

J. LINDERSKI

THE SURNAME OF M. ANTONIUS CRETICUS AND THE COGNOMINA *EX VICTIS*
GENTIBUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 80 (1990) 157–164

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE SURNAME OF M. ANTONIUS CRETICUS
AND THE COGNOMINA *EX VICTIS GENTIBUS*

M. Antonius Creticus, the son of a famous father and the father of a famous son,¹ had a bad press in antiquity — and still worse in modern times. In 74 as praetor he was appointed by the senate to an extraordinary command to combat the pirates in the whole of the Mediterranean; initially he operated in the West, but in 72 he invaded Crete, suffered a defeat, and died shortly afterwards.²

In 'Der Kleine Pauly' H.G. Gundel introduces him as "M. Antonius mit dem Spottnamen Creticus",³ and in this he follows a long and persistent tradition of abuse. For so Antonius also appears in Klebs' article in the RE: "mit dem Spottnamen Creticus", and further: "Wegen seiner Misserfolge wurde er zum Spott Creticus genannt".⁴ The same wording reappears in an article by A. Wilhelm: Antonius gained "den Spottnamen Creticus" through his "schimpfliche Misserfolge".⁵ H.A. Ormerod concurs: "His principal achievement ... was the invasion of Crete in the year 72 for which in mockery he was given the title of *Creticus*".⁶ So also Maurenbrecher: "Ludibrii causa antea (i.e. before his death) Cretici cognomen acceperat".⁷ P. Foucart speaks of "le surnom derisoire de Creticus",⁸ and E. Courtney of the "ironical conferment" of the name Creticus on Antonius.⁹ The phraseology goes back to

¹ His son was the Triumvir, and his father M. Antonius, the orator.

² For sources, see T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* 2, New York 1952, 101-102, 108, n.2, 111, 117, 123 (add Flor. 1.42). Cf. also below, n. 38. F.T. Hinrichs, *Hermes* 98, 1970, 501, argued (on the basis of the inscription from Epidauros, IG IV ².1.66, line 25 [cf. SEG 11.397]: Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου τοῦ ἐπὶ Κρητῶν στραταγοῦ that the command of Antonius was limited solely to Crete. This flies in the face of all other evidence, cf. E. Maroti, "On the Problem of M. Antonius Creticus' Imperium Infinitum", *Acta Antiqua Acad. Scient. Hungaricae* 19, 1971, 259-71. The title given to Antonius in the Epidauros inscription is perplexing, but we have to remember that this is a local honorific inscription and not a translation of a Roman document; the text is replete with errors and in many places barely legible, cf. W. Peek, *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*, *Abhandl. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.* 60,2 Leipzig 1969, 16-17, nr. 21. On the photograph reproduced by Peek the reading ἐπὶ παντῶν accepted by earlier scholars, seems indeed to be excluded; ἐπὶ Κρητῶν, printed confidently by Peek, is likely but by no means definitely assured.

³ H.G. Gundel, *KP* 1, 1970, 410 s.v. "Antonius 8".

⁴ E. Klebs, *RE* 1, 1894, 2594 s.v. "Antonius 29". In fact Gundel's phrase is taken verbatim from the opening statement of Klebs.

⁵ A. Wilhelm, "Zu einer Inschrift aus Epidauros", *MDAI Ath.* Abt. 26, 1901, 419.

⁶ H.A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World*, Liverpool 1924, 225.

⁷ B. Maurenbrecher, *C. Sallustii Historiarum Reliquiae* 1, Prolegomena, Lipsiae 1891, 72.

⁸ P. Foucart, "Les campagnes de M. Antonius Creticus contre les pirates en 74-71", *Journal des Savants* N.S. 4, 1906, 569-581 at 581. As his source Foucart quotes Livy, *Per.* 97, who, however, does not mention the cognomen of Antonius at all ("M. Antonius praetor bellum adversus Cretenses parum prospere susceptum morte sua finivit").

⁹ E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 391.

the old Drumann: "Man nannte ihn aus Spott Creticus",¹⁰ and beyond him to the antiquarian tradition summarized in the Onomasticon of Orelli and Baiter: "Propter ignominiosam in Cretam expeditionem per irrisionem nominatus est Creticus".¹¹

As their source Orelli-Baiter, Drumann, Klebs and Courtney cite Plutarch, Ant. 1, a surprising witness for Plutarch writes: "his father (i.e. of the Triumvir) was Antonius surnamed Creticus (ὁ Κρητικὸς ἐπικληθεὶς Ἀντώνιος), a man of no great renown in public life nor illustrious (οὐχ οὕτω μὲν εὐδόκιμος ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἀνὴρ οὐδὲ λαμπρός), but kindly and honest". No *Spott* here. Appian (Sic. 6.1-2) reports that Antonius καὶ οὐ πρᾶξαι καλῶς, χρηματίσαι δ' ὅμως διὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν Κρητικὸς — "although he did not perform well, he gained the name of Creticus for his work", and further: Metellus "was called Creticus with more justice than Antonius, for he actually subjugated the island". Antonius' honorific surname was unmerited, but Appian does not intimate in any way that it was given to him in mockery. Other sources do not mention the surname at all.¹²

Yet although there is no evidence for mockery there is ample room for doubt. For how could a man who had achieved nothing be given an honorific agnomen *ex virtute*? Accordingly E. Badian prints his surname in quotation marks.¹³

Now a classic statement on the origin of the honorific cognomina we owe to Livy. On the cognomen Africanus of the elder Scipio he has this to say (30.45.7): "Africani cognomen militaris prius favor an popularis aura celebraverit an, sicuti Felicis Sullae Magnique Pompei patrum memoria, coeptum ab adsentatione familiari sit, parum compertum habeo; primus certe hic imperator nomine victae ab se gentis est nobilitatus".¹⁴ This is normally interpreted to mean that the cognomen of Africanus was not bestowed on Scipio by an official act, a decree of the senate or the vote of the people. This would indeed be a welcome piece of information for the notice in the Fasti Consulares Capitolini is ambiguous. Under the year 205 we read "cos. P. Cornelius P.f. P.n. Scipio qui postea African(us) appell(atus) est." By whom we are not told. Similar notices we find under the years 190 (referring to L. Cornelius Scipio, "qui postea Asiaticus appellatus est"), 138 (D. Iunius Brutus, "[qui postea] Cal[li]aicus appel[latus est]"), and 79 (P. Servilius Vatia, "qui postea Isauricus appellatus est").

¹⁰ W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms* 1, (second edition by P. Groebe), Leipzig 1899, 46.

¹¹ I.C. Orellius et I.G. Baiterus, *Onomasticon Tullianum*, pars 2, Turici 1838, 47-48.

¹² Cic. 2 Verr. 2.8; 3.212-18; Sch. Bob. 96 St.; Ps.-Asc. 202, 259 St.; Flor. 1.42.7; Liv. per. 97; Diod. 40.1; Vell. 2.31.3-4; Lact. Inst. Div. 1.11.32.

¹³ E. Badian, *OCD*², 1970, 76 s.v. "Antonius 'Creticus' ". D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches*, Norman 1988, 16, also has "Creticus", but he prints Creticus in his *Cicero*, Philippics, Chapel Hill 1986, 117, n.13.

¹⁴ The last statement is not correct: in the Fasti as the first commander so nobilitated appears M. Valerius Maximus, cos. 263, see below in the text and nn. 19 and 20.

Under 88 we have a notice concerning L. Cornelius Sulla, "qui postea [Felix appellatus est]".¹⁵ Since this cognomen was closely connected with the idea of the *felicitas imperatoria*, it expressed (only in a more generalized and more potent form) the same concept as the cognomina acquired *ex victis gentibus*. According to Velleius (2.27.2) and the Auctor de vir. ill. (75.9) Sulla assumed his honorific surname (immediately) after the fall of Praeneste and the death of the younger Marius in 82. And in Appian (BC 1.97.451) we read that in order to honor Sulla the senate voted (in 82) to erect a gilded equestrian statue with the inscription Κορνηλίου Σύλλα ἡγεμόνος Εὐτυχοῦς = *Cornelio Sullae Imperatori* (or *Dictatori Felici*).¹⁶ In this way, Appian comments, the epithet which the flatterers had given to Sulla on account of the unbroken chain of his victories now became permanent and official.

On this basis Doer argues that after Sulla all honorific epithets were formally given by the senate,¹⁷ whereas Fetzner and Kneissl believe that Sulla's case was an exception and that in republican times the senate never formally bestowed the *cognomina ex virtute*. Kneissl writes: "Jene Beinamen wurden den militärischen Führern vielmehr durch private Initiative zuteil, allerdings scheint der Triumph die Voraussetzung für die Verleihung eines Siegerbeinamens gewesen zu sein. Es begegnet kein Träger eines Siegernamens, dem nicht auch ein Triumph zugestanden worden wäre".¹⁸

The formulation of Kneissl contains some truth, but misses the point. The *Fasti Consulares* assiduously distinguish between the men who acquired an honorific cognomen during their tenure of an office or subsequently (*postea*). Under 263 we read: "M. Valerius M.f. M.n. Maximus qui in hoc honore Messall(a) appell(atus) e(st)".¹⁹ Valerius gained this cognomen because of his capture of Messana (Seneca, *de brev. vitae* 13.6; Eutrop. 2.19). He celebrated his triumph still in the same year (263), and in the *Fasti Triumphales* he appears duly adorned with his new cognomen.²⁰ On the other hand the four men who are listed in the *Fasti* as having received their "victorious" cognomina subsequent to their consulship (*postea*) also celebrated their triumphs as proconsuls subsequent to their consulship: P. Cornelius Scipio (Africanus) in 201, L. Cornelius Scipio (Asiaticus) in 189, D. Iunius Brutus (Callaicus) in 136 or 135 (at the latest in 133), and P. Servilius Vatia

¹⁵ For references, see A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII, 1: Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*, Roma 1947, 46-47, 48-49, 54-55 and (commentary) 120, 122, 129, 130.

¹⁶ Cf. E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus*, Firenze 1958, 263-264 ad loc.; M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974, 397 (both with further literature).

¹⁷ B. Doer, *Die römische Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1937, 46-52, 68-71.

¹⁸ P. Kneissl, *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser*, Göttingen 1969, 21. He accepts the conclusions reached by K. Fetzner in his unpublished dissertation *Historische Beinamen im Zeitalter der römischen Republik*, Diss. Tübingen 1952.

¹⁹ Degrassi (above, n. 15) 40-41, 115.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 74-75, 547-48.

(Isauricus) in 74.²¹ The text of the *Fasti Triumphales* is lost for Africanus, Callaicus and Isauricus, but it is preserved for L. Scipio: he is duly styled Asiaticus.

The picture is clear. In the *Fasti* the phrase *postea appellatus est* attached to a cognomen *ex victoria* points to the year of the triumph, and to the decree of the senate granting this honor.

This was well perceived (though not expressly articulated) by T.R.S. Broughton. Of D. Iunius Brutus he writes (MRR 1.487): "He returned to celebrate a triumph ... over the Callaeci and Lusitani ... and assume the cognomen Callaicus". And of P. Scipio (1.321): "He took the title Africanus and celebrated his triumph". (He gives no comment on the surname of L. Scipio [1.362]). Consequently, until the year of the triumph, the honorific surnames of P. and L. Scipio, and of D. Iunius Brutus are given in parentheses — another example of the astounding *akribeia* of the MRR. Unfortunately, this principle was not carried out uniformly: Isauricus of P. Servilius loses its parenthesis already in 75 when Servilius was saluted as imperator (2.99), and not (as it should) in 74 when he celebrated his triumph (2.105). None of the sources adduced in MRR shows that Servilius was formally called Isauricus already in 74. In particular CIL I² 741: "P. Servilius C. [f.] / Isauricus / imperator cepi[t]" argues against this assumption. This inscription, found in Rome and now lost, was engraved on the basis of one of the statues which Isauricus brought to Rome as his *praeda bellica*, and which he will have paraded in his triumphal procession. In other words, at this moment Servilius already had a decree of the senate addressing him as Isauricus.²² Unexpected proof, clear and decisive, was furnished a few years ago by an inscription unearthed in Asia Minor:²³ it was set up by P. Servilius immediately after the capture of Isaura Vetus. He styles himself "Serveilius C.f. imperator". He is already acclaimed imperator, but does not yet carry the surname Isauricus.

Still it would be false to assume that the senate was granting the honorific cognomina on its own initiative. As a first prerequisite for a "victorious" surname we should posit not the triumph itself (as Kneissl does) but rather the *acclamatio imperatoria* or more generally, to use the words of Livy, the *militaris favor, aura popularis* or *adsentatio familiaris*. Thus the *fons et origo* of the honorific surnames was the private *appellatio* of the (victorious) general (which naturally enough may have been engineered by the general himself). But there was a sequel. A general acclaimed *imperator* by his soldiers remained the holder of this title whether or not the senate approved his request for a triumph. Similarly a general *appellatus*

²¹ Ibid. 201: 80-81, 554; 558; 564.

²² Cf. A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae* 1, Firenze 1957, 216 in his comment on this inscription (no. 371): "C. Servilius Vatia ... de Isauris a. 74, ut videtur, triumphavit et Isauricus appellatus est". So also Dessau, ILS 36.

²³ It was published by A. Hall, "New Light on the Capture of Isaura Vetus by P. Servilius Vatia", *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*, München 1973, 568-71 at 570.

Creticus remained Creticus regardless of whether he received a triumph or not. But as *imperator* did not equal *triumphator*, so also the surname *ex virtute* was hollow without a triumph. It was a great honor if the senate acknowledged the honorific surname by including it in the decree granting the triumph; only then would the general appear on the official roster of the *triumphatores* in the full splendor of his name *ex victa ab se gente*.

This leads us back to M. Antonius Creticus. He was a prime example of those who in vain emulation of Scipio Africanus "nequaquam victoria pares insignes imaginum titulos claraque cognomina familiarum fecerunt" (Livy 30.45.7). His surname was hollow and fraudulent. But how did he get it? Perhaps through *adsentatio familiaris*. As Antonius died without returning to Rome one might well imagine that he was styled Creticus in a funeral *laudatio*, and that his honorific cognomen was displayed below his *imago* in the atrium of the Antonii. Yet Appian's comparison of Antonius and Metellus seems to presuppose something more solid than a fleeting *laudatio*. Maurenbrecher may have been on the right track: if indeed Antonius got his surname before his death, he was so *appellatus* by his soldiers. This in turn presupposes an achievement that could pass for victory. Such an achievement is hard to come by. In fact modern scholars are unanimous in condemnation: Antonius suffered a disastrous defeat. How disastrous? Enough to cause his death: "bald darauf starb er von Scham und Kummer aufgerieben". So Drumann.²⁴ Foucart makes the fate of Antonius still worse: not only defeated but also taken prisoner by the Cretans.²⁵ The main source is Florus 1.42.3, but there is not the slightest intimation in Florus or in any other author that Antonius himself was captured. Still his defeat was painful enough. Antonius was so confident of victory that, as Florus writes, he "carried on board of his ships more fetters than arms", "pluris catenas in navibus quam arma portaret". Hostile slander perhaps, but the fact remains that "plerasque naves intercepit hostis, captivaque corpora religantes velis ac funibus suspendere, ac sic velificantes triumphantium in modum Cretes portibus suis adremigaverunt" ("the enemy captured many ships, and hung the bodies of their prisoners from the sails and tackle, and sailing with such sails the Cretans, as if celebrating a triumph, rowed back to their harbors").²⁶ As a result, "Antonius was compelled to conclude a humiliating peace before his death".²⁷

²⁴ Op. cit. (above, n. 10), 46.

²⁵ Op. cit. (above, n.8), 581: "Le préteur lui-même fut pris et conduit en Crète; il mourut bientôt d'après, non sans avoir signé une paix honteuse avec ses vainqueurs". So also J. Van Ooteghem, *Les Caecilii Metelli de la République*, Bruxelles 1967, 232.

²⁶ A fragment of Sallust probably (on account of *malo*) refers to this event: "In quis notissimus quisque aut malo dependens verberatur aut immutilato corpore improbe patibulo eminens affigebatur" (Hist. 3.9, with Maurenbrecher's note ad loc.). E.S. Forster's translation of Florus in *Loeb Classical Library* (1929): "and then spreading their sails the Cretans returned ... to their harbours" disregards the poignant force of *sic* and ignores the precise meaning of *adremigare*.

²⁷ Ormerod, (above, n.6), 227.

Of ancient authors only Diodoros mentions the peace, but he does not attach to it any derogatory epithet (40.1-2). He says that Antonius concluded an agreement with the Cretans (συνθέμενος πρὸς Κρήτας εἰρήνην), and that for a while they observed the peace (μέχρι μὲν τινος τάυτην ἐτήρουν).²⁸ This can only mean that the Cretans refrained from dealing (at least openly) with the pirates and Mithradates. In fact, the avowed reason for Antonius' invasion was the support the pirates and Mithradates were receiving from Crete: to his envoys the Cretans gave an arrogant answer, whereupon he attacked the island (App. Sic. 6.1.). As his goal was the pursuit of the pirates and not the conquest of the still independent Crete, Antonius could indeed maintain that he had achieved his objectives.

Under what circumstances was this agreement reached? Cicero (2 Verr. 3.312), writing a few years after Antonius' demise, is both critical and vague: "Antonium, cum multa contra sociorum salutem, multa contra utilitatem provinciarum et faceret et cogitaret, in mediis eius iniuriis et cupiditatibus mors oppressit". In any case no intimation here of a catastrophic military disaster.²⁹ Similarly the Scholiast of Bobbio (96 Stangl): "Cooperat ... M. Antonius piratas persequi, sed rebus nondum confectis morte praeventus est". So also Ps.-Asc. (259 St.): "M. Antonius ... Siciliam et provincias omnes depopulatus est et ad postremum inferens Cretensibus bellum morbo interiit". In another passage the Scholiast is firmer in condemnation but still relatively mild (202 St.): M. Antonius "indicto Cretensibus bello male re gesta ibidem periit". That Antonius died *ibidem*, in Crete,³⁰ is of interest and importance. As in this passage the Scholiast preserved much that derives from Sallust's Histories,³¹ also the indication *ibidem* may be a genuine piece of information. If so, despite the initial naval debacle, Antonius will have ultimately effected his landing on the island.³² But the Cretans

²⁸ A. Passerini, "La preparazione della guerra contro Creta nel 70 a.C.", *Athenaeum* 14, 1936, 45-53, tried to discredit the notice in Diodorus and maintained (p.49) that "Antonio non ha concesso ai Cretesi nessun trattato". Proof? "Ciò si accorda col fatto che egli morì di malattia in Creta stessa: altrimenti si sarebbe allontanato dal teatro della sua sconfitta al più presto, specialmente essendo un uomo, come dice Sallustio [3.3 M.], *vacuus a curis nisi instantibus*". No comment.

²⁹ It is certainly worth noting that of all possible abuses to be hurled at Antonius' father Cicero entertains in the Philippics only these two: still as a *praetextatus*, Antonius became bankrupt *culpa patris* (2.44); the first wife of his father was a daughter of the "traitor" Q. Numitorius of Fregellae (3.17). These examples are calculated to show that in squandering money and in matrimonial impropriety the son followed in the footsteps of his father. Again no mention of Creticus' military misfortunes, but this is hardly conclusive: at least as a general the son was very much unlike the father.

³⁰ Klebs, RE 1 (1894) 2594, adduces also Liv. Per. 97, but this passage contains no information as to the exact place of Antonius' death (see above, n.8). But as Professor W. Eck kindly points out to me, this interpretation may be too forced. *Ibidem* could simply mean "in den Gewässern vor Creta".

³¹ On the basis of the fragment preserved nominatim by the Juvenal Scholia 8.105 (ed. Wessner), Maurenbrecher (2 [1893], p. 108, and frgs. 3.2,3) recognized in Ps.-Asc. (202 St.) the following Sallustian words and phrases or their echoes, here given in italics: "<M.> Antonius *curator tuendae totius orae maritimae, qua Romanum erat imperium* non solum ipse *nequam* verum etiam comitibus pessimis, rem inauditam invasit et indicto Cretensibus bello male re gesta ibidem periit".

³² So also Maurenbrecher 2, p. 109: "Tamen Antonius ad insulam naves adpulit". Maurenbrecher refers to the campaign of Antonius in Crete also the fragments of Sallust concerning the geography and mythology

were not to be conquered: for this the forces of Antonius were quite insufficient. Both sides had good reasons for coming to terms: Antonius wished to save face and the Cretans prudently did not wish to engage in a protracted war with the Romans. Shortly afterwards Antonius died, and the Romans withdrew from the island.

Some time after the death of Antonius the Cretans sent an embassy³³ to Rome "to offer a defense against the accusations levelled against them" (Diod. 40.1) — no doubt an oblique reference to their dealings with the pirates and perhaps to the execution and torture of the Roman captives so vividly described by Sallust and Florus. They must have argued that they had been unjustly accused and unjustly invaded by Antonius; they fought in self-defense, and exercised great restraint in their actions. In particular the envoys expected some consideration for "saving the quaestor and his soldiers" (Cass. Dio. frg. 111). Apparently a detachment of Antonius' army led by a quaestor was either captured or trapped by the Cretans. By agreeing to a treaty Antonius saved his men.

This reminds us of another, more famous defeat and of another general who received his cognomen after the place of his *clades*. A. Alföldi in his study of the cognomina has this to say: "La débâcle catastrophique de 321 av. J.-C. a valu le surnom, de *Caudinus* à un Postumius, général vaincu; un Antonius a reçu le surnom de *Creticus* pour ces manœuvres malheureuses entre 73 et 71".³⁴ But the story of the surname Caudinus is not that simple. The *Fasti Consulares* for the year 321 are lost but under 332 we read: "[cens(ores) Q. Poblilius Q.f. Q.n. Philo, Sp. Postumius - f. - n. Albinus] qui postea [C]audinus appell(atus) [est]". The structure of this notice is identical to that of the notices recording the honorific cognomina. With his keen eye, Degrassi saw this well. His argument is as follows: "mirum est cognomen ex clade impositum in fastos receptum esse atque loco honoris habitum, tamquam Sp. Postumio non ignominiae causa inditum esset, sed ea magnanimitate qua patribus suasisset ut cum collega Samnitibus dederetur, ut populus religione exsolveretur". And Degrassi goes on to quote Livy 9.10.3: "Postumius in ore erat, eum laudibus ad caelum ferebant, devotioni P. Decii consulis, aliis claris facinoribus aequabant". Degrassi concludes: "Scilicet posteriores Postumii cladem a gentili suo acceptam decori vertere studebant".³⁵ Who can doubt that this is the right explanation? Its elegance springs to one's eyes.

of the island (3.10-15), but for this there is no compelling reason: why not connect them with the victorious campaign of Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus?

³³ At the latest in 69. On this embassy, and the sources recounting it (App. Sic. 6; Diod. 40.1-3; Cass. Dio frg. 111), see A. Passerini (above, n. 28) 45-53. His analysis is often disappointing.

³⁴ A. Alföldi, "Les Cognomina des magistrats de la République romaine," *Mélanges offerts à André Piganiol*, Paris 1966, 717.

³⁵ Degrassi (above, n. 15) 34-35, 107. The explanation of Degrassi was accepted by Broughton, *MRR* 1.152, n.1. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 186-87, has unfortunately disregarded Degrassi.

With the origin of the cognomen *Caudinus* thus illuminated, the surname *Creticus* of Antonius would remain the sole example of a cognomen *e clade acceptum*. The conclusion? The cognomen of Antonius was meant to be honorific — not derogatory. After all Antonius could well claim that he detached the Cretans from their previous association with the pirates and Mithradates, and that he saved his quaestor. Whether his surname was given to him by his soldiers or was propagated after his death by his *familiares* we cannot tell. One thing is, however, certain: it was an *appellatio privata*, never acknowledged by the senate.³⁶ Maurenbrecher is quite wrong when, forgetting what he wrote in his Prolegomena, he so opines in his commentary: "Sed Antonius turpiter cum Cretensibus foedere facto tamen postea Cretici cognomen a senatu accepit".³⁷ But the senate could have given this surname to Antonius only in the context of his request for a triumph; and we do not know whether he had made such a request, and indeed whether he was at all acclaimed imperator. And in any case Antonius' death made the whole question moot. Furthermore if the senate had in any way acknowledged the cognomen *Creticus*, it would have also had to acknowledge the arrangements Antonius made with the Cretans. It is true that the Cretan envoys almost got (through bribery) a decree proclaiming them friends and allies of Rome, yet ultimately the senate decided to assume an unforgiving posture and ordered the Cretans to deliver all their ships, send hostages, pay a large indemnity, and surrender Lasthenes and Panares, their leaders in the war against Antonius (Diod. 40.1-3; Cassius Dio frg. 111). The Cretans refused to comply. Q. Caecilius Metellus, the consul of 69, was now entrusted with the war; he brutally conquered the island, was acclaimed imperator (in 67), and after a long delay celebrated a triumph (in 62). Unlike Antonius he merited his cognomen of *Creticus*³⁸ "confecto bello ... ex virtute" (Sch. Bob. 96 St.).

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N.C.

J. Linderski

³⁶ Broughton prints his surname *Creticus* in a parenthesis under 74 when Antonius was praetor (MRR 2.101), but without any parenthesis under 73, 72, 71 (2.111, 117, 123). But since in 73 Antonius had probably not yet invaded Crete (cf. J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants Italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris 1919, 80-82) he could not in this year have carried the surname *Creticus* even unofficially; and as no triumph was accorded to him, his surname ought to have been printed in parentheses also under 72 and 71.

³⁷ Op. cit. (above, n.7), vol. 2, 109. Cf. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* 1, 1950, 293: "An attempt was made to gloze over his disgraceful failure by conferring on him posthumously the surname of *Creticus*".

³⁸ For sources, see Broughton, MRR 1.131, 139, 145, 154, 159, 163, 168-69, 176. The *Fasti Consulares* are not extant for 69, and from the *Fasti Triumphales* for 62 only a few letters remain. Broughton prints the surname *Creticus* in parentheses under 69 and 68 but without a parenthesis from 67 onwards; he dates to this year Metellus' *salutatio* as imperator (Degrassi, ILLRP 374, vol. 1, p. 217, favors 68). But in the inscriptions recording Metellus' *acclamatio imperatoria* (CIL 1².746 = ILS 867 = ILLRP 374; Inscr.Cret. 2.252, no. 14; IG 3.565) he still appears (like Servilius Isauricus before him) without his honorific cognomen. In view of the inscriptional evidence F. Münzer, "Caecilius 87", RE 3, 1899, 1211, points out that Metellus used his Siegerbeiname only after his triumph; this is also the view of Ooteghem (above, n. 25) 236, and Appian (Sic. 6.2) connects indeed the triumph and the grant of the cognomen: καὶ ἐθριάμβευσε, καὶ Κρητικὸς ἐκλήθη. But it would be more exact to say that Metellus officially received his victorious cognomen not after the triumph itself but rather after the senatorial decree granting him this honor.