



<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 Revisited

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **30 • 2000**

Seite / Page **1–14**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/227/4852> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2000-30-p1-14-v4852.6

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 Revisited*

The first decades of the Roman province of Asia have received intense scrutiny in the last twenty years. Besides the expected advances in interpretation and understanding, progress has also come from notable discoveries, among which two decrees from Claros and the Ephesian customs-law stand out.¹ Inevitably, certain conclusions that had seemed sure, like the date of the *senatus consultum de agro Pergameno*, are again floating, while others that seemed uncertain, like the beginning-date of the Third Mithridatic War, appear to be moored in place.²

A question that had seemed settled after long doubts, the dating of Diodoros Paspáros of Pergamon, has now been re-opened by DOMENICO MUSTI. Orthodoxies whether recent or inveterate usually profit from a good probe, and examining MUSTI's novel thesis will allow some recent evidence to be brought into play.³

* I have used the following special abbreviations: Claros = L. and J. ROBERT, Claros I: Décrets hellénistiques, Paris 1989; BROUGHTON, MRR I–III = T. R. S. BROUGHTON, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, 2 vols., New York, NY, 1951–52, with Supplement, Atlanta, Georgia, 1986; Bull. ép. = Bulletin épigraphique in REG; JONES, Diodoros = C. P. JONES, Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon, Chiron 4, 1974, 183–205; MUSTI, Nikephoria = D. MUSTI, I Nikephoria e il ruolo panellenico di Pergamo, RFIC 126, 1998 (1999), 5–40; RIGSBY, Provincia Asia = KENT J. RIGSBY, Provincia Asia, TAPA 118, 1988, 123–153; ROBERT, OMS = L. ROBERT, Opera Minora Selecta I–VII, Amsterdam 1969–1990.

¹ Claros (SEG 39, 1243, 1244), with the important discussion of J.-L. FERRARY, Le Statut des cités libres dans l'empire romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros, CRAI 1991, 557–577. Customs-law: H. ENGELMANN – D. KNIBBE, Das Zollgesetz der Provinz Asia, EA 14, 1989 (SEG 39, 1180); useful bibliography in: S. CARRELLI, Alcune osservazioni sul *portorium Asiae*, Studi ellenistici 8, Pisa – Rome 1996, 175 n. 1; see now also E. BADIAN, Zöllner und Sünder: Unternehmer im Dienst der römischen Republik, Darmstadt 1997, 219–231.

² Date of the *SC de agro Pergameno* (latest texts: G. PETZL, Die Inschriften von Smyrna, IGSK 24.2, 589; G. DI STEFANO, Una nuova edizione del *senatus consultum de agro Pergameno*, RAL ser. 9.9, 1998, 707–748): BROUGHTON, MRR III 23–24; BADIAN (previous n.) 181–183. Third Mithridatic War: BROUGHTON, MRR III 121–122 (favoring 73 for the opening of hostilities, as against his earlier preference for 74); B. C. MCGING, The Ephesian Customs Law and the Third Mithridatic War, ZPE 109, 1995, 283–288.

³ MUSTI, Nikephoria. For the currently accepted, «down» dating, JONES, Diodoros, with the discussion of J. and L. ROBERT, Bull. ép. 1974, 466; since then, see particularly

Since MUSTI claims to uphold the «traditional» date, it may help to recall what that date is and by what calculation it is reached. It goes back to an inference which MAX FRÄNKEL drew from a Pergamene decree honoring a priestess of Athena called Metris. She was in office during the ninth celebration of the «crowned» Nikephoria, and the decree orders the agonothete to announce her honors «on the second day of the *trieterides*, when the city holds the choruses for the goddess». As FRÄNKEL recognized, the expression «crowned» refers not to the original Nikephoria, founded by Attalos I, but to a reform of the contest undertaken by Eumenes II. This was known from an Aetolian decree found at Delphi and published in 1881. In addition, FRÄNKEL inferred from the decree for Metris that the crowned Nikephoria were identical with the *trieterides*, and in addition that the honors for Metris concerned Eumenes' successes, military and diplomatic, against the Gauls between 168 and 166. He thus proposed a date of 183 for the reform and of 167 for the ninth celebration.⁴

FRÄNKEL considered his thesis of a trieteric cycle to be corroborated by an inscription of 217 CE or later. A certain Apollonia, priestess of Athena Nikephoros, «held office gloriously and generously for a period of two years (διετεί χρόνῳ) and in the next two years (τῇ ἑξῆς διετίᾳ) showed all piety to the goddess».⁵ FRÄNKEL inferred that the normal term for a priestess's tenure was two years, and that Apollonia had then served as assistant or substitute to her successor. Equally well, however, the term could have been of four years, and she could have remained titular priestess in the last two while another acted as substitute for her. This is the situation of a priestess from Mantinea who served Demeter for one year and then «made herself serviceable to all those priestesses who served in her place» (ταῖς αἰεὶ ἀντιτυγχανούσαις ἱερεῖαις).⁶

Diodoros Paspáros first became known from a series of decrees in his honor published between 1904 and 1910. HUGO HEPDING, publishing one of them in 1907, restored a phrase to refer to the (twenty-)ninth celebration of the Nikephoria, the first held after the war with Eumenes III, known in the historical tradition as «Aristonikos»: ἐν τοῖς ἐννεα[χαιεικοστοῖς Νικηφοροῖς τοῦ στεφανίτου ἀγῶνος, ἀχθεῖσιν δὲ πρώτοις [- - - - -π]όλεμον. At this time HEPDING followed

B. VIRGILIO, *La Città ellenistica e i suoi «benefattori»: Pergamo e Diodoro Paspáros*, *Athenaeum* 82, 1994, 299–314; A. S. CHANKOWSKI, *La procédure législative à Pergame au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.*, *BCH* 122, 1998, 159–199, especially on the order of the various decrees in honor of Diodoros.

⁴ M. FRÄNKEL, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, I 167 (on p. 105); summarized by W. DITTENBERGER on OGIS 299 nn. 1 and 2; cf. JONES, *Diodoros* 186. Decree of Aetolians: Syll.³ 629, with improved text in IG IX² 1, 1, 179.

⁵ I. Pergamon 525; cf. DITTENBERGER, OGIS 299 n. 4, MUSTI, *Nikephoria* 27–29.

⁶ IG V 2, 266, lines 9–10. On substitute magistrates, priests, etc., ROBERT, *OMS* VII 579–580 (Stele Kontoleon).

FRÄNKEL's calculation and dated the event to 127/26.⁷ Three years later, he published another decree which he restored similarly: ἐν τε [τοῖς ἐννεακαιικοστοῖς Νικηφοροῖς τοῦ στεφανίτου ἀγῶνος τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστ]ονίκου ἐπινικίοις, at the same time supplying the lacuna in the earlier decree as [μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἀριστόνικον] πόλεμον. He now placed the event in 126, taking into account MAURICE HOLLEAUX's dating of the Aetolian decree to 182. Final precision came in 1930, when LOUIS ROBERT showed that while the reorganization took place in 182, the first celebration fell only in spring 181; on this calculation the twenty-ninth celebration was in spring, 125.⁸ In 1974, however, I argued that the supposed identity of the Nikephoria with the *trieterides* rested on a false inference: the *trieterides* were a well-known Pergamene festival of Dionysos, and the honors for Metris were announced there only because Dionysiac festivals were the customary occasion for such announcements. MUSTI appears to accept this argument, so that while professing to return to the «traditional» chronology he has in fact abandoned the foundation of the whole edifice.⁹

MUSTI's solution, for which he claims the merits of «perfect simplicity» and «geometrical clarity» («assoluta semplicità», p. 13; «chiarezza geometrica», p. 21), is as follows. He starts from a now agreed fact, that from 181 on the reorganized Nikephoria were penteteric, that is, occurred every fourth year. So much emerges from a letter of Eumenes II to Cos, augmented by a crucial fragment which MARIO SEGRE published posthumously in 1948: [καὶ νῦν ἐ]παύξειν δὲ βουλόμε[νοι τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῆς καὶ μείζω χαριστή]ρια τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀγῶνων ἀποδιδόναι, διεγν[ωκότες δὲ συντελεῖν αὐτῇ παν]ήγησιν τε διὰ πεν[ταετηρίδος καὶ μουσικο]ῦς καὶ γυμνικοὺς [ἀγῶνας, κτλ.].¹⁰ Now decrees both of the Amphictyons and of the Aetolians, clearly passed in response to a similar overture from the king, have a slightly different wording: τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὗς διέγωνκε

⁷ HEPDING, *Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1904–1905: Die Inschriften*, AM 32, 1907, 257–272 no. 8 = IGR IV 293; the phrase in question is on p. 260, col. 1, lines 49–51. There is general agreement that HEPDING's supplement of the numeral must be right, though disagreement about the calculation of the cycle.

⁸ HEPDING, *Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1908–1909: Die Inschriften*, AM 35, 1910, 410 lines 21–22, with discussion of the supplement and the dates, 412, 493. HOLLEAUX: *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* 2, Paris 1938, 68–69 (originally Mélanges Havet). ROBERT: OMS I 153–157 (BCH 1930).

⁹ JONES, *Diodoros* 186–188. At least, I understand MUSTI to accept this argument from his statement on p. 20: «al culto di Dioniso, così antico a Pergamo, e ai suoi ritmi, che sono naturalmente trieterici, si associa sempre, almeno nel stesso anno, se non addirittura nella stessa sequenza di giornate (le «giornate trieteriche», cioè le «giornate biennali») l'altro culto massimo della città, quello di Atena.» This hardly does justice to cults such as that of Zeus, Asclepios and Heracles in late Hellenistic Pergamon.

¹⁰ SEGRE in: L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 5, Paris 1948, 104 lines 12–17 (previously WELLES, *Royal Correspondence* no. 50); cf. JONES, *Diodoros* 185–186. The letter of Eumenes to Iasos on the same subject and the corresponding decree of the city (WELLES no. 49; SEGRE, p. 105) are now W. BLÜMEL, *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, IGSK 28.1,6.

συντελεῖν στεφανίτας τόν τε μουσικόν ἰσοπύθιον καί τόν γυμνικόν καί ἵππικόν ἰσολύμπιον.¹¹ Laying particular emphasis on the use of the singular ἀγών and the distinction between musical and gymnastic, MUSTI argues that Eumenes intended the Nikephoria to be both trieteric and penteteric. The first and thereafter every odd-numbered celebration was to be Pythian in that it was solely musical, every even-numbered to be Olympian in that it was solely gymnastic and equestrian. Thus, by actually falling every other year, the Nikephoria could be associated with the *trieterides* in honor of Dionysus. In MUSTI's formulation, «the cycle of the contest was to be «short», and so «high», in so far as it was in fact trieteric . . . though also penteteric in frame, in that it was a summation and interweaving of two penteteric series, Pythian and Olympian» («corta, quindi «alta», in quanto di fatto trieterica . . . anche se penteterica di cornice, per il sommarsi ed embricarsi delle due serie penteteriche pitica ed olimpica», p. 13).

Whether this represents a solution of «perfect simplicity» is perhaps a subjective question. From the standpoint of ancient athletics, two major objections immediately arise. One is that there is no other example of a periodic contest in which the events differed entirely between one celebration and the next: it would be as if the modern Olympics were for the arts in, say, 1996 and 2004, for athletics in 2000 and 2008. A more technical objection, peculiar to Greek athletics, is that expressions such as «equal to the Olympics», «to the Pythia», «to the Nemea» (ἰσολύμπιος, ἰσοπύθιος, ἰσονέμεος) refer not to the cycle of the contest but to the age-categories of the contestants and the honors accorded to the victors. As L. ROBERT summarized it in 1936: «Lorsqu'un concours est στεφανίτης, «panhellénique», il est, les inscriptions des Sôtéria nous le répètent, ἰσοπύθιος ou ἰσονέμεος, etc., par deux choses: ταῖς τιμαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἡλικίαις: – ταῖς ἡλικίαις, c'est-à-dire que le classement dans la catégorie des ἄνδρες ou des παῖδες (ou des ἀγένοιοι dans certains concours athlétiques) a lieu suivant les règles appliquées à Delphes ou de Némée, etc. . . .; – ταῖς τιμαῖς, c'est-à-dire que les vainqueurs jouiront . . . des honneurs accordés aux vainqueurs de Delphes ou de Némée, ou d'Olympie, etc.; ils auront des τιμαὶ ἰσολύμπιοι, etc.»¹²

These well-known points could be illustrated from several instances, the Ptolemaia celebrated by Ptolemy II in Alexandria, the Mouseia of Thespiai, the Leucophryena of Magnesia on the Maeander, but one will suffice, the Soteria of Delphi. As was first demonstrated by PIERRE ROUSSEL, this began as an annual contest held by the Amphictyons to celebrate the repulse of the Gauls in 279. At some date between 250 and 240 (until recently agreed to be 246/

¹¹ Amphictyons: Syll.³ 630 lines 12–13 (FDelphes III 3.2,261). The differences between this and the Aetolian wording are inconsequential, Syll.³ 629, 8–9 (FDelphes 240).

¹² ROBERT: OMS II 785 (REA 1936). On age-classes see further ROBERT, OMS I 625–627 (Anatolian Studies Buckler).

45) the Aetolians, at that time masters of the sanctuary, transformed the Soteria into a penteteric festival, and duly sent out letters to cities and kings asking for their recognition of the contest in its new form.¹³ Several of the replies are preserved, and that of the Chiotēs is expressed thus:¹⁴ δέχεσθαι τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Σωτηρίων . . . στεφανίτην, . . . τὸ μὲν μουσικὸν ἰσοπύθιον, τὸν δὲ γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἰσόνεμεον ταῖς τε ἡλικίαις καὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς. Since the Nemea was a biennial event, not a quadriennial one, these and the other replies show with especial clarity that the prefix ἰσο- refers to age-classes and prizes, not to periodicity. In making both parts of this reformed Nikephoria equal to the two great penteteric contests, the Pythia and the Olympia, Eumenes was aiming higher than the Aetolians, and that suits the account which he gives of his motives: «We honor Athena most of all the gods because she has bestowed upon us many great successes in all kinds of difficult circumstances, . . . and now wishing to augment her honors and pay her greater thanks for our struggles in war, and having decided to offer to her a *panegyris* every fourth year,»¹⁵ etc. And it is presumably because Athena is a goddess of the arts, not of athletics, that the king names the musical part of the competition before the athletic, exactly as the Aetolians do when honoring Apollo of Delphi.

Another contest is also relevant, the *Panathenaia kai Eumeneia* of Sardis. At a date usually reckoned to fall in the 160's, the Sardians founded a penteteric contest of this name, musical and athletic, and «equal to the Pythia». At a later date, but still in the reign of Eumenes, they added an equestrian *agôn* «equal to the Olympics», with reference to the great prestige of the equestrian events at Olympia. The two decrees of Delphi from which these transactions are known give not the slightest hint that the various sections were to constitute anything but the one contest of the *Panathenaia kai Eumeneia*. This contest survived the end of the Attalid kingdom, since a benefactor of Sardis, Iollas son of Iollas, was agonothete of the contest in the first century BCE as well as being priest of the goddess Roma: an indication how little such commemoration of the Attalids was thought likely to offend the Roman power.¹⁶

¹³ P. ROUSSEL, La Fondation des Sôtéria de Delphes, REA 26, 1924, 97–111; ROBERT, OMS I 141–151 (BCH 1930); G. NACHTERGAEL, Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes: Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques, Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Mémoires de la Classe des lettres, Collection in-8°, 2^e ser., t. 63, fasc. 1, Brussels 1977, especially 329–338 on the Aetolian reorganization. CH. HABICHT kindly informs me that new evidence appears to place the archonship of Polyeuctos, during which the Athenians accepted the new Soteria, in 250/49.

¹⁴ Syll.³ 402, 13–16 (FDelphes III 3,215; NACHTERGAEL [previous n.], 436–440, Actes no. 22). I omit square brackets, since the restorations are not in doubt.

¹⁵ SEGRE (n. 10) 104, lines 2–5, 12–16.

¹⁶ Institution of the contest and addition of the equestrian section: FDelphes III 3,2,241 (OGIS 305), 242. On the dating, ROBERT, OMS II 1182–1184 (RPh 1934). Iollas: I.Sardis no. 27.

There is another objection to MUSTI's scheme. It is more of a difficulty than he allows to suppose that the Nikephoria were held continuously in 133, 131, 129, 127 and 125, and that only the last was the first after the war with Aristonikos.¹⁷ According to Florus, M. Perperna, the consul of 130, «defeated and captured (Aristonicus) and after his surrender threw him into chains», while his successor M.' Aquillius, the consul of 129, «finished up the remnants of the Asian war».¹⁸ Perperna, according to a decree of Priene, «won gloriously and overcame the enemy, and gave thanks in the city of Pergamon and wrote to the people (of Priene) about the contests and sacrifices which he was going to celebrate»; the honorand Moschion «was elected ambassador and *theôros* and made a brilliant journey in company with his fellow-appointees». Even if this celebration did not take place under Perperna, who died and was buried in Pergamon, the language of the decree shows that it must have taken place.¹⁹ For Aquillius, Florus' information is again confirmed by a long decree of Bargylia in Caria. This shows that the consul campaigned in Mysia Abbatitis, taking with him troops from Bargylia and doubtless other of the Asian cities; the war then resumed in Caria, and Bargylia fell into further difficulties. HOLLEAUX, who is mainly responsible for elucidating this text, reckoned that these events took place in 129 or 128.²⁰ For Pergamon, therefore, the war was over in 130 or 129, and it seems more than strange that, on the assumption of a biennial cycle, the first celebration after the war would have occurred only in 125.

The decrees honoring Diodoros mention several persons, events or circumstances which must be taken into account, and MUSTI draws three arguments from them.

First, M.' Aquillius, consul of 129 and effectively the organizer of the new province. According to MUSTI, one of the decrees orders the *hierokéryx* «to bless in his prayers (ἐπεύχεσθαι), after M.' Aquillius, Diodoros» («benedire nelle preghiere, dopo M.' Aquillio, Diodoro»). «This takes Diodoros, on the simplest explanation, to the epoch of Aristonikos, over whom M.' Aquillius conquered and triumphed.»²¹ But MUSTI has been led astray by a small but crucial mis-translation. The Greek is: μετὰ Μάνιον ἐπεύχεσθαι καὶ Διοδώρῳ Ἡρώιδου

¹⁷ Cf. MUSTI, Nikephoria 15.

¹⁸ Florus, Bell. Asiat. 35.6–7 (p. 100 MALCOVATI), (*Aristonicus*) a *Perperna domitus et captus et per deditionem in vinculis habitus. Aquillius Asiatici belli reliquias confecit*. Cf. F. MÜNZER, RE 19,1, 1937, 894–895, s.v. Perperna. For an recent inscription from Cassope in Epiros referring to Perperna as the victor over Aristonikos, SEG 36, 555; R. MERKELBACH, ZPE 87, 1991, 132.

¹⁹ I. Priene 108, lines 223–232, cf. MÜNZER (previous n.), 895–896.

²⁰ HOLLEAUX, Études d'épigraphie II 179–198 (REA 1919), especially 193–194.

²¹ MUSTI, Nikephoria 16, referring to AM 32, 1907, 262 lines 23–24 (IGR IV 293 col. II lines 23–24). It has already been noted that M. Perperna, and not M.' Aquillius his successor, in fact conquered Aristonikos.

Πασπάρωι, and ἐπεύχεσθαι with the dative in such a context means «pray *to*», not «bless» or «pray *for*». ²² The herald is to pray to Diodoros, still living but already deified, after praying to Aquillius, just as the name of his priest is to follow that of Aquillius in the dating of public documents. ²³ As the virtual founder of the province, and almost certainly a particular benefactor of Pergamon, M.' Aquillius' memory could well have remained alive for long after his departure. Around the year 70 the province would have had particular cause to recall him, for about that time his grandson L. Aquillius Florus was quaestor in the province, and restored milestones erected by his grandfather. ²⁴

Second, MUSTI alleges a «highly probable mention of Aristonikos» («menzione probabilissima di Aristonico», p. 16) in one of the decrees for Diodoros. He refers to the passage restored by HEPDING to read: ἐν τε [τοῖς ἐννεακαιικοστοῖς Νικηφορίοις τοῦ στεφανίτου ἀγῶνος τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστ]ονίκου ἐπινικίοις. ²⁵ Here, however, there is a difficulty noticed in passing by J. and L. ROBERT. ²⁶ In documentary and literary texts, ἐπινίκια and related expressions refer primarily to a sacrifice on the occasion of a particular victory, which may be agonistic or military; in the second case, the victory is usually one of a king or a general. ²⁷ The ROBERTS wished to restore a reference to an athletic victory: ἐν τε [τοῖς συντελουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ δαῖνος τοῦ δαῖνος περιοδ]ονίκου ἐπινικίοις; but it would perhaps be preferable to understand -ονίκου as the end of the name of a priest or magistrate in whose tenure this festival was held. ²⁸ Whatever the solution, to restore ἐπινικίοις in apposition to the mention of a recurrent festival such as the Nikephoria, far from being «highly probable», is in fact extremely hazardous.

²² LIDDELL – SCOTT – JONES s.v. I, «pray or make a vow to a deity». MUSTI is perhaps influenced by LAFAYE's note, IGR IV p. 114: «Praeco sacer supplicabit pro Aquillio ac deinceps pro Diodoro.» On *epeuchai*, Bull. ép. 1983, 323, pp. 137–138.

²³ AM 32, 1907, 247 lines 38–40 (IGR IV 292).

²⁴ B. HAUSOULLIER, Un nouveau milliaire au nom de Manius Aquillius, RPh 23, 1899, 293–299; D.H. FRENCH, Milestones from the Izmir Region, EA 25, 1995, 99–101 (SEG 45, 1625; Ann. épigr. 1995, 1464).

²⁵ Above at n. 8. As MUSTI observes, Nikephoria 17, the lacuna in AM 32, 1907, 257–266, no. 8, col. I 5 (IGR IV 293) could be restored to contain the name of either Aristonikos or Mithradates.

²⁶ Bull. ép. 1974, 466, p. 270, «la mention inutile ou même gênante des Niképhoria».

²⁷ An excellent, brief account by O. CRUSIUS, Epinikion, RE 6,1, 1907, 183–184. I leave aside CRUSIUS' second category of victory-poem, which in epigraphy is practically confined to Hellenistic Boeotia: H. J. METTE, Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland, Berlin – New York 1977, 53–63. Cf. ROBERT, OMS II 1140–1141 (RPh 1930), «des Ἐπινίκια ne sont pas, le plus souvent, une fête célébrée périodiquement, mais une fois». Kings and generals: Polybius 30.22.1 (L. Anicius ca. 166); Diod. Sic. 16.18.5 (Syracusans); 16.55.1 and 86.6 (Philip II); 17.72.1 (Alexander); Plut. Luc. 23.1, App. Mithr. 83 (Lucullus).

²⁸ Bull. ép. 1974, 466 p. 270. For a proposed restoration, see below at n. 41.

MUSTI lays particular weight on his third point, «the rebirth of an *active* cult of the Attalids, and again of Attalos III, with so many renewed statues and sacrifices» («la rinascita di un culto *attivo* degli Attalidi, e dello stesso Attalo III, con tanto di statue rinnovate e sacrifici», p. 16). It is not in fact clear that the passages in question refer to a renewal of the cult, but they are similar in wording and perhaps refer to the same benefaction.²⁹ One mentions sacrifices which Diodoros made to Philetairos and Attalos III, and statues and sacrifices in honor of Attalos I, Philetairos «the benefactor» (both these names are restored), and Attalos III, «*philomêtôr* and benefactor». The other, fragmentary at this point, refers to «Philetairos the benefactor and the . . . of (Attalos) *philomêtôr* and benefactor». ³⁰ In his standard study of Hellenistic ruler-cult, CHRISTIAN HABICHT showed that the survival of such a cult depended on the feelings and attitudes of the worshipers: «when a cult is founded, annulled or restored, in every case that implies the manifestation of the community's political will, which is always dependent on the specific political situation of the moment». ³¹ As for the memory of the Attalids in Roman Asia, we should not think in modern terms of tsarist or royalist cults being maintained under a suspicious or frankly hostile regime. The Romans had inherited the core area of the province from Attalos III; as now appears, their arrangements for taxing it took over some of the royal infrastructure; benefactors such as Menippos of Kolophon strove to maintain foundations which the kings had left behind; Iollas of Sardis presided over the *Eumeneia* of his city about the time of Diodoros. ³² By a curiosity of recent historiography, while MUSTI has used references to the Attalids in the inscriptions of Diodoros to date him to the 120's, BIAGIO VIRGILIO has used these same references to show the longevity of their reputation. ³³

An argument from silence which might be held to favor the earlier date concerns Q. Mucius Scaevola, proconsul of Asia in the 90's, either around 97

²⁹ I do not understand MUSTI's phrase, Nikephoria 16, «un ginnasiarco identificato proprio da L. ROBERT con Diodoro Pasparo», referring to ROBERT, Documents d'Asie Mineure, Paris 1987, 460–470 (BCH 1984). ROBERT does not seem to mention Diodoros in those pages, and certainly no longer dated him to the 120's; cf. for example OMS VI 467 n. 56 (RPh 1984).

³⁰ HEPDING, AM 29, 1904, facing p. 153, lines 39, 47–48 (IGR IV 294); AM 32, 1907, 265 lines 17–19. On these passages see now CHANKOWSKI (n. 3), 189–191.

³¹ CH. HABICHT, Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte, 2nd ed., Munich 1970, 192, cf. 185.

³² Taxation: SEG 39, 1180, lines 67–69. Menippos: Claros p. 65 col. II lines 46–54 (SEG 39, 1244), with the ROBERTS' commentary, pp. 100–101. Iollas: I. Sardis 27.

³³ B. VIRGILIO, Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, Eredità, Memoria, Pisa 1993. The fragmentary decree AM 33, 1908, 381–383 no. 3, improved by HEPDING, AM 35, 1910, 419–420 (cf. Claros, p. 100), refers to funds for oil previously paid out of the royal treasuries: conceivably another inscription of Diodoros.

or around 94. Scaevola «earned the reputation of a model governor (and) the provincials honored him with an annual festival», and therefore it might seem odd that only M. Aquillius among previous governors is mentioned in the decrees for Diodoros.³⁴ It should be remembered, however, that the honors for Mucius of which we know are provincial, offered by a grouping of peoples and honored individuals which is either a forerunner of the later *koinon* or the *koinon* itself, whereas those mentioned in the decrees for Diodoros are civic. It is likely enough that Pergamon included Mucius among its benefactors, but it could well have rated him lower in importance than either Mucius or Diodoros.³⁵

To conclude this mostly negative discussion of MUSTI: his arguments drawn from allusions to historical circumstances are as fragile as his notion of Nikephoria simultaneously penteteric and trieteric. I briefly turn to the arguments for placing Diodoros' activity in the context of the Mithridatic wars.

The arguments for the later dating, like those for the earlier one, depend in part on the cycle of the Nikephoria and partly on allusions in the several decrees both for the priestess Metris and for Diodoros.

Metris presided as priestess over the ninth Nikephoria, and during her tenure «the king has had notable successes, from which the greatest benefits have resulted for our people and for all others». On the higher dating, the year of the festival is 165, and the successes are those of Eumenes II in the Gallic War of 168–166. On the lower dating, the year is 149, in which Attalos II finally got rid of his old enemy Prusias II of Bithynia by using Prusias' son Nicomedes as his agent; in their war of 156–154, of which this conflict was a recrudescence, Prusias had brutally sacked the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros.³⁶ Against this date MUSTI argues that «a solemn celebration of victory over a Hellenistic ruler, protected by Rome, and under the full Roman protectorate, would be less understandable (than in 165, sc.)» («non sarebbe altrettanto comprensibile una solenne celebrazione di vittoria su di un principe ellenistico, protetto da Roma, e in pieno protettorato romano», p. 35 n. 2). MUSTI seems to have forgotten that in 154 Rome had officially broken off relations

³⁴ BROUGHTON, MRR II 7, citing OGIS 437–439, Cic. Verr. 2.2.51.

³⁵ *Moukieia*: OGIS 438, 439, «the people and tribes in Asia and those included *viritim* in the friendship of the Romans and the others who have chosen to participate in the Moukieia and Soteria.» It may also be relevant that the *koinon* is found celebrating *Euergesia* in Pergamon, but not *Moukieia*: OGIS 438 n. 1; IGR IV 291.

³⁶ In general, CH. HABICHT, RE 23,1, 1957, 1115–1126 s.v. Prusias II.; J. HOPP, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden, Munich 1977, 74–79, 86–92. Attalos' success in the war of 156–154 appears to have occasioned his new penteteric festival at Pergamon, the *Soteria kai Herakleia*; an inscription records the second celebration in 149 or 148, ROBERT, OMS VI 457–468 (RPh 1984), esp. 461.

with Prusias; though the senate made a gesture to restrain Attalos in 149, sending the notoriously feeble embassy «without head, feet or brain», it did nothing to reverse the results of his coup. Attalos' triumph on this occasion emerges from an offering which he made to Zeus and Athena Nikephoros after Prusias had «broken the agreements made by the Romans».³⁷

In the decrees for Diodoros, the crucial passage has already been mentioned: ἐν τοῖς ἑννεα[χαικοστοῖς Νικηφορίοις τοῦ στ]εφανίτου ἀγῶνος, ἀχθεῖσιν δὲ πρῶτοις [- - - - -π]όλεμον. Calculating by a penteteric or four-yearly cycle which began in spring or early summer of 181, the twenty-eighth celebration would have fallen in 73, the twenty-ninth in 69. That precisely fits the chronology which has now become accepted for the outbreak of the Third Mithridatic War. Mithridates invaded the former kingdom, now province, of Bithynia in the spring of 73, took Calchedon, and from there advanced into the Propontis, where he was tied down by Lucullus at Cyzicos. In 70, after driving Mithridates out of his own kingdom into that of his son-in-law Tigranes of Cappadocia, Lucullus returned to Asia and, in Appian's phrase, «proceeded to celebrate his victory as if having brought the war to a successful conclusion» (ἐπινίκια ἔθυσεν ὥς δὴ τὸν πόλεμον κατωρθώως). He then returned east, probably in 69, to pursue Mithridates.³⁸ Because the twenty-ninth celebration is said to be the first after the war, and no numbered celebration is known thereafter, the ROBERTS argued that there had been a delay, and that this celebration actually took place after 69. That may be right, though it would not affect the question of the cycle.³⁹

The other passage important for this question is a fragmentary one published in 1907. It contains references to «lowering of interest . . . those who lost their lives (or: property) . . . (because?) of the high interest exacted . . . seizure of persons . . . winter-quartering of troops . . . expenditures on these . . ., an end to harassment . . . payments for these . . . exactions over and above the tribute . . . invalid contracts which were (enforced) with violence and compulsion» (ἐλαφροτοκία, ἀπολωλέκναι τοὺς βίους, μεγάλους πράσσεσθαι τοὺς τόκους, ἀνδροληψία, στρατοπέδων παραχειμασίαι, τῶν παρενοχλουμένων ἐπίστασις, τῶν εἰς ταύτας δαπανημάτων, τῶν ἔκτος τῶν φόρων ἐπιτασσομένων, τῶν κενῶν συγγραφῶν καὶ μετὰ βίας καὶ ἀν[άγκης] πραιομένων (?)). The list ends with «the property (or: the lives) of those killed by Mithridates

³⁷ I.Pergamon 225 (OGIS 327; IGR IV 287).

³⁸ Thus BROUGHTON, MRR III 121–122; MCGING (n. 2), refuting an attempt to reassert the year 74 for the beginning of the war; K. STROBEL, Mithridates VI. Eupator von Pontos: Politisches Denken in hellenistischer Tradition versus römische Macht, *Ktêma* 21, 1996, 93; F. DE CALLATAÏ, L'Histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies, Louvain-la-Neuve 1997, 345–362. Lucullus in 70: App. Mithr. 83, cf. Plut. Luc. 23.1.

³⁹ Bull. ép. 1974, 466, p. 269.

... in the war, from which intolerable danger had resulted for the city» (τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνειρημένων ὑπὸ Μιθραδ[άτου] . . . ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ἐξ ὧν ἀφόρητος ἐπηκολούθει τῇ πόλει κί[νδυνος]).⁴⁰ These phrases exactly fit the picture given by Plutarch, to a lesser extent by Appian, of the condition of Asia when Lucullus returned there in 70, and make it very tempting to see the same situation behind the *epinikia* mentioned in another decree for Diodoros: that is, instead of: ἐν τε [τοῖς ἐννεακαιικοῦς τοῖς Νικηφορίοις τοῦ στεφανίτου ἀγῶνος τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστ]ονίκου ἐπινικίοις may be suggested, *exempli gratia*, ἐν τε [τοῖς ὑπὸ Λικινίου Λευκόλλου ἀχθεῖσιν ἐφ' ἱερέως τοῦ δαῖνος τοῦ Στρατ]ονίκου ἐπινικίοις. Though the inscriptions of Lucullus usually refer to him with his *tria nomina* and filiation, that is because they occur in official contexts such as statue-bases: a less formal reference could include only the *cognomen*, as is shown by a newly published letter of Sulla.⁴¹ Similarly, the Mithridates who had killed certain of the citizens is surely Eupator, whether his victims are the eighty Pergamenes who plotted against him in 86 or other, perhaps judicial, victims.⁴²

Against the last identification, which if correct would be decisive for the later dating, MUSTI reverts to HEPDING's idea that the Mithridates in question is Euergetes' father Eupator. Yet this king aided the Romans against Aristonikos, is not known to have been in Pergamon during the war, and was rewarded with the gift of north-western Phrygia, or Phrygia Epictetos, for his services; and Pergamon was the headquarters of the Roman commanders during the war, and there is no known occasion on which this Mithridates could have killed any of its citizens. For MUSTI, all this merely shows «our limited knowledge of the war in connection with possible harm inflicted on a part of the population by Mithridates V» («nostra limitata conoscenza della guerra . . . riguardo ad eventuali danni procurati a una parte della popolazione da Mithridate V», p. 18). This is a counsel of despair.⁴³

In sum, MUSTI's arguments for placing the activity of Diodoros in the first years of the province, rather than in the Mithridatic wars, are no stronger than his notion that the Nikephoria were both trieteric and penteteric. It is perhaps

⁴⁰ AM 32, 1907, 245 lines 4–14 (IGR IV 292). On ἀνδροληψία see Claros, pp. 90–91. I signal here a restoration of a part of that passage, Claros p. 64 col. II lines 1–4 (SEG 39, 1244): [οὐ μόνον ἀπαρενόχλητον (e.g.) ἐτήρησε τὴν πόλιν, οὐδ' ἀτέλεστον ἐποίησε τὴν τῶν ἀντιπροσβουόντων ἐπιβουλὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κτλ. For this series of particles, R. KÜHNER – B. GERTH, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre II 257, citing Demosth. 18 (De Corona), 2.

⁴¹ Asia in 70: Plut. Luc. 20, App. Mithr. 83. Ἐπινίκια: above, n. 38. Letter of Sulla: SEG 44, 1227, lines 6, 9.

⁴² Plotres: App. Mithr. 48, cf. 58. Judicial victims: App. Mithr. 27.

⁴³ On p. 17, MUSTI seems to consider that this may be an unknown Mithridates: «(il nome) di Mithridate (è) assai più diffuso, fra personaggi del Ponto e altri.» The simple name without the patronymic, however, surely indicates the king: thus at Pergamon, IGR IV 298, [σώσαντα τὴν ἀπ]ολει(φ)θεῖσαν ὑπὸ [Μιθριδάτου φοροῦράν].

not beyond hope that, just as new discoveries and advances have occurred in the last quarter-century, so further ones may settle the question once and for all in the next.⁴⁴

Appendix: The caput Asiae in 129

Ephesos was certainly the chief city of Asia in the imperial period. It was there that the future Augustus in 30/29 permitted the Asians to establish a sanctuary of Rome and the deified Julius, in which Greeks and Romans were to worship, whereas *peregrini* were to worship himself in Pergamon; at the time, though not later, this clearly marked the superiority of Ephesos. It was in Ephesos also that proconsuls were obliged to land on reaching the province.⁴⁵

KENT RIGSBY has recently argued that Ephesos had the priority «from the establishment of regular provincial government in the 120's». Since Pergamon had been the royal capital, and nothing is at present known to explain the transfer of this position to another city, RIGSBY's arguments call for examination.⁴⁶

RIGSBY acknowledges that M. Perperna, the consul of 130 and actual captor of Aristonikos, was based in Pergamon; for his successor M. Aquillius, and the ten commissioners who helped him settle the affairs of the province, there seems no sure evidence beyond the fact of his cult at Pergamon.⁴⁷ Yet RIGSBY has overlooked an inscription of Priene which records the embassy undertaken by a certain Crates to C. Julius Caesar, father of the dictator and proconsul of Asia in the 90's. This contains the phrases «to C. Julius C. f. Caesar . . . traveling to Pergamon he made . . . so that the proconsul ordered . . .» The implication is surely that the proconsul was resident in Pergamon at the time of Crates' embassy.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ I do not invoke the publication of a heroon at Pergamon in which was found the portrait of a benefactor identified with Diodoros: M. N. FILGIS – W. RADT, *Pergamon XV 1: Die Stadtgrabung, Teil 1: Das Heroon*, Berlin 1986, with the doubts of H. MÜLLER, 114 n. 330^a.

⁴⁵ Octavian: Cass. Dio 51.20.6–9, on which CH. HABICHT, *Die augusteische Zeit und das erste Jahrhundert nach Christi Geburt*, in: *Le Culte des Souverains, Entretiens Hardt 19*, Geneva 1973, 55–64. Proconsuls: Dig. 1.16.4.5 (Ulpian). In general, R. HAENSCH, *Capita Provinciarum: Statthaltersitze und Provinzverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Cologne 1997, 298–300.

⁴⁶ RIGSBY, *Provincia Asia* 137–141; HAENSCH (previous n.), 312–315, is sceptical. For criticism of some of RIGSBY's other hypotheses, PH. GAUTHIER, *Bull. ép.* 1989, 279.

⁴⁷ Aquillius and the commissioners: evidence in E. KLEBS, *RE* 2,1, 1895, 323–324, s.v. Aquilius 10. BROUGHTON, *MRR* I 509. On the inscriptions OGIS 435 and 436 (SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* 11, 13), T. DREW-BEAR, *Three Senatus consulta concerning the province of Asia*, *Historia* 21, 1972, 75–87.

⁴⁸ I. Priene 111, 14–16 (S. L. AGER, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World*, Berkeley 1996, no. 171 I); cf. 117, 49 (n. 50), with the discussion of G. V. SUMNER, *Governors of Asia in the nineties B.C.*, *GRBS* 19, 1978, 147–149. On Caesar and the date of his tenure, possibly 92–90, BROUGHTON, *MRR* III 105.

By contrast, RIGSBY has misread a text of Cicero which also appears to concern an event of the 90's. The orator says: «Not so long ago, when M. Aemilius Scaurus made complaint on the ground that, when in Ephesos as quaestor, he had been prevented by force from taking a slave of his from the sanctuary of Artemis» (*nuper M. Aurelio Scauro postulante, quod is Ephesi se quaestorem vi prohibutum esse dicebat quominus e fano Dianae servum suum educeret*, Verr. 2.1.84). RIGSBY comments: «At Ephesos in the 90s B.C. (though this date is uncertain) a slave of M. Aemilius Scaurus, quaestor of Asia (*quaestor in Epheso* Cicero calls him) took refuge in the temple of Artemis . . . Probably already by the 90s (Scaurus *quaestor in Epheso*) [the] honor had passed to Ephesos.» In Cicero's sentence, however, *Ephesi* (not of course *in Epheso*) does not adhere to *quaestor*, but simply indicates where the incident took place.⁴⁹ The sanctuary of Artemis was the largest and most celebrated asylum in the province, and the incident shows nothing about the *caput provinciae*. It might be wondered whether an inscription of Priene mentioning the same Julius Caesar as proconsul is relevant: it refers to «a slave which they said they would give up» and in the same context to Ephesos.⁵⁰

The legal status of both Pergamon and Ephesos in the first decades of the province is not precisely clear, but they must have been free (*liberae*), and probably also exempt from tribute (*immunes*).⁵¹ The situation of a lesser city, Colophon, in this same period is now illuminated by the two decrees published by L. and J. ROBERT. This was outside the *formula provinciae* and in principle was autonomous and free from tribute, though obliged to defend its privileges from encroaching governors, its sacred land from *publicani*, and to offer hospitality at least to highly-placed Romans.⁵²

In the First Mithridatic War, both Pergamon and Ephesos went over to the king and participated in atrocities against Romans. Pergamon served as the king's headquarters, and from there he issued gold staters which reveal a new era beginning in 88. Though some eighty citizens formed a plot against him in 86, texts and coins show that he continued to reside there until mid-85.⁵³ The Ephesians were less steadfast for Mithridates: in 86 they killed the king's gener-

⁴⁹ RIGSBY, *Provincia Asia* 138, 140. The passage is correctly understood by J.-L. FERRARY, CRAI 1971, 571.

⁵⁰ I. Priene, 117, 46–49.

⁵¹ R. BERNHARDT, *Polis und römische Herrschaft in der späten Republik* (149–31 v. Chr.), Berlin – New York 1985, 285–294. BERNHARDT was not able to take account of ROBERT's attribution of Syll.³ 694 (IGR IV 1692, the «stele from Kopatzedes») to Elaia, Documents d'Asie Mineure 477–484 (BCH 1984), nor of course of the decrees from Claros.

⁵² Claros, especially Polemaios (SEG 39, 1243), col. II lines 51–61 (autonomy), col. IV 20–23 (hospitality), Menippos (SEG 39, 1244), col. I 23–31, 37–40 (autonomy, *formula provinciae*), col. II 10–18, 42–46 (hospitality).

⁵³ See now DE CALLATAÏ (n. 38), 41–43, 312, 321–322.

al Zenobios and went over to the Romans, and a law passed, though probably not inscribed, at this juncture shows them justifying their previous disloyalty by a plea of force majeure.⁵⁴ Both cities were punished with the loss of their freedom, and Pergamon certainly, Ephesos probably recovered theirs only in the administration of Servilius Isauricus, Caesar's proconsul from 46 to 44.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, it was to Ephesos that Sulla summoned the Greeks of Asia in 85 and harangued them for their disloyalty, and when Cicero passed through Asia on his way to Cilicia in 53 he landed first in Ephesos and met the current proconsul there.⁵⁶

It might therefore be inferred that, despite its degradation after the First Mithridatic War, Ephesos became the capital city of Asia at that time, as it was to remain, whereas Pergamon was permanently relegated to second place. When Diodoros Paspáros returned to the city after an absence of several years, and brought relief from some of the indignities suffered in the aftermath of the First War, it is not surprising that the citizens ranked him second only to M. Aquillius among their recent benefactors. Nor would it surprise if statues of the kings, several of them loyal supporters and allies of Rome, needed to be restored or maintained after the residence of Mithridates, since there is no evidence that, as well as residing in the Attalid capital, Mithridates also posed as a champion of the extinct dynasty.⁵⁷

Department of the Classics
Harvard University
Cambridge
MA 02138
U. S. A.

⁵⁴ Defection: App. Mithr. 48, cf. DE CALLATAY (n. 38), 318–319. Decree: Syll.³ 742; I.Ephesos 8.

⁵⁵ D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, I 417, II 1270–1271 n. 42. For Pergamon the restoration was obtained by Caesar's friend and ally Mithridates: evidence in CH. HABICHT, *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII 3: Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*, Berlin 1969, p. 23.

⁵⁶ Sulla: App. Mithr. 61; cf. the *koinon* of Asia meeting in Ephesos at a date probably between 80 and 70, J. M. REYNOLDS, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London 1982, 5. Cicero: Ep. ad Att. 5.13.1–2 = D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus 3*, Cambridge 1968, no. 106.

⁵⁷ Otherwise RIGSBY, *Provincia Asia* 140, «In residing at Pergamum, Mithridates will have restored the usage of the Attalids, rejecting that of the Romans.»