



Aegina and Megara (IG IV.22 750)

Author(s): Kent J. Rigsby

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (July 2010), pp. 308-313

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/658629>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 07:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

- Gomperz, T. 1893. *Aus der Hekale des Kallimachos: Neue Bruchstücke*. Vienna.
- Griffith, R. D. 2008. *Mummy Wheat: Egyptian Influence on the Homeric View of the Afterlife and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Lanham, Md.
- Heubeck, A., and A. Hoekstra, eds. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's "Odyssey."* Oxford.
- Hoffmann, H. 1997. *Sotades: Symbols of Immortality on Greek Vases*. Oxford.
- Hollis, A. S. 2009. *Callimachus: "Hecale"*². Oxford.
- Hopkinson, N. 1994. *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period*. Cambridge.
- Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 3. Basel.
- MacDowell, D. M., ed. 1971. *Aristophanes: "Wasps."* Oxford.
- Meier-Brügger, M. 2004. Zu griechisch τυρός, "Käse." In *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. J. H. W. Penney, 254–57. Oxford.
- Onians, R. B. 1954. *The Origins of European Thought*². Cambridge.
- Onions, C. T. 1966. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford.
- Rix, H. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*². Wiesbaden.
- Schliemann, H. 1878. *Mycenae*. New York.
- Snell, B. 1966. Zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Lyriker. In *Gesammelte Schriften*, 68–77. Göttingen. Originally published in *Philologus* 96 (1944): 282–92.
- Solmsen, F., ed. 1970. *Hesiodi "Theogonia"; "Opera et Dies"; "Scutum."* Oxford.
- Sommerstein, A. H., ed. 1989. *Aeschylus: "Eumenides."* Cambridge.
- Stanford, W. B., ed. 1958–1962. *Homer: "Odyssey"*². London.
- Ussher, R. G., ed. 1973. *Aristophanes: "Ecclesiazusae."* Oxford.
- West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod: "Theogony."* Oxford.
- Wilkins, J. M., and S. Hill. 2006. *Food in the Ancient World*. Malden, Mass.
- Wodtko, D. S., B. Irslinger, and C. Scheider. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.

AEGINA AND MEGARA (IG IV.2² 750)

A decree found on Aegina in the eighteenth century honors a citizen, Diodorus, for his services as *agoranomos*;¹ the date is "year 64" of the province, the 80s B.C.E. The grain-purchase fund was exhausted by war requisitions, pirates had entered and overrun the territory, there was famine, but he saw to it that grain was sufficient:

ἀπὸ συνέδρων καὶ τοῦ δάμου· ἐ[πεὶ ὑπὸ]	
τῶν πολιτῶν Διοδώρος Ἡρακλ[εῖδα]	
κατασταθεὶς ἀγορανόμος [τὸ τέ]-	4
ταρτον [καὶ] ἐξηκοστὸν ἔτος τῷ ἐπ[ι]-	
μέλειαν [πε]ποίηται τᾶς ἀρχαῖς ἀ[ξιῶς τᾶς]	
ἐγχειρισ[θείσα]ς αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ [δάμου]	
πίστιος, [τοῦ μὲν] σιτωνικοῦ κατ[αναλίσκο]-	8
μένου εἰς [στρατι]ωτικὰς οἰκονομ[ίας περὶ]	
[π]όλεμον, ἐτ[ι δὲ τῶν] πειρατῶν ἐπερ[χομένων]	
κα[ὶ κ]ατατρεχ[όντων] τὰν χώραν, ἅμ[α καὶ ἐν]-	
δείας οὖσας δ[ιὰ τὸ π]λειστοπολ[ι]-	12
[π]αρέχων ἱκανὸν σ[ιτο]ν (κτλ.)	

1. First copied by Fourmont; now, with improved readings and restorations, K. Hallof, *IG IV.2² 750* and pl. 15.

From the *synedroi* and the people: inasmuch as Diodorus son of Hercleidas, appointed *agoranomos* for year 64, has overseen the office in a manner worthy of the trust of the people that elected him: with the grain fund being consumed in the generals' expenditures in war, and again pirates entering and overrunning the territory, and famine . . . , supplying sufficient grain (etc.)

Diodorus is awarded a crown, to be proclaimed at the city's festivals:

ἀγακαρ[ύσσεσθαι δὲ]
[τὸν] στέφανον ἔν τ[ε] τοῖς Διο[νυσίοις καὶ]
[Ἡρακ]λείοις καὶ [Ῥ]ωμαί[οις] οἷς ᾄν [ἅ πόλιν] 32
[τῷ τ]ε Ἀπόλλωνι [καὶ] τῷ Ῥώμα[ι] τιθῆι· τοῦς]
[δ' ἐπι]μελητάς στάλαν λιθίν[αν ἐγδοῦναι (κτλ.)]

and to proclaim the crown at the Dionysia and Heracleia and Rhomaia that the city holds for Apollo and Rome; the overseers are to contract for a marble stele (etc.)

Two aspects of this decree cause concern: place and date.

PLACE

The dialect gives the first warning. In 210 B.C.E. the Aeginetans were sold into slavery by Rome (τῶν ταλαιπώρων Αἰγινητῶν, Polyb. 11.5.8); the island itself was given to the Aetolians, who sold it to Attalus I of Pergamum. The polis attested on Aegina in the second century B.C.E. and later must have been a creation of the Attalid monarchy. Why should that new community have spoken Doric?

In fact, Koine is what is largely in evidence. Thus five other decrees (*IG* 747 ff.) are in Koine. So, too, the magistrate lists of the second and first centuries B.C.E. (805 ff.); and two honorific texts come from the δῆμος.² There is an occasional Doric name among the magistrates (Eudamos 813, Mnasitimos 814). But it is not surprising that some Dorian families were on the island; more names, where a distinction can be made, are Koine. The exception in official usage, apart from ours, is a sliver that Fraenkel restored as a decree in Doric (753.7 τὸν [δ]ᾱμόν). These two are isolated among the several dozen public acts in Koine, and this raises the possibility that both are *pierres errantes*.

Second, the magistrates invoked in the decree: its *agoranomos* and *tamias*, and *epimeletai* to see to the inscribing, might be found anywhere. But the city is governed by the *synedroi* and the *damos*: thus line 2, and lines 24–25 (δε]δόχθαι [τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τῷ δά[μωι]. Aegina's other decrees show *boule* and *demos*, *strategoi*, and once (749.45) a "scribe of the people" to do the inscribing: there is little overlap.

Third, cults: our city gave first honor to Apollo. It made proclamations at the Dionysia (the common practice everywhere) and ἑίοις καὶ [Ῥ]ωμαί[οις]; Attalid Aegina used the Attaleia-Eumeneia-Nikephoria and the Dionysia (749.30). Nothing suggests that the patron of old Aegina was Apollo. It was probably Zeus Hellanios, whose temple in the south of the island was built by his son Aeacus. For Pindar, Aegina was the "shining star of Zeus Hellanios" ([ᾶ] Διὸς Ἑλλανίου φαεννὸν ἄστρον, *Pae.* 6.125, frag. 52f S.-M.); at Naucratis the Aeginetans established their own τέμενος

2. *IG* 771 already in the third century B.C.E. (recall that 210 B.C.E. was not the first expulsion of the Aeginetans); 773 of the first century B.C.E.

Διός (Hdt. 2.178.3). That polity, the descendants of Aeacus, was gone, but at least some of their traditions remained under the Attalids: a decree of the Attalid city cites [τὴν Ἡρακ]λέους πρὸς Αἰακὸν συγγένειαν (*IG* 747.17). Why should the Attalid city have changed the patron god to Apollo?

All of this suggests that this stone has come to Aegina from one of the mainland cities that ring the island. There, Doric continued in use into Imperial times. As to magistrates, the government of late Hellenistic Megara was οἱ σύνεδροι καὶ ὁ δᾶμος;³ of Epidaurus, ἔδοξε τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τῷ δάμῳ (*IG* IV.1² 63.9, late second century B.C.E.); and of Argos, ἔδοξε τῷ δάμῳ καὶ τοῖς συνέδροις (*SEG* XXII 266, c. 100 B.C.E.).

Pythian Apollo was honored throughout the region,⁴ including on Aegina (schol. Pind. *Nem.* 3.122a), and the temple of Apollo Pythaeus on the site of old Asine has been seen as the center of a religious amphictyony.⁵ But for most cities, he was not the chief god. Thus Troizen gave first honor to Poseidon (Plut. *Thes.* 6.1; Strabo 8.6.14), Hermione to Demeter Chthonia, Calauria to Poseidon (Ephorus *FGH* 70 f 150). At Epidaurus, Apollo Maleatas and Asclepius shared the chief temple, with public proclamations at the Apollonieia-Asklapieia (*IG* IV.1² 65–66). At Argos, the chief god was Apollo Lykeios, but perhaps joined by Hera.⁶ But Apollo as sole patron is certain only at Megara—Apollo Pythaeus. His chief temple was in the countryside,⁷ a lesser one in the city on the western acropolis (Paus. 1.42.5); the great national festival, the Πυθάρια, was distinct from the Πυθάρια [τὰ ἐν ᾗ] στε[ι] (*IG* VII 48; cf. Philostr. *VS* 1.24.5: τὰ Πύθια τὰ μικρά).

The proclamation for Diodorus (lines 31–33) might look to be stipulated for three occasions. But Rhomaia were usually an appendage to the existing chief festival. We should understand two festivals, the Dionysia (widely used for proclamations) and the chief festival (now compounded with the cult of Dea Roma). Apollo (line 33) ought not to be the honorand of [Ἡρακ]λείοις, or of Fraenkel's (otherwise unknown) [Αἰα]κείοις. Megara is one of the cities that is known to have added the cult of Roma to its national festival: a victory list of the second or first century B.C.E. includes Πυθάρια καὶ Ῥώμια τὰ ἐμ Μεγάρους ἵππιον καὶ ὀπλίταν (*IG* IV.1² 629). In the decree for Diodorus, restore:

ἐν τ[ε] τοῖς Διο[νυσίοις καὶ]
[Πυθ]αρίοις καὶ [Ῥ]ωμαί[οι]ς οἷς ἄγ[ει] ἡ πόλις]⁸ 32
[τῷ τ]ε Ἀπόλλωνι [καὶ] τῷ Ῥώμ[α]ι τὸς δὲ
[ἐπι]μελητὰς (κτλ.)

In sum, the diagnostic features of this decree do not point to the usages of Aegina; taken together, they point only to Megara. More than 150 inscriptions have come to

3. *IG* VII 18.5 [Canali di Rossi 1997, no. 215], first century B.C.E.; cf. 20.19, a letter from Tanagra to τὸ συνέδριον καὶ τὸν [δῆμ]ον of Megara.

4. Cf. Vollgraff 1956, 29–31; Kowalzig 2007, 145–48.

5. E.g., Farnell 1907, 215 n. b; recently Kowalzig 2007, 129–80 (highly speculative: “all the communities of the eastern Argolid” [p. 160] goes far beyond the evidence). Vollgraff (1956, 32–33) thinks rather of historical filiation of those cities where Apollo Pythaeus is found.

6. Paus. 2.19.3; *IG* IV 559; Moretti 1967, no. 42 (stele in the temple of Apollo, proclamation at the Heraia and Nemea, c. 170 B.C.E.), no. 40 (steles at Apollo and Hera, proclamations at the Hekatombaia and the Nemea, c. 300 B.C.E.).

7. At Tripodiscus, in my view: Rigsby 1987.

8. For this phrase compare ἐν τ[ο]ῖς ἀγ[ῶσιν] οἷς ἄγ[ει] ἡ πόλις at Epidaurus, *IG* IV.1² 63.17. The subjunctive ([τῷ] in 33) would be out of place when festivals are specified—normally it characterizes πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγῶσιν.

Aegina from elsewhere (*IG* IV.2² 1076–1239); these include seventeen from Megara (1115–31) and two from the Argolid (1234–35).⁹ The stone was found used in a church on Aegina; let it be added to the Megarian list. The territory that had been devastated by war and pirates before Diodorus took office was the Megarid.

DATE

Diodorus was *agoranomos* in “year 64” of the province. Many scholars speak of an era of Macedonia tied to 148 B.C.E. and an era of Achaea tied to 146. In the north, precision is given by a number of inscriptions that use a double date with the era of Actium (year 1 = 31/30): the two eras were separated by 116 years. In the era of the province, year 1 = 147/46. The few deviations from this by one year are errors of some sort.¹⁰

In the south, no such synchronism is extant. Some scholars tie the era there to 146/45: Corinth was destroyed in 146, the senatorial commission sent to organize the conquered land came in autumn 146 and left in spring 145 (Polyb. 39.5.1). Others have followed Paul Foucart, who preferred 145/44 on the basis of an event at Epidaurus: in “year 74” the praetor M. Antonius Creticus, preparing for war with pirates in the Aegean, sent a garrison to the city.¹¹ Foucart saw this as in 72/71 B.C.E., hence an era of Achaea beginning 145/44.¹² His argument was that Antonius, praetor in 74 B.C.E., operated first in Sicily, for one month soon after the harvest (late summer: Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.216); then in Liguria in summer (*aestate qu<ieta>*) and Spain (Sall. frag. 3.5 M.)—so the following summer, 73. Hence his activities in the West spanned two years, 74–73; he came to Greece in 72 and was defeated in 71.

But the sequence of Antonius’ actions in the West can as easily be Liguria / Spain / Sicily, as others have seen.¹³ And these events seem unlikely to have occupied two years. Rather he came to Greece in the first half of 73 and was defeated in 72.¹⁴ His “three wasted years”¹⁵ were 74–72 B.C.E. He will have moved promptly to secure the mainland: his action at Epidaurus belongs at the start of his Aegean campaign in 73.¹⁶ At Epidaurus did this fall in 74/73 or 73/72? Their year changed probably

9. Some were brought for the construction of the new capital of Greece after the liberation (see *SEG* LII 290), but ours had been seen by Fourmont well before then (1728).

10. Demitsas 1896, no. 366 (Pella)? But see Chrysostomou 2001, 126 n. 2) has $\varsigma\omicron 76 = \beta\varrho\rho 192$ (so 45/46 C.E.) = Claudius *trib.pot.* 4 (44/45); I assume that this last number is the error. In *IG* X.1 826 (Thessalonica), $\zeta\omicron\rho 177 = \beta\varrho\sigma 292$, I would guess that the error is $\zeta\omicron\rho$ for $\varsigma\omicron\rho 176$: counting through the alphabet, the writer forgot to include digamma. A modern instance is at Rigsby 2007, 143 n. 2, where I should have written “197.”

11. *IG* IV.1² 66, with Peek 1969, 16–18.

12. Foucart 1906. His arguments for 145/44 have been called irrefutable by Accame (1946, 11), probable by Ferrary (1988, 189 n. 228).

13. So already Maurenbrecher (1891–93, 108), who ordered the Sallust fragments thus with Antonius in the West in 74 and Greece in 73. Broughton puts Antonius in the West in 74 B.C.E., in Greece in 73, and confronting the pirates and being defeated “in 72 or 71” (*MRR* II 123). The sequence Liguria / Spain is guaranteed by Sallust.

14. Under Verres, so in 73, a subordinate of Antonius continued requisitions in Sicily (*praefectus Antonii quidam*, Cic. *Caec. Div.* 55); this, with Cicero’s “hardly one month” of Antonius’ earlier presence, suggests that he was elsewhere in 73.

15. Sall. frag. 3.16 M., *ibi triennio frustra trito*. Foucart (1906, 573) took “there [Crete] with three years spent in vain” to mean that three full years preceded Antonius’ coming to Crete.

16. The soldiers “remained more than ten months” at Epidaurus (*μεινάντων τῶν στρατ[ι]τῶν πλεόν [ἢ μ]ῆνας δέκα*, *IG* IV.1² 66.33), but it is not clear that this all fell within Euanthes’ year.

in late summer.¹⁷ Antonius is likely to have intervened in Epidaurus before then: hence “year 74” = 74/73, and year 1 = 147/46.

If this is so, then there is no firm basis for holding that the era attested in the south was different from that in the north. That is to say, there was no era of Achaëa (that distinct province lay far in the future),¹⁸ but only the era of the one province, Macedonia, from 147/46. Others have already urged that there was only one era.¹⁹ We can imagine the potential confusion of distinct eras, separated by only a year or two, coexisting in the province. And *cui bono*? Why would the southern cities choose to commemorate their addition to the province, or the sack of Corinth, rather than simply use the existing era? If Antonius was at Epidaurus in the first half of 73 B.C.E., then there is no need to postulate a distinct era in the south, and all the era dates on record may be assumed to descend from 147/46. At Megalopolis, we have a text already of “year 2,” so 146/45 (*IG* V.2 439); of particular interest is the treaty between Rome and Epidaurus in “year 34,” 114/13 (*IG* IV.1² 63); the Andania foundation, “year 55,” is 93/92 (*IG* V.1 1390).

Diodorus’ office at Megara was therefore in 84/83,²⁰ when he found devastation caused by war requisitions and pirates. This date moves him closer to events that seem relevant.

As to pirates, the troubles of the 80s are well known. Plutarch says that 400 cities and many temples were taken by them during the Mithridatic wars; his examples include some places in the Argolid.²¹ We can hardly doubt that Megara (and also Aegina) suffered. Sulpicius Rufus, sailing from Aegina to Megara thirty years later, lamented the ruination of both, and of Peiraeus and Corinth—though he states no occasions of the damage.²²

As to war, in 87 B.C.E. part of Sulla’s army of five legions bivouacked at Megara during the siege of Athens (App. *Mith.* 30). Athens fell on 1 March 86, Peiraeus soon after (Plut. *Sull.* 14.6–7). Sulla then moved his army to Boeotia, where the foraging was better (15.2), and in several battles defeated the forces of Mithridates (late 86). After some actions further north, he took four cohorts to Asia to confront Mithridates in person, in the fourth year after the Vespers (85: Plut. *Sull.* 24.4). Returning to Greece, he spent some time at leisure and administration. In the course of 84/83 the Roman army, some 40,000 (App. *BCiv.* 1.79), returned to Italy, laden with plunder (Paus. 2.21.6); they took ship at Patrae.²³ To reach there they had to pass through the Megarid; they will have lived off the land, as they surely had done during the

17. Trümper 1997, 140–42.

18. “This Achaean business,” Cicero called it in 46 (*hoc Achaicum negotium*, *Fam.* 4.4.2).

19. These include Holleaux, Wilhelm (sometimes), Klaffenbach, and others; see Tod 1918/19, 206–17, for citations; cf. Reinach 1904, 12; Wilhelm 1907, 20–22 (disputing Foucart). On the Aegina inscription, Wilhelm followed Fraenkel in assigning the year to what was then thought to be a Pergamene era of 134/33; cf. Rigsby 1979.

20. At what season the Megarian year changed is unknown; possibly in late autumn, see Trümper 1997, 147–55.

21. *Pomp.* 24. Several inscriptions recording trouble and famine have been assigned to these years but cannot be more narrowly dated: e.g., *FD* III.4 55 (Delphi), 69 (Daulis).

22. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5.4 (45 B.C.E.): *post me erat Aegina, ante me Megara, dextra Piraeus, sinistra Corinthus, quae oppida quodam tempore florentissima fuerunt, nunc prostrata et diruta ante oculos iacent . . . tot oppidum cadavera.*

23. So Appian (Peiraeus to Patrae to Brundisium). Plutarch (*Sull.* 27.1) says northern Greece to the sea to Dyrrachium to Brundisium; as this information is incidental to his account of the capture of a satyr, we should probably prefer Appian.

operations against Athens in 86. The soil of Megara was already poor by nature (Strabo 9.1.8). Whether or not the Romans had evacuated before the August grain harvest, we can suspect that the crop of 84 was destroyed or consumed. So we can see why, when Diodorus took up his duties as *agoranomos* in 84, he found the granaries of the Megarid empty.

KENT J. RIGSBY
Duke University

LITERATURE CITED

- Accame, S. 1946. *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*. Rome.
 Canali di Rossi, F. 1997. *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma*. Rome.
 Chrysostomou, P. 2001. Νέες επιγραφές από την Πέλλα. *Tekmeria* 6: 126–33.
 Demitsas, M. G. 1896. *Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις*. Athens.
 Farnell, L. R. 1907. *The Cults of the Greek States*. Vol. 4. Oxford.
 Ferrary, J.-L. 1988. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme*. Rome.
 Foucart, P. 1906. Les campagnes de M. Antonius Creticus. *JSav*, n.s., 4: 569–81.
 Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods*. Oxford.
 Maurenbrecher, B. 1891–93. *Sallustius, "Historiarum" reliquiae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
 Moretti, L. 1967. *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*. Vol. 1. Florence.
 Peek, W. 1969. Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros. *AbhLeip.* 60.2.
 Reinach, T. 1904. Inscription d'Orchomène d'Arcadie. *BCH* 28: 5–19.
 Riggsby, K. J. 1979. The Era of the Province of Asia. *Phoenix* 33: 39–47.
 ———. 1987. Megara and Tripodiscus. *GRBS* 28: 93–102.
 ———. 2007. A Greek Dedication at Sidon. *Tyche* 22: 143–50.
 Tod, M. N. 1918/19. The Macedonian Era. *BSA* 23: 206–17.
 Trümper, C. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*. Heidelberg.
 Vollgraff, W. 1956. *Le sanctuaire d'Apollon Pythéen à Argos*. Paris.
 Wilhelm, Ad. 1907. Inschrift aus Pagai. *JÖAI* 10: 17–32.

PLEASURE AND THE SAPIENS: SENECA *DE VITA BEATA* 11.1

At *De vita beata* 3.3–4.5 Seneca offers a number of definitions of the good life. In the course of his account he mentions several times (3.4, 4.4, 4.5) the *tranquilitas* and *gaudium* that are necessary consequences of happiness, though not constituents of it.¹ At 5.1–4 he contrasts this *tranquilitas* with that sought by the Epicureans and Pyrrhonists.² At 6.1 Seneca imagines the objection of an Epicurean interlocutor; this leads to a discussion of the relationship between *virtus* and *voluptas* that extends

I would like to thank the members of the Latin Philosophy Reading Group at the University of Michigan, Jay Reed, Charles Brittain, my two anonymous readers, and Elizabeth Asmis for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this note.

1. For this distinction, see 15.2–3.

2. These schools are implicitly introduced at 5.2, where Seneca mentions those persons whom an obtuse nature or their own ignorance has consigned to the rank of cattle or inanimate objects. The comparison to cattle is standard anti-Epicurean rhetoric (e.g., Sen. *Ep.* 92.6 and Cic. *Amic.* 9.32). I follow Reitzenstein (1984, 623) in reading *inanimalium* for the manuscripts' *animalium*. For comparison of skeptics to rocks, see Arr. *Epict. diss.* 1.5.1–7.