

A poetic word used as an epithet of men, its meaning "glitter-ish, splendid" is most apparent in Hesiod<sup>8</sup> where, followed by ἀνθρώπων, it seems to bear a semantic relation with χρύσειον [γένος] "the Golden Age";<sup>9</sup> whereas in Homer it is used as opposed to ἐλέγχιστον "coward."<sup>10</sup> Thus it may be seen as a *bahuvrihi*,<sup>11</sup> meaning "of glitter-ish aspect," like other similar compounds in Homer.<sup>12</sup>

BARBARA PASTOR DE AROZENA  
*University of Reading*

8. *Op.* 109–10 Χρύσειον μὲν πρότιστα γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων / ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες. See the translations by H. G. Evelyn-White (London, 1914), p. 11: "mortal men," and R. Lattimore (Ann Arbor, 1959), p. 31: "mortal people."

9. Cf. *Pl. Resp.* 468E, *Phdr.* 235E, *Cra.* 397E.

10. *Il.* 2.284–85 Ἀτρεΐδῃ, νῦν δὲ σε, ἄναξ, ἐθέλουσιν Ἄχαιοι / πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον θέμεναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν.

11. A type of compound word, meaning "having the aspect of"; cf. Ramat, "Su alcune tracce," pp. 150–51.

12. See on this type of nominal composition E. Risch, *Wortb. d. hom. Spr.* (Berlin, 1937), pp. 166–70, 182–86.

### SULLA PÈRE AND MITHRIDATES

Tradition from antiquity has handed down that Sulla came from a family that had been sunk in obscurity for several generations and that he himself had passed his youth in poverty.<sup>1</sup> Recently, however, doubt has been cast on this latter detail<sup>2</sup> and, at the same time, there have been attempts made to throw some light on the obscurer members of the Sullan family.<sup>3</sup> The dictator's father has certainly not escaped these efforts at rehabilitation. More than twenty years ago E. Badian suggested he might have held a praetorship, although all our sources actually tell us about him is that he was married twice.<sup>4</sup> F. Hinard has now gone further. Accepting the existence of the praetorship, he argues that the elder Sulla was a friend of Mithridates VI Eupator and thus, by implication, had held a promagistracy in Asia.<sup>5</sup>

It should be immediately pointed out, however, that the elder Sulla need not necessarily have held a praetorian promagistracy in the east in order to meet Mithridates. He might just as easily have served on someone else's staff and, in that capacity, there are a large number of offices he could have held, any one of which would have brought him into contact with the king.<sup>6</sup>

1. A view accepted and propounded most recently by A. Keaveney, *Sulla: The Last Republican* (London, 1983), pp. 6–12, and "Young Sulla and the *decem stipendia*," *RFIC* 108 (1980): 165–71, although even he argues for shabby gentility rather than outright penury.

2. L. E. Reams, "Sulla's Alleged Early Poverty and Roman Rent," *AJAH* 9 (1984): 158–74.

3. B. R. Katz, "Notes on Sulla's Ancestors," *LCM* 4 (1982): 148–49; L. E. Reams, "The Strange Case of Sulla's Brother," *CJ* 82 (1987): 301–5.

4. E. Badian, "Lucius Cornelius Sulla: The Deadly Reformer," *Todd Memorial Lecture* (Sydney, 1970), p. 5. Cf. *Plut. Sull.* 2.

5. This view was first advanced in Hinard's *Sylla* (Paris, 1985), pp. 21–22, and repeated in his "Marius: Sylla et l'Afrique," in *L'Africa romana*, ed. A. Mastino (Sassari, 1989), p. 86, n. 18.

6. For the governor's staff see, for example, A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life* (London, 1901), pp. 322–24.

We readily concede, however, that Hinard's hypothesis is not totally impossible. Between 165 and 107, as has been pointed out,<sup>7</sup> there were 348 praetors but of these only 120 are known by name. Moreover, Mithridates became king about 120 and, between 119 and about 107, only one governor's name, that of P. Rutilius Rufus, is attested for the *Fasti* of Asia and even this is by no means secure.<sup>8</sup> So there is a gap for the elder Sulla to fill.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, the evidence that would take this notion out of the realm of conjecture and into that of certainty will not bear the interpretation Hinard wishes to put on it. The evidence in question is Appian *Mithridatica* 54.216.<sup>10</sup>

This passage describes the preliminary negotiations in 85 B.C. that led to the Peace of Dardanus between Sulla and Mithridates VI in the following year.<sup>11</sup> Archelaus acting as negotiator for his master, Mithridates, with Sulla addresses the proconsul thus: φίλος ὢν ὑμῖν πατρώος, ὦ Σύλλα, Μιθριδάτης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπολέμησε μὲν διὰ στρατηγῶν ἐτέρων πλεονεξίαν, διαλύσεται δὲ διὰ τὴν σὴν ἀρετὴν, ἥν τὰ δίκαια προστάσσης. For Hinard the phrase, φίλος . . . πατρώος here refers to a friendship between Sulla's father and Mithridates. If that is so, then we may add that when Sulla, a little later in the same passage (219), upbraids Archelaus and says of Mithridates, τοσοῦτον ἐξήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν μῖσος ὁ νῦν ἡμῖν ὑποκρινόμενος φιλίαν πατρώαν, ἥς οὐ πρὶν ἑκκαίδεκα μυριάδας ὑμῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ συγκοπῆναι ἐμνημονεύετε, then the φιλίαν πατρώαν he mentions obviously refers to this same friendship.

We would further observe that Hinard does not appear to be the first to interpret Appian thus. H. White, the Loeb editor, was plainly thinking along the same lines as we may see from the relevant portions of his translation of the sections just quoted: (1) "King Mithridates was your father's friend, O Sulla . . ."; (2) "such hatred did this man bear towards Italy who now pretends friendship for my father . . ."

It is, however, our contention that both scholars misinterpret the passages because they have failed to appreciate that the *amicitia* that φιλία renders here is not a private friendship but formal relations between states.<sup>12</sup>

We first find the word φιλία applied to Romano-Pontic relations in Appian *Mithridatica* 10.30. There the aid rendered by the father of Mithridates VI, Mithridates V Euergetes, against Carthage is mentioned and that monarch is described as ὁ γὰρ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις πρῶτος ἐν φιλίᾳ γενόμενος. This surely refers to formal relations

7. Reams, "Sulla's Alleged Early Poverty," p. 171.

8. See W. F. Jashemski, *The Origins and History of the Proconsular and the Proprietarian Imperium to 27 B.C.* (Chicago, 1950), p. 135, together with *MRR* 2:9, n. 6. On the approximate nature of the dating of Cn. Aufidius to 107 see *MRR* 1:552, n. 2. See also (for background), B. C. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus* (Leiden, 1986), p. 43.

9. Acceptance of the hypothesis would mean rejecting Keaveney's suggestion, "Young Sulla," pp. 166–67, that the elder Sulla died when the dictator (born 138) was in his teens, but not Reams' theory, "Strange Case," p. 305, that the latter had a brother who died sometime between 107 and 96.

10. In his published work (above, n. 5) Hinard cites no source but has confirmed in correspondence that this is so.

11. For the background see Keaveney, *Sulla*, pp. 99–105.

12. For the terminology and its significance, see Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, pp. 292–93; L. E. Matthaëi, "The Classification of Roman Allies," *CQ* 1 (1907): 185–87; M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les Monarchies Hellénistiques* (Paris, 1921), p. 40, n. 2, p. 54, n. 3, pp. 69–70; A. Keaveney, "Roman treaties with Parthia circa 95–circa 64 B.C.," *AJP* 102 (1981): 195–97.

between Pontus and Rome. *Amicitia*, it is true, need not always imply the existence of a *foedus* but Mithridates V's role suggests it does here and we shall find this hypothesis confirmed by the next piece of evidence we must examine.<sup>13</sup>

The word *φιλία* is next invoked in the context of Romano-Pontic relations in Appian *Mithridatica* 12.38. The year is 89 and certain unscrupulous Roman officials have suborned Mithridates VI's neighbors to attack him.<sup>14</sup> The king protesting, ἀνεμίμνησκε φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας ἰδίας τε καὶ πατρώας. The interpretation of this passage can hardly be in question. Mithridates is reminding his audience that his father had been a *socius et amicus* and, like a good client, he himself (ἰδίας) had renewed the *foedus* which bound his kingdom to Rome and so was also a *socius*.<sup>15</sup> Any doubt on this point and any lingering suspicion that he might be referring to a personal friendship, on his part or his father's, with any of the legates,<sup>16</sup> is removed when further down the same passage φίλος ὦν ὑμῖν καὶ σύμμαχος is glossed with the remark, ὧδε γὰρ αἱ συνθήκαι λέγουσιν, for we know συνθήκαι means a *foedus* duly drawn up and signed by both parties.<sup>17</sup>

This now brings us to *Mithridatica* 54 where yet again *φιλία* is used of Romano-Pontic relations. In the light of what we have said, we have surely no option but to take it as referring to the *foedus* of Mithridates V (renewed by his son) since Appian gives no indication whatsoever that he wishes it to bear any other meaning.<sup>18</sup> Indeed one circumstance shows he did not. When Archelaus says φίλος ὦν ὑμῖν, ὑμῖν has to be taken literally and in reference to the Romans as a whole and not, as Hinard and White would wish, to Sulla alone because, later in the same sentence, Sulla is referred to in the singular, διὰ τὴν σὴν ἀρετὴν.<sup>19</sup>

Finally we would just add that when the subject of *φιλία* did actually come up at Dardanus as Sulla and Mithridates met face to face, then it was surely of the *amicitia* which once existed between Rome and Pontus that they spoke. Indeed, even White seems to have thought so, for he now translates, "Mithridates began by discouraging of his own and of his father's friendship and alliance with the Romans" (App. *Mith.* 56.228).

13. See the bibliography in the previous note.

14. Cf. Keaveney, *Sulla*, pp. 78–79 and E. Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," in *Assimilation et Résistance: Travaux du VI Congrès International d'Etudes Classiques* (Paris–Bucharest, 1976), pp. 507–8.

15. See Matthaëi, "Classification," p. 190; Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce*, pp. 64–68; Keaveney, "Roman Treaties," p. 200.

16. More plausible, on the surface, it has to be said than that postulated for Sulla's father. One of the legates, M. Aquilius, was probably the son of the conqueror of Asia (see *RE* 3 [1895]: 323–26, nos. 10 and 11), and Mithridates V had received Phrygia for help given against Aristonicus. See McGing, *Foreign Policy*, p. 36.

17. Cf. also, τὴν τοῦ Μιθριδάτου φιλίαν ἐνσύνθηκον ἔτι οὖσαν (*Mith.* 14.49). See H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1974), p. 90. Contrast App. *Mith.* 64 where Murena, pointing to the fact that the Peace of Dardanus was not formally ratified, οὐκ ἔφη συνθήκας ὄραν.

18. A subsidiary argument may be noted here. As may be seen from LSJ the primary meaning of πατρώος is "something inherited from/through one's father" and this surely is the meaning that best suits the internal logic of the passage. The message Archelaus is trying to convey is that Mithridates, though a friend to the Romans through his father, went to war with them because of the greed of other commanders. Now, because of Sulla's ἀρετή, he will make peace with them. In other words, an attempt to flatter Sulla and absolve the King from blame for the war is introduced, fittingly, with a reminder of Mithridates' hereditary friendship for the Roman people.

19. Note that later in the passage when Sulla speaks of the Asiatic Vespers, the plural also refers to the Romans as a whole. In the final sentence of 54 observe, too, the contrast made between ἡμῖν and ἐμοῦ.

So, we must thrust Sulla's father back into the obscurity from which he seemed briefly to have emerged. If this should seem a depressingly negative conclusion we may, perhaps, console ourselves with the thought that the father's continuing obscurity serves only to underline, once more, the remarkable nature of his son's rise and achievements.<sup>20</sup>

JOHN A. MADDEN  
*University College, Galway*

ARTHUR KEAVENEY  
*Darwin College,  
University of Kent at Canterbury*

20. The authors wish to thank an anonymous referee for some helpful observations.

### ROMAN EDICTS AND *TA<sup>ANIT</sup> 29A*

Babylonian Talmud, *Ta<sup>anit</sup> 29a*:<sup>1</sup>

When the wicked Turnus Rufus plowed the Temple [site],<sup>2</sup> it was decreed that R. Gamaliel be put to death. The *hegemon* came to the house of study and said, "The man of the nose is wanted; the man of the nose is wanted."<sup>3</sup> R. Gamaliel heard this and hid. The *hegemon* came to him secretly and asked, "If I save you, will you bring me to the world to come?" R. Gamaliel said yes. "Swear to me," he said. R. Gamaliel did. The *hegemon* went up to the roof, fell, and died. Now they [the Romans] have a tradition that when they make a decree and one of them dies the decree is annulled. A heavenly voice announced, "The *hegemon* merits the world to come."

The next to the last sentence of this curious passage has puzzled historians of Roman government.<sup>4</sup> Richard Talbert associates it with the assertion in Deuteronomy

1. For a treatment of the difficulties of this passage, see G. Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age (70–640 C.E.)*, vol. 2, ed. and trans. G. Levi (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 666–67. For an account of the Bar Cochba revolt generally and the scholarly problems in connection with it, see E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 428–66; Alon, *Jews in Their Land*, 2:592–634. The text here translated is that of the manuscripts as reported in *Dikdukei Soferim* ad loc., and available, e.g., in the Steinsaltz edition of the tractate, and in H. Malter, *The Treatise of Ta<sup>anit</sup> of the Babylonian Talmud* (Philadelphia, 1928), p. 225. The Soncino English edition translates the standard printed edition, in which variance at two points of significance obscures the solution to problems. A slight palaeographical change results in "destroyed" for the manuscripts' "plowed." The correct manuscript reading eliminates the difficulty faced in Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, p. 459, n. 122. Secondly, *hegemon* of the manuscripts and early printed editions was removed by Christian censors, apparently because of the medieval and modern Hebrew use of the word for "bishop," and replaced by *adon*, "master," "important person."

2. The plowing of the Temple site is presumably connected in some way with the founding, or preparation for the founding, of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem. For the chronological problems in connection with the founding of Aelia Capitolina, see Smallwood, *Jews Under Roman Rule*, pp. 432–35; for the significance of the plowing, *ibid.*, p. 459.

3. "Man of the nose" appears to be a play on words on the Latin *nasi*, "of the nose," and the Hebrew *Nasi*, "president of the Sanhedrin, patriarch," which was the position held by R. Gamaliel. See e.g., Alon, *Jews in Their Land*, 2:666. Given the clandestine nature of Rufus' mission, *amar*, "said," should not be translated more vigorously as "called" or "proclaimed," but perhaps rather as "hinted," "indicated."

4. The major problem for students of the passage has been the chronological difficulty in taking Turnus Rufus and R. Gamaliel to be contemporaries. See Alon, *Jews in Their Land*, 2:667. Scholars have variously suggested replacing the name of R. Gamaliel with that of whoever would have been *Nasi* at the