

# Appian, Manius Aquillius, and Phrygia

*B. C. McGing*

THE CHANGING STATUS of Phrygia towards the end of the second century B.C. has demonstrated great flexibility as a piece of evidence, being responsible for, or finding a place in, numerous theories concerning Rome and her provinces.<sup>1</sup> The ancient sources have been understood to refer to as many as three such changes of status. First, after being part of the kingdom of Pergamum, Phrygia was given to Mithridates V Euergetes, king of Pontus, as a reward for his services to Rome in the war against Aristonicus.<sup>2</sup> Then shortly after the death of Euergetes in 120 it was taken from Pontus and left free for a time.<sup>3</sup> Finally it was annexed to the Roman province of Asia. This last stage is usually dated to 116 from the fragmentary remains of a *senatus consultum* concerning Phrygia which mentions C. Licinius Geta, the consul of that year.<sup>4</sup> There is not, however, general agreement on the existence of the second stage, that period of autonomy mentioned only by Appian: T. Drew-Bear finds Appian's statement on Phrygian autonomy "inherently implausible" and dates the *senatus consultum* and thus Rome's annexation to 119 when Licinius was perhaps praetor.<sup>5</sup>

Important matters are clearly at stake, and yet the account of Appian, our main literary source for much of this, when examined closely will be seen to conflict in one way or another with all three of

<sup>1</sup> For many of these theories see T. Drew-Bear, "Three *Senatus Consulta* concerning the Province of Asia," *Historia* 21 (1972) 81–84. See also A. N. Sherwin-White, "Roman Involvement in Anatolia 167–88 B.C.," *JRS* 67 (1977) 68–69, who sees Rome's gift of Phrygia to the king of Pontus after the war against Aristonicus as a demonstration of the Senate's general lack of interest in Anatolia. W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327–70 B.C.* (Oxford 1979), appeared too late to use here, but does not substantially affect this paper.

<sup>2</sup> App. *Mith.* 12/39; Just. *Epit.* 37.1.2, 38.5.3; Oros. 5.10.2; Eutrop. 4.20.1.

<sup>3</sup> For the period of freedom see App. *Mith.* 56/232. For the removal from Pontic control App. *Mith.* 11/34, 12/39, 13/45, 15/51, 56/228, 56/232; Just. *Epit.* 38.5.3. All dates in this paper are B.C. unless indicated otherwise.

<sup>4</sup> R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) no. 13. For a new fragment and revised text see T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen 1978) 1–8.

<sup>5</sup> Drew-Bear (*supra* n.1) 82–83.

the stages outlined above: it involves, as will be suggested, a serious chronological error resulting from confusion over the name Manius Aquillius. Much of Appian's evidence on Phrygia occurs in speeches, the historical value of which has been doubted,<sup>6</sup> but which in this paper will be treated as valid evidence: even if they are fabrications,<sup>7</sup> they presumably contain what Appian himself, or his source, thought and are therefore important.

Probably at the end of 90<sup>8</sup> Manius Aquillius, the consul of 101, was given the job, which he carried out in the following year, of restoring to their thrones Nicomedes IV of Bithynia and Ariobarzanes I of Cappadocia, both of whom had been driven from their kingdoms by the ambitious king of Pontus Mithridates VI Eupator (Just. *Epit.* 38.3). Gaius Cassius, governor of Asia, and Mithridates were ordered by the Senate to cooperate in this restoration (App. *Mith.* 11/34),<sup>9</sup> but Mithridates refused, Appian tells us, because "he was angry with the Romans on account of Cappadocia and had recently (ἐναγχοc) been deprived of Phrygia by them." Thus the removal of Phrygia from Pontic control in 119 or 116 is said to be recent with respect to 90/89.<sup>10</sup> Temporal adverbs frequently pose the problem of how narrowly or loosely they should be understood.<sup>11</sup> ἐναγχοc can be used by Appian to refer to the immediate past: for instance in

<sup>6</sup> See D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (Princeton 1950) 1049 n.41: such speeches "cannot be regarded as having any real historical value." See also E. Badian, "Sulla's Cilician Command," *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford 1964) 176 n.51, for hesitation to use as evidence a speech in Appian. P. Desideri "Posidonio e la Guerra Mitridatica," *Athenaeum* 51 (1973) 14 n.60, criticizes the view of Magie.

<sup>7</sup> It has been argued that Appian did not invent them: see T. J. Luce, *Appian's Exposition of the Roman Republican Constitution* (Diss. Princeton 1958) 14ff.

<sup>8</sup> The date is not certain: 90 is perhaps when he received the commission which he carried out the next year, as suggested by A. N. Sherwin-White, "Ariobarzanes, Mithridates and Sulla," *CQ* 27 (1977) 182 n.48.

<sup>9</sup> Dio fr.99 also refers to this demand on Mithridates for help, as pointed out by D. Glew, "Mithridates Eupator and Rome: a Study of the Background of the First Mithridatic War," *Athenaeum* 55 (1977) 396 n.61. Appian gives Cassius' praenomen as Lucius, but it should be Gaius: see T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* II (New York 1952) 38 n.6.

<sup>10</sup> For the use of ἐναγχοc in the same connection see App. *Mith.* 15/51, where it was the cause of some concern to scholars of an earlier age. See the comment of S. Gelenius quoted by J. Schweighäuser, *Appiani Alexandrini Romanorum Historiarum quae supersunt* III.2 (Leipzig 1785) 600.

<sup>11</sup> For similar problematic adverbs applied to Mithridatic affairs see εἰθὺc in Plut. *Sull.* 5 and the debate over its interpretation between Badian (*supra* n.6) 159 and Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) 178. Cf. ἄπρῃ in App. *Mith.* 71/299.

*Mith.* 16/55 it covers a period of probably not more than a few months. A more flexible use occurs in *B.Civ.* 1.9 where Tiberius Gracchus, speaking in 133, refers apparently to the beginning of the slave war in Sicily (*i.e.*, 139 or 136) as recent.<sup>12</sup> And when Mithridates was planning to invade Italy near the end of his life in 64/63, the Social war is regarded as a recent event, although in Appian's account it merges into the revolt of Spartacus, so that ἔνεργος in this case looks back from 64/63 perhaps only as far as Spartacus' revolt some ten years earlier (*Mith.* 109/519).<sup>13</sup> The word can thus be used loosely, but it is difficult to accept that it may cover a period of nearly thirty years.

One suspects therefore that in Appian's mind Phrygia was taken away from Pontus at a date much later than 119 or 116. The suspicion grows when it is also observed that in almost all the passages mentioning Mithridates' loss of Phrygia this loss is associated with his loss of Cappadocia (*Mith.* 12/38, 13/45, 15/51, 56/228, 56/230). It was Sulla during his governorship of Cilicia who deprived Mithridates of Cappadocia in 96, 94, or 92.<sup>14</sup> The arguments in support of 94 seem the strongest, but the important point for the present purpose is that Mithridates' loss of Phrygia is associated chronologically by Appian with his loss of Cappadocia, which we know happened in the mid 90's, and that both losses are said to be recent with respect to 90/89.<sup>15</sup> When Mithridates and Sulla met in 85 to discuss peace after the First Mithridatic War, Mithridates complained that the Romans had been unjust to him in restoring Ariobarzanes to Cappadocia, in taking away Phrygia from him, and in allowing Nicomedes to wrong him (*Mith.* 56/228):<sup>16</sup> the order of

<sup>12</sup> For the date of the beginning of the slave war, see E. Gabba *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus*<sup>2</sup> (Florence 1967) 25.

<sup>13</sup> See also Plutarch's free use of the word to cover a period of thirteen years: C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966) 70.

<sup>14</sup> Sulla's praetorship was for a long time placed unquestioningly in 93 and his governorship in 92: *e.g.*, T. Reinach, *Mithridates Eupator König von Pontos* (Leipzig 1895) 98. Badian (*supra* n.6) was the first to challenge this, arguing for 97 and 96. Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) countered Badian and suggested 95 and 94. G. V. Sumner, "Sulla's Career in the 90's," *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 395–96, comes to the same conclusion as Sherwin-White, *via* a different argument.

<sup>15</sup> See especially *Mith.* 15/51.

<sup>16</sup> Mithridates goes on to say, curiously, that the Romans committed these injustices for money, taking it in turn from himself and from Ariobarzanes and Nicomedes. But Mithridates can hardly be supposed to have given money to have Ariobarzanes restored or himself deprived of Phrygia or Nicomedes invade Pontus. Possibly Appian is anticipating

events here is likely to be chronological, so that Appian must believe that Phrygia was taken from Pontus after Cappadocia, in the late 90's.

It also appears that Appian believed it was Mithridates VI Eupator who acquired Phrygia in the first place, not Mithridates V Euergetes. After the invasion of Pontus by Nicomedes IV of Bithynia which led to the First Mithridatic War, Pontic envoys went to the Romans to complain (*Mith.* 12/38). Ambassadors of Nicomedes were also present, who accused Mithridates of preparing war against Rome: Mithridates was angry, they said, at being ordered (or, ever since he was ordered) to give up Phrygia, which he had bought, bribing a Roman general. He was also annoyed about Cappadocia (*Mith.* 13/45). The general in question was Manius Aquillius, as we learn from a speech of Sulla: when answering Mithridates' complaints at their meeting in 85, Sulla says that Manius Aquillius gave Phrygia to Eupator (κοι) for a bribe. He also says that after removing it from Pontic control the Romans decided that neither would they themselves govern it (*Mith.* 57/231): Sulla's use of the present tense (ἀξιοῦμεν) implies that Phrygia is still autonomous now in 85. Concerning the recipient of Phrygia, Appian elsewhere seems to contradict his assertion that Eupator acquired Phrygia: for the Pontic envoy Pelopidas states that Phrygia was given by Rome's general (to a king of Pontus whom he does not name) as a reward for services rendered in the war against Aristonicus (ἐπινίκιον ἐπὶ Ἀριστονίκῳ, *Mith.* 12/39). In spite of the fact that the king can only be Mithridates V Euergetes, Appian does not specify this; it may well be that he does not recognize it, so that even here he is thinking of Mithridates Eupator.

This, then, is what Appian appears to have believed about Phrygian affairs: Mithridates VI Eupator received Phrygia from a Roman general Manius Aquillius and was deprived of it by the Romans at a date which from the reference point of 90/89 was still 'recent'—probably in the late 90's. And in 85 Phrygia was still autonomous.

Part of this is transparently incorrect. Appian's own reference to

---

the next chapter, where he says that Eupator bought Phrygia. Or else perhaps in Appian's source, Mithridates himself mentioned this purchase, no doubt in euphemistic terms, but Appian then omitted this mention, thus leaving us with no stated reason why Mithridates would have given money to the Romans.

Aristonicus fixes both the donor of Phrygia as Manius Aquillius, consul 129, proconsul in Asia 128–126, and the recipient as Mithridates V Euergetes, who died in 120. And Justin's statement on the subject is quite clear (*Epit.* 38.5.3): *cum sibi pupillo maiorem Phrygiam ademerint, quam patri suo praemium dati adversus Aristonicum auxilii concesserant*. Nor can Phrygia still have been free in 85: the epitomator of Livy calls it *provinciam populi Romani* when Eupator invaded it in 88 at the beginning of the First Mithridatic War (*Per.* 77). Appian's date for the removal of Phrygia seems unlikely if Justin is to be believed, for Eupator was not a *pupillus* in the 90's. Even so, an attempt has been made by P. Desideri to reconstruct events on the basis of Appian's version.<sup>17</sup> Desideri noticed the difficulty with *ἐναγχοσ* and the association of Phrygia and Cappadocia and concluded that *ἐναγχοσ* could not refer to an incident of the early years of Eupator's reign. He proposed the following sequence of events. In 126 Mithridates V Euergetes was given Phrygia as a reward for his help in the fight against Aristonicus. When Sulla says it was given to Eupator, this is merely a careless mistake for Euergetes.<sup>18</sup> After Euergetes' death and while Eupator was a minor, Rome took Phrygia from the control of Pontus and made it autonomous. Mithridates however reoccupied it (in a move recorded by none of our sources) but was finally forced to leave towards 95. It was only after this and before the First Mithridatic War that Phrygia became part of the Roman province of Asia.<sup>19</sup>

A more satisfactory explanation is at hand: Appian has become confused over the name Manius Aquillius. There were in fact two

<sup>17</sup> Desideri (*supra* n.6) 6 n.19.

<sup>18</sup> See also Schweighäuser (*supra* n.10) 623. Desideri does not mention that the Bithynian envoys, like Sulla, also credit the acquisition of Phrygia to Eupator, but presumably he would attribute this too to Appian's carelessness.

<sup>19</sup> Desideri (*supra* n.6) 247 n.148 cites in support of this reconstruction Orelli's emendation *τοῖς Φρυγῶν βασιλεῦσιν* at Memnon 22.4 (for *τοῖς Σκυθῶν βασιλεῦσιν* retained by Müller, *FHG* III 541; and Jacoby, *FGHist* 434 F 22.4 line 27—but Jacoby emends *κυθηνοῦς* to *Φρυγῶν* at line 30, mistakenly taking this to be Orelli's emendation; so too R. Henry, *Photius Bibliothèque* IV [Budé, Paris 1965] 73). Orelli was motivated by the unlikelihood of any interference in remote Scythian kingdoms, whereas Roman interference in Phrygia is documented (App. *Mith.* 11/34 and 13/45). But this interference is nowhere else said to have sought the restoration of Phrygia to its own kings. The historical context would better suit a reading *τοῖς Καππαδοκῶν* or *τοῖς Παφλαγόνων βασιλεῦσιν*, if there were need to emend: in fact the passage can be explained without emendation. See M. Janke, *Historische Untersuchungen zu Memnon von Herakleia* (Diss. Würzburg 1963) 40–44.

Manii Aquillii connected with Asia, separated in time by a generation. (1) The consul of 129, proconsul in Asia 128–126 and organizer of the new province.<sup>20</sup> After his return he was accused of taking bribes but was acquitted (App. *B.Civ.* 1.22). His gift of Phrygia to Mithridates Euergetes can hardly have been made on his own authority: he was presumably carrying out senatorial policy, which by no means excludes the possibility that he accepted money from Mithridates. (2) The consul of 101, proconsul in Sicily 100–99 where he achieved notable success in the slave war.<sup>21</sup> He, too, went on trial for peculation but was acquitted. In 89 he was in Asia restoring Nicomedes and Ariobarzanes to their thrones and reportedly goaded Nicomedes to invade Pontus in order to start a war with Mithridates Eupator. In the resulting conflict Manius was captured and killed.

I suggest that Appian has confused these two Manii, transferring to the time of the younger Manius events connected with the elder. Thus when he says that Manius (wrongly thinking of the younger) gave Phrygia to Eupator, he is not making a careless mistake for Euergetes: because he associates all this activity with the younger Manius and the late 90's, he does in fact mean Eupator. It is then quite natural for him to associate the losses of Phrygia and Cappadocia and to call their removal from Pontic control recent with respect to 90/89. His mistake is consistent, except for the implication of the passage mentioning Aristonicus, where he appears to realize that he is writing about the 120's and the elder Manius. For he may unwittingly have got things right in this case—unwittingly because, as we saw, the recipient of Phrygia is not named, and given the confusion elsewhere it is quite possible that here too Appian is thinking of Mithridates Eupator and the younger Manius. Perhaps his source mentioned Aristonicus but not the full name of the king of Pontus, and Appian failed to think out the implication of Aristonicus' name. As for the status of Phrygia in 85, in Appian's mind the removal of Phrygia from Eupator helped provoke the First Mithridatic War, which makes it easier to understand how he could have believed it free in 85.

The mistake with the Manii Aquillii would not be the only instance where Appian confuses names. In *B.Civ.* 1.120, for instance, he mistakes the consul of 73 M. Terentius Varro Lucullus for his more famous brother L. Licinius Lucullus. In *B.Civ.* 2.88 he names the

<sup>20</sup> See Broughton (*supra* n.9) I 504.

<sup>21</sup> See Broughton (*supra* n.9) I 570.

famous C. Cassius when it should be L. Cassius.<sup>22</sup> In *Mith.* 11/34, 17/60, and 24/94 he calls the governor of Asia at the beginning of the First Mithridatic War Lucius Cassius instead of Gaius Cassius.<sup>23</sup> Such inaccuracy with names lends support to the idea of a confusion between the two Manii Aquillii connected with Asia.

This solution has the advantage over Desideri's of not ignoring the existing evidence of the *senatus consultum* on Phrygian affairs, evidence which Desideri dismisses as too seriously mutilated. But quite apart from this document, there is evidence that Phrygia was part of the province at least by 100: as we now know from the Cnidos version of the Pirate Law, Lycaonia was under Roman rule before this date,<sup>24</sup> and it seems unlikely that Lycaonia could be in such a position if Phrygia were not also part of the province. Even if Rome retained the southwest corner of Phrygia while giving the rest to Pontus<sup>25</sup> and if Pisidia and Pamphylia "had long been nominally part of the Roman province,"<sup>26</sup> from the point of view of strategic geography, Lycaonia would be almost completely isolated if Phrygia were not under Roman rule. For the east-west routes connecting Lycaonia with Asia run through Phrygia; east-west travel for large numbers through Pisidia was out of the question.<sup>27</sup>

Although the Phrygian decree remains very incomplete even with the new fragment found by Drew-Bear, it is best to regard it as addressing the annexation of Phrygia, especially as it appears to be inscribed on the same stone as the *senatus consultum Popillianum de Pergamenis*, in which the acts of Attalus III are ratified and general principles for governing the new province of Asia are established.<sup>28</sup> Despite Drew-Bear, however, the inscription may well date to 116

<sup>22</sup> Suet. *Iul.* 63 and Cass. Dio 42.6 give L. Cassius. For these and similar mistakes by authors both ancient and modern see G. Perl, "Zur Chronologie der Königreiche Bithynia, Pontos und Bosphoros," in J. Harmatta, ed., *Studien zur Geschichte und Philosophie des Altertums* (Amsterdam 1968) 311 n.55.

<sup>23</sup> See *supra* n.9.

<sup>24</sup> M. Hassall, M. Crawford, and J. Reynolds, "Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century B.C.," *JRS* 64 (1974) 202, col. iii line 22. See now G. V. Sumner, "The Piracy Law from Delphi and the Law of the Cnidos Inscription," *GRBS* 19 (1978) 211-25.

<sup>25</sup> Magie (*supra* n.6) II 1042 n.26.

<sup>26</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White, "Rome, Pamphylia and Cilicia 133-70 B.C.," *JRS* 66 (1976) 3.

<sup>27</sup> If B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford 1967) 20, and E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* II (Nancy 1967) 354, are correct in maintaining that Pisidia and Pamphylia were not yet under Roman government, then without Phrygia, Lycaonia would be completely cut off from the province of Asia.

<sup>28</sup> For this inscription see Sherk (*supra* n.4) no. 11; Drew-Bear (*supra* n.1) 75-79.

when Licinius was consul, thus leaving a period of Phrygian autonomy between the removal from Pontic control and annexation in 116.<sup>29</sup> For although Appian is confused on Phrygian affairs and has evidently got the wrong time for Phrygia's alleged autonomy, his statement that it was made free has a certain credibility. A very similar measure was used in Cappadocia and Paphlagonia in the mid 90's: Rome ordered Mithridates Eupator out of these countries and then declared them free, only to find that the Cappadocians wanted a king, not liberty (Just. *Epit.* 38.2.7.) A grant of autonomy to Phrygia in 120/119 may well have provided a precedent for the same action in Cappadocia and Paphlagonia. Moreover, the Senate in this period was in no hurry to take on extensive new administrative duties. It was only after four wars that Macedonia was finally annexed. Attalus III left his kingdom to Rome, but there was no eager grasping of territory: only a small part of his bequest was turned into a province. Against the four years of senatorial indecision which Drew-Bear found unlikely<sup>30</sup> may be set the case of Cyrene, bequeathed to Rome by Ptolemy Apion in 96<sup>31</sup> but left unattended for over twenty years.<sup>32</sup> In 87/6 Ptolemy Alexander I appears to have left Egypt to Rome, but no action resulted.<sup>33</sup> These instances lend credibility to the implication of Appian that after taking Phrygia from Mithridates Rome initially left it free. Although Appian's confusion over the Manii Aquillii has led him to transfer to the eve of the First Mithridatic war events belonging to one generation earlier, his account is still usable, if chronologically unreliable, and not necessarily incorrect in assigning a period of autonomy to Phrygia.<sup>34</sup>

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

November, 1979

<sup>29</sup> This would involve the substitution of [ὑπατος] for [στρατηγός] in line 5 of Drew-Bear's edition of the new fragment, (*supra* n.4) 6.

<sup>30</sup> Drew-Bear (*supra* n.1) 83 n.29.

<sup>31</sup> Livy, *Per.* 70; App. *B.Civ.* 1.111; Just. *Epit.* 39.5.2.

<sup>32</sup> S. Oost, "Cyrene 97-74 B.C.," *CP* 58 (1963) 11-25, thinks it became a province in 74, but E. Badian maintains that P. Lentulus Marcellinus merely organised it on a more regular financial basis: "M. Porcius Cato and the Annexation and Early Administration of Cyprus," *JRS* 55 (1965) 118-21.

<sup>33</sup> For arguments that it was Alexander I and not Alexander II who made the bequest, see E. Badian, "The Testament of Ptolemy Alexander," *RhM* 110 (1967) 178-92.

<sup>34</sup> My thanks for their helpful advice to professors C. P. Jones and G. V. Sumner of the University of Toronto and to the anonymous reader for *GRBS*.