Lucius Mummius and the Spoils of Corinth

Liv Yarrow

Eutropius, writing his epitome in the 4th century AD, took the long view on history and treated momentous events with a rather elegant simplicity. In his summary of the year 145 BC he observes:

> Then in Rome at the same time there were three of the most celebrated triumphs: Africanus over Africa, before whose chariot Hasdrubal was led; Metellus over Macedonia, before whose chariot Andriscus walked, the same man known as the Pseudo-Philip; and Mummius over Corinth, before whom were borne works of bronze, painted tablets, and other ornaments of that most famous city. (4.14)

When these three generals returned to Rome each brought with him the symbols of his ultimate victory; the conquered empire was paraded before the people. As each commander tried to outstrip the spectacle of the others, they carefully staged the 'invasion' of the city by its most dreaded enemies. Scipio sent one of the legendary Barcids into the Roman Forum — even Hannibal never got so close. Metellus only had a pretender to Alexander's throne, and an unsuccessful one at that. But Mummius pointed the way to the future, to the next great perceived threat to the empire: he brought in the trappings of the East, the luxuries that were thought to have stifled the ambitions of the Greeks and the Persians before them.[1]

While Scipio and Metellus bound their rivals in chains and shut them out of sight, the effigies of Corinth were conspicuously displayed throughout the empire and thus were given new life, while serving Mummius' objectives. The statues of Corinth travelled to far-flung locations throughout those Mediterranean regions under Roman hegemony. From a combination of epigraphic and literary evidence seventeen separate communities, excluding Rome, have been identified as likely recipients of Mummius' munificence, seven from Italy and the west (Italica, Parma colonia, Pompeii, Nursia, Cures, Trebula Mutuesca, and Fregellae) and ten communities in the Greek East (Olympia, Tegea, Isthmia, Epidaurus, Delphi, Thespiae, Thebes, Aulis, Oropus, and Pergamum).[2]

Moreover, our evidence for this distribution, as in most areas of ancient history, is probably incomplete, meaning that in all likelihood even more communities received portions of the Isthmian wealth. Note how this list divides almost evenly between locations on the Italic peninsula and mainland Greece, but with the two notable outlying points of Pergamum in Asia Minor and Italica in Spain.

---

1 On the topos of decline as the result of the acquisition of empire see: Diod. 37.3; Trogus 36.4.12; Sall. *Cat.* 10-13, *Iug.* 41-2; Livy, *Preface*. See too A. Lintott, 'Imperial Expansion and Moral Decline in the Roman Republic', *Historia* 21 (1972), 626-38.

2 The epigraphic evidence is collected in the appendix.

Historians, both past and present, have seen 146 BC as a turning point in the history of Rome.[3] This is reflected in the choices of the ancient authors: Polybius finishes his *Histories* here, deliberately treating events such as the war against Numantia in monograph form. Posidonius picked up where Polybius left off. Sempronius Asellio also decided to start his history at this date. Velleius Paterculus uses the date to break his short history into two books. Sallust singles out this date as the turning point in Roman history (*Cat.* 10.1). Diodorus reflects a similar tradition in the speech he attributes to Scipio Nasica regarding the dangers of eliminating all the enemies of the Roman people (34/5.33.3-6). Similarly, Pliny the Elder makes Mummius responsible for introducing the Romans to Greek arts — for Pliny, his triumph marks the beginning of Roman decadence (*NH* 33.149; cf. 37.12).

Besides Pliny, other ancient authors also credit Mummius with significant innovations. Tacitus' assertion that Mummius was the first to introduce the theatrical arts to the city in his triumph has led to various interpretations.[4] Is Tacitus referring to the first performance by Greeks? A particular kind of performance or stage construction? Or was this simply the first time that theatre and a triumph were joined together? Some are tempted to connect this with Vitruvius' testimony that Mummius brought the acoustic vases from the theatre at Corinth back to Rome, but these vases ended up as dedications in a temple and served no particular sound-enhancing function (5.5.8). Pausanias goes so far as to credit Mummius with being the first Roman ever to make a dedication at a Greek sanctuary. In an attempt to redeem Pausanias' historicity, it has been proposed that *anathema* should be understood in this passage as meaning an image of a deity, but this seems to be an unnecessary stretch.[5] Even if we rightly doubt the validity of Pausanias' assertion and hesitate to draw any conclusions from the vague testimony in Tacitus, it is the association of Mummius with innovation which occupies the remainder of my discussion.

This representation of Mummius the innovator is at odds with the common characterization of Mummius in the literary sources as someone lacking an appreciation of Greek culture and one who shunned its physical trappings.[6] This absence of personal desire and lack of understanding of the true value of the plunder from Corinth is used by the ancient literary sources as a means of explaining his generosity in dispensing booty. However, the physical evidence tells another story. The known monuments demonstrate an awareness of diverse cultural norms and a desire to cultivate a positive reputation

---

3 N. Purcell, 'On the Sacking of Carthage and Corinth' in D. Innes, H. Hine, & C. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford, 1995), 133-48 and U. Hackl, 'Poseidonios und das Jahr 146 v.Chr. als Epochendatum in der antiken Historiographie', *Gymnasium* 87 (1980), 151-66.

4 *et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos nec quemquam Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatralis artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe praebuerit* (Tac. *Ann.* 14.21). See H. Hill, 'Tacitus, Annals XIV.21.2', *CR* 46.4 (1932), 152-3 and C. Knapp, 'Notes on Plautus and Terence', *AJPh* 35.1 (1914), 12-31, esp. 25, n. 1.

5 Paus. 5.24.4; see Y.Z. Tzifopoulos, 'Mummius' dedications at Olympia and Pausanias' attitude to the Romans', *GRBS* 34 (1993), 93-100.

6 Vell. Pat. 1.13.3-5; cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.55; *de Off.* 2.76; Strabo 8.6.23.

among non-Romans, foreshadowing the patterns of the late Republic when the Roman elite actively sought clients abroad.

If this is so, why is it that we remember Scipio Aemilianus as leading the cultural development of his generation? While Scipio built up his circle of educated companions from around the empire, Mummius was more concerned with impressing himself on the minds of the broader population. However, Mummius' use of monuments and spectacles demonstrates that he was no less aware of the cultural breadth of the empire than his patrician contemporary.

Historians in antiquity could not resist contrasting these two men, triumphators together in 145 and thrown together again in the censorship of 142. In these comparisons, Mummius somehow never wins.[7] The two following passages from Velleius Paterculus and Dio Cassius illustrate the favouritism of the historians and the inherent contradictions which arise in the literary sources.

> The two commanders differed in their characters as in their tasks. Scipio was a cultivated man and an admirer of liberal studies and of every form of learning... Mummius was so uncultivated (*rudis*) that when, after the capture of Corinth, he was contracting for the transportation to Italy of pictures and statues by the hands of the greatest artists, he gave instructions that the contractors should be warned that if they lost them, they would have to replace them by new ones. Yet I do not think, Vinicius, that you would hesitate to concede that it would have been more useful to the state for the appreciation of Corinthian works of art to have remained uncultivated to the present day. (Vell. Pat. 1.13.3-5)
>
> As regards their characters, Mummius and Africanus were utterly different from each other in every respect. The latter performed his duties with the strictest integrity and with impartiality... Mummius, on the other hand, was more popular in his sympathies and more charitable... (Dio Cass. 22.76.1; cf. Val. Max. 6.4.2a.)

Velleius contrasts the education of Scipio with the lack of artistic appreciation anecdotally attributed to Mummius, who is said not to comprehend the irreplaceable quality of a masterwork. He goes on to suggest that the empire would be better off if no Roman had learned to appreciate Corinthian treasures. This should imply that Mummius was the better Roman, but in fact one is left with the impression that Mummius' lack of education prevented him from fully considering the dangers of importing such goods to Rome. In the comparison offered by Dio of the behaviour of the two men during their censorship, it is Scipio's turn to play the 'old-fashioned' conservative, while Mummius is tarnished with the crime of popularity. I suspect that there is a grain of truth here: the relative newcomer to political life was not at liberty to alienate the members of the ruling

---

7 Further hostility toward Mummius is found in the historiographical tradition which emphasizes his usurpation of Metellus' *gloria*. Such narrations of the Achaean War credit Metellus with the decisive military accomplishments and Mummius with arriving at the final moment to receive the credit for his predecessors' actions: Val. Max. 7.5.4; Flor. 1.32.4; Oros. 5.3; *Lib. de Vir. Ill.* 60. Vell. Pat. 1.12.1 credits Metellus with the chief portion of the fighting, but does not emphasize Mummius' usurpation.

classes, while the well-established patrician was secure enough in his power base not to pander to the masses.[8]

We have ample evidence for Mummius' munificence to the Roman people, but no one is really surprised by dedications in the city of Rome. The temple Mummius built for Hercules Victor was just one of many such monuments erected with growing frequency by republican generals. Such buildings, while impressive in themselves, provided a pious excuse for displaying booty. Both Metellus and Scipio built such temples, the former going so far as to introduce the use of marble for the first time.[9] The dedicatory inscription found on the Caelian hill has caused all manner of scholarly debate.[10] The crude form of the lettering and the choice of peperino tufa have led some to suggest it is a forgery or a later copy. One scholar disregards this epigraphic evidence and suggests that the round temple between the Forum Boarium and the Tiber is actually that of Mummius.[11] While the round temple is undoubtedly of mid-to-late second century origin and probably built with triumphal associations, this marble structure cannot have been erected by Mummius if the numerous literary sources are correct in crediting Metellus with having built the first marble temple in Rome.

Besides Mummius' own temple, which was probably just one of many built during this time, the literary sources record many notable works of art displayed throughout the city of Rome. As already mentioned, acoustic vases were dedicated to the temple of Luna on the Aventine. Cicero in the *Verrines* refers to statues of the Muses from Thespiae in the temple of Good Fortune (2.4.4). Strabo reports that the painting of Dionysus by Aristides, although coveted by the king of Pergamum, was hung in the temple of Ceres (8.6.23 C381). Pliny believed this to be the first painting to become state property (*NH* 35.24). Such dedications demonstrate Mummius' awareness of the benefits of the arts, at least to his political career, if not to his own intellectual development. When Mummius showered Rome with gifts, we have little trouble identifying possible motiva-

---

8 The *nobilitas* or *novitas* of L. Mummius is a point of contention among modern scholars: M. Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility* (Oxford, 1969), 51; M. Dondin-Payre, '*Homo nouus*: Un slogan de Caton à César?', *Historia* 30 (1981), 22-81, esp. 39; P.A. Brunt, '*Nobilitas* and *Novitas*', *JRS* 72 (1982), 1-17, esp. 13. The problem arises from the conflicting vocabulary of Velleius Paterculus (1.13.2 and 2.128.2) and Valerius Maximus (6.4.2). Leaving aside the correct application of such terminology, it can be asserted that in all probability Mummius was the first of his family to obtain the consulship (146), but that he was well positioned to do so: his father was tribune of the plebs (187) and praetor in Sardinia (177), and he himself was awarded a triumph in 152 for his service in Spain as praetor and propraetor (153-2; App. *Iber.* 56-7).

9 For Scipio's temple, see Plut. *Mor.* 816; for the temple built by Metellus, see Vell. Pat. 1.11.5.

10 *CIL* I.2 626 = VI 331 = *ILLRP* 122. For a summary of the debate and relevant bibliography, see D. Palombi, 'Hercules Victor, Aedes et Signum' in Steinby, *LTUR* vol. 3, 23-25.

11 A. Ziolkowski, 'Mummius' temple of Hercules Victor and the round temple on the Tiber', *Phoenix* 42 (1988), 309-33.

tions. Any group of potential viewers — the army, the people, the equites, or the Senate — could also be a politically powerful force.[12]

The obvious motivations for lavish benefactions start to recede as we move away from Rome. It has been suggested that within Italy, at least, Mummius' actions could be explained as part of his 'campaign' for the censorship. However, electoral considerations cannot be the only motivation, since of the communities which we know to have benefited from his actions, only Parma possessed the franchise. This community, however, is so distant from Rome that it is difficult to imagine that its residents regularly made the journey to exercise their vote. Mummius' possible motivations for such munificence and the degree to which Mummius' benefactions were an innovation, are best explored without drawing *a priori* geographical divisions, and should be viewed in light of the actions of previous returning commanders.

The ancient authors are keen to point out to us the breadth of Mummius' dispersal of booty. They often use this as evidence for his generosity and contrast it with his own abstinence.

> After the capture of Corinth, Lucius Mummius adorned not merely Italy, but also the provinces, with statues and paintings. Yet he refrained so scrupulously from appropriating anything from such vast spoils to his own use that his daughter was in actual need and the Senate furnished her dowry at public expense. (Frontin. *Strat.* 4.3.14)

This passage is perhaps the most explicit testimony from antiquity to avoid any mention of the city of Rome and report donatives in both Italy and the provinces. The anecdote contrasting this generosity with his personal poverty was also known to Pliny (*NH* 34.36).[13] Strabo, at the other extreme, only mentions communities around Rome and has a general reference to Mummius' magnanimity in contrast with his lack of artistic appreciation.[14] Cicero in the *Verrines* depicts Mummius together with Marcus Marcellus, Lucius Scipio, Flamininus and Aemilius Paulus as men whose houses were devoid of treasures, but who filled Italy with the spoils of war (1.55; 3.8). Interestingly, in a similar list of virtuous commanders in the *de Officiis*, only Mummius is said to have decorated Italy with his booty (2.76). It will be worthwhile to return to some of these other generals later to see if they, in fact, provide any precedent for Mummius' action. The theme of Mummius' abstinence, on one hand, and generosity to Italy, on the other hand, is also picked up in the *periochae* of Livy (*Per.* 52) and in the *Liber de Viris Illustribus* (60.3).

---

12 For an overview of victory monuments constructed in Rome in the republican period, see T. Hölscher, 'Römische Siegesdenkmäler der späten Republik' in H.A. Cahn and E. Simon (eds.), *Tainia* (Mainz, 1980), 351-71, but especially for this period, 352-5.

13 The origins of this story may be related to the literary topos of a state taking care of a poor leader at his death; compare the reference to Epaminondas' public funeral (Plut. *Fab.* 27). However, preservation of patrimony and generosity to female dependents are more often represented as aspects of traditional Roman virtue; this may explain why Plutarch explicitly says that Fabius' own public funeral was provided as an honour and not because of Fabius' own need.

14 τινὰ δὲ καὶ αἱ κύκλῳ τῆς Ῥώμης πόλεις ἔσχον. μεγαλόφρων γὰρ ὢν μᾶλλον ἢ φιλότεχνος ὁ Μόμμιος, ὥς φασι, μετεδίδου ῥᾳδίως τοῖς δεηθεῖσι (Strabo 8.6.23).

The epigraphic evidence well supports these general statements of widespread dispersal of booty from the Achaean war, but before asking what Mummius hoped to gain from giving away his new-found wealth to non-Romans — some of whom he had just conquered — it seems reasonable to ask, in the first place, how secure our evidence is for his donatives. Looking again at the list given above (57), we might be tempted to scrutinize the outlying geographical points. And, in fact, Italica and Pergamum do raise the greatest concerns.

There are two separate restorations proposed for the inscription found at Italica and now partially preserved in Seville.[15]

[L Mumm]ius L f imp	[L Aimi]ḷius L f imp	]L F IMP
[ded Co]r̤intho capta	[ded Za]k̤intho capta	]CAPTA
[vico ital]ḷicensi	[civit Ita]ḷḷicensi	]NSI
(Mommsen)	(Canto)	(visible on the stone today)

As one can see, the fragments of *CIL* I 546 which were so neatly restored by Mommsen to refer to Mummius and Corinth have been re-interpreted by Canto as referring to Aemilius Paulus and the spoils of Zakinthos. However, half the stone is now lost and with it the crucial letters for interpretation, leaving only a drawing of the late nineteenth century. The text on the far right above shows what is visible on the stone today. While Canto's detailed re-reading of the stone is not necessarily convincing, it nevertheless does illustrate the insecurity of an attribution to Mummius.

Luckily, the likelihood of Mummius' benefactions to Pergamum is not quite as suspect, as it is based on the usually trustworthy literary testimony of Pausanias. On the Greek mainland, and particularly with regard to Mummius' dedications at Olympia, his assertions can often be confirmed by physical remains. However, the reference to Corinthian spoils being sent to Pergamum comes at the end of Pausanias' long account of the Achaean War. He neither mentions a particular monument nor any inscription bearing the name of Mummius, although he assures his readers that some of the booty is still on display in his own day. Moreover, since Pausanias mentions Philopoemen, Attalus' general, as a recipient of Mummius' largesse, any inscription found would probably bear the name Philopoemen or Attalus, rather than Mummius.[16]

The evidence is far less controversial regarding benefactions from Mummius to other cities in Italy and on the Greek mainland. In all but two cases, Delphi and Isthmia, we have solid epigraphic evidence, and our knowledge of the benefactions made to these two communities comes from Polybius' contemporaneous testimony (39.6.1). The testimony regarding Mummius' interactions with Isthmia raises the possibility that Mummius was at once both plunderer and benefactor. Polybius tells us that he repaired the track, but Dio Chrysostom both labels Mummius the Isthmian 'master of the games' (*agōno-*

---

15 *CIL* I 456 = *CIL* II 1119. See A. M. Canto 'Un nuevo documento de Paulo Emilio en la Hispania ulterior', *Epigraphica* 47 (1985), 9-19.

16 ἀναθημάτων δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου κόσμου τὰ μὲν μάλιστα ἀνήκοντα ἐς θαῦμα ἀνήγετο, τὰ δὲ ἐκείνοις οὐχ ὁμοίου λόγου Φιλοποίμενι ὁ Μόμμιος τῷ παρ' Ἀττάλου στρατηγῷ δίδωσι· καὶ ἦν Περγαμηνοῖς καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι λάφυρα Κορίνθια (Paus. 7.16.8).

thetēs), and at the same time heaps abuse on him for taking a statue of Isthmian Poseidon as a votive offering for Zeus. The crime in Dio's eyes seems to be not so much the hypocrisy of the dual nature of his relationship to the sanctuary as his ignorant confusion of one divinity for another. This anecdote is followed by other tales of Mummius mislabelling plundered statuary (37.42). Clearly Dio belongs to the literary tradition that we have already noticed in which Mummius typifies the uncultured, destructive Roman. We, the readers of Dio's discourse, are clearly meant to draw conclusions about the general Roman populace, for the author states that the people of Rome truly believed Mummius' reinterpretations. Far more significant is Dio's allusion to Mummius' dual role as both patron and despoiler of Greece; as will be seen, there is some potential epigraphic support for this representation.

One further problem with the evidence is that the fragmentary nature of an inscription can leave us in doubt as to whether the monument was intended to bear a gift from Mummius or was in fact an honorific statue of the commander initiated by the local community. In Greece, there are three such cases: one from Oropus, one from Tegea, and another from Thebes (the last three inscriptions listed in the appendix). The use of the nominative suggests that in all likelihood these inscriptions are indeed benefactions from the commander, not honorific dedications in his honour from the local communities. Nevertheless, given the variety of monuments mentioning Mummius which are known from Greece, we will have to remain in doubt as to the meaning of these three particular bases.[17]

In Italy three of the monuments — those from Pompeii, Fregellae and Cures — also lack any clear indication as to whether they originally commemorated gifts or an honorific statue. However, in Italy we have no secure evidence for such statues of Mummius, and given the ample literary testimony for Mummius' generosity towards the communities of Italy and the similar inscriptions from other communities with clearer indications

---

17 Honours awarded Mummius by communities included: an equestrian statue base dedicated by the Eleans at Olympia (W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold [eds.], *Inschriften von Olympia* [1896], no. 319; see H. Philipp and W. Koenigs, 'Zu den Basen des L. Mummius in Olympia', *MDAI[A]* 94 [1979], 193-216); a record of agonistic honours at a festival dedicated to Mummius and Artemis in Eretria (J. & L. Robert, *Bull. Ep.* [1977], no. 364 and [1979], no. 350); an equestrian statue base at Argos (*SEG* XXX 365; M. Piérart and J.-P. Thalmann, *BCH* suppl. 6 [1980], 277). A third class of inscriptions mentioning Mummius also exists, those in which reference is made to his legal decisions. Theoretically, of course, such decisions could become part of a benefaction or serve as a justification for an honorific monument, but this is not the case in either of the two examples of which I know. A highly fragmentary text from Nemea appears to be a judgment by Mummius on the Nemean Games and the dispute over their control (*SEG* XXIII 180 = D.W. Bradeen, 'Inscriptions from Nemea', *Hesperia* 35 [1966], n. 7, pl. 78.). In this text, Mummius' official titulature has the preface ἀνθ- appended to ὕπατος. This is usually interpreted as indicating his pro-consular status, the implication being that in all the other attested cases the inscriptions were set up in 146 before his change of status. The other inscription is from Olympia and records the land dispute between Messene and Sparta mediated by the Milesians (*ca.* 138 BC), which resolves that the possession should revert to whichever party possessed the land under Mummius (*I. Olympia* 52; *SIG*^{3} 683; *TDGR* 3.80; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.43.1-6).

of their function, I am ready to accept that these three also represent benefactions on the part of Mummius.

The Pompeii inscription is of particular interest.[18] As one enters the precinct of the Temple of Apollo off the Forum it is located on the base, still in situ, on the far left hand side. Originally only the first five letters of this inscription were visible and it was thought to be a graffito of some sort. However, with the removal of further plaster from the base, the full line of text is now clear. The Oscan inscription appears to have been covered at some later date, perhaps when Pompeii became a Sullan colony. For this investigation, however, it is most critical to note that the use of Oscan, like the use of Greek in the Eastern communities, reinforces the interpretation of these monuments as intended to impress a local audience. It has been suggested that the bronze Apollo in the Naples museum, or its mate, a stylistically similar Artemis, originally stood on this base and that in these two statues we actually have preserved spoils of Corinth.[19] There is no historical evidence for this theory, but it does give an idea of what the bases might have carried.

Mummius' donatives reached a wide range of communities. Among the Italian communities known to have received booty, all the possible relationships with Rome are represented: Parma is a citizen colony, Fregellae a Latin colony, and Pompeii an allied community. In Greece, not only the large religious sanctuaries, but also individual *poleis* benefited from Mummius' actions.

We may also observe that a number of communities received multiple donatives, including several in Greece: Thebes, Epidaurus, and Olympia. Although only one of the epigraphic bases found at Olympia which mentions Mummius is clearly his own donative (the other having been set up in his honour by Elis), we have detailed descriptions of other benefactions to the sanctuary from Pausanias. He mentions 21 gilt shields on the frieze above the columns on the temple of Zeus and two statues of Zeus outside the temple (5.10.5; 24.4, 8). The statues are both explicitly said to be from the spoils of the war, but only one had an inscription seen by Pausanias. Polybius also mentions that Mummius decorated the temple at Olympia, but offers no specific details (39.6.1). The pair of inscriptions from Epidaurus is noteworthy for the identical wording and line breaks in the texts, even though one was carved on a previously used statue base in the shape of a prow, and the other base was apparently made for Mummius' own dedication. There is greater variation in inscriptions from Thebes, with one dedicated 'to the gods', one 'to Apollo', and another, as already mentioned, without any such dedication, but with Mummius' name in the nominative. The base recording the dedication to Apollo had also been previously used. Such multiple donatives are also found in Italy at Trebula Mutuesca. Without this last instance from a relatively small community, we might have assumed that doubled donatives were reserved for the major sanctuaries or large cities of Greece. As this is obviously not the case for Trebula, it seems that Mummius was making a concerted effort to increase the perceived quantity of his benefactions.

A qualitative difference can be drawn between the inscriptions found in Greece and those in Italy. Of the eight Greek inscriptions recording Mummius' benefactions, five are

---

18 A. Martelli, 'Per una nuova lettura dell'iscrizione Vetter 61 nel contesto del Santuario di Apollo a Pompei', *Eutopia* II.2 (2002), 71- 81.

19 S. de Caro (ed.), *Il Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli* (Electa, 1994), 110.

actually on re-used stones with the previous inscriptions left intact.[20] Moreover, the inscriptions tend to be cut in a rather shallow and rough manner. By contrast, the inscriptions found in Italy have been executed on clean stones with clear deep letters. Obviously these differences may reflect matters beyond Mummius' control. The Greek communities may have had limited time in which to erect the monuments, or have had little interest in receiving the property of their neighbours. We might recall Polybius' moralizing passages on how he refused to accept any goods from the estates of his conquered fellow countrymen, and also urged his peers to refrain from buying any such goods from the quaestor who was liquidating their property (39.4).

However, other differences of perhaps greater significance are evident between the Greek and Italic inscriptions. While the Greek inscriptions all follow a strict formula — full *praenomen*, *nomen*, full patronymic *praenomen* in the genitive, the consistent titulature *strategos hupatos Romaiōn*, and a deity or deities in the dative — the Italic inscriptions show much more variations in the formula. Four — those from Trebula, Nursia, and Parma — begin with an abbreviated *praenomen*, full *nomen* and the abbreviated title. However, Nursia spells Mummius with only two "m"s, while Fregellae and Pompeii both include an abbreviated patronymic, with Fregellae also including the F of *filius*. Pompeii is the only community to spell out Mummius' consular title in full, but truncates his nomen. Nursia, Trebula, and Parma all use different forms to indicate that the statue is a gift to the community. Trebula uses '*vico*', Nursia abbreviates '*dedit Nursinis*', and Parma uses PP for *populo Parmensi*.

The one consistent feature is that in Italy the beneficiary is the community, but in Greece it is the deities. I would conjecture that the form of the inscription was dictated to the Greek communities by Mummius or a member of his staff, but that the donatives to Italic communities were dispatched without such rigid controls. Such lack of explicit directions might be reflected in the story told by Strabo (8.6.23) that Mummius lent the Thespian Muses to Lucullus for the opening of his temple to Good Fortune, and when Lucullus dedicated them to the deity, Mummius allowed them to remain in that temple without any inscription crediting him.

Thus far, it seems that the benefactions to Greece were conceived of as gifts to the gods, not necessarily the local communities, and were possibly accorded a lukewarm reception. This seems even more likely when we consider the evidence for the wide area in which Mummius confiscated artwork. Here we find reference to Thespiae and

---

20 These five are the inscriptions from Thespiae, Aulis, Tegea, the second inscription from Thebes, and the first from Epidaurus (see appendix for references). In the case of the base from Aulis, the Mummius inscription bears none of the hallmarks of the local dialect seen in the original inscription (*SEG* XXV 540), although the two may date from the same century. De Sanctis suggested with regard to the re-used base found at Thebes by Keramopoullos in 1929, that the original inscription was dedicated to commemorate the victory of Coronea in 447 BC and proposed that Mummius, by adding his own name, intended observers to realize that the same benefaction was also his: he relinquished his claim to the monument which was his by right of conquest (*Riv.Fil.* 10 [1932], 424-5). Since the Mummius inscription is generally on the same side as the original and the original text remained visible, de Sanctis may be correct that such reuse was in itself symbolic. However, to confirm this, one would need to determine whether the stones had been moved from their original dedication, and whether they showed signs of having borne different statues.

Pheneus in particular, along with general indications of widespread plunder in the Peloponnesus, Achaea, and Greece.[21] Although most testimony focuses on the treasures at Corinth, it is obvious that Mummius took freely from surrounding areas, even as far as Boeotia. Thespiae must have been particularly bemused to receive a dedication to their local gods, given that Mummius removed so many of their most famous works of art.[22] Similarly, Thebes, whom Livy's *periochae* names specifically as suffering punitive action, probably the dismantling of her walls, would have been particularly surprised to receive a votive offering from the commander.[23]

It is easier to understand why Thespiae, and perhaps Thebes, who suffered at the hands of Mummius, would try to appease the general by joining the numbers who visibly honoured him; Polybius assures us that when Mummius made his tour of the Greek cities, all the communities paid 'appropriate' tribute to him.[24]

Of course, this starts to sound familiar. We have ample evidence for communities honouring Roman commanders in the East. There is no need here to do more than point towards the numerous honours given to Flamininus (*ca.* 197 BC), including cult status.[25] By comparison, it seems fairly trivial that a few equestrian statues were erected and that a race was run in Eretria in honour of Mummius, a race such as those run for deities like Artemis.[26] However, this is comparing apples and oranges. To appreciate Mummius' innovations we need to look at how previous commanders 'gave' to communities at the time of their victory.

According to Plutarch, Flamininus did make dedications at Delphi, military gear to the Dioscuri and a golden wreath to Apollo (12.6-7). He is also said to have written verse inscriptions to accompany the gifts. These inscriptions praise Flamininus himself, refer to Aeneas, and mention his liberation of the Greeks. I have my doubts as to the genuine nature of this testimony. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that these are conceived as personal gifts, not taken from the spoils of war. The only tentative physical evidence for Flamininus' benefactions from the booty comes in the form of a gold coin issued with his portrait, name in Latin, and an image of victory (*RRC* 548/1). However, the only thing to tie the coin to spoils of war is a possible resemblance to the style of the portrait with that of Philip V on the latter's coins. Moreover, it is not at all clear who

---

21 On the Peloponnesus, Plut. *Phil.* 21 = Polyb. 39.3.10; on Achaea, Pliny *NH* 34.12; the rest of Greece, Dio Cass. 21.72 = Zonaras 9.31.

22 Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.4; Dio Chrys. 37.42.

23 Livy. *Per* 52; cf. Paus. 7.16.9-10.

24 See Polyb. 39.6.1 and the inscriptional evidence at n. 17. Thebes may perhaps be included in the list of communities honouring Mummius, depending on the interpretation of *IG* VII 2478a. The use of the nominative suggests it may be a dedication from Mummius, but the stone's shape, suited to an equestrian statue, may be more in the tradition of the dedication from the Eleans to Mummius erected at Olympia.

25 Plut. *Flam.* 16.3-4; Chalcis *IG* XII.9.931; Corinth *SEG* XXII 214; Gytheion *SIG*^{3} 592; Eretria *IG* XII.9.233; Delphi *SIG*^{3} 616; Argos *SEG* XXII 266; Scotussa in Thessaly *SEG* XXIII 412.

26 See n. 17.

would have received these coins as donatives. The use of Latin does not suggest much concern to impress a Greek audience.[27]

Moving closer chronologically, we are better equipped to speak about the actions of Aemilius Paulus after his defeat of Perseus (168 BC). Plutarch tells us that when settling affairs in Greece, Aemilius redistributed royal stores to communities in need (28.1). This type of benefaction was probably far more appreciated than Mummius' statues, but does not carry the same symbolic value. He made a well-documented trip throughout Greece, stopping at all the major sights, many of which were to benefit from Mummius' donatives: Aulis, Epidaurus, and Olympia. Walbank goes so far as to suggest that Mummius might have been consciously aping Aemilius' tour in his own visits.[28] However, there is no mention of Aemilius making any particular offerings, except for ordering a large sacrifice at Olympia (Livy 45.28.5).

At Delphi, of course, we have the famous record of Aemilius' conversion of the monument of Perseus:

> L.AIMILIUS L.F. INPERATOR DE REGE PERSE MACEDONIBUSQUE CEPET (*ILLRP* 323 at Delphi).
>
> At Delphi, he saw a tall square pillar composed of white marble stones, on which a golden statue of Perseus was intended to stand, and gave orders that his own statue should be set there, for it was meet that the conquered should make room for the conquerors. (Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 28.2; cf. Polyb. 30.10.2; Livy 45.27.7)

Here, however, I believe the actions to be significantly different from those of Mummius. The extant inscription provides no hint of any rhetoric of 'liberating' Macedonia from its king. Instead, the people themselves are listed as conquered. This is strongly reinforced by the vivid frieze decoration of the fallen Macedonians, marked out by their distinctive shield type.[29] If our extant monument originally began life as a monument for the last Antigonid king, it bears no visible trace thereof. The Roman nature of this monument of conquest is reinforced by the use of Latin. The Greeks would have understood the meaning of the monument from the visual representations, but the use of Latin reinforced the otherness of the conquerors. Unlike Mummius' benefactions, there is no wording to suggest that this was a 'gift' either to a community or a deity.

Mummius took a radical new approach to the conquered Greeks, in contrast to the action of Aemilius Paulus and Flamininus. Instead of just reaping honours and using dedications at the major sanctuaries to reinforce the new Roman hegemony, Mummius uses Greek art with Greek inscriptions to leave an ostensibly positive statement of his sentiments towards the conquered peoples. If either of his predecessors in Greece can offer a true precedent, it is probably to be found in Aemilius Paulus' inclusive victory celebration at Amphipolis before departing for Italy, where he put on Greek spectacles

---

27 Crawford notes that three of the five specimens are reportedly from Greece. He also observes the similarity of the reverse side with that of the gold staters of Alexander.

28 F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commmentary on Polybius*, volume III (Cambridge, 1979), 736.

29 H. Kähler, *Der Fries vom Reiterdenkmal des Aemilius Paulus in Delphi* (Berlin, 1965).

for a Greek audience.[30] In doing this he, like Mummius after him, was allowing those who had so recently come under Roman hegemony to feel as if their new 'allies' respected their cultural past and included them in their victories.

This new inclusive approach to conquered peoples is, of course, simply a physical representation of the rhetoric of friendship and alliances that Rome had used for generations to build her dominion. It should be no surprise, then, if Mummius was sharing his victory with the newest of allies in Greece, that it would also seem natural to do so with the backbone of the Roman army, the Italian allies.

However, precedents for the donatives to the communities of greater Italy are much harder to find. One possible relevant example is an inscription from the colony of Luna in Liguria, founded in 177.[31] A limestone base from the forum of the community seems to indicate that M'. Acilius Glabrio (cos. 191) donated to the community part of the spoils from the sack of Scarphea. This case is problematic since Glabrio is usually thought to have died by 181, when his son dedicated a temple to Pietas, a temple which had been promised by the father. It has been suggested that the veterans settled in Luna may have been part of Glabrio's army. Even so, the precedent remains unsatisfactory, and Mummius' actions look radical by contrast.

In 145 BC the idea of giving away the spoils of war seemed an estimable action, as can be seen from Scipio Aemilianus' decision to invite the cities of Sicily to come and recover works of art which had been pillaged from them by the Carthaginians in previous generations (Cic. *Ver.* 2.35.86). The initiative taken by commanders to forge positive reputations among allied communities is a noteworthy development of the second century BC. In just over a decade, the Gracchi will begin to complain about badly-behaved governors, who exploit the provinces and bring on threats of unrest. Diodorus tells us that the Social War began because the Italian allies felt excluded from a share in the Empire (37.1). Less than a century after Mummius, Cicero and Appius Claudius will vie to decorate Athens with appropriate monuments, such as new gates for Eleusis and the Academy.[32] Mummius' choices regarding the division of spoils seem to demonstrate an early awareness of the potential benefits to be derived from positive relations with conquered and allied states.

Appendix: Inscriptions Recording Benefactions from Mummius

Parma colonia (*CIL* I 2, 629)

L MVMMIVS
COS P P

---

30 See especially Livy 45.32.8-33.7, as well as Dio Cass. 31.8.9 and Plut. *Aem.* 28.3. See J.C. Edmondson, 'The Cultural Politics of Public Spectacle in Rome and the Greek East, 167-166 BC' in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (New Haven, 1999), 77-95, esp. 78-81.

31 R.U. Inglieri, 'Elogium di Manio Acilio Glabrione vincitore di Antioco il Grande alle Termopili', *NS* (1952), 20-21.

32 Cic., *ad Att.* 115.26 SB = 6.1.26 (20 February 50) and 121.2 SB = 6.6.2 (*c.* 3 August 50).

Nursia (*CIL* I 2, 628)

L MVMIVS
COS DED N

Trebula Mutuesca (*CIL* I 2, 627 a & b)

1. [L] MVM[MIVS COS]
[V]ICO

2. L MVMMIVS COS
VICO

Cures (*CIL* I 2, 631)

[L MVMMIVS] COS ACHAEA CAPTA

Fregellae (Bizzarri, *Epigraphica* 1973 XXXV: 140-142)
L MVMI L F
COS[

Pompeii (partially published in R.S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* [1897], no. 86 = Mau, *Pompeianische Beiträge*, 96 with drawing; but see now A. Martelli (n. 18).

l mvmmis l kvsvl (*right to left*)

Olympia (H. Philipp and W. Koenigs, 'Zu den Basen des L. Mummius in Olympia', *MDAI[A]*, 1979, XCIV: 193-216)

ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ
ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ
ΔΙΙ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΙ

Thespiae (*IG* VII 1808)

ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟ[Σ]
ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΘΕΟΙΣ

Thebes (*IG* VII 2478 and A. Keramopoulos, *Deltion Achaiologikon* (1930-31), 105-118 *non vidi* = *Historia* 7 (Milan 1933), 652, no. 526 = M.N. Tod, 'The Progress of Greek Epigraphy, 1933-34', *JHS* (1935), 193)

1. [Λ]ΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ
[Σ]ΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤ[ΟΣ ΡΩ]ΜΑΙΩΝ
ΤΟΙΣ ΘΕ[ΟΙΣ]

2. [Λεύκιος Μόμμιος Λε]υκίου στρατηγὸς ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων Ἀπόλλων[ι]

Aulis (*SEG* XXV 541)

ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ
ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΘΕΟΙΣ

Epidaurus (*IG* IV 1183 and W. Peek, *Neue Inschriften Aus Epidauros* (1972), no. 47, pl. 12, fig. 29-30)

1. in the shape of a prow
ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ
ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ
ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩΙ ΥΓΙΕΙΑΙ
2.
ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ
ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ
ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩΙ ΥΓΙΕΙΑΙ

Not enough remains of the following inscriptions to determine whether they are dedications 'from' or 'to' Mummius, although the use of the nominative suggests that they are indeed most likely benefactions from the commander, not honorific dedications in his honour from the local communities.

Tegea (*IG* V 2 77)

ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΣΤΡΑΤΗ[

Oropus (*IG* VII 433)

]ΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕ̣Υ̣[

Thebes (*IG* VII 2478a)

perhaps another equestrian statue base

3. ΩΝ
[ΛΕΥΚΙ] ΟΣ ΜΟΜΜΙΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ Σ[ΤΡ]ΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΥΠΑΤΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩ

Brooklyn College, City University of New York