

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLVI

HELSINKI 2012

INDEX

LUIGI ARATA	<i>Erbe leporine nella medicina greca antica</i>	9
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>New Prosopographical Data Derived from Roman Lead Pipe Inscriptions</i>	19
ROBERT CONNAL	<i>Rational Mutiny in the Year of Four Emperors</i>	33
ULRIKE EHMIG & RUDOLF HAENSCH	<i>Harmonia mundi – Eine indigene Gottheit, griechische Mythologie und römische Übernahme</i>	53
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>wa-no (KN Ch 5724)</i>	59
TUA KORHONEN	<i>On Human-Animal Sexual Relationships in Aelian's Natura Animalium</i>	65
MIIKA KUHA	<i>Note intorno alla tradizione manoscritta di Chronica Venetiarum di Benintendi de' Ravagnani</i>	79
CHRISTIAN LAES	<i>Latin Inscriptions and the Life Course. Regio III (Bruttium and Lucania) as a Test Case</i>	95
MIKA RISSANEN	<i>The Hirpi Sorani and the Wolf Cults of Central Italy</i>	115
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>The Nomina of the Samnites. A Checklist</i>	137
FEDERICO SANTANGELO	<i>Sullanus and Sullani</i>	187
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCLXXII-CCLXXXV</i>	193
MARGARITA SOTIRIOU	<i>Bacchylides Behind His Metamorphoses: The Poetic Identity of a Lyric Narrator in the late 5th century BC</i>	239
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	253
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	345
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	351
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	361

SULLANUS AND SULLANI

FEDERICO SANTANGELO

In modern scholarship – especially in English – it is not infrequent to find references to individual supporters of Sulla as "a *Sullanus*", and to the cohort of Sulla's supporters as "*Sullani*".¹ It is worth asking whether this is borne out by the ancient attestations of these words.

Sullanus is mainly attested as an adjective or as a substantivised adjective, as one would expect. Priscian acknowledged and discussed an aspect of its meaning: *in "nus" quoque terminantium formae et significationes diuersae inueniuntur, quibus Latini frequenter utuntur in significatione possessiua, ut "Pompeianus", "Caesarianus", "Sullanus"*. This is just a part of the picture. The application of the adjective is vast: it may be associated to *coloniae, agri, adsignationes, partes,*

* I am grateful to Alexander Thein and an anonymous referee for their comments on early drafts of this note.

¹ See, e.g., E. Badian, "Waiting for Sulla", *JRS* 52 (1962) 47–61, at 54 (= *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford 1964, 206–34, at 220); Id., *Lucius Sulla. The Deadly Reformer*, Sydney 1970, 30; W. C. McDermott, "Curio pater and Cicero", *AJP* 93 (1972) 381–411, at 382, 389; P. B. Harvey, "Socer Valgus, Valgii and C. Quinctius Valgus", in E. N. Borza – R. W. Carruba (eds.), *Classics and the Classical Tradition. Essays Presented to Robert E. Dengler on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, University Park 1973, 79–94, at p. 90; M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974, 388; A. Keaveney, "Who were the Sullani?", *Klio* 66 (1984) 114–50; R. Seager, *Pompey. A Political Biography*, Oxford 2002², 29 ("for what the label is worth"); A. Keaveney, *Sulla. The Last Republican*, London 2005², 172; M. Tröster, *Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus: The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat*, Stuttgart 2008, 84 (with an important qualification). W. K. Lacey, *Boni atque improbi*, *G&R* 17 (1970) 3–16, at 7 argues that the supporters of Sulla called themselves *nobiles*; the claim rests mainly on Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 135–138, where Cicero speaks of a *causa nobilitatis*, and the Sullan connection is far from clear. J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire politique des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, Paris 1963, 437 n. 2 argues that in the *Pro Roscio Amerino* the word *nobilitas* actually refers to "le "parti" des Mételli", in opposition to Chrysogonus and his minions.

tempus, dominatio, arma, regnum, exemplum, dies, crudelitas, uiolentia – and the list could continue.² Such a wide-ranging use is matched, although not on the same scale, by other comparable adjectives: *Marianus, Cinnanus, Sertorianus*.³

The attestations of *Sullanus* as a noun are few; most of them are in Cicero, and usually in politically charged and historically instructive contexts. In the second *Verrine* Cicero takes on the whole record of the defendant, and reads out the account that Verres gave in 81 BC, three years after the end of his quaestorship, which he had held under Cn. Carbo.⁴ He points out that the account is unacceptably vague and intrinsically fraudulent; Verres' claim that he had left 600,000 sesterces at Ariminum was made in the full knowledge that the city was sacked during the Civil War, just around the time when the account was submitted. Cicero notes that the reason which led Verres to become a *Sullanus* was his wish to be allowed to present such a wildly inaccurate account – not the desire to support the cause of the *nobilitas*. That is identified as a motive of many of those who joined Sulla; Cicero is referring to the early stages of the Civil War, when Sulla arrived on Italian soil and received the loyalty of a number of members of the political elite; Cicero later points out that Sulla never wanted to have much to do with Verres.⁵

The more conspicuous cluster of uses of *Sullanus* as a noun is in the third speech on Rullus' agrarian law, delivered to the people in early 63 BC. Here Cice-

² *Coloniae*: Sall. *Cat.* 28,4, Plin. *nat.* 14,62; *agri*: Cic. *agr.* 2,68 and 3,3; *adsignationes*: Cic. *agr.* 3,3; *praedia*: Cic. *agr.* 3,10; *partes*: Nep. *Att.* 2,2; *tempus*: Cic. *Verr.* 2,1,43, *Mur.* 49, *dom.* 43, 79, *har.* 18, *fam.* 13,4,1; 13,5,2; Plin. *Nat.* 9,123; *dominatio*: Cic. *agr.* 1,21, 2,70; *arma*: Cic. *Vat.* 23; *regnum*: Cic. *Att.* 8,11,2; 9,7,3; *dies*: *Att.* 10,8,7; *crudelitas*: Val. Max. 6,8,2, Sen. *ira* 2,34,3; *uiolentia*: Val. Max. 9,15,5. Cf. also τὸν Σύλλειον τρόπον in Dio 46,33,2 and Xiphil. p. 43,21 Dindorf-Stephanus (in a discussion of the triumviral proscriptions).

³ *Marianus*: *tribunus plebis* (*agr.* 3,7), *partes* (Vell. 2,24 and 29; Eutr. 5,8,1; 5,9,1), *monumenta* (Val. Max. 2,5,6; 4,4,8), *gloria* (Val. Max. 9,12,4), *colonia* (Mela 2,122). *Cinnanus*: *tempus* (Cic. *dom.* 83, *har.* 18, *red. sen.* 9), *dies* (Cic. *Sest.* 77), *partes* (Vell. 2,24), *proscriptio* (Val. Max. 5,3,3). *Sertorianus*: *milites* (Cic. *agr.* 2,5,72, 146; Val. Max. 5,5,3), *tempora* (Cic. *agr.* 2,83), *bellum* (Cic. *Phil.* 11,18; Vell. 2,30,5; Flor. 2,134), *duces* (Cic. *Manil.* 20), *arma* (Sen. *ep.* 94,64), *exemplum* (Plin. *nat.* 3,9,11). *Pompeianus* and *Caesarianus* have a much larger number of attestations, especially thanks to Caesar's *De bello ciuili*, and pertain to a different generation: they will be excluded from the present discussion.

⁴ Cic. *Verr.* 2,1,36–37.

⁵ Cf. the digression on Sulla in *Verr.* 3,81–82, which is intended to imply that Verres is even worse than Sulla; see C. Steel, "The Rhetoric of the *De frumento*", in J. R. W. Prag (ed.), *Sicilia nutrix plebis Romanae. Rhetoric, Law, and Taxation in Cicero's Verrines*, London 2007, 37–48, at 40–2.

ro scrutinises another text, that of the bill itself, and comments on the reference to two consuls who were committed enemies of Sulla (C. Marius and Cn. Papirius, *coss.* 82 BC). In Cicero's view, this was just a cheap ploy on Rullus' part to avoid referring to the year of Sulla's dictatorship and to conceal the fact that the bill actually confirmed the rights of the Sullan *possessores*. Cicero's rhetorical strategy in this speech is remarkably complex, and A. Drummond has shown that identifying who the Sullan *possessores* may be in this context is no straightforward undertaking.⁶ Again, the word *Sullanus* is used with a sarcastic touch: a Marian tribune like Rullus is trying to cast "us Sullans" (*nos Sullanos*) into disrepute. In an earlier speech Rullus had accused his opponents of being defenders of Sulla's policies (*rationes Sullae*); Cicero – who is, significantly, addressing a *contio* – retorts the accusation against Rullus himself. His proposal to ratify the Sullan land assignments is sufficient to place him among the *Sullani*; he should frankly admit to being one. The rest of his agrarian bill, with all the new envisaged land assignments, seems to bring back to life Sulla himself and his arbitrary use of power.

There is another important factor that links Rullus to the legacy of Sulla: his father-in-law is the infamous Quinctius Valgus, one of the great profiteers of the Sullan period, who would have greatly benefited had Rullus' bill been passed. Unlike Rullus, though, Valgus does not conceal his Sullan connection: *neque se Sullanum esse dissimulat*. The beneficiaries of the Sullan land assignments are referred to in similar ways. In a letter he wrote to Atticus on 15 March 60, Cicero summarises his work of lobbying on an agrarian bill presented by C. Flavius, in which – among other things – he confirmed *Sullanorum hominum possessiones*. In this case, the reference must be to the veterans of Sulla who had received some land assignments.⁷ The reference to Valgus as *Sullanus* must be interpreted in the same sense.

The neatest reference to the Sullani as a *group* in a late Republican source is in a fragment of Sallust's *Historiae* (1,42 Maurenbrecher = 1,34 McGushin): *ut Sullani fugam in noctem componerent* ("so that the *Sullani* were planning their escape for the night-time"). This fragment has been read as a reference to a phase of the Colline Gate battle in which Sulla's army was in a difficult position, and its commanders considered the possibility of an escape.⁸ In this case *Sullani* does

⁶ A. Drummond, "Rullus and the Sullan *possessores*", *Klio* 82 (2000) 126–53: see esp. 139–41 for an overview of the categories of landholders that may fall under this definition.

⁷ Cf. Drummond, "Rullus", *cit.*, 130 for a different reading: "Sullan partisans, who, by definition, were men of some consequence, in Italy as well as in Rome".

⁸ P. McGushin, *Sallust. The Histories. Volume I. Books I–II*, Oxford 1992, 103.

not refer to a political group, but to an army that is fighting under Sulla's leadership, much in the same way in which we find frequent references to *Caesariani* and *Pompeiani* in Caesar's *De bello ciuili*. The same meaning may be found in Pliny the Elder, again in connection to the Civil War, and notably in a reference to Pompey (7,96): *igitur Sicilia recuperata, unde primum Sullanus in rei publicae causa exoriens auspicatus est*. Far from pointing to a long-term political allegiance to Sulla, Pliny is merely drawing attention to the fact that at the time of his Sicilian campaign Pompey was fighting under Sulla's standards.⁹

The only occurrence of *Sullani* as a *political* group – of a kind – is an enigmatic source of uncertain dating and unclear purpose, the *De uiris illustribus*.¹⁰ In the biography of Cicero the *Pro Roscio Amerino* earns pride of place as the moment in which the young orator showed his qualities: the *Sullani* were on the receiving end of his attacks (*adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquentiam et libertatem suam aduersus Sullanos ostendit*). With the same independence of spirit (*qua quondam Sullanos libertate perstrinxerat*) he later attacked Pompey and Caesar, whom he suspected of coveting *dominatio* (a term with clear Sullan associations), paying the hefty price of exile. Chrysogonus and his minions, however, may be easily assimilated to the veterans who had been the beneficiaries of Sulla's generosity – the *homines Sullani*; it is not so much question of their political loyalty, much as it is of their personal connection with, and debt to, the Dictator. The targets of the *Pro Roscio* are not the senatorial followers of Sulla, or indeed the Dictator himself (at least not directly); the polemic is carefully directed at some individuals who are made vulnerable by their relatively low status.

Perhaps surprisingly, it is in a Greek source that we find the clearest illustration that there may be question of "Sullans" as a political group. According to Appian, after Sulla's death there is a dispute between Catulus and Lepidus on the funeral: Catulus and οἱ Σύλλειοι won the argument.¹¹ This can only be understood as a group of people who had been on Sulla's side and were loyal to his memory. The same word is used two chapters later, with reference to Lepidus' oath

⁹ Cf. the reference to veteran colonisation in Siculus Flaccus, *De condicionibus agrorum* 132.19 Campbell ([*scil. lapides*] *quos Gracchani aut Syllani posuerunt*).

¹⁰ Cf. the suggestion of L. Braccesi (*Introduzione al "De uiris illustribus"*, Bologna 1973), who argued that the *DVI* is work of the Elder Pliny, not intended for publication.

¹¹ App. *BC* 1,105. On the year 78 and the wide-ranging implications of the clash between Lepidus and Catulus see V. Arena, "The Consulship of 78 BC. Catulus versus Lepidus: an *optimates* versus *populares* Affair", in H. Beck – A. Duplá – M. Jehne – F. Pina Polo (eds.), *Consuls and res publica. Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2011, 298–318, esp. 300–6.

not to wage war on the Σύλλειοι – and, by extension, on the *res publica* itself.¹² Interestingly, Appian refers to Sulla's supporters with the collective Σύλλειοι only when the legacy of Sulla begins to be put into question. It is tempting to see the direct influence of a Latin text; behind Appian's Σύλλειοι there is conceivably the *Sullani* of a source to which the historian from Alexandria had access.¹³

Surely, then, it is not entirely illegitimate to speak of *Sullanus* and *Sullani* in discussions of political history. The scarcity of the evidence and the fluidity in the use of those terms should however invite to caution. The individuals who receive the label of *Sullanus* fought under Sulla in the Civil War, and there appears to be mention of *Sullani* only in the immediate aftermath of Sulla's death. This fact in itself may provide an interesting insight on the quality of Sulla's legacy in internal politics and on the nature of the political ties that he built around himself and his cause.

Newcastle University

¹² App. *BC* 1,107. Σύλλεια is used in the sense of "faction of Sulla" in *BC* 1,85. Cf. also the civic games called Σύλλεια that were established at Athens shortly after the First Mithridatic War (*JG* II² 1039, with *SEG* XXII 110; *SEG* XIII 279). Cf. Flor. 1.84 (*denique in se ipse [scil. populus Romanus] conuersus Marianis atque Sullanis*) and 2.132 (*cum tam ferox in Sullanos Marius fuisset*).

¹³ É. Famerie, *Le latin et le grec d'Appien. Contribution à l'étude du lexique d'un historien grec de Rome*, Geneva 1998, has nothing on this specific point; cf. however *ibid.* 24–7 for some sobering remarks on Appian's sources.