

# Mummius' Dedications at Olympia and Pausanias' Attitude to the Romans

Yannis Z. Tzifopoulos

*For Charles L. Babcock*

PAUSANIAS' *Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις* is among the sources that have been studied in an attempt to assess the relations between Greeks and Romans in the second century A.D., but the results have led to opposing points of view: Pausanias has been variously convicted of anti- and pro-Roman sentiments.<sup>1</sup> Recently Christian Habicht has re-evaluated Pausanias' statements in a more balanced response to the problem, with particular attention to the historical events that marked relations between Greeks and Romans.<sup>2</sup> One of the most significant events in Greco-Roman history occurred during the year 146 B.C., when Mummius defeated the Achaean Confederacy and sacked and levelled Corinth. Pausanias' narrative of this event and his treatment of the Roman consul and general L. Mummius, who arguably was a strong candidate for harsh criticism and partisanship, provides a good case in point for the author's attitude towards the Romans. For Mummius, a protagonist in this watershed event, is the only Roman before the

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (=SkrLund 57 [Lund 1959]); N. Petrochilos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (Athens 1974); and E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley 1984) 203–356.

<sup>2</sup> C. HABICHT, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (=Sather Classical Lectures 50 [Berkeley 1985: hereafter 'Habicht']) 117–40, arguing (122f) that, as far as Pausanias is concerned, "the Romans, like the Persians, the Macedonians, the Gauls, and the Pontic king Mithridates, are foreigners who do not belong in Greece and ought not to rule there. They had not contributed to Greek culture, as expressed in religion, literature, art, and philosophy.... The picture becomes a little brighter in Pausanias' own time, owing to the fact that the good emperors succeeded not only in reconciling the monarchy with the ideology of the republic, but also in reconciling the Greek world to its fate.... Their philhellenism achieved a great deal, and this was acknowledged by the Greeks. Pausanias is no exception."

Principate whose dedications in the Altis are recorded by Pausanias.<sup>3</sup>

In the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia Pausanias saw and described dedications set up by the Roman consul in honor of Zeus in order to commemorate his victory in 146 B.C. In Book 5, the *Eliaka*, Pausanias notes in his description of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (5.10.5) that

On the outside of the frieze, which runs round the temple [sc. of Zeus] at Olympia above the columns, are twenty-one gilded shields, dedicated (ἀνάθημα) by the Roman general Mummius after he had conquered the Achaeans, taken Corinth, and expelled the Dorian inhabitants.<sup>4</sup>

Later, in his section on the various statues of Zeus that were scattered in the sanctuary, Pausanias states (5.24.4):

We know of no Roman before Mummius, whether private person or senator, who dedicated an offering (ἀνάθημα) in a Greek sanctuary, but Mummius dedicated a bronze Zeus in Olympia from the spoils of Achaea. It stands on the left of the offering of the Lacedaemonians, beside the first pillar on this side of the temple.

Finally, Pausanias mentions another statue of Zeus (5.24.8):

Beside the wall of the Altis there is another image of Zeus facing the west, but it has no inscription. This image was also said to have been dedicated by Mummius from the spoils of the Achaean war.

Pausanias' narrative about these dedications is quite explicit. The first dedication, the twenty-one shields, adorns the outer frieze of the temple of Zeus. The second is a statue of Zeus dedicated by Mummius. That Pausanias is certain about this, because he read an inscription on it, may be surmised from his description of the last Zeus statue as uninscribed. Pausanias cannot say definitely who the dedicator of this second statue

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias *does* include in his narrative statues of Roman emperors in the Altis: Trajan and Hadrian (5.12.6), Augustus (5.12.7); Roman emperors in the Metroon (5.20.9), a building converted from a temple to the Mother of the Gods into a temple to all Roman Emperors: see A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich 1972) 160–63. Statues of Roman emperors have been found in the excavations of the Olympia Metroon and are now in the 'Roman Hall' of the new museum.

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all translations of Pausanias' text are from J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece* I (London 1898).

was; nevertheless, he reports what he was told (probably by the local exegetes) that it too had been set up by Mummius. These three references to Mummius' dedications in the Altis, and especially Pausanias' assertion that Mummius was the first Roman who, as a private citizen or a senator, offered a dedication in a Greek sanctuary, have been a cause for much discussion, even criticism, of Pausanias' accuracy.

Most students of Pausanias have pointed out that this comment about Mummius cannot be true, for inscribed Roman bases dating before 146 B.C. have been found at Delos and Delphi.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, they refer to Plutarch's testimony elsewhere about dedications made in Greek sanctuaries by Flamininus, Aemilius Paullus, and Acilius.<sup>6</sup> Recently Habicht has observed (100) that "this is Pausanias' error, but a harmless error, and not so important as his willingness to make such observations." Pausanias' statement is, of course, false, if by the word *anathema* he means "any kind of dedication that may be set up" (this is indeed the term Pausanias uses for the first two dedications of Mummius).<sup>7</sup> Yet his assertion that Mummius was the first Roman to offer a dedication to a Greek sanctuary is not appended to the first dedication, the twenty-one shields, but introduces the statue of Zeus. Before finding fault with Pausanias,<sup>8</sup> perhaps closer attention to the text and the other evidence may explain so positive a statement for Mummius, certainly not Pausanias' favorite Roman.

The insurmountable obstacle of this statement rests on the meaning of the word *anathema*. If, as it has generally been understood, the word means "any kind of dedication that may be set up," then there is no apparent reason why Pausanias chose the Zeus statue of Mummius to make this statement. For in that case Pausanias could have made it when he mentioned

<sup>5</sup> See M. Guarducci, "La dedica di L. Mummio a Tegea," *BullComm* 64 (1936) 41-49, and "Le offerte dei conquistatori romani ai santuari della Grecia," *RendPontAcc* 13 (1937) 41-58; Gruen (*supra* n.1) 166-72; Habicht 99f.

<sup>6</sup> Plut. *Flam.* 12.5ff, *Sull.* 12.6.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἀνάθημα: "that which is set up: hence like ἄγαλμα, votive offering set up in a temple." Without doubt, this statement is not exclusive, *i.e.*, *anathema* may be *anything* that may be set up *anywhere*, inside, outside, or near a temple, or within a precinct.

<sup>8</sup> A. A. Donohue, in her convincing *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (= *American Classical Studies* 15 [Atlanta 1988]) 232, has reached the conclusion that in his usage and limited definition of the word *xoanon* Pausanias is consistent.

the shields.<sup>9</sup> If, however, in using the word *anathema* Pausanias has in mind some specific type of dedication, then his extraordinary assertion may not be false.

In his description of Elis in Books 5 and 6 of his Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις, Pausanias includes programmatic statements in which he explains what he is doing and how. Inside the Altis he describes first the buildings and the offerings they house (5.10–20); then he proceeds with and comments on other dedications, which he divides into two groups: statues (ἀνδριάντων) and dedicatory offerings (ἀναθήματα) and explains his procedure (5.21.1):

I think it best not to mix up the descriptions of them together. For although on the Acropolis at Athens the statues (ἀνδριάντες) and everything else (καὶ ὅποσα ἄλλα) are all alike dedicatory offerings (ἀναθήματα), it is not so in the Altis, where, while some of the objects (τὰ μὲν [sc. ἀναθήματα]) are dedicated to the honor of the gods, the statues of the victors (ἀνδριάντες τῶν νικῶντων) are merely one of the prizes assigned to the successful competitors. The statues (τῶν ἀνδριάντων) I will mention afterwards, but first I will turn to the dedicatory offerings (ἀναθήματα) and go over the most remarkable (ἀξιολογώτατα) of them.

So Pausanias begins his exposition of dedicatory offerings, but not any kind of offerings. He distinguishes three groups: first, the statues of Zeus paid for and set up by the fines imposed on athletes caught cheating, the Zanes (5.21.2–18, ἀγάλματα Διός). Then, “there are also images of Zeus dedicated by states and individuals” (22.1, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀγάλματα Διὸς δημοσῖαι τε καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν ἀνατεθέντα ιδιωτῶν). Within the description of this group of Zeus statues (22.1–24.11), Pausanias mentions Mummius' second and third dedications. He completes this section with a summarizing comment (25.1, τσαῦτα ἐντὸς τῆς Ἄλτεως ἀγάλματα εἶναι Διὸς ἀναριθμησάμεθα ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον) and moves to the third group of dedicatory offerings in honor of other deities within the Altis (25.1 to the end of the book).

<sup>9</sup> There is no way of knowing which dedications of Mummius came first. Pausanias' general arrangement of the material he gathered for the Altis is as follows: first he notes the buildings and the offerings that they housed, then the specific groups of Zanes, of Zeus statues, and statues of other gods, and finally all other dedications. It should be emphasized that Pausanias includes only what he considers to be significant and noteworthy for his narrative.

This is not a careless author's narrative. Pausanias states clearly what he is describing, so as to help his reader follow a difficult exposition. There is only one object, not a dedicatory offering, that he inserts in this section of his narrative for obvious reasons: the bronze stele, set up in front of a statue of Zeus, on which there was inscribed the thirty-years' treaty between Athens and Sparta (5.23.4). More importantly, however, of the fourteen Zeus statues that Pausanias records in the second group, only three are dedications offered by individuals: a Zeus by Cleolas from Phlius, another Zeus by Hippagoras, Phrynon, and Aenesidemus from Leontini,<sup>10</sup> and finally the Zeus of Mummius. The remaining eleven were dedicated by Greek cities. This is indeed extraordinary. Individual dedications of statues of Zeus were few and far between, and the Eleian *boule* clearly granted permission only rarely for such offerings. In light of this, Pausanias' claim about Mummius' dedication of a statue of Zeus, if *anathema* is understood as referring only to the specific group of Zeus statues that Pausanias is discussing, may well be accurate.

The phenomenon of a Roman dedicating a statue of Zeus (or of any god for that matter) in the Altis is rare. It hardly ever happened either at Olympia or elsewhere. The only other author who mentions dedications by Roman generals before Mummius is Plutarch. At *Sulla* 12.6 Plutarch relates the story of Sulla's demand that the Delphic authorities send him various offerings from the sanctuary. This, he notes, reminded the Amphictyons how differently previous Roman generals had behaved towards Greek sanctuaries: "Titus Flamininus, Manius Acilius, and Aemilius Paulus ... not only kept away from the Greek sanctuaries, but they increased them with gifts and honor and great dignity." This general statement does not reveal what kind of dedications the three victorious generals offered at Delphi. Of these three, however, only Acilius' offering is not known.

Plutarch records (*Flam.* 12.5ff) that Flamininus dedicated silver shields—as well as his own long one—and a golden wreath

<sup>10</sup> E. Kunze, "Ausgrabungen in Olympia 1962/3," *ArchDelt* 18 B1 (1963) Chronika 107–10, pl. 142, reports that a small inscribed and reused offering of this Phrynon of Leontini has been discovered in the excavations where the altar of Artemis has been found. He does not give a text, and the inscripton has not yet been published. Also *IOlympia* 838, a fragmentary marble base that reads AIN[- ], has been tentatively associated with this Ainesidemus.

to Apollo at Delphi. On these were inscribed epigrams, quoted by Plutarch, that emphasize the magnificent gift of Flamininus, the descendant of Aeneas, to the Greeks, *i.e.*, their liberty. He made similar offerings of a shield and crown at Delos, as recorded in the accounts of the *hieropoioi* (*IDélos* 442B 85f, 89, 178). These accounts also list other Romans who dedicated mainly wreaths, among them Scipio (*IDélos* 442B 100ff). Aemilius Paullus' dedication at Delphi has been found before the entrance to the temple of Apollo (*FdD* III.4 36)—a column set up originally by Perseus to commemorate a victory that never came. Paullus, who won at Pydna, placed his own statue on top and designated the offering as a dedication from the spoils of the battle.

This evidence, far from disproving Pausanias' statement about Mummius, corroborates it. Apparently offerings of the Roman generals to Greek sanctuaries consisted primarily of booty taken from the battlefield (only shields are mentioned, and in fact the first offerings by Mummius, noted by Pausanias, were the twenty-one gilded shields), wreaths, and self portraits, not statues of a god. As Pausanias claims, there is no evidence, so far at least, that any Roman before Mummius dedicated a statue of a god in a Greek sanctuary.

The archaeological finds at Olympia offer further support for this view and also highlight Pausanias' attitude towards Mummius. Excavation has brought to light four inscribed bases that supported statues of Mummius.<sup>11</sup> One is a pedestal, preserved intact, with cuttings on its upper surface which indicate that Mummius' bronze statue was on horseback.<sup>12</sup> On its short sides there are cut two inscriptions that can be dated by their letter style: the one in or soon after 146 B.C. (*IOlympia* 278) and the other between the middle of the first century B.C. and the middle of the first century A.D. (*I.Olympia* 279). Both texts are identical and read:

Λεύκιος Μόμμιος Λευκίου υἱός,

<sup>11</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Ms. G. Chatzis of the Ephorate at Olympia and the staff, and also Dr U. Zinn of the German Archaeological Institute, for their permission to examine Mummius' inscribed bases and for their valuable assistance.

<sup>12</sup> For a recent discussion see H. Phillip, "Zu den Basen des L. Mummius in Olympia," *AM* 94 (1979) 193–204; W. Koenigs, "Basen des L. Mummius in Olympia," *AM* 94 (1979) 205–16.

στρατηγὸς ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων,  
Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳι.

Similar to this monument seems to be another pedestal, preserved in a fragmentary state (*IOlympia* 280, 281).<sup>13</sup> The material of the stone, the text, and the letter style are all very close to the previous base; only the text is laid out a little differently. In all probability these two were identical statues of Mummius. Another inscribed base that supported a statue of Mummius has also been found. The inscription (*IOlympia* 319) states that the statue was dedicated by the city of Elis on account of Mummius' *arete* and *euergesia* towards the Eleans and the other Greeks. Finally, fragments of a long pedestal have been found on which eleven statues were mounted (*IOlympia* 320–24): these were portraits of Mummius and the ten legates sent by the Roman Senate to assist him in the reorganization of the province Achaëa after 146 B.C.<sup>14</sup>

Pausanias does not mention these four statues, although he undoubtedly saw them in the Altis. All were portraits of the victorious consul, whereas the dedications of Mummius mentioned in Pausanias' narrative of Olympia were not. This discrimination cannot be accidental. The omission of Mummius' portraits is deliberate and indicative both of Pausanias' methodology and of his attitude towards the Roman general. The reason for omitting these four statues is not simply that in this part of his narrative Pausanias is reporting only those statues on the Altis that depict Zeus, *i.e.*, dedicatory offerings in honor of Zeus. Had he wanted to mention Mummius' statues, he clearly could have done so, for it seems that the Elean Boule honored the Roman conqueror (*IOlympia* 319) and also the Senate's embassy (*IOlympia* 320–24) with statues in the precinct of Zeus.

The reason for Pausanias' deliberate omission of these four dedications of Mummius, which in a sense glorify the personal achievement of the Roman consul, must lie in his negative opinion about Mummius' excesses after his victory. That is clear elsewhere in the *Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις*, where Pausanias discusses the events of Corinth's annihilation by Mummius (2.1,

<sup>13</sup> I have collated the inscriptions, and the drawings in *IOlympia* are accurate.

<sup>14</sup> Mummius' consulship or proconsulship of Achaëa is also mentioned in *IOlympia* 56 (lines 56, 64) as a chronological reference in the border dispute between the Messenians and the Lacedaemonians, which was judged by Milesian ambassadors.

7.15.16). Although Pausanias lays the blame squarely on the Achaean Confederacy and its leaders, nevertheless one cannot help but notice in his narrative a sense of disappointment in Mummius' excessive behavior after the victory, which no doubt reminded Pausanias of Sulla's senseless destruction of Athens in 86 B.C.<sup>15</sup> Pausanias' negative attitude about early Roman involvement in Greece does not necessarily imply that he was prejudiced, especially when absolute characterizations do not work with Pausanias. He is critical in his exposition of events, sometimes regardless of the ethnic origin of the perpetrators.<sup>16</sup>

And yet this negative attitude does not divert him from his main task, *i.e.*, to provide an explanation of the most notable monuments in the Altis. Pausanias tries to present a specific instance of Greco-Roman involvement in a reasonably balanced way, and so he incorporates in his work the three dedications of Mummius that were truly remarkable and surely beyond common practice. The twenty-one gilded shields were, after all, fitted on the outside of the frieze of the temple of Zeus! Likewise, Mummius was given the unparalleled permission to set up certainly one, and perhaps two, statues of Zeus. To Pausanias' credit, he records them and accurately emphasizes that Mummius was the first Roman to dedicate a statue of a god in a Greek sanctuary.<sup>17</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF CRETE, RETHYMNO

July, 1993

<sup>15</sup> Sulla, he notes, acted with a cruelty that was "worse than what could be expected from a Roman" (1.20.7, ἀγριώτερα ἢ ὡς ἄνδρα εἰκὸς ἦν ἐργάσασθαι Ῥωμαίων; tr. Habicht 120f n.16)

<sup>16</sup> He blames, for example, the Macedonians for Greece's submission to Rome, but that of course does not imply pro-Roman sentiments. *Mutatis mutandis* his harsh criticism of Sulla's destruction of Athens does not necessarily imply anti-Roman bias. Pausanias blames or praises individuals rather than peoples.

<sup>17</sup> A version of this paper was delivered in October 1991 at Ohio State University, where a symposium was held in honor of C. L. Babcock by his former students. For their insight and rigorous criticism of earlier drafts of this paper I would like to express my gratitude to Professors C. L. Babcock, J. W. Allison, S. V. Tracy, and S. A. Frangoulidis, and also to the referee for *GRBS*.