

Governors of Asia in the Nineties B.C.

G. V. Sumner

THE CASE for attaching the governorship of Q. Mucius P.f. Scaevola to his consulship (95 B.C.) is not as good as the case for connecting it with his praetorship. The decisive point is that, according to Asconius (15 Clark), Scaevola as consul vetoed the *senatus consultum* granting his colleague a triumph (late 95) and had refused to take up his own province.¹ Scaevola, then, did not administer a consular province, and his administration of Asia must have been a praetorian *provincia*. Asia, of course, normally was a praetorian province in this period.

The date of Scaevola's praetorship happens not to be attested, but it can be defined within close limits by reference to the normal operation of the *cursus honorum*. He and L. Crassus were *aequales* and were colleagues in the quaestorship, curule aedilate, praetorship and consulate (Cic. *Brut.* 145, 161), and this suggests that their careers followed the normal pattern particularly closely. They were both born in 140,² so could not have held the praetorship before 100. By virtue of the requisite *biennium* between praetorship and consulate they could not have been praetors after 98, since they were consuls in 95. Of the three years 100, 99 and 98, the least likely is 100, but there is no obvious reason to prefer 98 over 99, or *vice versa*.

Since Scaevola was *proconsul* of Asia,³ his *provincia* must have fallen partly at least in the year following his praetorship. He was there for

¹ . . . ne fieret S.C. intercessit. idem provinciam, cuius cupiditate plerique etiam boni viri deliquerant, deposuerat ne sumptui esset oratio (read *ornatio*; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 11.23, *instructam ornatamque a senatu provinciam deposui*; Pis. 5). For full discussion consult T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York 1951–60) II 5 n.2 and *Supplement* 42 [hereafter, MRR]; cf. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *CR* 51 (1937) 8ff; B. A. Marshall, *Athenaeum* 54 (1976) 117ff, with detailed argumentation against the rival view as represented by E. Badian (*Athenaeum* 34 [1956] 104ff).

² G. V. Sumner, *Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (Toronto 1973) 94, 97 [hereafter, SUMNER, *Orators*]. Crassus was tribune of the plebs in 107 (aged 32), Scaevola in 106 (aged 33). In a subsequent year they held the curule aedileship (MRR I 575). As the minimum age for the aedileship was 36 (A. E. Astin, *Lex Annalis before Sulla* [Brussels 1958] 41; Sumner, *Orators* 7ff), 103 is the earliest possible date for their tenure.

³ OGIS 437, ἀνθύπατος; OGIS 439, [στρατη]γὸν ἀνθύπατον; cf. Livy, *Peri.* 70.

only nine months (Cic. *Att.* 5.17.5). The *Μουκίεια* were set up in his honour in Daisios (April/May) of the year of his proconsulship.⁴ Presumably this happened nearer the end than the beginning of his tenure. Cicero's "novem menses" will represent the amount of time Scaevola was actually in Asia, not including the time needed to travel from and to Rome. The full period of his absence from Rome was probably twelve months or so. We can assume that he left Rome about June/July and was back in Rome about July/August of the following year (98 or 97) having been in Asia from *ca* September (99 or 98) to *ca* June (98 or 97). When he departed from Asia, he may have left P. Rutilius Rufus as legate in charge until the arrival of his successor. This is probable but not provable.

Who was Scaevola's successor in Asia? We do not know. L. Valerius P.f. Flaccus, having been curule aedile in 98 (or 99?), was praetor in 95 (96?) or later, and held the governorship of Asia.⁵ So Flaccus could be fitted in as governor 95–94 (or 96–95?). There is probably a gap between Scaevola and Valerius Flaccus. Next comes L. Gellius Publicola, praetor in 94 and proconsul in the East *ex praetura*, so probably proconsul of Asia in 93.⁶

The career of C. Iulius Caesar *pater* is somewhat lacking in fixed dates, but it included the proconsulship of Asia in the late nineties.⁷ He was praetor [*inter cives et peregrinos, pro*] *cos. in Asia*.⁸ So his governorship came in the year after his praetorship. Indeed a Priene inscription⁹ indicates that his term in Asia lasted into at least a second year. Lines 14–22 of the inscription are read as follows:

] πρὸς Γάϊον Ἰούλιον Γαίου υἱὸν Καί-

15 [καρὰ ----- ἀποδ]ημήσας εἰς Πέργαμον ἐποίησατο
 [-----] ὥστε τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐπιτάξαι
 [-----] ἐπόνησαν· ἐπὶ δὲ στεφανηφό-
 [ρου -----]ν συντελεσθέντων ὑπ' αὐτῶν

⁴ OGIS 437 n.33. Daisios = 24 April–23 May: see F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* III (Leipzig 1914) 19.

⁵ Sumner, *Orators* 81f.

⁶ MRR II 16; E. Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford 1964) 87. Cic. *Leg.* 1.53, *cum pro consule ex praetura in Graeciam venisset essetque Athenis...* There is, however, a tenuous possibility that he had Cilicia as his *provincia*.

⁷ T. R. S. Broughton, *AJA* 52 (1948) 323ff; MRR II 22.

⁸ *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 3.75 (elogium).

⁹ *Inchriften von Priene* no.111.

20 [----- στε]φανηφόρου μηνός Αθηναίων
 [----- τ]ὸ ἱκανὸν περὶ τῆς οἰκοδομίας
 [----- στρ]ατηγοῦ Γάτου Ἰουλίου Γάτου υἱοῦ
 [Καίσαρος ----- καὶ ταύτην τὴν π]ρεσβείαν ἐτέλεσεν δωρεὰν

15 *init. restitui.* 19 *ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δεινός στε]φανηφόρου rest.* Hiller v. Gaertringen. 22 *init. restitui.*

This appears to tell us that the honorand, Krates, made an embassy to the proconsul Caesar (lines 14–17): then a new *stephanephoros* was in office (line 17); then, if the restoration [ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δεινός στε]φανηφόρου is right (line 19), a second change of *stephanephoros* took place, and in his year in the month of Lenaion (January/February)¹⁰ Krates made another embassy, in connection with which Caesar is again mentioned (line 21). Thus:

Stephanephoros A

Roman year I

Caesar proconsul

Stephanephoros B

Roman year II

Caesar proconsul

Stephanephoros C

Roman year III (Jan./Feb.)

Caesar proconsul

On this scheme, with L. Gellius occupying the year 93 in Asia, we could fit Caesar in as proconsul from some point in 92¹¹ to at least January/February of 90.

Further on in the same inscription honouring Krates we meet the governor L. Lucilius, in two passages separated by a change of *stephanephoros* (lines 135–36, 147–48):

135 ἡμῶν καὶ καταπειραζόντων αἰεὶ ποτε τοῦ[ε] εἰς Ἀσίαν ἐ[ε]στ]α[α]λμένους(?)
 ε[ε]στ]ρα[α]τ]ηγούς, ἐντυ[χ]όντων δὲ καὶ
 136 τῶι στρατηγῶι Λευκίωι Λευ[κ]ιλίωι Λευκίου [υ]ἱῶ[ι]-----
 147 [ε]στ]ρα[α]τ]ηγοῦ ἐπικοινωνούντων, καὶ περὶ ὧν ὁ στρατηγὸς Λεύκιος Λε[υ]κίλιος
 ἔγραψεν] καὶ ἀνέπεμψεν [πρὸς τὴν]
 148 [ε]στ]ρα[α]τ]ηγοῦ, καθότι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα περιέχει καὶ ΤΩΙΤΩΙΣ(?)-----

¹⁰ Lenaion = 24 January–21 February: see Ginzel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4), where also it is indicated that the *stephanephoros* year began at the autumn equinox. (On *stephanephoroi* as eponyms at Priene, *RE* 3A [1929] 2343).

¹¹ There is likely to be significance in the fact (if it is one) that Caesar, who was C. Marius' brother-in-law, was governing Asia in the year when Marius' political opponent P. Rutilius Rufus was on trial for alleged extortion in Asia (*cf.* A. H. J. Greenidge/A. M. Clay/E. W. Gray, *Sources for Roman History* 133–70 B.C.² [Oxford 1960] 125ff). Caesar was in a position to aid the prosecution when (if) it sought evidence in the province.

The subject matter, Asian complaints about *publicani*, is continuous in the inscription from the governorship of C. Caesar to that of L. Lucilius. It is probable that they were consecutive governors. Lucilius, straddling two *stephanephoroi*, may have continued into the beginning of a second Roman year.

A fixed point for the chronology of the governors of Asia is the fact that C. Cassius was proconsul in 89 and 88.¹² This enables us to set up the sequence from Valerius Flaccus to Cassius as follows:

94. L. Valerius Flaccus.
93. L. Gellius Publicola (?).
92. C. Iulius Caesar.
91. C. Iulius Caesar.
90. (C. Iulius Caesar). L. Lucilius.
89. (L. Lucilius?). C. Cassius.
88. C. Cassius.

Another Priene inscription (no.121) offers some more names of governors of Asia in this period. An unknown honorand was sent on numerous diplomatic missions, of which his embassies to Roman governors are mentioned first (lines 21–24):

21 πρὸς [τούς τε ἀπεσταλμέ]νους εἰς τὴν
Ἀσίαν ὑπὸ ῥωμαίων στρατηγούς Γάϊόν τε Λαβέωνα καὶ Λεύκιον Πείσωνα
καὶ Μάρκον Ὑψαῖον κ<αὶ Μ>ᾶρκον Σιλανὸν Μυρέναν ταμίαν καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους
ῥωμαίους

The inscription goes on to mention many embassies to Miletus, Magnesia, Samos, Tralles, Alexandria Troas, Ephesus, Mylasa, Colophon, and to Seleucus son of King Antiochus son of King Demetrius, *i.e.*, Seleucus VI (either before his very brief reign or not recognizing him as king). This provides an important dating point since Seleucus, having eliminated Antiochus IX in 95, was in the same year expelled from Syria by Antiochus X, fled to Cilicia and was killed, still in 95.¹³ So the ambassador's mission to him cannot have been later than 95.

¹² MRR II 34, 38 n.6, 42. It will be noticed that the tabulation which follows leaves no scope for a recent proposal to flout the evidence and convert L. Sulla (from a praetorian proconsul with the *provincia* of Cilicia) into "the regular proconsul of Asia" (in 92: A. N. Sherwin-White, *JRS* 66 [1976] 9, *cf.* *JRS* 67 [1977] 72; but in *CQ* 27 [1977] 182 he prefers 94). I hope to show elsewhere that Sulla's Cilician command may date to 94.

¹³ *Cf.* E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* II (Nancy 1967) 375.

The inscription goes on to state that the honorand was sent to Gaius Egnatius as *dikastes* (line 33). This could be C. Egnatius C.f. Rufus, a senator who was a member of a commission headed by L. Licinius Crassus, probably after Crassus' consulship, so between 94 and 91, when Crassus died (*MRR* II 23). It is not clear what was Egnatius' position in Asia, though it is not excluded that he was a governor or, better, some lesser official such as a legate. The diplomatic activity of this ambassador clearly centres round the 90s B.C. This need not entail that he cannot have been active in the preceding or succeeding decade.

The governor of Asia C. Labeo is almost certainly a C. Atinius Labeo. He could scarcely be the tribune of 130,¹⁴ who is most unlikely to have been praetor after 115. He might well be the tribune's son, for whom a birthdate in the 130s and a praetorship (about the age of 40) in the 90s would not be anything out of the ordinary.

The governor L. Piso cannot be the consul of 112, L. Piso Caesoninus, who would have been praetor by 115 (*MRR* I 523, 538)—too early for the Prienean ambassador. The quaestor of 100, almost certainly his son, comes into question. But this L. Piso could hardly have been praetor before 90, and indeed almost certainly was praetor in 90 and author of the *Lex Calpurnia*.¹⁵ He cannot be fitted in as governor of Asia.¹⁶ It is necessary to assume that there was another L. Piso in this period. This is not difficult since Cn. Piso, consul 139, or (less likely) Q. Piso C.f.C.n., consul 135, could have had a son Lucius of praetorian age in the 90s.

The governor M. Hypsaeus must surely be son of M. Plautius Hypsaeus, consul 125, and seems likely to be the father of the last of the Hypsaei, P. Plautius Hypsaeus, curule aedile 58, consular candidate for 52 (hence born by 95).¹⁷ A praetorship and Asian governorship in the 90s for M. Hypsaeus would present no problem. Theoretically,

¹⁴ Cf. Sumner, *Orators* 58, on this date.

¹⁵ Sisenna fr.17, 120 Peter; *MRR Suppl.* 13 (based on R. Syme, "Missing Senators," *Historia* 4 [1955] 58).

¹⁶ Syme, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15), assumes that L. Piso Caesoninus, praetor 90, was in Asia toward 83, not as governor. But the phrase used in *I.Priene* no.121, [τούς τε ἀπεσταλμένους εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγούς, is a regular formula for the governors of Asia: cf. *OGIS* 339.21; *I.Priene* no.111.135.

¹⁷ Cf. *MRR* II 195, 216, 324; *Suppl.* 46.

the 80s would be equally acceptable. But there is no room for extra governors of Asia in the 80s, as the following table illustrates:¹⁸

89. C. Cassius.
88. C. Cassius. *Mithradates*.
87. *Mithradates*.
86. *Mithradates*.
85. (*Mithradates*). L. Sulla.
84. (L. Sulla). L. Licinius Murena.
83. L. Murena.
82. L. Murena.
81. (L. Murena). M. Minucius Thermus.
80. (M. Minucius Thermus). C. Claudius Nero.

It is a natural assumption that Labeo, Piso and Hypsaeus, to whom the Prienean went on embassy, were consecutive governors, and that may even be correct. It cannot be regarded as the only possibility.

A difficult problem is presented by the fourth name on the list in *I.Priene* no.121, κ<αὶ Μ>άρκον Σιλανὸν Μυρέναν ταμίαν. The editor, Hiller von Gaertringen, following the advice of Fredrich and Hirschfeld, emended *Μυρέναν* to *Μυρένα*, thus producing a Marcus Silanus 'quaestor of Murena'. Emendation could be thought particularly justifiable because in the same line of the inscription there is a bad scribal error. The Murena in question could only be the legate L. Murena whom Sulla left in command in Asia from 84 to 81.¹⁹ In 83 and 82 Murena left Asia to invade Pontus,²⁰ so it would make sense that an Asian ambassador going to make representations to the Roman administration (in Ephesus?) would have had to make do with the quaestor.²¹ On the other hand, this solution creates a rather long interval between the ambassador's missions to the governors of Asia in the first half of the 90s and his mission to Silanus *ca* 83 or 82. Still, one can envisage a situation where this veteran diplomat was called out of retirement for a special mission suited to his experience and talents.

¹⁸ Cf. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (Princeton 1950) 1579.

¹⁹ *MRR* II 61, 64, 70, 77.

²⁰ *App. Mith.* 64–66, 112; Memnon, *FGrHist* 354 F 36.

²¹ As a result M. Silanus is listed as quaestor in 84 and proquaestor in 83–82 by Broughton, *MRR* II 60, 64, 69. He is also plausibly identified with the praetor of 77, who was to be himself proconsul of Asia in 76 (*MRR* II 94).

The alternative, advocated by T. P. Wiseman,²² is to retain the original reading on the stone and postulate a person named M. Silanus Murena. He could be quaestor in the 90s, so that the chronological gap in the Prienean missions would disappear. The name M. (Iunius) Silanus Murena would presumably be of the same type as M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, who was a Lucullus adopted by a M. Terentius Varro. M. Silanus Murena would be a Murena adopted by a M. Iunius Silanus. I confess to some hesitation about this convenient solution. It would be reassuring to have more than a single attestation of the nomenclature Silanus Murena.

Because of the difficulty of fixing the date of Q. Mucius Scaevola exactly, it is not possible to make a single list of the governors of Asia in the first half of the 90s. The following are two of the several possible permutations:

- | | | |
|------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 101. | | C. Labeo. |
| 100. | | L. Piso. |
| 99. | Q. Scaevola. | M. Hypsaeus. |
| 98. | (Q. Scaevola). C. Labeo. | (M. Hypsaeus). Q. Scaevola. |
| 97. | (C. Labeo). L. Piso. | Q. Scaevola. |
| 96. | (L. Piso). M. Hypsaeus. | |
| 95. | (M. Hypsaeus). L. Flaccus? | |

Until new epigraphic evidence turns up, this particular issue will have to remain unresolved.²³

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
 March, 1978

²² In *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 1 (1976) 2; he is cautiously followed by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (New York 1976) 118f.

²³ I should like to thank C. P. Jones for helpful comments on this paper.