

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE ALLEGED *INIMICITIAE* OF POMPEIUS AND LUCULLUS: 78–74

Evidence for the existence of *inimicitiae* between Pompeius and Lucullus before 66, the year of their conflict over the Mithridatic command, is meager, consisting of several short passages of Plutarch on the years 78 and 74.¹ Yet to some scholars Pompeius and Lucullus were *inimici* of long standing by 66.² Not all, of course, are so explicit: some implicitly accept the *inimicitiae* of Pompeius and Lucullus; others operate under the assumption that their relations were strained.³ Such attitudes naturally influence the interpretation of politics.⁴ Dissent has been rare.⁵

In all cases, however, historians in asserting, accepting, or assuming enmity or strained relations for the years 78–74 have gone beyond the evidence. Examination of this much-cited, little-discussed evidence will show how infirm and implausible the case for antipathy at this time is.⁶

Pompeius and Lucullus no doubt met when the latter, elected aedile for 79 *in absentia*, returned from the East in 80 (Cic. *Acad. pr.* 2. 1. 1), but no dealings between them before 74, or details of personal contact before 66, are in evidence. Plutarch, however, says that in 78 Sulla's will sparked διαφορά and ζηλοτυπία between them, because Pompeius was left out of it, and Lucullus became guardian of the Dictator's children: καὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτον πρῶτον αὐτοῖς ὑπάρξαι διαφορᾶς αἴτιον καὶ ζηλοτυπίας, νέοις οὖσι καὶ διαπύροις πρὸς δόξαν (*Luc.* 4. 5). This merits attention, since their

1. 78: *Pomp.* 15. 3–4, *Luc.* 4. 5, *Sull.* 38. 1–2. 74: *Pomp.* 20. 1–2, *Luc.* 5. 2–3. I should like to thank the Editor, whose time and insight have improved this paper.

2. Thus, e.g., E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 279–81; D. F. Epstein, *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics, 218–43 B.C.* (New York, 1987), pp. 36, 77, 83–84; E. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 11, 20; id., “Pompey, Metellus Pius, and the Trials of 70–69 B.C.: The Perils of Schematism,” *AJP* 92 (1971): 8; A. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic* (Columbia, 1977), p. 37; id., “Cicero and Pompey in 75 and 70 B.C.,” *Latomus* 29 (1970): 64.

3. This distinction is not easily or neatly drawn. See M. Gelzer (strained relations) “L. Licinius Lucullus,” *RE* 13.1 (1926): 381–82; id., *Pompeius*² (Munich, 1949), p. 51; H. Last and M. Gardner, *CAH* 9:324; R. Seager, *Pompey: A Political Biography* (Berkeley, 1979), esp. p. 19, n. 54 (see also p. 67 for a later explicit assertion of enmity); R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939; repr. 1960), p. 29, implies this by calling Pompeius the People's General and Lucullus the Senate's General; J. Van Ooteghem, *Lucius Licinius Lucullus* (Brussels, 1959), p. 47; id., *Pompée le Grand: Bâtisseur d'Empire* (Brussels, 1954), pp. 121–22 with nn. 2–4, quoting Gelzer, *Pompeius*², p. 51 with n. 91.

4. See Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, pp. 279–81; Gruen, *Last Generation*, pp. 11, 20; Last and Gardner, *CAH* 9:324; Van Ooteghem, *Pompée*, p. 122, n. 4; id., *Lucullus*, p. 47; Seager, *Pompey*, pp. 28, 32; Syme, *Roman Revolution*, p. 29; Ward, *Crassus*, p. 37.

5. B. Twyman, “Pompeius, the Metelli, and Prosopography,” *ANRW* 1.1 (1972–73): 848–53.

6. Gruen, e.g. (“Pompey,” pp. 7–9), dismisses Lucullus’ “fear” (Plut. *Pomp.* 20. 1, *Luc.* 5. 2) of Pompeius over the Mithridatic command in 74. This he does against Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, pp. 279–81 and nn. 4 and 6, who accepts Plutarch's assertion. Neither, however, discusses the evidence or questions the putative enmity of Pompeius and Lucullus and its alleged role. Even Twyman, “Pompeius,” pp. 850–51, who completely rejects the enmity, does so without discussion of Plutarch's text.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

supposed difficulties, whether strained relations or *inimicitiae*, allegedly begin with this will.⁷

First, we must note that Plutarch never says that the will made them ἐχθροί or *inimici*. Rather, it caused a “disagreement” or “difference” (διαφορά) and a “rivalry” (ζηλοτυπία). *Nobiles* could surely be rivals at odds without being enemies. Taking these words, therefore, to indicate that Plutarch was thinking of ἐχθρα or *inimicitiae* would seem to be pushing the evidence too hard.

But Plutarch also never calls Pompeius and Lucullus ἐχθροί or uses ἐχθρα to describe their relations. Διαφορά and διάφορος are the only words he uses.⁸ Significantly, however, Plutarch contrasts Lucullus’ φιλία toward others to his relations with Pompeius; and at *Lucullus* 41. 4 he directly opposes Lucullus’ φιλία with Cicero to his διαφορά with Pompeius.⁹ This suggests that διαφορά is stronger than mere “difference” or “disagreement.” Other passages confirm this suggestion: to Plutarch διαφορά and ἐχθρα are synonymous.¹⁰ Thus, in Plutarch’s eyes, Sulla’s will did cause the *inimicitiae* of Pompeius and Lucullus.

Second, Plutarch’s contention has little to recommend it. No other source makes this report. Thus the conclusion reached by Plutarch may well be his own, if we consider the later, undoubted enmity of Pompeius and Lucullus, and Plutarch’s tendency to retroject later conditions into an earlier time.¹¹

Third, Plutarch’s own evidence argues against it. Romans expected to be named in the wills of their *amici* and considered it an insult if they were not. Yet alone of all his friends Sulla had passed Pompeius over (*Plut. Sull.* 38. 1, *Pomp.* 15. 3, *Luc.* 4. 5), a parting shot that may be attributed to their deteriorating relations since 81 (*Pomp.* 14. 1–11, 15. 1–2, *Sull.* 34. 7).¹²

Clearly Pompeius had anticipated some bequest from the late dictator, for exclusion vexed him (*Sull.* 38. 1, *Pomp.* 15. 4, *Luc.* 4. 5). It is clear, too, that Pompeius blamed no one but Sulla (*Sull.* 38. 1). Publicly he bore the insult well and exerted himself to secure a proper and uneventful public funeral for Sulla, an effort in which Lucullus no doubt cooperated (*Sull.* 38. 2, *Pomp.* 15. 4).¹³

7. Thus Gelzer: “Das Verhältnis der beiden war begreiflicherweise gespannt, da Pompeius, der mehr als ein Jahrzehnt Jüngere, eine weit glänzendere Laufbahn hinter sich hatte, sich aber anderseits durch die gefällentliche Übergehung in Sullas Testament gekränkt fühlte . . .” (“L. Licinius Lucullus,” col. 382; cf. *Pompeius*², p. 51).

8. Since Plutarch uses διαφορά / διάφορος to describe every stage of their association, any change is, therefore, of degree rather than kind; see *Pomp.* 20. 2 (the year 74), 30. 8 (66); *Luc.* 41. 4 (61 or 60).

9. *Luc.* 36. 2, 42. 5–6, *Pomp.* 31. 3, 8.

10. This is made sufficiently clear by, e.g., *Pomp.* 47. 2, 4; *Caes.* 13. 3–14. 1; *Crass.* 14. 1–2. See esp. *Mor.* 483D, which may profitably be compared with these passages for the juxtapositions of ἐχθρα / διαφορά and φιλία / ὁμόνοια. To cite the very many other pertinent passages would be tedious.

11. On this tendency, consider, e.g., *Plut. Crass.* 7, where Plutarch inserts a discussion of the division of Rome into three powers (Pompeius, Caesar, and Crassus) into the 70s. See C. B. R. Pelling, “Plutarch and Roman Politics,” in *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, ed. I. S. Moxon, J. D. Stuart, and A. J. Woodman (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 161–62; id., “Plutarch’s Adaptation of His Source Material,” *JHS* 100 (1980): 128–29.

12. We cannot, of course, assume that Pompeius had been in Sulla’s will, only to be written out of it; or that Sulla had failed to include him in a new will made when he knew his end was near (*Plut. Sull.* 37. 1–3). Plutarch, however, is quite right to point out that Pompeius’ exclusion shows just how displeased Sulla was with him.

13. The horrors of Pompeius Strabo’s funeral might well have influenced Pompeius in his support for Sulla’s: *Plut. Pomp.* 1. 2; *Vell.* 2. 21. 4; *Lic.* 35. 42–45.

Lucullus, moreover, as Pompeius knew, had the greater claim to Sulla's gratitude. His service to Sulla had been long.¹⁴ It is reasonable that Lucullus was the sole officer who did not desert Sulla when the latter marched on Rome in 88.¹⁵ His other services had been signal as well, and the two were so close that Sulla dedicated his memoirs to him (Plut. *Luc.* 1. 4, 4. 5, *Sull.* 6. 10). Such ties cannot have gone unnoticed. Pompeius was no fool. By service, by treason committed therein, and by friendship Lucullus had earned his inheritance. No evidence indicates that Pompeius grudged Lucullus this. Neither *inimicitiae* nor strained relations may be found here.

Plutarch, however, knew of Pompeius' displeasure at the will; he knew of Lucullus' favored status in it; and he knew that enmity between them later existed. He, therefore, wrongly discovered in the will the source of their *inimicitiae*, because, as he says, "they were young and on fire for glory" (*Luc.* 4. 5). Plutarch's conclusion is a retrojection unworthy of acceptance.¹⁶

Rejection of the will as the source of their *inimicitiae* will also necessarily affect the interpretation of Lucullus' military and financial assistance to Pompeius in Spain of 74. Of this, Plutarch says that Lucullus, "Πομπηίῳ μὲν ὦν διάφορος" (*Pomp.* 20. 1), nevertheless helped Pompeius for fear that he would otherwise return to deprive him of the Mithridatic command (*Luc.* 5. 2–3, *Pomp.* 20. 1–2).

Scholars, however, have correctly noted the implausibility of this claim on historical grounds.¹⁷ Sufficient and necessary motivation for Plutarch's explanation is found in the putative διαφορά: Lucullus' assistance to his *inimicus* had to be explained. But their *inimicitiae*, as we have seen, did not exist. Once this is recognized, the implausibility of Plutarch's assertion, already noticed by historians and based upon a false assumption about Pompeius and Lucullus, becomes clearer.

Furthermore, Sallust, Plutarch's source, knows nothing of Plutarch's version of Lucullus' motives or of his διαφορά with Pompeius.¹⁸ Sallust had no love for either Pompeius or Lucullus.¹⁹ The historian, moreover, pays close attention elsewhere to *inimicitiae* as a motive for political action.²⁰ It is unlikely, then, that he would have disdained comment, had antipathy between them existed.²¹ The hostility and

14. See Gelzer, "L. Licinius Lucullus," coll. 376–81; Van Ooteghem, *Lucullus*, pp. 18–44.

15. See App. *BC* 1. 7. 57; E. Badian, "Waiting for Sulla," *JRS* 52 (1962): 54–55.

16. Gelzer, "L. Licinius Lucullus," col. 382, accepts Plutarch's conclusion. Although in *Pompeius*², pp. 50–51, Gelzer accepts Sallust's reason for Lucullus' activity in 74 on Pompeius' behalf, rather than Plutarch's, he nevertheless thinks that Lucullus already "stand in keinem guten Verhältnis zu Pompeius," an opinion that can only derive from Plutarch.

17. Twyman, "Pompeius," pp. 850–52; Gelzer, *Pompeius*², pp. 50–51 with n. 91; Gruen, *Last Generation*, pp. 19–20; id., "Pompey," pp. 5–9; Seager, "Pompey," p. 19 with n. 53. Plutarch's version is nevertheless accepted by Van Ooteghem (*Pompée*, p. 122; *Lucullus*, p. 47), and by Badian (*Foreign Clientelae*, p. 279, n. 6), who declares that "we have no serious reason for rejecting Plutarch's account of events at Rome."

18. The similarities between Sall. *Hist.* 2. 98. 1–10 (esp. 10) and Plut. *Pomp.* 20. 1–2, *Luc.* 5. 2–3, and *Sert.* 21. 8–9 are striking, but Plutarch often garbles what Sallust has said. This can be quite misleading, as, e.g., in Pompeius' remarks about what would happen if he received no support.

19. For Sallust's treatment of Lucullus, see R. Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1964), pp. 202–3; on Pompeius, see pp. 113, 201, 202 n. 97, 212.

20. See *BC* 10. 5, 17. 7, 19. 1, 34. 2, 49. 2; *Hist.* 2. 47. 4, 3. 48. 27.

21. On this view, we might also allow that Sallust's silence about *inimicitiae* here indicates that he did not see the will of Sulla as the cause of the enmity of Pompeius and Lucullus.

dark motives of Plutarch's Lucullus would have been grist to Sallust's mill.²² His Lucullus assists Pompeius for other motives (*Hist.* 2. 98. 10).²³

Neither *inimicitiae* nor strained relations may be detected between Pompeius and Lucullus in the years 78 to 74. Rather, the evidence shows them on correct terms in this period; nor did this change before 66.²⁴ To be sure, calling them *amici* would be unwarranted. Pompeius and Lucullus, however, were certainly not yet the *inimici* that they have for too long been considered.

THOMAS P. HILLMAN
Middlebury College

22. Sallust's theme was the failure and weakness of the Sullan oligarchy and the unfitness of Pompeius for power. See B. Maurenbrecher, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae* (Stuttgart, 1893; repr. 1966), p. 1; Syme, *Sallust*, p. 201.

23. See Gruen, "Pompey," pp. 7–9 contra Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, p. 279 with n. 6.

24. Plut. *Luc.* 37. 6 attests Lucullus' financial support of Pompeius in his campaign against the Pirates in 66. It is the last evidence of cooperation and correct relations.

INDIA'S IVORY PALISADE

Against the theory that atoms of each shape are infinite in number it could be objected that certain things in nature are extremely rare. Forestalling this argument, Lucretius appeals to the Epicurean doctrine of *isonomia*, according to which the uncommonness of a species in one place is balanced by its abundance in another. For example, elephants are rare in Italy but plentiful in India (Lucr. 2. 536–40):

sicut quadripedum cum primis esse videmus
in genere anguimanus elephantos, India quorum
milibus e multis vallo munitur eburno,
ut penitus nequeat penetrari: tanta ferarum
vis est, quarum nos perpauca exempla videmus.

The "ivory palisade" defending India has been interpreted in three ways: (1) as a legend of some kind (Munro, Bailey),¹ referring either to an actual wall of ivory or a living barrier of elephants (Reid);² (2) as an exaggerative reference to the practice of using elephant tusks as palings or incorporating them into buildings (Ernout, Borthwick);³ (3) as a metaphorical allusion to the use of elephants in warfare (Creech,

1. H. A. J. Munro, *T. Lucreti Cari "De Rerum Natura" Libri Sex*,⁴ vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1893), p. 148 ("I know no other mention of this fable"), C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari "De Rerum Natura" Libri Sex*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1947), p. 891; cf. O. Gigon, "Lukrez und Ennius," in *Lucretius*, Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, Entretiens 24 (Vandoeuvres-Genève, 1977), p. 185.

2. J. S. Reid, "Lucretiana," *HSCP* 22 (1911): 38. The elder Pliny reports that elephants will spontaneously form a battle-line against hunters (*HN* 8. 9).

3. A. Ernout, "Lucretius et les éléphants," *RPh* 44 (1970): 203–5; E. K. Borthwick, "Lucretius' Elephant Wall," *CQ* n. s. 23 (1973): 291–92. To judge from Creech's note (see n. 4 below), this was also the interpretation of Lambinus.