



<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

C. P. Jones

Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **4 • 1974**

Seite / Page **183–206**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1506/5855> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1974-4-p183-206-v5855.9

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).

C. P. JONES

Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon

No text of ancient literature mentions the name of Diodoros Paspáros.¹ In modern times it remained unknown until 1907, when H. HEPDING assembled a series of Pergamene inscriptions (two already published) relative to him.² These revealed Diodoros as a great benefactor of Pergamon, and active on its behalf when Asia had become a province of republican Rome. The inscriptions of Diodoros have rightly been considered among the richest of all Hellenistic decrees concerning benefactors;³ and he himself, still unheard of when the standard encyclopedia reached the name Diodoros in 1903, now receives handsome amends from the latest volume of supplements in a full and helpful discussion by D. KIENAST.⁴

¹ I am grateful to Professors E. BADIAN, T. D. BARNES, G. W. BOWERSOCK, P. S. DEROW, and CH. HABICHT for their help and criticism, and to Dr. E. ERXLEBEN for kindly lending me two squeezes from the files of IG.

All dates are B. C. unless otherwise indicated. The following abbreviations will be used: BOWERSOCK, *Augustus* = G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965; BROUGHTON, *MRR* = T. R. S. BROUGHTON, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic I-II*, New York 1951-1952; BROUGHTON, *Survey* = T. R. S. BROUGHTON, *Roman Asia*, in: TENNEY FRANK, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV*, Baltimore (Md.) 1938; HABICHT, *Inscr. Asklep.* = *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII 3*: CH. HABICHT, *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*, Berlin 1969; HANSEN, *Attalids*² = E. V. HANSEN, *The Attalids of Pergamon*², *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* 36, Ithaca (N. Y.) and London 1971; HOLLEAUX, *Études* = M. HOLLEAUX, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, ed. L. ROBERT, 6 vols., Paris 1938-1968; MAGIE = D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 2 vols., Princeton (N. J.) 1950; OHLEMUTZ, *Kulte* = E. OHLEMUTZ, *Die Kulte und Heiligtümer der Götter in Pergamon*, Würzburg 1940; ROBERT, *Ét. anat.* = L. ROBERT, *Études anatoliennes*, Paris 1937; ROBERT, *OMS* = L. ROBERT, *Opera minora selecta*, 3 vols., Amsterdam 1969; ROBERT, *Villes*² = L. ROBERT, *Villes d'Asie mineure*², Paris 1962; ROSTOVITZ = M. ROSTOVITZ, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 3 vols., Oxford 1941; SHERK, *Documents* = R. K. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore (Md.) 1969; WILL = Éd. WILL, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*, 2 vols., Nancy 1966-1967. The *Bulletin épigraphique* of J. and L. ROBERT appearing annually in REG will be cited as 'Bull.' with the year and number of the item.

² HEPDING, *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 243-272, 314-315; further fragments, id., *MDAI(A)* 35, 1910, 407-414, 467. These discoveries revealed that IPergamon II 256 and *MDAI(A)* 29, 1904, 152-160 no. 1 also concerned Diodoros. The most important texts were republished as IGR IV 292-294. See the useful survey by KIENAST, *RE Suppl.* 12 (1970) 224-225.

³ L. ROBERT, *Ét. anat.* 45.

⁴ KIENAST, art. cit. 224-232.

The present study is not concerned with Diodoros' benefactions generally, but with a more limited problem: his date and historical circumstances. It has been universally agreed since the fundamental discussion of HEPDING that Diodoros' activities belong to the very earliest years of the province of Asia. That dating is ultimately based on a synchronism: one of the inscriptions of Diodoros mentions the twenty-ninth celebration of the Pergamene festival of Athena Nikephoros, and this in its turn is now generally agreed to have fallen in 125. It will be argued here, however, that Diodoros was active about half a century later, and that the celebration in question really fell in 69. It will first therefore be necessary to examine the cycle of the Nikephoria (a notorious snare) and to establish that the inscriptions mentioning numbered celebrations of the festival can be dated otherwise than at present. Only then will it be possible to examine the inscriptions of Diodoros for reference to events of the first century.

I. The Cycle of the Nikephoria

The festival of the Nikephoria at Pergamon was probably instituted by Attalos I in the late 220's.⁵ Its transformation into a major event, however, was due to Attalos' son and successor Eumenes II. After his great triumph over his hereditary enemy, Prousius I of Bithynia, and the Gauls led by Ortiagon, Eumenes sent sacred envoys to cities of the Greek world inviting them to recognize the Nikephoria as a festival of the highest rank, a στεφανίτης ἀγών. The envoys, who were sent out in the course of 182, were successful, and beginning in 181 celebrations of the Nikephoria were counted from the date of this reorganization.⁶

So much is certain. The problems begin with the cycle of the reorganized festival. It has been generally held that the Nikephoria were trieteric, that is, held every other year, and the several inscriptions mentioning numbered celebrations have been dated accordingly; thus the twenty-ninth celebration mentioned in one of the texts of Diodoros Paspáros is dated to 125. The notion of a trieteric period was based principally on an inscription in which the Nikephoria appeared to be referred to as τριετηρίδες.⁷ It will be argued later that this text has been misinterpreted: but

⁵ Polyb. 4, 49, 3. Thus M. HOLLEAUX, *REA* 18, 1916, 170–171 = *Études* II 61–62; cf. OHLEMUTZ, *Kulte* 34. The notion of W. KOLBE, *Hermes* 68, 1933, 445 (followed by F. W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I, Oxford 1957, 503, and HANSEN, *Attalids* 448), that the festival mentioned by Polybius might be the Pergamene Panathenaea, is unlikely: Polybius' account implies that Attalos' festival was new, like Prousius' Soteria, whereas the Panathenaea are already attested under Eumenes I (OHLEMUTZ, *Kulte* 25).

⁶ These dates were established by L. ROBERT, *BCH* 54, 1930, 332–338 = *OMS* I 151–157. Cf. ROSTOVITZ, II 636; III 1473 n. 45; MAGIE, I 21; II 764–765; HABICHT, *RE* 23 (1957) 1098–1103; WILL, II 241–242. On the ἀγῶνες στεφανίται see ROBERT, *Hellenica* 1, 1940, 116–117.

⁷ *I Pergamon* I 167, 17 (OGIS 299). See further below, pp. 186–188.

the prevailing interpretation would probably never have been called in question except for an inscription published posthumously by M. SEGRE in 1948.⁸ This added a substantial portion to a text already known, a letter of Eumenes II to the Coans concerning the reorganization of the Nikephoria (WELLES, Royal Correspondence no. 50): a parallel letter of the king on the same subject to Iasos (WELLES, Royal Correspondence no. 49) enables some of the remaining lacunae to be restored with certainty. The crucial passage runs as follows (with the words guaranteed by the letter to Iasos spaced out, as in SEGRE's text):

[καὶ νῦν]

[ἐ]παύξειν δὲ βουλόμενοι τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῆς]

[κ]αὶ μείζω χαριστή[ρια τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀγῶνων]

15 [ἀ]ποδιδόναι, διέγν[ωκότες δὲ συντελεῖν αὐτῇ πα-]

[ν]ήγουριν τε διὰ πεν[ταετηρίδος καὶ μουσι]-

[κο]ῦς καὶ γυμνικοῦς [ἀγῶνας, κτλ.]

The reading διὰ πεν[ταετηρίδος] is, as SEGRE observed, inevitable: in particular, he compared the very similar inscriptions concerning the establishment of the Leukophryena at Magnesia on the Maeander.⁹ Since Eumenes intended to «increase the honours» of Athena, it was natural that he should wish the reorganized Nikephoria to be equal to the great, penteteric festivals of the period, the Olympia and the Pythia (just as the constituent ἀγῶνες were to be ἰσοπύθιοι and ἰσολύμπιοι),¹⁰ and not merely to the lesser, trieteric Isthmia and Nemea.¹¹

The new fragment, however, is at obvious variance with the accepted notion of trieteric Nikephoria. SEGRE, holding it «absolument certain» that the Nikephoria were trieteric after their reorganization in 182, was constrained to argue that the letters to Cos and Iasos concerned some earlier reform.¹² This hypothesis was soon demolished by G. KLAFFENBACH, who showed that the reorganization mentioned in the two letters of Eumenes was the same as that referred to in two decrees from Delphi of the Aetolians and the Amphictyons (Syll.³ 629; 630), and that these were securely dated to 182.¹³ KLAFFENBACH, therefore, also considering it «außer allem

⁸ M. SEGRE in ROBERT, *Hellenica* 5, 1948, 102–128: the complete text on 104–105. Cf. Bull. 1949, 129.

⁹ SEGRE, art. cit. 109. See IMagnesia, Index XII s. v. πενταετηρίδος, and note especially IMagnesia 44, 7–8: πανάγουριν διὰ πενταετηρίδος καὶ ἀγῶνα μουσικὸν καὶ ἱππικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν στεφανίταν ἰσοπύθιον (also 61, 27–29; 82, 2–6). διὰ πέν[τε ἐτῶν], tentatively suggested by J. and L. ROBERT, Bull. 1952, 127, is perhaps too short: with SEGRE's restorations, line 16 has 33 letters, the surrounding lines respectively 33 (13), 38 (14), 39 (15), 35 (17), 35 (18), 36 (19).

¹⁰ Syll.³ 629, 9. 15 (FDelphes III 3, 240; IG IX² 1, 179); Syll.³ 630, 13. 28 (FDelphes III 3, 261; HOLLEAUX, *Études* II 63–72).

¹¹ On this distinction, L. ROBERT, RPh 41, 1967, 17.

¹² SEGRE, art. cit. 109–110.

¹³ KLAFFENBACH, MDAI 3, 1950, 99–106, referring to ROBERT, BCH 54, 1930, 332–336 = OMS I 151–155.

Zweifel» that the reorganized Nikephoria were trieteric,¹⁴ proposed the reading διὰ πέν[θ] ἡμερῶν in Eumenes' letter to Cos, thus making the king refer only to the duration of the festival and not its cycle. This suggestion in its turn was immediately refuted by J. and L. ROBERT: the reference to the cycle was guaranteed by the parallel texts, and διὰ πένθ' ἡμερῶν could only mean «every five days». «Il nous paraît», they observed, «qu'il ne faut pas violenter le texte pour le mettre en harmonie avec une reconstruction de l'histoire des Niképhoria, mais que celle-ci doit tenir compte de tous les textes».¹⁵ Such a reconciliation of the available evidence, principally that concerned with Diodoros, is the aim of the present investigation.¹⁶

The difficulties of SEGRE and KLAFFENBACH arose from their conviction that the Nikephoria were trieteric. The principal evidence for this belief, as has been noted, is a supposed reference to the festival as τριητηρίδες. This is contained in an inscription from Pergamon recording honours for a priestess of Athena called Metris, who was in office during the ninth celebration of the reorganized Nikephoria, on the accepted dating 165.¹⁷ During Metris' tenure, «the king has had notable successes, from which the greatest benefits have resulted for our people and for all others» (μεῖζονα εὐημερήματα γέγονεν τῷ βασιλεῖ, ἐξ ὧν τὰ μέγιστ' ἀγαθὰ τῷ τε ἡμετέρῳ δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν περιέγρονεν, lines 7–8); as a result of this «most fortunate state of affairs» (τὴν καλλίστην κατάστασιν . . . τῶν πραγμάτων, line 12), Metris is to be honoured with a statue in the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros, and «the announcement of the honours voted is to be made by the agonothete on the second day of the trieterides, when the city holds the dances in the goddess's honour» (τὴν δ' ἀναγόρουσιν ποιήσασθαι τῶν ἐψηφισμένων τιμῶν τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην τριητηρίδων τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ἣι τοὺς χοροὺς ἴστησιν ἡ πόλις τῇ θεᾷ, lines 16–18).¹⁸ To leave aside for the moment the «notable successes», M. FRÄNKEL, the first editor of the inscription, argued thus: since Metris was being crowned as priestess of Athena, and since the dances were to be in Athena's honour, the τριητηρίδες and the Nikephoria should be identical, and hence the festival was trieteric.¹⁹ Now that the new fragment from Cos has revealed the Nikephoria as penteteric, however, it becomes easier to see flaws in FRÄNKEL's argument. First, it is curious that the same festival should be named in the same text both τὰ Νικηφόρια and αἱ τριητηρίδες. Second

¹⁴ KLAFFENBACH, art. cit. 102.

¹⁵ J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull.* 1952, 127.

¹⁶ L. ROBERT's announced *Études pergaméniennes et attalides*, containing a study of this same problem (*Bull.* 1952, 1-27; *Villes*² 250 n. 8, on p. 251), has not yet appeared. I. RINGWOOD ARNOLD promises a study of Pergamene festivals, *AJA* 76, 1972, 17 n. 1.

¹⁷ IPergamon I 167 (OGIS 299).

¹⁸ From the Greek it is uncertain whether τριητηρίδων qualifies τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην (as usually assumed), ἡμέρᾳ, or both. In the regal period, agonothetes of individual festivals are found: in the republican, there appears to have been only one agonothete, charged with all the festivals (HABICHT, *Inschr. Asklep.* 85–86).

¹⁹ FRÄNKEL on IPergamon I 167 (p. 105), followed by DITTENBERGER, OGIS 299 n. 4, OHLEMUTZ, *Kulte* 39, and others.

and more important, there is already a famous festival of Pergamon called by the latter name: not surprisingly, since Dionysos was the *τριετηρικός θεός* *par excellence*, the Dionysia.²⁰ Moreover, in every Greek city the Dionysia are the festival usually reserved for the proclamation of public honours:²¹ the proclamation is often carried out by the agonothete, and is sometimes associated with the performance of tragedies or as here, though less often, with the holding of public dances, clearly because such occasions guaranteed a large audience for the announcement.²² From the fact that in the present inscription the agonothete is charged with the proclamation, it has been inferred that he controlled the whole festival: if that were correct, it would distinguish these *τριετηρίδες* from those in honour of Dionysos, where it was the god's priest who presided.²³ However, the agonothete is clearly charged with the proclamation, as in the many parallel texts, because of his association with the events (dances or tragedies) at which it was to be made, while the priest is naturally concerned with the religious aspects of the festival. Nor is it a difficulty that the dances in question are in honour of Athena (τῇ θεῇ) and not Dionysos. Since Athena was the chief divinity of Pergamon, it was natural to include in the Dionysia dances in her honour: in exactly the same way, the Eleusinian Dionysia are known to have included dances for the local goddesses, Demeter and Kore, as well as Dionysos.²⁴ That Athena was not in fact the chief divinity of these *τριετηρίδες* may be indicated by the holding of her dances on the second day: in the decrees of other cities concerning proclamations at the Dionysia, it is regularly stipulated that they shall be made «when the city first holds the dances in honour of the god».²⁵ It may be suspected that in the Pergamene *τριετηρίδες* the dances for the god were likewise held on the first day, and that Metris' honours are delayed until the second because

²⁰ OHLEMTZ, *Kulte* 108–109; note especially Suda T 971 ADLER, *Τριετηρίδες ἡμέραι* . . . ἐν αἷς . . . καθόλου πολλήν τιν' εἶχε ῥαθυμίαν τὸ Πέργαμον. On Dionysos as ὁ *τριετηρικός* see A. S. PEASE on Verg. *Aen.* 4, 302; Cic. *de nat. deor.* 3, 58.

²¹ Thus J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull.* 1961, 419, p. 187: «la fête banale qui ne manque dans aucune cité grecque et dans laquelle on proclame le plus souvent les honneurs decernés par la ville»; cf. *Bull.* 1966, 317 (Lepsia), 1970, 456 (Chalcis), 1971, 623 (Iasos). For Athenian examples, see the collection of Sir A. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*², Oxford 1968, 82 n. 2. Cf. Ehippos in *Athen.* 12, 538 A–B (FGrHist 126 F 5), crowns for Alexander at the Dionysia celebrated in Ecbatana.

²² Agonothete: see for example IPriene, Index IV 4 s. v. ἀγωνοθεσία. Tragedies: IG XII 7, 231, 34 ff.; IPriene 8, 32; 17, 42; 18, 8; 23, 14. Dances: see the examples collected by A. WILHELM, *Neue Beiträge VI*, SAWW 183, 3, 1921, 50–51, and L. ROBERT, *RA* 24, 1926, 180 = OMS I 239, to which add now ASAA 47–48, 1969–1970 (published 1972) 375 no. 3, 6–7 (Iasos).

²³ Thus OHLEMTZ, *Kulte* 39; cf. OGIS 331, 8. 10 (WELLES, *Royal Correspondence* no. 65, 4. 6), IGR IV 293 II 30. 35.

²⁴ IG II² 1186, 13–14; cf. L. DEUBNER, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932, 137; PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *op. cit.* 47 n. 4.

²⁵ Thus, among the examples in n. 22, observe IPriene 57, 4–5, τοῖς μὲν Διονυσίοις [ἔσταν] ἡ πόλις πρῶτον τοὺς χοροὺς συντελεῖ τῷ θεῷ.

Athena, whose priestess she was, was only associated with the festival by local courtesy. Metris, therefore, having held office during the ninth celebration of the reorganized Nikephoria, was to receive her public reward at the festival of Dionysos, the *τριετηρίδες*, whether that fell later in the same year or in a subsequent year of her tenure.²⁶ It follows that the inscription of Metris offers no support for presuming that the Nikephoria were also known as *τριετηρίδες*.

There remains the argument from supposed synchronisms between numbered celebrations of the Nikephoria and external events. In fact, though four such synchronisms are known, only two are particularly helpful, and these happen to occur in the inscriptions of Metris and Diodoros Paspáros. The four may be taken in order.

First Metris. As has been seen, Metris was priestess during the ninth celebration, and her tenure coincided with «notable successes» of «the king». On the usual dating, that is with trieteric Nikephoria counted from 181, the ninth celebration fell in 165. Now there is a notable event that more or less fits this chronology: Eumenes II's Gallic War of 168–166, which resulted in a decisive defeat of the Gauls and great rejoicing for cities of Asia.²⁷ On the other hand there is nothing in the inscription to compel this interpretation, since neither the king nor his enemies are named: indeed, the language might seem pale for a war which was represented as a triumph of civilization over barbarism.²⁸ By penteteric reckoning, the ninth celebration fell in 149: and it so happens that this was the year in which Eumenes' brother and successor, Attalos II, invaded Bithynia and achieved the deposition and death of his family's inveterate enemy Prousius II.²⁹ Apart from the literary references which show how highly this triumph was regarded by Attalos,³⁰ a lucky chance has preserved the text of the dedication which he made «to Zeus and Athena Nikephoros in return for his successes in the outcome of the war» (*Διὶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Νικηφόρῳ ἂντι τῶν*

²⁶ The priestess's tenure was probably, if the present argument is correct, for four years. An inscription of the third century A. D. (IPergamon II 525 = OGIS 513 = IGR IV 451) suggests that at that time priestesses held office for a term of two years (*διετία*: on this word, ROBERT, *Hellenica* 13, 1965, 209–210), perhaps renewable, and this has been held to support a trieteric cycle of the Nikephoria: but the history of the festival under the Empire is obscure (for an interesting detail, G. DAUX, *REG* 84, 1971, 366–369).

²⁷ On this war, HOLLEAUX, *REG* 37, 1924, 305–330; 478–479 = *Études* II 153–176; ROSTOVITZ, II 800; III 1519 n. 70; MAGIE, I 22–24; II 766 n. 62; WILL, II 245–246.

²⁸ Cf. OGIS 305, 10–11; 763, 9–13 (WELLES, *Royal Correspondence* no. 52). Note that F. STÄHELIN, *Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater*¹, Basel 1897, 89 n. 4, on p. 90, thought that OGIS 299 might equally well refer to Pydna; in the second edition, Leipzig 1907, 72, n. 4, he was persuaded by DITTENBERGER (OGIS 299 n. 2) to refer it to the Gallic war of 168–166. L. ROBERT compares OGIS 299, 7–8 with an Athenian inscription honouring a Seleucid ambassador (SEG 24, 135): *AE* 1969, 3.

²⁹ On this war, MAGIE, I 317; II 1198 n. 44; CH. HABICHT, *RE* 23 (1957) 1120–1123; WILL, II 324.

³⁰ Note especially Strabo 624, in a catalogue of Attalos' notable achievements, ἀνεῖλε . . . δὲ καὶ Προυσίαν ἐπισυστήσας αὐτῷ Νικομήδῃ τὸν υἱόν.

διὰ] τῆς τοῦ πολέμου συντελείας ἐπ[ιτευγμάτων]).³¹ This recalls the «notable successes» (μεῖζονα εὐημερήματα) of the Metris inscription; and the reference in the same inscription both to Pergamon and to «all other peoples» as the king's beneficiaries again suits the circumstances of 149. The literary tradition, clearly influenced by the Attalid version of events, stresses the general hatred felt by the Bithynians for Prousius and their joyful collaboration in his overthrow.³² The «successes» may not only have been over Prousius, but also over his relative by marriage, Diegylis the king of Thrace, who is known to have assisted him in this war.³³ It seems likely that Attalos would have used the occasion of his invasion of Bithynia to take punitive action against Diegylis, and if so this would certainly have been a success to be celebrated by «other peoples» than Pergamon. The hostility between Diegylis and the Greek cities of the Propontic coast soon broke out into open warfare, during which Lysimacheia was cruelly ransacked: in the end, Attalos on his last campaign crossed over into Thrace and inflicted a great defeat on the king.³⁴ In sum, Attalos II's war of 149 against Prousius II of Bithynia, and probably Diegylis of Thrace also, not only coincides exactly with the ninth celebration of the Nikephoria reckoned penteterically, but also accords with the language of the inscription of Metris. At the very least, therefore, the inscription may be said to raise no obstacle to the dating here proposed.

The other two synchronisms before Diodoros are less helpful, but still indicative. A certain Bito was priestess of Athena in the fourteenth celebration of the reorganized Nikephoria, 155 on the old dating, 129 on the new (IPergamon I 223 = OGIS 322). 155 was the year in which Prousius II invaded the kingdom of Pergamon, shut Attalos II up in the city, and ravaged the Nikephorion which stood outside the walls: yet the inscription of Bito gives no hint of unusual circumstances.³⁵ Asklepias was priestess of Athena Πολιάς καὶ Νικηφόρος in the eighteenth celebration, 147 on the standard dating, 113 on the new (IPergamon I 226 = OGIS 324). The dozen or so other inscriptions of Pergamon in which Athena is given these titles in this order all appear to be later than the establishment of Roman rule in Asia.³⁶

³¹ OGIS 327, 5–6 (improved from IPergamon I 225). On the reference, 149 and not 154, HABICHT, RE 23 (1957) 1122.

³² Note especially Polyb. 36, 15, 7; App. Mithr. 21–22. It is true that these events did not literally affect Pergamon «and all other peoples», but the phrase is obviously exaggerated whatever its reference.

³³ App. Mithr. 18. For the meaning of κηδεστής (not necessarily «brother-in-law» as WILLRICH, RE 5 [1903] 475; MAGIE, 779 n. 90): A. WILHELM, JÖAI 11, 1908, 79.

³⁴ On these events, Diod. 33, 14–15, cf. ROBERT, BCH 52, 1928, 440–441 = OMS I 122–123; ROSTOVITZEFF, I 766; 801; II 1520 n. 71; MAGIE, II 779–780 n. 90.

³⁵ Polyb. 32, 15. That Polybius here refers to events of 155 and not 156 was shown by HABICHT, Hermes 84, 1956, 101–110. HANSEN, Attalids² 134 n. 13, appears to accept HABICHT's demonstration, and yet still dates the event to 156, op. cit. 450.

³⁶ See FRÄNKEL's index, IPergamon II p. 516; add SEG 4, 687, contemporary with Diodoros (see below, p. 197 n. 81). Cf. DITTENBERGER on OGIS 324 n. 1.

II. The Date of Diodoros Paspáros

The last synchronism occurs in one of the inscriptions of Diodoros Paspáros. With HEPDING's restoration, Diodoros was gymnasiarch ἐν τοῖς ἐννεα[χαιεκοστοῖς Νικηφορίοις τοῦ στ]εφανίτου ἀγῶνος, ἀχθεῖσιν δὲ πρώτοις [μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἀριστόνικον] πόλεμον.³⁷ As far as space is concerned, the numeral could be any ordinal ending in nine between nineteen and ninety-nine. Yet the inscriptions impose certain limits, since a war has recently finished and Pergamon is clearly under Roman rule. When HEPDING wrote, he followed FRÄNKEL in placing the first year of the reorganized Nikephoria in 183 or 182: his restoration of ἐννεα[χαιεκοστοῖς] thus produced a date of 127 or 126, and the adversary named in the lacuna was naturally Aristonikos, the self-styled Eumenes III who spent four years fighting the Romans as a pretender to the throne of Pergamon.³⁸ This is the foundation on which the dating of Diodoros ultimately rests since, as will be seen, all the other allusions in his dossier to circumstances of the 120's are based on inference or restoration. L. ROBERT later showed that the first year of the reorganized festival was 181, and thus produced for Diodoros' gymnasiarchy the now generally accepted date of 125.³⁹ This, however, already creates a slight difficulty. On a trieteric cycle, the Nikephoria should have fallen in every second year; and since the war with Aristonikos was essentially over by 129,⁴⁰ it is odd that the first celebration after the war should have occurred in 125, and not 127 or even 129. The recourse of supposing that the games had been suspended is not available, for if they had been the twenty-ninth celebration would not have fallen in 125, but in 123, 121, or even later.⁴¹

On a penteteric cycle, the only possible restoration is, by a coincidence, again ἐννεα[χαιεκοστοῖς]. The year will then be 69: the nineteenth celebration in 109 did not fall after a war, the thirty-ninth in 29 would be the first after Actium, but the absence of all reference in the dossier to triumvirs or emperor would be strange. If 69 is right, the name of the adversary can be easily supplied: Μιθραδάτην.⁴² Although the chronology of the Third Mithradatic War is disputed,⁴³ there is no

³⁷ HEPDING, MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 412, cf. IGR IV 293 I 49–51. This restoration was unfortunately overlooked by LAFAYE in IGR.

³⁸ On the war of Aristonikos see (most recently) V. VAVRINEK, *La révolte d'Aristonikos*, *Rozprawy Československé Akademie Věd* 67, 2, 1957 (Bull. 1960, 339); ROBERT, *Villes** 253; 261–271; J. CH. DUMONT, *Eirene* 5, 1966, 189–196; WILL, II 352–356; F. CARRATA THOMES, *La rivolta di Aristonico e le origini della provincia romana d'Asia*, Torino 1968.

³⁹ ROBERT, BCH 54, 1930, 332–346 = OMS I 151–165.

⁴⁰ On the aftermath of the war, see especially HOLLEAUX, REA 21, 1919, 1–19 = *Études* II 179–198.

⁴¹ Nevertheless, this is assumed by VAVRINEK, *op. cit.* 50. ROBERT, *art. cit.* 337 = 156, merely observes, «on voit que la cité mit longtemps à se relever de la terrible crise qui s'ouvrit pour elle avec la mort d'Attale III.»

⁴² On a supposed reference to Aristonikos in another inscription of Diodoros, MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 410 lines 21–22, see below, p. 201.

⁴³ See especially BROUGHTON, MRR II 106–108.

doubt that by 69 Lucullus had caused Mithradates to flee to Armenia and had spent a considerable time in Asia setting the province in order. According to Plutarch he «filled Asia with much orderliness and peace» (πολλῆς μὲν εὐνομίας, πολλῆς δ' εἰρήνης), and celebrated his successes with «processions and festivals of victory» (Lucull. 23, 1). If the new dating of Diodoros is correct, the year of his gymnasiarchy falls exactly in this period of «much peace»: it is of course no difficulty that the war with Mithradates was not in fact over, since the Pergamenes could not have been expected to foresee the king's resurgence two years later. On the more probable chronology, the previous celebration in 73 would have fallen after the outbreak of war and the siege of Cyzicos, but before the decisive defeat of Mithradates at Cabira: on the less probable, even before Cyzicos. In neither case, therefore, is it a problem that the celebration in 69 was the first «after the war», as it is with the trieteric dating.

The inscriptions of Diodoros may now be considered for further evidence of their date. Three of them are of particular importance.⁴⁴ The first of these (IGR IV 292) appears to be earlier in date than the other two, since it records a decree passed by the city soon after Diodoros' return from an embassy to Rome, and this embassy is mentioned in the other two inscriptions as an event of some time ago.⁴⁵ The relative order of the several decrees contained in the second inscription, and of those in the third and two other inscriptions,⁴⁶ is not clear.

The first fifteen lines of the first inscription, the one concerning Diodoros' achievements on his embassy, are the most important in the whole dossier for establishing the general context of his activity. These same lines, which are only partly preserved, received a full restoration from A. WILHELM.⁴⁷ However, only at very few points is it possible to restore the wording, or even the syntax, with certainty, since the text is not of a kind to which there are abundant parallels: and at least one of WILHELM's restorations will be seen to be definitely incorrect. The following text is therefore the comparatively conservative one of HEPDING, reproduced as IGR IV 292.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Reprinted as IGR IV 292–294 (an inferior text of 294 in OGIS 764).

⁴⁵ IGR IV 293 II 11; 294, 30.

⁴⁶ IPergamon II 256; MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 409–411 no. 3.

⁴⁷ WILHELM, *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* V, SAWW 214, 4, 1932, 21–22.

⁴⁸ HEPDING, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 245. Note, however, that in line 5 IGR prints -ρηται instead of -ρηναι, in 7 changes HEPDING's vertical hasta to an iota, and suppresses all his subscript dots. HEPDING and IGR mark an illegible letter after κατοικοῦσιν in line 3, but this is not visible on the photograph or squeeze. The trace after kappa at the end of the same line does not seem to be that of an alpha, as WILHELM supposed, though this is not impossible.

- [---]εμφωνος πολυετη χρόνον κ[ατέμεινε(?) καὶ ἐν ἐλάσσονι θέμενος τὰ καθ' αὐτὸν τοῦ τη]
 [πατ]ρίδι συμφέροντος τὰ μέγιστα [ἀγαθὰ κατειργάσατο τῇ τε ἡμετέρῃ πόλει καὶ πᾶσιν]
 τοῖς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν κατοικοῦσιν εκ[-----]
 5 καὶ περὶ ἐλαφροτοκίας τῷ πάντας τοὺς [-----]
 μεγάλους πράσσεισθαι τοὺς τόκους ἀπέλυσε [-----]
 10 αν τῆς γεινομένης ἀνδροληψίας ἐκ τῶν κυλ[-----] τῆς τῶν στρατο-]
 πέδων παραχεμιασίας ὅπως ἡ πόλις ἀπαρεν[όχλητος -----]
 ἔσται τις τῶν παρενοχλουμένων ἐπίστασις ομ[-----] τῶν]
 15 εἰς ταύτας δαπανημάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν λόγων εἰ[-----]
 κτος τῶν φόρων ἐπιτασσομένων ὥστε καὶ ἐν τούτῳ [----- ἀπολύσε-]
 θαι δὲ καὶ τῶν κενῶν συγγραφῶν καὶ μετὰ βίας καὶ ἀν[άγκης -----]
 το δὲ καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνειρημένων ὑπὸ Μιθραδ[άτου -----]
 ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ἐξ ὧν ἀφόρητος ἐπηκολούθει τῇ πόλει κί[νδυνος ----- τῶν δὲ]
 15 ἀγαθῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μεγάλων καὶ σωτηρίων ὄντων, κτλ.

Two points require immediate discussion. In line 7 WILHELM restored ἐκ τῶν Κυί[ντου Καίρωνος ἐπιταγῶν], «as a result of the orders of Q. Caepio», and this if correct would settle the matter immediately in favour of the accepted date. Q. Servilius Caepio is attested in two inscriptions, one from Bargylia in Caria and the other recently published from Maeonia in Lydia, as a legate in the last stages of the war with Aristonikos.⁴⁹ Another text was adduced by WILHELM to show Caepio operating close to Pergamon: an epigram from the city's port, Elaia, mentions a Κίντος apparently involved in a war against Celts.⁵⁰ Although WILHELM's restoration of the Diodoros inscription has been treated as a certainty,⁵¹ it cannot be right. In texts of republican date, the Latin *Quintus* is invariably transliterated as Κόιντος;⁵² Κύντος is stated not to occur before the first century A. D. in inscriptions, before the second in papyri.⁵³ As for Κίντος, L. ROBERT has shown that this is an authentically Greek name and not a form of *Quintus*, so that the epigram from Elaia cannot be

⁴⁹ HOLLEAUX, REA 21, 1919, 7 = Études II 185 lines 25, 30; P. HERRMANN, Ergebnisse einer Reise in Nordostlydien, Denkschr. Akad. Wien, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 80, 1962, 5-8 no. 2 (Bull. 1963, 220). BROUGHTON, MRR I 505, now needs revision.

⁵⁰ WILHELM, op. cit. 26-30, discussing KAIBEL no. 242 a (IGR IV 272; now PEEK, GVI 754).

⁵¹ Thus MAGIE, II 1050 n. 1; KIENAST, RE Suppl. 12 (1970) 227: «Da in dem Beschlusse von den ἐπιταγαῖς des Q. Servilius Caepio die Rede ist», etc.

⁵² No exceptions in SHERK, Documents 390-392 (index of Roman names); Κόιντος in both the inscriptions referring to Q. Caepio (above, n. 49).

⁵³ Inscriptions: TH. ECKINGER, Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften, diss. Zürich, München 1893, 125. Papyri: B. MEINERSMANN, Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri, Leipzig 1927, 78-79. WILHELM, op. cit. 27, refers to MEINERSMANN, but does not mention his chronology.

connected with Caepio either.⁵⁴ While the correct restoration of KYI is uncertain, it will be argued below that the last letter has been misread.⁵⁵

The other passage of immediate interest occurs in line 13, which mentions «the property»⁵⁶ of those killed by Mithradates ... in the war.» Here it is opportune to pay tribute to the acumen of HEPDING. He brought this sentence into connection with a passage of Appian's Mithradatic War, which describes a plot formed against the king in 86 by eighty Pergamenes. The plot was discovered, agents of Mithradates were sent to Pergamon and other cities involved, many citizens laid information against their political rivals, and altogether over sixteen hundred persons were put to death, and their property confiscated by the king; Sulla later punished those informers who had not committed suicide or fled to Mithradates.⁵⁷ From this passage HEPDING was at first inclined to date the whole dossier to the Mithradatic period: but other considerations, chiefly the supposed equivalence of the twenty-ninth Nikephoria with 127 or 126, made him prefer the earlier date. On this reconstruction, which has been universally followed, Mithradates has to be the fifth of the name, Euergetes, who is thus imagined to have been «responsible for the suppression of the movement [that is, in favour of Aristonikos] in Pergamum itself».⁵⁸ But on the contrary there is no sign that Pergamon was at any time disaffected: rather, it took energetic steps to undermine all support for the pretender.⁵⁹ While Euergetes certainly helped the Romans against Aristonikos, the natural area for his operations was Phrygia in the east of the new province, the same region which he was granted as a reward after the war.⁶⁰ Nothing shows, though this has been alleged, that he was active on the Aegean coast.⁶¹ The problem vanishes when the twenty-ninth Nikephoria are equated with 69, and simultaneously HEPDING's first intuition is proved correct. This passage thus becomes a reference to Mithradates VI Eupator, and indeed a clear corroboration of the later date. It is not, however, necessary to suppose (though it is not impossible) that the property of Mithradates' victims was still an issue in 69 since, as has been seen, the present decree is probably earlier than the one mentioning that date. It will be assumed from here on that the Mithradatic date is correct, and the inscriptions of Diodoros will be examined accordingly.

⁵⁴ ROBERT, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris 1938, 206–209; id., *JS* 1968, 202–204.

⁵⁵ Below, p. 195.

⁵⁶ For this sense of βίος, cf. line 5 (below, p. 194) and another inscription of Diodoros, *IGR* IV 293 II 12; *Syll.*³ 708, 33; other examples in *LSJ* s. v. II.

⁵⁷ App. *Mithr.* 192–193, cited by HEPDING, *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 249, cf. *Oros.* 6, 2, 8.

⁵⁸ H. M. LAST, *CAH* 9, 1932, 105; so also ROSTOVITZEFF, II 808; III 1523 n. 80.

⁵⁹ *IPergamon* I 249 (OGIS 338). On the rural nature of Aristonikos' support, ROBERT, *Villes*² 264–268.

⁶⁰ Cf. BROUGHTON, *Survey* 508; MAGIE, I 150; 154; II 1037 n. 11; 1042–1044 nn. 26–27. On the cancellation of this grant see now TH. DREW-BEAR, *Historia* 21, 1972, 79–87.

⁶¹ ROSTOVITZEFF, III 1647, cites Justin 37, 1, 1 for Phocaea supporting Mithradates, but appears to have misread the text.

To begin with the fifteen lines already under discussion, presumably πολυετὴ χρόνον (line 1) refers to Diodoros' embassy to Rome, and -εμῶνος is part of the name of the magistrate in whose term he arrived back.⁶² Several inscriptions of Diodoros mention this and other embassies, and the «long absences and dangers» that he underwent in the course of them.⁶³ The date of this embassy to Rome, and its connection with other ambassadorial activity of the Mithradatic period, will be discussed below.⁶⁴

The following lines (3–6) clearly dealt with some achievement of Diodoros connected with high rates of interest (ἐλαφροτοκίας, 4; μεγάλους τόκους, 6), which had caused people to lose their entire property (ἀπολωλέναι τοὺς βίους, 5).⁶⁵ The troubles alluded to are illustrated several times in the literature of the period. After the First Mithradatic War and Sulla's indemnity of twenty thousand talents, «the cities», according to Appian (Mithr. 261), «being desperate and borrowing at high rates of interest (δανειζόμεναι μεγάλων τόκων), pledged to their creditors their gymnasia, or walls, or harbours, or any public property they had, while the soldiers used violence to make them pay up.» Ten years later, Lucullus on his arrival in Asia found the province «suffering intolerably from Roman money-lenders and publicans» (Plut. Lucull. 7, 6); after the defeat of Mithradates, he returned and took further steps, reducing the rate of interest to twelve per cent, forbidding accumulated debt to exceed principal, and limiting the amount a debtor could pay his creditor to a quarter of his income annually, «so that the lenders received back twice what they had lent, yet they had now driven up the debt by their rates of interest to a hundred and twenty thousand talents» (Plut. Lucull. 20, 4).⁶⁶ Such exactions might naturally have been the subject of Greek representations in Rome before the reforms of Lucullus, and in fact a recently published decree of Aphrodisias, which has persuasively been dated to this same period, records how the behaviour of the publicans impelled the province to send ambassadors to Rome asking it to help.⁶⁷ So also when the publicans batted on Heraclea after the establishment of Roman rule in Bithynia in 74, the local historian Memnon (FGrHist 434 F 27, 5–6) observes that his fellow-citizens «should have sent an embassy to the senate in order to rid themselves of the publicans' companies»: instead, they annihilated them.

The reference in τῆς γεινομένης ἀνδροληψίας ἐκ τῶν KYI (line 7) is unclear. In Attic law ἀνδροληψία referred to seizure of citizens abroad in reprisal for an offence committed by their city, but in later texts ἀνδρολήψιον at least means

⁶² Thus WILHELM, SAWW 214, 4, 1932, 22.

⁶³ IGR IV 292, 36; 293 II 10–11; 294, 31; MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 408 no. 2, 11.

⁶⁴ Below, pp. 203–204.

⁶⁵ For this sense of βίους cf. n. 56 above.

⁶⁶ On the condition of Asia in this period, BROUGHTON, Survey 545; ROSTOVITZ, II 953–954; III 1563 n. 28.

⁶⁷ DREW-BEAR, BCH 96, 1972, 444, lines 2–9; on the date, id. 469–471.

simply «summary arrest».⁶⁸ This, despite the feminine form, seems the more plausible sense here. It would probably therefore not be right to connect this «seizure» with a widespread affliction of the Mithradatic wars, piracy:⁶⁹ it is more likely to have something to do with the occupying armies mentioned in the next lines. As for ἐκ τῶν KYI, it has been seen that WILHELM's restoration of the name of Q. Caepio cannot stand. He may, however, have been right to interpret ἐκ as «because of», though this may rather cohere with the verbal notion contained in ἀνδροληψία and mean «(seizure) from». The last letter of KYI is probably not an iota: none of the very few words so beginning suit the context, and on the photograph only the lower half of an upright can be seen.⁷⁰ I cannot think of a likely supplement.⁷¹

The reference to occupying armies (8) probably coheres with the «molestations» of the next line, and perhaps also with the «expenses» of the line after that.⁷² These allusions again fit closely the accounts of the years following the Sullan settlement. Sulla had billeted his army on the province during the winter of 85/84, and fixed the terms on which the unwanted guests had to be entertained: as a result, whole families are said to have been «crushed by the violence and the greed of those quartered on them» (Plut. Sulla 25, 4).⁷³ Clearly the burden would have been lightened by Sulla's departure, but not removed. The two legions that had served under Fimbria remained in the province until the arrival of Lucullus in 74, and during that period were allegedly «corrupted by luxury and greed» and «accustomed to disorderliness» (Plut. Lucull. 7, 1). While it is not known that any of the Fimbrian troops were stationed in Pergamon during this period, that is an almost certain inference, since the city had been Mithradates' capital in Asia and was probably punished with the loss of its freedom.⁷⁴

The φόροι of line 11 are clearly, if the new dating is correct, the tribute reimposed by Sulla after Dardanos, whether the reference is to the five years' tribute which

⁶⁸ Seizure in reprisal (ἀνδροληψία): law in Demosth. 23, 82; Demosth. 51, 13. Summary arrest (ἀνδρολήψιον): App. bell. civ. 4, 6, 13; Philostr. Ep. 50. Cf. Thesaurus s. v. ἀνδροληψία, fuller than the entries in LSJ.

⁶⁹ On the activities of the pirates in Asia see especially Plut. Lucull. 2, 6 (86), Caes. 1, 8 (75/74), App. Mithr. 262–263 (84). Cf. BROUGHTON, Survey 519–525; ROSTOVITZ, I 948–951; 954–955; MAGIE, I 239–240; 287–288; 292–293.

⁷⁰ On the squeeze (n. 1 above) nothing is visible after the upsilon.

⁷¹ It is perhaps worth considering κύκλω followed by a noun like χωρίων, «from the (estates?) round about», though this would not be compatible with WILHELM's plausible [ἐπαρχε]ῖαν at the beginning of the line. This sense of κύκλω is frequent in Strabo: τὰ κύκλω χωρία precisely of Pergamon, 624. For the misreading of kappa as iota, ROBERT, JS 1968, 197.

⁷² WILHELM clearly took ταύτας (9) to refer back to his ἐπιταγῶν in 5; it may, however, refer to παραχειμασίας (6), if this is in the accusative plural and not the genitive singular.

⁷³ Cf. BROUGHTON, Survey 517; ROSTOVITZ, I 945; II 1561; MAGIE, I 237; II 1115 n. 15.

⁷⁴ Below, p. 203.

he ordered paid in one year as arrears, or the regular annual tax thereafter.⁷⁵ On the previous dating, these presented a problem, since by the settlement of 129 Pergamon was declared free and federated:⁷⁶ indeed a speech in Appian (bell. civ. 5, 4) might be taken to imply that Asia was generally not subject to tribute until 123. Hence it has been supposed, either that Appian is in error (which many anyhow be true), or else that the φόροι were a special levy for the war against Aristonikos.⁷⁷

The «invalid agreements», presumably invalid because «force and compulsion» were used to oblige the Greeks to sign them (line 12), recall Plutarch's account of how the Roman money-lenders exacted payment from debtors: «the rope-, lattice-, and horse-tortures, being made to stand in the open under the burning sun or, when it was cold, with their feet in mud or ice» (Plut. Lucull. 20, 2).⁷⁸ Though Plutarch is describing the collection of debts, it is not implausible that the same businessmen should have used similar methods to force their terms on the Greeks, whether cities or individuals: if that is right, Diodoros seems to have tried to obtain cancellation of such agreements.

In lines 12–14, WILHELM plausibly restored [ἀνεκτήσα]το δὲ καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀναιρεμένων ὑπὸ Μιθραδ[άτου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀποθανόντων] ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ἐξ ὧν ἀφόρητος ἐπηκολούθει τῇ πόλει κί[νδυνος], «he recovered the estates of those killed by Mithradates and of the others who died in the war, as a result of which (estates) intolerable danger had arisen for the city».^{78a} ROSTOVITZEFF preferred ἀποστάντων or ἀφεστακότων to ἀποθανόντων and took these «rebels» to be the antecedent of the relative clause,⁷⁹ but sense and syntax require that the antecedent be the estates, the recovery of which saved Pergamon from disaster. It has already been seen that those «killed by Mithradates» are probably the conspirators of 86: it is in fact attested that the estates of these were confiscated by the king.⁸⁰ The «others killed in the war» may be conjectured to be the supporters of Mithradates executed by Sulla after Dardanos (App. Mithr. 193; 252; Licinian. p. 28 F.). That the estates of either of these groups had been confiscated by Sulla is not stated in the sources, though some of Mithradates' supporters are said to have been sold into slavery (App. Mithr. 251): it is, however, likely enough in view of the general

⁷⁵ On the Sullan φόρος, Plut. Lucull. 4, 1; Sulla 25, 4; App. Mithr. 259; cf. BROUGHTON, Survey 518–519; ROSTOVITZEFF, II 945–946; III 1560–1561 n. 17; MAGIE, II 1115–1116 n. 16.

⁷⁶ Status of Pergamon: Syll.³ 694, 22 (on the provenance, ROSTOVITZEFF, III 1522 n. 79); Jos. ant. Iud. 14. 253. Cf. MAGIE, II 1045–1046 n. 34 (who, however, doubts the authenticity of the document quoted by Josephus).

⁷⁷ Appian in error: ROSTOVITZEFF, II 812–813. Special levy: MAGIE, II 1045 n. 34; F. TIBILETTI, JRS 47, 1957, 136.

⁷⁸ On this passage see H. W. GREENE, CR 41, 1927, 124.

^{78a} WILHELM, however, took the antecedent of ὧν to be understood ἔ, referring generally to Diodoros' efforts for the restitution of property.

⁷⁹ ROSTOVITZEFF, III 1523 n. 80.

⁸⁰ Oros. 6, 2, 8, whose figure of sixteen hundred shows that these are the conspirators mentioned by Appian, Mithr. 192, cf. 257.

severity of Sulla's sentence. Nor is it difficult to imagine the nature of the «intolerable danger» caused by these confiscations. With the progression of the war friction among social classes had become ever greater, as Mithradates despaired of the support of the upper classes and proclaimed a general liberation of slaves. After Dardanos Sulla ordered these slaves to return to their owners: the result, according to Appian (Mithr. 251, cf. 189–190; 257), was «the slaughter of multitudes of men, both free and slave, on the slightest excuse». That the period of Diodoros' activity coincided with one of social unrest in Pergamon is shown in the next line by «his great and salutary benefactions» (line 15) and by the several references in his dossier to «concord» (ὁμόνοια) and «salvation» (σωτηρία).⁸¹ These words and their cognates are characteristically used of the healing of political discord.⁸² The connection between civil strife and disloyalty to the ruling power is a familiar one, and Diodoros' efforts on behalf of concord show him a friend of Rome as well as of Pergamon.

In the rest of the decree, there are many items of great importance for the internal history of Pergamon and for the cult of benefactors.⁸³ For the general historical context, the arrangements for the worship of Diodoros are of particular importance (lines 37 ff.). These reveal that, at least in some details, his cult was to be modelled on that of M'. Aquillius, the organizer of the province of Asia after the defeat of Aristonikos (line 39, cf. IGR IV 293 I 23–24).⁸⁴ These references have been held to support the earlier date for Diodoros;⁸⁵ and it might seem an argument against the later one that there is no mention of another well-known benefactor of Asia, Q. Mucius Scaevola, proconsul of the province in the 90's and warmly remembered, notably by the holding of special games in his honour, the Moukieia.⁸⁶ But it is not surprising that Pergamon long maintained a special cult of Aquillius: as consul he had presided at the hearing of the senatorial consilium

⁸¹ IGR IV 293, 56; IPergamon II 256, 5; MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 408 line 14. Cf. IGR IV 292, 20; 293 II 21, 40; SEG 4, 687, as restored by L. ROBERT ad loc. and in BCH 54, 1930, 346 = OMS I 165.

⁸² Note the expressive text from Sagalassos, TAM III, 1, 7 (Bull. 1942, 160); cf. Plut. praec. ger. reip. 824 C – 825 A. Cf. J. and L. ROBERT, Bull. 1971, 621, p. 509: «on parlait beaucoup de la concorde» parce que celle-ci n'existait pas.»

⁸³ Thus, on Diodoros' equestrian statue (24), H. B. SIEDENTOPF, Das hellenistische Reiterdenkmal, Waldsassen (Bayern) 1968, 26; 64 (Bull. 1970, 44); on the statue showing him being crowned by the people (24–25), cf. the new inscription of Archippe from Kyme, AA 1967, 50 C lines 2–3, D line 33 (Bull. 1968, 444), and the Zoilos frieze from Aphrodisias, K. T. ERIM, National Geographic Magazine, August 1967, 281, cf. Bull. 1970, 537; on the later history of the tribe Παισπαρηίς (37), HEPDING, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 243; id. Philologus 88, 1933, 94 n. 25.

⁸⁴ On Aquillius see MAGIE, I 153; 157–158; II 1042 n. 24; 1048–1049 nn. 39–41.

⁸⁵ HEPDING, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 249.

⁸⁶ For the commemoration of Mucius, see especially OGIS 438–439; cf. MAGIE, I 173–174; II 1064–1065 nn. 47–48; BOWERSOCK, Augustus 116, 150. The date of his proconsulate is disputed: see especially E. BADIEN, Athenaeum n. s. 34, 1956, 104–112.

at which Pergamon won its dispute with the publicans, and during his tenure the city had received its charter as a free and federated city.⁸⁷ His cult could easily have lasted for fifty years: that of P. Servilius Isauricus, proconsul from 46 to 44, lasted at least until the second century A. D.⁸⁸ Though Pergamon as one of the chief cities of Asia no doubt took its part in celebrating the Moukieia,⁸⁹ that did not affect the special regard in which the city held M'. Aquillius.

The extravagance of the honours for Diodoros is to be noted. If the new dating is correct, they cannot be connected with the privileges granted to Pergamon in 129.⁹⁰ Rather, they are an index of the city's condition in the years following the First Mithradatic War. Pergamon had lost its treaty and its freedom, and probably other privileges also.⁹¹ The inscriptions of Diodoros show the extent of the city's degradation under the burden of Roman troops and businessmen. Diodoros seems to have managed by his embassy to have gained at least some alleviation of the city's plight and to have restored some of its pride. His reward was the accumulation of honours equal to those of the great proconsul M'. Aquillius and not far short of those once granted by the city to its kings.

The second inscription of Diodoros contains parts of four decrees relative to his benefactions as gymnasiarch in the year of the twenty-ninth Nikephoria: these decrees, it has been seen, are probably later than that of the first inscription. The first of them contains the reference already considered to the twenty-ninth Nikephoria and to a war that must be the third against Mithradates (I 49–51). In the second decree, the mentions of Diodoros' embassy to Rome (II 10–11) and of the cult of M'. Aquillius have already been discussed. A notable item, which recurs in other inscriptions of Diodoros, is his «influence with the (Roman) magistrates» (τῆς παρὰ τοῖς ἡγουμένοις [ἐντρ]οπῆς, lines 14–15).⁹² While not incompatible with a date in the late second century, this fits satisfactorily into the last decades of the Roman republic. Several ambassadors to Rome are known in the Mithradatic period:⁹³ the new inscription from Aphrodisias already mentioned has added two more, who went on an embassy to «the senate and magistrates» ([τὴν τε σύνκλητον

⁸⁷ Dispute: SHERK, Documents no. 12 lines 9, 17, on which see most recently BADIAN, *Publicans and Sinners*, Ithaca (N. Y.) 1972, 60; 132 nn. 40–42, especially n. 42 on the date (H. B. MATTINGLY's arguments for 101, *AJPh* 93, 1972, 412–423 do not convince). Charter: above n. 76.

⁸⁸ ROBERT, *Hellenica* 6, 1948, 38–42, especially 40–41. Cf. *Plut. Tit. Flam.* 16, 6–7, showing that the cult of Flamininus was still observed in the author's day.

⁸⁹ The Moukieia are not in fact attested at Pergamon, though the provincial *Euergesia* held there are sometimes assumed to be the same festival (*IGR* IV 291).

⁹⁰ This was the natural assumption on the previous dating: thus ROBERT, *Ét. anat.* 49; J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull.* 1970, 44.

⁹¹ See below, p. 203.

⁹² For the reading and the correct punctuation (after [ἐντρ]οπῆς and not πόλιν), see WILHELM, *SAWW* 214, 4, 1932, 36–37, adding *MDAI*(A) 35, 1910, 408 line 12; 414 b line 5. On this sense of ἡγούμενοι see now DREW-BEAR, *BCH* 96, 1972, 453–455.

⁹³ BOWERSOCK, *Augustus* 5–6; add Xenokles of Adramyttion, *Strabo* 614.

καὶ τοῖς ἡγουμένοις), and while in Rome «waited upon the magistrates at every opportunity» (προσεδρεύσαντες ἐν παν[τὶ καιρῷ τοῖς ἡγουμένοις]).⁹⁴ The reference in the third decree to «most urgent and pressing crises» (τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καὶ κατεπείγουσιν καιροῖς, II 49–50) similarly suits a Mithradatic date, though it does not require it, since this and similar phrases are found over a considerable span of time.⁹⁵ The kind of crisis surrounding Pergamon at this juncture is probably illustrated by the same inscription from Aphrodisias, which tells how Asia was being «crushed by the publicans» ([θλιβομένων] ὑπὸ τῶν δημοσιωνῶν) and driven to «the utmost despair» (τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀπόγνωσιν).⁹⁶ The reference in the same decree of Diodoros to his efforts on behalf of «salvation and concord» has already been discussed.⁹⁷

The third inscription of Diodoros does not in fact contain his name, but the reference to him is almost certain.⁹⁸ Several allusions in this inscription are worth noting, though none of them compel the date here proposed. These are best taken in order.

Among Diodoros' beneficiaries are «the resident Romans» (Ῥωμαίων τοῖς ἐπιδημοῦσιν, 19).⁹⁹ Their presence in Pergamon accords well with a date in the 60's, when Roman businessmen were fully reestablished in the province after the disruption of the 80's: in 59 Cicero mentions the many Romans in the city (pro Flacco 71). However, there could also have been such a group there in the 120's.¹⁰⁰

The cult of the Attalids seems to be still flourishing (19–20, 39, 47–48), but how long this lasted is not known: there seems no reason to suppose that it lapsed soon after the end of royal rule.¹⁰¹

⁹⁴ DREW-BEAR, art. cit. 444, lines 6, 19–20. Cf. p. 194 above. For other epigraphical examples of οἱ ἡγούμενοι in the same period, DREW-BEAR, art. cit. 454.

⁹⁵ Thus Syll.³ 694, 13 (Pergamon, time of Aristonikos); ROBERT, *Ét. anat.* 312 line 2 (perhaps Mithradatic, BOWERSOCK, *AJPh* 91, 1970, 225–226); ROBERT, op. cit. 325 = J. and L. ROBERT, *La Carie II*, Paris 1954, 102–105 no. 6. 7–8 (43 B. C.); Syll.³ 796 A 11 (probably 69 A. D., cf. C. P. JONES, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971, 18 n. 28).

⁹⁶ DREW-BEAR, art. cit. 444, lines 2, 3.

⁹⁷ Above, p. 197.

⁹⁸ IGR IV 294 (OGIS 764): note especially that the honorand had returned from an embassy to Rome on the same day as Diodoros, lines 30–31, cf. IGR IV 292, 35–36. Thus HEPDING, *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 252; ROBERT, *Ét. anat.* 68 n. 8.

⁹⁹ On the reading, thus and not ἐπιθυμοῦσιν as in IGR: *MDAI(A)* 29, 1904, 389. MAGIE's statement, 162, that this is the earliest mention of resident Romans in Asia Minor, is now obsolete: a partially published inscription of Chios attests *παρεπιδημοῦντας Ῥωμαίων* in the late third or early second century: N. M. KONTOLEON, *Πρακτικά* 1953, 271 (*Bull.* 1958, 384); on the date, SEG 16, 486; F. W. WALBANK, *JRS* 53, 1963, 3; J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull.* 1965, 305. Many Roman names are found in the ephobic lists of Pergamon generally dated to the late second and early first centuries (cf. JACOBSTHAL, *MDAI(A)* 33, 1908, 385): a separate list of Ῥωμαῖοι in *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 438 no. 303.

¹⁰⁰ See preceding n.

¹⁰¹ Nevertheless HEPDING, *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 249, took «die ganz lebendige Fortdauer des Herrscherkults» to favour the earlier date of Diodoros.

Diodoros had revived the festival of the *κριοβόλια* «interrupted because of the difficult times» (διὰ τοὺς καιροὺς ἐπεισχημένα, 25). Though the war with Aristonikos may well have caused such interruptions,¹⁰² they are known in several other cities after the Mithradatic Wars: Tralles, Rhodes, and Miletos revived their major festivals only in the 60's.¹⁰³ There is a possibility of such a revival precisely at Pergamon, where an inscription honours a benefactor who «revived the festival of the Soteria Herakleia and was the first agonothete after the war».¹⁰⁴ The first editor, P. JACOBSTHAL, took the war to be against Mithradates, while HEPDING favoured Aristonikos.¹⁰⁵ If the new dating of Diodoros is right, it may without circularity be held to provide support to JACOBSTHAL's view, and a further parallel to the *κριοβόλια* which Diodoros revived.

The Aristoboulos who was the eponymous magistrate when Diodoros was honoured with a decree (31–32) is to be identified, as was seen by L. ROBERT, with the father of a priestess of Athena apparently called Sardion who served the goddess «for the salvation of the city» (ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῆς πόλεως).¹⁰⁶ If the new date of Diodoros is right, the «salvation of the city» will refer not to the aftermath of the war with Aristonikos,¹⁰⁷ but like the allusions to «salvation» and «concord» in the inscriptions of Diodoros to the troubled circumstances after the First Mithradatic War.

The «king Ptolemy» to whom Diodoros erected a statue (42) will presumably be Ptolemy XII Auletes, though it might be his younger brother Ptolemy of Cyprus.¹⁰⁸ If Auletes, there might appear to be a difficulty in the fact that he had not yet in 69 been recognized by Rome. He was not, however, a public enemy: in 65 a proposal to dethrone him was quashed by the *princeps senatus* Q. Lutatius Catulus, and in 64 and 63 he is found paying court to Pompey.¹⁰⁹ It is possible that Diodoros' statue was a mark of gratitude for some generosity of Ptolemy to Pergamon: the king is found benefiting temples of Egypt at this very time, and in 54 he made a gift to the temple of Apollo at Didyma.¹¹⁰

¹⁰² ROBERT, BCH 54, 1930, 338 n. 2 = OMS I 157 n. 2, adducing MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 273 no. 10, but the date of this does not seem clear.

¹⁰³ ROBERT, Ét. anat. 426–428; on the Didymeia at Miletos see now IDidyma 367.

¹⁰⁴ IGR IV 300.

¹⁰⁵ P. JACOBSTHAL, MDAI(A) 33, 1908, 406 no. 35, followed by MAGIE, II 1119 n. 22; HEPDING, MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 412, followed by HABICHT, Inschr. Asklep. 27 n. 3, with bibliography: add ROBERT, RPh 41, 1967, 68 n. 2.

¹⁰⁶ TH. WIEGAND, ADAW 1928, 3, 19 no. 3 (SEG 4, 687): ROBERT, BCH 54, 1930, 346–347 = OMS I 165–166, cf. Bull. 1938, 331 for the name.

¹⁰⁷ As ROBERT, art. cit. 347 = 166.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. H. VOLKMANN, RE 23 (1959) 1748–1755 (Ptolemy Auletes); 1755–1756 (Ptolemy of Cyprus).

¹⁰⁹ Catulus: Plut. Crassus 13, 2, cf. VOLKMANN, art. cit. 1750. Pompey: cf. VOLKMANN, art. cit. 1751.

¹¹⁰ VOLKMANN, art. cit. 1750 (Egypt); 1754 (Didyma: IDidyma 394).

At this stage Pergamon possessed four gymnasia (59). By the year 18/17 it had five and by 14 A. D. six: hitherto it has been believed on the evidence of the present inscription that the number had already reached four by the 120's.¹¹¹

The other fragmentary decrees for Diodoros coincide with those already considered in their reference to his «influence with the magistrates for the best» and his efforts on behalf of «concord».¹¹² One of them, however, was restored by HEPDING in a way that cannot be reconciled with the dating advanced here: ἐν τε [τοῖς ἐννεακαίκοστοις Νικηφορίοις τοῦ στεφανίτου ἀγώνος τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστο]νίκου ἐπινικίοις. HEPDING himself, however, acknowledged the uncertainty of the supplement; rightly, since there are dozens of names ending in «-onikos».¹¹³

So far appeal has not been made to the writing or the style of the inscriptions for help in dating. HEPDING was swayed by the letter-forms to favour the earlier rather than the later date.¹¹⁴ Only two of the Diodoros inscriptions have been published in photograph:¹¹⁵ however, by the courtesy of Dr. E. ERXLEBEN I have been able to consult two squeezes from the files of the Inscriptiones Graecae, one showing the decree in honour of Diodoros after his embassy, and the other the inscription on one of his statue-bases.¹¹⁶ In the former, several of the letters have fairly pronounced serifs; while alpha always has a horizontal bar, omicron is sometimes suspended above the base-line, and the right leg of pi is somewhat shorter than the left, yet beta is bulbous, with flattish base and broad waist,¹¹⁷ theta has a complete cross-bar, xi appears to lack the vertical,¹¹⁸ sigma has parallel branches, omega is large and full. In the other inscription, the writing is naturally more formal: again some of the letters show pronounced serifs, alpha has a horizontal bar, xi has the vertical,¹¹⁹ omicron rests on the base-line, the hasta of phi projects above the line and the loop is ovoid, omega is full but not very tall. These forms are consistent with a date in the late second or early first centuries: they cannot be expected to resolve a question of fifty years within that period.¹²⁰ As for orthography, mute iota is usually written but often omitted, and there does

¹¹¹ See now HABICHT, *Inscr. Asklep.* 83, 165.

¹¹² ἐντροπή: MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 408 lines 12–13. ὁμόνοια: IPergamon II 256, 5; MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 408 line 14.

¹¹³ MDAI(A) 35, 1910, 410 lines 21–22, cf. 411 («sehr unsicher»). Previously he had suggested that -onikos could be an agonistic victor, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 272. I count 41 names with this ending in FR. BECHTEL, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917, 332–334.

¹¹⁴ MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 250.

¹¹⁵ MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 244 (= IGR IV 292); O. KERN, *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Bonn 1913, 38 (= IGR IV 294). There is also an unclear photograph of the inscription of the priestess Sardon (above, n. 106) in WIEGAND, art. cit. 20, fig. 8; *Altertümer von Pergamon* IX, Tafel 61 e.

¹¹⁶ That is, IGR IV 292 and MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 313 no. 36.

¹¹⁷ Visible in KERN, op. cit. 38, lines 6, 7, 13 etc.

¹¹⁸ Clear in KERN, op. cit. 38, lines 18, 22, 42.

¹¹⁹ Not visible on the squeeze, but reported by HEPDING, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 313.

¹²⁰ On the limitation of letter-forms as an aid to dating, ROBERT, *Hellenica* 2, 1946, 16; J. and L. ROBERT, *La Carie* II, Paris 1954, 286–287; Bull. 1971, 33.

not appear to be haplography of double consonants, yet in the first decree at least (IGR IV 292) there is pronounced itacism.¹²¹ These signs again seem to suit the early first as well as the late second century.

A different criterion, however, may be more useful: that of coins. Students of Pergamene coinage have long isolated a group of bronzes, similar in their early style and their motifs, and usually bearing the name of a mint-magistrate. WROTH in the British Museum Catalogue dated these coins between 133 and the reign of Augustus: VON FRITZE then placed them in the reign of Eumenes II.¹²² HEPDING, however, observing that one of the magistrates named was a Diodoros, identified him with Paspas and urged a date later in the second century.¹²³ Recently the late K. KRAFT appears to have returned to WROTH's date.¹²⁴ That it is correct is suggested by another identification, which does not seem so far to have been proposed. The heaviest and most imposing of these coins are those that bear the name ΜΙΘΡΑΔΑΤΟΥ.¹²⁵ The name «Mithradates», when borne by a Pergamene, immediately evokes the famous friend of Julius Caesar, who brought him aid at Alexandria and won many privileges for Pergamon.¹²⁶ This same man has rightly been identified with the Mithradates who was the mainstay of the prosecution at the trial of L. Flaccus in 59.¹²⁷ It has already been seen that the activity of Diodoros must extend into the 60's, since he was gymnasiarch in 69: the conclusion is hard to resist that both he and Mithradates are the magistrates whose names appear on this series of coins, and that the date of the series should be lowered to the first century. Indeed Mithradates may have succeeded directly to Diodoros' position as the leading citizen of Pergamon.¹²⁸

¹²¹ Thus ι for ει (ἰκόνι, 24, but εἰκόνων, 31), ει for ι (γεγονομένης, 7, 16; ἔχεινεν, 18; κρείνη, 26; but γίνηται, 41), η for ει before a vowel (ἐπαρχῆαι, 15), ει for η (ἀνελθιμένων, 7). All these instances, some of them involving the same words, recur in the new inscription of Aphrodisias dated by DREW-BEAR to this period, BCH 96, 1972, 446.

¹²² WROTH in BMC Mysia 127. H. VON FRITZE, *Corolla Numismatica: Numismatic Essays in honour of Barclay V. Head*, Oxford 1906, 54–55; 57; id., *Die Münzen von Pergamon*, ADAW 1910, 1, 5–6.

¹²³ HEPDING, MDAI(A) 32, 1907, 243; cf. R. MÜNSTERBERG, NZ 20, 1927, 65; KIENAST, RE Suppl. 12 (1970) 225–226. For examples, see BMC Mysia 128–129, nos. 141; 150–152; Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Sammlung v. Aulock, IV nos. 1378; 1383; XVI 7492.

¹²⁴ Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Sammlung v. Aulock, on IV 1371–1383: «2. Jh. v. Chr. (– 1. Jh. v. Chr.?)».

¹²⁵ Examples in BMC Mysia 127, nos. 129–134; Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Sammlung v. Aulock IV 1377.

¹²⁶ HEPDING, MDAI(A) 34, 1909, 329–340; ROBERT, *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, Manchester 1939, 228–230 = OMS I 612–614; ROSTOVITZ, II 821–822; III 1527–1528 n. 98; ROBERT, *Hellenica* 8, 1950, 96; MAGIE, I 406; II 1259 n. 4; BOWERSOCK, *Augustus* 9; ROBERT, CRAI 1969, 61–62.

¹²⁷ Cic. pro Flacco 17, 41 (*columen accusationis*). Thus ROSTOVITZ, III 1528 n. 98.

¹²⁸ I. e., ROSTOVITZ's remark that «Mithridates was the real successor of the great Paspas», III 1528, may be truer than he knew.

The activity of Diodoros may now be briefly placed in its historical context. The Peace of Dardanos in 85 ended the confrontation between Rome and Mithradates, but did nothing to close the local fissures created by the war: these were in fact only widened by the measures of Sulla, his execution of the Mithradatic ringleaders and confiscation of their properties, the restoration of slaves to their masters, the indemnity of twenty thousand talents and the reimposition of tribute, the billeting of insolent and victorious troops. While many cities were rewarded for their support of the Roman cause,¹²⁹ others were severely punished. Pergamon, which since 129 had been a free and federated city, now probably lost its freedom and other rights.¹³⁰ Across the strait, Mytilene held out until 80, when it likewise lost its freedom.¹³¹ The distress of these and other cities offered a tempting field for Italian speculators, who now returned to the province after the massacre of 88. In order to pay off their debts, the cities borrowed at high rates of interest, often pledging their public buildings as security.

But Mithradates was not conquered: his conflict with the pro-praetor L. Licinius Murena, the so-called Second Mithradatic War, was a sufficient reminder of that. The Fimbrian legions remained in Asia, at once a punishment for past and a precaution against future misconduct. Provident senators warned that renewed war was inevitable.¹³² The Greek upper classes saw a way to exploit these fears and so alleviate their cities' burdens: and hence the years between Dardanos and the outbreak of the Third War witnessed intense diplomatic activity directed by Asia to Rome and the Roman magistrates in the province. Several of the latter, including a quaestor of Murena, seem to have been approached by an anonymous ambassador of Priene.¹³³ The cause of Asia was defended in Rome by the Asianic rhetor Xenokles of Adramyttion (one of Cicero's teachers) and by the cultivated Diodoros Zonas of

¹²⁹ MAGIE, I 233–235; II 1111–1113 nn. 3–9. Add now the letters of Sulla and Cn. Cornelius Dolabella to Thasos, SHERK, Documents nos. 20; 21; for the *senatus consulta* concerning Tabae and Carian Stratonicea, see now SHERK, Documents nos. 17; 18.

¹³⁰ On Pergamon's status in 129, see above, p. 196. That it lost these privileges in 85 is not directly attested, but is an obvious inference from the fact that it recovered its freedom and immunity from Caesar: IGR IV 433; 1682 (= OGIS 433). Thus MAGIE, I 237; see further SHERK, Documents 282–284; HABICHT, *Inscr. Asklep.* 5; 23 (HABICHT's statement, 4–5 with n. 4; 23 n. 8, that Sulla made Pergamon a *civitas libera* without *foedus* is a slip: Cic. pro Flacco 70 refers to Apollonis, not Pergamon, as observed by D. M. LEWIS, CR n. s. 20, 1970, 407).

¹³¹ MAGIE, I 245–246; II 1124–1125 n. 41.

¹³² Plut. Lucull. 5, 1, cf. Sall. hist. 2, 47, 7 M.

¹³³ IPriene 121. The στρατηγοί C. Labeo, L. Piso, and M. Hypsaeus are generally held to have governed before the First War: thus MAGIE, II 1579, followed by BROUGHTON, MRR II 462; 463; 465. But the order of names in the inscription may be by rank, not by chronology: and L. Piso is perhaps to be identified with L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, praetor in 74, and M. Hypsaeus with a legate of Sulla (Val. Max. 4, 6, 3): cf. MÜNZER, RE Suppl. 3 (1918) 231 no. 98; RE 21 (1951) 15–16 no. 22.

Sardis.¹³⁴ The same period, between about 80 and 70, has been convincingly argued as the setting of the new inscription from Aphrodisias already mentioned; this reveals the embassy of two brothers of the city to Rome on behalf of the province when it was oppressed by the publicans.¹³⁵ So also in Greece itself Oropos in 73 was able to thwart the encroachments of the publicans by appeal to the senate.¹³⁶ The reforms effected in Asia by Lucullus in 74 and 71–70 were therefore only part of a series of steps taken by the Roman administration to alleviate the distress of its Greek allies: and just as Lucullus is stated to have kept in mind the loyalty of Asia and the disaffection of the populaces,¹³⁷ so the earlier ambassadors to Rome will surely have represented to the senate the explosive consequences of ignoring the plight of the cities.

Diodoros Paspáros may now be added to the roll of these influential Greeks who represented their city and province at Rome after the First and (probably) before the Third Mithradatic War. Like those other ambassadors, he used his influence with senate and magistrates to lighten the conjoint burden of tribute and debt, made heavier by the commitments of the cities to the ruthlessly efficient Roman businessmen. For Pergamon in particular he won some relief from the abuses of Roman troops billeted there, probably part of the Fimbrian legions, and restoration of the property of dead citizens which had been confiscated by Sulla. Within the city he spent abundantly on magistracies, buildings, and games, not forgetting to benefit the resident Romans as well, and like other benefactors revived festivals interrupted by the recent wars. The restoration of «concord» brought about by this generosity, and of civic pride by the concessions obtained from Rome, caused Diodoros to be granted extraordinary honours. Among the other benefactors of Greek cities in this period, the closest to him is A. Aemilius Zosimus of Priene, whose names reveal his Roman connections. Like Diodoros, Zosimus revived liberalities that had not been seen «since the war» (probably the First War with Mithradates), benefited resident Romans, and served the cause of «concord».¹³⁸

Despite the efforts of Diodoros and others, Pergamon's recovery was still far from complete. It was left to the next generation to finish what they had begun. The citizen Mithradates, reputedly a bastard son of the king, was already in 59 prominent by his benefactions and his efforts at Rome on behalf of the province.¹³⁹ In due course, Mithradates joined the cause of Julius Caesar, earning for himself a prin-

¹³⁴ Xenokles: Strabo 614, cf. Cic. Brutus 316 with DOUGLAS' note. Diodoros Zonas: Strabo 627–628, cf. A. S. F. GOW and D. L. PAGE, *The Greek Anthology II: The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge 1968, II 264; 413–418.

¹³⁵ TH. DREW-BEAR, BCH 96, 1972, 443–471, especially 469 and 471, on the date.

¹³⁶ SHERK, Documents no. 23 (Syll.³ 747).

¹³⁷ Plut. Lucull. 7, 6–7.

¹³⁸ IPriene nos. 112–114: on the date, HILLER on no. 113, 41, cf. MAGIE, I 256; II 1119 n. 23. Liberalities revived «after the war»: IPriene 113, 41–42. 60–61; 114, 18. 25. Romans: 112, 80; 113, 39. 43. 77. Concord: 113, 68. 86.

¹³⁹ Cic. pro Flacco 17, 41 (see above, p. 202).

ciality in the Crimea and for his city the restoration of its freedom and immunity.¹⁴⁰ As in the time of Diodoros, the fortunes of Pergamon ran parallel to those of other Asian cities. Mytilene had already recovered its freedom from Pompey, through the influence of its leading citizen Theophanes.¹⁴¹ Cnidos with the help of the mythographer Theopompos gained from Caesar not only freedom and immunity, but a formal treaty with Rome.¹⁴² The tribulations of Asia were not over: the exactions of Brutus and Cassius, and the invasion of Labienus Parthicus, were still to come. But slowly the foundations were being laid for the great revival of the second and third centuries A. D. The start of that process of rebuilding belongs in the years after Mithradates Eupator. With men like Diodoros in Pergamon and Zosimus in Priene begins the great series of ambassadors and benefactors that runs without interruption from Republic to Principate.¹⁴³

For clarity, it may help to summarize the principal theses here advanced.

1. The Nikephoria of Pergamon were pentetetic after their reorganization in 182–181, and were never called *τρετηρίδες* (pp. 184–188).
2. The inscription of Metris (OGIS 299) belongs not to 165 but to 149, and refers to Attalos II's deposition of Prousius II of Bithynia (pp. 186–189).
3. The inscription of Bito (OGIS 322) belongs not to 155 but to 129, and that of Asklepias (OGIS 324) belongs not to 147 but to 113 (p. 189).
4. The twenty-ninth celebration of the reorganized Nikephoria mentioned in an inscription of Diodoros Paspáros (IGR IV 293 I 49–50) belongs not to 125 but to 69, and Diodoros' activity is to be associated with the aftermath of the Mithradatic Wars rather than of the war of Aristonikos (pp. 190 ff.).

¹⁴⁰ See above, pp. 202–203 and n. 130.

¹⁴¹ Plut. Pomp. 42, 8. On Theophanes, see MAGIE, I 365; II 1230 n. 28; BOWERSOCK, Augustus 3–4; 30–31; ROBERT, CRAI 1969, 42–64 (Bull. 1970, 388), publishing an important new inscription relative to him: a further, fragmentary one in BCH 95, 1971, 997.

¹⁴² Plut. Caes. 48, 1. Cf. MAGIE, I 406; II 1259 n. 5; BOWERSOCK, Augustus 9; 114; ROBERT, AC 35, 1966, 420. See now the series of inscriptions of Theopompos reported from Knidos: IRIS C. LOVE, AJA 76, 1972, 401–402. The fragment found at Chalcis, Mélanges Cagnat, Paris 1912, 53 (E. TÄUBLER, Imperium Romanum I, Leipzig 1913, 450–451), is presumably from the same dossier, cf. ROBERT, RPh 13, 1939, 128 = OMS II 1281.

¹⁴³ Cf. BOWERSOCK, Augustus, especially 1; 140–149.

