

From Pergamon
to Sperlonga

Sculpture and Context

ME
91
.P1
F76
2000

EDITED BY

Nancy T. de Grummond
and
Brunilde S. Ridgway

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

Berkeley Los Angeles London

CONTENTS

University of California Press
Berkeley and Los Angeles, California
University of California Press, Ltd.
London, England

© 2000 by
The Regents of the University of California

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

From Pergamon to Sperlonga : sculpture and context /
edited by Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunilde S. Ridgway.
p. cm. — (Hellenistic culture and society ; 34)

Articles based on papers presented on Feb. 21–22, 1997, at the Fourth Annual
Langford Conference of the Department of Classics at the Florida State University.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-520-22327-6 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Pergamum Altar of Zeus (Sculpture)—Expertising. 2. Grotto of Tiberius
(Sperlonga, Italy)—Expertising. 3. Sculpture, Hellenistic—Turkey—Bergama.
4. Sculpture, Roman—Italy—Sperlonga. I. De Grummond, Nancy Thomson.
II. Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo, 1929- III. Langford Conference of the
Department of Classics (4th : 1997 : Florida State University) IV. Series.

NB91.P4 F76 2000
733'.3—dc21
00-037775

Manufactured in the United States of America

08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R 1997) (*Permanence of Paper*).

ILLUSTRATIONS / vii

PREFACE / xv

ABBREVIATIONS / xvii

INTRODUCTION / I

Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunilde S. Ridgway

Culture as Policy: The Attalids of Pergamon / 17

Erich S. Gruen

Pergamo ara marmorea magna: On the Date, Reconstruction,
and Functions of the Great Altar of Pergamon / 32

Andrew Stewart

Pergamon to Hierapolis: From Theatrical "Altar" to Religious Theater / 58

Mary C. Sturgeon

The Sperlonga Sculptures: The Current State of Research / 78

Brunilde S. Ridgway

The Phantom of a Rhodian School of Sculpture / 92

J. J. Pollitt

Odysseus at Sperlonga: Hellenistic Hero or Roman Heroic Foil? / 111

H. Anne Weis

Pergamon and Sperlonga: A Historian's Reactions / 166

Peter Green

Ubiquitous Barbarians: Representations of the Gauls
at Pergamon and Elsewhere / 191

John R. Marszal

17. Publication ed. P. Zanker (Göttingen, 1976); cf. *supra*, n. 11.

18. Publication ed. P. Guldager Bilde, I. Nielsen, and M. Nielsen (Copenhagen, 1993).

19. Moltesen, "Lapis Albanus: A Group of Hellenistic Sculptures in Peperino," in Guldager Bilde et al., eds., 1993 (*supra*, n. 18), 245-50.

20. Hampe 1972, 25-28, had argued that Palinurus was represented as the steersman on the boat, but the idea did not find approval among later publications.

21. See, e.g., B. S. Ridgway, "Court Art and Hellenistic Art: The Role of Alexander the Great," *ArchNews* 11 (1982), 43-58, esp. 48-49.

Culture as Policy

The Attalids of Pergamon

Erich S. Gruen

The Attalids of Pergamon, a ruling dynasty of splendor and renown, mastered the art of cultivating an international image. They needed to. Their city had been a cipher prior to the Hellenistic period when it suddenly burst into the limelight. The founder of their clan, Philetairos, stemmed from an even less significant town on the Black Sea, reputedly a eunuch, born of a mother whom rumor branded as a flute player and a lady of the night.¹ Furthermore, he seized power by confiscating the vast sum entrusted to him at Pergamon by the Diadoch Lysimachos, betraying his overlord, and taking control of the garrison.² Some of this damage was cleaned up much later. An aristocratic pedigree was attached to the founding family and duly carved on marble.³ But a far more concerted contemporary effort derived from the rulers themselves, determined to cast into shadow their dubious origins with a blaze of cultural glory.

And none can deny their success. The Great Altar of Pergamon must have dazzled contemporaries as it excites moderns. The monument stands as emblematic of Attalid authority and prosperity. The grip which that imposing structure holds on the imagination has made it the defining image of the dynasty. Culture and politics amalgamate here: the Great Altar provides the *privata* links both to the heritage of Athens and to the power of Rome. The Gigantomachy carries clear echoes of the Parthenon friezes, thus associating the Attalid achievement with that of classical Athens, standard-bearer of order against chaos, of Hellenic civilization against barbarism. And the celebration of victory over the dreaded Gauls sent a signal to Rome, it is generally said, either of collaboration or of defiance. Hence, the Great Altar takes on, in modern treatments, a central role in construing the ideology of the Attalids and the international posture that they projected in the mid-second century B.C. Perhaps too much so.

Attalid ambitions had wider scope. And their self-representations were not directed exclusively or even primarily to Athens and Rome. The rulers of Pergamon carved out a place for their realm in western Asia Minor while cultivating connections far and wide in the Greek world. Long before the Great Altar was conceived, they exhibited themselves as holding the fort against barbarous Gauls, as cultural champions quite unconnected to the Athenian past, and as earning plaudits independent of the Roman presence.

The Gauls arrived in Asia Minor in 278, provoking hostility and opposition from the start. Philetairos, earliest of the Attalid rulers, had barely begun to establish his own position in Pergamon, but seized the occasion to participate in the resistance. A stele in Kyzikos records the gratitude of that community for a series of benefactions bestowed by Philetairos in the 270s. Among them was a handsome gift of grain delivered in the course of the war against the Galatians.⁴ The dynast, however, seems to have done more than just subsidize others. He earned a victory himself over the Celts, an event later commemorated on a dedication at Delos.⁵ Details elude us. The fragmentary epigraphical evidence is more tantalizing than informative. But it already puts on show two critical aspects of the Attalids' policy adumbrated from the outset: a self-representation as challengers to barbarian inroads in Asia Minor and a readiness to advertise that fact in Hellenic circles far from their base.

A dramatic increase in prestige on this score came in the reign of Attalos I. He pointedly refused to pay tribute to the Gauls, thus shattering precedent.⁶ He then inflicted significant defeats upon the enemy, achievements that gave him the impetus and justification for claiming the title of king, first of his clan to do so.⁷ The victories were memorialized in a series of dedications to Athena inscribed on three monuments in Pergamon that contained sculptural depictions and recorded several triumphs. Others can speculate on the character of the figures portrayed. The inscriptions, in any case, denoted victories, among others, over two separate Gallic tribes at two separate sites.⁸ These structures were designed for home consumption. But Attalos extended his publicity abroad. As is well known, he dedicated four monuments near the south wall of the Akropolis in Athens, with a noteworthy combination of portrayals: the War of the Giants, the Battle of Athenians and Amazons, the victory of Athens over the Persians at Marathon, and his own destruction of the Gauls.⁹ In that company, of course, Attalos's success is conjoined with those of the great historical and legendary triumphs of Hellenism over barbarism. Athens itself was a most logical site for such advertisement, still acknowledged as the principal repository of Hellenic cultural traditions. Athens, in fact, gained at least as much from the association as did the king. In 200 B.C. Attalos crossed to Athens from Aigina, where he had been pursuing the forces of Philip V. There he was lionized by the Athenians, who showered gifts and honors upon him. The entire populace came

out to greet him, the priests and priestesses enjoined him to offer sacrifice in all the temples, and the citizenry even voted to name a tribe after him, thus putting Attalos on a par with the city's eponymous tribal heroes.¹⁰ Whether the idea for the monuments arose during that visit or earlier, Attalos took full advantage. It was not the Athenians alone to whom he directed his message. He employed Athens as a medium for proclaiming his championing of the Greek cause against the forces of chaos and barbarism. The monarch expected his accomplishments to resonate from that locale throughout Hellas.

The image markedly outstripped reality. If Attalos was indeed the first of his clan to terminate tribute payments to the Gauls, then it follows that his predecessor Eumenes I had been paying them—not something the Attalids made a point of emphasizing. Victories proclaimed by monuments and inscriptions lend themselves to exaggeration; some, at least, may represent no more than defeats of Gallic mercenaries serving in the forces of Antiochos Hierax. One can go further. Attalos himself employed Gallic troops in his war against the Seleukid contender Achaïos, even promising them settlements and further favors when they proved recalcitrant.¹¹ He was in truth no inveterate foe of the barbarian. But the image mattered. Triumphs over Gauls constituted a valuable pose, so long as they were not confused with the facts.¹²

Eumenes II promoted the posture as well. Pergamene troops under the king's brother Attalos joined eagerly with the Roman commander Manlius Vulso in campaigns against the Galatians in 189, following the defeat of Antiochos III, and Attalos earned high plaudits.¹³ In subsequent years Eumenes clashed again with Gallic tribes who had allied themselves with his opponents Prousius of Bithynia and Pharnakes of Pontos.¹⁴ But, despite appearances, no consistent hostility existed between the ruler of Pergamon and the wicked Gauls. A generally neglected passage in Livy discloses the fact that prior to the war with Antiochos III Gallic leaders maintained friendship with Eumenes, and one stuck with him even after the outbreak of that war.¹⁵ Like his predecessor, Eumenes II chased after the image rather than the reality.¹⁶

Eumenes' career is commonly interpreted as proceeding under the lengthening shadow of Rome—a questionable conception. Eumenes certainly benefited from association with Rome in the Antiochene War, obtaining some prime real estate in the settlements that followed that conflict and the expedition of Manlius Vulso against the Galatians.¹⁷ And he incurred Roman displeasure in the course of the Third Macedonian War, resulting, among other things, in the senate's declaration of autonomy for the Galatians who had taken up arms against him.¹⁸ Those developments have led most to assume that Eumenes undertook his actions and conceived his representations largely with the Romans in mind. And the Pergamene altar it-

self, on this analysis (and assuming that Eumenes is its originator), directed its message to a world dominated by Rome. The matter cannot here be discussed at length and has, in any case, received extensive treatment elsewhere.¹⁹ Suffice it to say that the notion of Eumenes perpetually and nervously looking over his shoulder at Rome is a gross oversimplification. His victories over Prousius and Pharnakes, with their Gallic allies, in the 180s came without Roman assistance, sanction, or intervention, apart from fruitless diplomatic missions. Eumenes won his own battles and made his own settlements. The senate may have frowned upon his actions in the Third Macedonian War and expressed unhappiness with him afterwards. But the king ignored Roman pronouncements and pursued an aggressive policy against Celts and Bithynians, unhindered by the western power. The Great Altar, most probably erected in the last years of Eumenes' reign as symbol of his smashing of the Gauls, had little or nothing to do with a Pergamene posture vis-à-vis Rome. It broadcast to the states and peoples of Anatolia the claim that Pergamon carried the banner of Hellenic civilization against the exemplars of barbarism.

The intense concern for the image of the regime and its role as conveyor of cultural patronage was consistent and dominant throughout. That fact is well known. But it might be worth recalling that the cultural intensity did not confine itself to building connections with Athens, any more than the political policy revolved around Rome. The Pergamene kings reached out to a range of Hellenic communities, with a diversity of implications and reverberations.

As so often, Philetairos set the mold. The practice of providing gifts to cities within the reach of Pergamene influence established itself from the outset, conveniently and easily. The benefactions to Kyzikos have already been noted. Philetairos also subsidized the purchase of land by Pitane and supplied endowments to the temple of Apollo in Aigai.²⁰ More interesting and more revealing, however, was the Attalids' exercise of patronage well outside the environs of their realm. Delphi honored Philetairos and members of his family with *proxenia* and a number of other privileges, doubtless in return for Pergamene favors bestowed upon the sacred city.²¹ At Delos a festival was instituted in honor of the founder of the dynasty, the Philetairaia, on the initiative either of Philetairos or of his successor Eumenes I, who provided a vase each year to the temple of Apollo for the celebration.²² The desire to put on display the generosity of the Attalids in the principal religious sites of the Greek world is plain and intelligible. Not so obvious, and thus more striking, are Philetairos's donations to Thespiiai in Boiotia: land endowments for the shrines of the Helikonian Muses and of Hermes.²³ And one might observe that an Attalos, probably nephew and adopted son of Philetairos, gained a coveted victory in a chariot race at Olympia, bringing glory to his uncle.²⁴ The expansionism of Philetairos went well beyond any territorial am-

bitions in Asia Minor. The dynast seems embarked on a mission: to establish an international reputation as a connoisseur of Hellenic culture and religion, a patron of the arts and of sacred shrines. Lest anyone think that Pergamon was some distant backwater, Philetairos would set them straight. The donations were not especially lavish or ostentatious—no temples, porticos, or monuments; they might be offensive. Philetairos avoided the risk of being perceived as a boorish upstart. He raised the profile of his house without treading on toes.

The successors followed suit, each in his own way. Select examples make it clear. The court of Eumenes I provided hospitality and subsidy for intellectuals like the Peripatetic philosopher Lykon, for whose services he outbid Antiochos II of Syria, and Arkesilaos, head of Plato's Academy, who composed an epigram praising Pergamon for fame that exceeded mere military power.²⁵

Attalos I cast his net more widely. A number of artists, including the celebrated Athenian sculptor Phrymachos, created representations of Attalos's victories over the Gauls, doubtless on commission by the ruler. His signature is found, together with that of another renowned sculptor, Nikeratos, on a Pergamene dedication to Athena. And victory monuments in Pergamon carry the name of the local artist Epigonos, who had also established a major reputation.²⁶ The dates are disputed, but there can be little doubt that Attalos promoted the careers of artists who would profit from celebrating the achievements of the regime. The king was also an avid collector of art, his trips abroad often issuing in classical masterpieces acquired to be put on display in Pergamon.²⁷ Like his predecessors, Attalos was keen to advertise his connections with the great religious centers at Delos and Delphi. Two statue bases at Delos possess dedicatory inscriptions by Eumenes and Attalos; the figures depicted by the statues may well have been that pair. Both of the inscriptions record their family relationship with Philetairos, thereby to stress the continuity of the regime.²⁸ The statues are associated at Delos with depictions of Mysian heroes.²⁹ The site of Delos thus served the Attalids to join their dynasty to the traditions of the region and to present that coalescence to the wider Greek world. Delos also hosted the Attalicia and Philetairaia festivals, instituted in this era and linked with celebrations of Hellenistic kings and queens around the Mediterranean.³⁰ The tentative and restrained character of Philetairos's benefactions broadened out somewhat in the heyday of Attalos I. The king erected a whole building complex in Delphi, a stoa, a terrace, and other structures, doubtless containing representations of his Gallic victory.³¹ He also provided skilled workers to help bring the project to fruition.³² In response, the grateful Delphians may well have authorized the erection of a statue in his honor.³³ Certainly they passed honorary decrees to reward Pergamene troops whom the king had sent to protect a nearby city.³⁴ Examples can be multiplied.

The drive of the Attalids to establish their cultural credentials and make their place in the wider Hellenic world can hardly be plainer. Pergamon would be a beacon of learning and a center of artistic achievement. Nothing better symbolizes the zeal of the dynasty than the great Library. The renowned edifice included sculptural portrayals of eminent literary figures of the past, like Homer, Alkaios, and Herodotos, thus to tie Pergamene patrons to the best exemplars of the Hellenic tradition.³⁵ The kings' ardor for collecting became nearly proverbial. The city of Skepsis, we are told, scrambled to bury its precious manuscripts of Aristotle, before royal agents from Pergamon swooped down to expropriate them for the Library.³⁶ The assiduous character of their activities provoked a whole industry of manuscript forgers in order to preserve ownership of the originals.³⁷ This even gave rise to the apocryphal story that the Ptolemies prohibited the export of papyrus out of fear that the Pergamene Library would eclipse their own, thus prompting the Attalids to invent parchment!³⁸ So great was Ptolemy's envy, a subsequent conjecture had it, that the Mousaion in Alexandria took its cue from Pergamon.³⁹ The Library, so it is reported, reached a total of two hundred thousand volumes by the time Mark Antony proudly presented it as a gift to Cleopatra.⁴⁰ It stood as emblematic of Attalid prestige, a signal of how that dynasty wished to convey its strongest impression.

Gifts and endowments, artistic and literary collections, however, tell only a part of the story. The ingenuity of the Attalids is perhaps best exemplified in another sphere: the creation of a mythology. The dynasts fabricated a genealogy and fashioned legendary connections not only to give themselves an illustrious pedigree but to claim links with tradition and history that associated them with a range of Greek states and principalities.

The myth of Telephos proved to be especially serviceable. It long predated the Attalids, of course. The earliest version, in fact, had Telephos born in Mysia itself, the land in which Pergamon later rose. His mother was Auge, a refugee in Teuthrania, protected by Teuthras, the ruler of Mysia, but seduced by Herakles when he was in the vicinity. Telephos was the product of that union, subsequently growing up to become king of the Mysians himself. In that capacity he fought and defeated the invading Achaians, who aimed for Troy but missed and landed in Mysia instead. Telephos, however, suffered a severe wound at the hands of Achilles, from which he gained relief only by making a trip to Greece at the behest of an oracle. Achilles himself provided the cure, on condition that Telephos guide the Achaians back to Troy, this time without losing their way.⁴¹ Telephos thus became a collaborator in the fall of Troy. A rather checkered career. Such was the story that circulated in archaic Greece.

The legend took on an interesting twist in the classical era. Auge was daughter of the king of Tegea, impregnated there by the ubiquitous Herakles, and gave birth to Telephos, much to the dismay of the king. He rid

himself of both daughter and bastard grandson. In one tale he shut them up in a box and sent it out on the high sea. But the crate bobbed up at Teuthrania, where king Teuthras took them under his protection, marrying Auge in the bargain. A variant on that fable has Auge shipped off by herself and eventually landing in the kingdom of Teutiras. The infant Telephos was exposed on a mountaintop in Arkadia but survived, suckled by a hind; he learned his origins from the Delphic Oracle and went off to find his mother in Mysia. The happy reunion led to Telephos's succeeding Teuthras as lord of the region, and then engaging in his adventures with the Achaians.⁴² The latter version, recounted or alluded to many times in fifth-century literature, became the dominant one, and a form of it was embraced by the Attalids and enshrined in the celebrated Telephos Frieze of the Great Altar.

Why choose that version? Certain obvious advantages accrued from tying the new regime to the progeny of Herakles and to the legends of the Trojan War, a hoary pedigree that set the Attalid house in the midst of Hellas's most ancient traditions. But those benefits would derive from any of the renditions of the tale. The dynasty, in fact, eschewed the oldest variants, which had Telephos born and raised in Mysia, the seat of the Attalid kingdom. For what reason? An explanation may lie in the pursuit of cultural diplomacy and international prestige. Telephos's roots, in this version, lay in Tegea, thus providing a link between the recent realm of Pergamon and the ancient land of Arkadia. That the relationship gained expression at the level of interstate negotiation is explicitly attested. An inscription of the mid-second century provides the documentation: an *isopoliteia* agreement between Pergamon and Tegea. The decree accords to the Tegeans all the privileges belonging to Pergamene citizens, heaping praise upon them for their consistent good will, zeal, and devotion to Pergamon. No specific actions are mentioned; there may have been none. The language is conventional. But the affiliation is a special one. The Pergamenes proclaim that the treaty will be recorded on stone as permanent memorial to the kinship between the two cities. And the marble stele would be set up in the sanctuary of Athena that had been installed by Auge herself.⁴³ Reference to the legendary matriarch announces that the pact between the states goes beyond any political arrangements (which few could have taken advantage of anyway). It signaled Pergamon's participation in the cultural heritage of Arkadia.

Mythical ancestors extended the Pergamene reach still further. One expects to encounter an eponymous founder amidst the traditions of the city. And indeed he does turn up: Pergamos, a shadowy figure, surprisingly obscure and marginal—not in the same league with the mainstream legend of Telephos. Little evidence on him survives, and he left but little mark. The story, as subsequently attested, has Pergamos as third and youngest son of Andromache and Neoptolemos, thus grandson of Achilles. His home ground was Epiros, the realm of Neoptolemos, ruler of the Molossians. Pergamos

then found his way to Asia Minor, where he hooked up with a certain Gynos, grandson of Telephos. The two of them enjoyed major success in warfare and conquest, Pergamos, for his part, slaying the king of Teuthrania in single combat, occupying his realm, and renaming his city. Gynos proceeded to found a city of his own, also named after himself.⁴⁴ An interesting tale, but one that made relatively small impact. Pergamos does not appear on extant Pergamene monuments; his name is attested only on a couple of dedicatory inscriptions, and his head with the legend ΠΕΡΓΑΜΟΣ ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ occurs on some bronze coins of the imperial period.⁴⁵ The Attalids did not make much of him, preferring to stress their link with the supposed son of Herakles.

What purpose, then, did he serve at all? The Pergamos and Telephos legends evidently had quite separate and independent origins. The context for the former was Epiros, not Asia Minor.⁴⁶ Pergamos simply claimed a place among the descendants of Achilles. The tradition that linked him with a grandson of Telephos and had each found a city in Mysia doubtless owes its creation to the age of the Attalids. It provided the dynasty with still another connection to the heroes of the Trojan War, extending and enhancing its pedigree. Yet Telephos took central place in the realm's imagery, while Pergamos received scant notice. Why? A conclusion suggests itself. The appropriation of Pergamos by the Attalids as eponymous founder was directed not to the peoples of Asia Minor but to the Epirotes. It represents, in short, another instance of Attalid cultural policy, an amalgamation of their ancestors with the earliest figures of Epirote tradition.⁴⁷ The Pergamene dynasty thus promoted a web of legends that connected them to both Epiros and Arkadia. The importance of association with the antiquity of mainland Greece evidently held a high priority for the Attalids.

The proposition can be explored further. We return to the most celebrated boast of the Pergamene kings: their defeat of the Celts and protection of Hellenic civilization from barbarian inroads. The Great Altar in Pergamon, of course, memorialized the boast in most dramatic and conspicuous form. And the Pergamene victory monuments in Athens broadcast their claims widely, providing those images that grace every textbook of Greek and Hellenistic sculpture. The value of Athens as venue needs no elucidation. But the exposure of their achievements in Delphi, which gets much less attention, may carry equal or greater importance. As we have seen, Attalos I erected a building complex in that city in the later third century, probably containing representations of his triumph over the Gauls. Why Delphi? Its sacred character and its role as center for religious expressions are clear enough. And the advice of Apollo played a major part in the Telephos legend.⁴⁸ But another aspect has relevance. Delphi lay in the sphere of the Aitolian Confederacy, indeed a showcase for that power, now at the peak of its prestige. And the Aitolians too had a major claim to fame regarding the

Celtic menace. It was in their land that the marauding Gauls, having swept all before them, came to grief. Aitolian forces drove off the barbarians in 279 and saved Greece—or so the League's propagandists proclaimed.⁴⁹ And it was at Delphi itself that the major miracle transpired. Apollo in person materialized to rescue his holy city and secure the future of Hellenic culture and religion.⁵⁰ The Aitolians had milked the propaganda value of those events or purported events for all it was worth.⁵¹ What then were the Attalids doing there? Was this an effort to steal some Aitolian thunder, to capture the limelight for themselves, to usurp the title of liberators and saviors of Greece, and to trumpet their triumph in the very heartland of Aitolian authority? Hardly a plausible proposition. The proud display at Delphi of Pergamene achievements must have come with the sanction of the city's overlords.⁵² By choosing to advertise his victory in that location, Attalos I deliberately associated it with the glorious Aitolian feat of a half-century earlier. This was no usurpation but the asserting of a parallel accomplishment. Attalos had fulfilled in Asia Minor the same role that the Aitolian League, under the protection of Apollo, had performed in Greece. Only natural that he should wish to enshrine his success in the site sacred to that god. The ruler of Pergamon thus highlighted the Aitolian deed by attaching his own to it. The policy of the Attalids possessed a subtlety not always conceded to them. Just as their monuments near the south wall of the Akropolis in Athens made explicit reference to the Athenian rout of the Persians in conjunction with their own destruction of the Gauls, so the declaration at Delphi hitched their wagon to the Aitolian star. The sagacious Attalos enhanced his deeds by celebrating them in the locale of Hellas's greatest moments. This sent the message that his victories were not unique ones; they followed in the wake of glorious predecessors. The policy avoided offense while augmenting his image. The Aitolians themselves had supplied something of a precedent. By hanging Gallic shields on the temple of Apollo where the Athenians had hung up the captured shields of the Persians, they had announced a direct connection with that past triumph.⁵³ Attalos showed similar sensitivities. He sought a share in the greatness of Hellas, not a confiscation of it.

The cultural diplomacy of Pergamon thus provided ties, both ancient and current, with states, peoples, and shrines of Greece proper: not just with Athens, but with Boiotia, Arkadia, Epiros, and Aitolia. The roots of that policy, however, went deeper still, and its reverberations wider. The fabled city of Troy lay within reach of the Attalids. In the time of Attalos I the Troad had come within the sphere of Pergamene influence, thus giving the kings control of Mt. Ida and of Ilion itself. Appropriation of Trojan legends was logical, even inevitable. For a dynasty entranced by cultural connections that accorded the aura of antiquity, such legends were irresistible. As we have seen, the tales of Telephos supplied a linkage with the age of Troy and the heroes

who fought there. Homer offered further sanction if it were needed. He identified the citadel of Troy as "Pergamos," a welcome affiliation for the Attalids.⁵⁴ By the late third century B.C., the terms "Troy," "Ilion," and "Pergamon" were interchangeable.⁵⁵ The correspondence can be laid to the credit of Pergamene intellectuals and literary figures.

In the same years the international involvements of the city brought it into contact for the first time with the great power from the West. Attalos I entered into the so-called First Macedonian War on the side of Rome, the first Asiatic prince to enjoy the status of a Roman *amicus*.⁵⁶ The association was indirect, through the intermediacy of Aitolia. A firm alliance held between Aitolians and Pergamenes. The Confederacy elected Attalos I to its highest office and made him a present of the island of Aigina.⁵⁷ Aitolian importunings brought the king into the war against Philip V of Macedon, a war in which his contribution was minimal and his collaboration with Rome marginal. It proved to be the inception, however, of a long-term friendship. The enterprising Attalos saw a future in this relationship that went beyond the merely military. And the legend of Troy provided a convenient bond.

The two states joined in an extraordinary piece of combined symbolic activity in the year 204. Rome, in the waning years of the Hannibalic War, received counsel from both the Sibylline Books and the Oracle at Delphi on how to bring the contest to a close. The prophetic notices advised that the Romans transport the Magna Mater from Asia to Rome. To that end, a distinguished group of Roman aristocrats solicited the assistance of Attalos I, who duly obtained the sacred stone or meteorite in which the goddess resided and had it shipped to Italy. As a consequence, throngs greeted her arrival, a shrine was installed on the Palatine, and annual games were instituted in her honor.⁵⁸ How to account for this elaborate show? The Romans did not need Delphi or Pergamon to wrap up the Hannibalic War. The matter was concluded without diplomatic assistance, let alone military support, from the Greek East. But the Roman senate, like the Pergamene king, took a keen interest in projecting the right image for the cultural milieu of the Hellenistic world.

The point of convergence was the Trojan legend. Rome had long since embraced the tradition that traced its origins to Aeneas and the refugees from Troy.⁵⁹ And Pergamon had its own ties to the stories associated with Aeneas. The Trojan hero sought refuge first at the citadel of Troy, the heights known as Pergamos.⁶⁰ And he subsequently took his followers to Mt. Ida, his own birthplace, the locus of assemblage before embarkation to Europe.⁶¹ Mt. Ida was a principal seat of the Great Mother, who, in the tradition conveyed by Vergil, advocated the Trojan cause to Zeus and stood forth as protector for the exiles.⁶² The region now lay under the suzerainty of Attalos, lord of the Troad and of Mt. Ida, and heir to the legends that accompanied it. The advice of Delphi, that Rome have recourse to Attalos in obtaining

the symbolic stone of Magna Mater, can be no random event. Delphi, as we have seen, was a prime locus for Attalid display, a source of honors for the Pergamene kings, and a valuable sign of their associations with central Greece. The sacred city served as convenient vehicle for the collaboration of Rome and Pergamon. Divine sanction would provide the proper pretext for transferring the Magna Mater from Asia to the West.⁶³ The idea may well have come from Attalos I. After the First Macedonian War, in which Pergamon played a less than spectacular role, Attalos had reason to shore up his prestige. Advertisement of his tie with Rome, announced at Delphi, would do the job very nicely. And, characteristically enough, the medium took the form of cultural expression. The connections among Rome, Troy, and Pergamon had already received publicity in the previous year, when the first two signatories on the treaty that ended Rome's war with Macedon were Ilion and Attalos—neither of whom had played much of a role in the war.⁶⁴ The cultural symbolism mattered: Rome claimed a relationship to the traditions of the Greek East. The delivery of the Magna Mater from the birthplace of Aeneas to its new home on the Palatine through the good offices of the prince of Pergamon reinforced and entrenched that relationship, a mutual benefit to the partners.⁶⁵ Appropriation and expansion of legends surrounding the Trojan War and its aftermath provided the Attalids with significant cultural capital. They extended their links to Arkadia, Delphi, Epiros, and now Rome.

The affiliation gained additional exposure in subsequent years. Rome proclaimed its kinship with Ilion in the Peace of Apameia of 188, according the site special privileges for that reason.⁶⁶ The town was a mere backwater at that time but enjoyed a great revival in subsequent years.⁶⁷ Splendid new buildings rose in Ilion in the mid-second century B.C., monumental structures that served both civic and religious functions, obviously the benefactions of the Pergamene rulers.⁶⁸ Such endowments allowed them not only to broadcast their munificence but to project themselves as protectors of the mother city of Rome. Epigraphic evidence attests to continued generosity to and close relations with Ilion in the reign of Attalos II.⁶⁹ And there is more. The overlappings and interconnections manifested themselves in myth. Lykophron's maddening poem *Alexandra*, parts of which, at least, were composed in the second century, illustrates the intertwining traditions. It includes allusions to Aeneas as forefather of Rome accompanied to Italy by Tarchon and Tyrsenos, sons of Telephos and descendants of Herakles.⁷⁰ Tyrsenos or Tyrrhenos was, of course, the eponymous ancestor of the Tyrrhenians or Etruscans. Some versions had him as son of Telephos, others as son of Herakles, his migration to Italy following the fall of Troy.⁷¹ The stories multiplied. One tradition on Rome's beginnings had its name derive from a certain Rhome, a Trojan refugee to the shores of Italy, daughter of Telephos and wife of Aeneas.⁷² The Romans themselves, it appears, welcomed these asso-

ciations and propagated them.⁷³ But their origins lie in the inventive creations of Attalid artists and intellectuals.

To sum up. Two monuments dominate the contemporary image of Pergamon: the Great Altar, so brilliantly reconstructed in the Pergamene Museum in Berlin, and the Stoa of Attalos, conspicuous in its modern recreation in the agora of Athens. Hence the *Kulturpolitik* of the Attalids is generally defined in terms of buildings and sculptures, a proclamation of their splendor and accomplishments at home and an exhibit of their patronage abroad. The treatment here shifts the focus somewhat. Attalid policy, driven largely by the need to overcome humble origins, to establish an impressive pedigree, and to earn a place among the concert of Hellenistic powers, had a sophistication not always fully appreciated. This was no crude propaganda or mere boastful ostentation. The kings naturally availed themselves of the legends of Troy, taking advantage of the locale, but did not trace their ancestry to the great Trojan heroes or to the central figures of Homeric epic. Instead they fastened on the more equivocal and ambiguous character of Telephos, monarch in Mysia. His story had value outside Asia Minor: it supplied Pergamon with a link to Arkadia. Similarly, the rather marginal and obscure eponymous founder of the city, Pergamos, provided little prestige in the Attalid realm, but he represented a connection with the House of Achilles in Epiros. The rulers of Pergamon therefore delivered the message that they were no mere Asiatic dynasty but a clan with roots in mainland Greece. In comparable fashion, they were at pains to demonstrate that their proudest boast, victory over the dreaded Gauls, carried significance well beyond its Asian setting. That is plain enough and repeatedly commented upon with regard to the Attalid monuments contributed to Athens. But it is at least equally noteworthy at Delphi, where the Pergamene triumph was set in the context of the prior Aitolian defeat of the barbarian. The Attalids' aim was not to outshine rivals but to associate their own accomplishments with the great deeds of the Hellenic past—a legitimizing of their credentials. The Roman connection can be seen in an analogous fashion. Pergamon may have been the junior partner in political and military matters. But its rulers could define the relationship in cultural terms that had a broader meaning. The Trojan origins of Rome gave the Attalids access to valued symbolic capital, for the homeland stood under their sway. So they supplied the stone of the Magna Mater, they enhanced and embellished the city of Iliion, and they promoted traditions that associated Aeneas and the founding of Rome with the progeny of Telephos. Attalid *Kulturpolitik* therefore was subtle and nuanced, not blunt or heavy-handed, engaged as much in the manipulation of myth as in the erection of buildings and statues—a tribute to Pergamene ingenuity and imagination.

NOTES

For sites mentioned in this chapter and those that follow, see Map 1, p. xxi.

1. Strabo 12.3.8, 13.4.1; Paus. 1.8.1; Athenaios 13.577b.
2. Strabo 13.4.1; Paus. 1.10.4.
3. *OGIS* 264, lines 10–15 (2d century A.C.).
4. *OGIS* 748, lines 18–19; ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς τοὺς Γαλάτας.
5. Durrbach 1921, 31.
6. Livy 38.16.14.
7. Polyb. 18.41.7–8; Strabo 13.4.2.
8. *OGIS* 269, 275, 276, 280; cf. Trogus, *Prol.* 27.
9. Paus. 1.25.2. Pausanias, to be sure, does not identify the Attalos responsible for these monuments. But since Attalos II could claim no significant victories over Gauls, his father is far more likely the director of the enterprise.
10. Polyb. 16.25; Livy 31.14.11–12, 31.15.6. See Habicht 1997, 197–98, 224–25.
11. Polyb. 5.77.2, 5.78.1–5.
12. But the pose was potent. Cf. the speech put into a Roman consul's mouth by Livy 38.17.15: "cos [Gauls] Attalus rex saepe fudit fugavitque."
13. Polyb. 21.33.2; Livy 38.12.6–9, 38.13.3, 38.20.3, 38.20.9, 38.21.2, 38.23.11.
14. Gallic assistance to Prousius: Polyb. 3.3.6; Trogus, *Prol.* 32; Segré 1932, 446, lines 11–13. Gallic alliance with Pharnakes: Polyb. 25.2.4.
15. Livy 38.18.1: "missisque ad Eposognatum legatis, qui unus ex regulis et in Eumenis manserat amicitia."
16. Note also the later cordial relations of Eumenes and Attalos II with the Gallic priest of Pessinous: *OGIS* 315.
17. For Eumenes' gains under the Peace of Apameia, see Polyb. 21.46.2–3, 21.46.9–10; Livy 38.39.7–8, 38.39.14–16; Diod. 29.11; Appian, *Syr.* 44. For Eumenes' hand in the settlement after the Galatian campaign, see Polyb. 21.41.6; Livy 38.37.6, 38.40.1–2.
18. For Roman displeasure, see Polyb. 30.19; Livy, *Per.* 46; Justin 38.6.4. For the declaration of autonomy, see Polyb. 30.28.
19. Gruen 1984, 551–63, 573–84.
20. Pitane: *OGIS* 335. Aigai: *OGIS* 312.
21. *FdD* 3.1, 432.
22. *IG* XI.2, 224A, line 4; cf. 224B, line 20.
23. *OGIS* 310–11, 749; cf. 750. See Schalles 1985, 36–38, 42–43.
24. *IuP* 10–11, 19.
25. For Lykon, Diog. Laert. 5.67; for Arkesilaos, Diog. Laert. 4.30. Cf. Hansen 1971, 396–97.
26. Phyromachos: Pliny, *NH* 34.84. Phyromachos and Nikeratos: *IuP* 132–34. Epigonos: *IuP* 21–28; cf. Pliny, *NH* 34.88.
27. *IuP* 47–50; Pliny, *NH* 36.11; Paus. 6.14.11, 8.42.7, 9.35.6. See Hansen 1971, 316–19.
28. *IG* XI.4, 1107–1108.
29. *IG* XI.4, 1206–1208; Robert 1973, 478–85.
30. *Idelos* 361, line 11; 363, lines 8, 26; 366, lines 54, 57, 63–64, etc. On Attalos I and Delos, see Schalles 1985, 60–68, 127–35.

31. *SIG*³ 523. See the reconstruction (though considerably speculative) of Schalles 1985, 104–23; and the full study by Roux 1987, 1–163, with references to earlier discussions. See further Jacquemin and Laroche 1990, 215–21; 1992, 229–58.
32. *SGDI* 2001.
33. *SIG*³ 630, lines 29–30, if the restorations of Bourguet are correct: ἐν Δ[ελφοῖς εἰς τὴν βᾶσιν τοῦ ἀνδριάντος τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλέως Ἀττάλοιο.
34. *FdD* 3.4, 132–35; *ISE* II, 81.
35. *IvP* 198–203.
36. Strabo 13.1.54
37. Galen, *In Hipp. de Nat. Hum.* 5.16.
38. Pliny, *NH* 13.70.
39. Vitruvius 7.4–7. On the Pergamene library, see now Nagy 1998, 206–14.
40. Plut. *Ant.* 58.
41. The texts are conveniently collected by Stewart 1997, 109–19.
42. Paus. 8.4.9; Strabo 12.8.4, 13.1.69; Apollodoros 2.7.3.2, 3.9.1. A fuller collection of evidence in *LIMC* 7 s.v. “Telephos.”
43. *IvPI*, 156, lines 17–24: [ἵνα δὲ τὰ ἐν] τοῖς προπάρχουσιν [ὑπ]ομνήμ[α]σι περὶ τῆς συγγ[ενεί]ας ἡμῶν πρὸς] T[εγε]α[τα]ς κ[αὶ] τῆς ψήφισμα τοῦτό τε καὶ τὸ παρ[ὰ] Τέγεα[τῶ]ν ἐνηνεγμέν[ο]ν ἐμφανῆ τοῖς ἐπιγνο[μ]ένους ἦ[ι] . . . καὶ ἀναθεῖναι [α]ὐτῆν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀθηναῖς [ἦ]ν ιδρύσατο Αὐγῆ. See Curty 1995, 86–87, no. 41.
44. Paus. 1.11.1–2; Servius *in Verg. Ecl.* 6.72; Schol. Eurip. *Andr.* 24.5–6, 32.5–6. See the valuable study by Kosmetatou 1995, 133–44.
45. *IvP* 289; Head 1911, 536.
46. Cf. Kosmetatou 1995, 133–37.
47. Epiros may have held attraction also as birthplace of Olympias, the mother of Alexander, thus an indirect link to the House of the Argeads. Kosmetatou 1995, 143–44, sees the invention strictly as a means of connecting to Alexander and the heroes of the Trojan War. If so, then why did the Attalids not make more of Pergamos?
48. Apollo advised Telephos on where to find his mother: Diod. 4.33.11; Apollodoros 2.9.1; Schol. Vat. Eurip. *Rhesus*, 250. He also recommended the means whereby to cure his wound: Dem. 18.72; Libanios, *Decl.* 5.9; Schol. Aristoph. *Clouds*, 919. And he directed the Achaians to seek Telephos’s guidance in their expedition to Troy; cf. Apollodoros 3.19–20. Further details in Stewart 1997, 113–17.
49. Paus. 1.4.4, 10.18.7, 10.20.4, 10.22.2–7, 10.22.13, 10.23.12–13. For the sources, both literary and archaeological, on the Gallic invasion of Greece, see Nachtergaele 1965, 15–125.
50. Diod. 22.9.5; Justin 24.8.1–9; cf. Paus. 10.22.12, 10.23.1–2.
51. On the political exploitation of these events, see Nachtergaele 1975, 175–205.
52. Notice Attalos’s financing of Aitolian fortifications: Polyb. 4.65.6–7. He was, in fact, a close ally of the Aitolians. See references in Gruen 1984, 530.
53. Paus. 10.19.4.
54. Homer, *Iliad* 4.508, 6.512.
55. Cf. Plautus, *Bacch.* 926, 933, 1053–54.
56. Polyb. 21.20.3.
57. Polyb. 9.42.5, 11.5.8, 22.8.9–10; Livy 27.29.10, 27.30.1.
58. Livy 29.10.4–29.11.8, 29.14.5–14; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.247–348.
59. Cf. Gruen 1992, 26–29.
60. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.46.1.
61. Birthplace: Homer, *Iliad* 2.820–21. Place of refuge and assemblage: Dion. Hal. 1.46.3–1.47.6.
62. Vergil, *Aen.* 6.784–87, 7.135–40, 9.80–92, etc.
63. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.255–72; Gruen 1990, 31.
64. Livy 29.12.14.
65. The case is argued at length in Gruen 1990, 5–33. That the stone containing the Magna Mater came from Mt. Ida is asserted by Ovid, *Fasti* 4.263–64; cf. Herodian 1.11.3; Varro, *LL* 6.15; Livy 29.10.5, 29.14.5: *mater Idaea*. Burton, 1996, 42–58, revives the notion that the stone came not from Mt. Ida but from Pessinous in central Anatolia, where the bulk of the evidence locates it. This is not the place to reargue the matter. Burton, in any case, acknowledges that the Trojan connection was the important one for the Romans.
66. Livy 38.39.8–11.
67. Strabo 13.1.27.
68. See Rose 1994, 75–104.
69. *IvI* 41–43.
70. Lykophron 1226–49.
71. Dion. Hal. 1.28.1–2. On Etruscan representations of the legend, see Massa-Pairault 1985, 58–67, 173–74, 206–207.
72. Plut. *Rom.* 2.1.
73. Cf. Propertius 1.11.11. For the Roman response to Pergamene themes in the Augustan era, see Hardie 1986, 125–43. That subject is explored in much fuller detail in Ann Kuttner’s forthcoming work on Rome and Attalid Pergamon. A preliminary study of Pergamon as viewed in Republican Rome can be found in Kuttner 1995b.