

THREE HELLENISTIC PERSONAGES: AMYNANDER, PRUSIAS II, DAPHIDAS

AMYNANDER*

Amynder of Athamania first appears in our sources in 209 B.C. and last appears in 189 B.C.¹ In what follows I shall discuss two episodes from within this period.

I

An Athamanian letter has come down to us, sent to the people of Teos by King Theodorus and Amynder of Athamania during the years 205–1 B.C.:²

Col. i

Ἀθαμ[άν]ω[ν].

[B]ασιλεὺς Θ]εόδωρος [κα]ὶ Ἀμύνανδ[ρο]ς Τ[η]ῶν τῇ βουλῇ [κ]αὶ τ[ῶ]ι δῆμῳ χαίρειν·

Πυθαγό[ρ]ας κ[α]ὶ Κλείτος οἱ ἀποσταλέντες πα[ρ'] ὑμῶν π[ρ]ε[σ-]

βευταὶ τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν [καὶ αὐ]τ[ο]ὶ δι[ε]λέγησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς π[ε]ρ[ὶ]

5 τοῦ συγχωρηθῆναι παρ' ἡμῶν τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἰε[ρ]ὰν τῷ

Διόνυσῳ καὶ ἄστυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον· ὧν [δι]ακούσαντες προθύ-

μως ἅπαντα τὰ ἀξιούμενα ὑπακηκόαμεν καὶ σ[υ]γχωροῦμεν εἶναι καὶ τὴν

πόλιν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄστυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον· καὶ τοῦτο

πράσσομεν καὶ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἅπαντας μὲν τοὺς Ἕλληνας οἰκείως

10 ἔχοντες τυγχάνειν, ὑπαρχούσης ἡμῖν συγγενείας πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν

ἄρχηγόν τῆς κοινῆς προσηγορίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ δι-

ὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν φιλόστοργον διάληψιν ἔχειν· ἔτι

δὲ καὶ μέλλοντες ἅμα καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἡξιώκοσιν τὴν χάριν διδόναι

καὶ τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐμένειαν ὡς ὑπολαμβάνομεν περιποιεῖσθαι

(Probably one or two lines missing)

* I would like to thank Joyce Reynolds for her advice on this section. All responsibility is my own of course.

¹ The standard treatment of Amynder's career is S. I. Oost, 'Amynder, Athamania and Rome', *CPh* 52 (1957), 1–15. See also K.-W. Welwei, *Könige und Königschaft im Urteil des Polybios* (1963), pp. 118–22 and id. 'Amynder's ὄνομα τῆς βασιλείας und sein Besuch in Rom', *Historia* 14 (1965), 252–6; cf. E. Rawson, *JRS* 65 (1975), 152. Also valuable are F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (1940 repr. 1967) and N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (1967) *passim*.

Our earliest reference to Amynder is often taken to be Pol. 4. 16. 9, whence it is deduced that he was in a position of power in Athamania, if not king, as early as 220 B.C. and was related by marriage to Scerdilaidas of Illyria: thus, most notably, *R.E.* Bd. 1 (1894), col. 2004, Oost, art. cit. 3, J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books xxxi–xxxiii* (1973), p. 127. However, there seems little to recommend the view. The Athamanian king named at Pol. 4. 16. 9 is called 'Aminas', not 'Amynder'; 'Aminas' is taken to be a shortened form of the latter, but elsewhere in Polybius and our other sources Amynder always appears with his full name. Further, Pol. 4. 16. 9 apart, Amynder does not appear in our sources until 209 B.C., some eleven years later (Livy 27. 30. 4). The sole support for the identification of Aminas and Amynder seems to be that both are called kings of the Athamanians and have similar names. As Walbank has observed, it is quite possible that Aminas was a predecessor of Amynder on the throne of Athamania: F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* 1 (1957), pp. 463–4. Given the balance of the evidence it seems preferable to regard him as such.

² The letter is printed as C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (1934), no. 35; for other replies, see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), p. 942 n. 39. The

Col. ii

εἰν παν
 ;ν τῶν πολ;
 ορισμένα τοῖς πα...;
 ἀκριβεστέραν τήν
 5 I[εἰ]ς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπε-
 ;IAEI[...] ἔρρωσθε.

This letter constitutes a reply to a Teian embassy which had requested that the Athamanians recognize the city of Teos and its land as sacred to Dionysus, inviolable and tax-exempt; the Athamanians give their consent to this request: their reasons for so consenting are our principal concern.

First, the Athamanians account for their consent by stating their claim to be related to all the Hellenes, through their kinship with the eponym of the Hellenes, Hellen himself (lines 8–11). On this claim Welles observes, after Waddington, that ‘... mythology recognized among the sons of Hellen an Athamas, ancestor and eponym of the Athamanians’. In fact, to be precise, Athamas was thought to be a grandson of Hellen through his father Aeolus.³ The Athamanians follow up this claim to kinship with the Hellenes in general by affirming their feeling for the city of Teos in particular: this they describe as *φιλόστοργον διάληψιν* (line 12). Welles translates this phrase as ‘friendly feeling’, comparing *τὴν φιλανθρωποτάτην διάληψιν* of RC no. 31, lines 16–18. However, there may be more to the phrase than this translation would seem to imply.

The crucial point is our translation of *φιλόστοργος*: LSJ translates ‘loving tenderly, affectionate, freq. of family affection’, while TGL gives ‘Propensus ad amorem... Proprie parentes dicuntur quibus natura indidit affectum quendam amoris erga suam prolem... et vicissim liberi, qui parentes suos ejusmodi amoris affectu prosequuntur’. *φιλόστοργος* therefore tends to evoke the notion of affection within the family – a notion which seems particularly apposite in this letter. We have seen that the Athamanians refer to their kinship with Hellen through Athamas: if we translate *φιλόστοργον διάληψιν* as ‘family affection’ rather than ‘friendly feeling’, we can proceed to interpret the phrase as a second reference to the legend of Athamas.

Pausanias provides the key:

Τέων δὲ ὥκουσιν μὲν Ὀρχομένιοι Μινύαι σὺν Ἀθάμαντι ἐς αὐτὴν ἐλθόντες· λέγεται δὲ ὁ Ἀθάμας οὗτος ἀπόγονος Ἀθάμαντος εἶναι τοῦ Αἰόλου.

(Paus. 7. 3. 6)

That is, the founder of Teos was not only called Athamas, but was also a descendant of the ancestor and eponym of the Athamanians, Athamas son of Aeolus.⁴ The founder of the city of Teos was therefore of the family of the founder of the Athamanian people. This, I suggest, is the legendary connection to which the Athamanians are alluding formulation ‘King Theodorus and Amynder’ has proved baffling. The central difficulty resides in the fact that our literary sources consistently describe Amynder as king of the Athamanians, but fail to mention Theodorus at all. Welles’ objection to the notion that Theodorus and Amynder were co-regents on the grounds that Amynder had been king since 220 and that a co-regency of some 15 years is improbable is undermined once we reject the identification of Amynder and Amynder at Pol. 4. 16. 9, as he himself allows: see above note 1. On this crux see especially Welles, *RC*, p. 154, Oost, art cit. 13 n. 9 and Briscoe, loc. cit.

³ For the legend of Athamas, see W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* 1 (1884–90), cols. 669–75. The immediate family is set out particularly clearly by H. J. Rose, *OCD*² s.v. ‘Aeolus (2)’. On the notion of kinship in inter-state relations, see D. C. Braund, *CQ* 30 (1980), 421 n. 8.

⁴ With Pausanias compare Pherecydes, *FGH* 3 F 102, and Roscher, op. cit. col. 675 s.v. ‘Athamas (2)’. Strabo observes that Anacreon, himself a native of Teos, refers to his city as ‘Athamantis’ (14. 633).

when they state their family affection for Teos. They thus move from proclaiming their kinship to the Hellenes in general to pointing out their particular link with Teos.⁵

II

My second suggestion also relates to the legend of Athamas. In 189 B.C. M. Fulvius Nobilior laid siege to the city of Ambracia. There, he was joined by Amynder, who, we are told, went on to bring about a successful end to the siege for Nobilior. Polybius says that Amynder approached Ambracia, with Nobilior's backing, and pleaded with the defending Aetolians to surrender. Eventually Amynder was allowed into the city itself, whereupon he persuaded them to abandon their defence (Pol. 21. 29. 1 ff.). Amynder was in a very good position to act as an intermediary in this way, for he had lived in Ambracia after his expulsion from Athamania by Philip V of Macedon in 191 B.C. until shortly before Nobilior's siege.⁶

Also with Nobilior at the siege of Ambracia was the poet Ennius. If we can accept Polybius' account of the key role played by Amynder in this siege – and there seems no reason to doubt it – we may suppose Ennius to have known of the king; indeed, Ennius and Amynder may even have met at Ambracia. In fact, Ennius may have known of Amynder before 189, for Amynder had visited Rome in 198 as an envoy of Flamininus: we are told that Flamininus chose Amynder for this mission partly for the very reason that his royalty would make an impression at Rome (Pol. 18. 10. 7).⁷

After the siege, Ennius went on to write a play entitled *Ambracia* and to describe Nobilior's Aetolian campaign in his *Annales*, probably in Book XV. Given the prominent part he seems to have played at Ambracia, Amynder may well have featured in these works.⁸ It may be, I suggest, that Ennius wrote yet another work consequent upon the siege of Ambracia, or, perhaps, upon Amynder's visit to Rome

⁵ For a similar use of *φιλόστοργος* in the context of dealings between 'related' cities, see L. Robert, *Op. Min. Sel.* 1 (1969), p. 311 n. 2, quoting *IPE* 1² 357. We may observe another legendary link between Athamania and Teos. One of the wives of Athamas, son of Aeolus, was Ino: she was the aunt and nurse of the young Dionysus. Dionysus must be central to any interpretation of *RC* no. 35, for in this letter the city and land of Teos are recognised as sacred to Dionysus: in fact, the letter was inscribed on a wall of the temple of Dionysus at Teos. For the legend of Ino, see Eitrem, *R.E.* Bd. 12 (1925), cols. 2297–300. We may note that Ino, as Leucothea, had a festival at Teos, amongst other places: see Eitrem, art. cit. cols. 2293–7 for a survey of the evidence.

⁶ On Nobilior's campaign, *MRR* 1 360. On Amynder's expulsion, see Pol. loc. cit., Livy 36. 14. 7–9, App. Syr. 17, Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 203–4. He took back his kingdom shortly before his exploits at Ambracia with the support of the Aetolians (Pol. 21. 25. 1–2). On the whole affair, Oost, art. cit. 11.

⁷ On Ennius at Ambracia, see H. D. Jocelyn, 'The Poems of Quintus Ennius', *ANRW* 1. 2 (1972), 993; O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (1967), pp. 18–20. F. Skutsch, *RE.* Bd. 5 (1905), col. 2591 sets Ennius' role at Ambracia in its Hellenistic context.

On Amynder's journey to Rome, Walbank, *HCP* II (1967), p. 561; Briscoe, op. cit. 24. Rawson, loc. cit. (n. 1) and Oost, art. cit. p. 8 observe that to be impressed by Amynder's royalty was to be easily impressed. M. Holleaux, *Études d'Épigraphie et d'Histoire Grecques* v (1957), p. 70 n. 4 in making this observation holds that Amynder was the first king to have visited Rome; he was certainly *one* of the first, but Hiero II had already visited Rome in 237 B.C.: Eutrop. 3. 1–2, set in its broader context by A. M. Eckstein, 'Unicum subsidium populi Romani: Hiero II and Rome, 263 B.C.–215 B.C.', *Chiron* 10 (1980), 196.

⁸ Jocelyn, art. cit. 1005–6 on the place of Ambracia in the *Annales*. On the *Ambracia*, see F. Skutsch, art. cit. col. 2599. The fragments of Ennius are to be found collected in J. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*² (1903).

in 198, though in this case we can do no more than observe a possibility. Among the tragedies of Ennius we find a play with the title *Athamas* of which one short fragment survives. We have already seen that Arynander was concerned to point out his descent from Athamas: indeed, he might in Greek or Latin have been described as 'Athamas' (= 'an Athamanian'). We have also seen that Ennius must have known of the king and may even have met him. On the basis of this evidence we may offer the hypothesis that Ennius was led to write his *Athamas* by his knowledge of the king of the Athamanians. It must immediately be allowed that Ennius was neither the first nor the last to write a play so entitled: such plays are accredited to Aeschylus, Sophocles, Astydamas and Accius (though not, it seems, to Ennius' favourite, Euripides). I wish only to raise the possibility that Ennius may have been stimulated to write a play on this particular theme by his awareness of his contemporary, Arynander of Athamania.⁹

PRUSIAS II: KING AND FREEDMAN

Polybius tells us that when some Roman envoys visited Prusias II, king of Bithynia, the king met them with his head shorn and wearing a *pilleus*, toga and *calcei*. As Polybius observes, this was the outfit of a recently manumitted slave at Rome. He adds that Prusias made the point explicit by describing himself to the envoys as their freedman, one who wished to indulge in and imitate everything Roman. Livy misrepresents Polybius: he says that Polybius states that Prusias habitually acted in this fashion. In fact, Polybius seems to be referring to a single incident. Similarly, Dio holds that the practice was habitual. Appian gives a slightly different version: he says that Prusias met not Roman envoys but Roman στρατηγοί. As Walbank points out, Appian seems to have thought that Prusias' meeting was with the Roman generals in Greece, upon the conclusion of the Third Macedonian War.¹⁰

Polybius gives no precise date for the meeting, but places it before Prusias' visit to Rome in 167 to offer his congratulations upon the Roman victory over Macedon, *inter alia*. We have seen that Appian is more precise, setting the incident between the capture of Perseus and the visit of Prusias to Rome, but his version must be suspect in that it deviates from Polybius. Walbank suggests that the meeting may have taken place in 172, before the war with Perseus.¹¹

Prusias' behaviour, both on this occasion and later when he entered the Senate in 167, has met with universal censure. In fact, indignation has tended to preclude consideration of what Prusias was actually doing at this meeting. Our sources are perfectly explicit that he was posing as a Roman freedman, just manumitted. This is surely somewhat strange: no other king is known to have adopted such a posture on any occasion.¹² But it can be explained and the explanation in turn suggests a date.

⁹ For the single extant fragment of the *Athamas*, see H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (1967), fr. 52, with commentary, *ibid.* 267–70. The fragment concerns the worship of Dionysus: see above n. 5. For other plays entitled *Athamas*, *ibid.* 267. On Ennius' predilection for Euripides and *Athamas*, *ibid.* 45 and Jocelyn, *art. cit.* 1001.

¹⁰ Pol. 30. 18. 1–5; Livy 45. 44. 19; Dio 20, fr. 69; App. *Mithr.* 2; F. W. Walbank, *HCP* III 441. The material on Prusias II is collected and discussed by C. Habicht, *R.E.* Bd. 23 (1957), cols. 1107–27.

¹¹ *HCP* III 441. Evidence on the embassies of this period is conveniently available in *MRR* I.

¹² Though kings in Rome's orbit are sometimes referred to as slaves by those hostile to them: Sall. *Hist.* 4, fr. 69. 8; Jos. *BJ* I 132; Tac. *Hist.* 2. 81; *Ann.* 2. 2; 11. 16; 14. 26.

Freedom had long been a catchword of inter-state relations in the Greek world, first used by Greeks and later by the Romans too: the most spectacular manifestation of this must surely be Flaminius' proclamation of 196.¹³ I suggest that it is in this context that Prusias' stance is to be understood: it is in this sense that he claims to have just been freed. But freed from whom?

Down to 171 B.C. Bithynia had long been in alliance with Macedon. Thus, for instance, Prusias' wife was Apame, the sister of Perseus. When the Third Macedonian War broke out in 171, Prusias at first remained neutral, but by 169 he had changed his position, for in that year five Bithynian ships joined the combined fleet of Rome and Pergamum in the Thermaic Gulf. According to the annalists, Prusias made much of his part in this war when he spoke in the Senate in 167.¹⁴ In the course of the war, Prusias had moved from a cautious neutrality to open support for Rome: he thereby abandoned the Macedonian alliance.

It may now have seemed expedient to represent the old alliance, within which Bithynia could only be the weaker partner, as the enslavement of Bithynia by Macedon. It was surely from Macedon that Prusias claimed to have been freed: no other 'master' is available. If this is correct, Appian's chronology – though not his narrative – becomes attractive. Prusias is most likely to have posed as a slave just freed from Macedon in the aftermath of the Roman victory over Macedon. Although it must be admitted that no embassy to Prusias is known from this period, such an embassy does not seem impossible.

DAPHIDAS AND ATTALUS III

Strabo tells us of a *grammaticus* called Daphitas,¹⁵ who was said to have been crucified on Mt. Thorax, near Magnesia-on-the-Maeander in the kingdom of Pergamum. His offence was that he had insulted 'the kings' – that is, the Attalids – in a distich:

Πορφύρεοι μώλωπες, ἀπορρινήματα γάζης
Λυσιμάχου, Λυδῶν ἄρχετε καὶ Φρυγίης.

Previously, he had received an oracle warning him to beware of the *thorax* – ordinarily meaning, the 'breastplate'.¹⁶ But, as so often, the oracle's warning was borne out in an unexpected fashion, when the *thorax* in question turned out to be Mt. Thorax.

Strabo's contemporary, Valerius Maximus, tells much the same story, with certain details changed. Unlike Strabo, Valerius names the subject of the story 'Daphnites' and describes him as a sophist: what is more a sophist *ineptae et mordacis opinionis*. He tells us how Daphnites set out to ridicule the Delphic oracle by asking it whether he would find his horse. It was a trick question: he had no horse. Yet the oracle replied that he would indeed find his horse, but would be thrown off it and killed. Delighted at the apparent success of his trick, he left the oracle only to fall in with a 'king Attalus', at whose command he was thrown from a crag. Attalus inflicted this punishment

¹³ See, most recently, R. Seager, 'The Freedom of the Greeks of Asia: From Alexander to Antiochus', *CQ* n.s. 31 (1981), 106–12, and the literature he cites.

¹⁴ On Prusias and Apame: Livy 42. 12. 3; 29. 3; App. *Mithr.* 2. On his neutrality, Livy 42. 29. 3; App. *Mithr.* 4. On Prusias in 169: Livy 44. 44. 8. In 167: Livy 45. 44. 8. The standard history of the kingdom of Bithynia remains G. Vitucci, *Il Regno di Bitinia* (1953).

¹⁵ Despite Strabo, Cicero ('Daphitas') and Valerius Maximus ('Daphnites'), the name is conventionally given as 'Daphidas', after the Suda and Hesychius.

¹⁶ The Loeb translates: 'Purpled with stripes, mere filings of the treasure of Lysimachus, ye rule the Lydians and Phrygians'. We should note that the Greek says something nearer: 'Purple stripes, filings of the treasure of Lysimachus, ye rule Lydians and Phrygia'. Strabo 14. 647.

because he had often been attacked by Daphnites *contumeliosis dictis*, from a (safe) distance (*absentem*). The joke was thus on Daphnites, for the oracle had come to pass: the crag from which he was thrown was called Equus (Horse).¹⁷

These are our two earliest accounts of the story of Daphidas, but it goes back at least as far as Posidonius, to whom Cicero attributes – somewhat scornfully – the essence of the tale (*De Fato* 5). Posidonius' version seems to have been closer to Valerius than to Strabo, in that he seems to have given the *equus*-version. Strabo was no stranger to the work of Posidonius, but, in this instance, seems to have followed an alternative tradition: his use of *φασί* as his authority might suggest a local tradition.

Our remaining sources are Hesychius of Miletus and the *Suda*, which are very similar to Valerius' version and still more so to each other. They vary from Valerius in that they name our man 'Daphidas' and give him a provenance: Telmessus. They vary from each other only in that the *Suda* provides an additional snippet of information: that Daphidas wrote that Homer was a liar, for the Athenians did not take part in the expedition to Troy.¹⁸

The aim of this piece is to assess the evidence for dating Daphidas. It was long thought that Daphidas died in the reign of Attalus I. But, in 1960, J. Fontenrose published what has become the standard article on Daphidas in which he argues that Daphidas was active, not in the reign of Attalus I, but in that of Attalus III. Thence, he proceeds to relate the story of Daphidas to the other events of Attalus III's reign.¹⁹ It is the possible connection between Daphidas and these events that raises the question of Daphidas' date above the morass of scholarly minutiae to which it might otherwise be consigned.

However, it is my contention that, despite the ingenuity of Fontenrose and the popularity of his views,²⁰ the evidence upon which his case rests is insufficient and inconclusive. To my knowledge only one small part of his case has met with any criticism: his tentative suggestion that Daphidas might have outlived Attalus III and been killed either by a member of the Attalid family or by the Romans has been demolished by Carrata Thomes.²¹ But this suggestion was no more than a tailpiece to Fontenrose's case, which still stands intact.

The paucity of our evidence on Daphidas should already be apparent. We have only two possible clues. First, the Pergamene king who ordered Daphidas' execution is named Attalus by all our sources except Strabo, who gives no name. This must indicate Attalus I, II or III. Secondly, we have the distich quoted by Strabo, which may be conveniently treated in three sections.

Daphidas opens his epigram by addressing the Attalids as 'purple weals'. Fontenrose argues that he does so in order to draw attention to their subjection to the Romans:

¹⁷ Val. Max. 1. 8. ext. 8.

¹⁸ *Suda* s.v. 'Daphidas'. Hesych. *Onom.* 14 (iv 160 M.).

¹⁹ J. Fontenrose, 'The Crucified Daphidas' *TAPhA* 91 (1960), 83–99. The most recent treatment of Daphidas is by J. Hopp, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden* (1977), pp. 119–20: Hopp is to be read with the important review of E. Badian, *JRS* 70 (1980), 200–3. In addition, Fontenrose has himself recently collated the story of Daphidas with other stories relating to the oracle at Delphi: J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: its Responses and Operations* (1978).

²⁰ Fontenrose's most notable supporter is perhaps Hopp, loc. cit. E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon*² (1971), pp. 144, 151 is more cautious. F. Carrata Thomes, *La Rivolta di Aristonico e Le Origini della Provincia Romana d'Asia* (1968), p. 29 observes: 'A parte l'identificazione del personaggio Dafida, che resta incerta, ogni dubbio sull'epoca del distico sembra oggi superata dopo la recente analisi operata dal Fontenrose'.

²¹ Carrata Thomes pp. 29–30 points out that the sources not only provide no support for this suggestion but tend to contradict it. *Contra* Fontenrose (1960), 99.

he developed the argument as a response to those who dated Daphidas to the reign of Attalus I and took the phrase to be an allusion to his father's subjection to Lysimachus. The meaning of this phrase is not readily conveyed in translation. The evocative range of *molops* may be gauged from the list of meanings given by LSJ: it may mean a weal, a bruise, an eruption resembling mosquito-bites or a blood-clot. Purple was the colour of royalty in Daphidas' world.²² But, says Daphidas, the purple of the Attalids is not the purple of royalty, but the purple of weals, bruises, eruptions and blood-clots. The royalty of the Attalids is thus impugned. However, there seems to be no reference to Lysimachus or Romans, let alone subjection to either: the phrase is sufficiently meaningful without that.

The second clause of the distich is more explicit: Daphidas clearly refers to the beginnings of the dynasty, when Philetaerus founded the Attalid kingdom with treasure stolen from Lysimachus. Fontenrose is surely correct to stress that this allusion tells us nothing about the date of Daphidas: it is a sneer that might be made against any Attalid ruler.²³

The third and final clause seems potentially more significant: Daphidas describes the Attalids as the rulers of Lydians and of Phrygia. Fontenrose deduces that the distich must date from a period when the Attalids did indeed rule Lydians and Phrygia and proceeds to dismiss Attalus I for that very reason, 'since there was probably no time when he held all Lydia and Phrygia'.²⁴ Fontenrose is probably right to assume that this clause is not ironic, but a difficulty remains: Fontenrose's argument requires that we take Daphidas to mean all the Lydians and all Phrygia. But he does not say as much and it can hardly be assumed. The evidence of the distich therefore, in all its three clauses, seems inconclusive.

Having rejected Attalus I, Fontenrose proceeds to reject Attalus II on the grounds that 'he was not a harsh and cruel king'. In support of this assessment he cites Attalus II's treatment of Thracian captives in his war with Diegylis of Thrace in 145 B.C. He further stresses the ignominy and severity of the punishment inflicted upon Daphidas in relation to his crime: 'we can hardly believe that either the first or second Attalus was the sort of ruler who would condemn a man to death by any method because he had made unkind remarks about the dynasty – the reason implied in our sources'.²⁵

This seems very fragile: modern judgements of the characters of individuals in antiquity are at best perilous and particularly so in the case of Attalus II, on whom we are relatively poorly informed. Attalus II's lenient treatment of Thracian captives in the war of 145 is the only act of his reign which might be interpreted as indicative of any mildness on his part. It can tell us nothing about Daphidas. Treatment of foreign captives is a poor parallel for treatment of a single insulting subject. Moreover, Diodorus explicitly states that Attalus II deliberately adopted the pose of a humane ruler in 145 in order to win over the subjects of the apparently brutal Diegylis. There seems no reason, therefore, to suppose Attalus II, or indeed Attalus I, to have been incapable of dealing harshly with Daphidas. Particularly so when we recall that our sources describe Daphidas as an unusually objectionable individual, who insulted everybody, even the gods and Homer, and attacked 'King Attalus' often, according to Valerius Maximus. This seems to be rather more than 'making unkind remarks about the dynasty'.²⁶

²² Fontenrose (1960), 85–7 for the argument. On purple in the Hellenistic World, see M. Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (1970), pp. 29–36.

²³ Fontenrose (1960), 85–6. For an historical account of the beginnings of the Attalid kingdom, see Hansen², pp. 14–21.

²⁴ Fontenrose (1960), 86.

²⁵ *ibid.* 87.

²⁶ Diod. 33. 15. 1. On Attalus II's war against Diegylis, Hopp, pp. 96–8.

Having rejected Attalus II in addition to Attalus I, Fontenrose is left only with Attalus III. He points out that the reign of Attalus III was unsettled and proceeds to argue that 'Daphidas was associated with Aristonicus' uprising or its antecedents'. He offers two alternative views of Daphidas. Either he was a preacher of subversive doctrines among the slaves, poor and discontented of the Pergamene kingdom and was executed by Attalus III, or we may suppose him to have been such a preacher and to have survived Attalus III, only to be killed by another member of the Attalid family or by the Romans. The latter alternative has already been demolished by Carrata Thomes:²⁷ only the former remains.

Any close connection between Daphidas and Aristonicus seems unlikely. Aristonicus claimed to be the son of Eumenes II and an Attalid.²⁸ But Daphidas' distich is overtly hostile to the Attalid dynasty as a whole, not just Attalus III: there is no reason to suppose that he ever changed this position. In fact, our sources give no hint that Daphidas was allied with any group or individual. On the contrary, he is depicted as rejecting and reviling everything and everybody – especially the Attalids, but also such pillars of the Greek world as Delphian Apollo and Homer. Neither is there any suggestion in our sources that Daphidas' behaviour was part of a broader unrest, nor that he was inciting such unrest. We do not even know how much time Daphidas spent in the kingdom of Pergamum: the only times we know him to have been in the kingdom are at his birth and at his death. The only other geographical location we have for him is Delphi. We should perhaps note that Valerius Maximus states that Daphidas often insulted Attalus 'from a distance' (*absentem*): this could mean that Daphidas did so from outside Attalus' kingdom.

Fontenrose makes much of the sequence of Strabo's narrative: he notes that the crucifixion of Daphidas is mentioned only a short time after a summary of the Aristonican war. From this he infers that Daphidas' story occurred to Strabo because he had just been writing about the Aristonican war, in which Daphidas had (allegedly) taken part. But this is to misunderstand the structure of Strabo's *Geography*. Strabo regularly mentions historical details relating to a particular locality, but these details bear no relation to each other. Thus with the Aristonican war and Daphidas: the former arises out of, and is itself part of, Strabo's treatment of Leucae, a focal point in the war, while the latter arises out of his treatment of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander and the nearby Mt. Thorax. The Aristonican war and the story of Daphidas are two essentially distinct episodes from the history of two different, though proximate, communities, Leucae and Magnesia. No link between the two episodes can therefore be supposed.²⁹

If these arguments are accepted, there is no reason to suppose that Daphidas was executed by Attalus III: Attalus I and II are also possible. If that is right, what has been seen as an indicator of social unrest under Attalus III can no longer be relied upon. At the same time, a key point has emerged, which must undermine the importance of the story of Daphidas for any reign: our sources consistently present Daphidas as a man alone, not part of any movement in society at large. It is precisely this that makes him so difficult to date. As such an individual he may very well be indicative of nothing more than himself.

University of Exeter

D. C. BRAUND

²⁷ See note 21 above.

²⁸ On Aristonicus and Eumenes II, Hansen², pp. 150–1.

²⁹ *Contra* Fontenrose (1960), 93–4.