

## SHORTER CONTRIBUTIONS

### MEMNON ON THE SIEGE OF HERACLEA PONTICA BY PRUSIAS I AND THE WAR BETWEEN THE KINGDOMS OF BITHYNIA AND PERGAMUM\*

**Abstract:** This article argues against the traditional dating of the attack of Prusias I of Bithynia on Heraclea Pontica to the 190s, that is to the time before the Apamean settlement (188). The following re-examination of the only surviving literary source to refer directly to this event (Photius' excerpts of the history of Heraclea Pontica by Memnon), together with relevant information from several other literary and inscriptional texts, allows us to connect the attack of Prusias with the war between the Bithynian and Pergamene kingdoms, which would then be dated to c. 184-183. The other major conclusion presented is that this war had no direct relation to the outcome of the Apamean settlement, as has been the majority opinion.

PRUSIAS I of Bithynia is known to have attacked Heraclea Pontica. He invaded the territory of this city, besieged it for some time without success, and seized two of its dependencies: Cierus (re-founded as Prusias by the Hypias) and Tius, according to our only literary source about this siege, a surviving excerpt from the history of Heraclea Pontica by Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F19.1-3 = *FrHistGr* III, F27). Here Memnon says only that Prusias I died 'not many years' (ἔτη οὐ πολλά) after this siege of Heraclea, without offering any direct chronological indication for the siege or for the king's death. But the common opinion has generally dated the conflict between Prusias and Heraclea Pontica to the mid-190s or even the last years of the third century BC.

What are the grounds for this dating? The idea that the siege of Heraclea by Prusias occurred before the Apamean settlement (188 BC) was originally formulated by Eduard Meyer,<sup>1</sup> who relied on another passage of Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F20.1), which refers to the attack on Heraclea Pontica by the Galatians 'before the Romans crossed over to Asia' (οὐπω τῶν Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότων). Meyer's understanding, therefore, was that since the 'Roman crossing over to Asia' (*FGrHist* 434 F20.1) happened in 190 as part of the Roman war against Antiochus III,<sup>2</sup> the siege of Heraclea by Prusias, which Memnon mentions earlier in the text, should be dated to before 190. Meyer has been followed by Felix Staehelin, Carl Georg Brandis, Ernst Meyer, Giovanni Vitucci and Christian Habicht,<sup>3</sup> among many others.<sup>4</sup> Not everybody, however, appears to have been totally convinced. For example, although David Magie also dated Prusias' assault on Heraclea to soon after the Roman victory over Philip V in 196, he nevertheless noted that 'the date of Prusias' attack on Heraclea is uncertain, for Memnon records only that it was 'not many years' before his death'. Magie, of course, referred to the excerpt of Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F19.1-3) that directly concerns Prusias' siege of Heraclea and, as we have seen, offers by itself no direct chronological indication as to its date. Interestingly, some of those who shared Meyer's idea have referred to this excerpt as well,<sup>5</sup> even though Meyer himself had based his conclusions on a different passage (*FGrHist* 434 F20.1).

\* This article has profited from comments by the two anonymous readers.

<sup>1</sup> E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Koenigreichs Pontos* (Leipzig 1879) 5 n.2 ('between 200 and 195').

<sup>2</sup> And this is how this phrase has been traditionally understood: e.g. G. Vitucci, *Il regno di Bitinia* (Rome 1953) 51; M. Janke, *Historische Untersuchungen zu Memnon von Herakleia* (Diss. Würzburg 1963) 32. Further such references: Meyer (n.1) 51; J. Hopp, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden* (Munich 1977) 41 n.33; A. Bittner, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Herakleia Pontike* (Bonn 1998) 85.

<sup>3</sup> F. Staehelin, *Geschichte der Kleinasiatichen Galater bis zur Errichtung der römischen Provinz Asia* (Diss. Basel 1897) 60 (with n.1) and 61; C.G. Brandis, 'Bithynia', *RE* 3.518 (with reference to 'Memnon 27'); E. Meyer, *Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien*

(Leipzig 1925) 114 (with n.1) and 115; Vitucci (n.2) 51-2; C. Habicht, 'Prusias I.', *RE* 23.1096.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. E.V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (2nd edn, Ithaca and London 1971) 88; E.S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1984) 736 ('that campaign predates the Antiochene war, occurring probably some time in the 190s'); W. Ameling, in *I. Prusias ad Hypium* (Bonn 1985) 3; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* 1 (Oxford and New York 1993) 23 (with n.115); K. Strobel, 'Herakleia [7: Pontica]', *NPauIy* 5.366 (196-190); Bittner (n.2) 84-5 (with n.510), 93.

<sup>5</sup> D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) 314, 1196 n.38; see also, e.g., Vitucci (n.2) 51-3; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (2nd edn, Oxford 1971) 151, 419 n.9.

The dating of Prusias I's assault on Heraclea to the 190s, therefore, appears to be based on two observations concerning (i) the place of this information in the collection of Photian excerpts from Memnon's text, and (ii) a statement by Memnon that Prusias died 'not many years' after this assault. However, neither represents a solid ground. As for the surviving text of Memnon, all other fragments provide chronologically consistent information. He then (*FGrHist* 434 F18.6) speaks of the negotiations between Heraclea Pontica and the Roman generals, when the latter 'had already crossed over to Asia' (πρὸς τοὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγούς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότας). These negotiations (*FGrHist* 434 F18.7-8) paralleled those that the Scipios conducted with other cities in Asia Minor, such as Colophon and Heraclea by Latmus, in c. 190-189.<sup>6</sup> Then, 'not long afterward', Antiochus III 'again' went into battle against the Romans (*FGrHist* 434 F18.9), which surely points to their battle near Magnesia on the Maeander in 189. Whether Heraclea Pontica established a treaty of 'friendship and alliance' with the Romans following this battle (*FGrHist* 434 F18.10) has been debated.<sup>7</sup> But these doubts do not undermine the sequence of events that we see in the surviving fragments of Memnon's history, as preserved by Photius.

The excerptor then informs us (*FGrHist* 434 F19.1) that having dealt with these matters in Books 13 and 14, Memnon proceeded to Book 15, and this is where he described Prusias' assault on Heraclea. After that, Memnon is said to have mentioned (*FGrHist* 434 F21) the help of the people of Heraclea Pontica to the Romans against the Marsi and the Peligni as well as against the Marrucini. Here reference is clearly being made to the Social War that broke out in 91,<sup>8</sup> whereas the next surviving fragment (*FGrHist* 434 F22.1) deals with the start of the First Mithridatic War in 89. It follows that the surviving excerpts of Memnon's history, as we know them from *FGrHist* 434 FF18.6-22.1, offer a chronologically consistent view of the events in Asia Minor from c. 190 to the beginning of the Mithridatic wars, even though there are big gaps between some of these events. Memnon's reference to the Galatian siege of Heraclea (*FGrHist* 434 F20.1-3) thus stands out from the rest of what has been preserved of this part of Memnon's text and should be treated as an historical excursus.<sup>9</sup> As such, this reference neither does nor can support dating Prusias' siege of Heraclea to the 190s.

As we have seen above, the other argument for this dating is that Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F19.3) put the assault of Prusias on Heraclea 'not many years' before the death of the king. Here the ground appears to be even shakier. The dating of Prusias' assault on Heraclea to the mid-190s could formally be accepted insofar as the death of Prusias was thought to have occurred in c. 185 or c. 190.<sup>10</sup> The majority opinion, however, has redated the death of Prusias to the late 180s.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, we know from Strabo (12.4.3, p. 564) that the same Prusias 'welcomed Hannibal' (for this, see below) and then 'retired from Hellespontine Phrygia according to agreements made with the Attalids'. The latter obviously referred to the peace treaty that ended the war between the Attalid

<sup>6</sup> *SEG* 1.440 (letter of Cornelius Scipio to Colophon, c. 190 BC); *Syll.* 3 618 = R.K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) no. 35, ll.10-15 (letter of the Scipio brothers to Heraclea by Latmus, 189) with M. Wörrle, 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos, I: Antiochos III., Zeuxis und Herakleia', *Chiron* 18 (1988) 428-30. See also their letter to Prusias I, which belongs to the same time: Polyb. 21.11.2-3.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Bittner (n.2) 96 (with n.582).

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Livy, *Per.* 72-6. See R. Laqueur, 'Localchronik', *RE* 13.1101; Bittner (n.2) 96.

<sup>9</sup> So already, e.g., Laqueur (n.8) 1101; Janke (n.2) 136-8, who put this episode as one such example among several in Memnon's history; Gruen (n.4) 736 (who, however, still dated Prusias' assault on Heraclea to the 190s; see n.4

above). Pace F. Jacoby in his comments on Memnon in *FGrH* III.b, p. 269.

<sup>10</sup> For 185 as the then traditional dating for the death of Prusias, see references in Meyer (n.1) 75 n.2 (who, however, broke the line, by opting for 190), and K. Meischke, *Zur Geschichte des Königs Eumenes II. von Pergamon* (Pirna 1905) 23, 27 (see n.17 below).

<sup>11</sup> For the death of Prusias I in the late 180s, see, e.g., B. Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea* 3 (Gotha 1903) 74 n.1 (182); Brandis (n.3) 519 (after the war against Eumenes II); Hopp (n.2) 42; P.S. Derow, 'Prusias I Cholos' and 'Prusias II Cynegus', *OCD* (3rd edn) 1268 (182); M. Schottky, 'Prusias I.' and 'Prusias II.', *NPauily* 10.491-2 (182).

and Bithynian kingdoms, which has been usually put in 183.<sup>12</sup> In other words, the death of Prusias has received a new dating, whereas the majority opinion continues to date his assault on Heraclea as before. Memnon's 'not many years' can hardly be pressed too far. However, provided Prusias I died in the late 180s, the usual dating of Prusias' siege of Heraclea to the mid-190s will result in a more than ten-year interval between Prusias' wound and death, which clearly contradicts what Memnon says.<sup>13</sup>

Summing up, neither the chronological sequence of the events described in the surviving fragments of Memnon's text (*FGrHist* 434 FF18.6-22.1) nor Memnon's reference to the death of Prusias 'not many years' after his siege of Heraclea can argue by themselves for dating this siege to the mid-190s. The information that we have from these fragments and the dating of Prusias' death to the late 180s suggest that his assault on Heraclea happened in fact after the Roman crossing over to Asia Minor in 190. Can we further narrow down the time of this assault? Because the Roman war against Antiochus involved the Bithynian kingdom, Prusias' siege of Heraclea could occur only after the Apamean settlement. But then a war broke out between the Bithynian kingdom and the Attalids of Pergamum. Where does Prusias' siege of Heraclea fit in?

Answering this question depends, among other things, on when the war between the two kingdoms started. The usual explanation for the assault on the Bithynian territory by Attalus, a younger brother of Eumenes II of Pergamum, has been that the Attalids wanted to recover the 'part of Mysia', which they had received at the Apamean settlement but of which Prusias I had deprived them.<sup>14</sup> Largely for this reason, it seems, the beginning of the war between Eumenes II and Prusias I has been dated to almost immediately after the Apamean settlement.<sup>15</sup> But this dating can be questioned on the basis of the evidence that we have about the war and the events that surrounded it.<sup>16</sup>

Two such observations have already been offered by Kurt Meischke. First, he dated this war to 185/184-183, with reference to the assembly of the Achaean League in 185: the envoys of Eumenes II, while attending this assembly and renewing the treaty of alliance between Eumenes II and the Achaean League, said nothing about the war.<sup>17</sup> Second, Meischke noted that the envoys

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Polyb. 22.20.8 and 24.1.2 with the comments by F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* 3 (Oxford 1979) 212 and 254 respectively, who also provided references to further bibliography.

<sup>13</sup> Not surprisingly, Magie felt uncomfortable: he also made a reference to 'not many years', but refrained from making statements about the dating of Prusias' assault on Heraclea (Magie (n.5) 314, 1196 n.38), whereas Vitucci (n.2) 64 n.1 simply questioned the validity of this statement by Memnon.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Brandis (n.3) 519; H. Willrich, 'Eumenes II.', *RE* 6.1096; Habicht (n.3) 1098; Jones (n.5) 151; Hansen (n.4) 97; Hopp (n.2) 40, 42; S.L. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1996) 303; Schottky, 'Prusias I.' (n.11) 491. For what this 'part of Mysia' could have meant, see, e.g., Meischke (n.10) 26-7, 28; C. Habicht, 'Über die Kriege zwischen Pergamon und Bithynien', *Hermes* 84 (1956) 92-6; Hansen (n.4) 97, 100; Hopp (n.2) 40 (with n.31); Mitchell (n.4) 24 and n.135, with further bibliography in D.W. Baronowski, 'The status of the Greek cities of Asia Minor after 190 B.C.', *Hermes* 119 (1991) 452 n.4; K. Strobel, 'Galatien und seine Grenzregionen', in E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Forschungen in Galatien* (Bonn 1994) 34 (and n.60), 36, 40; Schottky, 'Prusias I.' (n.11) 491. Cf. S.M. Burstein, 'The aftermath of the Peace of Apamea', *AJAH* 5 (1980) 1 ('at the root of the war was Prusias' refusal to accept the

decision of Cn. Manlius Vulso awarding Phrygia Epictetus to Eumenes').

<sup>15</sup> E.g. C.G. Brandis, 'Galatia', *RE* 7.528 ('about 188 B.C. '); Habicht (n.3) 1096 ('ca.186/83'), 1098 and C. Habicht, 'The Seleucids and their rivals', *CAH* 8 (2nd edn, 1989) 325 ('hostilities began in c.187'); Hopp (n.2) 40-1 ('already soon after 188 B.C. '); Burstein (n.14) 1 (the war 'broke out soon after 188 and lasted until 183'); Strobel (n.14) 34-5; R.M. Errington, 'Eumenes II',  *OCD* (3rd edn) 568 (187-183); Bittner (n.2) 85-6; Schottky, 'Prusias I.' (n.11) 491; M. Sartre, *L'Anatolie hellénistique de l'Égée au Caucase: 334-31 av. J.-C.* (Paris 2003) 200.

<sup>16</sup> So already, e.g., Meyer (n.1) 75 (with n.3): 185/4, dating the end of this war to 184; Niese (n.11) 70 (with n.2): the war started in c. 186, on the premise that it should have ended in 185/4, and 72: the war lasted a short time and ended in 184; Vitucci (n.2) 52 ('c. 186'); R.B. McShane, *The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum* (Urbana 1964) 160 (before 184); Hansen (n.4) 97 (the war started 'sometime before 184 B.C. '); A. Mehl, 'Eumenes II.', *NPauIy* 4.252 (186-183).

<sup>17</sup> Meischke (n.10) 22-3 (his reference should, in fact, be Polyb. 22.7.8-9), who, however, referred to the Bithynian king at the time of this war as Prusias II, whose enthronement Meischke dated to 185; see Meischke (n.10) 23, 27.

of Eumenes II to Rome in late 186 made no complaint that Prusias had not observed the Apamean settlement.<sup>18</sup> One can take a step further and compare the two embassies that Eumenes II sent to Rome in the 180s. The first such embassy, led by Attalus in late 186, complained of Philip V's taking over of Thracian cities, including Aenus and Maronea.<sup>19</sup> The next embassy, led by Athenaeus (a younger brother of Eumenes II and Attalus), the date of which has been established in late 184, accused Philip V not only of subjugating Thracian cities but also of helping Prusias I in his war against Eumenes II.<sup>20</sup> The fact that the embassy from 186 did not complain of Philip's help to Prusias I suggests that there was not yet the war between Prusias I and Eumenes II at that time.<sup>21</sup>

Further support for dating the beginning of this war to *c.* mid-180s can be added. First of all, we know directly of only two military engagements that happened during this war: the naval victory of Hannibal, who used the stratagem of hurling jars with poisonous snakes onto the Attalid ships,<sup>22</sup> and the victory of Attalus over the combined forces of Prusias and the Galatians at Mt Lypedros.<sup>23</sup> Hannibal is known to have left the court of Antiochus III and come to that of Prusias I via Armenia (where he founded Artaxata), Crete, and probably Rhodes. Plutarch's statement that Hannibal ended up in Bithynia after 'having wandered a lot' (πλανηθεὶς πολλά) also shows that Hannibal could hardly have arrived in Bithynia very soon after Antiochus' defeat by the Romans in 189.<sup>24</sup> It looks as if some more time passed after the arrival of Hannibal in Bithynia and before the war between the two kingdoms started: Nepos says that Hannibal re-equipped and trained the army of Prusias, won him the friendship of local kings, and allied him with 'warlike nations'. According to Justin, it was his confidence in Hannibal's abilities that influenced Prusias I to break the treaty with Eumenes II.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, the beginning of the war should have followed, first, Hannibal's wanderings and, then, all these necessary military and diplomatic preparations.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Meischke (n.10) 27.

<sup>19</sup> Polyb. 22.6.1-4; Livy 39.24.6-7. For the date of this embassy, see, e.g., Meischke (n.10) 16 (with n.6); Gruen (n.4) 551 (186). Cf. the senatorial commission, which was then dispatched to investigate the matter: Polyb. 22.6.5-6; Livy 39.27.1-10, and Meischke (n.10) 17: this commission returned to Rome in 'late autumn 185', with reference to Livy 39.33.1-2.

<sup>20</sup> Polyb. 23.1.4, 23.3.1; Livy 39.46.9. Meischke (n.10) 19 (with n.3), 21 (with n.7).

<sup>21</sup> The other possible explanation for this difference between the two embassies could have been, of course, that Philip was not yet offering his help to Prusias in late 186. But it is unlikely that Philip, who had been in conflict with the Attalids over the Thracian cities, would have missed the earliest opportunity to weaken the Attalid power.

<sup>22</sup> Nepos, *Hann.* 10-11.

<sup>23</sup> See *I.Pergamon* I 65 = *OGI* 298 ('soon after 183'); Nepos, *Hann.* 10-11. See also L. Robert, *OMS* II 1183-4 (183) = R.E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom. A Constitutional History* (Oxford 1983) 211, no. 7 (184/3), with Vitucci (n.2) 56 (184); Habicht (n.14) 99 and Habicht (n.3) 1099.

<sup>24</sup> Armenia (and Artaxata): Strabo 11.14.6, p. 528; Plut. *Luc.* 31.3-4. Crete: Nepos, *Hann.* 9; Iust. 32.4.3-6. For Rhodes, see Niese (n.11) 70 n.5, with reference to Nepos, *Hann.* 13.2 (Hannibal addressed the Rhodians in a speech about the deals of Cn. Manlius Vulso in Asia). Plut. *Flam.* 20.2.

<sup>25</sup> Nepos, *Hann.* 10.2; Iust. 32.4.2. Meischke (n.10) 27 proposed that the war started before the arrival of Hannibal and, therefore, doubted Justin's evidence for the two following reasons: first, Hannibal would have been more eager to come to Bithynia after the beginning of the war, which would have allowed him to demonstrate his military skills and, second, Nepos' 'Hann. 10.2' (in fact, *Hann.* 10.1-3) allegedly suggests that some military engagements had occurred already before Hannibal's coming to Bithynia. But the first argument is hardly convincing: Hannibal could just as well have provoked Prusias to start the war for the same reason; and Prusias could have been more eager to welcome Hannibal, if the war was expected, or planned, in the future. Meischke's second argument was based on the fact that Nepos first mentions Hannibal only in connection with the naval battle that Hannibal won by the above-mentioned stratagem (Nepos, *Hann.* 10-11; see n.22 above), even though several military engagements between the two kingdoms had occurred prior to that battle. However, since Nepos' work focuses on Hannibal, Nepos most likely omits everything that is not directly connected with Hannibal's military exploits. And, finally, Nepos says that Hannibal prepared the kingdom of Bithynia for this war, by training the army and establishing important alliances, which refutes both Meischke's arguments.

<sup>26</sup> Cf., e.g., Hansen (n.4) 98: Hannibal arrived before the war started.

Attalus' victory near Mt Lypedros has been put in the autumn of 184,<sup>27</sup> largely on the basis of the two known inscriptions that commemorated that victory.<sup>28</sup> A similar dating also follows from the fact that the Attalid embassy to Rome in late 184 was presided over by Athenaeus,<sup>29</sup> because Attalus was then leading a military campaign against the forces of the Bithynians and Galatians.<sup>30</sup> While the dating of the naval battle can be established only approximately, the campaign of Attalus and his victory near Mt Lypedros should have occurred in 184 or 184-183. Therefore, neither of the only two military engagements about which we have direct evidence allows us to date this war to immediately after 188.<sup>31</sup> Finally, no complaint against Prusias I was made (or, at least, was documented to have been made) by the envoys of Eumenes II to the Romans in either 186 or 184. It follows, therefore, that, on the one hand, no indication exists that Prusias I had in any way damaged the interests of the kingdom of Pergamum, and on the other, that there is no evidence that Prusias kept for himself the 'part of Mysia' that the Apamean settlement had restored to the Attalids.<sup>32</sup>

Such observations suggest that the war between the two kingdoms had no direct connection to the Apamean settlement and that the real reasons for this war should be sought elsewhere. In chronological terms, therefore, this war need not necessarily have occurred immediately after the Apamean settlement. The question then arises about the reason for the war between the two kingdoms. Justin (32.4.2) says that Prusias I, being incited by Hannibal, 'broke his treaty' with the Attalids. It follows that the war between the two kingdoms was not directly connected with the outcome of the Apamean settlement and that the treaty that Prusias I broke was indeed his treaty with the Attalids. Prusias I's assault on Heraclea Pontica provides the explanation for the start of the war.<sup>33</sup> Heraclea is thought to have been allied with the Attalids during this war.<sup>34</sup> We also know that Heraclea subscribed (together with Mesambria, Chersonese and Cyzicus) to the treaty concluded between Eumenes II and Ariarathes IV (Eusebes) on the one hand, and Pharnaces on the other hand in 179.<sup>35</sup> Eumenes II was thus consistently offering his protection to Heraclea Pontica after Antiochus III had been expelled from western Asia Minor.

## CONCLUSIONS

A re-examination of the surviving evidence allows us to draw the two following conclusions: (i) the assault of Prusias I on Heraclea Pontica happened after the Apamean settlement of 188, and (ii) this assault was directly connected with the war between the Attalid and Pergamene kingdoms.<sup>36</sup>

The fact that Eumenes II began this campaign only several years after the Apamean settlement and

<sup>27</sup> E.g., Errington (n.15) 568; Mitchell (n.4) 24; Habicht (n.15) 328.

<sup>28</sup> Robert, *OMS* II 1183-4 = Allen (n.23) 211, no. 7, ll.11-13 (Telmessus), dated to 183 (Robert) or 184/3 (Allen), with Habicht (n.14) 99 and Habicht (n.3) 1099, and K. Strobel, 'Keltensieg und Galatersieger', in *Forschungen in Galatien* (n.14) 88 n.117 ('November/December 184'); *I.Pergamon* I 65 (= *OGI* 298).3 ('soon after 183').

<sup>29</sup> Polyb. 23.1.4, 23.3.1; Livy 39.46.9 (see n.20 above).

<sup>30</sup> So already Meischke (n.10) 19 n.3, 22.

<sup>31</sup> This does not mean by itself, of course, that Hannibal's naval victory chronologically preceded the victory of Attalus near Mt Lypedros: Nepos (*Hann.* 10.1-3) mentions several military engagements, which had been won by the Attalid forces, before this naval battle took place, and Attalus' victory could have been one of these battles. See also Iust. 32.4.6. On the other hand, there are no grounds for following Hansen (n.4) 97-9, who put the battle at Mt Lypedros in the 'early phase of the war'.

<sup>32</sup> It is true that the Apamean settlement restored to the Attalids 'that part of Mysia of which Prusias had formerly deprived Eumenes': Polyb. 21.45.10 (tr. W.R. Paton); cf. Livy 38.3.15, who speaks of the whole of Mysia. But there is no evidence in either Polybius or Livy that this territory happened to be retained by Prusias, and, as we have seen above, the envoys of Eumenes II to Rome never made such a complaint.

<sup>33</sup> So also McShane (n.16) 160.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. Niese (n.11) 71; Hansen (n.4) 98 (who likewise proposed that Cyzicus was on Eumenes' side as well); Hopp (n.2) 41 n.33.

<sup>35</sup> Polyb. 25.2.13. Whether these cities participated in the war (on the side of Eumenes II) has been debated; see, e.g., Habicht (n.15) 330 (with n.13), who was inclined to think that they did.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Habicht (n.3) 1096-1101, presenting these two conflicts as separate wars: 'Expansion am Pontos' (1096-7) and 'Krieg gegen Eumenes II' (1098-1101), because he had accepted the dating of Prusias' assault on Heraclea

only after Prusias' assault on Heraclea Pontica suggests that Eumenes II's justification for going to a war against Prusias was to help Heraclea Pontica. This city is known to have been allied with the Attalids in the post-Apamean period. The interpretation suggested for this war by Benedikt Niese can, therefore, be upheld. However, his dating of this war to c. 186-184 needs to be changed to c. 184-183.<sup>37</sup>

SVIATOSLAV DMITRIEV  
Ball State University

[n. 36 cont.] Pontica in the 190s, i.e. before the Apamean settlement. This view, as we have seen, derives from the opinion that can be traced back to Meyer (n.1) 75 (with nn. 2 and 3), who put the siege of Heraclea Pontica by

Prusias in the period between 200 and 196 and his war against Eumenes II in 185/4.

<sup>37</sup> See Niese (n.11) 70-2.

### A NEW MONOGRAPH BY ARISTARCHUS?

**Abstract:** This article argues that the Homeric scholia preserve the title of a lost monograph by the second-century BC Alexandrian scholar Aristarchus on the date of Hesiod's life. Apparent references to the contents of this monograph occur in the Homeric as well as the Hesiodic scholia, and demonstrate that Aristarchus compared the works of the two poets and concluded that Hesiod had lived sometime near 700 BC.

THE AbT scholia to Homer's *Iliad* are an invaluable source for our understanding of ancient Homeric criticism.<sup>1</sup> They inform us about scholarship and readership, and occasionally transmit the titles of now-lost monographs.<sup>2</sup> I will argue that one such title, hitherto unnoticed,<sup>3</sup> resides in the following scholion:

Schol. A ad Hom. *Il.* 10.431 a (Aristonicus): καὶ Φρύγες ἰππόδαμοι (καὶ Μήονες ἰπποκορυσταί)· (ἢ διπλῆ) ὅτι ἐτέρους τῶν Τρώων οἶδεν τοὺς Φρύγας· καὶ ὅτι Ὅμηρος οὐκ οἶδεν καλουμένους Λυδούς, ἀλλὰ Μήονας, πρὸς τὰ Περί ηλικίας Ἡσιόδου.<sup>4</sup>

καὶ Φρύγες ἰππόδαμοι (καὶ Μήονες ἰπποκορυσταί): <The *diple*> is because he [i.e. Homer] knows that the Phrygians are separate from the Trojans, and because Homer does not know that the people are called Lydians, but Maeonians. Refer to Περί ηλικίας Ἡσιόδου (*On the Age of Hesiod*).

This scholion derives from Aristonicus' commentary entitled Περί σημείων Ἰλιάδος which offered explanations of Aristarchus' marginal notations in his *diorthosis* of Homer's *Iliad*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Erbse (ed.), *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)* (7 vols, Berlin 1969-88). For a recent assessment of Erbse and his edition's impact on the field of ancient Homeric criticism, cf. M. Schmidt, 'The Homer of the scholia: what is explained to the reader?', in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome 2002) 159-83.

<sup>2</sup> R. Janko (*The Iliad. A Commentary 4: Books 13-16* (Cambridge 1992) 71 (note ad 13.195-7)) was the first to spot Aristarchus' Περί τῆς πατρίδος in the Homeric scholia (schol. A ad Hom. *Il.* 13.197: Αἴαντε (μεμαότε): ὅτι συνεχῶς κέχρηται τοῖς θυϊκοῖς· ἢ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὰ Περί τῆς πατρίδος· Ἀθηναίων γὰρ ἴδιον). Aristonicus regularly cites Aristarchus' works with the formula πρὸς τὰ + title.

<sup>3</sup> Unnoticed perhaps because in I. Bekker's edition of the *Iliad* scholia (*Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* (Berlin 1825) 1.295) he printed πρὸς τὰ περὶ Κιλικίας Ἡσιόδου in the last line instead of the reading of Venetus A, cor-

rectly printed in Erbse's edition (cf. n.1). The great Aristarchean critic K. Lehrs (*De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (3rd edn, Leipzig 1882) 229) noted the correct reading of the scholion, but did not follow its implication.

<sup>4</sup> Scholia such as this normally begin with a reference to the sign Aristarchus used in his marginal notation; none is recorded here, though it was surely a *diple*, which I have added.

<sup>5</sup> Aristonicus' biographical entry in the *Suda* (s.v. Ἀριστόνικος (Adler A 3924)) lists the titles of three such commentaries: Περί τῶν σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας. The fragments of Aristonicus' *Iliad* commentary were collected by L. Friedländer, *Aristonici Περί σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores* (Göttingen 1853), those of his commentary on the *Odyssey* by O. Carnuth, *Aristonici Περί σημείων Ὀδυσσεΐας reliquiae emendatiores* (Leipzig 1869).