

PROVINCIA ASIA

KENT J. RIGSBY
Duke University

These notes attempt to sort out some testimonies on the early province of Asia; they stem from an observation of Louis Robert on what is and is not Roman in Roman Asia Minor,¹ and were written amid the recollection of Robert's kindness, patience, and good humor.

I. Two Villains

The literary sources on the end of the Attalid monarchy offer us some indications concerning the two chief actors, from which vivid portraits have been painted. First, Attalus III (138–33 B.C.), who willed his kingdom to Rome.² He was—we are assured—mad with suspicion, the model of the paranoid tyrant. He passed his time experimenting in chemistry and botany in order to discover new ways to poison his real or imagined enemies, or in practicing the casting of bronze, with an eventually fatal disregard for his health. Isolated and vindictive, he plotted to eliminate anyone he imagined to be a threat to his power. A long decree of Pergamum voting him certain honors after a military victory (*OGIS* 332) has sometimes been read as evidence of his insecurity, immaturity, and megalomania. The credibility of this image has been challenged by several scholars;³ and indeed the case against it is easily made. The inscription just mentioned has suffered from this reputation, as Robert has proved:⁴ the honors are in fact either typical of the age or even rather chaste and conservative on the score of royal cult. And in general, it is not difficult to recognize that Attalus has been the victim of a partisan historian. We can without embarrassment see in this king a successor to the distinguished scientific tradition of the Hellenistic monarchs, especially the Attalids,⁵ a sponsor and practitioner of research; Attalus himself wrote a tract on agriculture, which was much cited.

¹ In *Laodicée du Lycos* (Quebec/Paris 1969) 326, note 5.

² The *locus classicus* is Diod. 34/35.3. See E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamum*² (Ithaca/London 1971) 142–50, and J. Hopp, *Untersuchungen zu den letzten Attaliden*, *Vestigia* 29 (1977) 107–20 (cited hereafter by authors' names), for further references and for bibliography.

³ Thus Hansen and Hopp have each sought in some measure to rehabilitate Attalus' reputation; cf. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950: hereafter "Magie") I 30–31 (the source "some sensation-loving and inimical writer"), and E. R. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome II* (Berkeley 1984) 593.

⁴ *BCH* 108 (1984) 472–89; 109 (1985) 468–81 (esp. 477).

⁵ Already Attalus I (on the giant pine of the Troad, Strab. 13.1.44 [603] with Hansen 405); cf. *FGrH* 234 F10 (Eumenes and the pigs of Assus).

Thus it seems likely that someone in antiquity undertook to portray Attalus as unfit for power and to distort his scholarly and scientific interests accordingly.

Second, Aristonicus, the illegitimate son of Eumenes II who led the resistance to Roman annexation. He, it is alleged, was a social revolutionary, animated by a program: he freed the slaves, founded a utopian city-state Heliopolis on the advice of philosophers, and meant to destroy the propertied classes. His struggle against Roman rule has been classified as a slave war, to be studied (as it was in antiquity) alongside contemporary events in Sicily and the rebellion of Spartacus. He is often met in histories of ideas, under the rubric of utopian theory, especially Stoic and Syrian, and in social histories, for the commentary that his revolutionary program provides on the social fabric of the Hellenistic kingdoms or of the Greco-Roman world.⁶

This portrait has sometimes elicited caution or skepticism, on various arguments—in particular, the freeing of slaves who will fight for the state was a common practice in the ancient world in times of military necessity and need not reflect an ideological program.⁷ Thus for Aristonicus too we may suspect that someone distorted the facts. But what were the facts?

Aristonicus was officially King Eumenes, issuing coins under this name.⁸ Military events—his defeat at sea by the Ephesians and consequent loss of support among the coastal cities—increasingly confined him to the eastern highlands. There he held out, supported by cities like Thyateira and Apollonis, until his defeat at Stratonicea in the upper Caicus valley. As Robert observed, the loyal core of Aristonicus' support was in the eastern highlands of the kingdom. In the cities of this region were many Greek and Macedonian veterans;

⁶ See T. R. S. Broughton in T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* IV (Baltimore 1938) 506–7, and Magie 1037 for older literature; more recently J. Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* (Cambridge, Mass. 1975) 69–73, 93–102; F. C. Thomes, *Rivolta di Aristonico* (Turin 1968); C. Delplace, *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 20–53; Hopp 121–47; Gruen (above, note 3) 597–98.

⁷ J. C. Dumont, *Eirene* 5 (1966) 189–96 (skeptical because Aristonicus was supported by some among the propertied classes, as shown by *OGIS* 338); R. E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford 1983) 85 (because Aristonicus called himself King Eumenes); F. Collins, *AncWorld* 3 (1980) 83–87 (because his supporters were probably recent refugees from Macedonia and therefore anti-Roman). Note too the caution of Magie 1037, and Gruen (above, note 3) 597. On freed slaves see L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie mineure*² (Paris 1962) 261–68; *Fouilles d'Amyzon I* (Paris 1983) 262; cf. *Op.Min.Sel.* I 516–18. See *contra* Vogt (above, note 6) 95–96, who on *OGIS* 338 deduces from the absence of any requirement of military service for gaining citizenship that the policy was forced on Pergamum by Aristonicus' program. On this decree see part III below. Mithridates was credited with a proposal to abolish debts, grant the metics citizenship, and free the slaves (App. *Mithr.* 48); if true at all, this was a late and desperate stance: see B. C. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI* (Leiden 1986) 115–16, 128.

⁸ Robert, *Villes d'Asie mineure*¹ (Paris 1937) 31–40, saw that the coins of a Eumenes are dated by regnal years; E. S. G. Robinson, *NumChron* VI.14 (1954) 1–7, made the attribution to Aristonicus; cf. Robert, *Villes*² (1962) 252–60.

and scattered among the cities were military colonies, the “Macedonians of Doidye” and the like.⁹

To a significant degree, therefore, this was a land dominated not by barbarian peasants but by a Greco-Macedonian ruling class created by the Attalid crown. As a group they may be considered a colonial elite,¹⁰ the bearers of Greek culture and royal authority amid a population of Mysians, Lydians, and Phrygians. The military colonists depended on the king for their privileges, duties, and local authority. They had no future under the will of Attalus III and Roman rule, and their interest surely lay in the preservation of the monarchy. The old Greek cities of the coast had their time-tested means of making friends with the powerful;¹¹ the colonists did not, and they very likely looked upon the great coastal cities, Catullus’ “shining cities of Asia,” as degenerate in culture and time-serving in politics. I suggest that the Macedonians and colonists of this high country were the truest royalists in the kingdom: they had no choice but to stand firm with Aristonicus—with Eumenes III—and what they stood for was the traditional privileges of their order. If modern analogies hold, they are not likely to have been social revolutionaries. The attribution of such a program to Aristonicus and his supporters should be reckoned an item of propaganda.

One might for simplicity conclude that a single author was moved to blacken the memory of both Attalus III and Aristonicus. But the two need separate examination.

The intent of the portrait of Aristonicus is self-evident: it is pro-Roman, an attempt to frighten the prosperous Greek cities of the region with the specter of social revolution and the abolition of slavery. Perhaps it is not accidental that much the same program was attributed in the same year to Tiberius Gracchus in Rome, the utopianism of his Stoic advisor Blossius of Cumae. Blossius in fact is asserted to have gone from Rome to Asia upon Tiberius’ death to become advisor to Aristonicus;¹² and the analogy alleged with the Sicilian slave war¹³

⁹ Robert, *Villes* 36, 76ff, 261–68. The colonies and some of the cities in this region dated by regnal years, consistent with the practice of the kings themselves (*Staatsvertr.* III 481.10–11; *Syll.* 3 627.9; *Royal Corres.* 65–67; the seals *I.Perg.* 641–729, *AthMitt* 27 [1902] 144–45) and in contrast with the eponymous offices typical of many other cities, including Pergamum.

¹⁰ A situation the modern world knows well. The classic Macedonian instance is Dura-Europus: see C. B. Welles, in *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in honor of A. C. Johnson* (Princeton 1951) 251–74, and *Aegyptus* 39 (1959) 23–28.

¹¹ Assessed at Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.16.

¹² Cic. *De amic.* 11.37, Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 20. This claim has aroused skepticism; for the state of the question see E. Badian, *ANRW* I.1 (1972) 679–80. Compare the Roman portrait of Perseus of Macedonia as a demagogue: D. Mendels, *AncSoc* 9 (1978) 55–73.

¹³ τὸ παραπλήσιον at both Diod. 34/35.2.26 and *FGrH* 87 F108b (the excerpta of Constantine X, uncertainly attributed to Posidonius). Athenaeus (272F) knew a monograph “On the Slave Wars,” which he attributed to the Augustan philologist Caecilius, a Jew from Sicily (*FGrH* 183 F1); to judge from the context in Athenaeus, the monograph encompassed at least the second Sicilian war (104–99 B.C.) and the rebellion of Spartacus (73–71).

surely reflects a deliberate feature of the original hostile account of Aristonicus. Some Roman or pro-Roman propagandist must lie behind this portrait of a revolutionary leader and his advisor.

Attalus III, at first blush, looks to have suffered the same treatment as many other last representatives of dynasties. It is their common fate—Nero, Domitian, Commodus, Phocas, Richard III, others—that their histories were written by the usurpers who supplanted them and who had every interest in showing them to have been unfit to rule. With Attalus, however, this explanation may not serve. His successors were the Romans, the beneficiaries of his will. The Attalid kings had been their dogged allies, and at least for public purposes the Romans must have regarded Attalus III as a sensible fellow who did the right thing. The portrait of him, in contrast, shows him precisely as *non compos mentis*: its goal is to undermine the validity of his will. It should therefore derive from the supporters of Aristonicus and the continuation of the monarchy.

If this is so, then it seems that one historian cannot have composed both portraits. This admittedly makes an assumption about the competence and consistency to be expected of an author; and we must reckon with the possibility that conflicting viewpoints are expressed (and may be echoed by later writers) when a historian composes speeches: a pro-Roman author might put an anti-Attalus speech in the mouth of Aristonicus.¹⁴ If nevertheless two rival accounts lie behind our notices on the beginnings of the province of Asia, there may be any number of candidates, including the general tract recorded “On the Slave Wars” (above, note 13); I mention two authors whose writings are known to have been influential.

Artemidorus of Ephesus was a local and nearly contemporary; he may have witnessed some part of the events in question. His geography looms large in the work of Strabo, one of our chief sources on the late Attalids and Aristonicus.¹⁵ According to Artemidorus (Strab. 14.1.26 [642]), “the kings” deprived Artemis of Ephesus of the revenues of her lake Selinusia; the Romans restored these to the goddess, but the publicans then (in or after 123 B.C.) usurped them, until Artemidorus, sent to Rome for the purpose, got them restored once more. Strabo’s account of an inept effort by Attalus II (159–138) to deepen the harbor of Ephesus seems hostile to that king (14.1.24 [641]), and may well derive from Artemidorus of Ephesus. Strabo’s notice, in a topographical excursus, about Daphitas, who was crucified for reviling “the kings,” possibly comes from Artemidorus (14.1.39 [647]). These passages seem unfriendly to the Attalid house: therefore perhaps pro-Roman, discrediting the competence of the Attalid dynasty generally. But it is conceivable—though improbable—that Artemidorus disparaged the more recent kings while portraying Eumenes III as the restorer of proper kingly rule.

¹⁴ Cf. the anti-Roman speech that Posidonius attributed to Athenion at Athens (*FGRH* 87 F36), or Sallust’s letter of Mithridates (*Hist. fr.* IV.69)

¹⁵ Strab. 14.1.38 (646). For his use of Artemidorus see W. Aly, *Strabon von Amaseia* (Bonn 1957) 498 s.v.

Posidonius of Apamea, teacher to prosperous Romans in the age of Sulla, certainly canvassed these events in his *History*, and surely in a way friendly to Rome, to judge from what survives of his account of the Mithridatic war. He dealt extensively with the slave war in Sicily in the 130s and with the program of Tiberius Gracchus. He was much used by Diodorus, our other major extant source on the end of the Attalids. Constantine's excerptors may reflect Posidonius when they draw an analogy between the Sicilian war and that of Aristonicus, and thus the same expression in Diodorus (above, note 13) may derive from Posidonius. We know that he described the crucifixion of Daphidas (Cic. *Fat.* 3.5), and this may have occurred under Attalus III. But no certain fragment of Posidonius alludes to the end of the kingdom and the war of Aristonicus, so that the thrust of his presentation can only be surmised.¹⁶

That there was some account favorable to Aristonicus seems clear from the summary notice of Justin (36.4.1–5), which criticizes both Attalus III and the first Roman governor Licinius, but praises the competence and popularity of Aristonicus and says nothing of a revolutionary program.¹⁷ No certainty seems possible about the ultimate sources on the last two Attalids. It seems enough here to conclude that our portrait of Aristonicus is no more trustworthy than that of Attalus III; we should suspect that in reality Attalus was a scientist and scholar, Aristonicus a defender of the monarchy and its traditional order.

II. The Artists of Dionysus

At the beginning of Roman Asia, a city in the Caicus valley had good cause to celebrate the wisdom of its treaty of alliance with Rome, to which, the citizens declare, they have adhered loyally through the dangers of the war against Aristonicus (*Syll.*³ 694, found re-used at Klissekoi near the coast); they now vote elaborate celebrations to mark the dedication of the bronze plaques on which the treaty is to be inscribed. After long uncertainty, the identity of this city was established definitively by Robert: not Pergamum, but Elaea on the coast, the valley's major port.¹⁸ The chief proof is that the patron divinities of the city are Demeter and Kore, prominent on the coins of Elaea but virtually unknown in Pergamene evidence. To Robert's arguments I would add only the reverse of the same point, that we know very well who was the divine patron of Pergamum: it was Athena Nicephorus¹⁹, and no Pergamene can ever have spoken of the Eleusinian goddesses as [ταῖς π]ροκαθημέναις [θε]αῖς τῆς

¹⁶ *FGrH* 87 FF1–27; frs.53–78 E.–K.; cf. K. von Fritz, in *Historiographia Antiqua* (Louvain 1977) 179–87. See J. Fontenrose, *TAPA* 91 (1960) 93, on the version of the Daphidas story reported by Posidonius; this may be from his *De fato*.

¹⁷ The brief notice at Florus 1.35.4 (also omitting any social program) might be taken to indicate royalist sentiment in behalf of Aristonicus: "Aristonicus, regii sanguinis ferox iuvenis, urbis regibus parere consuetas partim facile sollicitat, paucas resistentis...vi recepit."

¹⁸ *BCH* 108 (1984), 489–96.

¹⁹ E. Ohlmutz, *Die Kulte und Heiligtümer der Götter in Pergamon* (Giessen 1940) 16–59.

πόλεως ἡμ[ῶν] (lines 50–51). These words alone ought from the first to have excluded attribution of this decree to Pergamum.

In Elaea the Artists of Dionysus, the professional guild of musical and theatrical performers, play a major political role: upon dedicating the plaques the officials will pray that the treaty will endure forever, ἐπ' ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ τε [ἡμε]τέρου δήμου καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ τοῦ κοι[νοῦ] τῶν περὶ τὸν Καθ[ηγεμό]να Διόνυσον τε[χ]νιτῶν (44–47). The presence of the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon, the Pergamene branch of the Ionian/Hellespontine guild, had been one reason for attributing the decree to Pergamum. As Robert saw (invoking Strabo), the Artists have simply made another of their several moves, abandoning Pergamum for Elaea. Strabo gives this account of the Ionian/Hellespontine guild: formerly they lived at Teos, but *stasis* arose and they fled to Ephesus; Attalus²⁰ next settled them at Myonnesus between Teos and Lebedos; the Teans later appealed to the Romans to prevent the Artists from fortifying Myonnesus;²¹ finally they moved to Lebedos, which was in need of population and welcomed them, and where they were in Strabo's day.²² Thus at the transition from Attalid to Roman rule the Asian Artists were headquartered at Myonnesus.

Elaea does not enter Strabo's account. The decree of Elaea, however, speaks only of the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon—that is, not the Ionian/Hellespontine guild as a whole but the Pergamene branch, founded by the Attalids and added to the original guild so as to form (when it met as a whole) the κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπ' Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Καθηγεμόνα Διόνυσον. The enlarged guild, so named, survived the monarchy and is attested as late as the 80s B.C.²³ though thereafter it is found only with its original title of Ionian/Hellespontine. Our decree invokes only the Pergamene branch; Elaea is therefore not to be added to Strabo's list of the guild's movements, which concerns the Asian guild as a whole.

Thus it is this branch, the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon, that has moved from Pergamum to Elaea. Can this move be explained? I take one

²⁰ II or III, in effect the years 159 to 133 B.C.

²¹ The fortification, by some faction, of a site on the territory is a well-known problem in Greek civic life: cf. L. and J. Robert, *JourSav* 1976, 153–235, and note 56 below; K. Rigsby, *REG* 99 (1986) 356–59. Myonnesus had been part of the territory of Teos in the fifth century (Thuc. 3.32.1) and apparently still was in the 130s. The fortunes of this headland (off which the Romans defeated Antiochus' fleet in 190) may well be more complex, but the poor estate of Hellenistic Lebedos, repeatedly the object of refoundation (cf. *Royal Corres.* 3–4; Paus. 1.9.7, 7.3.5; *I. Magn.* 53.79–81) makes it unlikely that its territory ever was expanded at the expense of Teos so as to include Myonnesus.

²² 14.1.29 (643). Plutarch (*Ant.* 57) says that Antony, after his great celebration on Samos in winter 33/2, in gratitude to the Artists for their services gave them Priene as a place to live. Strabo does not mention this; presumably the gift was not taken up before Actium and was cancelled thereafter.

²³ Sherk, *Roman Documents* 49. After this we do not hear of the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon, although the cult of Dionysus Cathegemon survived at Pergamum into Imperial times: *I. Perg.* 317–20.

principle as basic: the Artists will not have left the great city of Pergamum, with its literary culture, its widely patronized gymnasium,²⁴ and its spectacular theater, for some superior attraction at little Elaea. Rather, they were expelled from Pergamum, and in consequence had to use their considerable resources to prevail upon the Elaeans to take them in. What wants explaining is that expulsion.

Scholars have blamed the Artists themselves for their impermanence, regarding them as troublesome and sometimes invoking the several ancient testimonies to the low moral character of theater people—which is perhaps a different matter.²⁵ The sort of trouble the guild might cause a civic government is known to us from the efforts of the Attalid kings to adjudicate the dispute between the Artists and their host city Teos; the control and financing of festivals had been one source of conflict there (*Royal Corres.* 53). It seems clear, moreover, that the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon were closely linked with the Attalid royal house. The best evidence is the series of letters, in the last years of the dynasty, revealing that the priest of the god was appointed by and served at the pleasure of the king.²⁶ How might the guild have been viewed by the Pergamenes upon the end of the dynasty?

The date of Elaea's decree must fall within a fairly narrow range, as has always been obvious. Among the most self-referential of Greek inscriptions, the decree has no function other than to provide for the inscribing of the treaty with Rome and for celebrations on the now-to-be sacred day of the dedication of those bronze plaques. The Elaeans had the foresight to cast their lot with Rome during the war—and perhaps not at its very start; for the Romans have only now accepted the alliance, and it is with evident relief that the Elaeans vote to inscribe the treaty. The first Roman land forces reached Asia in 131 B.C.; I should guess that Elaea sided with Rome only after Aristonicus' defeat at sea (132?).²⁷ The Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon apparently were still at Pergamum as late as 135, when we find Attalus III making provision there for their priest. Pergamum seems to have sided with Rome almost at once, for already in 132 Nasica and the commission of five operated from there.²⁸ The natural inference is that in the course of the war itself, the Pergamenes found it expedient to rid themselves of the Artists. By the time of our decree, they had established themselves at Elaea.

I suggest that this expulsion resulted not from any turbulence on the part of the Artists, but from their special relationship with the dynasty. Created by the king, their priest a royal courtier, they may well have been regarded as an embarrassment by the city of Pergamum as it cultivated the goodwill of

²⁴ See Robert, *Villes* 51–52, for references

²⁵ On the guild expressly, [Arist.] *Pr.* 856b (πονηροί, φαυλότης); quoted by Gellius 20.4. Cf. Welles, *Royal Corres.* p. 232.

²⁶ *Royal Corres.* 65–67, though admittedly the Artists are not mentioned here, only their god. Cf. L. Robert, *BCH* 1984, 495–96, note 41.

²⁷ See *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 47, note 31.

²⁸ E.g. Vogt (above, note 6) 99. The date of the s.c. *Roman Documents* 11 from Pergamum is disputed; see most recently Gruen (above, note 3) 604 (129 B.C.); E. Badian, *LCM* 11 (1986) 14–16 (132 B.C.).

Rome—seen as royalists in the midst of a war waged against enemies one of whose goals (perhaps their primary and avowed goal, as argued above) was to continue the monarchy. At a new city the Artists might honestly make a new beginning, doubtless ridding themselves of their old priest in order to demonstrate a break with the royal past. If this is so, the inscription testifies to the maneuverings of the cities during the war, as they worked to side with the winner. Pergamum, the great city, felt safer without the Artists; little Elaea acquired a potentially embarrassing guest, but succeeded in winning Roman friendship—and not easily, if we may judge from their extravagant response to Roman approval.

III. A Grant of Citizenship

A famous inscription found a century ago in the theater of Pergamum displays a legal decision made at the beginning of Roman rule in Asia Minor. Attalus has died and in his will left the city free and added to its territory; the will must be ratified by Rome. For the sake of the common security, citizenship is granted to various subordinated groups because they have steadfastly maintained their loyalty to the people: to *paroikoi*, soldiers, Macedonians and Mysians, troops stationed at different places in the territory (the Fortress and the Old City), Masdyenians, their assistants, their families; freedmen and royal and civic slaves are to be promoted to the status of *paroikoi*.²⁹

The importance of this text hardly needs stressing. One of our richest testimonies on the social make-up of a Hellenistic city, it might serve to illustrate the peculiarity of a royal capital, mixed in populace and heavily militarized;³⁰ or to illustrate the paranoia of Attalus III, as having surrounded himself with foreign mercenaries out of distrust of the Pergamenes (cf. Diod. 34/35.3); but above all it has been invoked to illustrate how the Pergamenes competed with Aristonicus' revolutionary program by granting privileges to the unenfranchized.³¹ We might rather deduce from the decree that the war is over and the victor certain, for ostensibly the unenfranchized are being rewarded for

²⁹ *I.Perg* 249 [OGIS 338; Michel, *Rec.* 518; *IGR* IV 289]; cf. L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 251, 265. In support of the restoration πολε[ιτικῆ] γ[εν]ήν in line 6 (Niese, *Geschichte* III 368, note 1) see Polyb. 6.45.3, where χώρα πολιτική = the more common γῆ δημοσία, and now the letter of Antiochus III exempting Sardes from the 5% tax ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν (γῆν or χώραν, I take it; in G. M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times* [Cambridge/London 1983] fig. 169 and p. 111). Land given by a king to a city would certainly have begun there as public land, whatever the city then did with it.

³⁰ Allen (above, note 7) 93, cf. 177, reckons that the Masdyenian and other military settlements were on Pergamene territory but stood "outside civic life."

³¹ So for example Vogt (above, note 6: 94–96), "It is obvious (and accepted by all commentators) that Pergamum was in a desperate situation"; cf. Broughton (above, note 6) 507, Magie 149, Hansen 152, Gruen (above, note 3) 596–97. This interpretation of the text was first made by U. Wilcken, *RE* 2 (1895) 963 s.v. "Aristonikos" (14).

past loyalty.³² However this may be, a more mundane concern is prompted by the first line.

This decree is dated by the eponymous priest: ἐπὶ ἱερέως Μενεστρά[του τ]οῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου, μηνὸς Εὐμενείου ἑννεακαιδεκάτη. About the institutions of Pergamum we are not ill informed: the eponymous magistrate was the prytanis.³³ The inconsistency has not caused serious concern, for scholars have been content to repeat Fränkel's observation that a second decree of Pergamum also exhibits an eponymous priest.³⁴ The theory here is that two swallows make a spring. Perhaps so, if the swallows are in tandem. These, however, are separated by more than a century, the other decree dating under Eumenes I (263–241 B.C.); in between come texts dated by the usual prytanis.³⁵ So we should have to postulate not just two events but four: the decisions to change from prytanis to priest and then to change back again, then those same two decisions repeated more than a century later—none with an evident reason. Or we must admit in two official documents an unaccountable indifference to ordinary usage.

In fact, the decree under Eumenes I does not include a date in its preliminaries. The king has written to Pergamum praising the out-going *strategoi* for their administration; the Pergamenes respond by voting to crown them at the Panathenaia, "and henceforth the treasurers appointed annually for the Eumeneia" are to give them a sheep for sacrifice (31ff.: ἀεὶ οἱ ταμίαι οἱ κατιστάμενοι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τοῖς Εὐμενείοις); the inscribing of the present act is to be overseen by τοὺς ταμίας τοὺς ἐφ' ἱερέως Ἀρκέοντος (36ff.). I suggest that this last phrase is not chronological but bureaucratic. The treasurers in this inscription are elaborately specified in order to distinguish them from the annually-elected treasurers of the city, the ταμίαι pure and

³² Contrast in the Mithridatic war, Ephesus' grant of citizenship or legal immunity to various classes of persons if they take up arms and face the danger (*Syll.* ³ 742; *I.Ephesos* 8). The fact that our city makes no such promise confirmed for Vogt (above, note 6) 55, 95–96, that the policy was forced on it by the social program of Aristonicus (for the conclusion that the war is over cf. Magie 1037). Many have felt that our decree is quite early, probably 133, for Rome has not yet "ratified the will" of Attalus (see Magie 149 with references). I would assume, however, that the "confirmation" for which our city is waiting, and preparing, concerns the relevant specifics—freedom and the added land. Such details surely were not ratified until the organization of the province, and could not be enacted while the war was in progress and the behavior of the many cities remained to be assessed.

³³ Note in particular *I.Perg.* 254.7, τῷ πρυτανικῷ καὶ ἐπων[ύμῳ τέλει] (I B.C.?). I pass over the coins of Imperial date, which show a number of magistrates, most often a strategos but occasionally a priest; the randomness of usage here, by contrast with the eponymous prytanis of Imperial inscriptions, shows that these men are not eponymous but rather oversaw the issue of coins.

³⁴ *I.Perg.* 18 [*OGIS* 267], with Fränkel's remarks on p. 5; cf. Dittenberger, *OGIS* 238, note 1; Welles, *Royal Corres.* 23 (p. 112); Hansen 189, note 147; Hopp 131, note 49.

³⁵ E.g. Welles, *Royal Corres.* 48 (Eumenes II).

simple, often met in Pergamene texts.³⁶ The treasurers mentioned twice here are by contrast identified as those who serve at the festival of the Eumeneia: surely this was their one function, and they probably did not serve an entire year. After this general identification for the future (ἀεί), those currently serving are designated as “the treasurers under the priest Arceon,” presumably the priest of the royal cult in this year, who would preside over the festival. In this context, the phrase indicates the authority to whom these treasurers of the Eumeneia, unlike the ταμίαι of the city as a whole, are subject; it is not a date.

We have potentially better evidence that Pergamum might date an act by a priest, of which Fränkel could have only a dim idea, as the gymnasium of Pergamum had not yet been excavated. But this too proves illusory. Ephebic lists and other texts from the gymnasium usually begin with a date “in the year of the prytanis and priest X,” and then (often) name the hierarchy of the gymnasium.³⁷ Exceptions are found, ephebic lists that begin “in the year of the prytanis X, the priest Y,” etc.³⁸ From this material we learn not that the eponym of Pergamum might be a priest, but that the annual prytanis normally, but not invariably, also held the priesthood that was the senior rank among the gymnasium supervisors. This addition of a priest to the dating formula is a peculiarity of texts pertaining to the gymnasium. But no Pergamene text, even from the gymnasium, is dated by a priest alone. Several decrees for gymnasiarchs are dated at the head with the usual ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως X, but in the course of the text use the formula “serving in the year of priest X.”³⁹ Here again we have a bureaucratic indication, the authority pertinent to the gymnasium, which can serve as a date only in this special context; and even

³⁶ Recall the many boards of treasurers found in Athens (cf. M. H. Hansen, *GRBS* 21 [1980] 61–63). Allen (above, note 7) 167, note 34, who like others does not distinguish the ταμίαι of this inscription, deduces from κατιστάμενοι that Pergamene treasurers were appointed by the king. But the verb is colorless as regards how one obtained office (especially the formula with ἀεί, e.g. *Syll.*³ 578.54); at Athens it is applied to both elected and allotted magistrates.

³⁷ Ephebic lists and decrees for gymnasiarchs: *AthMitt* 32 (1907) 279, 285, 415ff.; 33 (1908) 376, 380; 35 (1910) 401. Fränkel could know only *I.Perg.* 254 [*IGR* IV 290] and 466. Allen (above, note 7) 161–65, adds confusion, claiming a “sacral significance” for the prytanis and an “identification of priest and prytanis.”

³⁸ *AthMitt* 32 (1907) 432 no. 284.

³⁹ *AthMitt* 33 (1908) 376 and 380. For such secondary “eponyms,” functional in the context, see Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* I 567; *Mélanges Isidore Levy* (Brussels 1955) 557; *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Paris 1966) 14. At late Hellenistic Ephesus, for example, the eponymous prytanis served also as agonothete of the Dionysia (*I.Ephesos* 9), which does not make the agonothete the eponym of Ephesus. An extreme case is a decree of the Athenian council concerning the Amphiaracum which, when inscribed at the temple, was stripped of its official heading and “dated” instead by the priest of Amphiaracum: D. Knoepfler, *Chiron* 16 (1986) 72. There is nothing in the content of our citizenship decree to invite a secondary or “false” eponym.

this formula is sometimes expanded to “in the year of the prytanis and priest X.”⁴⁰

Three texts from the gymnasium are exceptional in being dated by regnal years; these are worth a digression. Our earliest ephebic list is dated by the fourteenth year of Attalus II (147/6 B.C.). Several scholars have taken it to show that at Pergamum ephebes were inducted at the age of fifteen; some have gone on to argue that, as it is dedicated to prince Attalus (III), it reveals the year of his birth, if we may assume that he was himself one of the ephebes.⁴¹ None of this will stand. The list is introduced thus:

βασιλεύοντος Ἀττάλου Φιλαδέλφου καὶ Εὐεργέτου τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτου ἔτους, παιδονομούντων (κ.τ.λ.: four men), οἱ ἐκκριθέντες ἐκ τῶν παίδων εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους εἰς τὸ πεντεκαίδεκάτον ἔτος, γυμνασιαρχοῦντος Ἡρακλέωνος τοῦ Μενεκράτου, Ἀττάλῳ Βασιλέως Εὐμένου· (names)

This is not how one would state that the boys inducted were aged fifteen (e.g., ἐκ τῶν παίδων τῶν πεντεκαίδεκαετέων). The Greek says simply, “In the fourteenth year of King Attalus, under the *paidonomoi* (etc.), those selected from among the boys into the ephebic corps for the fifteenth year, under gymnasiarch Heracleon...” This “fifteenth year” is not an age but another regnal date, the up-coming year (146/5); the new recruits are making a dedication to prince Attalus before their year begins, on the occasion of their selection in 147/6 (hence, I take it, ἐκκριθέντες rather than the ἐγκριθέντες of the usual ephebic lists). Another fragment from the gymnasium in the time of the kings is rigorously parallel in its formulas, though details are lost.⁴² Finally, a third text, of uncertain character but concerned with education, also appears to use a regnal date: with a group of girls victorious in some competition are mentioned the “prytanis and the priests serving with him, in the thirty-eighth year” (203 or 159 B.C.).⁴³ The kings, at Pergamum as elsewhere in the Hellenistic world, took a special interest in the gymnasium.⁴⁴ As the two anomalous lists derive from future inductees, making a dedication of their own, rather than from current ephebes marshalled for graduation, perhaps the royal house played a special role in the selection ceremony and these lists are dated accordingly, after which the

⁴⁰ *AthMitt* 35 (1910) 402.

⁴¹ *AthMitt* 29 (1904) 170–73 no. 14; this interpretation derives from J. Sensie, in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Charles Moeller* (Louvain 1914) 18, note 3; developed by Hansen 392, 473; Hopp 25. On educational age groups see M. P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule* (Munich 1955) 34–42 (39 on Pergamum, but not using this inscription).

⁴² *AthMitt* 32 (1907) 423 no. 272. Note the decree honoring a gymnasiarch with mention of ἐκκρισις (id. p. 279).

⁴³ *AthMitt* 37 (1912) 277, πρυτανήα [μετὰ τῶν σ]υγχορηματιζόντων ἀ[ντ]ῶν ἱερέων ἔτους τρ[ια]κοστοῦ καὶ ὀγδόου.

⁴⁴ Hansen 390–95. Cf. M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques II* (Paris 1950) 813–74, on the gymnasium and military life. On the gymnasium and royal cult see Nilsson (above, note 41) 71–75; J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* (Paris 1960) 342–46.

civic institution, the gymnasium with its own usages, came into play. However this may be, it is enough here to repeat that at Pergamum no document is dated by a priest alone.

From Imperial times we have a fragment of an historical narrative by the Pergamenes, which mentions a constitutional matter: in the fourth century B.C. "Archis [persuaded the city] to [elect] prytaneis annually, and Archis was the first prytanis, and from him until now there have been prytaneis in office."⁴⁵ We have seen no good reason to doubt them: Pergamum had always used the prytanis as its eponymous magistrate; and the heading of our citizenship decree must therefore be reckoned a grave problem.

Furthermore, this decree is our sole attestation of a month "Eumeneius" at any city—hence a *non liquet*: but no other month at Pergamum is named for a king. In fact, the known calendar of Pergamum is already rather crowded,⁴⁶ and there is little room to posit months named for Attalus and Philetaerus as well. It happens that no city anywhere (ours apart) is on record naming a month for an Attalid. Such an unusual honor might best be expected at a city actually founded by the dynasty (and these are poorly documented), which Pergamum of course was not. Perhaps too we might wonder that the Pergamenes should have been so eager to add to their citizenry in the same years in which they found it convenient to expell the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon (section II).

The conclusion must be that the citizenship decree was not voted by Pergamum but by some other city of the former kingdom. Two possibilities then exist: either the stone is a *pierre errante*, brought up onto the citadel of Pergamum during one of the many building enterprises of Imperial or later date, and its author probably was one of the small cities nearby in the Caicus valley; or some city in the new Roman province decided to inscribe a public act of substantial importance at Pergamum as well as at home, and the city might be anywhere in the former kingdom. I can cite no good parallel for either situation. A physical fact about the stone, however, suggests that it is a *pierre errante* and thus from the neighborhood of Pergamum: we have the top margin, and there is no heading to identify the author; unless we postulate that one was once painted on, this stone probably was meant to stand in the city that passed the decree. The importance of Masdyenians here, moreover, points to the same conclusion, a city in the Caicus valley rather than some more distant quarter of the kingdom; for Masdyenians are the most numerous of the non-Pergamenes represented in the ephebic lists of Pergamum and certainly dwelt in this vicinity.⁴⁷

A different item in the text must now come into play. Our city stands in a certain relation to an "Old City": the troops stationed ἐν [τῇ πόλει τῇ]

⁴⁵ OGIS 264 (FGrH 506); cf. IG XII.2 243, τὰν ἐπώνυμον ἀπὸ βασιλέων πρυτανηία[v].

⁴⁶ References at A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Munich 1972) 125–27, with E. Boehringer, *Alt. Perg.* IX (1937) 79–81; cf. Hansen 470.

⁴⁷ See Robert, *Villes* 52, *Études anat.* 155. For the opposite journey, see IGR IV 1243, a statue base originally at Pergamum but discovered in the necropolis of Thyateira forty miles up-country.

ἀρχαία (15–16) will receive citizenship. Dittenberger realized long ago that this is an impossible situation for Pergamum, which has always occupied the citadel on which we see it today;⁴⁸ he gave up the oddity in despair, not thinking to question the attribution of the decree. In fact ἀρχαία πόλις denotes a distinct city, as opposed to παλαιὰ πόλις, a former site now reduced, as a result of a relocation of the city-center, to being a village on the territory. And yet our city has the authority to extend citizenship rights at the Old City. This can only mean that our city shares in a sympolity with another of the same name, as did for example Colophon and Old Colophon. If Pergamum ever had such a colleague, our rich evidence would not have failed to produce more substantial evidence of the fact.⁴⁹

These then are the criteria for identifying the author of the decree: the city must date its acts by a priest, must be linked in sympolity with a homonymous Old City, and probably is in or near the Caicus valley. Any number of cities might fit this description—our knowledge of civic life in this region is most incomplete. Two are known to have had an old and a new site (whatever their legal relation). To the south of the familiar Atarneus on the coast stood a second Atarneus, obscure and a bone of contention among several Hellenistic cities—but conceivably independent and linked to the other Atarneus in the second century B.C.⁵⁰ The eponymous magistrate of Atarneus is not known; but this city is perhaps less likely in that Mysians and Masdyenians and Macedonian colonists would be expected up-country rather than on the coast. Gambreum, three hours up the valley from Pergamum, is more promising; in 400 B.C. one Gorgion was tyrant of both Gambreum and Palaegambreum (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.6). The eponym of Gambreum, however, was a *stephanephoros*:⁵¹ we should have to postulate a change in the constitution to assign the citizenship decree here.

Another candidate is possible, Stratonicea in the upper Caicus, for there is reason to think that it too had a double site. Some ephebic lists of Pergamum derive from the late second and first centuries B.C., thus spanning the last Attalids and the early province. The gymnasium of Pergamum attracted foreigners from the vicinity—citizens of the small cities of the Caicus, settlers

⁴⁸ But for one interruption in the fourth century B.C.: the Pergamene Chronicle (*OGIS* 264) shows the satrap Orontes restoring the Pergamenes “to our former city,” [εἰς] τὴν πα[λαι]ὰν πόλιν; Dittenberger (*OGIS* 338, note 15) saw that this must be the citadel itself, after a temporary expulsion, with no bearing on the Old City of our citizenship decree. On usage see Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* II 1237–38: παλαιὰ πόλις is a former site and part of the territory, ἀρχαία an existing and distinct city of the same name; a neat instance is Strab. 10.1.10 (448).

⁴⁹ The nearest thing is a slight fragment of a Roman decision on boundaries in the region of Pergamum, with - - -] ἀρχαίας εἰς τ[- - -, perhaps - - - πόλεως] ἀρχαίας: Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* I 613.

⁵⁰ Strab. 13.1.67 (614), cf. Hdt. 1.160 (with Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* I 481, note 6), Paus. 4.35.10, 7.2.11, Plin. *HN* 5.32.122.

⁵¹ *Syll.*³ 1219.28 (Hellenistic but not closely dated); cf. *Hermes* 116 (1988) 000–00.

in the τόποι up-country, resident Romans.⁵² In these lists occur our only Hellenistic references to Stratonicea: in two lists, several men are designated simply Στρατονικεύς; but in one of these two lists and again in another, we find also a Στρατονικεύς τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰνδαιπεδίου.⁵³ This last specification served, as Robert saw, to “distinguish it from homonymous cities”; presumably he was thinking of the famous Stratonicea, in Caria.⁵⁴ I would guess, however, that a man from the Caicus valley, among Pergamenes and others from the valley, will have added this specification not because there was a Stratonicea 130 miles distant in Caria but because there was yet another Stratonicea in the immediate vicinity—that is, that distinct Stratoniceas are represented in the two usages of the ephobic lists.

That Stratonicea stood in a sympolity relationship with another city was the chief among the discoveries of Robert’s chapter on this place. His deductions concerned the Imperial period, when the other city was called the Ἰνδαιπεδιάται.⁵⁵ I suggest that that city may have begun as another Stratonicea, the Στρατονικεῖς τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰνδαιπεδίου of two of the ephobic lists, and that from its creation it stood in sympolity with the original Stratonicea. A parallel, recently recognized, is Amyzon in Caria versus the derivative and short-lived Amyzon τῶν ἀπὸ Πέτρας.⁵⁶

I mean only to argue a possibility. No one will doubt the fragility of a hypothesis that the Stratonicea and the Stratonicea of Indeipedia of the ephobic lists were distinct cities. What, for the sake of argument, would be the implications of assigning the citizenship decree here?

Stratonicea was at modern Siledik; but it used as eponym the prytanis,⁵⁷ and cannot be author of our decree. The “Indeipediae” of Imperial date probably held the valley of modern Gelembe below Siledik; they, Stratonicea of Indeipedia on this theory, must be the author. Thus the original city had the uncompounded name Stratonicea; and it is referred to simply as the “Old City” by its offshoot Stratonicea of Indeipedia. Stratonicea is widely suspected to be an Attalid foundation, like its neighbor Apollonis;⁵⁸ hence the month

⁵² See Robert, *Villes* 52-53. Allen (above, note 7) 92-93, 176, believes that the τόποι were on Pergamene territory.

⁵³ *AthMitt* 35 (1910) 422 no. 11 Στρατονικεύς τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰνδαιπεδίου (with Hepding’s comments, 424); 32 (1907) 443 no. 319.3 [- - - Στρα]τονικεύς, .7 [- - - Στρατο]νικεύς (both complete on the right); 446 no. 328.1 [- - - Στρα]τον[ικεύς], 4 [- - - Στρατονικεύς τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰ]νδαιπεδίου].

⁵⁴ We hear elsewhere of a Stratonice in the Chalcidice (Ptol. 3.12.9) and a Stratonicea in Mesopotamia (Plin. *HN* 6.118), each attested only once (*RE* 4A [1931] 318).

⁵⁵ He sought a pre-Imperial testimony in one of the ephobic lists (*AthMitt* 1907, 446 no. 328.5), urging the restoration Ἰνδαιπ[ε]διάτη[ς] (*Villes* 54). This is uncertain, as such endings are numerous in Anatolia, cf. the Midapedeitai in the Caicus valley (*Villes* 79); this list, moreover, includes also a “Stratonicean from Indeipedia” and perhaps a “Stratonicean” (above, note 53).

⁵⁶ J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d’Amyzon* 277-80.

⁵⁷ Michel, *Recueil* 643 (I B.C.), with Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* III 1583-86.

⁵⁸ See Robert, *Villes* 255-60, on the origins of Stratonicea and Apollonis.

"Eumeneius," attested at the derivative city. The ethnography would be suitable: Mysians, Masdyenians, and Macedonian settlers played a major role in the life of this eastern end of the Caicus.

This is the region that stood with Aristonicus, and in fact it was at "Stratonicea"⁵⁹ that he was captured. Concerning the war and the Roman victory, our city exhibits a reticence quite uncharacteristic of cities that sided with Rome, as Pergamum had done. These, once the issue was settled, are found to trumpet their loyalty to Rome during the "war against Aristonicus";⁶⁰ surely the Pergamenes, who joined Rome early and had a valid claim, would have done likewise if this were their decree.⁶¹ Here, by contrast, the Romans are mentioned only because they must ratify Attalus' will; the lower classes are now enfranchised because they have maintained loyalty to the city—in what circumstances it is not said. Our city apparently can make no claim to have served Rome; we may suspect that it had been a partisan of Aristonicus. If this is "Stratonicea of Indeipedia," the cause is lost and the date is as late as 130 B.C. The enfranchisement of the lower classes would suggest that such constitutional largesse had not happened under a revolutionary program of Aristonicus—a program we have seen reason to doubt.

But a positive attribution of the decree is doubtful in the extreme; it is a beginning to argue the exclusion of Pergamum and the conditions to be met by a new assignment.

IV. *Caput Asiae*

Which city was the capital of Republican Asia?⁶² No one denies that the capital in Imperial times was Ephesus. For the Republic, however, some scholars say Pergamum, and recently it has been argued that a passage of Cassius Dio shows that Augustus made the change from Pergamum to Ephesus

⁵⁹ Thus briefly Eutrop. 4.20 (*apud Stratonice civitatem*) and Oros. 5.10.5. These same passages are also our only testimony to the fact that the consul Perperna died at Pergamum; evidently a fairly detailed source lies behind the two.

⁶⁰ The newest example of a post-war decree comes from Gordus: H. Malay and G. Petzl, *EpigrAnat* 3 (1984) 157–65. The editors are rightly surprised to find this Mysian city on the Roman side. But it is not certain that Gordus supported the Romans, only that the man they now honor had: "by taking a leading role in the war against Aristonicus and going on embassies in the public interest he preserved the people..." ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀριστόνικον ἐνστάντι πολέμῳ πρωταγῶ[νιστῶν καὶ π]ρεσβεύων περὶ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων συνεφ[ύλαξ]εν τὸν δῆμον [ἐν εὐνοίᾳ πρὸς Ῥ]ωμαίο[υς] (the editors are understandably uneasy about the last phrase, which seems unparalleled).

⁶¹ Nor was truthfulness necessary; note the Ephesians' elaborate pretense of having been loyal to Rome even though they sided for a time with Mithridates: see above, note 32.

⁶² For the expression cf. Caes. *Bel.Hisp.* 3.1 on Corduba: *eius provinciae caput*.

soon after Actium.⁶³ A question of Roman policy is at stake; it seems useful to survey the evidence or potential evidence.

In 133/2 a senatorial commission was sent to Asia to inspect Rome's inheritance; they established themselves at Pergamum. The famous member, Scipio Nasica, murderer of Tiberius Gracchus, soon died; a monument of his survives there. A copy of the senate's decree to take up the bequest, passed probably in 133 or 132, is inscribed at Pergamum.⁶⁴ Perperna, consul in 130, after defeating Aristonicus, made a thank-offering at Pergamum and invited the cities to attend games and a sacrifice there: ἀποδίδοντος δὲ χαριστήρια ἐν [τῇ] Περγαμηνῶν πόλει καὶ γράψαντος πρὸς τὸν δῆμον [Priene] ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡμελλε συντελεῖν ἀγώνων τε καὶ θυσιῶν (*I.Priene* 108.223–30). He died in Pergamum in 129 (Eutrop. 4.20, Oros. 5.10.5).

At Ephesus in the 90s B.C. (though this date is uncertain) a slave of M. Aurelius Scaurus, quaestor of Asia (*quaestor in Epheso*, Cicero calls him), took refuge in the temple of Artemis. When Scaurus attempted to extract the slave, he was prevented, it seems forcibly, by an Ephesian magistrate Pericles. Pericles was brought to Rome to be tried for this wrong.⁶⁵

When at rest in western Asia, Mithridates seems to have resided at Pergamum.⁶⁶ As to Ephesus, he made the father of his favorite wife ἐπίσκοπος Ἐφεσίων (App. *Mith.* 48), a royal *epistates* in the Hellenistic manner. After the re-establishment of Roman rule, Ephesus was punished with special harshness for its servility to Mithridates; but it was here that Sulla held court to judge the καππαδοκίσαντες of the recaptured province (*Mith.* 61), and here that Lucullus held games commemorating his own victories (Plut. *Luc.* 23.1). In the years after Sulla, the *Koinon* of Asia is found holding a meeting at Ephesus (*I.Aphrod.* 5.5)—dubious testimony, since at least in later times the site rotated (in 9 B.C. at Smyrna, *Roman Documents* 65.D.41). In 75 Caesar set out from Miletus to avenge himself on his pirate captors. After capturing them, he had them imprisoned at Pergamum and went to the governor to demand justice; when the governor temporized, Caesar returned to Pergamum and carried out his own justice (Plut. *Caes.* 2.6–7): thus the governor was not in Pergamum at the time.

⁶³ To cite only a great name, H. Dessau, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* II.2 (Berlin 1930) 580, thought Pergamum probably the capital, invoking in evidence the fact that Mithridates, once victorious, resided there. The argument from Dio: D. Knibbe, *RE* Suppl. 12 (1970) 263; cf. Knibbe and W. Alzinger, *ANRW* II. 7.2 (1980) 759.

⁶⁴ Cic. *Flac.* 75, Val. Max. 5.3.2e, Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 21; *ILLRP* I² 333. The s.c.: Sherk, *Roman Documents* 11; see most recently Badian (above, note 28) 14–16 (date in 132).

⁶⁵ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.63, 85; on the problem of the identity and date of Scaurus see G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (Toronto 1973) 79–82; and Broughton, *MRR* III 32, cf. 212. A Pericles was mint magistrate at Ephesus in 58/7 B.C.: B. V. Head, *NumChron* n.s. 20 (1880) 156.

⁶⁶ Plut. *Luc.* 3.4, *Sul.* 11.1–2, 23.4, *Mor.* 259A; cf. T. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator* (Paris 1890) 147–48.

Cicero twice sums up the province in a sentence, each time beginning with Pergamum: in 70 B.C., "Pergamum, Cyzicum, Miletum, Chium, Samum, totam denique Asiam" (*Verr.* 2.5.48.127); in 63, "Pergamum, Smyrnam, Tralles, Ephesum, Miletum, Cyzicum, totam denique Asiam" (*Leg.Agr.* 2.15.39). Occasionally he offers superlatives, calling Cyzicus "urbem Asiae clarissimam nobisque amicissimam" (*Leg.Man.* 8.20, cf. *Arch.* 9.21), Smyrna "urbem Asiae clarissimam" (*Phil.* 11.13.7).

In the 60s a Roman businessman long resident in Pergamum obtained (unscrupulously, according to Cicero) some land in nearby Apollonis. The city refused to register his ownership, so he resorted to Pergamum, which also refused. Pergamum had once voted this man an honorific decree, which Cicero contrasts with the greater honors voted Scipio Nasica by Smyrna: the Pergamenes' praise was tongue-in-cheek; "Pergamum is no more honorable than Smyrna, is it? Not even they themselves claim that" (*Flac.* 70–78). Possibly the man turned to Pergamum because there were his domicile and his greatest influence; perhaps too because Apollonis was in the *conventus* of Pergamum.⁶⁷

In 62 governor Flaccus divided his fleet into two parts, one to patrol north of Ephesus, the other south (*Cic. Flac.* 32). In 58 a slave belonging to a friend of Cicero fled from Italy to Asia; arrested, he was confined somewhere in Ephesus. Cicero appealed to the governor, his brother Quintus: "since he is in Ephesus, please track down the man" (*Ad Q.fr.* 1.2.14).

In July 51 Cicero, on his way to Cilicia, passed three days in Ephesus, where he attended to certain *negotiola* for Atticus; he enjoyed a rather formal *adventus*, greeted by the publicans, who seemingly were headquartered there,⁶⁸ as though he were possessed of *imperium* and by the Greeks "as though governor of Asia," *quasi Ephesio praetori* (*Cic. Att.* 5.13).⁶⁹ The governor was also in Ephesus (*Att.* 5.20.10, *Fam.* 13.55.1, 57.2), and there too a representative of the out-going governor of Cilicia met Cicero (*Fam.* 3.5.5). In about the same year the governor of Asia wrote a letter to Miletus in which he mentions his letters to the *Koinon*, to "you" (Miletus), and to other cities, giving then a roster of the other *conventus* centers of the province: this list (after "you") is headed by Ephesus (*Roman Documents* 52.44).

In 44 the governor Dolabella wrote to the cities to exempt the Jews from military service; Josephus quotes as exemplary his letter to Ephesus, *πρωτευούση τῆς Ἀσίας* (*AJ* 14.224). When in the 30s the Jews of Jerusalem petitioned Antony concerning their privileges, they found him at Ephesus (14.304, 307, 314), where he is placed by other testimonies (*Roman Documents* 57.5; *Plut. Ant.* 58.5). It was at Ephesus in 32 that he organized for the war of Actium (*Plut. Ant.* 56).

No one of these testimonies is conclusive. The several presences and activities in one city or the other might be fortuitous, given the mobility of the

⁶⁷ Plin. *HN* 5.126; Chr. Habicht, *JRS* 65 (1975) 78.

⁶⁸ So for example V. Chapot, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris 1904) 144–45; cf. Magie 165.

⁶⁹ For the phrase compare Sall. *Jug.* 104.1 of the governor of Africa, *praetorem Utica* (the capital: *Cic. Verr.* 2.1.70).

instruments of Roman rule.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, two conclusions seem to me to follow with some assurance. First, in the immediate aftermath of the death of Attalus III, the Romans, as was natural, took up Pergamum as the seat of government, and there they conducted their business during the war of Aristonicus. They had no reason to change the Attalid situation and end Pergamum's role as the capital city of the region. Second, certainly by Cicero's day (perhaps the best evidence is his *Ephesius praetor* of the governor) and probably already by the 90s (Scaurus *quaestor in Epheso*), that honor had passed to Ephesus. On the generation between the beginning of the province and Scaurus we have no information. In residing at Pergamum, Mithridates will have restored the usage of the Attalids, rejecting that of the Romans.

With this in mind we can address a crucial text concerning both cities, the passage of Dio that has been taken to show that Pergamum was the capital until the time of Augustus. Dio reports under 29 B.C. that Augustus permitted the cults of Rome and Caesar in Ephesus and in Nicaea, for at that time these cities had gained first honor in their respective provinces (αὗται γὰρ τότε αἱ πόλεις ἔν τε τῇ βιθυνίᾳ προετιμήντο); by contrast, the Asians' new temple of Octavian himself was to be at Pergamum, while the Bithynians' was to be at Nicomedeia.⁷¹

The cities of a province, in establishing some cultic observance, had of course to place the cult somewhere; but that need not be the capital, as is obvious here from the distinct League cults at Ephesus and Pergamum. After Actium, the League established a cult of Octavian at Pergamum, a new item by contrast with the cult of Rome and Divus Iulius at Ephesus. Surely by his τότε Dio is contrasting the primacy of Ephesus in 29 not with the preceding time but with his own, for it was the Imperial epoch that witnessed the resurgence of Pergamum and especially its healing shrine of Asclepius. Already Pliny the

⁷⁰ So too the gestures of other states; for example, under Augustus (*isto nomine*: 27 B.C. or later) Amisus in Bithynia dedicated a statue of him at Pergamum (*IGR* IV 314), in a time when no one thinks that Pergamum was the provincial capital (he had freed Amisus after Actium: Strab. 12.3.14 [547]). Presumably the statue was erected in the League's temple of Augustus at Pergamum (see note 71).

⁷¹ Dio 51.20.6–7. If Dio's γενέσθαι ἐφῆκεν implies that the cults at Ephesus and Nicaea were new in 29 B.C., he is mistaken: see S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (New York 1970) 401–3. Of those at Pergamum and Nicomedia he uses τεμενίσαι ἐπέτρεψε. The temple at Pergamum (*Roman Documents* 65.58; *OGIS* 456.12; *FGrH* 505 T1) is represented on some provincial cistophori of the first century B.C., which led C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Cistophori of Augustus* (London 1970) 102–3, to attribute these coins to Pergamum (but the rest to Ephesus). That seems unnecessary: this is a governor's coinage, not civic, and his choice of Roman emblems of the province proves nothing about where the coins were struck. As to Nicaea and Nicomedeia, there seems to be no evidence which was capital of Republican Bithynia (see W. Ruge, *RE* 17 [1936] 472); for Roman favors to Nicaea, however, see T. Reinach, *Trois royaumes d'Asie mineure* (Paris 1888) 143–49. That the capital was Nicomedeia in Imperial times is clear from Plin. *Ep.* 10.25 with 63 and 67.1. On their competition for titles see L. Robert, *HSCP* 81 (1977) 1–39.

Elder, in whose time Pergamum was certainly not the capital, could declare that it was by far the most distinguished city of Asia (“longe clarissimum Asiae Pergamum”);⁷² this is merely an atmospheric judgment, as is Dio’s. By Dio’s time Pergamum had followed Ephesus in gaining the title πρώτη, first city of the province (as had Smyrna),⁷³ an honor independent of being the governor’s seat. In 29 B.C., Dio says, greatest notoriety in Asia was still enjoyed by Ephesus. That Ephesus was site of the older League cult, that of Rome and Caesar, is consistent with its standing as capital.

I have suggested elsewhere⁷⁴ that the Roman decision to make Ephesus the capital was the result of gratitude for the Ephesians’ unparalleled service in the war against Aristonicus—that is, that Ephesus was capital from the establishment of regular provincial government early in the 120s. The evidence as we have it seems consistent with that view. Whatever steps Pergamum may have taken to befriend Rome during the war, nothing rivaled the speedy intervention at sea by Ephesus. Ephesus, after all, had the good fortune to have been the station of the Attalid fleet⁷⁵—the wherewithal for decisive action.

V. Scaevola, Sardes and Ephesus

In the 90s B.C. the governor Q. Mucius Scaevola is thought to have presided over the adjudication of a dispute between Sardes and Ephesus; the arbiter of their dispute was the city of Pergamum, where the resulting documents were inscribed. The fragments, found in various parts of the city, were brought together by Fränkel so as to yield three non-joining sections, top, middle, and bottom, written at first in two columns (extending through the upper and middle fragments), then in one (the lower). Since Dittenberger, the two columns have been taken to contain identical letters of the governor to Sardes and Ephesus narrating the affair, below which, spanning the two columns, was inscribed the treaty that stemmed from the adjudication.⁷⁶

As to the two columns, for substance we must rely on the right. The left, restored to duplicate the right on the grounds of some telling words in the middle section, is too meager to be used independently. Mucius Scaevola’s letter begins with an explanation of his action: “inasmuch as the cities and nations that share in our friendship have decided to hold every fourth year a thymelic and athletic contest”—so far the upper portion. This festival is the Σωτήρια καὶ Μουκίεια, attested independently. In the middle part, we find the author narrating the details of a dispute between Sardes and Ephesus: he had sent an

⁷² *HN* 5.126; on the passage see Robert, *Villes* 156–60.

⁷³ Well known from various coins and inscriptions; cf. Chapot (above, note 68) 22; for Pergamum see Chr. Habicht, *Alt. Perg.* VIII.3 (1969) pp. 72, 78.

⁷⁴ *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 39–47.

⁷⁵ Strab. 14.1.24 (641); cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 807; Allen (above, note 7) 120.

⁷⁶ Fränkel, *I.Perg.* 268 [Dittenberger, *OGIS* 437; *IGR* IV 297; Sherck, *Roman Documents* 47 (without the treaty)]; Wankel, *I.Ephesos* 7 (plates 8–9). On the governance of Asia in the 90s see E. Badian, *Athenaeum* 34 (1956) 104–23.

envoy, an Athenian, to urge them to send negotiators to work out a resolution; the fragment breaks off as the names of these are listed.⁷⁷

I submit that these two passages (the upper and middle sections) are so much at variance that we should posit two different documents. For the first seems to be addressed to the cities of the province or to the provincial League, responding to the honors voted—perhaps with praise and thanks and modest disclaimers. The second is an account of a decision in a particular case; it ought to be addressed to the two principals, only Sardes and Ephesus.⁷⁸ Substance, therefore, seems to me to indicate that these two passages are not addressed to the same recipients and thus are not parts of a single letter. The middle portion, by contrast, concerned with the dispute between Sardes and Ephesus, certainly goes with the lower, their treaty resolving the conflict, because the same Sardian and Ephesian negotiators are named in both.

The best reason for associating the upper and middle fragments was that they agree well in length of line, ca. 32 to 35 letters; but this is a natural enough length, approximated by some other public acts at Pergamum.⁷⁹ The script, which Fränkel thought the same in the several fragments, is less compelling; for one mason, if it is one, might do much work, spanning many years, as we know occurred in Hellenistic Athens.⁸⁰ Fränkel's drawing, however, showed in the upper fragments alphas with broken bars, while in the extensive middle and lower fragments only straight bars. And now we have the photographs published by Wankel in 1979 (above, note 76): in addition to the contradictory alphas, they seem to my eye to reveal a script rather more crowded, both horizontally and vertically, in the upper portion than in the middle and lower.

There are some grounds, then, both physical and textual, for severing Fränkel's upper fragments from the middle and lower. It will follow that this inscribed material represents not one event but two: we have a letter of Scaevola in the 90s (the upper portion) responding to the foundation of games in his honor; and a record of a dispute of Sardes and Ephesus consisting of a letter narrating the facts and the eventual treaty between the two cities (the middle and

⁷⁷ Fränkel had thought the middle section to contain identical decrees of Pergamum sent to the two disputants; Dittenberger (in his note 1) saw that this is excluded by the author's Athenian envoy and therefore took the middle as continuing Scaevola's duplicate letters to the two.

⁷⁸ Dittenberger (his note 8), noting the inconsistency of topics, speculated that the League approached the governor for approval of the games, but simultaneously a dispute between Sardes and Ephesus threatened the undertaking; Scaevola therefore addressed both matters in his response. That seems unlikely: the lengthy affair he narrates—dispute, embassies, hearing, treaty—has been played to the end before he writes this letter.

⁷⁹ Compare *I.Perg.* 160, 163 (also in columns: 34–37 letters), and 251.

⁸⁰ See Stephen V. Tracy, *The Lettering of an Athenian Mason* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 15 [1975]), who describes and tests the formidable criteria to be met in identifying masons; his "hand 5" is attested from 194/3 to 155/4 B.C. (cf. L. Threatte, *GRBS* Suppl. Monograph 10 [1984] 260).

lower fragments). As a result, we lose the author of the second letter and the date of the dispute.

The historical context of this dispute thus needs to be argued independently of Scaevola, who may or may not have presided over its resolution and written this letter. Our author first sent an Athenian,⁸¹ probably "one of my friends," certainly "a man deserving of the highest trust with us,"⁸² to ask the two cities to submit their differences to arbitration. They did so, and in the resulting treaty they agreed for the future to provide for the adjudication of private grievances and to abstain from acts of war against each other. Any dispute will be mediated by some third city, which will supervise the selection of yet another city to serve as arbiter, chosen by lot from among candidates agreeable to both parties. Mediator of the present conflict we assume to be Pergamum, where the documents are to be inscribed.

Without Scaevola, the date is not self-evident. Some items might point even to the Attalid period, with a king as author: so his apparent deference to the liberty of cities to undertake hostilities against one another, which so many scholars have found surprising in a Roman province.⁸³ One wonders too whether a governor of this early date would send a Greek friend to carry his request.⁸⁴ But such solicitude might be taken to point, among Roman governors, precisely to Scaevola. In any case, the dating systems employed by Ephesus and Sardes in their treaty (lines 34–36) seem to reflect the Roman province. The Ephesian year is identified by the prytanis Seleucus and the priest of Rome Artemidorus, the Sardian by the priest of Rome Socrates and the priest of Zeus Polieus Alcaeus. The Ephesian prytanis is not informative,⁸⁵ less still

⁸¹ His father was Phylotimus, a rare name indeed. Of Athenians we know otherwise only one, a thesmothete in 100/99 B.C. (*IG* II² 2336.97, *PA* 15050, kindly confirmed as unique by John Traill).

⁸² ἐ[μῶν φίλων] Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* II 859, note 6. Sherk objects that this would mix singular and plural; but that is a common usage of both Hellenistic and Roman letters: Welles, *Royal Corres.* 1.65 with references, 14, 30, 33, 65–67 (Attalus II and III); *Syll.*³ 572; *Roman Documents* 49, 58. For the sentiment [μεγίστης ἄξι]οῦμενον πίστεως see the late Attalid letters *Royal Corres.* 65.17, 66.6, *I.Ephesos* 202.2.

⁸³ Chapot (above, note 68) 147; Dittenberger's note 19; cf. Sherk's comment, "more a concession to old treaty formulas than a statement of possibility."

⁸⁴ This however is what Brutus did in Greece in 43, and to raise support among Romans: Plut. *Brut.* 24.1. See G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965) 3–8, for Greeks in Roman service in the late Republic.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 39–47: on Ephesian coins from 133 to 48 B.C. a civic era rather than the usual prytanis; but I was wrong to suggest that the usages were exclusive, for the date of *I.Ephesos* 9 (a list of priests of Rome dated each by the annual prytanis) is now certain (thanks to *I.Ephesos* 1387, fixed at 39/8 by a double date, the Caesarian era and the prytanis), and shows a prytanis date as early as 51/0. The era is confined to the coins and ends with them in 48; and the several inscriptions dated by prytaneis that have been assigned by palaeography to the early province (e.g. *I.Ephesos* 900, 901) can be left there. Of the Ephesian ambassadors named in the treaty, Hicesius may recur at 900.19, and possibly Aristogeiton at 901.24.

the priest of Zeus at Sardes, which is unique here;⁸⁶ but the use of priests of Rome seems decisive. Students of Sardes have felt that the cult of Dea Roma implies a date under Roman rule, and Mellor has doubted that cults of Rome are likely anywhere within the Attalid kingdom.⁸⁷ However that may be, the atmosphere evoked by *each* city's pointedly citing its priest of Rome (certainly an unusual gesture at least at Ephesus) would indicate the province rather than the kingdom.

No more exactitude seems possible for the date of the treaty between these cities; it may well be under Scaevola and an instance of his famous justice. Ancient ties joined Sardes and Ephesus. Already in Achaemenid times, Ephesian *theoroi* are found solemnly bringing a sacrifice from their city to Artemis of Sardes—the occasion of an appalling affront.⁸⁸ We have a fragment of another treaty between the two (*I.Sardis* 6). Whatever the date, the context and cause of their quarrel are obscure.

Even if in the end we should not detach those fragments from Fränkel's "upper" section, which unambiguously contains a letter of Scaevola, this other event can now be assessed without reference to the civic dispute: in the 90s B.C. the cities of Asia established games in honor of Q. Mucius Scaevola. The substance of his response is lost. He did not veto the honor, for this contest is mentioned on the base of a statue of him erected by the Asians at Olympia on the occasion of the first celebration, and on another of a benefactor of about the same date; Cicero and his commentators also knew the games, and this was the basis on which the Scaevola of our letter was identified and distinguished from the governor of the 120s.⁸⁹

First the text; as presented since Foucart, the right column reads:

Κόιντος Μού[κιος Ποπλίου υ]ἱὸς Σκαιό[λας]
 ἀνθύπατος Ῥω[μαίων Ἐφεσί]ων τῇ βουλ[ῇ] καὶ
 τῷ δήμῳ χαί[ρειν· τῶν ἐν τῇ]ι φιλίαι κριθέν[των]
 δήμων τε καὶ ἐ[θνῶν ψηφισαμέ]νων τιθέναι θυμ[ε]-
 λικούς κ[α]ὶ [γυμνικούς ἀγῶ]να(ς) πενταετηρι-

⁸⁶ Of the usages of Sardes we know far less and can discern no order across these centuries: in *I.Sardis*, twice dates by a *stephanephoros*, several times by a priest (once expressly of Rome), once by both, only in our treaty by the priest of Zeus (though this cult is attested, first in 2 B.C.—he shared the temple of Artemis; cf. G. M. A. Hanfmann and J. C. Waldbaum, *Survey of Sardis* [Cambridge/London 1975] 75, 179). Robert, *Op.Min.Sel.* II 858–62, sought to identify Socrates and Alcaeus in other Sardian documents; but the two names are common, and other than Alcaeus the victim of Mithridates (*FGrH* 188 F1) the homonyms cannot be closely dated.

⁸⁷ See *I.Sardis* pp. 47 and 96; R. Mellor, *Θεὰ Ῥώμη* (Göttingen 1975) 57–58, 70, though he leaves the question open to future discovery. For the early history of the cult cf. M. Errington, *Chiron* 17 (1987) 97–118.

⁸⁸ *I.Ephesos* 2; contemporary attacks on sacred ambassadors are attested by Tod II 137, *I.Delos* 98.B.26, and Diod. 15.49.

⁸⁹ *OGIS* 439 from Olympia, 438 from Poemanenus in northern Mysia (with Dittenberger's note 7 on the date); Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.51; Ps-Ascon. 202, 262 St.; cf. Broughton, *MRR* I 523–24.

[κοὺς βουλευσαμένων - - - - - α]ι περί του
[- - - - - π]ροτρεψο-

That the left and right columns are related is proved by a heading that spans them. If I am right to sever the upper portion from the rest, then Fränkel's restoration of the heading, [Συνθήκαι Σαρδια]νῶν κ[αὶ Ἐφεσί]ων, does not belong; we need instead some allusion to the new festival. [Μουκιείων τῶν ἀγῶ]νων κ[αὶ θυσι]ῶν is a possibility, or [Σωτηρίων τῶν ἀγῶ]νων κ[αὶ Μουκιεί]ων. Either would extend roughly to the left margin (if the two columns were of equal width) but would fall short of the right; other guesses may be better. In the left column we have nine letters scattered down four lines; the reconstructed text has been made to duplicate the right only by assuming that the line length on the left suddenly becomes shorter with the fourth line of text. This I think is unlikely, and unnecessary: better to posit different documents in the two columns. If that is granted, then the left may have contained the decree of the *Koinon* of Asia establishing the contest, or their letter to Scaevola informing him of that action; and the right column, Scaevola's letter, addressed not Ephesus or Sardes but Pergamum, Περγαμην]ῶν τῇ βούλ[ηι καὶ] τῷ δήμῳ χαί[ρειν, his response sent to each of the cities of Asia. Of his message we have only a hint, the future προτρεψο-, perhaps of envoys sent to him "in order to urge," προτρεψόμενοι.

What was the character of these games? In a Hellenistic text the collocation of thymelic and gymnic competitions is surprising. Naturally a festival might have a program comprising both physical and musical events, an ἀγὼν γυμνικός καὶ μουσικός, as was common. But the joining of choral competition, a specific and narrow category of μουσική, with the generically physical, γυμνική, is attested, so far as I have found, only in Imperial times.⁹⁰ One might consider θυμ[ε]λικοὺς κ[α]ὶ [μουσικοὺς, making the competitions uniform in nature, all musical; but the progression from the specific to the general is improbable.⁹¹ Instead I would urge θυμ[ε]λικοὺς κ[α]ὶ [σκηνικοὺς, consistent with logic (proceeding from the generically choral to the species drama) and some parallels.⁹² As to the rest, the addition of sigma is Fränkel's necessary correction; but his βουλευσαμένων is otiose and may be ignored.

⁹⁰ Instances are *IGR* IV 1273 (Thyateira), *OGIS* 566.22 (Termessus Minor, under M. Aurelius or later). In Egypt in the late third century we find σκηνικός γυμνικός applied to the Capitolia and to the Paneia (adding ἵππικός): P. Frisch, *Zehn agonistische Papyri* (*Pap.Colon.* 13 [1986]) 1, 3, and 9, from the 270s and 280s. Note however Athen. 437A on Alexander's funeral games for an Indian, γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ μουσικὸν ἐγκωμίων; and *SEG* IV 180 (*I.Keramos* 7; II B.C.?), [τοῖς γ]υμνικ[οῖς καὶ θυ]μελικ[οῖς καὶ σκηνικ]οῖς ἀγῶσιν—though this refers not to one festival but sums up "all the games the city holds." See L. Robert, *Études d'épigraphie et de philologie* (Paris 1938) 33, on the care with which athletic and musical enterprises were distinguished; cf. the joke at Athen. 350B–C.

⁹¹ The progression μουσικός καὶ θυμελικός occurs at Plut. *Fab.Max.* 4.4.

⁹² E.g. *Syll.*³ 704E.18, 711L.29–30, 728K.24 (Delphi, II/I B.C.); *MAMA* VIII 492.b.16 (Aphrodisias, Imperial). At Hellenistic Thespiae, the *Mouseia* were at first an ἀγὼν θυμελικός, but later expanded to an ἀγὼν ἀλλητῶν καὶ

If this restoration is correct, then the Greeks of Asia honored Scaevola with games thymelic and dramatic, not thymelic and athletic. From this come two consequences. First, such competitions would be appropriate to Scaevola, famed for his justice to the provincials: so Cicero and other authors, and so we could guess from his statue-base at Olympia, διενέγκαντα ἄρε[τῇ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ] καὶ καθαριότητι (*OGIS* 439). Military success is more fitly commemorated with athletic competitions; Scaevola was honored for the arts of peace and good government.⁹³ Ancient authority held that the goal of choral and dramatic poetry was to educate the citizens to good policy (*Ar. Ran.* 1418ff.).

Second, the choral games included the most splendid and ambitious form of that art, drama, specified here with the same pride that one specified ἵππικός after γυμνικός. Drama demanded far more of what is fashionably called infrastructure—not only the professional flutists and chorus-leaders of any thymelic competition, but also actors, costumes, sets and theaters. A contest in “thymelic and gymnic” events would call on various talents, variously recruited. The restoration σκηνικούς rather than γυμνικούς shifts the burden and honor of organization and performance entirely to one group, the Artists of Dionysus. In anything thymelic, they will have been needed; if next we have σκηνικούς, their services were required in a far more substantial way, and theirs alone. This may be reckoned a political success for the Artists: the first example of provincial games in the Roman world is given over completely to the care of the Artists of Dionysus.

What is the background of this event? The Ionian/Hellespontine Artists had flourished in the third century, as had the parallel guilds in Greece and Egypt. They were a government, so recognized in international law (*I. Magn.* 54). In 204/3 their host city Teos was taken from the Attalids by Antiochus III,⁹⁴ and remained under Seleucid rule until the treaty of Apamea in 188. This, I believe, is why the Attalid house in these years founded its own guild at Pergamum, the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon; this group in turn was conjoined with the old guild when the Attalids regained Teos in 188. The establishment of the Pergamene branch must have been seen by the old guild as a usurpation, and the

τραγωιδῶν καὶ κωμωιδῶν—that is, θυμελικὸς καὶ σκηνικός; M. Feyel, *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne* [Paris 1943] 88–132. In a decree of the Athenian Artists in the time of Sulla (*IG* II² 1338.4–5, [- - ἀγῶνας γυμνικὸς καὶ μουσικὸς τε καὶ σκηνικὸς]) we should probably delete γυμνικὸς καί, given the τε and the skills of the Artists.

⁹³ Thymelic games are several times specified in the cult of benefactors in the Hellenistic period. At one Attalid subject city the chief event of the *Attaleia/Eumeneia/Nicephoria* was the thymelic competition: *OGIS* 329.41. *I. Cos* 8 has thymelic games among a long list of cult honors for someone, presumably a king. Mytilene included among its honors for Augustus κατὰ πενταετηρίδα ἀγῶνας θυμελικούς [- - -] (*OGIS* 456.7). Cf. at Attalid Tralles the μουσικοὶ ἀγῶνες in honor of the king: Robert, *Op. Min. Sel.* II 1178–90. See in general I. Frei, *De certaminibus thymelicis* (Basel 1900); cf. F. Robert, *Thymélè* (Paris 1939) 291. In Imperial times, however, the *koina Asiae* included athletic and musical competitions; see L. Moretti, *RIFC* n.s. 32 (1954) 276–89.

⁹⁴ P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965) 29–160.

subsequent fusion as an offense. Thus the Ionian/Hellespontine Artists may have had little cause to love either the Attalid house or the Artists of Dionysus Cathegemon; and I urged above that the royal origins and patronage of the Pergamene branch brought it into disfavor among the Pergamenes themselves upon the death of Attalus III.

How, amid such rivalries, might the Romans view matters? In the 90s, the Asian guild gained the privilege of staging the honors of Scaevola. Here was proof that the Artists could get along well with the new rulers, indeed serve as the means of honoring the justice of Roman rule. We may view the *Mucieia* as a step in the process whereby the Asian guild placed itself in the good graces of Rome. I have argued that the Pergamene branch fell under some suspicion at the beginning of Roman rule; if it was abolished after the 80s B.C., when we last hear of it, that may well represent a diplomatic success on the part of the old guild, suppressing a rival and re-establishing a truly unified guild.

What was the fate of this quadrennial festival? In particular, how must Scaevola's successors have viewed it?⁹⁵ We should acknowledge what a rarity this gesture is—unprecedented, so far as we know, as a provincial honor for a governor. Perperna, we have seen, sponsored victory games at Pergamum after the defeat of Aristonicus; but this was his own gesture, made once, not an institution of the province, and not in his own honor.⁹⁶ Cultic honors for Roman magistrates were uncommon even in civic religion; games bearing their names are rarer still, with none attested before the *Mucieia*.⁹⁷ The city of Pergamum honored in cult M'. Aquillius, who pacified the province in 129 and

⁹⁵ A later age, but one not less attuned to *invidia*, put limits on the honors provincials might vote governors: Dio 56.26.6 (A.D. 11).

⁹⁶ Aemilius Paullus had done likewise at Amphipolis in 167, celebrating the defeat of Perseus: Liv. 45.32.8–33.7, cf. Polyb. 30.25.1, Plut. *Aem.* 28.3–5, Diod. 31.8.9.

⁹⁷ Of cults of Roman magistrates, Bowersock (above, note 84) 150–51 lists four earlier than Scaevola; cf. Chr. Habicht in *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 19 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1973) 61–62. The earliest, of M. Claudius Marcellus at Syracuse, is not explicitly attested, though highly likely; the Syracusan games *Marcellia* are called by Cicero a recent foundation for C. Claudius Marcellus (governor in 79), though also honoring the family as a whole (*Verr.* 2.2.51, evoking the *Mucia* as analogy for games for a governor); Syracuse replaced these with *Verria*, which Messana also founded (2.2.154, 2.4.24). See J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1965) 14. In 117 B.C. the proquaestor of Macedonia M. Annius was honored by Lete: an equestrian competition will be held for him annually at the games at which other benefactors are honored (*Syll.*³ 700); this seems rather less than cult, and is not a new festival named for Annius. There remain before the 90s only cults of T. Quinctius Flamininus in Greece and M'. Aquillius at Pergamum. For games for Sulla see A. E. Raubitschek, *Studies Johnson* (above, note 10) 49–57. All this is civic; of joint provincial establishments, there is later the *templum et monumentum nostrum* that Cicero says he refused “the cities” (*Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.26, cf. *Att.* 5.21.7). It is not clear whether the *Luculleia* that Plutarch says were established by “the cities” after 70 were various civic games or federal (*Luc.* 23.1); civic *Luculleia* are known at Cyzicus, App. *Mith.* 76.

gave the first *lex provinciae*.⁹⁸ Here in the 90s, in our earliest view of a provincial league, we see it performing what would be its essential service in Imperial times—indeed, the essential service of Greek leagues from the earliest Delphian Amphictyony to the Hellenistic cities that shared in honoring Athena Iliensis—the holding of federal games. Yet of Asian games in honor of governors, the examples are few, and uncomfortably crowded. Three items are on record.

(1) The quadrennial Σωτήρια καὶ Μουκίεια are attested both by Scaevola's letter and by two statue bases, one certainly and the other presumably contemporary with this celebration, with no later inscriptions. Cicero however says that the festival was left intact by Mithridates (*Verr.* 2.2.51).

(2) Still in the 90s, the governor L. Valerius Flaccus was to be honored by the cities with games held at Tralles, his hereditary client. Funds to pay for the celebration were collected from all Asia, but were never spent, for the Trallians, according to Cicero, diverted this money to a loan.⁹⁹ Cicero leaves it unclear whether the games were in fact celebrated.

(3) At an early date, when the League was still “the peoples adlected into the friendship” of Rome, it erected at Pergamum a statue of a citizen whose father had presided over “the fifth *Euergesia*, conducted at public expense at Pergamum”: τοῦ ἀγωνοθετήσαντος τὰ πέμπτα Εὐεργέσια τὰ ἀχθέντα δημο[σί]α ἐν [Περγά]μῳ (*IGR* IV 291). This might be a Pergamene festival and unrelated to the League games, but as Foucart pointed out, the presence of the League is then inexplicable. Moreover, the specification δημοσία would be otiose of a civic festival: here, I suggest, it means that Pergamum did the League the benefaction of paying for the games (“at the people's expense” rather than the League's).

The complexity implied by these three items is jarring. Did the League truly sponsor three recurring festivals, at least two of them on four-year cycles and two in honor of individual governors? I offer the following scheme as a suggestion, a variant of Foucart's.¹⁰⁰

The League's quadrennial *Soteria kai Mucieia* had its origin in the 90s as an honor to Scaevola. The name rapidly proved inexpedient and was changed to the generic and inoffensive *Euergesia*, attested at Pergamum sixteen years later (the fifth celebration). Cicero calls the games *Mucia* because that was for him the significant element of the old title, serving as contrast to the *Verria* he denounces. That is, the *Mucieia* and the *Euergesia* are the same festival. The specification ἀχθέντα...ἐν [Περγά]μῳ of the *Euergesia* shows that the festival rotated among the several cities, presumably the *conventus* centers. This

⁹⁸ *IGR* IV 292.39, 293.B.23; for the date of these inscriptions in the Mithridatic period, see C. P. Jones, *Chiron* 4 (1974) 183–205.

⁹⁹ Cic. *Flac.* 52, 55–56, 59; for parallels for such diversions see C. P. Jones, *JRS* 73 (1983) 121–22.

¹⁰⁰ P. Foucart, *RevPhil* n.s. 25 (1901) 88, concluded that the *Euergesia* was a League festival, and that its site rotated among the cities. A new inscription from Ephesus will add to our evidence on the provincial games in Imperial times: H. Engelmann and D. Knibbe, *EpigrAnat* 8 (1986) 28–31.

equation means that the festival survived the Mithridatic wars and the Sullan settlement in the 80s—as Cicero says of the *Mucia*.

I suggest that the games for Flaccus, not named by Cicero, are also the same festival. Perhaps within the first quadrennium, the Asians realized the potential embarrassment of their games named for one governor but presided over by another. One never knew what to expect of a governor; and Flaccus may be the man who nearly was prosecuted by his own quaestor.¹⁰¹ The funds, collected from the cities across each four-year interval, were deposited at the city scheduled to host the games, appropriately Flaccus' client Tralles. Perhaps this celebration did occur (Cicero does not accuse the Trallians of failing to fulfill this religious obligation), Tralles using its own money (as I have suggested the Pergamenes did at the fifth *Euergesia*).¹⁰²

In sum, it may be that these testimonies all concern one festival, not three. Once established for Scaevola, it became a feature of the life of the province, but stripped of its potentially invidious association with one governor and given the generic name *Euergesia*. Eventually it would be succeeded by the κοινά, the provincial games familiar in Imperial times.

VI. A Letter to Carian Nysa

There is a place in Caria, a sacred grove in the foothills of Mt. Mesogis overlooking the Maeander valley. Here was a temple of Pluto and Kore, a famous healing shrine where pilgrims sought cures through dream-visions. In the slope above the grove was the cave of Charon, an *abaton* where each year the ephebes of the city of Nysa, which owned the shrine, sacrificed a bull to the infernal gods. At the grove was celebrated the festival of the Theogamia, the wedding of Pluto and Kore, panhellenic in status in Imperial times. Nysa stands a mile east along the hills, connected to the shrine by a sacred way.¹⁰³

In 1 B.C. a collection of old documents pertinent to the privileges of this temple was inscribed in the precinct. A decree of Nysa reports the success of a petition to the governor of Asia to permit the restitution of these texts to the public record office in the city (τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα περὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῆς ἀσυλίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ[ς] ἰκεσίας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀτ[ε]λής), and publishes his letter to the city. Then, along with slight traces of other documents, we have two substantial acts: a letter of Seleucus I in 281 B.C. granting the temple some privilege (in response to an embassy of Athymbria, which then possessed the shrine and which would later be absorbed by the Seleucid foundation Nysa); and a letter of a second king, whose identity has

¹⁰¹ Cic. *Div. Caec.* 63; see Broughton, *MRR* III 32, 212.

¹⁰² One implication of this thesis is that a four-year interval separates Scaevola and Flaccus. This seems to be possible, despite Badian's formidable arguments (above, note 76) for placing Scaevola in 94 B.C.: see Sumner (above, note 65), and Broughton, *MRR* III 145–46, 212 (Scaevola in 98 or 97, Flaccus in 95 or 94).

¹⁰³ Testimonia in W. von Diest, *Nysa ad Maeandrum* (*Jdl* Erg.h. 10 [1913]); cf. Robert, *BCH* 101 (1977) 65–77.

been much debated.¹⁰⁴ Ambassadors from Nysa addressed this king about the temple's privileges, asking him to grant what the previous kings had granted: ἱκεσίαν καὶ ἀσυλίαν καὶ ἀτέλειαν. Wishing to increase their friendship towards him and seeing that those rights existed from ancient times, the king confirms them as defined by the boundaries dictated by the previous kings, and permits all else the kings had granted (ὅσα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς συνεχώρησαν).

The first editor thought the author to be Antiochus III, who is mentioned in the four lines that precede, which he took to be a long heading: (traces) καὶ Ἀθυμβριανοῖς [- - - Ἀντιόχου δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου [- - -]ου ιζ'. Welles however argued that these lines are the end of a separate document, pointing out the length, the unaccountable δέ, and the fact that the letter of Seleucus I has no heading and follows upon another document without interval. At the beginning of our letter, Welles reckoned the space to be too long for the name of an Attalid, and thought the style too clumsy and repetitious for the Attalid chancery: rather some barbarian, an Ariarathes or a Mithridates, one king among many responding to the *asylia* embassies of Nysa. Welles was thinking of the familiar Hellenistic phenomenon, a city canvassing the world for recognitions of its temple's inviolability—though he was puzzled by the “air of authority” that this one king exhibits at Nysa.¹⁰⁵

I would urge, first, that a relatively late date is indicated by the accumulation of vague and seemingly redundant privileges granted by this king. Grants of the third and early second centuries are by contrast chaste and specific; the present list, which was repeated in the Nysaeans' petition to the governor in 1 B.C., reads like the general and ambitious requests that Greek cities addressed to their Roman conquerors.¹⁰⁶ Second, attribution to a Seleucid should be rejected, because a Seleucid would have spoken not of “the previous kings” (or not only of them) but of his ancestors; here instead we have a new dynasty.

Now, there should be no doubt that this king controls Nysa. His attentiveness to precedent shows that he alone will decide on these privileges: against Welles, he is not one of many kings recognizing the status simultaneously. In that latter situation, richly documented, a change of status is the purpose, and concern for legal precedent is irrelevant and not expressed. Here we are in the arena not of international law but of internal governance. The obvious alternative then would be an Attalid of the second century, as Welles confessed.

¹⁰⁴ The whole gathered by Hiller, in von Diest (above, note 103) 62–67; whence Sherk, *Roman Documents* 69 (the civic decree and governor's letter); Welles, *Royal Corres.* 9 and 64 (Seleucus I and the anonymous).

¹⁰⁵ *Royal Corres.* pp. 261–62, cf. 278, note 1. The Roberts, *Fouilles d'Amyzon* 144, note 10, have maintained the attribution to Antiochus III—evidently from analogy with his several grants of *asylia* during the Carian campaign of 204–202 B.C.

¹⁰⁶ Compare what the Delphians proposed for themselves to the Roman authorities in 190 B.C.: *Roman Documents* 1 and 37, with J. P. Michaud, *BCH Suppl.* 4 (1977) 125–36; cf. Chr. Habicht, *Hesperia* 56 (1987) 59–71.

A parallel of sorts is a letter confirming the *asylia* of the temple of the Persian Goddess in the Hyrcanian plain, on condition that this change nothing of what was formerly valid. This letter has been attributed variously to a Seleucid or an Attalid; but in fact there is doubt whether the author is Greek at all, rather than Roman.¹⁰⁷ And it is the difference between the two letters that is striking and suggestive. The Hyrcanian text curtly permits the continuation of a traditional privilege, in what is obviously a straightforward matter of internal administration. Our author, though his action is the same, couches his decision in the rhetoric of foreign diplomacy, stating the vapid hope of increasing the citizens' friendship towards him and of being useful to them in the future.¹⁰⁸ It is the combination of this sentiment, the polite uncertainty of foreign relations, with an unchallenged and authoritative decision that is the strange and characterizing feature of this letter. I can see no parallel in other royal letters for this illogical combination—a confusion that is consistent with the repetitiousness, vague-ness, bumptiousness, and disorder of the letter that made Welles deny it to an Attalid.

Thus, in my view, substance as well as style excludes the Attalids, who would not express these sentiments to a city under their absolute control, nor treat so authoritatively a free city allied with them. Our author seems unsure of his relations with Nysa. In fact this is rather the way Roman magistrates often talk, expressing the hope of being useful,¹⁰⁹ in circumstances indeed conducive to ambiguity of tone: for a governor exercised great power over a city in his province, yet was only a subordinate of the true power in Rome, while a Greek city might have resources of its own—treaties and friends in Rome—to circumvent his will. The insistence on precedent (οἱ ἔμπροσθεν βασιλεῖς twice, οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς) is itself something of a Romanism, while rare among Hellenistic monarchs;¹¹⁰ provincial governors are well known for their anxiety

¹⁰⁷ *Royal Corres.* 68 (citing as precedent decisions παρά τε τῶν πρόσθεν καὶ τῶν ἑμῶν προγόνων); following a suggestion of Robert (*REA* 36 [1934] 525), I hope to argue in a corpus of *asylia* documents that the author is a Roman emperor (restoring τῶν βασιλέων). On the site see J. and L. Robert, *Hellenica* VI (Paris 1948) 56–69.

¹⁰⁸ This is the answering phrase to a city's invitation to a benefactor to be disposed to do the city some good in the future; see Welles, *Royal Corres.* p. 353. It was a banality of honorific decrees (an Attalid instance, though for a royal governor rather than the king, is *OGIS* 329.23; for an early literary example see Dem. 23.188). But the sentiment is rare in the royal letters: Herrmann (above, note 94) 157 (Antiochus III upon liberating Teos); *Royal Corres.* 14.5 (the king's statement of a past fact), 48.a.10 (fragmentary, evidently echoing the envoys' speech). Compare Laodice's letter to Sardes after intervening with her husband Antiochus III to protect the city (Hanfmann [above, note 29] 112): here, as apparently in our letter, the realities of power were uncertain.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Sherk, *Roman Documents* 35.9ff.; 38.22; 26.b.4, 35; 58.80.

¹¹⁰ Most predecessors evoked by Hellenistic kings are their own ancestors (*progonoi*), and are cited by way of hopeful example rather than legally binding precedent: see Welles, *Royal Corres.* p. 398 s.v.; note the unusual καθάπερ οἱ πατέρες at Herrmann (above, note 94) 157 (Antiochus III); on ὑφήγησις =

on this score, and we find it too among emperors.¹¹¹ Here again, our author seems to have one foot in the Roman world.

If these things are so, we have a late Hellenistic monarch, neither Seleucid nor Attalid, who controls Caria, and yet seems uncertain how to address Nysa. I think there can be only one candidate: Mithridates the Great of Pontus, during the period of rule that followed the Roman Vespers in Asia, 88 to 85 B.C. The present text is to be added to the growing epigraphical and numismatic evidence that derives from the years of his power in Anatolia and Greece.¹¹²

Only one other stone has come down to us that bears letters of Mithridates; it comes from Nysa. On it there is first a letter from the governor C. Cassius to the Nysaeans, in 88 B.C. before his defeat by Mithridates, praising their citizen Chaeremon for his large gift of grain to the proconsul's army. There follow two letters of Mithridates, after his defeat of Cassius, to his satrap to order the pursuit and arrest of Chaeremon, who has fled Nysa upon the king's march into Caria.¹¹³ After the eventual defeat of Mithridates, Chaeremon (or his family, if he did not live to return) was pleased to commemorate by this inscription both the king's special antipathy to him and the governor's gratitude. No doubt the citizens of Nysa now felt it expedient to join in this pro-Roman display; but Nysa must have gone over to Mithridates as did most other cities (including Nysa's immediate neighbor Tralles: Cic. *Flac.* 59), however briefly. For, as we have seen, it was more than eighty years before the Roman government permitted the reinstatement of the privileges of the Plutonium and the re-inscribing of the documents that supported them; other cities typically were rehabilitated in the time of Caesar or before. We may guess that Romans or their supporters were murdered in the temple, as they were in the Asclepieum at Pergamum and the Artemisium at Ephesus.¹¹⁴

exemplum see L. Robert, *REG* 94 (1981) 351, note 60. We find also what are phrased as generous concessions to tradition rather than obedience to precedent: J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amizon* nos. 9.5 (*Royal Corres.* 38), ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν τὰ τε ἄλλα ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου [συμμαχίᾳ] (Antiochus III), and 13.3, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον εἴθισται.

¹¹¹ Thus Claudius in A.D. 48 cites "the privileges granted by the emperors before me and by the senate," τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ Σεβαστῶν καὶ τῆς συνκλήτου δεδομένα δίκαια (Rehm, *Delphinion* 156); compare his insistence, in his second year, on the precedents of the deified Augustus, *BGU* 1074.2 (both at Smallwood, *Documents...Gaius Claudius Nero* 373; cf. 371 for another Claudian citation of Augustan precedent); so too, in his first year, Nero's τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ αὐτοκρατορῶν (*SB* 11012; this recusatio should have been cited at *BASP* 22 [1985] 288); Trajan (at Plin. Ep. 10.66.1), "in commentariis eorum principum qui ante me fuerunt" (cf. Nerva at 10.58.7). In my opinion, *Royal Corres.* 69, with its τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ βασιλέων, was written by a Roman emperor; on 68 see above, note 107.

¹¹² See in particular L. Robert, *JSav* 1978, 151–63; and generally McGing (above, note 8).

¹¹³ *Syll.*³ 741 (Cassius' letter, *Roman Documents* 48; the king's, *Royal Corres.* 73–74).

¹¹⁴ Cf. the list at Reinach (above, note 66) 130. Hiller's notion (above, note 104, p. 65, followed by Sherck) that the original documents had been destroyed by

Possibly the restitution of the temple's rights waited until 1 B.C. simply because of the relative obscurity of Nysa and Nysa's friends, by comparison with a Pergamum or an Ephesus.¹¹⁵ One might wonder that a letter of Mithridates is included among testimonials now submitted to the Roman authorities; but many of the Hellenistic kings were sworn enemies of Rome, yet their precedents were freely invoked and inscribed in just such circumstances. We are here well into the Augustan age, perhaps sufficiently removed from the bitterness of the Mithridatic episode.

To return to the style of our letter: the mixture of authority and deference would suit a freshly victorious king unsure of his new allies and of his future success. Moreover, our author's repetitious evocation of the "previous kings" (three times in two sentences) takes on point if this is Mithridates. In the Chaeremon letters, obliged to mention the Romans, he glosses them as "the common enemy," οἱ κοινοὶ πολέμιοι.¹¹⁶ In the present letter, if I am right about its author, his silence is deliberate, even affected. A city has approached him with a request; he will renew only such privileges as were granted by "the previous kings," "the kings before us"—and not the Romans. By virtue of this insistence and of the name left unsaid, the acts of the Romans are void, and the province of Asia, *clarissima provincia*,¹¹⁷ is no more.¹¹⁸

time or accident does not explain why a governor's permission was needed to re-inscribe them.

¹¹⁵ Chaeremon's son, a friend of Pompey, had moved to Tralles by the 60s: Strab. 14.1.42 [648], Cic. *Flac.* 22, 52; cf. Bowersock (above, note 84) 8. The family was perhaps not much loved at Nysa in the aftermath of the Mithridatic war.

¹¹⁶ Welles translated "the common enemy of mankind" and thought this in parody of οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται τῶν Ἑλλήνων (or πάντων: e.g. *AthMitt* 72 [1957] 242 no. 65.21); but it is a reasonable description of an alliance's declared enemy, and is attested early (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.15, Dem. 17.11; cf. later Diod. 12.8.3, 15.50.5, Dion. Hal. 3.28.7, Lucian *Pisc.* 1). On κοινὸς πόλεμος see E. Maroti, *Klio* 40 (1962) 124–27. For "the common enemy of mankind," however, note Cic. *Off.* 3.29.107, *Verr.* 2.4.21 (pirates), 2.5.76 (Verres).

¹¹⁷ Cicero *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.9.

¹¹⁸ A version of part VI was read at the American Philological Association meeting of 1977; II was indicated at *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 44, note 23. My warm thanks to Roberta Stewart.