius I*, Oxford 1957, 353 f.

⁶⁶ M. P. NILSSON, *MDAI(R)* 43, 1933, 255 f.; for treaty, cf. OGIS 762.

⁶⁷ Livy 43, 6, 6.

⁶⁸ BCAC 74, 1954, 38 ff.

⁶⁹ F. COARELLI – L. USAI, *Guida Archeologica di Roma*², Rome 1975, 45; 159; BERTOLDI, *Quaderni* 5, 1968, 53; F. COARELLI, *MEFR* 81, 1969, 157.

⁷⁰ Appian BC 1, 83–86.

⁷¹ Livy 40, 51, 3.

⁷² BADIAN, *JRS* 58, 1968, 243; 245, cautions scholars to consider the possibility of re-engraving when the physical and historical evidence seem to be in conflict.

⁷³ COARELLI – USAI, *op. cit.*, 45; Fides could be connected with Jupiter and Roma, the guardians of Rome's diplomatic good faith: IGRR IV 1556; hymn in Plutarch, *Flamininus* 16.

and discordant historical evidence, rather than ignoring or explaining away important contradictions.⁷⁴ The dedications from Mithridates and from the Lycians can be dated to the 160's, while those from Ephesus and Laodicea can be placed (with less certainty) in the aftermath of the bequest of Attalus. The brief Tabaeian text resulted from Sulla's generous treatment of Tabae in 81, which may explain the differences in formulas from earlier texts. And paleographic differences in the Ariobarzanes text are easily explained if the text was added to the monument on the accession of Ariobarzanes II in 62.⁷⁵ If we accept this suggestion of a Sullan monument of both new and old texts with others added still later, we can approach the historical context of each individual text with far greater flexibility than has been the case heretofore.

So this large monument was built on the Capitol during the Sullan era – covered with dedications and surmounted with statues of Roma and the *Populus Romanus*. Not far off, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus was rebuilt by Q. Lutatius Catulus and was dedicated in 69.⁷⁶ This conjunction of monument and temple gives a special relevance to the dream of Catulus reported by Suetonius and Cassius Dio.⁷⁷ The old censor dreamed that a group of boys were playing near the altar of Jupiter, and Jupiter himself took a statuette of Roma and placed it in the folds of a boy's toga. That boy was the young C. Octavius, later to be Augustus. Though the dream is an invention of Augustan hagiographers, the image is a felicitous one. For Augustus replaced Jupiter in an association with Roma, and it was to Roma and Augustus that dedications were made and cults established by the provincial subjects of the new dynasty.

⁷⁴ MAGIE's attempt to place the freedom of Ephesus before 150 is indicative; on contradictions in the CAH, cf. n. 7 above.

⁷⁵ BADIAN, *JRS* 58, 1968, 247 f.

⁷⁶ Plutarch, *Publicola* 15.

⁷⁷ Suetonius, *Divus Augustus* 94, 8; Cassius Dio 45, 2, 3.