

Troy, between Mithridates and Rome

Luis Ballesteros-Pastor

Troy, because of its mythic past, became an essential point of reference for Greek and non-Greek conquerors, who had a desire to re-enact Homeric deeds and to establish a comparison with the heroes. Moreover, from Xerxes to Antiochos III, the sacrifice to Athena Ilias was a rite considered obligatory for those who wanted to conquer Asia from Europe or vice-versa.¹ Although the origins of this ritual could be related to the location of the city at the edge of both continents, it was thought that the goddess might give her approval to any military expedition that aimed to rule over the two parts of the world.² The two sides in the Mithridatic Wars were not oblivious to the value of repeating the efforts of the mythic heroes. Both Mithridates and his Roman enemies strove to be regarded as favoured by the goddess of Ilion.

As in the case of Alexander and Pyrrhos, Mithridates and the Romans had an ambivalent perspective regarding their own relationships to Troy.³ The king of Pontos aspired to be a new Alexander and a sincere friend of the Greeks.⁴ However, Mithridates ruled over peoples that, according to the legend, had helped the house of Priamos: Paphlagonians, Enetoi, Chalybes, Syrians and Amazons.⁵ In fact, Appianos (*Mith.* 67) mentions the Achaians that Mithridates fought in the Caucasus, referring to them as the descendants of Troy's enemies. The Romans had a similar situation: they proclaimed their Trojan origin, while at the same time, the Mithridatic War looked like a great crusade against the Asian peoples ruled by the Pontic king.⁶ The Romans admired Achilles' valour to such an extent that Virgil described Aeneas as a sort of "super-Achilleus".⁷ Furthermore, Achilles was very important because of the use of him as an example by Alexander, whom several Romans sought to imitate. Additionally, we must bear in mind that Troy's remote past involved a Greek heritage.⁸ Therefore, Aeneas' Trojan stock should have been compatible with a strongly Hellenized Rome, that wanted to be seen as a new Athens. In the same way, Mithridates, a descendant of Kyros, wanted to be considered as a defender of the Hellenic cause.⁹

Like other cities of the province of Asia, Ilion fell into Mithridates' hands during his first war with Rome.¹⁰ Afterwards, when the Romans had forced the withdrawal of the Pontic troops, the course of the war led two armies of the Republic to the city of Priamos: that of Fimbria and that of Sulla. After having murdered the consul Valerius Flaccus, Fimbria entered the province and fought with the Pontic armies.¹¹ In the course of events he reached Ilion, where the citizens had demanded Sulla's help. There are two versions of the

story concerning Fimbria's conquest of the city: Appianos and Cassius Dio on the one hand both tell how Fimbria tried to mislead the Ilians into thinking that he was a friend, alluding to the kinship of the Romans with the city. On the other hand, Strabon and Livy affirm that the city of Priamos was taken by force after eleven days of siege.¹² According to both traditions, the city was ravaged and burned after Fimbria entered it. Only the statue of Athena miraculously escaped from the fire. Shortly thereafter, Sulla took over the legions of Fimbria, who, abandoned by his soldiers, committed suicide in Pergamon. Sulla then tried to appear as a benefactor of Ilion, which was not punished with any fine as an amends for the sufferings of the city, and as recognition of the Ilians' kinship with the Roman people (App. *Mith.* 61; Oros. 6.2.11).

This episode can be viewed from different perspectives. In a general sense, the remaining accounts try to highlight Sulla's positive attitude when faced with Fimbria's *perfidia*. The Ilians would have preferred the favourite of Aphrodite rather than a seditious commander.¹³ However, the real situation might have been somewhat different: the cities of Asia had formerly denied help to the consul Valerius Flaccus, and made the decision to resist the Roman troops. Later on, those cities took a similar attitude towards Fimbria, who conquered Kyzikos and other *poleis* that were harshly treated to frighten the people of the province (Diod. Sic. 38.8.2-3; App. *Mith.* 53; Memnon, *FGrH* 434 F 1, 24.3). Ilion's attitude should be understood in light of the common behaviour of the cities of Asia at that time, when there may well have been a widespread fear of reprisals from the Roman side of the conflict (Cic. *Flac.* 61). Therefore, the decision of the Ilians was not the result of an attempt to resist a cruel general. It was just a pragmatic position, taken in an attempt to keep their city safe, and without any objection to the legality of Sulla's power.

The conquest of Ilion by Fimbria appears as a violent episode, in which the walls laden with history were demolished and the city burnt. Archaeological research has confirmed this fact although the actual destruction seems not to have been so extensive.¹⁴ What is more interesting for us is the account of the salvation of the statue of Athena Ilias. This can be understood as a fateful presage for Fimbria, because the goddess who had to recognize the conqueror of Asia turned her back on this general, predicting the fatal end of his adventure. It is clear that the main source for this episode are the memoirs of Sulla, because the dictator tried to highlight his helpful role in contrast to the cruelty of his opponent. Sulla tried to hide the glory of Fimbria, who wanted to be considered a general greater than Agamemnon, because he had done in eleven days what it took the son of Atreus ten years to accomplish.¹⁵

Sulla, having defeated Mithridates, also wanted to appear as the future master of Asia: this would have been another reason for the diffusion of the story of Athena's prodigy. Propaganda may have been spread which linked this general with the Homeric legend as a new Agamemnon. It is noteworthy that Licinianus (35 p. 26 Flem.) relates that the meeting between Sulla and Archelaos was not in Delion, but in Aulis itself, the place from which the Acha-

ian fleet departed for the rescue of Helene. Agesilaos had made a propitiatory sacrifice there before sailing to Asia, and from this same port other naval campaigns departed as well. The Romans knew of the port of Aulis: Aemilius Paulus visited it in 167 BC.¹⁶ As Sulla aimed to be a new Agamemnon, it was clear that he might wish to present Fimbria as the negative counterpart of the leader of the Achaians.

Sulla should have favoured the city protected by Aphrodite, and, at the same time, the homeland of Aeneas, ancestor of the founders of Rome. This general, who claimed to be a new Romulus, did not hesitate to declare Ilion free from any punishment since this city had given glory and honour to the humble beginnings of Rome, the same origins that the Pontic propaganda strove to diminish.¹⁷ It is significant that Sulla's meeting with Mithridates took place in Dardanos, a city that, according to the myth, would have been founded by the ancestor of Hektor and Aeneas, that is, the oldest origins of the Trojan lineage.¹⁸ Dardanos had been declared free after the Peace of Apameia because of its relationship with the Trojans.¹⁹ Sulla could also compare his attitude towards Ilion with Alexander's exploits: the proconsul, in fact, had fought against some barbarian tribes who could be related to the Thracian peoples who were subdued by the Macedonian king.²⁰

From a different point of view, Appianos' account goes against the epic meaning of the Roman presence in Ilion at the time. We are facing here a hostile historiographical bias towards Rome. It is true that Fimbria took the city by a trick, what could of course recall the deeds of the artful Odysseus. However, in Appianos' source, the original meaning could have been different, namely that Fimbria was a perfidious man. He probably promised *amicitia* to the Ilians, who were convinced by those flattering promises (cf. App. *Mith.* 53). But Fimbria did not keep his word, and he acted as is related in Mithridates' propaganda against Rome.²¹ This behaviour contradicted the Romans' belief in their honourable way of fighting as compared to the tricks and stratagems used by the Greeks.²² Appianos (*Mith.* 53) also tells that Fimbria alluded ironically to the kinship between Ilion and Rome. That phrase would indicate that, according to Appianos' source, Fimbria did not believe in such a kinship: he merely used it to gain the trust of the Ilians. Appianos also comments explicitly that Fimbria did not respect those who had taken refuge in the shrine of Athena: thus, the Roman behaviour was similar to what the followers of Mithridates had done in the Ephesian Vespers.²³

Regarding the wonderful salvation of Athena's statue, Appianos relates that this prodigy could not have taken place, since Odysseus and Diomedes had carried off the image of the goddess more than a thousand years previously.²⁴ This remark seems also to have come from an account hostile towards Rome: Athena could not have been propitious to Sulla, or to Fimbria, or to any other Roman, who lied when they spoke about prodigies favourable to their purposes. The authentic Palladion was not in Ilion, and therefore the statue that miraculously had been preserved was, in the best case, a mere copy.

There are several links between that remark of Appianos and anti-Roman propaganda. We must bear in mind that some oracles negative to the Roman dominion announced that Athena would be the future avenger of Asia and Greece because of the sufferings inflicted by the Romans. In the wars between Rome and Antiochos III the Aitolians had formerly spread this theme, and it was probably elaborated on in the propaganda of Mithridates.²⁵ As proposed by Marta Sordi, the sacrifice of Scipio Africanus to Athena Ilias may have been a sort of expiatory ritual of Rome's triumph over Asia.²⁶ Perhaps the diffusion of a prodigy by Athena favourable to Sulla was a similar means to check the anti-Roman omens spread by the Pontic king. In the Third Mithridatic War, Athena appeared to the Ilians in their sleep, saying that she had helped the people of Kyzikos against Mithridates' siege (Plut. *Luc.* 10.3). Quite possibly the building of a shrine to Minerva by Pompeius after his eastern campaign was also not coincidental.²⁷

The Aitolians would also have insisted on the tale of the Palladion and the Aitolian Diomedes, who was likewise related to the hostility towards Rome.²⁸ On one side, Diomedes was the rival of Aeneas in the *Iliad*: the two heroes fought a duel in which the Achaian king wounded both his rival and Aphrodite (Hom. *Il.* 5.297-351; Verg. *Aen.* 11.277-290). On the other side, the theft of the Palladion proves that the Trojans could not have carried the image of Athena to Italy. The Palladion would have been considered as a symbol of universal power, and therefore it was very important for Rome to appear as the owner of the authentic image of Athena Ilias, which also confirmed the Trojan origins of that city.²⁹ Furthermore, Diomedes had been connected with the opposition to Rome since the fourth century BC: this hero was the presumed ancestral founder of certain Italian peoples and Greek colonies, and this gave them a glorious past.³⁰ There was indeed a tradition that considered Diomedes the founder of the shrine of Lavinium, which was linked with the Trojan roots of Rome.³¹

Just as the Pontic propaganda could have taken advantage of the oracles that announced Athena's anger against Rome, this passage of Appianos shows us how Mithridates, or his supporters, could have insisted on the importance of the legend of Diomedes. We do not know of any explicit assimilation between this hero and Mithridates Eupator, but both of them share common aspects: the winner of the chariot race in the funeral games celebrated in honour of Patroklos could be compared to the most skilful charioteer among the ancient kings.³² Diomedes was worshipped by the Italian Enetoi, and Mithridates ruled over the Enetoi who lived on the Black Sea.³³ The Pontic king, favoured by the Athenians,³⁴ could also have appeared as protected by Athena, the avenger of Asia over the Romans' greed for power and wealth. In the same way that Herakles had conquered Troy, Mithridates, as a new Herakles, became the master of the city of Priamos.³⁵

Appianos' allusion to the theft of the Palladion by Diomedes can also be related to the significance of this hero within some circles of opposition to

Augustus. Jullus Antonius, the triumvir's son, wrote an epic poem in twelve books entitled *Diomedia*, which presumably proposed a critical view of Augustus' rule.³⁶ This poem reflected a critical trend that was relatively widespread and inspired other poems with the same title, which have not survived.³⁷ The importance of Diomedes in the anti-Roman and anti-Augustan propaganda could have provoked different accounts in favour of or against this hero: for instance, in the *Aeneid*, Diomedes recognizes Aeneas' superiority,³⁸ and Athena shows her anger for the theft of her image, which could not be seen by mortals without punishment from the goddess.³⁹ In this work, Virgil makes a comparison between the honour of Nysos and Eurialos and the *perfidia* of Diomedes and Odysseus when they went to steal Athena's statue.⁴⁰ As Coppola affirmed, Antonius' *Diomedia* may have been a counterpart to the *Aeneid*, an alternative to the official myth.⁴¹ Furthermore, one version of the legend stated that the authentic Palladion had been preserved by the Athenians.⁴² This may have been a matter of pride for a city protected by Athena, a city that was accused of being ungrateful by Roman leaders such as Sulla and Caesar, and which on the contrary, had welcomed Mithridates and Marcus Antonius.⁴³

It is difficult to determine what could have been Appianos' source for this episode. It seems beyond doubt that it came from a writer critical towards Rome. It is hard to label him as "anti-Roman", because we do not know to what extent there were authors within the Empire who could openly claim that they wished the end of Roman superiority.⁴⁴ However, we must bear in mind that Augustus tolerated some dissident groups.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, among the possible authors within these circles, it is difficult to find a concrete person: Strabon is one possibility, as he wrote on Fimbria, although without giving any opinion about the Palladion and, at the same time, highlighting Augustus' euergetic attitude towards Ilion.⁴⁶ Another option is Metrodoros of Skepsis, who is always mentioned among the pro-Pontic historians, although we have little evidence concerning him, and far less concerning his work. Metrodoros may have been read by Timagenes, but we do not have any fragments from the latter regarding to the history of Mithridates.⁴⁷ I propose a different hypothesis: the source in question could have been King Juba II of Mauretania. There are several reasons for suggesting this writer: Juba might well have been involved in the dissident circles in Rome because of his personal experience. He was the son of a Pompeian king from an ancient lineage, and he came as a hostage to Rome, where he met several men who were in opposition to Augustus' government, men such as Asinius Pollio and Timagenes.⁴⁸ He also married Kleopatra Selene, the daughter of Marcus Antonius and Kleopatra, and he was deprived of his ancestral kingdom, which was turned into a Roman province.⁴⁹ Juba wrote on the First Mithridatic War, as Plutarch notes in his account of Sulla's campaign in Greece. That fragment of Juba offers a divergent opinion regarding the main historiographical tradition, represented above all by the memoirs of Sulla.⁵⁰ Moreover, Juba was most probably one

of the sources used by Pompeius Trogus for his account on Mithridates. We can deduce this mainly from the passage recounting the Pontic king's speech, preserved literally from Trogus by Justinus. In this discourse there is a passionate praise of Massinissa and a surprising defence of Jugurtha (Just. *Epit.* 38.6.4-6), which would have made no sense considering that Mithridates was delivering a harangue to an army of Asian troops. Trogus makes an allusion to the humiliating presence of Jugurtha in Marius' triumph, perhaps because his source Juba remembered his own experience as a child when he had to march among the prisoners of Caesar.⁵¹

Trogus seems to have used Juba as a source in other passages of his work as well. Both authors were "barbarians" (an African and a Gaul) with a wide knowledge of Hellenic culture. Analogies can be found between several expressions in Mithridates' speech and other phrases in Justinus' *Epitome*, but we also see evidences for this hypothesis in the content of this work. Trogus is the only source for several episodes of the history of Carthage, for instance the tale of Malchus (Just. *Epit.* 18.7), the reference to the Carthaginians' payment of tribute to the Numidians (Just. *Epit.* 19.1.3-5), and at least two passages in the *Epitome* in which we can detect the point of view of an African who was probably not a Carthaginian.⁵² The kings of Numidia had a long tradition as historians, which may have given Juba information that was unknown to other writers. For example, the name of Malchus, mentioned by Trogus, may be the Latin transcription of the Punic term "milik": thus, the word could reveal the use of books in the Punic language, which have not been preserved.⁵³ Trogus might have taken from Juba the description of the borders of the *oikoumene*. This king could likewise have been the Trogus' well-informed source on Parthian history recently suggested by Josef Wolski.⁵⁴ Juba also wrote a work entitled *Libyka* that provided important information on Mauretania,⁵⁵ and he may have been used as a source concerning Sertorius' campaign and Antaios' tomb in Tingis.⁵⁶ The ruler could likewise have been the source of Trogus for the legend of Gargoris and Habis, the kings of Tartessos (Just. *Epit.* 41.4.1-13). This would explain why such myth concerning civilisation were located on the far western border of the inhabited world. Leaving aside the fact that both Juba and his ancestors had visited Hispania, the closeness of Mauretania to the land in which this kingdom was located could be another reason for Juba's knowledge of those mythic rulers. The tale recorded by Justinus differs from all the other accounts of Tartessos, and provides prestige to the region around the Pillars of Herakles.⁵⁷

Juba could, perhaps indirectly, be one of the sources of Appianus' Mithridatic book, as well. The Numidian prince met both Timagenes in Rome, and Alexander Polyhistor, who wrote works on Bithynia, Paphlagonia and the Euxeinos.⁵⁸ Besides, Juba went to the East with Gaius Caesar, and was at the court of Archelaos I of Kappadokia, great-grandson of the Pontic general of the same name.⁵⁹ This king had been favoured by Marcus Antonius, but despite this he was kept on the throne by Augustus. When Kleopatra Selene

died, Juba married Glaphyra, Archelaos' daughter.⁶⁰ At the court of Mazaka, Juba also met Konon the mythographer (who wrote on Diomedes), and probably learned some of the information that was transmitted through the works of Appianos and Trogus.⁶¹ Regarding the first of these historians, there are scattered references in the Mithridatic book that could have come, at least in some cases, from a well-informed source for Pontic history, possibly Juba. Those references are, among others: the foundation of the kingdom by seven Persian nobles (as Arrianos relates on the Parthian empire),⁶² the mention of Mithridates Euergetes' conquests of Kappadokian territory (App. *Mith.* 12), the names of the Pontic generals who expelled Ariobarzanes I (*Mith.* 10), the sacrifices to Zeus Stratios (*Mith.* 66, 70), and the reference to Machares as *archon* of Bosporos, a detail that reflects knowledge of the royal titlature of the Spartokids (*Mith.* 78). Furthermore, Appianos is the only source on the Ptolemaic princes caught on Kos by Mithridates (*Mith.* 23), and on the story of two Pontic princesses who were betrothed to Lagid princes (*Mith.* 111). This would have been a well-known episode for Kleopatra Selene. Appianos is also the only author who gives importance to the objects of the Lagid house, which were in the hands of Mithridates (*Mith.* 115), although this author doubts that the cloak worn by Pompeius in his triumph, taken from the royal Pontic treasury, were actually that of Alexander (*Mith.* 117). Appianos provides our sole reference for Pontic aid to Rome in the Third Punic War (*Mith.* 10). He is, together with Memnon, almost our only source on the Second Mithridatic War, a particularly shameful episode for Rome, which had as a background the dispute over territories between Pontos and Kappadokia.⁶³ Appianos records in this work several anti-Roman discourses: some of them could reflect the perspective of certain opposition circles in Augustan Rome.⁶⁴

Nor can we ignore that Appianos and Trogus are the only authors that compare Mithridates directly with Alexander, with the sole exception of a passage in Strabon where the Pontic king is mentioned together with Alexander and Marcus Antonius as a benefactor of the Artemision in Ephesos.⁶⁵ Appianos, however, seems not to hesitate when speaking of the Achaemenid descentance of the royal Pontic house and the Persian traditions in the Pontic kingdom (App. *Mith.* 9, 112, 115, 116, cf. 66, 70). These aspects are ignored by Strabon in his *Geography*, and likewise there are no references in this work to Zeus Stratios or to Persian *magoi* in Pontos.⁶⁶

If Juba received information from Archelaos or from Glaphyra, that would explain the favourable image of their forefather, the Pontic general, in Appianos' book on Mithridates. We know that king Archelaos wrote historical works.⁶⁷ It would be plausible that he wrote about his ancestor's role in the Pontic Kingdom. Archelaos and his brother Neoptolemos appear in Appianos (*Mith.* 18) as the protagonists of the first Pontic victory over Rome in 89 BC by the river Amnias.⁶⁸ Archelaos was the commander-in-chief of the Pontic invasion in Greece, whose development is recorded in detail by Appianos (*Mith.* 29-45; 49-51; 54-56). His account of the negotiations between Sulla and

Archelaos describes the later as an honourable man, who defended his king and criticized the Romans, in spite of the treacherous image that appears in Plutarch's *Life of Sulla* (App. *Mith.* 54-55; Plut. *Sull.* 22.5, 23.1-2). Perhaps Appianos summarized a speech of Archelaos to Sulla (*Mith.* 54), which was recorded in his original source. It is noteworthy that this author mentions the kings Eumenes and Masinissa at the meeting of the two generals (*Mith.* 55). This is another similarity to Trogus' speech, in which the help of those kings to Rome is exalted as well (Just. *Epit.* 38.6.3-5). In Appianos' account of the Peace of Dardanos there is an openly anti-Roman discourse on the part of Mithridates (*Mith.* 56), while in Plutarch, Sulla does not allow his enemy to speak and the king is clearly humiliated by the Roman general (Plut. *Sull.* 24.2-3).

There is further evidence to support this hypothesis. It is well known that Juba was an important source for Pliny, who took several observations on plants and animals from this ruler.⁶⁹ Therefore, it is remarkable that Appianos (*Mith.* 112) agrees with Trogus and Pliny that the length of Mithridates' life was 68 or 69 years. Justinus (*Epit.* 37.1.7) affirms that Mithridates fought against Rome for 46 years, and that the first war began after the 23rd year of his reign (*Epit.* 38.8.1). Those 23 years are identified here with the whole life of the king prior to this war (that would be an error of the epitomator).⁷⁰ The two figures again add up to 69 years. Appianos (*Mith.* 62) alludes to 24 years of peace in the Province of Asia prior to the beginning of the Mithridatic Wars, which recalls the 23 years of Justinus. Regarding Pliny (*HN* 25.2.6), some manuscripts record a reign of 56 years, which, added to the age of Mithridates of 11 or 13 years when his father died, also gives 67 or 69 years.⁷¹ Another interesting analogy between Appianos and Pliny is that they are the only sources that described the torment of Manius Aquillius, when Mithridates poured melted gold down his throat. That sort of torture is in fact a Persian tradition, which appears in certain episodes of the Achaemenid and Parthian history.⁷²

Juba had a special interest in Diomedes, and he wrote on the fellows of this mythic king, who were transformed into birds.⁷³ The Numidian recorded the hero's journey to Africa and his romance with the nymph Kalirrhoe as a parallel to the legend about Dido and Aeneas.⁷⁴ It has indeed been noted that some images of Juba represent him as Diomedes, and this may not be incidental.⁷⁵

To sum up, the legend about the theft of the Palladion by Diomedes, used by Aitolian propaganda against Rome in the second century BC, may have been repeated by Mithridates. Appianos' source on Ilion's history in the First Mithridatic War could have been king Juba II, an almost ignored author regarding the history of Pontos, but one who actually dealt with the struggle between Mithridates and Rome. The work of Juba may well have had an important influence on authors like Appianos and Trogus, who make no mention of their sources regarding Eupator's story.⁷⁶

Notes

- 1 Sordi 1982c, 140-149; Erskine 2001, 226-253, with sources and bibliography. On Alexander, see Prandi 1990.
- 2 Sordi 1982c, 143; Erskine 2001, 227.
- 3 On Pyrrhos, see Erskine 2001, 157-161. Alexander aimed to be a new Achilles, nevertheless, he could be regarded also as a descendant of the Trojans, because his mother was a princess from Epiros: Bosworth 1988, 39; Prandi 1990, 351.
- 4 On Mithridates' philhellenism, see in general McGing 1986, 89-108; Ballesteros-Pastor 1996, 402-416, 430-442; Ballesteros-Pastor 2006a.
- 5 The Pontic Kingdom included both Paphlagonia and Pontic Kappadokia, whose inhabitants were called Syrians. Strabon (12.3.19-27) presents an *excursus* to demonstrate that the peoples east of the Halys were engaged in the Trojan war. Mithridates ruled over Themiskyra, considered the homeland of the Amazons. The peoples who were living near the the river Thermodon, such as the Chalybes, were part of the Pontic army (App. *Mith.* 69). On the relationship between the Asian Enetoi and those from the Adriatic, see Strab. 4.4.1, 5.1.4, 12.3.8, 12.3.25; Malkin 1998, 234-257; Erskine 2001, 136.
- 6 This opposition between East and West appears in some passages from our sources for the Mithridatic Wars; as for example: the consideration of the Oriental troops as slaves: (Plut. *Sull.* 18.5, 21; *Luc.* 28.7); the luxury of the clothes and weapons (Plut. *Sull.* 16.2-3; *Luc.* 7.3-5); the disorder and difficulties in giving orders to the troops (Plut. *Sull.* 16.4, 18.2; *Luc.* 17) the cowardice of the Asiatic men (App. *B Civ.* 2.91; Cass. Dio 36.19), etc. Furthermore, Mithridates is often represented in the image of an Oriental ruler.
- 7 Stahl 1990, 198-209. On Achilles as model for the Romans, see also Ameling 1987, 689-690; Seng 2003, 125-128.
- 8 Erskine 2001, 138-139. On Alexander's attitude towards Ilion, see Erskine 2001, 228-231.
- 9 On Mithridates' philhellenism, see above n. 4. On his Achaemenid lineage, see Diod. Sic. 19.40.2; Flor. 1.40.1; Just. *Epit.* 38.7.1; App. *Mith.* 9, 112, 115, 116; Sall. *Hist. fr.* 2.85M; *Vir. Ill.* 76.1; Tac. *Ann.* 12.18.2.
- 10 Erskine 2001, 238. Coins with the image of Pegasus have been understood as a symbol of Pontic rule over Ilion, although the evidence is not clear (Erskine 2001, 238, n. 59).
- 11 On Fimbria's campaign, see McGing 1986, 130-131; Ballesteros-Pastor 1996, 175-176; Callataj 1997, 320-324; Mastrocinque 1999, 60-62; Erskine 2001, 237-245.
- 12 App. *Mith.* 53; Cass. Dio fr. 104.7; Liv. *Per.* 83; Strab. 13.1.27; Oros. 6.2.11; August. *De civ. D.* 3.7; Obseq. 56b; *Vir. Ill.* 70.3; cf. Luc. 964-969; Erskine 2001, 239, n. 63.
- 13 Liv. *Per.* 83: (Fimbria) *urbem Ilium, quae se potestati Syllae reservabat, expugnavit ac delevit*. On Sulla's relationship with Venus, see Keaveney 1983, 60-64; Erskine 2001, 243.
- 14 Perhaps the sources exaggerated the destruction of the city by Fimbria, although the levels of burning are well attested (Erskine 2001, 242, with further bibliography). I am grateful to Prof. Brian Rose for the information about the archaeological remains from this episode.
- 15 Strab. 13.1.27. On the Homeric meaning of the campaigns of Lucullus and Pompeius, see Champlin 2003, 298.
- 16 Liv. 45.27.9; Erskine 2001, 87-88.

- 17 Just. *Epit.* 38.6.7; Sall. *Hist.* fr. 4.69.17M; Briquel 1997, 137-138. On Sulla as a new Romulus, see Martin 1994, 283-285.
- 18 Hom. *Il.* 20.215-218; Thraemer 1901a; 1901b.
- 19 Liv. 38.39; Erskine 2001, 175 with n. 57.
- 20 On Sulla's campaign in Thrace: Liv. *Per.* 82-83; App. *Mith.* 55; *Vir. Ill.* 75.5; Eutr. 5.7.1; cf. Plut. *Sull.* 23.10. On the relationship of Thrace and the Balkans with the Roman's *imitatio Alexandri*, see Suet. *Aug.* 94.5; Plut. *Aem.* 24.4; Coppola 1999. L. Sura, legate of C. Sentius (governor of Macedonia 93-87 BC) issued coins with the image of Alexander (Bruhl 1930, 205).
- 21 On the Romans' *perfidia* in the sources on Mithridates, see Sall. *Hist.* fr. 4.69.6-9 M; Just. *Epit.* 38.5.3, 38.6.3; App. *Mith.* 12, 15, 16, 56, 64, 65, 67, 70; Memnon, *FGrH* 434 F 1, 26.1; Strab. 12.3.33.
- 22 Brizzi 1999.
- 23 On that aspect of the Ephesian Vespers, see App. *Mith.* 23, 25, 58, 62; Posidonios, *FGrH* 87 F 36 *apud* Athen. 5.123b; cf. Sall. *Hist.* fr. 1.47 M; Ballesteros-Pastor 2005, 397. A similar kind of sacrilege is also related by Appianos regarding the proscriptions of Sulla (*B Civ.* 1.95).
- 24 Ziehen 1949, 172-174; Gantz 1993, 642-646; Erskine 2001, 117 with n. 109.
- 25 Phlegon of Tralles, *FGrH* 257 F 36; Gauger 1980; with further remarks in 1995, 54-57; Ballesteros-Pastor 1996, 398-402; Mazza 1999, 66-68. On the importance of Athena Itonia for the Aitolian propaganda, see Thornton 2001, 202, n. 94 (with further bibliography).
- 26 Sordi 1982c, 148.
- 27 In that temple was shown the inscription that described Pompeius' achievements in the East: Plin. *HN* 7.26.97; Diod. Sic. 40.4.
- 28 Coppola 1990b, 132.
- 29 Ziehen 1949, 182-185; Sordi 1982b; Coppola 1990b, 132; Wiseman 2004, 20-21.
- 30 On Diomedes' foundations in Italy, see Malkin 1998, 234-257. On his significance among the Italians fighting against Rome, see Coppola 1990a; 2002, 78; Pasqualini 1998, 667-668 (with further bibliography). Some of those places claimed to be the owners of the authentic Palladion (Ziehen 1949, 185; Erskine 2001, 140-142).
- 31 App. *B Civ.* 2.20; Pasqualini 1998.
- 32 On Diomedes: Hom. *Il.* 23.351-513. On Mithridates: Suet. *Ner.* 24.2; App. *Mith.* 112; *Vir. Ill.* 76.1.
- 33 On the Enetoi, see note 5. Our sources mention also some Enetoi near the Roman province of Macedonia, who were fought by Sulla (App. *Mith.* 55). On the meaning and use of those connections between peoples with the same name, see Yarrow 2006, 180-183.
- 34 On Athens and Mithridates, see Habicht 1997, 297-314; Ballesteros-Pastor 2005 (with further bibliography).
- 35 On Herakles, see Gantz 1993, 400-402; Erskine 2001, 63-64. On Mithridates' relationship with Herakles, see Ballesteros-Pastor 1995, 128-130. It has been suggested by Andreae (1994-1995) that this king ought to be identified with an image of Telephos, the son of Herakles and founder of Pergamon. There were also Pontic coin types with Athena's image (Imhoof-Blumer 1912, 176-177) although we cannot specify the meaning of this symbol.
- 36 Coppola 1990b. Our only reference is a phrase of Pseudo Akron in his commentary to Hor. *Od.* 4.2.33: *Heroico metro Diomedias duodecim libros scripsit egregios, praeterea et prosa aliquanta.*

- 37 Coppola 1990b, 134.
- 38 Coppola 1990b, 131, 133.
- 39 Verg. *Aen.* 2.164-175, 185-186, cf. 9.151. Nevertheless, Virgil presents the old Diomedes as a peaceful and wise hero, see Barbara 2006. Indeed, Augustus may have been represented in the image of Diomedes, see Landwehr 1992, 123-124.
- 40 Perotti 2000.
- 41 Coppola 1990b, 134.
- 42 Ziehen 1949, 176-179.
- 43 Habicht 1997, 360-365; Coppola 1997. On those accusations, see App. *Mith.* 38; *B Civ.* 2.88.
- 44 See the remarks of Edson 1961, 200-201; Goukowsky 2001, CIX-CX; Yarrow 2006, 283-341.
- 45 Yavetz 1990, 35; Toher 1990, 142.
- 46 Strab. 13.1.27. On Strabon's relationship with the circles of opposition in Augustan Rome, see Dueck 2000, 112-115. The influence of Strabon as a source for Appianus has been defended by Mastrocinque 1999, in particular 104-109, cf. the review by Ballesteros-Pastor (2007, 420).
- 47 On Metrodoros, see McGing 1986, 160; Portanova 1988, 334-336; Ballesteros-Pastor 1996, 393; Briquel 1997, 121-127, 150-152; Goukowsky 2001, CV-CVI; Yarrow 2006, 31-32. On Timagenes, see Sordi 1982d.
- 48 On all the influences that Juba may have received at Rome, see Roller 2003, 65-72.
- 49 See above all Roller 2003, in particular 84-90, 100.
- 50 *FGrH* 275 F 27 *apud* Plut. *Sull.* 16.4; Roller 2003, 168-169. This fragment discredited Aulus Gabinius (*cos.* 58), the legate sent by Rome to end the Second Mithridatic War, and the same Roman who defeated Archelaos, the grandfather of the king of Kappadokia who ruled in Egypt for six months (Strab. 12.3.34).
- 51 On Jugurtha: Just. *Epit.* 38.6.6. On Juba's presence in the triumph of Caesar: Plut. *Caes.* 55.2; Roller 2003, 59 on Mithridates' speech, see Ballesteros-Pastor 2006b.
- 52 Just. *Epit.* 19.1.4: *Sed Afrorum sicuti causa iustior, ita et fortuna superior fuit*, and 29.1.7: *apud Karthaginenses quoque aetate immatura dux Hannibal constituitur (...), fatale non tam Romanis quam ipsi Africae malum*. On the possible use of native sources by Trogus for his account on Malchus, see Ehrenberg 1928, 849; Gras, Rouillard & Teixidor 1989, 230-231. Nevertheless, Trogus mixed different traditions: see the negative image of Africa in Just. *Epit.* 32.4.11 (Syme 1988, 370, n. 60).
- 53 On this meaning of the name Malchus, see Krings 1998, 37 with n. 8, although this scholar refutes such an identification. On Hiempsal and his Punic books, see Matthews 1972; Roller 2003, 27, 68, 159. On Juba's knowledge of the Punic language, see Roller 2003, 166, n. 26.
- 54 Wolski 2003. On Juba's special interest in the borders of the *oikoumene*, see Roller 2003, 183-243. On the problem of Juba as source for Strabon, see Roller 2003, 164, n. 14.
- 55 On this work, see Roller 2003, 183-211.
- 56 See Rebuffat 1999. Plutarch (*Sert.* 9.6) does not explicitly mention Juba as his source, although this king must have been well informed about Sertorius in Mauretania (Roller 2003, 185), and wished to appear as a descendant of Herakles when the hero passed by this country. Perhaps Pliny's account concerning Antaios' foundation of Tingis (*HN* 5.2.3) may also have been taken from Juba.

- 57 The use of Juba as a source would confirm the hypothesis regarding the autochthonous character of the tale (Bermejo Barrera 1994, 80-81). Juba probably went to Spain with Augustus (Roller 2003, 72-73) and was honoured in Gades and Carthago Nova (Roller 2003, 156).
- 58 Roller 2003, 66-67. Appianus probably used Juba for his African book, see Goukowsky 2002, XLV.
- 59 Roller 2003, 212-226.
- 60 On the circumstances of this marriage, see Roller 2003, 247-249. On Archelaos, see also Sullivan 1989, 182-185.
- 61 Roller 2003, 26, n. 86. On Konon's account about Diomedes, see *FGrH* 26 F 1, 24. Archelaos was also a scholar, but only a few fragments of his works have been preserved (Roller 2003, 220-221).
- 62 *App. Mith.* 9; *Arr. Parth.* 2; Frye 1964, 42-43.
- 63 *App. Mith.* 64-66; Memnon, *FGrH* 434 F 1, 26.
- 64 *App. Mith.* 12, 15-16, 54, 56, 70, 98. Some of these passages only suggest the abbreviation of original discourses in Appianus' source. For an analysis of some of these speeches, see McGing 1992, 516-517.
- 65 *App. Mith.* 20, 89; *Just. Epit.* 38.7.1; *Strab.* 14.1.23.
- 66 That presence has been inferred by Mastrocinque (2005, 178-179).
- 67 Roller 2003, 163, 219-220.
- 68 We must note that in the battle the *phalanx* was commanded by Diophantos, who may have been an important general. Our further accounts of the Mithridatic Wars are focused on Archelaos and Neoptolemos, meanwhile Diophantos is occasionally mentioned in the battles against Fimbria (Memnon, *FGrH* 434 F 1, 34.4), probably because he remained in Asia as a commander of the Mithridatic army. The allusions to a Diophantos in the Third Mithridatic War cannot be easily assigned to the same person: Portanova 1988, 239-240.
- 69 For a discussion of those fragments of Juba taken by Pliny, see Roller 2003, 261-263.
- 70 *Just. Epit.* 38.8.1: *Sic excitatis militibus post annos tres et XX sumpti regni in Romana bella descendit*; Yardley 2003, 111.
- 71 The 11 years are recorded by Strabon (10.4.10); the 13 appear in Memnon (*FGrH* 434 F 1, 22.2).
- 72 *App. Mith.* 21; *Plin. HN* 33.14.48; Boyce 1975, 35. On other similar episodes recorded in classical sources, see *Flor.* 1.46.11; *Cass. Dio* 40.27.3; *Plut. Artax.* 14.5. For other interpretations of Appianus' account, see Amiotti 1979, 76. Appianus (*Mith.* 64) also describes the shackles of gold that Mithridates put on his eldest son, which may be considered another Persian punishment: *Hdt.* 3.130; *Just. Epit.* 11.15.1; *Curt.* 5.12.20; *Amm. Marc.* 27.12.3; *Oros.* 6.19; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 12.47.3.
- 73 *FGrH* 275 F 60 *apud* *Plin. HN* 10.61.126-127; Roller 2003, 209-210.
- 74 Coppola 1990b; Roller 2003, 209.
- 75 Landwehr 1992.
- 76 Justinus' *Epitome* does not allude to any specific author, and the only source mentioned by Appianus (*Mith.* 8) in his Mithridatic book is Hieronymos of Kardia, who has no relation to the history of Mithridates.

Bibliography

- Ameling, W. 1987. Alexander und Achilleus. Ein Bestandsaufnahme, in: W. Will & J. Heinrichs (eds.), *Zu Alexander den Großen*, vol. 2. Amsterdam, 657-692.
- Amiotti, G. 1979. La tradizione sulla morte di Manio Aquilio, *Aevum* 53, 72-77.
- Andreae, B. 1994-1995. Eracle, Telefo e il re Mitridate VI del Ponto. Un esempio di propaganda politica contro i Romani in Asia Minore in età tardo Ellenistica, *RendPontAc* 67, 111-122.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 1995. Heracles y Dioniso, dos modelos en la propaganda de Mitrídates Eupátor, in: *Arqueólogos, historiadores y filólogos. Homenaje a Fernando Gascó* (Kolaios, 4, vol. 1). Sevilla, 127-133.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 1996. *Mitrídates Eupátor, rey del Ponto*. Granada.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 2005. Atenión, tirano de Atenas, *StHist* 23, 385-400.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 2006a. Los cultos de Mitrídates Eupátor en Delos: una propuesta de interpretación, *Habis* 37, 209-216.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 2006b. El discurso de Mitrídates en el *Epítome de las Historias Filípicas de Pompeyo Trogo* (Iust. XXXVIII 4-7): un estudio sobre las fuentes, *MedAnt* 9.2.
- Ballesteros-Pastor, L. 2007. Rev. of A. Mastrocinque, *Studi sulle guerre Mitridatiche*, *Ancient West and East* 6, 419-421.
- Barbara, S. 2006. Le Diomède de l'Énéide ou le bon roi selon Virgile, *REA* 108, 517-558.
- Bermejo Barrera, J.C. 1994 *Mitología y mitos de la Hispania preromana*, P. Madrid.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1988. *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- Boyce, M. 1975. *A History of Zoroastrianism, I: The Early Period*. Leiden.
- Briquel, D. 1997. *Le regard des autres. Les origines de Rome vues par ses ennemis*. Paris.
- Brizzi, G. 1999. Guerre des Grecs, guerre des Romains. Les différentes âmes du guerrier ancien, *CahGlottz* 10, 33-47.
- Bruhl, A. 1930. Le souvenir d'Alexandre le Grand et les Romains, *MEFRA* 47, 201-221.
- Callataÿ, F. de 1997. *L'histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Champlin, E. 2003. Agamemnon at Rome. Roman dynasts and Greek heroes, in: D. Braund & C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Exeter, 295-319.
- Coppola, A. 1990a. Benevento e Argirippa. Pirro e la leggenda di Diomede, *Athenaeum* 78, 527-531.
- Coppola, A. 1990b. Diomede in età augustea. Appunti su Iullo Antonio, in: L. Braccisi (ed.), *Hesperia* 1. *Studi sulla grecità di Occidente*. Roma, 125-138.

- Coppola, A. 1997. Consenso e dissenso ad Atene nell'età di Augusto, *RendLinc*, ser. 9, 8 661-673.
- Coppola, A. 1999. Fra Alessandro e gli Eneadi, da Tiberio a Traiano, *Athenaeum* 87, 447-456.
- Coppola, A. 2002. *Il re, il barbaro, il tiranno*. Padova.
- Dueck, D. 2000. *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome*. London.
- Edson, C. 1961. Review of "O. Seel, Pompei Trogi Fragmenta", *ClPhil* 56.3, 198-203.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1928. s.v. Malchos 1, *RE* 14, 849-851.
- Erskine, A. 2001. *Troy, between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.
- Frye, R.N. 1964. The charisma of kingship in ancient Iran, *IranAnt* 4, 36-54.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.
- Gauger, J.-D. 1980. Phlegon von Tralleis, Mirab.III. Zu einem Dokument geistigen Widerstandes gegen Rom, *Chiron* 10, 225-261.
- Gauger, J.-D. 1995. Orakel und Brief. Zu zwei hellenistischen Formen geistigen Auseinandersetzung mit Rom, in: C. Schubert & K. Brodersen (eds.), *Rom und der griechische Osten*, Stuttgart, 51-67.
- Goukowsky, P. 2001. *Appien. Histoire Romaine. Tome VII, livre XII. La guerre de Mithridate*. Paris.
- Goukowsky, P. 2002. *Appien. Histoire Romaine. Tome IV, livre VIII. Le livre africain*. Paris.
- Gras, M., P. Rouillard & J. Teixidor 1989. *L'universe phénicien*. Paris.
- Habicht, C. 1997. *Athens, from Alexander to Antony*. Princeton.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F. 1912. Die Kupferprägung des mithradatischen Reiches und andere Münzen des Pontus und Paphlagoniens, *NumZ* 45, 169-192.
- Keaveney, A. 1983. Sulla and the Gods, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 3. Bruxelles, 44-79.
- Krings, V. 1998. *Carthage et les Grecs c. 580-480 av. J.C. Textes et histoire*. Leiden.
- Landwehr, C. 1992. Juba II. als Diomedes?, *Jdl* 107, 103-124.
- Malkin, I. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley.
- Martin, P.M. 1994. *L'idée de royauté à Rome*, vol. II. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Mastrocinque, A. 1999. *Studi sulle guerre Mitridatiche*. Stuttgart.
- Mastrocinque, A. 2005. I magi nell'educazione del principe, in: V. Alonso Troncoso (ed.), *Diadochos tes basileias. La figura del sucesor en la realeza helenística*. Madrid, 177-184.
- Matthews, V.J. 1972. The libri Punicii of King Hiempsal, *AJPh* 93, 330-335.
- Mazza, M. 1999. *Il vero e l'immaginato. Profezia, narrativa e storiografia nel mondo romano*. Roma.
- McGing, B.C. 1986. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontos*. Leiden.

- McGing, B.C. 1992. Appian's "Mithridateios", *ANRW* II.34.1, 496-552.
- Pasqualini, A. 1998. Diomede nel Lazio e le tradizioni leggendarie sulla fondazione di Lanuvio, *MEFRA* 110, 663-679.
- Perotti, P.A. 2000. Eurialo e Niso: "Fides" e "Perfidia", *Minerva* 14, 71-85.
- Portanova, J.J. 1988. *The Associates of Mithridates VI of Pontus*. Ph.D. Diss. Columbia University, New York.
- Prandi, L. 1990. Gli oracoli sulla spedizione asiatica di Alessandro, *Chiron* 20, 345-369.
- Raaflaub, K.A. & M. Toher (eds.) 1990. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford.
- Rebuffat, R. 1999. Auguste et les dinosaures, in: *Imago Antiquitatis. Religions et iconographie du monde romain. Mélanges offerts à R. Turcan*. Paris, 371-381.
- Roller, D.W. 2003. *The World of Juba II and Kleopatra Selene. Royal Scholarship on Rome's African Frontier*. London.
- Seng, H. 2003. Die Troja-Motive bei Lucan, *Gymnasium* 110, 121-145.
- Sordi, M. (ed.) 1982a. *Politica e religione nel primo scontro tra Roma e l'Oriente* (CISA, 8). Milano.
- Sordi, M. 1982b. Lavinio, Roma e il Palladio, in: Sordi (ed.) 1982a, 65-78.
- Sordi, M. 1982c. Il confine del Tauro e dell'Halys e il sacrificio in Ilio, in: Sordi (ed.) 1982a, 136-149.
- Sordi, M. 1982d. Timagene di Alessandria, uno storico ellenocentrico e filo-barbaro, *ANRW* II.30.1, 775-796.
- Stahl, H.P. 1990. The death of Turnus: Augustan Virgil and the political rival, in: Raaflaub & Toher (eds.) 1990, 174-211.
- Sullivan, R.D. 1989. *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30 B.C.* Toronto.
- Syme, R. 1988. The date of Justin and the discovery of Troilus, *Historia* 37, 358-371.
- Thornton, J. 2001. *Lo storico, il grammatico, il bandito. Momenti della resistenza greca all'imperium Romanum*. Catania.
- Thraemer, E. 1901a. s.v. Dardanidai, *RE* 4.2, 2158-2163.
- Thraemer, E. 1901b. s.v. Dardanos 3, *RE* 4.2, 2164-2179.
- Toher, M. 1990. Augustus and Roman historiography, in: Raaflaub & Toher (eds.) 1990, 139-154.
- Wiseman, T.P. 2004. *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter.
- Wolski, J. 2003. Schöpften Strabon und Justinus aus der gleichen Quelle bei der Darstellung der frühen Geschichte Parthiens, *Latomus* 62, 373-380.
- Yardley, J.C. 2003. *Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's "Epitome" of Trogus*. Toronto.
- Yarrow, L.M. 2006. *Historiography at the End of the Republic. Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*. Oxford.
- Yavetz, Z. 1990. The personality of Augustus, in: Raaflaub & Toher (eds.) 1990, 21-41.
- Ziehen, L. 1949, s.v. Palladion, *RE* 18.3, 171-189.

