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WHAT DID ARSINOE TELL LYSIMACHUS ABOUT PHILETAERUS?

Daniel Ogden

Strabo’s note on the origin of the Pergamene state is full of interest for the history of the Diadochic world:

Pergamum was the treasury \( \gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\omicron\rho\nu\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu \) of Lysimachus, the son of Agathocles, one of the Successors to Alexander, and it consists of a settlement upon the very top of the mountain. The mountain is cone-shaped and tapers to a sharp point. *Philetaerus was entrusted with the guarding of this fort and its money* (there were 9,000 talents). He came from Tium, and he was a eunuch \( \theta\lambda\iota\beta\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \) from his boyhood. For it happened that a great crowd had gathered to watch at some funeral, and the nurse who was carrying Philetaerus, who was still an infant, was caught back in the crowd and was crushed so hard \( \sigma\nu\theta\lambda\iota\beta\iota\varepsilon\nu\lambda\xi \) that the child was maimed. But although he was a eunuch \( \varepsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma \), he was reared in a decent fashion \( \tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\varsigma \) and appeared worthy of being entrusted with the citadel. For some time he remained well disposed \( \varepsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \) towards Lysimachus, but then he fell at variance with his wife, Arsinoe, who was slandering \( \delta\iota\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma \), and detached the place from his rule. He continued to govern it in a fashion that best suited the circumstances, since, as he could see, change was in the air. For Lysimachus’ household had fallen into disarray, and he had been compelled to kill his son Agathocles. Then Seleucus came and destroyed him, only to be destroyed himself, deceitfully murdered by Ptolemy Ceraunus. In the midst of all this turmoil, the eunuch continued in control of the fort and managed it by making promises to or by paying court to whoever was powerful or in the offing at any one time. That is how he maintained charge over the castle and the money for twenty years.

(Strab. C623)

The two themes of this passage upon which I wish to concentrate initially are the eunuchism of Philetaerus and the slander of Arsinoe, the historical setting for the latter of which, since it is closely associated with the death of Agathocles, seems to be c. 283–2 BCE.

It is possible to historicise both of these themes. As to the eunuchism, Pausanias too asserts that Philetaerus was a Paphlagonian eunuch, though he offers a seemingly incompatible,

---

1 It is a pleasure and a privilege to be able to offer this paper in celebration of Prof. Heckel’s inspirational and indispensable scholarship.

2 Wordplay, evidently.
and rather more demeaning, account of how he came by that status: he was in origin the eunuch slave of one Docimus, a general of Antigonus. If Pausanias is right, and he is not merely reflecting a piece of hostile propaganda generated at some indeterminate point in the Attalid era, then Strabo’s story of the crushing at the funeral would be exposed as the engaging fiction we might in any case suspect it to be. Philetaerus’ eunuchism can be contextualised historically in other ways too. First, eunuchs were particularly associated with the role of treasurer. Accordingly, we are told by Phylarchus and Plutarch that Demetrius Poliorcetes used to abuse Lysimachus as a mere ‘treasurer’ (γαζοφύλαξ), a term which angered Lysimachus precisely because eunuchs were particularly associated with the role, being considered, as they were, particularly loyal and reliable. Secondly, Cybele, patron goddess of the eunuch galli, was the object of the most prominent cult at Pergamum under Philetaerus and his successors. Philetaerus himself dedicated a temple to the goddess, the ‘Megalesium’, where dedications to and statuettes of Attis have been found, as well as one to Demeter, in honour of his mother Boa, and one to ‘the Mother of the Gods’ at Mamurt-Kaleh. It is possible to read these two contexts both forwards and backwards, as it were. Both of them could indicate that Philetaerus’ eunuchism, however acquired, was a historical fact. Alternatively, both could provide the starting-point and justification for the tradition’s misrepresentation of Philetaerus as eunuch. It is, accordingly, impossible to know whether the historical Philetaerus was a eunuch or not. Another type of evidence to which one might think of turning here, the iconography, is indecisive: the statuary and the coin portraits alike represent him as corpulent, certainly, though there is nothing further about them specifically to indicate eunuchism.

It is possible to historicise the dispute between Arsinoe and Philetaerus by putting it into a broad historical context. This friction is testified to also by Pausanias, who states that, after the murder of Agathocles, Philetaerus transferred his allegiance to Seleucus because he was suspicious of the treatment he would receive from Arsinoe (τὰ παρὰ τῆς Ἀρσινόης ὑποπτα ἡγούμενος). Lysimachus had given some cities in north west Asia Minor to Arsinoe, including the cities of Heraclea and Amastris, the latter named for the widow of Dionysius,
tyrant of Heraclea, and sometime wife of Lysimachus himself. Amastris had created it through a synoecism that had briefly encompassed Philetaerus’ birthplace of Tium, and the city was managed by one Eumenes, probably Philetaerus’ own brother. Arsinoe’s rule in the region was evidently meddlesome and harsh: Upon Heraclea she imposed a brutal tyrant, Heraclides of Cyme. This would seem to offer cause enough for friction between Arsinoe and Philetaerus, whether or not Arsinoe was attempting to exert direct control over Pergamum itself. But why are we told that Arsinoe ‘slandered’ him? Slander seems to speak of a more personal tale, and one of intrigue. What might have been the supposed content of this mysterious slander?9

Moreover, Strabo’s passage takes on a rather different light when read in conjunction with Lucian’s tale of Stratonice and Combabus in his poem On the Syrian Goddess. Here we are told how Stratonice, the young wife of Seleucus, dreams that Hera (Atargatis) orders her to build a temple for her in Hierapolis (Bambyce), with threats of punishments should she not do so. She ignores the dream at first but eventually confesses it to Seleucus, who bids her go up to Hierapolis and build the temple. The king orders his friend Combabus to escort her, together with the treasure she has to take to fund the operation. He begs him not to send him for fear of jealousy, but the king insists, and so he seeks a week’s deferment, castrates himself, preserves his testicles in a pot of honey, seals it with his ring, and gives it to the king as a great treasure to guard whilst he is gone. The king additionally seals it with his own signet ring. Combabus works for three years with Stratonice in building the temple, and she begins to fall in love with him. At first she conceals her love, but in the end determines to get drunk and declare it. Combabus rudely rejects her advances and tells her off for drunkenness. When she threatens to kill herself, Combabus tells her what he has done. People returning from Hierapolis regale the king with rumours of an affair. So the king summons Combabus before the work is finished. An untrue story, Lucian adds, tells that Stratonice herself wrote letters to the king accusing Combabus of trying to rape her, just as in the mythical stories of Anteia-Stheneboea and Phaedra.10 But anyway, Combabus returns and the king imprisons him. Seleucus accuses him of threefold wrongs, adultery, disloyalty and impiety before Hera, and resolves to execute him. Combabus asks the king to bring forth the pot, and they break the seal. Upon discovering the contents, the king embraces Combabus, weeps and undertakes to execute the false accusers. He offers Combabus wealth and promises that he will never leave his side, even when he sleeps with


his wife. Combabus returns to complete the temple. He is rewarded with a bronze statue in the sanctuary—a woman in shape, but clothed like a man.\textsuperscript{11}

Lucian's tale can hardly be regarded as historical in any meaningful sense. Were we to insist on historicising it, the action would have to have fallen between 298 BCE, when Seleucus married Stratonice, and 292 BCE when he passed her on to his son Antiochus.\textsuperscript{12} The tale is usually said to be unique in terms of the Greek tradition (we shall qualify this shortly), but it is rather less so in the context of Near Eastern and Asian tradition more generally, where a number of parallels have been identified:\textsuperscript{13}

- A Persian tale first fully preserved in Arabic in al-Tabari's \textit{History} of c. 915 CE, and then in Persian in Ferdowsi's \textit{Shahnameh} of 1010 CE, but evidently already lurking behind the Pahlavi \textit{Deeds of Ardashir} of c. 600 CE. According to this story, King Ardashir has asked his chief mage, Harjand (or perhaps Abarsam) to execute his wife, either because she has attempted to poison him or because he has discovered that she is the daughter of his erstwhile enemy, the supplanted king Ardevan. But when the mage learns that she is pregnant, he resolves, in an extraordinary act of loyalty, to keep her secretly in a cellar and rear her child, Shapur, there. In the meantime he castrates himself and gives his genitals, preserved in salt, to the king in a sealed casket. When, years later, the king regrets his sonlessness and repents of his order to execute the woman, the mage brings the pair forth, revealing all, and is rewarded with a share of the king's rule and the construction of the city of Jundishapur in his honor.\textsuperscript{14}

- A Tocharian B tale recorded by Xuan Zang in c. 630 CE in the city of Kucha (Kuqa) in Turkestan (Xinjiang). When the king of the land is to leave his palace to go on a Buddhist pilgrimage, he puts his younger brother in charge. The brother castrates himself and gives his testicles to the king in a golden casket, who entrusts it to a guard. Upon the king's return, craftsmen slander the brother, telling him he has brought debauchery to the inner palace. The brother prevails upon the king to open the casket before he punishes him. The brother is rewarded with the free run of the inner palace.\textsuperscript{15}

- A Turkish tale recorded by Paul Lucas in Iconium in 1705 CE. When a former governor of Iconium, Mullak Onker, wishes to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, he leaves the city and his house in the hands of his friend, the Christian bishop Epsepi. As Mullak Onker is departing Epsepi castrates himself and gives him his genitals in a little box to store in a secure place until his return. Epsepi proceeds to make many enemies in the course of his administration, including even in the harem, and these enemies determine to destroy him. Upon Mullak's return they tell him that Epsepi has been debauching his womenfolk, including his mother. The women of the harem endorse the accusations, and throw themselves upon Mullak complaining of Epsepi's brutality. Epsepi avoids the decreed beheading by asking Mullak to look inside the box first. Mullak makes a vow of eternal friendship with Epsepi, and they are eventually buried side by side.\textsuperscript{16}

- A Kannada tale recorded by Captain W. H. Sykes in his camp at Bejapoor (Bijapur) in 1818. Mohammad-Shah (Muhammad b. 'Ibrahim b. Tahmasp, whose historical rule spanned 1626–56 CE) dispatches his

\textsuperscript{11} Luc. \textit{Syr. D.} 19–27, with Lightfoot 2003 \textit{ad loc.}

\textsuperscript{12} See Ogden 1999, 119–24.

\textsuperscript{13} Discussed at Benveniste 1939, 251; Krappe 1946; Lightfoot 2003, 384–8, the latter of whom also gives attention to more recent literary adaptations of Lucian's tale.


friend Mulik from Bejapoor to fetch a new concubine for him from Sungul Deep. Mulik castrates himself and gives his genitals to the king in a casket. Upon his return his enemies tell the king that Mulik has anticipated him with the woman. He avoids beheading by asking the king to examine the contents of the casket first. The king rewards him by building the magnificent Taj Bowree cistern in his name.¹⁷

Most of these tales function as aetiologies: Lucian’s as an aetiology of the cult of Hera-Atargatis at Hierapolis-Bambye and of her eunuch devotees; the Persian tale as an aetiology of the foundation of Jundishapur; the Turkish tale as an aetiology of a curious pair of tombs; the Indian tale as an aetiology of the Taj Bowree.¹⁸ But the overriding theme of all these tales is, manifestly, the absolute loyalty of the courtier-figure to his king, loyalty even to the point of self-harm.

Lucian’s tale of Combabus has hitherto been regarded as the earliest attested example of the eunuch-slander story-type.¹⁹ But, for all that Strabo’s account of Philetaerus and Arsinoe lacks the motifs of auto-castration and casket, I suggest that the elements of the story-type nonetheless lurk behind it, and this, of course, pushes the attestation of the story-type back at least to the late Augustan or Tiberian age.

The content of Arsinoe’s slander is not so mysterious after all: it is the same as that of Stratonice’s slander against Combabus in Lucian’s less preferred variant, the same as that of Sthenoboea’s against Bellerophon, and the same as that of Phaedra’s against Hippolytus: Philetaerus had attempted to force himself upon her. This accusation will have been rebutted by the late revelation of Philetaerus’ eunuch condition. And Arsinoe – or rather the figure of Arsinoe as represented elsewhere in the tradition – gratifyingly has form in the levelling of such accusations. For, in an episode which has its own striking resonances with the Combabus tale, we are told by Pausanias that after failing in her attempt to seduce Agathocles, Lysimachus’ son and seeming heir, and her own stepson, she had similarly slandered him:

Many disasters are wont to arise for men on account of love. For although Lysimachus was already advanced in age, although he himself was considered fortunate in his children, and although Agathocles already had children himself by Lysandra, he married Lysandra’s sister Arsinoe. It is said that this Arsinoe was frightened on behalf of her children, lest they should fall under the power of Agathocles after Lysimachus’ death, and it is said that for this reason she plotted against Agathocles. People have written too that Arsinoe fell in love with Agathocles, but that since her love was unrequited she plotted death for him. And they say that Lysimachus later realised what his wife had dared to do, but that it was no use to him, now that he was completely bereft of friends...

(Pausanias 1.10.3–4)

This episode in turn exhibits further gentle resonances with the Seleucus tradition, the well known and oft-told story of Seleucus’ son Antiochus falling in love with his young step-mother Stratonice.²⁰

²⁰ V. Max. 5.7 ext.1; Plin. Nat. 7.123; Plut. Dem. 38; Rufus of Ephesus pp. 607–8 Daremberg-Ruelle; App. Syr. 59–61; Luc. Syr. D. 17–18 (cf. Calumny 14; Icaromenippus 15; How to Write History 35); Gal. On
What did Arsinoe tell Lysimachus about Philetaerus? Under what circumstances might he have acted as her guardian or chaperone in the absence of the king? Perhaps the context, half fictive, half historical, was a visit by Arsinoe to Asia Minor to inspect or administer the possessions that Lysimachus had bestowed upon her there.

It is conceivable that the Arsinoe-Philetaerus tale, like the Stratonice-Combabus tale, did at some point in its archaeology contain an episode in which the adult Philetaerus advisedly castrated himself prior to chaperoning Arsinoe, giving Lysimachus the pot and revealing the contents at the appropriate time. In that case we would have to suppose that Strabo’s story of the accidental childhood castration of Philetaerus was a variant fiction developed to explain the same fact, if fact it was, that of Philetaerus’ eunuchism. But Occam’s razor, and the proximity in Strabo’s text of the childhood tale, which is clearly sympathetic towards Philetaerus, and the slander of Arsinoe invite us to suppose rather that it was precisely the accidental childhood castration that was the object of the revelation in the tale all along. Closer inspection of Strabo’s words suggests that it could quite appropriately have functioned in this way. The claim that Philetaerus was reared ‘in a decent fashion’ implies that Philetaerus was brought up as, and lived the life of, a man rather than as a eunuch. Accordingly, Philetaerus’ longstanding eunuchism would have remained a secret until the point of Arsinoe’s accusation, when it had to be brought out into the light.

In what dramatic fashion was this eunuchism then revealed, with no pot to show? It can hardly have been seemly to have Philetaerus hoicking up his tunic before an assembled court. Perhaps a clue lurks in the figure of the nurse. Was she brought before Lysimachus’ court to confess her story? One thinks here of the nurses found so frequently on the Menandrian stage (a stage, as it happens, quite contemporary with the lives of Arsinoe and Philetaerus), who often have a key role in revealing a long-lost secret from a baby’s childhood. In the fragmentary Tithe the titular ‘Nurse’ confessed in the prologue either to having borrowed or lent a baby (presumably on a permanent basis), and must have contributed to the revelation of that baby’s true identity in adulthood in the course of the play. In the Eunuch, which was adapted by Terence, the nurse Sophrona is brought in to identify the recognition tokens of the (unnamed) long-lost girl at the centre of the action, who will go on to marry Chaerea. In the Heautontimorumenos, also adapted by Terence, Sostrata

21 Reconstruction at Webster 1974, 193.
22 Ter. Eu. 806–7, 910–15; cf. Webster 1974, 139–41 for the reconstruction of the underlying Menandrian
confirms the identity of her long-lost daughter Antiphila with the help of a recognition token in the form of a ring and the recollections of the girl’s former nurse.\textsuperscript{24}

Whatever the historical pegs upon which the story of Arsinoe and Philetaerus was hung, why was it developed? We may offer two reasons. The first is that it adds drama to what could be seen as a critical moment in Lysimachus’ tragic end, and his annihilation by Seleucus. As Strabo and Pausanias indicate, Philetaerus could be seen as instrumental in allowing Seleucus to prevail over Lysimachus by transferring himself and Pergamum from the suzerainty of the latter to the former. The crucial transfer of resources aside, it was this change of allegiance that prompted Lysimachus to cross over into Asia and so enter the battle with Seleucus, Corupedium, in which Seleucus was to kill him.\textsuperscript{25}

The second is that it functions as part of a wider parallelism established in tradition between Lysimachus and Seleucus. Just as Seleucus had his wife Stratonice fall in love with, be rejected by, and slander the secret eunuch Combabus, so Lysimachus was to have his wife Arsinoe fall in love with, be rejected by, and slander the eunuch Philetaerus. An explicit parallelism between Seleucus and Lysimachus survives in Appian’s account, in the course of his so-called ‘Seleucus excursus’, of the fateful battle of Corupedium and its aftermath, in which Seleucus was himself then killed by the wicked Ptolemy Ceraunus. Appian works hard to manufacture a parallelism between the immediate fates of the two kings’ bodies after their death. First he tells, in finishing off his biography of Seleucus, how Philetaerus used his vast wealth to ransom Seleucus’ body from Ptolemy Ceraunus, how he cremated it, and sent the urn to his son Antiochus, who installed it in a hero-shrine, the ‘Nicatoreum’, in the city named for Seleucus, Seleucia-in-Pieria. But then Appian curiously travels back in time to speak of the prior fate of the body of Lysimachus on the battlefield of Corupedium. Lysimachus’ body was guarded where it lay by his loyal dog, until it could be retrieved by his son Alexander, who installed it in a hero-shrine, the ‘Lysimacheum’, in the city named for Lysimachus, Lysimachia.\textsuperscript{26}

In three of the four stories mentioned here, that of Stratonice and Combabus, that of the dead Seleucus and Philetaerus, and that of the dead Lysimachus and his dog, the central

\textsuperscript{24} Ter. Hau. 614–17; cf. Webster 1974, 144–6 for the reconstruction of the underlying Menandrian play.

\textsuperscript{25} Paus. 1.10.4–5; cf. 1.8.1.

\textsuperscript{26} App. Syr. 62–4. Discussion at Marasco 1982, 117–40; Brodersen 1989, 178–90; Goukowsky 2007, xviii, 161–4. The last contends that the parallelism between the description of the placing of Seleucus in the Nicatoreum of Seleucia (he wrongly locates in Antioch) and that of the placing of Lysimachus in the Lysimacheum of Lysimachia suggests that Appian’s treatment of these matters may have originated in an epideictic oration he had given in one or other of the cities, to glorify the relevant founder.

Appian also makes another parallelism between Lysimachus and Seleucus at this point by telling, with little warrant in context, the tale of how Lysimachus had been given an omen of his future kingship, or even predestined for it, when Alexander had placed his diadem on his head to staunch a wound; this picks up the tale Appian has told at c.56, in accordance with which Seleucus was given an omen of his future kingship, or even predestined for it, when he placed Alexander’s diadem on his own head in order to retrieve it from the marsh into which it had been blown.

For Lysimachus’ loyal dog, which is also said to have committed suttee on his pyre, see also Duris FGrH 76 F55 (= Plin. Nat. 8.143; the dog was called ‘Hyrcanus’); Phlegon of Tralles FGrH 257 F9; Ael. NA. 6.25; Tzetzes Chiliades no. 132.
theme is manifestly ultimate loyalty. We may presume that it was also the central theme of the Arsinoe and Philetaerus story, but that in this case the great loyalty of the eunuch figure was crucially sacrificed. And so it was that this loyalty was transferred to Seleucus, to be demonstrated so strikingly in the redeeming of his body, but, before that, and signal, to set in chain the series of events that led to Lysimachus’ own downfall.

This thematic cluster leads me to suppose that the tale of Arsinoe and Philetaerus originated in the rich fictive traditions that developed around the figure of Seleucus, as indeed seems to have been the case with the tale of the dead Lysimachus and his dog, which is found, as we have noted, in Appian’s Seleucus excursus. (In any case, what reason might one have, after the death of Lysimachus and with it the extinction of his dynasty, for developing traditions focusing upon him in his own right?) The evidently once very rich fictive traditions about Seleucus are refracted still not only in Appian, but also Libanius, John Malalas and many others. Without reference to these other texts, a glance at Malalas aside, Peter Fraser found the fictive elements of the Seleucus excursus alone so striking that he hypothesised their derivation from a lost ‘Seleucus Romance’, a text supposedly resembling the Alexander Romance.28
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CMG Corpus medicorum Graecorum 1907–
FGrH Jacoby et al. 1923–
FHG Müller 1878–85
IvP Fränkel et al. 1890–
OGIS Dittenberger 1903–5

Bibliography
Beloch, K. J. (1912–27) Griechische Geschichte. 2nd edn. 4 vols. 8 parts, Strasburg.

27 I would point in particular to Euphorion of Chalcis F119 Lightfoot (c. 200 BCE); Diod. 19.55 (c. 30 BCE); Just. 15.3–4, 17.1–2 (iv CE?), after Trogus (c. 20 BCE); Plut. Dem. 31–2, 38, 47–52 (c. 100 CE); App. Syr. 52–63 (130s–160s CE); Polyaeus Strategemata 4.9 (c. 163 CE); Luc. Syr. D. 17–27 (c. 170s CE); Libanius Orations 11 (Antiochus) 76–105 (356 CE); John Malalas Chronicle 197–203 (vi CE), after Pausanias of Antioch/Damascus FGrH 854 F10 (before 358/9 CE?).


*Corpus medicorum Graecorum* (1907–) Berlin.


