

THE EARLY RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CICERO AND POMPEY UNTIL 80 B.C.

ALLEN M. WARD

THE TENDENCY HAS often been to ignore or discount the possibility of any personal contact between Cicero and Pompey in their early years.¹ Richard Johannemann vigorously maintained that Cicero first came into personal contact with Pompey only in 71.² A re-examination of the evidence will show, however, that Cicero and Pompey probably did have contact with each other well before 71 and possibly from a very early date.

Johannemann argued that if there had been any early association between the two, Cicero would not have failed to mention it, just as he did not fail to mention early friendship between himself and Caesar in the *De Provinciis Consularibus* of 56 (40) and in a letter of 54 to P. Lentulus (*Fam.* 1.9.12).³ This argument is not as decisive as Johannemann may have thought. First, much of the evidence for the period of Cicero's life before 67, the earliest year from which letters survive, is lost. Second, in 56 and 54 Cicero dredged up some early ties (however tenuous) with Caesar only because he was hard pressed to explain his sudden reversal from hostility to friendliness towards Caesar. During the period for which the most evidence survives, friendship between Cicero and Pompey, though strained from time to time, was already well established (*Att.* 1.1.2; *Fam.* 5.7.3). In fact, although he did not use the specific word *amicitia*, in the very letter cited by Johannemann, Cicero did argue that his continued support of Pompey was based on ties that stretched

¹Cf. e.g., G. Boissier, *Cicéron et ses amis* (ed. 3, Paris 1905); M. Gelzer, *RE* 7A.1 (1939) 827.31–842.44, s.v. "Tullius" (29); K. Büchner, *Cicero* (Heidelberg 1964) 17–110. Some have allowed that they at least met in 89: e.g., T. Petersson, *Cicero, A Biography* (Berkeley 1920) 61; E. Sihler, *Cicero of Arpinum* (ed. 2, New York 1933) 20; E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)* (Oxford 1958; hereafter cited as *Clientelae*) 283. The only one who has seriously considered the question of early contact between Cicero and Pompey is W. S. Anderson in "Pompey, His Friends, and the Literature of the First Century B.C.," *Univ. Calif. Pub. in Class. Philol.* 19.1 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1963) 48–52; but concerning the period before 71 he has given evidence for 89 only. For a complete discussion of 89, see below.

²R. Johannemann, *Cicero und Pompeius und ihre wechselseitigen Beziehungen bis zum Jahre 51 vor Christi Geburt* (diss. Münster 1935; hereafter cited as Johannemann) 2. Gelzer (*op. cit.* 843.46–49) seems to concur since his first mention of any personal contact between Cicero and Pompey is this reference to Johannemann's thesis: "Gewiss mit Recht vermutet Rich. Johannemann dass damals C. in persönliche Berührung mit Pompeius kam."

³Johannemann, 13, note 6.

at least as far back (*ab adulescentia*) as those claimed in the case of Caesar above (*Fam.* 1.9.11).

By investigating the similarity of their backgrounds and their circles of friends, it can be shown that Cicero and Pompey most likely had contact with each other during the 80's and could have met in the 90's as young boys. They were both born in 106 B.C., Cicero on January 3 (Gell. *N.A.* 15.28.3) and Pompey on September 29 (Vell. Pat. 2.53.4; Pliny *H.N.* 37.13). They were both from municipal families, Cicero's from Arpinum and Pompey's from Picenum.⁴ Members of Cicero's family were prosperous, educated equestrians of some political importance in their municipal government (Cic. *Mur.* 17; *Planc.* 59; *Leg.* 2.3; 3.36), and Pompey's family had only recently passed from a similar equestrian status into the nobility through Q. Pompeius, the first of the family to obtain the consulship. He had reached that office in 141, only a generation before Pompey's father was consul, a very short time in the eyes of Roman nobles, some of whom traced back their noble ancestors for hundreds of years.⁵ Therefore, Pompey's family was socially and politically more akin to the *Equites* than to the old noble families of the Senate.⁶ As if to stress the similar positions of their families, Cicero pointed out the *novitas* of the first Pompeian consul several times (*Font.* 23; *Mur.* 16; *Brut.* 96) and said that he had been *humili atque obscuro loco natus* (*Verr.* 2.5.181).

Nevertheless, neither family was a stranger to Rome and the leading senatorial families. Cicero's family had connections with the famous orators M. Antonius and L. Crassus (Cic. *De Or.* 2.2).⁷ At an early age, Cicero came to Rome with his brother and some cousins to receive his schooling.⁸ Similarly, since Pompey's father was elected to the consulship at Rome in the elections of 90 B.C., there seems to be little doubt that his family had been living at Rome for a number of years prior to 90 and that Pompey was receiving his education there at the same time as Cicero.

The families of the two boys even lived in the same neighbourhood at Rome, as might be expected of families with their similarities of class and background. The combination of two passages, one from Plutarch

⁴Cf. F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920) 48.

⁵Cf. Vell. Pat. 2. 25.5 and W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms* (ed. 2 by P. Groebe; hereafter cited as Drumann-Groebe), 4 (Berlin and Leipzig 1908) 314. For corroboration of the view that the three main branches of the Pompeii were related, see E. Badian, "Notes on some Roman Senators of the Republic," *Historia* 12 (1963) 138-139.

⁶Cf. the analysis of Pompey's important friends among the *Equites* by Anderson, *op. cit.* (above, n. 1) 52-54.

⁷Cf. Gelzer, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 1) 827.58-828.6.

⁸*Ibid.* 828.10-12. Probably Cicero was about seven years of age, for seven was the most commonly accepted age at which boys began to go to school (Quint. *Inst.* 1. 1.15).

(*Cic.* 8.3) and one from Cicero (*Q. Fr.* 2.3.7), shows that when Cicero was a boy, his family lived in a house on the Carinae.⁹ In addition, Suetonius provides the information that Pompey's family had long lived in that same neighbourhood at Rome (*Gram.* 15).¹⁰ It is highly possible, therefore, that these two young men of the same age and of similar background, whose families had lived in the same neighbourhood and who were being trained for careers in Roman politics, met each other at an early date in the 90's.

The most important argument for early personal contact between Cicero and Pompey involves the question of their service together at the age of seventeen in the *consilium* of Pompey's father, Cn. Pompeius Strabo. Strabo was a consul for 89 and led an army in the Social War. As was customary, he had with him a *consilium*, a staff of advisors and young men who were being trained as future officers.¹¹ According to M. I. Henderson, these young men starting their careers on a general's staff "were chosen *amicitiae causa* (*Caes. BGall.* 1.39) and this *officium* to relatives and friends is fair evidence for personal obligations."¹² Therefore, if Cicero and Pompey did serve together on Strabo's staff in 89, it is possible that they had already met through some connection between their two families, and it would be impossible to deny some personal contact between the two young men at that time.

That Pompey was a member of his father's *consilium* in 89 is certain from an inscription which commemorates Strabo's grant of citizenship to some Spanish auxiliaries and gives a fragmentary list of the people on his staff.¹³ The problem is to prove that Cicero was also a member. Cichorius has argued very persuasively that he was, but Johannemann, without making any attempt to refute Cichorius' arguments, refuses to accept his conclusions.¹⁴ Since most other scholars either wrote before Cichorius published his *Römische Studien* (1922) or have not made full use of him,¹⁵ it will be useful to restate Cichorius' case. Cichorius emphasizes this sentence from Cicero's twelfth Philippic:

⁹"The western end of the southern spur of the Esquiline hill, . . ." S. B. Platner: *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London 1929) 100, s.v. "Carinae."

¹⁰Cf. also *Cic. Har. Resp.* 49; *Suet. Tib.* 15.1; *Vell. Pat.* 2.77.1; and *Dio* 48.38.2.

¹¹For the nature of a general's *consilium*, see T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 1 (ed. 3, Leipzig 1887) 316–317/302–303, and E. Badian, "Caepio and Norbanus," *Historia* 6 (1957) 337–340.

¹²M. I. Henderson, review of H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics 220–150 B.C.*, *JRS* 42 (1952) 115.

¹³*CIL* 12.709 = H. Dessau, *ILS.* 8888; cf. C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (Leipzig and Berlin 1922; hereafter cited as Cichorius) 164; *Plut. Pomp.* 4.

¹⁴Cichorius 181–184; Johannemann 3, esp. note 9.

¹⁵Only J. van Ooteghem in *Pompée le Grand, Bâtitteur d'Empire* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, *Mémoires* 49 [Bruxelles, 1954]) 39–40 appears fully to have utilized the arguments of Cichorius.

Cn. Pompeius, Sexti filius, consul me praesente, cum essem tiro in eius exercitu, cum P. Vettio Scatone, duce Marsorum, inter bina castra collocutus est (Phil. 12.27).

To Cichorius, the phrase *me praesente* implies that Cicero must have been a member of Strabo's *consilium*. He argues that no common soldier would have been present with the leaders of two opposing armies, yet, contrary to expectation, he does not find Cicero's name on the inscription that lists the members of Strabo's *consilium*.¹⁶ Also missing is the name of Cicero's *contubernalis* at the time of his military service, L. Aelius Tubero (Cic. *Lig.* 21). The lack of these two names cannot be explained merely by saying that they must have been included in the missing part of the inscription, for only the part that contains the names of the older and higher ranking men is missing, whereas the part that contains the names of people belonging to Cicero's age and rank is complete.¹⁷

Cichorius solves the difficulty, however, by showing that at the time this inscription was made, Cicero was no longer a member of Strabo's *consilium* but had joined the staff of Sulla.¹⁸ Plutarch (*Cic.* 3.1) clearly says that Cicero had served for a time with Sulla during the Marsian War.¹⁹ Furthermore, in the *De Divinatione*, Cicero may be saying that he and his brother Quintus had been with Sulla's staff at the siege of Nola. Cicero, speaking to Quintus, mentions a sacrifice which Sulla had performed in the presence of Quintus: *te inspectante*, he says (1.72). Later, in speaking further about the same sacrifice, he says, *nam de angue illo qui Sullae apparuit immolanti, utrumque memini . . .* (2.65). Cichorius takes *memini* to imply that Cicero was present with Quintus at the sacrifice.²⁰ Hence, he concludes that during the first half of 89 Cicero

Anderson (*op. cit.*, [above, n. 1] 48) ignores Cichorius and appears to follow the older, less decisive account of Drumann and Groebe (5. 240).

¹⁶Cichorius 181. See *CIL* 13.2.709 = H. Dessau, *ILS* 8888.

¹⁷Cichorius 182.

¹⁸*Ibid.* 182–183.

¹⁹Drumann and Groebe (5.240, note 9) object that Plutarch's testimony is false. They say that Sulla was only a legate under Cato and did not command an army. However, Cato was killed early in 89 in a battle with the Marsi (Oros. 5. 18.24; Livy *Per.* 75; and App. *BCiv.* 1.6.50). Broughton (*MRR* 2.38, note 7) suggests that after the death of the consul Cato, Sulla had received command of the army just as Marius and Caepio had taken command of armies whose commanders had perished in the previous year (cf. E. Ciaceri, *Cicerone e i suoi Tempi* 1 [Milan-Rome-Naples 1926] 11). It is impossible to deny that Sulla had taken over the command of the army: Cicero says that Sulla made the sacrifice before the decisive battle at Nola and refers to him as *imperator* (*Div.* 2.65). Accordingly, since Sulla did command an army in 89, Plutarch may well be right in placing Cicero on Sulla's *consilium*.

²⁰It must be admitted that *te inspectante* and *memini* alone may furnish too little support for all the weight that Cichorius has placed upon them. His final conclusion, however, still stands because of Plutarch's statement about Cicero's service with Sulla. Moreover, since there is no doubt from Cicero's words that Quintus was on Sulla's *consilium*, it is not difficult to conceive that arrangements were made for Cicero to join his brother some time after Sulla took over the dead Cato's command.

served in Strabo's *consilium*, before the fall of Asculum in November and the grant of citizenship to the Spaniards, but that during the second half of the year, Cicero served with his brother and their friend Tubero on Sulla's staff at the siege of Nola, which began no earlier than the summer of 89.²¹

Since there is evidence that Cicero and Pompey did serve together in the *consilium* of Pompey's father for at least the first half of 89, there is an increased possibility that the two had met earlier, and it is very difficult to deny that they had personal contact at the time of this service.

Through an investigation of their mutual friends and associations it is also possible to demonstrate that Cicero and Pompey were acquainted with each other during the rest of the 80's, not necessarily as close friends, but as two people who shared common associations that would have provided occasions for personal contact and acquaintanceship. Johannemann also insisted that an attempt to link the two in their early years through mutual friends is fruitless:

Eine Untersuchung ob unter den "Mitschulern" und Jungenfreunden Ciceros der eine oder der andere gewesen ist, der auch mit Pompeius Verbindung hatte—*les amis de nos amis sont nos amis*—verläuft negativ.²²

Johannemann could not have studied the evidence very carefully. There is reason to believe that Cicero and Pompey shared several important mutual friends during this period. The whole *gens Terentia* may have afforded a basis for acquaintanceship between Cicero and Pompey. Many Terentii were closely associated with both of them. The inscription containing the names of people who served in Strabo's *consilium* lists two Terentii, T. Terentius and L. Terentius, the latter of whom was Pompey's *contubernalis* (Plut. *Pomp.* 3.1).²³ Another Terentius, M. Terentius Varro, was one of Pompey's closest friends for many years. He served as Pompey's legate in Spain from 76 to 71 (Varro, *Rust.* 3.12.7), in the war against the pirates during 67 (Florus 1.41.10; Pliny, *H.N.* 3.101), and in Further Spain in 49 before he surrendered to Caesar (Florus 2.13.29). From an early date, therefore, there were close connections between the Terentii and Pompey.

Cicero had friends among the Terentii as early as Pompey did. He, too, was a long-time friend of M. Terentius Varro.²⁴ They had been students together under L. Aelius Stilo (Cic. *Brut.* 205–206). Although they were never such close friends as were Cicero and Atticus,²⁵ they

²¹Cichorius 183–184.

²²Johannemann 3.

²³*CIL* 1^a.2.709 = H. Dessau, *ILS* 8888.

²⁴They may even have been related since Cicero's mother's nephew was named C. Visellius Varro (*Brut.* 264), but there can be no certainty about any kinship (cf. F. Münzer, *RE* 5A.1 (1934) 676–677, s.v. "Terentius," 76 ff.).

²⁵C. Kumaniecki, "Cicerone e Varrone, Storia di una Conoscenza," *Athenaeum* n.s. 40 (1962) 221–243, esp. 224–225.

shared a common circle of friends²⁶ and had no little personal contact through the years (*Fam.* 9.1–8; *Att.* 3.8.3; 15.1; 18.1). They were both supporters of Pompey and firm friends of Atticus. Varro's greatest show of friendship towards Cicero came when he helped to obtain Cicero's return from exile (*Att.* 3.8.3; 15.1; 18.1) and then aided him in recovering his confiscated property (*Att.* 4.2.5).

Furthermore, one should not overlook Cicero's marriage into a fairly wealthy and important branch of the *gens Terentia* through his first wife, Terentia. Since the latest he could have married her is 77 B.C.,²⁷ Cicero must have been well known to her family and betrothed to her, in accordance with Roman custom, several years earlier.²⁸ Therefore, Cicero probably developed early, close connections among the Terentii, several of whom also became good friends of Pompey.²⁹

That Cicero and Pompey were acquainted with each other in the 80's is further supported by the friendships that Cicero made during the same period with some of Pompey's relatives. Cicero proudly declared that when he was a student (in the 80's), he used to give declamations with Pompeius Bithynicus and that they were closely associated in their rhetorical studies (*Brut.* 240 and 310). Bithynicus was also a faithful follower of Pompey. Cichorius has proven that this Bithynicus and his brother Aulus were legates of Pompey in 67,³⁰ and Orosius says that he was killed along with Pompey in Egypt (6.15.28).

Another of Pompey's relatives, though not politically significant, whom Cicero knew personally was Pompey's cousin Sextus, the mathematician (*Off.* 1.19). That Cicero knew Sextus personally is strongly indicated by a passage from *De Officiis* 1.19: *ut in astrologia C. Sulpicium audivimus, in geometria Sex. Pompeium ipsi cognovimus*. . . . The words *ipsi cognovimus* suggest that Cicero's knowledge of Sextus was more than literary. For example, in a letter of November 48 to Atticus Cicero uses

²⁶E.g., L. Aelius Tubero (*ibid.* 222; *Cic. Lig.* 21; *Planc.* 100), Servius Sulpicius Rufus (Kumaniecki, *loc. cit.* 223), Aemilius Scaurus (*ibid.* 222), and Cato's sister, Porcia (*ibid.* 223).

²⁷O. E. Schmidt, "Cicero und Terentia," *NyP* 1 (1898) 175.

²⁸It is interesting to speculate that M. Terentius Varro was a close relative of Terentia and that he may have introduced his fellow student Cicero to her family. However, I have to agree with Drumann and Groebe (6.604) that there is no real evidence for any kinship.

²⁹In addition to M. Terentius Varro, one of these Terentii may have been A. Terentius Varro Murena. Cicero thought very highly of him (*Fam.* 13.22.1; 16.12.6), and he was a staunch supporter of Pompey at Dyrrachium (Caes. *BCiv.* 3.19.3). Another one may have been Q. Terentius Culleo. As a tribune in 58, Culleo tried to have the law which banished Cicero nullified on the ground that it was a *privilegium* (*Att.* 3.15.5), and he was closely enough acquainted with Pompey to attempt to persuade him to divorce Julia and form an alliance with the Senate (Plut. *Pomp.* 49.3). There is, however, no evidence that Murena and Culleo were connected with Cicero and Pompey in the 80's.

³⁰Cichorius 188–189.

the word *cognovi* in reference to Pompey the Great himself, whom he certainly knew personally at that time (*Att.* 11.6.5). Moreover, the probability of Cicero's personal acquaintance with Sextus is increased because he served with Sextus' son in Strabo's *consilium*.³¹ Therefore, since Cicero was friendly with some of Pompey's relatives at least as early as his service in the *consilium* of Pompey's father and his period of study in the 80's, it is not difficult to conclude that, inasmuch as Pompey was in Rome during part of this time, Cicero was not a stranger to him either.³²

One might well ask, however, why Cicero makes no specific mention of any association with Pompey during the 80's. It can be replied that in his extant writings, Cicero mentions only those people with whom he was closely associated in his rhetorical and philosophical studies during this period. Pompey, however, did not actively pursue any course of higher studies after his entrance to the military at about the age of seventeen (*Vell. Pat.* 2.29.5; *Cic. Leg. Man.* 28). As Cicero says, his preference for military glory pre-empted any interest in the study of rhetoric (*Brut.* 239). Certainly, however, it would be extreme to say that Cicero had no contact with others than those with whom he was actively engaged in study, although this contact may not be specifically recorded.

The most important evidence for some personal acquaintanceship between Cicero and Pompey during the 80's is found in the circle of young men gathered about Q. Mucius Scaevola the Pontifex (consul in 95). In 90 B.C., Cicero had begun to receive instruction in the law from this man's cousin, Q. Mucius Scaevola the Augur (consul in 117).³³ When he died, perhaps at the beginning of 87,³⁴ Cicero transferred to the circle of the Pontifex (*Cic. Amic.* 1). Therefore, from 87 until Scaevola's death in 82, Cicero was closely connected with the people and events surrounding the Pontifex.

During much of this same period, Pompey also was at Rome and associated with Scaevola.³⁵ The judge, Antistius, who had presided at Pompey's trial concerning the booty from Asculum and who collaborated

³¹For the service of Sextus' son in Strabo's *consilium*, see E. Badian, *Historia* 12 (1963) 139.

³²For Pompey's presence at Rome, see note 35.

³³Cf. *Cic. Amic.* 1 and M. Gelzer, *RE* 7A.1 (1939) 829.38-44, s.v. "Tullius" (29).

³⁴F. Münzer, *RE* 16.1 (1933) 435, s.v. "Mucius" (21).

³⁵From 87 to some time in 84: Pompey's father died just outside of Rome in 87 (*Drumann-Groebe* 4.331) while he was defending the city against Cinna (*Vell. Pat.* 2.21.3-4). Presumably, Pompey entered the city at that time and remained there, for early in 86 he was tried in court on a charge of unlawfully possessing booty from Asculum (*Plut. Pomp.* 4.1; *Cic. Brut.* 230). Sometime in 84 Pompey left Rome when he went to collect troops for the consuls, Cinna and Carbo (*Plut. Pomp.* 5.1; *De Vir. Ill.* 69.4; cf. M. Gelzer, "Cn. Pompeius Strabo und der Aufstieg seines Sohnes Magnus," *Abh. Berlin* (Phil.-hist. Klasse) n. r. 14 (1941) 21-22 = *Kleine Schriften* 2 (Wiesbaden 1963) 126.

in his acquittal, apparently was a friend of Scaevola and was killed along with him in 82.³⁶ Later, probably in 80, Pompey married Scaevola's daughter, Mucia.³⁷ Therefore, it is very likely that Cicero and Pompey were also in contact with each other through Scaevola and his daughter, Mucia, whose good-will towards himself on many occasions Cicero attributed to his close relationship, *necessitudo*, with Pompey (*Fam.* 5.2.6).³⁸

Another important link between Cicero and Pompey was their slightly older contemporary Q. Hortensius Hortalus the orator. He, too, appears to have been a member of the circle surrounding Scaevola the Pontifex (*Brut.* 229). Although he and Cicero are often viewed primarily as strenuous rivals, they were friends before their famous opposition during the trial of Verres in 70. In the 90's and 80's Cicero, perhaps through their association with Scaevola, closely observed Hortensius' career in the courts (*Brut.* 301-308). Indeed, during Cicero's career as a pleader before 70, he and Hortensius often shared the same side in trials (*Div. Caec.* 44). Hortensius was also an early friend of Pompey, again perhaps by acquaintance through the circle of Scaevola; he was one of Pompey's three defenders in 86 (*Brut.* 230). Most likely Cicero followed Pompey's trial with interest, not as a mere spectator, but as one who could increase his knowledge of the courts through discussion with the principals of the case.³⁹

³⁶Plut. *Pomp.* 4.2; cf. Broughton, *MRR* 2.54; Vell. Pat. 2.26.2; App. *BCiv.* 1.10.88.

³⁷Drumann and Groebe (4.560-561) and M. Hadas (*Sextus Pompey* [New York 1930], 9) place the date in 81. This date is possible if Pompey returned to Rome to celebrate his first triumph in March of 81, as Badian claims (E. Badian, "The Date of Pompey's First Triumph," *Hermes* 83 [1955] 107-118). On the other hand, 81 may be too early a date for Pompey to marry Mucia since his second wife, Aemilia, had just died early in that same year. Moreover, to have Pompey returning to Rome in March of 81 crowds his exploits in Sicily and Africa into an extremely brief space of time. Accordingly, I agree with Smith that March of 80 is a better date for Pompey's return to Rome and his first triumph (R. E. Smith, "Pompey's Conduct in 80 and 77 B.C.," *Phoenix* 14 [1960] 10-12, note A). This date is compatible with the accounts given in the sources and allows a more reasonable amount of time for Pompey's actions in Sicily and Africa. Now, if 80 is accepted as the year of Pompey's first triumph, there is a slight possibility that he did not marry Mucia until sometime in 79, as Carcopino argues (J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée*³ [Paris 1947; hereafter cited as *Sylla*] 188-189). However, 79 does not seem to be a very likely date for the marriage in view of both the long delay that would exist between it and Pompey's triumph and the short time that would exist before the birth of their daughter, also in 79 (cf. *Sylla ibid.*). Therefore, it seems most reasonable that Pompey returned to Rome for his first triumph in March of 80 and married Mucia afterwards in that same year.

³⁸How long before the date of this letter (62 B.C.) these "many occasions" existed is difficult to say. Conceivably, they could have extended as far back as the time when the three may have come to know each other in association with Mucia's father, Scaevola.

³⁹Hortensius had also had contact with Cicero's former teacher Scaevola the Augur

From 84/3 to 82 or 81 B.C. there was probably no opportunity for personal association between Cicero and Pompey. In 84/3, Pompey left Rome and went to Picenum. There he raised an army on his own initiative and supported Sulla by fighting the forces of Carbo and Cinna (Plut. *Pomp.* 5-6). In 82, he was at Rome very briefly when he married Sulla's step-daughter Aemilia (*ibid.* 9.2), but he was soon occupied with fighting the Marian forces in Sicily and Africa. After Pompey returned home, however, he and Cicero appear to have had common associations again by the time Cicero defended Sextus Roscius of Ameria in 80.⁴⁰

It was by defending Roscius that Cicero first made his mark as an important orator at Rome. He defended Roscius against a charge of parricide which two of Roscius' relatives, Capito and Magnus, had brought against him. They were working in conjunction with Sulla's henchman Chrysogonus. Since all three had profited from the murder of Roscius' father, they were trying to remove the embarrassing presence of the younger Roscius so that they could rest secure in their possession of his father's property. Cicero, in his defence of Roscius, openly attacked Chrysogonus. There was no doubt that his attack upon Sulla's favourite would be viewed as an attack upon Sulla himself, and, years later, Cicero expressly prided himself on his courage in attacking Sulla at that time (*Off.* 2.51).⁴¹

The question is, "Who gave him this courage?" In 80 B.C. Cicero was still a struggling young advocate who had no political significance, as he himself admits (*Rosc. Am.* 1-4). It is unlikely, therefore, that he took it upon himself to attack the all-powerful dictator without some sort of powerful support. Drumann and Groebe rightly recognized that these supporters came from the faction of the Metelli, the most powerful group among the *optimates*.⁴² In addition, Badian has recently shown that the Metelli had to attack Sulla, their benefactor, in order to ensure the loyalty of their clients, who were the basis of the power which they needed to preserve Sulla's newly established constitution.⁴³ The Metelli

whom his father had served as a legate in Asia. Cf. Lucilius 2.60 (Marx) and C. Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin 1908) 339.

⁴⁰Despite Carcopino's arguments for the date 79 (*Sylla*, 156), Gellius confirms the date 80 (Gell. *N.A.* 15.28.3). Cf. M. Gelzer, review of Carcopino's *Sylla*, *Gnomon* 8 (1932) 607 = *Kleine Schriften* 2 (Wiesbaden 1963), 105; and Badian *Clientelae* 297, note u.

⁴¹To be sure, Cicero's attack upon Sulla was not direct, and it was strictly limited in scope: he showed approval of Sulla's reorganization of the state but criticized the existence of a situation in which a scurrilous freedman could, with the hope of impunity, injure the friends of nobles (136-142). Nevertheless, it did take some courage to speak out in criticism of the dictator even in this limited way.

⁴²Drumann-Groebe 5.258.

⁴³*Clientelae* 249-251.

chose Cicero to conduct the defence of Roscius because he was not closely identified with any one political group and, therefore, was the only one who could conduct this attack on Sulla without stirring up any party strife (Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 1).

That the Metellan *factio* was supporting Cicero is clear from his speech. According to Cicero, Sextus Roscius senior had enjoyed *hospitium* with the Metelli, the Servilii, and the Scipiones (15).⁴⁴ At the height of his troubles, the younger Roscius had sought protection with Caecilia Metella, the sister of the elder Metellus Nepos⁴⁵ and the daughter of Metellus Balearicus (27).⁴⁶ Metella was also closely related to several other important members of the Caecilii Metelli and their *factio*: she was a cousin of Metellus Pius, Sulla's colleague in the consulship of 80;⁴⁷ she was the wife of Appius Claudius Pulcher, a consul in 79;⁴⁸ and she was an aunt of Metellus Celer⁴⁹ and Metellus Nepos.⁵⁰ Since she sheltered Roscius and arranged for his defence (149), it appears that the Metellan *factio* was intimately involved with Cicero's defence of Roscius and its implicit attack upon Sulla.

Since Cicero was working with the Metelli in the trial of Roscius, he was probably associated with Pompey, who had become an ally of the Metellan *factio* through his marriage to Mucia.⁵¹ Although Carcopino may be wrong in his main thesis that the Metelli sought Pompey's support in an attempt to force Sulla into retirement,⁵² one cannot ignore, as Gelzer does,⁵³ Pompey's alliance with them at this time. Again, Badian has supplied a very sound appraisal of the situation. He claims that the Metelli, acting from the traditional aristocratic Roman fear of one man's holding too much power, had sought an alliance with Pompey through his marriage with Mucia. He argues that they wanted to provide a counterweight to Sulla, but not to overthrow him, for they needed him to complete the reorganization of the state.⁵⁴ Accordingly, it is clear, in the light of the preceding evidence, that Cicero and Pompey were

⁴⁴The Scipiones appear to have had close connections with the Metelli. Cf. Badian, *Clientelae* 298, note w.

⁴⁵F. Münzer, *RE* 3.1 (1897) 1216, s.v. "Caecilius" (95).

⁴⁶*Ibid.* 1207-1208, s.v. "Caecilius" (82); cf. note 48.

⁴⁷*Ibid.* Stammtafel, 1229-1230.

⁴⁸*Ibid.* 1235.42-52, s.v. "Caecilius" (135).

⁴⁹*Ibid.* 1208-1209, s.v. "Caecilius" (86).

⁵⁰*Ibid.* 1216, s.v. "Caecilius" (96).

⁵¹Mucia formed a direct link between Pompey and the Metelli: She was the uterine sister of Metellus Celer and Metellus Nepos; hence, she was also a niece of their aunt Caecilia Metella (Cic. *Fam.* 5.2.6; cf. M. Fluss, *RE* 16.1 [1933] 449.16-23, s.v. "Mucius" [28]). The first one to recognize this connection seems to have been Carcopino (*Sylla* 192).

⁵²*Sylla* 186-204.

⁵³M. Gelzer, *Pompeius*³ (Munich 1959) 39-41.

⁵⁴*Clientelae* 248-249.

working closely with the Metellan faction at the time of Roscius' trial. Therefore, the conclusion that the two were personally associated with each other in 80 can hardly be avoided.

In conclusion, therefore, the reconstruction of the relationships between Cicero and Pompey during their early years until 80 B.C. stands as follows. It is very possible that in the 90's they first met each other as two young boys of the same age and of similar background, who lived in the same neighbourhood at Rome and whose families may have had some political connection with one another; later, in 89 at the age of seventeen, they appear to have had personal contact through service in the *consilium* of Pompey's father; after 89, there is evidence for personal acquaintanceship, though not real friendship, between Cicero and Pompey through mutual friends among the Terentii, the Pompeii, and the circle of people about Q. Mucius Scaevola the Pontifex; finally, at least as early as 80, some personal association between the two seems assured by their common political association with the *factio* of the Metelli.⁵⁵

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS

⁵⁵I should like to thank Professors F. C. Bourne and T. J. Luce of Princeton University and Professor W. C. McDermott of the University of Pennsylvania for their help at various stages during the development of this paper. How much they may wish to agree with it, if at all, I cannot say.