

## V. The Crucified Daphidas

JOSEPH FONTENROSE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Next to Magnesia-on-Maeander, says Strabo, is a mountain called Thorax; on this eminence, he tells us, a certain *grammatikos* named Daphitas (as he spells the name) was crucified because he had reviled the kings in an epigram:

*Πορφύρεοι μάλωπες, ἀπορρινήματα γάζης  
Λυσιμάχου, Λυδῶν ἄρχετε καὶ Φρυγίης.*

Earlier he had received an oracle telling him to beware of the *thōrax*. Obviously he had understood this to be a warning against putting on a breastplate; but it was the usual equivocal oracle of legend: the god meant the mountain called Thorax and was predicting the scene of Daphitas' death.<sup>1</sup>

Valerius Maximus, Hesychius of Miletus, and Suidas tell a different story. Daphidas of Telmessus (Hesych., Suid.), or the sophist Daphnites (Val. Max.), reviled everyone, not sparing even the gods. He was especially hateful to King Attalus, upon whom he had heaped abuse. One day Daphidas went to Delphi with the sole purpose of tricking the Pythia. He asked whether he would find (his) horse (*ton hippon*), and was told that he would find it soon (Hesych., Suid.), or that he would find it, but would be thrown from it and killed (Val. Max.). Now Daphidas owned no horse, and he let everyone know how he had tricked the Delphic oracle. But Apollo had the last laugh: for when Daphidas went back to Asia, Attalus seized him and had him thrown from a cliff called Hippius (Equus, Val. Max.), or which stood in a place called Hippius (Hesych., Suid.).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strabo 14.1.39: κείται δ' ἐν πεδίῳ πρὸς ὄρει καλουμένῳ Θώρακι ἢ πόλιν, ἐφ' ᾧ σταυρωθῆναι φασὶ Δαφίταν τὸν γραμματικὸν λοιδορήσαντα τοὺς βασιλεῖς διὰ διστίχου.... καὶ λόγιον δ' ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτῷ λέγεται φυλάττεσθαι τὸν Θώρακα.

<sup>2</sup> Hesych. Miles. *Onom.* 14 (4.160 M), Δαφίδας ὁ Τελμισσεὺς πᾶσιν ἐλοιδορεῖτο μὴδὲ αὐτῶν φειδόμενος τῶν θεῶν διὸ καὶ ἐχθρὸς ἦν Ἀττάλῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ Περγάμου. οὗτος ἐλθὼν ποτε εἰς Πυθίαν ἔσκωπτεν εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον καὶ ἐπεγγελῶν ἡρώτα εἰ τὸν ἵππον εὕρήσοι· ἔχρησε δὲ αὐτῷ εὕρησιν ταχέως. ἐκεῖνος δὲ διεθρύλλησε τοῦτο ὥς οὐδὲ ἦν αὐτῷ ἵππος οὐδὲ ἀπώλετο. ἀναχωρήσαντα δὲ συλλαβόμενος Ἀτταλὸς ἐκέλευσε κρημνισθῆναι. ὁ δὲ τόπος ἐν φ

This is all that we hear concerning Daphidas (Daphitas, Daphnites) of Telmessus, sophist and scholar (*grammatikos*). Strabo's version, which I shall call the Thorax version, differs from the other, the Hippius version, in two important features—the oracular response and the means by which Daphidas was executed.<sup>3</sup> Cicero knew the Hippius version, and his source was Posidonius of Apamea's discussion of fate, which is no doubt the ultimate source of the Hippius version as told by Valerius Maximus and by the common source (probably Aelian) of Hesychius of Miletus and Suidas.<sup>4</sup> The authority of Posidonius may seem to lend greater weight to the Hippius version; but we should notice that it is Strabo, our sole authority for the Thorax version, who quotes the lampooning epigram attributed to Daphidas.

Yet though we learn little from these brief notices about Daphidas, that little attracts attention and may be more significant than at first glance it seems to be. (1) Daphidas is called either sophist or *grammatikos*; as such he was interested in religion, politics, and poetry, and was himself a writer of biting epigrams. (2) He was critical of accepted theology and tried to undermine confidence in oracles and in Homer's authority: according to Suidas, he accused Homer of falsehood, citing as example the poet's inclusion of Athenians in the host that attacked Troy.<sup>5</sup> (3) He attacked the royal family in scornful terms. (4) He was either crucified

τοῦτο ἐγένετο ἐκαλεῖτο Ἴππος. καὶ ἔγνω πρὸς τῷ θανάτῳ μὴ ἐψεῦσθαι τὸ λόγιον. Suid. 499: text very similar to the foregoing, except the opening sentence, for which see note 5, below. Aelian was probably the common source for both Hesych. and Suid. Val. Max. 1.8, ext. 8: "Non invitus huic subnecto Daphniten, ne quis ignoret quantum interfuerit cecinisse deorum laudes et numen obtrectasse. hic, cum eius studii esset cuius professores sophistae vocantur, ineptae et mordacis opinionationis, Apollinem Delphis inridendi causa consuluit an equum invenire posset, cum omnino nullum habuisset. cuius ex oraculo reddita vox est inventurum equum sed ut eo proturbatus periret. inde cum jocabundus quasi delusa sacrarum sortium fide reverteretur, incidit in regem Attalum saepenumero a se contumeliosis dictis absentem laceratum, eiusque jussu saxo, cui nomen erat Equi, praecipitatus ad deos usque cavillandos dementis animi iusta supplicia pendit."

<sup>3</sup> See H. W. Parke, D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle 2: The Oracular Responses* (Oxford 1956) 145, nos. 359 (Hippius), 360 (Thorax).

<sup>4</sup> Cic. *Fat.* 3.5: "... in aliis autem fortuita quaedam esse possunt, ut in illo naufrago, ut in Icadio, ut in Daphita; quaedam etiam Posidonius, pace magistri dixerim, comminisci videtur; sunt quidem absurda. quid enim? si Daphitae fatum fuit ex equo cadere atque ita perire, ex hocne equo qui cum equus non esset nomen habebat alienum?"

<sup>5</sup> Suid. 499 (= ps.-Eudocia *Viol.* 310): Δαφίδας Τελμισσεὺς γραμματικὸς γεγραφὼς περὶ Ὀμήρου καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ποιήσεως ὅτι ἐψεύσατο. Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ οὐκ ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ Ἴλιον.

or thrown to his death from a high rock. Daphidas then was a teacher who died because his teachings had offended the sovereign of his country. He thus resembles other teachers who suffered death, some of them crucified, in the troubled centuries between Alexander's time and Constantine's, because rulers found their teachings seditious.

When did this teacher live? That depends upon which King Attalus it was who sentenced him to death. That an Attalus did so we learn from the Hippus version; Strabo speaks only of kings (*tous basileas*) whom Daphidas reviled and does not tell us who had him crucified. Only the epigram which Strabo quotes allows one to suppose that the kings were Attalids, for the author calls them scrapings of Lysimachus' treasury and rulers of Lydia and Phrygia. The former epithet seems to refer to Philetaerus, founder of the Attalid dynasty, whom Lysimachus had placed in command of Pergamum, and who appropriated a treasure of nine thousand talents, which Lysimachus had deposited in the fortress of Pergamum; for in 282 B.C. Philetaerus revolted against Lysimachus and laid the foundations of the independent Attalid kingdom. "Purple welts" (*Porphyreoi mōlōpes*), the abusive phrase with which the epigram opens, refers apparently to Philetaerus' original position as underling of Lysimachus; Philetaerus was said, moreover, to have been a eunuch (his successor, Eumenes I, was his nephew and adopted son). The poet meant to say that the Attalid kings, who now wore purple robes, had been once the slaves of Lysimachus, and that they had purple backs then too, or should have had.<sup>6</sup>

The allusion in the epigram to the relation between Lysimachus and Philetaerus has caused most scholars, beginning with Jacobs and including Wilamowitz and Miss Hansen, to identify the enemy of Daphidas with Attalus I, on the ground, apparently, that the taunting allusion must have been written under that Attalus who was nearest to the date of Philetaerus' revolt against Lysimachus.<sup>7</sup> Yet although we may grant that a taunt has more bite if it alludes to recent deeds, we must also believe that Attalus I, who had a good reputation as a wise and just king, "was guilty of one of the most arbitrary acts of Hellenistic despotism," as

<sup>6</sup> See Esther V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (Ithaca 1947) 15-18.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae* 2.1 (Leipzig 1799) 105 f.; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Commentariolum grammaticum* 3 (Göttingen 1889) 11 f.; Hansen (above, note 6) 39; Crusius, *RE* 4.2134, s.v. "Daphitas."

Miss Hansen puts it, i.e. that he was thin-skinned enough to put a man to death for a few quips made at the expense of the royal family.<sup>8</sup> We must also realize that for only five or six years could Attalus I be said to rule over Lydia and Phrygia. Only within the period 228–222, at most, did he maintain an (insecure) hold on the country north of the Taurus. There was probably no time when he actually held all Lydia and Phrygia: the Seleucids invaded Phrygia several times in efforts to recover the territories lost to Attalus in 228, finally succeeding in 223–221; and Lysias, ruler of Phrygian Philomelium, was independent of Attalid authority for much of this time.<sup>9</sup> The epigram, however, says, “. . . you rule over the Lydians and Phrygia,” words more suitable to a secure control of those lands.

The argument based upon the reference to Lysimachus' treasury, that the Attalus concerned must have been Attalus I, if the taunt was to be timely, is in fact weak. The time of Attalus I's dominion over Asia was already nearly 60 years after Philetaerus' break with Lysimachus. A dynasty's origins are as likely to be held up to ridicule after 150 years or more as after 60. In the later eighteenth century, seven centuries after the Norman conquest, Thomas Paine made scornful remarks about the origins of the English monarchy, founded by a usurper who was the bastard son of a barmaid.

Among the few scholars who have taken notice of Daphidas, only Susemihl, as far as I know, has referred his life's end to the reign of Attalus II or III, although he gave no argument for his opinion.<sup>10</sup> Yet both Attalus II (159–138) and Attalus III (138–133) held undisputed sway over Lydia and Phrygia, for the kingdom of Pergamum had been in secure possession of these lands since 188. The words of the pentameter, then, are more suitable to the later Attalids than to the reign of Attalus I. The first words of the hexameter, *porphyreoi mōlōpes*, also fit the later Attalids at least as well as they fit the earlier. In these words scholars have too easily read an allusion to Philetaerus as dependent and servant of Lysimachus; yet the last three Attalid kings were dependents of Rome. Sallust allows Mithridates to speak (or write) the follow-

<sup>8</sup> On the character of Attalus I see Hansen (above, note 6) 39, 65, and citations.

<sup>9</sup> See Hansen (above, note 6) 34–40; Maurice Holleaux, “Études d'histoire hellénistique I,” *REA* 17 (1915) 237–43.

<sup>10</sup> Franz Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit. in d. Alexandrinerzeit* 2 (Leipzig 1892) 22, note 111; see Parke-Wormell 1 (*The History* [above, note 3]) 390 f.; 2.145, nos. 359, 360.

ing words: "Eumenem . . . habitum custodiae agri captivi, sumptibus et contumeliis ex rege miserrimum servorum effecere (Romani) . . ." He alluded to such events as the Romans' humiliating treatment of Eumenes II in 167/6, when they refused to let him enter Rome.<sup>11</sup> An enemy of the later Attalids might very well make derisive allusion both to the shady manner in which the family rose to power and to their submission to Roman domination.

We have, therefore, good reason to connect Daphidas with either Attalus II or Attalus III. Attalus II is unlikely, at least as the king who condemned Daphidas to death, although he may have been included in the sophist's sarcasm. He was not a harsh and cruel king; on the contrary he was a fairly mild man, who in 145 treated his Thracian captives leniently; he may even be considered a weak king who depended upon his advisers, possibly because he was already old when he came to the throne.<sup>12</sup> In identifying the Attalus of the story we must realize the meaning of the mode of Daphidas' execution, whether he was crucified or thrown from a high rock: either was an ignominious and humiliating form of capital punishment. 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 merely because he had made unkind remarks about the dynasty—the reason implied in our sources. If either king sentenced a wellborn or learned man to crucifixion or *katakrémnismos*, he must have done so because that man had been guilty of a grave offense against the dynasty, some especially serious act of sedition or treason against the state and its rulers: the offender must have taken a leading part in a conspiracy to overthrow the king, to incite civil war or insurrection of the slaves and underprivileged, or to betray the kingdom to foreign enemies. Wilamowitz supposed that Daphidas was a partisan of the Seleucids in their wars with Attalus I. If Daphidas was a citizen of Telmessus, as Hesychius and Suidas say, he had every right to support the Seleucids against Attalus I, since Telmessus, whether the Carian or the Lycian city, was then in Seleucid territory except for the short time when Attalus I held it.<sup>13</sup> Only if he had been a Pergamene or Mysian in a high position of trust

<sup>11</sup> Sall. *Ep. Mithr.* 8; Polyb. 29.6.4, 30. 19. See Hansen (above, note 6) 117.

<sup>12</sup> See Plut. *Mor.* 792b; Hansen (above, note 6) 132.

<sup>13</sup> See Wilamowitz (above, note 7) *loc. cit.*, who thinks, however, that Daphidas

and had then been found guilty of treasonous dealings with the Seleucids—only then might the king have sentenced him to such an ignominious death for favoring the Seleucids. Furthermore, if Daphidas was a Cynic, as Wilamowitz says, what reason is there to suppose that he admired the Seleucids any more than he admired the Attalids? So we are left with conspiracy to promote usurpation or civil strife of some kind. And if we suppose that this occurred under either the first or second Attalus, we have no record of it, no hint of any internal sedition or strife to which we can attach it.

Attalus III, however, is just the kind of ruler that suits the story, either as a king who would put a man to death merely for having insulted the dynasty, if we take the sources of the Daphidas story at face value; or as a king whose reign was troubled by sedition and rebellion (actual or threatened), if we believe that Daphidas was executed because he had taken part in a conspiracy or movement directed against the dynasty or state. For Attalus III, as Diodorus tells us, immediately upon his accession to the throne revealed a very different character from that of his predecessors.<sup>14</sup> We are told that he suspected the most powerful of his father's friends of plotting against himself. Therefore he hired the most savage of his mercenary soldiers to kill them and their wives and children. His suspicions were not abated by these murders in the capital city: he had generals and provincial governors killed, and among his victims were kinsmen.<sup>15</sup> Perhaps he was not completely sane: his phobic attachment to seclusion and his neglect of his person and of his royal duties reveal an unhealthy and unstable character—such a king as might spitefully put a sharp-tongued critic to death.

Yet although Attalus undoubtedly condemned many innocent

was not Telmessian but from Alexandria-in-Troad; for *CIG* 1564 (= *OGIS* 316), which Wilamowitz dates about 235–220, mentions Agedicus, Daphitas' son, citizen of Alexandria. Dittenberger, however, dates it in the second century; hence if this is the same Daphitas (this is the only other instance of the name), the case for putting him under Attalus I is weakened, though still possible. Wilamowitz explains away the sources' Telmessus as *solita ariolatio* of ancient scholars: "...impium divinationis irrisorem ad vatium nobilem patriam rettulit (ariolatio)"—but this too is *ariolatio*.

<sup>14</sup> Diod. 34.21 (ed. Bekker, Leipzig 1853 [Teubner]). See Hansen (above, note 6) 136.

<sup>15</sup> Diod. 34.21; Pomp. Trog. epit. (Justin) 36.4.1. According to the latter he charged some of his friends and relatives with the murder of his mother and wife. This was apparently not his only motive, and the murders were apparently not limited to the beginning of his reign. So many murders for an imaginary cause indicate an unsound mind.

men on unfounded suspicions, he really had enemies who would, if they could, have taken his throne and perhaps his life. His cruel and suspicious behavior aroused the hatred of many subjects and made them ready and eager for revolution.<sup>16</sup> They may then have wanted to give the crown to Aristonicus, Attalus' illegitimate half-brother, who after Attalus' death opposed the bequest of the kingdom to the Romans and led an armed rebellion which lasted four years. But we know nothing about Aristonicus' movements or plans before Attalus III's death. He may have already been actively engaged in conspiracy or rebellion; but either he must have conspired very secretly, or he must have been where Attalus could not arrest him.<sup>17</sup> At any rate the rebellion of 133–129 surely had antecedents in disturbances and unrest among discontented sections of the population during Attalus' reign.<sup>18</sup> Attalus' bequest, which was accompanied by a grant of freedom to the *polis* of Pergamum and to other *poleis* within the kingdom's borders, is in itself evidence of powerful forces opposed to Attalus and likely to take over the kingdom. It was not the testament of an old and childless king who bequeathed his realm to the Romans in default of heirs; for Attalus died suddenly in his thirties at the end of a five-year reign, during which he could expect to live a long life and have sons. It appears likely, therefore, that he meant to forestall powerful and threatening enemies, who might take his life, and to prevent the succession of Aristonicus.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Diod. 34.21, διὰ δὲ τὴν ὀμότητα μισθεῖς οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλησιοχώρων πάντας τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους ἐποίησε μετεώρους πρὸς κεινοτομίαν.

<sup>17</sup> See P. Foucart, "La Formation de la province romaine d'Asie," *Mém. Acad. Inscr. B.-L.* 37 (1904) 302, 319; Giuseppe Cardinali, "La Morte di Attalo III e la rivolta di Aristonico," *Saggi di storia antica e di archeologia* (Rome 1910) 279, 294–99; Joseph Vogt, *Struktur der antiken Sklavenkriege* (Wiesbaden 1957) 21; Vladimír Vavřínek, *La Révolte d'Aristonico* (Prague 1957) 18, 29; Hansen (above, note 6) 140, 142; Wilcken, *RE* 2 (1896) 962, s.v. "Aristonikos 14."

<sup>18</sup> The principal sources for Aristonicus' rebellion are Strabo 14.1.38; Pomp. Trog. epit. (Justin) 36.4.6–12; Livy epit. 59; Diod. 34.4; Val. Max. 3.2.12, 3.4.5, 5.3.2e, 8.7.6; App. *Mithr.* 9.62; Vell. Pat. 2.4.1, 2.38.5; Eutrop. *Hist. Rom.* 4.20; Flor. 1.35; Oros. *Hist.* 5.10. See Foucart, Cardinali, Vavřínek, Wilcken (above, note 17); Vogt (above, note 17) 15, 21 f., 35–37, 41, 51; Hansen (above, note 6) 142–48; Karl Bücher, *Die Aufstände der unfreien Arbeiter 143–129 v. Chr.* (Frankfort-on-Main 1874) 100–114 (reprinted in his *Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte* [Tübingen 1922] 164–74); T. R. S. Broughton, *Roman Asia Minor* (Baltimore 1938) 505–11; T. R. S. Broughton, "Stratoniceia and Aristonicus," *CPh* 29 (1934) 252–54.

<sup>19</sup> On Attalus' motives see Hansen (above, note 6) 140 with citations in notes 85–88; see also Cardinali (above, note 17) 273 f., who believes that Attalus was not so bad as Diod. and Pomp. Trog. painted him; cf. *IPerg.* 246.

Once Aristonicus declared himself, he found supporters among all the discontented: noble and upperclass families of men whom Attalus had killed, all sections of the population that had suffered from Attalus' cruelty and misrule, and the slaves, serfs, and poor freemen, who were ready to revolt, if not already insurgent. We do not know whether Aristonicus initiated the slave uprising which began at latest in the early months of his rebellion; and if he did, whether he did so upon beginning his revolt or after his initial defeat near Cyme; the latter is Strabo's sequence.<sup>20</sup> It may be that the slave revolt had begun within the last year of Attalus' reign and independently of Aristonicus' claim to the kingship. At any rate Aristonicus and the slaves were soon allied in a common enterprise.<sup>21</sup> The rebellion against Rome was also a civil war in the Pergamene kingdom. In general the native Asiatic populations and the slaves, who were largely Asiatic, were pitted against the Greco-Macedonians and the Hellenized natives, who supported the Attalids and Rome.<sup>22</sup>

Now Aristonicus' rebellion had an ideological inspiration: at least we may say that there were certain political, philosophical,

<sup>20</sup> On the slave uprising see Strabo 14.1.38; Diod. 34.4; Plut. *Tit. Flam.* 21. Strabo says that Aristonicus, forced out of Leucæ by his defeat, went inland and quickly gathered a multitude of poor men and slaves who had been called to freedom (*ep' eleutheriâi katakeklēmônî*). Strabo's summary account cannot be pressed too closely for the sequence of events. See the inscription, *IPerg.* 249 = *OGIS* 338 = Michel 518: the city of Pergamum in 133 granted citizenship to *paroikoi*, mercenary soldiers, and other resident foreigners, and *paroikia* to the children of freedmen, to public slaves, and to royal slaves, with certain exceptions; and those *paroikoi* who had left the city and its territory, or who should leave, were subject to disenfranchisement and confiscation of property. This seems to have been a move of the newly free city government to prevent an exodus of slaves and metics to join Aristonicus. See Cardinali (above, note 17) 281–83; Hansen (above, note 6) 142 f.; Vogt (above, note 17) 21 f.; Vavřínek (above, note 17) 18–20.

<sup>21</sup> The slaves who worked in the mines and textile factories and upon the royal and large private estates were badly exploited and oppressed, suffering from miserable conditions of labor and maintenance, not so bad, perhaps, as those which Sicilian slaves suffered, but bad enough. The land was studded with forts and garrisons, without which the slaves could not have been held down: they were ready to revolt at the first chance. The free working men and peasants suffered great poverty. See Vavřínek (above, note 17) 5–12; Vogt (above, note 17) 15; M. Rostovtzeff, "Notes on the Economic Policy of the Pergamene Kings," *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (Manchester, London, New York, etc., 1923) 375–83.

<sup>22</sup> The fleet of Ephesus gave Aristonicus his initial defeat at Cyme; see Strabo 14.1.38. For the attitude of the Greek city governments in the Attalid realm see *OGIS* 339 = Michel 327, lines 16–27, 53–59; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 694, lines 11–22; Foucart (above, note 17) 328, 334 f. = *REA* 21 (1919) 2, 7, 16 (inscription of Bargylia, A 13–21, B 22–35, C); *IPriene* 108, lines 223–32.



and religious ideas which inspired Aristonicus himself and some of his lieutenants and advisers. Strabo says that Aristonicus gave the name *Hēliopolitai* to the multitude of slaves and poor men who flocked to his standard. It appears that he then founded a new state, which he called Heliopolis, based on social justice, freedom, and equality. Several scholars have supposed that Aristonicus took the name of his state from Iambulus' Utopian romance, which described a communistic paradise in the Isles of the Sun, somewhere far out in the southern ocean, four months' voyage from the Ethiopian shore.<sup>23</sup> Others have doubted whether a literary work of this sort could have inspired a slave revolt and look rather to oriental ideas of the Sun as a god of justice.<sup>24</sup> Both positions are essentially correct, I believe: Iambulus' Utopia and Asiatic Sun cults had each something to do with the Aristonican slave rebellion. True enough Iambulus' book can hardly have been known to most slaves or other followers of Aristonicus; nevertheless it probably influenced Aristonicus and other leaders and determined both the name and the character of the new state. We do not need to suppose that Iambulus was the sole source of ideological inspiration for the movement. And the slaves, many of them Syrians and Canaanites (see note 32), could be inspired through the cult of *Hēlios Dikaíos*, whom under various native names they had worshipped in their own countries.

Evidence of the role of ideas in Aristonicus' uprising is also seen in the presence of the Stoic Blossius among Aristonicus' counselors. He was a radical Stoic, who had given aid and counsel to Tiberius Gracchus, and had fled to Mysia to join Aristonicus soon after the assassination of Gracchus.<sup>25</sup> Most Stoics seem to have

<sup>23</sup> Diod. 2.55–60. On Iambulus see W. Richter, *Jambulus* (Schaffhausen 1888); Robert von Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt*<sup>3</sup> 2 (Munich 1925) 305–24; Edgar Salin, *Platon und die griechische Utopie* (Munich, Leipzig 1921) 235–41; J. Bidez, *La Cité du monde et la cité du soleil chez les Stoïciens* (Paris 1932); B. Farrington, *Head and Hand in Ancient Greece* (London 1947) 75–84. For influence on Aristonicus see Pöhlmann 1.406; Bidez 290; Farrington 84; W. W. Tarn, "Alexander Helios and the Golden Age," *JRS* 22 (1932) 140, 147 f.; Hansen (above, note 6) 144.

<sup>24</sup> See Vavřínek (above, note 17) 35–43; Vogt (above, note 17) 35 f.; Robert Eisler, *Ἰησοῦς Βασιλεὺς οὐ Βασιλεύσας* 2 (Heidelberg 1930) 724, note; and works cited by these authors. We are not sure of Iambulus' date, but it was almost certainly second century and probably earlier than 133. Cf. Euhemerus' Panchaea, another Utopia, which had a river called Sun's Water (Diod. 5.44.3).

<sup>25</sup> Cic. *Lael.* 11.37; Plut. *Tib. Gr.* 20; see also Plut. *ibid.* 8, 17, and Val. Max. 4.7.1 for Blossius as a Gracchan. See D. R. Dudley, "Blossius of Cumae," *JRS* 31 (1941) 94–99.

been politically conservative; for conservatism is likely to follow from theodicy: the world is in all respects as it should be. Yet their theodicy and pantheism made Stoics aware of the worth of all men. Zeno, first founder, already had an idea of the world as Cosmopolis under divine government, the City of Zeus of which Marcus Aurelius later spoke (4.23), in which every man is a citizen. And so some Stoics drew radical conclusions from the idea of Cosmopolis; hence Stoicism, like nineteenth-century Hegelianism, became divided into right and left wings. On the left side were Blossius, Sphaerus, and Iambulus; for the author of the Utopia seems to have belonged to this school.

Cleanthes, Zeno's successor, a working man who came from Assus (later in Attalid territory), put Helios at the head of Cosmopolis; his Heliopolis was the Stoic Cosmopolis translated into an earthly society. As Bidez has shown, the three founders of Stoicism—Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, natives of Cyprus, the Troad, and Cilicia—drew their concept of Cosmopolis from the Orient: they were influenced by astrology and the cults of the Sun God, Helios or Baal Cosmocrator, and of other astral deities.<sup>26</sup> Therefore the two views about the source whence Aristonicus derived his Heliopolis are easily reconciled, since Iambulus' Sun City is itself ultimately derived from oriental ideas about the Sun God.

Daphidas surely had something to do with the ideology of Aristonicus' uprising. If it was Attalus III who put him to death expressly for his teachings and attacks on the dynasty, we must interpret that event in the context of the times. Daphidas' teachings and political criticism must have been associated with the antecedents of the rebellion, with the growing discontent and social unrest that plagued Attalus III's short reign. In Attalus' eyes they were surely subversive teachings, a real and present danger to the state. Daphidas is designated a sophist and *grammatikos* in the sources; and Wilamowitz called him a Cynic (see note 7). He could just as well be a Stoic, although we need not suppose that the Aristonican rebellion's sole intellectual inspiration was Stoic. The Cynic school, after all, contributed much to Stoicism. Or Valerius Maximus may have rightly

<sup>26</sup> See Bidez (above, note 23), especially 273–91; Farrington (above, note 23) 65–75; Salin (above, note 23) shows that Iambulus' Heliopolis had Platonic roots; Richter (above, note 23) 67–70 argues against a Stoic source for Iambulus' Sun Islands.

called Daphidas a sophist. For we know only that he was a critic of the accepted gods, of the rulers, and of the Homeric poems. This sort of criticism began among fifth-century Sophists, some of whom were teachers of democratic, socialistic, libertarian, and humanitarian ideas—thinkers whom we should call radicals and liberals.<sup>27</sup> Probably several currents of advanced political and religious ideas flowed together to form the ideological background of the Pergamene revolutionaries.

That Daphidas was associated with Aristonicus' uprising or its antecedents appears more probable when we look at the sources of our knowledge about him. Posidonius' essay on fate was the source of the Hippias version, as we learn from Cicero; Suidas and Hesychius of Miletus probably got it from Aelian, who undoubtedly took it from Posidonius. Now Posidonius was deeply interested in the slave revolts that shook the Roman dominions in the second half of the second century. He is almost our sole authority for the history of the Sicilian slave revolts which began about 135; his account is paraphrased by Diodorus, whose history of this period has come to us in an epitomized form.<sup>28</sup> It is evident from Diodorus that Posidonius also told the story of the Pergamene revolt in the same part of his *Histories*; there can be little doubt that the news of the revolt in Sicily and of its initial successes inspired the slaves of the Pergamene kingdom. Posidonius' historical knowledge furnished him with examples for his philosophical essays, and it is likely that he drew the example of Daphidas' ironical fate from his detailed knowledge of the lore which surrounded the Aristonican revolt. We must remember too that he began his *Histories* where Polybius left off; and so if Posidonius wrote about an event which occurred under an Attalus, it probably happened in the reign of Attalus II or III. My conjecture is supported by Strabo's sequence: almost immediately after his summary account of the Aristonican war (14.1.38) Strabo introduces his description of Magnesia-on-Maeander (14.1.39); only a few words (six Teubner lines) on Phocaea intervene; then after

<sup>27</sup> See Eric Havelock, *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics* (London 1957) chapters 7–10; Pöhlmann (above, note 23) 1.282–300.

<sup>28</sup> Diodorus, Books 34–36, includes both Sicilian slave wars. See Posidonius in *FGH* 87 F 108. On Posidonius as Diodorus' source see Georg Rathke, *De Romanorum bellis servilibus* (Berlin 1904) 7–13. The story as Strabo tells it may have been in Posidonius' *Histories*, but Posidonius may have revamped it for use as an *exemplum* in his *De fato*.

a sentence or two on Magnesia's site, he speaks of the hill Thorax and of Daphidas' crucifixion upon it. He had no need to do more than mention Thorax, but the name meant something in relation to the Aristonican war with which he had just been dealing. It is true that Posidonius told the Hippias story, whereas Strabo knew the Thorax version. Yet Strabo, who was also a Stoic, may have drawn upon a source which Posidonius also used. In that case why should Strabo and Posidonius differ so much? Perhaps because Posidonius altered the story. Between two sentences in which Cicero alludes to the tales of Daphidas, Icadius, and a *naufragus*, he expresses the suspicion that Posidonius invented some of his *exempla*: the tales are absurd enough, he says (see note 4). Posidonius saw fit perhaps to caricature the intellectual leadership of the Pergamene uprising by distorting the story of Daphidas, making him into a comic figure, the victim of his own attempt at trickery. Though Posidonius probably disliked slavery—in his account of the Sicilian slave wars he shows some sympathy for the slaves—he was a conservative Stoic who favored the senatorial party in Rome and disliked the Gracchan party, from which the radical Stoic Blossius had gone directly to Aristonicus' camp. Though Posidonius may have felt that slaves might justly object to harsh treatment, he did not sympathize with free citizens who disturbed the established political and social order.<sup>29</sup> Strabo's story of Daphidas, we should notice, lacks the element of comedy and caricature: Daphidas, after receiving an oracular warning against *thorax*, was crucified on Mount Thorax. The Thorax version hardly favors Daphidas, but its tone is serious.

Though, as I have said, we need not insist that Daphidas was a Stoic, yet we should observe that we learn about him only from Stoic writers: Posidonius, Strabo, Aelian. And the Stoic Blossius is the only intellectual supporter of Aristonicus known to us. The Stoic philosophy, however, defended and accepted the mantic art, whereas Daphidas is represented as a mocker of oracles and gods. Was he merely a bad example that Stoic teachers presented to their pupils? Perhaps—yet in this very contempt of oracles we find a remarkable parallel between Daphidas and Blossius. For

<sup>29</sup> See J. B. Bury, *Ancient Greek Historians* (New York 1909) 221–23; K. Reinhardt, *RE* 22 (1953) 626 f., 631–36, s.v. "Poseidonios 3." Reinhardt points out Posidonius' anecdotal method as an historian and his tendency to caricature; the Daphidas episode, we may believe, was an example of both traits.

when one bad omen after another had come to Tiberius Gracchus' notice, including failure to obtain the *tripudium solistimum* from the oracle of the sacred chickens, Blossius allayed Gracchus' anxiety by disparaging the omens: it would be a shame, he said, for a man of Gracchus' stature to fail his fellow-citizens for fear of a crow (which was the central figure in one omen); his enemies would be sure to misrepresent the motives of his inaction (Plut. *Tib. Gr.* 17). A Stoic then might deny the validity of divination; and we know that so great a Stoic as Panaetius had little faith in it.<sup>30</sup> Yet we need not believe that either Blossius or Daphidas rejected the mantic art *in toto*. The sacred chickens and Delphi represented orthodox *mantikê*, especially valued and supported by the oligarchic parties and the groups who controlled state and society—the very forces that Gracchus and Aristonicus opposed. It may be that Blossius and Daphidas scorned these official modes of divination because they accepted and valued other modes. For we have reason to believe that the political and social ideology of Aristonicus' uprising had a religious foundation. I have already mentioned the influence of the Sun cult. The contemporary slave rebellion in Sicily under Eunus, a Syrian magician and prophet, had a strong religious inspiration. Eunus was devoted to Atargatis who, he said, appeared to him and told him that he would become king, a prophecy which was fulfilled when he ruled over slave-held Sicily as King Antiochus—he may be called a Messianic king. So many slave uprisings followed in the wake of the Sicilian revolt—in the Pergamene kingdom, Delos, Attica, Rome itself, and elsewhere—that they can be said with fair certainty to have followed its example.<sup>31</sup> Since many Pergamene slaves were Syrians and Canaanites, as in Sicily, it is probable that their rebellion was associated with the same or similar cults and beliefs.<sup>32</sup>

We must realize that our only information about Daphidas—

<sup>30</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.3.6. Panaetius, Posidonius' teacher, was well acquainted with Pergamum, having studied there under Crates; see Hansen (above, note 6) 383 f.

<sup>31</sup> The slaves were the messengers and letter-carriers of the ancient world. News of rebellion in one country was quickly carried to all others. See Vogt (above, note 17) 48–57; Vavřínek (above, note 17) 27 f. On the slave revolts under Eunus (135–132) and the very similar Salvius and Athenion (103–99) see Diod. 34.2–20, 36.1–4; Bücher, *Aufstände* 33–81 (*Beiträge* 119–152); Rathke (above, note 28) 25–47; Vogt (above, note 17) 9–35, 39–43, 47; Vavřínek (above, note 17) 23–25.

<sup>32</sup> See Vavřínek (above, note 17) 40. The Attalids certainly took captive many Syrians and Cilicians in their wars with the Seleucid kingdom.

two versions of a hostile and partisan account of his life's end—is much distorted and that Posidonius' version is no more than a caricature. The story of the oracular consultation cannot be true in either version, since it has all the earmarks of prophetic legend or folktale; and it is certain that the Delphic oracle never spoke responses of that kind in historical times, if ever.<sup>33</sup> Therefore we must conclude that we have been given only a much biased view of Daphidas' teachings, which are negative and iconoclastic as reported. But iconoclasm is often the reverse face of positive doctrines. Let us review what the sources tell us.

1. Daphidas abused the gods. This resembles the charges of atheism made against Socrates and early Christians. If Daphidas preached new doctrines, and if in doing so he depreciated the state's gods and cults, then he would incur this charge, particularly in a time of social disturbance.

2. Daphidas mocked the Delphic oracle. Consultation of Delphi was part of the religion of most Greek states. It was a very conservative oracle indeed, supported by and supporting the established authorities, especially the oligarchic and monarchic. No one would ever have gone there to ask approval of a social revolution.

3. Daphidas depreciated Homer, saying that he lied. The instance cited, Athenian participation in the Trojan War, is trivial; but our source gives this as one example out of many. The man who adversely criticizes scripture seizes upon large and small alike—Cain's wife, for instance—and the Homeric poems may truly be called the scripture of the Greek state religion. Moreover Daphidas had a particular reason for his carping criticism of Homer: he was surely replying to Herodicus, an Homeric scholar who disliked Plato intensely because of his remarks against Homer.<sup>34</sup> In particular Herodicus pointed out numerous anachronisms in Plato's dialogues, and we notice that Daphidas pointed out an anachronism in the one bit of his anti-

<sup>33</sup> This statement I shall demonstrate in the book on Delphic responses in legend and history which I am now writing. See Pierre Amandry, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes* (Paris 1950) chapter 14. Parke and Wormell (above, note 10) reject both versions of the response.

<sup>34</sup> The anti-Platonic passages in Athenaeus 5 and 11 come from Herodicus; see especially 5.215c–220a, 11.504e–508d; Hansen (above, note 6) 380–82. For Herodicus' date and works see Gudeman, *RE* 8 (1912) 973–78, s.v. "Herodikos 1."

Homeric criticism known to us. I say "surely replying to Herodicus" because Herodicus, though a Babylonian, was a disciple of Crates of Mallos, who founded a school of grammar and Homeric criticism in Pergamum and presided over it in the reigns of Eumenes II and Attalus II; he may have lived to or through the reign of Attalus III.<sup>35</sup> Herodicus, his pupil, could have been in Pergamum in Attalus III's reign. In any case we know that Crates and his school had the good will of the Attalid dynasty. Daphidas, whose career may have begun under Attalus II or even earlier, was therefore directing his anti-Homeric criticism at the "establishment," at the state-favored views of Crates and Herodicus. He made himself a rival *grammatikos*, the title that our sources give him. And so the particular character of his criticism of Homer is another reason for placing Daphidas in the reign of Attalus III. Moreover, if my view of Daphidas is correct, he would have been inclined to favor Plato in spite of Plato's anti-democratic bias, since Plato had sketched an ideal communistic republic and described the Utopia of Atlantis, conceptions that had a profound effect on all later Utopias. And Plato too had unusual religious ideas, in which worship of astral deities had a place.<sup>36</sup>

4. Daphidas lampooned and reviled the Attalids. This means in particular the last Attalids: Eumenes II, Attalus II, and Attalus III, who were hardly more than vassals of Rome, and the last of these gave his kingdom to the Romans—perhaps his testamentary intention was known before his death. In Daphidas' scornful epigram, "Ye purple welts, scraps of Lysimachus' treasury, ye rule over Lydia and Phrygia," we can discern a positive teaching: the kings, servile and contemptible, are no better than other men; why should they rule over them?

Significant too is the manner in which Daphidas died. Crucifixion and *katakrimnismos*, as ignominious punishments, were commonly imposed upon rebellious slaves (though certainly not limited to them). The crucifixion of a slave for killing his master's son, in the course of Aristonicus' uprising, is attested by an inscrip-

<sup>35</sup> See Hansen (above, note 6) 371-79.

<sup>36</sup> Plato's philosophy contributed much to Stoicism, particularly to that of the second century; see also note 26, above. Crates too was a Stoic, and perhaps Herodicus (though he disliked Plato), but surely conservative and opposed to the Aristonian Stoics.

tion of Amyzon.<sup>37</sup> The mass crucifixion of slaves after Spartacus' uprising is well known. In the first Sicilian slave war Rupilius, after taking Tauromenium, subjected the captured slaves to torture and *katakrémnismos* (Diod. 34.2). Freeborn leaders of slave rebels, upperclass leaders of lowerclass uprisings, have in all ages incurred the special hatred of the rulers, who are likely to put them to death in cruel and humiliating ways. So the manner of Daphidas' death is consistent with my interpretation of him as a teacher of doctrines that inspired the Pergamene rebels, slave and free. It is tempting to see in Daphidas the Pergamene counterpart of Eunus, prophet and Messiah (though not Messianic king) of the rebellion. But we know too little about him to make such a suggestion with confidence.<sup>38</sup>

The Hippias story with its *katakrémnismos* bears an interesting resemblance to the legend about the fabulist-slave Aesop at Delphi: Aesop denounced the Delphians for poor character and greed, whereupon in anger they framed him on a charge of theft and threw him from a cliff.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps Posidonius, or whoever invented the Hippias story, wanted to give Daphidas, as mocker of Delphi, the same death as Aesop's; for Aesop was a hero of the lowly, and Daphidas may have used the Aesop story in his critical attacks on Delphi.<sup>40</sup> As Daphidas cited anachronisms against Homer, so, like Oenomaus of Gadara, he may have cited against Delphi many instances of cruelty, deception, folly, and error. And the traducer of Daphidas perhaps derived the sophist's attempt to trick the oracle from an Aesopic fable of a knave who

<sup>37</sup> *Anc. Gr. Inscr. in the Br. Mus.* 4. 1036 = L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 389, note. Aristonicus was strangled in a prison in Rome (Vell. Pat. 2.4.1; Eutrop. 4.20; Oros. *Hist.* 5.10.5), and Eunus died in a lice-infested prison (Diod. 34.2).

<sup>38</sup> On possible Messianism in the Pergamene rebellion see Dudley (above, note 25) 99. On the Messianic movements from about 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. which were also social-revolutionary movements, see Eisler (above, note 24); Hans Windisch, *Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum* (Tübingen 1909); Vogt (above, note 17) 33–35. Perhaps the form *Daphnites*, as Val. Max. called Daphidas, is not a mistake: to be laureate is much like being anointed as a mark of divine favor.

<sup>39</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 556F–557A; Ox. Pap. 1800, col. 2, frag. 2, lines 30–63; Ael. frag. 203; Liban. *Or.* 24.31, *Decl.* 1.181; Schol. on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446; *Vit. Aesop.* pages 60–68 Perry (below, note 40); Parke-Wormell (above, note 3) 1.398, 2.26 f., no. 58. In this story one sees the theme of the Delphic knife, and Aesop plays the part of Pyrrhus; see my *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi* (Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Cl. Arch. 4; Berkeley, Los Angeles 1960) 219–25.

<sup>40</sup> See B. E. Perry, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Haverford [Pa.] 1936) 1, 15 f.



tried to deceive the Delphic Apollo and failed—but changed the manner of the oracle test (from the knave's concealed sparrow to Daphidas' non-existent horse) for the sake of a "Jerusalem Chamber" plot.<sup>41</sup>

So much can be said about Daphidas, in spite of the lack of any certain information about him. We may take at least two views of him. (1) Daphidas preached subversive doctrines among the slaves, poor, and discontented in the Pergamene kingdom and was arrested and executed by Attalus III, probably within the last months or weeks of the latter's reign. (2) Daphidas preached his doctrines and survived Attalus III, taking part in the Aristonican war as counsellor and "prophet." The "Attalus" of the sources then refers inexactly either to the Romans, Attalus' heirs, or to members of the Attalid family who opposed Aristonicus and either favored the bequest or acquiesced in it.<sup>42</sup> It may be that an Attalid acted as temporary regent to control the dominions—outside the newly freed cities—from Attalus' death until the Romans' arrival.

We do not know enough to decide. Whatever the truth about Daphidas, it seems evident that the story about him refers to the troubled end of the Attalid kingdom and to the Aristonican uprising or its antecedents. If that is the context in which it should be placed, then it must be interpreted accordingly.

<sup>41</sup> Aesop *Fab.* 36=Babr. 229; see Parke-Wormell (above, note 3) 1.390, 2.226, no. 580. Possibly *Hippus* and *Thorax* have a symbolic meaning in the Daphidas legend and represent the victorious armies of the Romans and their allies. The sources indicate that Roman cavalry was engaged: *Inscr. v. Priene* 108, lines 223–27; Frontin. *Strat.* 4.5.16; Val. Max. 3.2.12. The hill *Hippus* is perhaps Hippocorona in Adramyttene (Strabo 10.3.20). For the "Jerusalem Chamber" motif see Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*<sup>2</sup> (Bloomington [Ind.] 1955–58) M341.3.1.

<sup>42</sup> There were surely Attalids in Pergamum after 133. It seems certain that Attalus II had sons; according to Plut. *Mor.* 489E–490A, although Stratonice bore several sons to Attalus, he recognized none as his successor, that the throne might go to the son of Eumenes II. A Delphian inscription (*Fouilles de Delphes* 3.2.12) of 128/7 B.C. includes an Ariarathes son of Attalus among the Athenian Pythaists; Stratonice was daughter of King Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia. See Cardinali (above, note 17) 286, note; Hansen (above, note 6) 90. *Inscr. v. Pergamon* 245A, C, mentions Megisternus son of Attalus. Members of the family held office under the Romans; for it is probable that certain men named Attalus were descendants of the royal family. A Pergamene house is known to the excavators as the "House of the Consul Attalus" from its owner, the consul suffectus Attalus, who lived around 200 A.D.; see *Ath. Mitt.* 32 (1907) 362, no. 117; Hansen (above, note 6) 234, 334. Menyllius Attalus and Claudius Attalus Paterculianus were proconsul of Asia and legate of Bithynia about the same time (*Ath. Mitt.* 21 (1896) 113; 32 (1907) 360, 364). In Pompey's time an Attalus became tetrarch of Paphlagonia, very likely a member or kinsman of the royal family, which was Paphlagonian in origin (App. *Mithr.* 17.114).