

ARIOBARZANES, MITHRIDATES, AND SULLA

The widely accepted redating of the praetorship and propraetorship of Cornelius Sulla from the conventional years 93–92 to the years 97–96 B.C., proposed by E. Badian in an ingenious paper, involved the rearrangement of the story of the Cappadocian succession between c. 101 B.C. and 90 B.C.¹ Badian proposed a much simpler reconstruction of the events recorded in the summary narratives of Justin, Appian, and Plutarch, than the version established by Th. Reinach which has hitherto held the field.² But though Badian's version makes good sense in itself it involves certain sophistries in the manipulation of the sources, it does not take account of all the relevant evidence about Cappadocian affairs, and the numismatic evidence for the chronology has recently altered. There is also a doubt about the validity of his interpretation of the evidence about Sulla's praetorship which may undermine his whole position. Since the story concerns the decisive change in Roman policy towards Mithridates Eupator, and in the attitude of Mithridates towards Rome, a reconstruction of the evidence for this crucial moment is desirable.

About the first phase of the Cappadocian entanglement there is no serious dispute, though the chronology is at best approximate. Mithridates, aided by the Cappadocian quisling Gordius, overran Cappadocia, and eliminated the last effective Ariarathid king, Ariarathes VII, in about 101–100 B.C. He then installed one of his sons under the fictitious name of Ariarathes (known as the ninth) while Nicomedes III of Bithynia set up a rival and equally fictitious claimant. Both submitted the claims of their creatures to the Roman Senate. Difficulties arise at this point. The older version of the next phase is reconstructed from the sources as follows: after rejecting these claims the Senate encouraged the Cappadocian nobility to set up a man of their own choice, Ariobarzanes, as king (c. 96–95 B.C.), who was then ousted by Tigranes king of Armenia in or after 95 in the interest of Mithridates and Gordius: Justin, Strabo. Ariobarzanes fled to Rome and on the instruction of the Senate was restored to his throne by the propraetor Sulla with armed force in 92 B.C.: Plutarch, Livy (*Ep.*). He was again ousted c. 91 B.C. by an army of Mithridates led by 'Bagoas and Mithraas': Appian. The Senate now dispatched the mission of Aquilius to restore Ariobarzanes to Cappadocia (90–89 B.C.), and the later actions of this mission precipitated the great war with Mithridates: Justin, Appian, Livy (*Ep.*). In all this the only certain dates are the starting-point of 102–101 and the termination in 90, as will gradually emerge.³

This story, as the insertion of the sources briefly indicates, is a conflation of the evidence of Justin and Appian into which the mission of Sulla, of which they

¹ E. Badian, 'Sulla's Cilician Command', *Athenaeum* N.S. 37 (1959), 279 ff., cited below from the reprint in his *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 157 ff.

² Justin 38.2, 3. Strabo 12.2.11 (540). Livy, *Ep.* 70. Appian, *Mithr.* 10. Th. Reinach, *Trois royaumes de l'Asie mineure* (Paris, 1888), repeated with modifications

in his *Mithridate Eupator* (Paris, 1890). Cf. *CAH* ix.235 ff. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), i. 203 ff., ii.1098–9, nn.11–19. E. Will, *Histoire du monde hellénistique* (Nancy, 1967), ii.395 ff. For the numismatic evidence, see below nn.38, 41, 45.

³ For the significance of 90 B.C. see below, nn.16, 48.

have no direct knowledge, is inserted with the help of the Livian epitomator, while Appian's contribution is treated as a continuation of Justin. In Reinach's version Sulla restores Ariobarzanes after he has lost his throne. Badian's variant is that the Sullan episode comes at the beginning. Sulla does not restore an ejected king. He restores an exiled person, and sets the man up as king in the first place, in 96 B.C., when the influence of Gordius nullified the proposal of the Cappadocian nobles. Some five or six years later the officers of Tigranes, not of Mithridates, Bagoas and Mithraas, expel Ariobarzanes, and the mission of Aquilius is sent out to rectify the situation. This for Badian is the first and only restoration of Ariobarzanes down to 90 B.C.

The virtue of this version is that it extracts the same story from both Appian and Justin, though Badian discounted Appian as 'unsatisfactory'. He inserts the Sullan episode at the beginning of Justin's story under cover of the reference to the decision of the Senate to recognize Ariobarzanes,⁴ whereas Reinach inserted it into the middle of Justin's account, assuming the omission both of the Sullan episode and of the intervention of Bagoas and Mithraas. So far Badian has the advantage. Difficulty arises when he goes on to insist: 'The modern account . . . in its crowning absurdity . . . has to assume that Gordius (and the boy king . . . whom we can ignore) evacuated the country after the Senate's order, only to invade it again almost at once to be expelled by Sulla'.⁵ This refers to the first installation or recognition of Ariobarzanes by *senatusconsultum*. He has not observed that his favoured source Justin records elsewhere that in deference to the Senate Mithridates at this time withdrew his son voluntarily from Cappadocia after seizing it previously (i.e. c. 100) 'by right of conquest'.⁶ So the crowning absurdity turns out to be well documented.

Other difficulties concern the placing of the Sullan intervention in the year 96—determined by Badian's reconstruction of Sulla's magisterial career—and before any expulsion of Ariobarzanes from the kingship. When Sulla arrives in Cappadocia he is confronted by Gordius, who is supported by native Cappadocians and by Armenians who 'come to his aid'.⁷ The connection between Mithridates, Gordius, and Tigranes is well documented in Justin. These Armenians can come only from the kingdom of Tigranes, who according to Badian does not intervene in Cappadocia until c. 91–90. Tigranes himself was installed as king of northern Armenia—the region of the upper Euphrates basin north of the Antitaurus watershed—by the Parthian monarch Mithridates the Great in a year that should not be earlier than 96–95.⁸ It was only after his annexation of the principality of Sophene, south of the Antitaurus, that he acquired a common frontier with Cappadocia, and easy access by the Euphrates crossing at Tomisa.⁹ The Cappadocian intervention of Tigranes could occur only after the annexation of Sophene. Hence Badian is reduced to explaining the conflict between Armenian forces and Sulla by interpreting them as an advance party of the army of Tigranes

⁴ Justin 38.2.8, 'itaque rex illis a senatu statuitur'. He supposes (p. 167) that it was irrelevant to Justin's purpose to explain who set up Ariobarzanes, or how. But Justin 38.3.4 names the Romans who restored him in 90–89, including the obscure Maltinus.

⁵ p. 166.

⁶ Justin 38.5.6. Being grouped with the withdrawal from Paphlagonia, the reference to the invasion of c. 101 is clear; in 90–89

Mithridates refused to co-operate in restoring Ariobarzanes (Appian, *Mithr.* 11).

Badian, p. 166 n.45, cites an adjacent item from this speech in Justin (loc. cit. 9) with strong approval.

⁷ Plut. *Sulla* 5.6–7.

⁸ Justin 38.3.1. Plut. *Luc.* 21.6 dates it twenty-five years before an event of 71–70; cf. Badian, p. 176 n.49.

⁹ Strabo 11.14.15 (532), 12.2.1 (535).

that annexed Sophene, crossed the Euphrates, and impinged upon the outposts of Sulla.¹⁰ The ex-hostage had hardly returned to his father's kingdom before he set about the conquest of Sophene. This conflicts with the plain statement of Plutarch—taken from the Memoirs of Sulla as Badian insists—that the Armenians came to support Gordius and were a considerable force. Unfortunately the episode cannot be dated a year later when Sulla might still be in Cappadocia and the annexation of Sophene is less improbable. The precise Obsequens in his chronicle of portents records that the consular year 95 was remarkable, like the year 93, for the absence of any Roman military action, an *annus tranquillus*.¹¹

There is another item of contrary evidence. Badian explained Plutarch's statement that Sulla 'brought Ariobarzanes back' to mean no more than that he brought him back from exile to his own country, not 'to his throne'. He was then declared king, as Plutarch adds, which is interpreted to mean that he had not been king before. This would do very well, if the epitomator of Livy did not produce the story in the form: 'Ariobarzanes in regnum Cappadociae a L. Cornelio Sulla reductus est'. He uses the phrase elsewhere without ambiguity to mean the restoration of kings to their thrones.¹² The implication is that Sulla's restoration of Ariobarzanes followed an expulsion from the kingship itself.

There is an improbability in the notion that the original installation of the king was done by a Roman army. That was not the way of the Roman Senate in its dealings with the problems of succession in the oriental kingdoms during the second century. Senatorial commissions sometimes intervened in such disputes, but armed force had not yet been used. In a similar situation c. 158–156 B.C. when the Senate favoured the division of Cappadocia between Ariarathes and his brother Orophernes, and the latter succeeded in expelling the former, Ariarathes was left to his own devices to secure his restoration.¹³ So too no direct help was given to the dynasts of Bithynia, Syria, and Egypt in their feuds.¹⁴ Much more recently in the affair of the Numidian succession, when Jugurtha twice defied the Roman settlement, expelling and destroying his fellow king in open warfare, the Senate resorted to force only after the failure of a series of diplomatic missions.¹⁵

Likewise the open defiance by Mithridates of the Senate's formal declaration in favour of Ariobarzanes does not fit with his cautious attitude in these years.

¹⁰ Badian, p. 168.

¹¹ Obsequens 50.110, 'pax domi forisque fuit'; cf. *ibid.* 52.112, 'totus annus tranquillus', for 93, while for 94 he notes a Roman victory in Spain. The years 94–93 are also excluded because C. Sentius was urban praetor in 94, (*SIG*³ 732), for Sulla's praetorship and propraetorship, but 95–94 remains.

¹² Livy, *Ep.* 70. Cf. *Ep.* 74, 'Nicomedes in Bithyniae, Ariobarzanes in Cappadociae regnum reducti sunt'. So too in Appian, *Mithr.* 57, when Sulla in a speech claims *κατήγαγον Ἀριοβαρζάνην* the verb must mean, as it does twenty lines below, 'restored to his throne', *pace* Badian, n.51.

¹³ Pol. 32.10–12. Diod. 31.28, 32, 34. Appian, *Syr.* 47. Livy, *Ep.* 47. Cf. Will, *op. cit.* ii.312 ff. (158–156 B.C.). Likewise the

Senate does nothing effective to help its favourite Ptolemy VII Physcon against the intransigence of his brother in the same decade, cf. Will ii.302–3: Pol. 31.10, 17–20, 33.11. Diod. 31.23, 33.

¹⁴ In 150–149 a senatorial mission was complacent when Nicomedes II eliminated his father Prusias II, whom they were supposed to support; Pol. 36.14.4. Diod. 32.20–1, 33.14–15, Livy, *Ep.* 50. Equally the Senate gave no material support to its protégés in the dynastic feuds of Seleucid Syria: Pol. 31.2.1–11, 11.1–15, 33; 32.2–3, 3.11–12; 33.18.6–14. Diod. 31.27 A, 29–30, 32A. Appian, *Syr.* 46, 47, 67. Cf. Will, *op. cit.* ii.309–23.

¹⁵ Sallust, *B.J.* 13, 16.1–2, 21.4, 25.4, 27.

He had nominally accepted the Senate's decision in the affair of the Scythian princes, and over the occupation of Paphlagonia. When the mission of Aquilius restored Ariobarzanes and Nicomedes by armed force in c. 89 Mithridates gave way, and even when Nicomedes under Roman pressure ravaged western Pontus he merely made 'strong representations' to the Roman mission.¹⁶ He only opposes force with force when his representations are rejected and his kingdom is directly menaced by an army under Roman leadership.¹⁷ It seems that the wily king was bent on securing his ends by indirect means without open conflict if he could. Hence his acceptance of the original decision of the Senate against his nominee Ariarathes makes good sense. At this phase nothing required the dispatch of a Roman army to install the Roman protégé in the acquiescent kingdom. Ariobarzanes is expected to make good with the support of his Cappadocian friends, just as Adherbal was left to maintain himself by his own resources against Jugurtha, and Ariarathes V against Orophernes—and Mithridates was expected to follow the advice given to him by Marius in 99: 'silently obey the orders of Rome'.¹⁸ In the next phase Mithridates operates through Tigranes precisely because he was not yet ready to take direct action against a clear Roman instruction, and he is conspicuously absent when Sulla arrived. But from the Roman angle it was a very different matter when the candidate whom the Cappadocians had rejected, through an ingenious intrigue with a third party, succeeded in expelling the Senate's nominee, whether Mithridates appeared openly in the affair or not. Nothing quite like this had happened before in the long story of Roman indirect control of the Asian kingdoms. The Senate acts with resolution at much the same moment as in the Jugurthan affair. Hence the traditional arrangement of events makes better historical sense than the new order, which ignores the reluctance of Mithridates to defy the Senate openly, and of the Senate to take direct action in the dynastic feuds of the dependent kingdoms.

Badian assumes that Gordius was acting always in the name of the fictitious Ariarathes, and that the two abandon Cappadocia only after the arrival of Sulla.¹⁹ When Justin records the claim of Gordius to have been chosen as king in his own right by his partisans, after the Senate left the choice of a king to the Cappadocian nobles, this is explained as a minor slip—Gordius was merely to be a regent for Ariarathes, and Sulla expels both.²⁰ But Justin's statements are consistent. When Mithridates withdrew Ariarathes, Gordius was left free to stand in his own right, since the Senate had rejected both pretenders. Hence Mithridates could claim that he had no hand in the matter.²¹ The young Ariarathes reappears only in the ensuing phase, recorded by Appian, when Mithraas and Bagoas restore him to Cappadocia.²² This is at the same time as the intervention of Mithridates in Bithynia, some years after the death of Nicomedes III, which replaced the Roman nominee Nicomedes IV by his brother Socrates, and led to the mission of Aquilius.²³

¹⁶ Appian, *Mitbr.* 11, 12–14. Livy, *Ep.* 74, ambiguously dates the restoration either to late 90 or to 89, though the notice may refer to the *s.c.* passed in 90 which took effect in summer 89; cf. n.48 below. For the Scyths, Memnon 30.2.

¹⁷ Appian, *Mitbr.* 15, restoration of Ariarathes; 17, march against Aquilius.

¹⁸ Plut. *Marius* 31.5.

¹⁹ p. 166.

²⁰ Justin 38.5.9. Badian, p. 175 n.45.

²¹ Justin 38.5.8.

²² Appian, *Mitbr.* 10.

²³ Ibid. 11. Justin 38.3.4. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator*, p. 112 n.2, dates the death of Nicomedes III to c. 94 by allowing some three years for the two marriages, and the birth of the two children, of

That nexus of events appears in both Justin and Appian, and might require us to identify the action of Bagoas, omitted by Justin, and connected by Appian with Mithridates, with the coup of Tigranes. But Mithridates alone is the impediment, in Appian's narrative, to the restoration of both Nicomedes and Ariobarzanes by Aquilius.

Badian expresses great confidence in the essential accuracy and completeness of Justin, and makes fun of the traditional reconstruction that artificially grafts the material of Plutarch into a non-existent gap. But this confidence is misplaced. The errors and confusions of Justin elsewhere are manifold and manifest. He is capable of remarkable transitions and omissions. Thus the *Prologus* of Trogus to Book 42, which dealt with the rise of the Arsacid power, listed the achievements of the Parthian Mithridates the Great, and 'after the succession of a number of kings', those of Orodes, Pacorus, and Phraates, in correct order. But Justin's epitome of the same book conflates the story of Mithridates the Great, who died c. 93, with that of Mithridates Philopator and his brother Orodes, of c. 60 to 54. So too Justin can place the conversion of Cyrene, Cilicia, and Crete into Roman provinces—events of 76 to 65 B.C.—before the intervention of Tigranes in Syria in 83 B.C., and make it the cause.²⁴ There is no primacy of value as between Justin and Appian, except that Justin gives a great deal more, but not the whole, of the story. An argument that presumes the reliability and coherence of Justin is built on sand.

The starting-point of the new thesis is the assumption that Plutarch draws directly from the memoirs of Sulla the statement that Sulla proceeded 'immediately' after the defeat of the Cimbri in 101, in which he shared as a legionary officer, to stand for election to the praetorship, which he secured under the rules of the *Lex Annalis*, after a check, in 98 for 97.²⁵ But this paragraph about the election cannot derive as a whole from Sulla's memoirs, because it is too full of derogatory statements: Sulla is said to owe his success largely to bribery, and the point is rubbed in by a satirical anecdote. Plutarch cites the memoirs here only to reject the explanation that Sulla offered for his electoral defeat at his first attempt—that the People were angry with him for dodging the aedileship and its attendant Games.²⁶ The passage contains a notable error. Plutarch states that Sulla stood for the 'civic praetorship', that is, the *praetura urbana*, which according to a late source he actually held.²⁷ But men do not stand for specific praetorships: the *provinciae* are assigned by lot to the successful candidates. Plutarch has misunderstood his source.

As for the immediacy, Plutarch says that Sulla turned immediately to 'political activity' and so to candidature for the praetorship. Badian does not question the literal meaning of the adverb *εὐθύς*, or Plutarch's use of it. Recent researches into the narrative techniques of the interrelated Lives of the Ciceronian period have shown how misleading the chronological arrangements of Plutarch can be, and

Nicomedes IV before his expulsion, which Appian, *Mithr.* 11, synchronizes with the expulsion of Ariobarzanes by Bagoas, c. 91–90. But *ibid.*, p. 111 n.2 he takes too literally *nuper* in Cic. *de Or.* 3.229 to mean that Nicomedes was recognized by the Senate against the claims of Socrates just before Sept. 91.

²⁴ Justin 39.5, cf. 40.1: The Syrians invite Tigranes to be king (in 83) because of their adjacency to the Romans (from 69 on).

²⁵ Plut. *Sulla* 5.2; Badian, pp. 158 f.

²⁶ Plut. *Sulla* 5.2–5.

²⁷ *de Vir. Ill.* 75, 'praetor inter cives ius dixit'.

how much more they owe to Plutarch than to his sources.²⁸ A palmary instance elsewhere occurs in the opening of the *Timoleon*, where the same adverb covers an interval of four years.²⁹ Elsewhere in the *Sulla* Plutarch says that on entering Greece Sulla 'immediately' secured the other cities but was held up by the siege of Athens. The fuller version of Appian shows that the procedure was decidedly more protracted.³⁰ It is the way of Plutarch to sharpen his narrative by the intensification of chronological connections. In the present passage he is interested in stressing the check caused by the unexpected defeat of Sulla at the polls, on which he elaborates. Even on Badian's chronology the 'immediately' has little force, since under the rules of the *Lex Annalis*, of which Plutarch is unaware, Sulla must wait two years after the victories of 101 before standing for the praetorship at the elections of 99, although the war was over many weeks before the elections of 101, at which Marius himself was able to be a candidate: nothing prevented Sulla from standing for the aedileship then or in 100, if he was in a hurry for office, securing it—and pressing on.³¹ The adverb is more likely to reflect Plutarch's own stylistic purpose than to be copied unthinkingly from his source. Even if derivative, it is as likely to stand for the dilatory *mox* as for the pressing *statim*.

There is no force in the argument that Livy, *Ep.* 70, favours a date before 92 for Sulla's Cappadocian adventure, because its summary of this precedes the account of the trial of Rutilius Rufus, which probably belongs to 92, and the beginning of the tribunate of Drusus in December 92. It is not true, as Badian assumes, that the Epitomator has a regular usage of placing foreign events after internal events of the same consular year; though he often does so there are many exceptions. Thus for the year 125 in *Ep.* 60 the warfare in Gaul precedes the revolt of Fregellae and the census, though for 133 and 123 the tribunates of the two Gracchi, which began in the preceding years, come before the warfare of the summers of 133 and 123. In *Ep.* 61 the warfare in Gaul of 121 precedes the civic tumult of that consular year. In *Ep.* 68 the Cimbric campaign of 101 precedes political events at Rome in the same year, while the Epitomator adds

²⁸ I owe what follows to the as yet unpublished thesis, and private advice, of Dr. C. Pelling, whose commentary on Plutarch's *Caesar* carries further the study of Plutarch's handling of his sources initiated by D.A. Russell's discussion of the *Coriolanus*, *JRS* 53 (1963), 21 f. Plutarch also misrepresents the time factor in *Cic.* 30.1 by passing straight from the Bona Dea trial to the election of Clodius to the tribunate and his attack on Cicero, with an *εὐθὺς*. So too in *Caes.* 21.8 the dispatch of Cato to Cyprus in 58 is connected with the protection of legislation of several years earlier, though Plutarch elsewhere knows the correct date (*Cic.* 34.2, *Pomp.* 48.9, *Cato Min.* 39–40.). Cf. also *Caes.* 6.7, 7.1, on the entry of Caesar into public life, for concealed time lag, and *Lucullus* 5.1.

²⁹ Plut. *Timol.* 1.1.

³⁰ Plut. *Sulla* 12.1; Appian, *Mithr.* 30. I add that in Plut. *Sulla* 11.8 Brutius withdraws 'immediately' from Boiotia at the

request of Lucullus, but in Appian, *Mithr.* 29, he withdraws without haste because reinforcements reach Archelaus. In *Sulla* 10.8 Cinna on entering office 'immediately' turns on Sulla, who faced by prosecution leaves for Greece: hardly likely, with an army and a sea voyage, in *January*.

³¹ Badian, pp. 159 f. But why should a man of obscure family expect to hold the praetorship *suo anno*, as Badian assumes? Holding the aedileship would only delay him two years—nothing to a man who had as yet, as Velleius says (2.17.1), no pretensions to the consulship, and who had been in no hurry to secure the quaestorship, which he held five years later than his most distinguished contemporaries; cf. A.E. Astin, *The Lex Annalis before Sulla* (Brussels, 1958), pp. 44–5, who shows also (pp. 11–12) that less than half of the known praetorians who secured the consulship between 179 and 88 did so within the legal minimum.

that the book, which covered two consular years, also contained the wars of the Syrian kings.³² There is no sufficiently general usage or fixed rule, but much adaptation to circumstances and doubtless to the order of Livy himself. So *Ep.* 70 does nothing to prove that Sulla's campaign was earlier than the consular year 92. But it does not disprove an earlier date, since it records no preceding events except the Spanish war of 98–97 and the acquisition of Cyrene in 96.³³

So the arguments for dating Sulla's praetorian activities to 97–96 are not convincing, and a later date has historical advantages. But how much later? The only evidence for the traditional dating of Sulla's praetorship to 93 is ambiguous and indirect. It consists of the evidence of Livy, *Ep.* 70, discussed above, and the implications of Obsequens that the years 95 and 93 were years without military activity. That leaves 96, 94, and 92 open for the military mission of Sulla as propraetor. More attention might be paid to the attribution of Sulla's praetorship by Velleius to 'the year before the Italian war'. Badian dismisses this as impossible.³⁴ Certainly Sulla cannot have been *praetor urbanus* in 91 and propraetor in Cappadocia in 90, since he was then undoubtedly fighting in Italy. Of course Velleius makes chronological mistakes elsewhere. But he twice goes out of his way to emphasize the chronological connection between Sulla's praetorship and the War.³⁵ In the second passage he stresses the late development of Sulla's ambition to reach beyond the praetorship and his acquisition of the consulship only in his forty-ninth year. So he should not be wildly wrong about the praetorship. What he says in chapter 15 is not that Sulla was praetor for the consular year 91 B.C., but that he was praetor the year before the Italian war burst out after the death of Drusus and spread in the next consular year to involve all Italy. In fact the war 'burst out' with the massacre of the Romans at Asculum late in the consular year 91.³⁶ The error of Velleius need be no worse than attributing Sulla's actual praetorship to the year of his more famous activity in Cappadocia.

A restoration of Ariobarzanes by Sulla in 92 and an expulsion by Bagoas in c. 91 is a historical pattern made intelligible by the circumstances of Rome at the time. The latter date is suggested by the Livian dating of the restoration of Ariobarzanes (by Aquilius) to the year 90–89, and lightly supported by the resumption of coinage in the name of Ariarathes IX in his twelfth year, which cannot be earlier than 91–90. But this brings into question the numismatic evidence for the chronology of this decade.

THE CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The chronological framework of the whole decade after the murder of Ariarathes VII depends upon the supposed regnal dates of the coins of the Cappadocian kings. The central date in the confused story, common to all

³² In *Ep.* 63 the campaign of the consul in summer 114 rightly precedes the trial of the Vestal in December (cf. Macrobian *Sat.* 1.10.5).

³³ For this date, Obsequens 49.109. It is true that the Epitomator in 62, 68, 70 places at the end oriental events in which Rome was not directly involved, though in *Ep.* 74 they come in the middle of a year.

³⁴ Velleius 2.15.3. Badian, p. 158, 'It may safely be ignored'.

³⁵ Ibid. and 17.2, 'deinde post praeturam inlustratus bello Italico, etc.'. Admittedly in 2.24.3 he tells the story of Sulla and the Parthian *legatus* out of place, and the text of 31.3 has a horrid error in back reference sometimes cured by amendment: but 33.1 is a correct back reference.

³⁶ Livy *Ep.* 72, dealing with the events of winter 91–90: the warfare of 90 comes in *Ep.* 73. Obsequens 54 (114). Appian *B.C.* 1.38 (cf. 40). So too Velleius 2.15.1.

versions, is that Ariobarzanes became king of Cappadocia, by whatever manner, in or about the year 96 B.C. This date depends on the reconstruction established ingeniously from the coinage by Th. Reinach. Badian rightly insisted that the chronology is more elastic than the followers of Reinach allow, because the latest known coins of each king are not necessarily his last issue, and because the regnal years of the kings are anchored at one end to dates that are more approximate than precise, given by literary sources.³⁷ But he still accepted as decisive the same numismatic data as Reinach. Recently a new survey of the Cappadocian coinage, based on a much larger range of coins than was available to Reinach, has been made by B. Simonetta.³⁸ This both removes some of the evidence known to Reinach and Badian, and adds fresh material. The situation would now seem to be as follows.

The accession date of Ariobarzanes was secured by combining his latest regnal year, which is now his thirty-second instead of his thirty-fourth, with the moment of his retirement in favour of his son in the proconsular presence of Pompeius Magnus.³⁹ This incident, which is otherwise undated by its source, may belong to any of the years 64, 63, or 62, after the Armenian and Caucasian campaigns of Pompeius. It can no longer be fixed even approximately by the duration of the reign of Ariobarzanes II, who was assassinated some time before the arrival of Cicero as proconsul in Cilicia in the summer of 51 B.C., because the latest known regnal year of Ariobarzanes II is his eighth, and not his eleventh as Reinach thought.⁴⁰

So the accession of Ariobarzanes I can no longer be dated even loosely by the cumulative evidence of the regnal years of himself and his son. A second line of approach is to connect his installation with the regnal years of Ariarathes IX, the puppet of Mithridates set up after the assassination of Ariarathes VII.⁴¹ Coins record his second to fifth, twelfth, thirteenth, and now his fifteenth regnal years. His accession date is also controlled by a dedication at Delos in honour of Ariarathes VII, dated by a Delian magisterial year to 102–101.⁴² The opening quinquennium of Ariarathes IX was taken by Reinach, whom Badian here followed, to be a closed period that coincides with the years from the installation of Ariarathes to his replacement by Ariobarzanes. That for Badian should mean from a moment in or after the campaigning season of either 101 or 100, when Mithridates disposed of Ariarathes VII, to that of 96, when Sulla set up Ariobarzanes, to allow for the issue of five coinages in five consecutive years. Badian sought to confirm this with another argument drawn from Reinach—that the death of Ariarathes IX and his last known regnal year can be anchored to

³⁷ Reinach, *op. cit.* above, n.2. Badian, nn.53–7.

³⁸ B. Simonetta, 'Notes on Cappadocian Coinage', *Num. Chron.* 1961, 9 ff.

³⁹ Val. Max. 5.7. ext. 2. Reinach, *Trois royaumes*, p. 60. Simonetta, pp. 19 f.

⁴⁰ Cic. *ad Att.* 5.20.6, *ad Fam.* 15.2.4–6: the assassination seems to have been fairly recent. Simonetta, *loc. cit.*, Magie, *op. cit.*, ii. 1249 n.40, was already aware of the correct numismatic sequence.

⁴¹ For the dates of Ariarathes IX, Reinach, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 f. Magie, *op. cit.* ii. 1098 n.12, Badian, p. 177 n.56 to be adjusted to Simonetta, *op. cit.*, p. 18. He is

numbered Ninth because the Ariarathid claimant after the murder of Ariarathes VII (Justin 38.2.1–2) is counted as Eighth. Recently coins have been attributed to him which suggest that he held part of Cappadocia for some two years: O. Mörkholm, *Essays in Greek Coinage presented to Stanley Robinson*, (Oxford, 1968), pp. 248 ff.

⁴² This was first revealed by G. Daux, *BCH* 57 (1933), 81 f., citing the evidence redating *OGIS* 353, available in *Inscr. Delos* (1938) 1576, 1902, which Badian, n.42, does not use.

87 B.C., so that his reign began about 100. But the death recorded by Appian, which is utilized thus, turns out to be almost certainly that of a different person;⁴³ in any case the last known regnal year of Ariarathes is no longer his thirteenth but his fifteenth, which spoils the calculation.

So the positive dating of Sulla's propraetorship and Ariobarzanes' accession in the system of Badian to 96 depends solely upon the elastic and unstable quin-quennium of Ariarathes, which may begin as early as 102 or as late as 98. Fortunately Simonetta has not confirmed the evidence put forward tentatively by Reinach for a sixth regnal year of Ariarathes IX. But his addition of a fifteenth, and his removal of the last two regnal dates of Ariobarzanes I are a warning that the numismatic evidence may not yet be complete.⁴⁴ None of the possible variants affects adversely the pattern of events proposed by Reinach, and here advocated in a modified form. But any date for Ariobarzanes earlier than 96 creates great difficulty for the thesis of Badian in the matter of the Armenian intervention, while a later date is pointless for him.

Yet this is not the end of the numismatical difficulties. The whole framework has been brought into question by the researches of Dr. O. Mørkholm into the classification of the Ariarathid coinage.⁴⁵ He has argued at great length that the letters found in the exergues do not always denote regnal years, from the fact, which appears to be agreed, that the same die was used for the obverse of drachmas of Ariarathes IV, bearing the letter-numbers 5 and 33, and likewise for different issues of Ariarathes VI bearing the letter-numbers 1 and 15, and 3 and 15, respectively. The improbability of the re-use of old dies after so many years is apparent. Mørkholm also urged on grounds of style and content that coins with the exergual numbers 29 and 30, attributed to Ariarathes IV (c. 220–163 B.C.) cannot be dated to c. 191 as regnal numbers require, but belong to issues of Ariarathes V c. 160 B.C.⁴⁶ Yet, somewhat inconsistently, he admits that continuous series of exergual numbers represent regnal years, provided there is no technical objection. Thus subversive criticism manages to leave the series 2–5 of Ariarathes IX intact, though under suspicion, as chronological evidence. Hence the crucial date of the accession of Ariobarzanes is in danger of losing its last prop, while the interpretation of his own series, which run 2 to 3, 11, 13 to 16, 18, and 21 to 32 (bar 23), as regnal years, stands only because they have not yet been examined from this standpoint. The technicalities can be evaluated only by numismatists. But the case is not perhaps desperate. Mørkholm has argued that the Cappadocian coinage was introduced in the middle of the second century under Seleucid influence. That is the period when

⁴³ Badian, p. 177 n.56. Arcathias, son of Mithridates, who leads the invasion of Thrace and dies in Macedonia (Appian, *Mithr.* 17–18, 35, 41), is identified with an Ariarathes named by Plut. *Sulla* 11 as commander, but not as a prince, in the same expedition, and both with Ariarathes IX, then barely twenty years old. Badian ignores the strong counter arguments of Magie, op. cit. ii. 1105 n.41. It may be added that Appian's man ruled not Cappadocia but Armenia and that he took part in the northern campaign of the first year (88 B.C.) into Paphlagonia and Bithynia, when the recently restored Ariarathes IX should have been defending

his kingdom against the southern thrust of Oppius through Lycaonia (Appian, *Mithr.* 17, 18, 20).

⁴⁴ Simonetta, op. cit., pp. 17 ff. For possible accession in 99–98, cf. Magie, op. cit. ii. 1098 n.12, and below.

⁴⁵ O. Mørkholm, 'Some Cappadocian Problems', *Num. Chron.* 1962, 407 ff: 'Some Cappadocian Die Links', *ibid.* 1964, 21 ff; 'The Clarification of Cappadocian Coins', *ibid.* 1969, 26 ff. The criticisms of B. Simonetta, *ibid.* 1964, 83 ff. and 1967, 7 ff. seem not to have been effective.

⁴⁶ Op. cit. 1962, p. 408.

dates first appear on the dynastic coins of the Seleucid kings.⁴⁷ These are found frequently but not invariably in the exergues, and though they are not regnal years but era dates, it is likely that the Cappadocian mint was following Seleucid example. But at present the only chronological certainties are those given by the dedication from Delos, for the survival of Ariarathes VII alive and reigning in 102–101, and by the indication of Livy, *Ep.* 74, which is here sufficiently clear, that Nicomedes IV and Ariobarzanes were restored temporarily to their thrones, by the unnamed agency of Aquilius, in 89 B.C.⁴⁸

One last warning should be offered. If the numismatic evidence is to be accepted for the limitation of the first phase of Ariarathes IX to five years, then logically the isolated *triennium* of Ariobarzanes should carry similar weight.⁴⁹ That, combined with the implication of Livy *Ep.* 74 that Ariobarzanes was ousted by Bagoas in 91 or 90, should mean that he first began to rule in 94 or 93, and that Ariarathes IX began in 99 or 98, contrary to most modern constructions. The great virtue of these is that they agree in placing the first direct intervention of Mithridates in Cappadocian affairs in the period around 101 B.C., when the Romans were too deeply involved in the Cimbric invasion of Italy to be able to intervene in oriental affairs. But that is no proof of correctness. Mithridates was to miss the best moment for intervention again at the time of the Social War, when he delayed his move until the Romans were winning in Italy. This numismatic speculation may be offset by another. The persistent gap between the third and thirteenth issues of Ariobarzanes favoured an early date for his installation. If the thirteenth issue corresponded to his restoration by Curio in 85 B.C.,⁵⁰ then his first installation would be pushed back to 97–96, and to 97 rather than 96. But the reported existence of an eleventh issue brings the date down to 95–94. So the coinage evidence remains enigmatic.

In conclusion it may be urged that while Badian was right to question the late date for Sulla's praetorship and to criticize Reinach's somewhat artificial dovetailing of the sources into one another, he could only establish his case by forcing the evidence. A more probable solution might be that the Senate did no more than recognize Ariobarzanes as king in 97 or 96, and that when, despite the withdrawal of Mithridates' puppet, he failed to maintain his position in face of the opposition of Gordius—as Badian came close to suggesting—and fled to Rome, Sulla was sent to restore him in 94 rather than 96 or 92 among the viable years.⁵¹ Tigranes, who had already supported Gordius, now sent him aid again. This failed to prevent the restoration of Ariobarzanes, who remained in possession

⁴⁷ Mørholm, *op. cit.* 1962, 409 f. Babelon, *Monnaie de la Syrie ancienne*, xxxviii, lxxxiv.

⁴⁸ Livy, *Ep.* 74, places the restoration of the two kings between the events of 90 ('L. Porcius praetor') and those of 89 ('Cn. Pompeius consul'). Since the operations of Aquilius spread over 89 and 88 (Livy, *Ep.* 77, 78, with Appian, *Mithr.* 17) *Ep.* 74 may refer to the *s.c.* instructing Aquilius at the end of 90 which had its effect in 89. Cf. Magie, *op. cit.* ii.1100 n.20, Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 115 n.4, for another solution.

⁴⁹ A recently discovered, though dis-

sipated, hoard of over 800 Cappadocian drachmas added no new regnal number to the material of Simonetta, except for the 'eleventh' of Ariobarzanes I, while confirming the limitation to 'five' for the first phrase of Ariarathes IX: Mørholm, *op. cit.* n.41 above, pp. 257 f. Simonetta, *op. cit.* n.38 above, removed the 'six' from the series of Ariobarzanes I.

⁵⁰ App. *Mithr.* 60, after the death of Fimbria and before the congress of Ephesus.

⁵¹ This implies that Ariobarzanes was not sufficiently established in Cappadocia to issue coinage until the intervention of Sulla. For 94 B.C. cf. above, n.11.

until driven out *c.* 91 either directly by officers of Mithridates, or indirectly by those of Tigranes in the interest of Mithridates. This version, while avoiding the weakness of other reconstructions, leaves open the possibility of combining the versions of Justin, Plutarch, and Appian in full, and uses the numismatic evidence only for the *quinquennium* and *triennium* of the rival claimants.

St. John's College, Oxford

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE