

matar.³⁹ While it is true that there was a Medieval Latin *matare* meaning to “check-mate,” this verb is not evidenced before the middle of the thirteenth century.⁴⁰ It is difficult to believe that so basic a Spanish word as *matar* “to slay” could derive from so technical a phrase for which the evidence is so late. DuCange gives an example of *matare* “to slay” from a Spanish text, for which he gives the date 734: “et non matabunt hominem sine jussu de alcaide seu aluacile Sarraceno; se monstrabunt suos juzgos, et ille dicebit: Bene est, et matabunt culpatum.” This *matare* is clearly a spelling variant of *mattare* of *Glossaria Latina*, 1. 359: *mattant: interficiunt, occidunt. Matare/mattare* comes directly from *maclare* in the well-attested sense “to slay” and is not a denominative of *matus/mattus*. The spellings with single and double *t* can be explained by the same arguments used in respect of *matus* and *mattus* from earlier *mactus*. *Matare* is older than *mattare*, as *matus* is older than *mattus*. Its existence in imperial times has, I think, been satisfactorily demonstrated by G. R. Watson in his clarification of *Cena Trimalchionis* 62. 9, so that it now reads: “gladium tamen strinxi et matavi, tetavi, et umbras cecidi, donec ad villam amicae meae pervenirem.”⁴¹

MICHAEL HERREN
York University
Toronto

39. For a summary of theories advanced as to the origin of this word, see the item directly above.

40. See J. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*, s.v. “matare.”

41. “Petronius 62. 9,” *CP* 60 (1965): 118.

SULLA, THE MARSI, AND THE HIRPINI

Plutarch *Sulla* 4. 1 narrates an incident in the career of Sulla which took place in 103 B.C. while he was serving as a military tribune under Marius in Gaul.¹ This is the sole source and as printed by K. Ziegler in the latest Teubner edition (1972) it reads: καὶ χιλιαρχῶν μέγα καὶ πολυάνθρωπον ἔθνος †Μαρσούς ἐπεισε φίλους γενέσθαι καὶ συμμάχους Ῥωμαίων.

Long ago, one of Plutarch's finest commentators, E. H. G. Leopold, pointed out the problem posed by the obelized word and also proposed a possible solution.² Since his contribution is of great importance and has too often been ignored or simply forgotten, it is worthwhile to quote his words: “Haud dubie hi Marsi ad gentes Teutonicas sunt referendi. Nam de Marsis, Italica gente cogitari non posse, facile adparet. . . . Marsos, Germaniae populum, memorant Strabo i. VII, p. 444 et Tacitus *Annal.* I. 50, 56, II. 25, *de mor. Germ.* c. 2. Sedes habebant ad Luppiam flumen (hodie Lippe) in vicinia Bructerorum et Sicambrorum. . . . Huius igitur gentis, quae posteriori aevo sub Tiberio cladibus aliquot, a Germanico acceptis nobilitata fuit, haud improbabile est, magnam partem tunc temporis ceteros Teutonum gentes in Galliam secutam fuisse.”

Subsequent commentators have been less confident and sometimes considerably less surefooted. A case in point is H. A. Holden, who knew of Leopold's work but does not appear to have given it much attention at this juncture, since his note on

1. *MRR*, 1:564.

2. *Plutarchi “Marius,” “Sulla,” “Lucullus” et “Sertorius”* (Leipzig, 1795), p. 158.

Μαρσους consists of a potted history of the Italian Marsi.³ E. Valgiglio asks doubtfully if the passage refers to the tribe mentioned by Tacitus and says that some detect an error here.⁴ Precisely the same verdict is reached by R. Flacelière and G. Chambray in the Budé edition (1971).

Nor has this incident fared much better at the hands of historians. Presumably because of the difficulties that Plutarch's passage seems to present there is no mention of it in the standard histories of Bloch-Carcopino, Mommsen, and Heitland. It is also ignored in the pages of the Cambridge Ancient History and in the latest article, that of E. Demougeot, which deals with the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones.⁵ Even those historians who do deal with the incident do not appear to have treated it in a completely satisfactory manner. Thus F. Fröhlich simply mentions it without alluding to the problem of the Marsi in any way.⁶ J. Carcopino says that Plutarch's passage stands in need of correction.⁷ In what is, so far as I am aware, the only work devoted solely to Sulla's part in the war against these barbarians, E. Sadée confesses himself unable to evaluate the significance of Plutarch's evidence. He suggests that the Marsi may perhaps be a tribe of southern Gaul, but, as he himself notes, they are mentioned nowhere else in antiquity and this lack must shake our confidence in the suggestion. Sadée adds that *Μαρσους* may be corrupt or that Plutarch may have confused these people with the Marsi of Italy.⁸

Despite all this silence and hesitation there are good reasons for accepting Leopold's hypothesis as a plausible and satisfactory explanation of the difficulty and in consequence including the incident among Sulla's diplomatic triumphs in a future biography. As Leopold points out, the passage seems to require a Germanic tribe and, as it happens, the name of just such a tribe, the Marsi—resembling what we find in Plutarch's text—is known. Nor need their presence in Gaul at this time cause any anxiety. The invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones has been described in such terms as “die frühgermanische Wanderzeit”⁹ and “jenes ersten gewaltigen Eingreifens von Germanen in die Geschichte der Mittelmeerwelt.”¹⁰ The invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones was nothing more than a movement of peoples, a kind of foretaste of the movement which was to destroy the Roman Empire some centuries later. In this great folk movement they were joined by several other peoples. For example, we know that the Tigurini and Toygeni tribes of the Helvetii were part of the movement,¹¹ as were the Ambrones.¹² If peoples such as these could join the Cimbri and Teutones, is it really straining credulity to suggest that the Marsi could have done likewise? It must at very least be admitted that such a thing is not beyond the bounds of possibility. And it need not occasion

3. *Plutarch's "Life of Sulla"* (Cambridge, 1886). pp. v and 65–66.

4. “*Vita di Silla*” (Turin, 1960), p. 14.

5. “L’invasion des Cimbres–Teutons–Ambrones,” *Latomus* 37 (1978): 910–38.

6. S.v. “Cornelius” (392), *RE* 4.1 (1900): 1522–66.

7. *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris, 1931), p. 24, n. 2.

8. “Sulla im Kimbernkrieg,” *RhM* 88 (1939): 44, n. 4.

9. E. Sadée, “Die Eroberung der Etschklausen 101 V. Chr. durch einen kimbrischen Sturmtrupp,” *Bonner Jahrbücher* 143–44 (1938–39): 75.

10. Sadée, “Sulla im Kimbernkrieg,” p. 43.

11. Strabo 7. 2. 1; cf. Demougeot, “L’invasion,” pp. 924–25.

12. W. E. Heitland, *The Roman Republic*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1923), p. 364; Demougeot, “L’invasion,” pp. 922–23.

surprise that this is the only mention of them at this time. Anybody familiar with the fragmentary and unsatisfactory nature of our sources will easily understand how such a thing could happen. We should also bear in mind that they made their peace with the Romans before the great battles in which the barbarians were destroyed. As it was these battles which occupied the attention of our sources, we could have expected the ancient authors to mention the Marsi, if they had remained to participate in them. But, since they made their exit at an earlier, less well-documented time, it is easy to understand why only one source mentions them and that in passing. They play no role in the best-documented part of these events.

It should also be noted that if the behavior of the Marsi in migrating is perfectly consistent with that of other Germanic and Celtic tribes at this time of a movement of peoples, so is Sulla's action in keeping with what seems to have been Marius' policy at the same period. The consul seems to have made it his business to woo by diplomacy as many as possible of those tribes who were allies (or potential allies) of the barbarian horde. So we find him testing the loyalty of *Gallorum et Ligurum*. He also despatched Q. Sertorius, who spoke one of the Celtic languages, to spy on and discover the attitudes of one of the tribes.¹³ Sulla's diplomatic mission is perfectly consistent with actions such as these. Indeed one may go so far as to say that, given the present state of knowledge, Sulla's diplomatic coup represented the greatest triumph of Marius' policy: a large and populous nation had been detached from the barbarian horde and (presumably) persuaded to return home.

Clearly, then, Leopold's explanation of this difficulty is perfectly satisfactory and should be accepted. There is nothing strange about the Marsi being in Gaul at this time,¹⁴ and the silence of other sources concerning them can be put down to their fragmentary nature and their concentration on a period when the Marsi had left the scene.

Discussion of this incident naturally recalls to mind a passage from Book 2 of Sulla's *Memoirs* (Aul. Gell. 20. 6. 3 = frag. 3 Peter) which has sometimes been taken as referring to it.¹⁵ This fragment is as follows: "Quod si fieri potest, ut etiam nunc nostri vobis in mentem veniat, nosque magis dignos creditis quibus civibus quam hostibus utamini quique pro vobis potius quam contra vos pugnemus, neque nostro neque maiorum nostrorum merito nobis id continget." It is difficult, however, to believe that the passage could refer to Sulla's dealings with the Marsi. One could easily imagine the barbarians calling themselves *socii* or *amici*, but it seems highly unlikely that they would claim to be treated like *cives*. As Pascucci remarks, we would seem to be dealing here with a people bound to Rome by a tight political connection, and, if we accept this plausible interpretation, several other more likely suggestions present themselves.¹⁶ The passage could possibly refer to

13. Frontin. *Str.* 1. 2, 1. 6; Plut. *Sert.* 3. 2; cf. T. Mommsen, *History of Rome*, vol. 3 (London, 1876), p. 443.

14. There is no need to assume with *MRR*, 1:556, that Sulla and Sertorius carried out missions far to the north. The tribes with whom they dealt could have been anywhere in Gaul.

15. The various theories as to what the passage may refer will be found listed by G. Pascucci, "I 'Commentari' di Silla," *Atti del convegno sugli storiografi latini tramandati in frammenti* (Urbino, 1975), pp. 287-88.

16. *Ibid.*

Sulla's activities as a recruiting officer among the Latins and the allies in 107.¹⁷ But one may object to this on the grounds that the allies, at this period, were not being treated as *hostes* and had not yet begun to aspire to be *cives*. Again, one could argue that the passage might refer to the period of Sulla's propraetorship. In his campaigns in Asia he made use of troops drawn from Rome's allies there.¹⁸ It is just possible that the passage, given its humble tone, comes from an address by some of the allies. Once more, however, there are difficulties. Why should *socii* want to be treated like *cives*? And what evidence is there, despite what happened when Mithridates shortly afterward invaded Asia, that any of these Roman allies were behaving like *hostes* or, at any rate, were being treated as such at this time?

All in all it seems best to agree with Madvig that the passage must be assigned to the period of the Social War.¹⁹ We need not, however, accept his theory in its entirety. He believed that the fragment comes from a speech made by the Italians before the Senate or the people at the outbreak of the war. In his view *merito* should, therefore, be changed to *immerito*, since the submissive tone hardly suits Italians who are vigorously demanding the citizenship. Against this view one could urge that we might reasonably expect, in this context, the speech to be addressed, not to the Senate or people, but to Sulla himself. More important, one could add that this very submissive tone is not any ground for changing a text which seems to be sound in itself but rather for seeking some other occasions in the Social War when such a tone would be more fitting than at the start.

In fact, there are two incidents in the war, both involving Sulla, when a submissive tone, like that in the fragment, might be expected from an Italian source. Both of them involve the Hirpini. The first possible occasion to which we might assign the fragment is the siege of Aeculanum by Sulla in 89.²⁰ The besieged, anxious to gain time for reinforcements to reach them, offered to treat with Sulla. I would argue that it is at least possible that our fragment could perhaps come from a speech they made, since the submissive tone would suit the occasion well enough. The second occasion seems, however, marginally more attractive, although here again certainty is impossible. Most of the Hirpini did indeed revolt from Rome, but we know of at least one man who remained loyal: Minatius Magius, great-grandfather of Velleius Paterculus. He even raised a legion with which he aided the Romans in the siege of Herculaneum and Pompeii, which was conducted by Sulla. It is surely not beyond the bounds of possibility that the fragment could be from a speech which he made on first offering his services. A humble attitude would not be out of place at this juncture and, since most of his fellow countrymen were in rebellion, he might be expected to plead to be considered as a *civis* and not a *hostis*. Given the history of his people's dealings with the Romans he might very well claim *neque nostro . . . continget* with some justification. If the fragment is to be given to him, then we might note that the Romans were glad, which is hardly

17. Sall. *Iug.* 95.

18. Plut. *Sulla* 5. 6.

19. *Adversaria critica*, vol. 2 (Copenhagen, 1873), p. 612. It certainly seems unlikely, since it comes from Book 2, that it could refer to any later incident in Sulla's career.

20. App. *B.C.* 1. 51; *MRR*, 2:36.

surprising in the circumstances, to take his request literally and give him citizenship by a special grant.²¹

Finally, if the assignment of this fragment from Book 2 of the *Memoirs* is accepted, then it provides some further evidence to support Valgiglio's suggestion²² that Book 1 began with the Jugurthine War and casts doubt on the view that Sulla devoted the first two books to the history of his ancestors.²³

Our conclusions may be summarized briefly. The Marsi of Plutarch *Sulla* 4. 1 are almost unquestionably the German tribe later mentioned by Strabo and Tacitus. Fragment 3 P. from Book 2 of Sulla's *Memoirs* has sometimes been thought to refer to the same incident as the Plutarch passage, but this is unlikely. The fragment should rather be taken as referring to some incident during the Social War involving Sulla and the Hirpini.

ARTHUR KEAVENEY
Darwin College
University of Kent,
Canterbury

21. Vell. Pat. 2. 16. 2-3.

22. "L'autobiografia di Silla nelle biografie di Plutarco," *Atti del convegno sugli storiografi latini tramandati in frammenti* (Urbino, 1975), p. 225.

23. E. Badian, *Lucius Cornelius Sulla—The Deadly Reformer* (Sydney, 1970), p. 4.

CINNA FRAGMENT 6 MOREL

Antiquity has given us but three lines and a stray word from Helvius Cinna's epyllion *Zmyrna*, the poem whose publication is greeted with fraternal enthusiasm in Catullus 95. Two verses are provided by the Virgilian scholia (ad *G.* 1. 288):

Te matutinus flentem conspexit Eous
et flentem paulo vidit post Hesperus idem.

The setting of these lines must be recovered from Ovid's narration of the same story in *Metamorphoses* 10. 298-528: they will have formed part of the description of Smyrna's anguish as she weighs the depth of her passion for her father Cinyras against the horror of incest. This emotional torment Cinna portrays with much neoteric art. The maiden's weeping is graphically represented by the affective repetition of the participle *flentem*, while the morning and evening stars are given their Greek names.

For the conflation of Eous and Hesperus scholars rightly draw attention to a fragment from the *Hecale* of Callimachus (frag. 291 Pfeiffer):¹

ἦνίκα μὲν γὰρ ἴφαινεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ταῦτα†
αὐτοὶ μὲν φιλέουσ', αὐτοὶ δὲ τε πεφρίκασιν,
ἐσπέριον φιλέουσιν, ἀτὰρ στυγέουσιν ἐῶον.

1. See H. Dahlmann, *Über Helvius Cinna* (Mainz, 1977), p. 42; R. O. A. M. Lyne (ed.), "*Ciris*": *A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 251-52. Chiefly to be compared in Latin are Catull. 62. 34-35 "nocte latent fures, quos idem saepe revertens, / Hesperie, mutato comprehendis nomine Eous" and *Ciris* 351-52 "quem pavidae alternis fugitant optantque puellae / (Hesperium vitant, optant ardescere Eoum).