



<https://publications.dainst.org>

---

# iDAI.publications

---

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

## Christopher Tuplin Coelius or Cloelius? The Third General in Plutarch, Pompey 7

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **9 • 1979**

Seite / Page **137–146**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1366/5715> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1979-9-p137-146-v5715.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

## Coelius or Cloelius?

### *The Third General in Plutarch, Pompey 7*

Ἀνέστησαν οὖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν [sc. Πομπήιον] τρεῖς ἅμα στρατηγοὶ πολέμιοι, Καρρίνας καὶ Κοίλιος καὶ Βροῦτος . . . . ὡς ἀναρπασόμενοι.

Κοίλιος] sic S. Κλοίλιος G Κοίλλιος L (Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1).<sup>1</sup>

The names and identities of two of the generals who attacked Pompey in 83 B. C. are clear: C. Carrinas and L. Iunius Brutus Damasippus, praetors of 82 B. C. and both staunch Marians. The third general is more of a problem. Those who accept the reading of S have inclined to identify Κοίλιος with C. Coelius Calvus (cos. 94 B. C.).<sup>2</sup> However, if the conclusions of E. BADIEN are to be accepted,<sup>3</sup> the consul of 94 B. C. was not of the Marian persuasion, at least in the 90's and early 80's B. C., and there is no reason to suppose that his attitude changed thereafter – if indeed he was still alive in 83 B. C.

The alternative has been to accept G's Κλοίλιος. This line was taken by, for example, MOMMSEN, SCHUR and PERRIN,<sup>4</sup> none of whom however offered any comment on the identity of the individual in question. BROUGHTON supplied that, taking Κλοίλιος to be T. Cloulius, a man known otherwise only as a moneyer;<sup>5</sup> in this he has been followed by R. SEAGER.<sup>6</sup> At first sight Cloulius seems a rather insubstantial figure, but this impression has been somewhat mitigated in a note by T. P. WISEMAN which suggests a different version of BROUGHTON's identification.<sup>7</sup> According to WISEMAN's thesis, the third general was a brother of T. Cloulius,

---

<sup>1</sup> Text and apparatus after K. ZIEGLER, *Plutarchus: Vitae Paralleleae III 2*, Leipzig 1973, and R. FLACELIÈRE – E. CHAMBRÉ, *Plutarque: Les Vies*, Paris 1973.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. W. DRUMMAN – P. GROEBE, *Geschichte Roms II*<sup>2</sup>, Leipzig 1902, 345; J. VAN OOTEGHEM, *Pompée le Grand*, Brussels 1954, 54; F. MILTNER, *RE* 21, 2066; FLACELIÈRE – CHAMBRÉ ad loc.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford 1964, 90 f.

<sup>4</sup> TH. MOMMSEN, *Römische Geschichte II*<sup>8</sup>, Berlin 1889, 332; W. SCHUR, *Das Zeitalter des Marius und Sulla* (*Klio Beiheft* 46), 1942, 159; B. PERRIN, *Plutarch's Lives V*, Harvard/London 1917 etc., ad loc. (following the editions of BEKKER and SINTENIS, cf. vi).

<sup>5</sup> *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (hereafter = MRR), New York 1951–2, II 65 (where the man is called T. Cluilius), 436 (where he is T. Cloulius).

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch: *The Fall of the Roman Republic*<sup>2</sup>, Harmondsworth 1972, note ad loc.

<sup>7</sup> *CR* (81 =) n. s. 17, 1967, 263–4.

quaestor and moneyer in 98 B. C., and a son of another T. Cloulius, who struck coins in 128 B. C.<sup>8</sup> The latter is further identified with T. Cloelius of Terracina, a man of whom we know something from Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino*.<sup>9</sup> Not many years before the Roscius trial, this man was murdered in circumstances which led to the unsuccessful prosecution of his two sons on a charge of parricide. WISEMAN's suggestion is thus that the third general in Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 is one of these sons. In *New Men in the Roman Senate* he has modified this position, entering the general of 83 B. C. in the register as Cloelius (?Cloulius) and noting «perhaps identical with T. Cloulius, q. c. 95 and son of no. 123» [sc. T. Cloulius, mon. 128 B. C.].<sup>10</sup> For the present purposes these different positions are fairly immaterial. What is interesting about WISEMAN's general line is the claim that the Cloulii were Marians, a view that would make one or other of them fit the bill in Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 very neatly. The important argument for this conclusion is based on the coin-types of T. Cloulius, q. 98 B. C.<sup>11</sup> The reverse of his quinarii shows Victory crowning a trophy alongside which are a bound captive and a *carnyx* (i. e. Gallic military trumpet).<sup>12</sup> This evidently refers to some victory over the Gauls and that of Marius is the natural candidate. Hence, it is argued, Cloulius is a supporter of Marius loyally celebrating his hero's martial glory.

Two questions pose themselves, (i) is this conclusion about Cloulius' attitudes in 98 B. C. certain?, and (ii) even if it were certain, how cogently would it support the hypothesis that he (or his brother) reappears fifteen years later as a Marian general?

(i) M. H. CRAWFORD argues<sup>13</sup> that the coins of Cloulius together with the similar ones of C. Egnatuleius in the following year (97 B. C.)<sup>14</sup> represent an issue made in connection with the settlement of Marian veterans in Gaul. If that is correct, can one assume that Cloulius and Egnatuleius were striking coins merely in a partisan spirit? Might not the Gallic victory device be a natural choice even for neutral moneyers?<sup>15</sup> This possibility seems to be admitted by CRAWFORD: «C. Egnatuleius

<sup>8</sup> For the dates c. 95 and c. 125 in WISEMAN's note I substitute the dates now given in M. H. CRAWFORD, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974, I 285 (n. 260), 331 (no. 332).

<sup>9</sup> 64, where WISEMAN restores the MSS reading Cloelius.

<sup>10</sup> *New Men in the Roman Senate*, Oxford 1971, Register no. 122.

<sup>11</sup> WISEMAN also speculates that the ear of corn on the elder Cloulius' coins might allude to a Gracchan *frumentatio* (but see CRAWFORD II 729), and notes that the wife whom Sulla divorced in 88 B. C. was called Cloelia (Plut. Sulla 6, 16), but lays little stress on either point.

<sup>12</sup> CRAWFORD I 331 (no. 332).

<sup>13</sup> CRAWFORD II 629.

<sup>14</sup> CRAWFORD I 332 (no. 333).

<sup>15</sup> The use of the *carnyx* picks up the precedent of issues by M. Furius Philus (119 B. C., CRAWFORD I 297 [no. 281]), L. Licinius Crassus, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and

... may perhaps be regarded as a Marian, since he is striking for Marius, *though the inference is not a necessary one* . . .<sup>16</sup> But if it is not necessary for Egnatuleius it is not necessary for Cloulius either, and in fact CRAWFORD nowhere states that Cloulius' types by themselves prove him to have been a Marian. Rather he starts from the assumption of WISEMAN's identification of him with «the Marian Cloulius, leg. 83»,<sup>17</sup> which from the point of view of the present paper is a *petitio principii*.

(ii) It is of course impossible to prove or disprove Cloulius' (or his brother's) survival until the late 80's B. C. If he did survive there is no guarantee that a Marian alignment in 98 B. C. (if such a thing could be proved, which we have seen it cannot) was maintained. P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus issued what might be called Marian coins in 100 B. C.<sup>18</sup> But, if BADIAN is correct,<sup>19</sup> his natural and adoptive fathers (of whom the former had been a legate of Marius) had changed sides by the late 90's B. C., and the latter suffered for it in 87 B. C., so it would hardly be legitimate to assume that Marcellinus retained a Marian attachment in the Civil War of 83/82 B. C. D. Silanus L. f. also issued, in 91 B. C., coins with a reverse similar to that of Cloulius and Egnatuleius.<sup>20</sup> Nothing more is known of him; but another Silanus (M. Iunius Silanus, *pr.* 77 B. C.) was with Sulla in the 80's B. C.,<sup>21</sup> which perhaps endangers any rash assumptions about D. Silanus' alignment in 83/82 B. C. Possibly the vacillations of Cornelii Lentuli and Iunii Silani cannot properly be used as parallels for the behaviour of mere Cloulii. More apposite, perhaps, is the less distinguished C. Fundanius. The reverse of his quinarii, issued in 101 B. C. when he was quaestor, resembles that of the quinarii of Cloulius and Egnatuleius.<sup>22</sup> Yet a C. Fundanius C. f., who may well be the same man, turns up as an active senator in 81 B. C.,<sup>23</sup> which must incline one to think that, at the least, he had not compromised himself by any obviously pro-Marian activity during the Civil War. A precisely similar line of argument applies in the case of another issuer of apparently Marian coinage, L. Sentius,<sup>24</sup> who appears as an active senator in 80 B. C.<sup>25</sup> In general, the first two decades of the first century B. C. constitute a

associates (118 B. C., CRAWFORD I 298 [no. 282]) and C. Fundanius (101 B. C., CRAWFORD I 328 [no. 326]).

<sup>16</sup> CRAWFORD II 731 (my italics).

<sup>17</sup> CRAWFORD I 332.

<sup>18</sup> CRAWFORD II 730.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.* (note 3) 52 f.

<sup>20</sup> CRAWFORD I 336 (no. 337).

<sup>21</sup> MRR II 64, 69.

<sup>22</sup> CRAWFORD I 328 (no. 326).

<sup>23</sup> *SC de Stratonicensibus* (= OGIS no. 441 = R. K. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore 1969, no. 18) lines 20 f. For the identification of this Fundanius with the moneyer, cf. R. SYME, *JRS* 53, 1963, 58 n. 40.

<sup>24</sup> CRAWFORD I 327 (no. 325, 101 B. C.), II 730.

<sup>25</sup> *SC de Cormis* (= SHERK, *op. cit.* [note 23] no. 19) line 4.

period in which continuity of allegiance on the part of any given individual cannot with entire safety be assumed in the absence of specific information.<sup>26</sup>

WISEMAN's construction, therefore, though specious, is perhaps not sufficiently watertight to compel the adoption of G's text at Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 against that of S (and L), if there should prove to be a substantive argument in favour of the latter. We have seen that such an argument is not afforded by the identification of Κοίλιος with the consul of 94 B. C.<sup>27</sup> There is, however, another candidate, whose Marian credentials are much more certain than those of Cloulius and whose activity as a Marian general in the Civil War is independently and reliably attested. This was perceived long ago by GELZER. In 'Cn. Pompeius Strabo und der Aufstieg seines Sohnes Magnus'<sup>28</sup> GELZER refers to Plutarch Pompey 7, 1 and, *en passant*, identifies the third general as C. Coelius Antipater. No argument is advanced, apart from a reference to Appian, *bella civilia* 1, 91 (which is not however even quoted).<sup>29</sup> Perhaps because GELZER did not draw any special attention to the identification he had made, it has not, despite two reprintings of the monograph,<sup>30</sup> been widely, if at all, noticed. Most unfortunately it failed to secure even a footnote in BROUGHTON's 'Magistrates of the Roman Republic', the work to which one inevitably turns for illumination on matters of this sort.<sup>31</sup> Since the identification with C. Coelius Antipater is arguably the best that is available, this is a pity, and it seems worth re-proposing it, together with some arguments having a bearing on the general reconstruction of events in 83 B. C.

The key passage, as GELZER saw, is Appian's account of the murderous dinner party given by Albinovanus in 82 B. C.<sup>32</sup> One of the Marian victims at this grisly social gathering appears in Appian as Γάλιος Ἀντίπατρος. The cognomen inevitably suggests the nomen Coelius and a relationship to the historian L. Coelius Antipater – perhaps his son. It is worth noting the possibility that C. Coelius Antipater might in earlier days have moved in the circle of L. Licinius Crassus, the pupil and

<sup>26</sup> Among other issuers of Marian coins (CRAWFORD II 730), C. Fabius C. f. (*ibid.* I 326 [no. 322, 102 B. C.]) may be C. Fabius Hadrianus (*pr.* 84, *propr.* Africa 83/82 B. C., MRR I 60, 64, 69) rather than a C. Fabius Buteo as his coin-types might at first sight suggest (CRAWFORD, *loc. cit.*) in which case he is at least not pro-Sullan in the Civil War period. Of L. Iulius (CRAWFORD I 327 [no. 323, 101 B. C.]), M. Lucilius Rufus (*ibid.* [no. 324, 101 B. C.]), and P. Servilius Rullus (CRAWFORD I 329 [no. 328, 100 B. C.]) nothing to the purpose can be said.

<sup>27</sup> Above, p. 137.

<sup>28</sup> *Abh. Preuß. Akad. Phil. Hist. Kl.* 14, 1941, 23.

<sup>29</sup> There is also a reference to C. CICHORIUS, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*, Berlin 1908, 5. But CICHORIUS does not, as the unwary reader might assume, anticipate GELZER's solution of Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1.

<sup>30</sup> *Vom römischen Staat II*, Leipzig 1943, 56–98; *Kleine Schriften II*, Wiesbaden 1963, 106–138.

<sup>31</sup> The Supplement (New York 1960) does not rectify this.

<sup>32</sup> *Bell. civ.* 1, 91. All further references to Appian are to *bell. civ.*

friend of L. Coelius Antipater.<sup>33</sup> In the last years of his life Crassus was, through the marriage of his daughter to the younger Marius (the future consul of 82 B. C.), an *adfinis* of C. Marius. This fact might have some bearing on the eventual fate of his teacher's son as a *Marianus dux*. The point does not, however, have to be pressed to render probable the identification of Γάιος Ἀντίπατρος as a member of the *gens Coelia*, and such an identification is more or less *communis opinio*.<sup>34</sup> It is its relevance to the text of Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 that has not been generally appreciated. Both Brutus and Carrinas reappeared in the fighting in Etruria, Picenum and Cisalpine Gaul in 82 B. C.<sup>35</sup> Since there is no reason to suppose that the third general had met his end (certainly not in the clash with Pompey, for it was Brutus' army that Pompey attacked),<sup>36</sup> it would not be at all surprising if he too turned up in the northern theatre of war in 82 B. C. Granted that we know of a Coelius active there at that time and that the manuscripts of Plutarch allow (or even encourage) us to restore the reading Κοίλιος, it is natural to conclude that the two Coelii are the same.

The argument might stop at that point, allowing the identification to stand or fall by the coincidence of names. But curiosity prompts one to consider the question of Coelius' official position in 83 and 82 B. C. in order to see if anything can be said about it that has any bearing on the identification.

According to BROUGHTON,<sup>37</sup> in 82 B. C. C. Coelius Antipater was a legate of Norbanus. This is perhaps not unassailable. Appian writes:<sup>38</sup> ἐπὶ ἐστίασιν ἐκάλει Νωρβανόν τε καὶ τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῷ στρατηγούς, Γάιον Ἀντίπατρον καὶ Φλάβιον Φιμβρίαν . . . ὅσοι τε ἄλλοι τῶν Καρβωνείων στρατηγοὶ τότε παρῆσαν. BROUGHTON evidently took τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῷ [sc. Νωρβανῶ] στρατηγούς to mean that the generals named were technically Norbanus' legates. But that obviously involves reading a good deal more into the phrase than is absolutely necessary.<sup>39</sup> Indeed the sentence taken as a whole might imply that Coelius and Flavius were Καρβώνειοι στρατηγοί, a formula which means either simply 'generals of the Marian party' or even 'legates of Carbo'.<sup>40</sup> On this sort of reading, the generals with Norbanus may have been among those involved in the defeat at Faventia, who had later with-

<sup>33</sup> Cf. e.g. Cic. de orat. 2, 54.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. CICHORIUS, loc. cit., F. MÜNZER, RE 4, 185 (no. 6), MRR II 71, E. GABBA, Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus, Florence 1967, 243, G. V. SUMNER, Orators in Cicero's Brutus, Toronto 1973, 57.

<sup>35</sup> MRR II 67.

<sup>36</sup> Plut. Pomp. 7, 1; Diod. 38/39, 9.

<sup>37</sup> MRR II 71.

<sup>38</sup> 1, 91.

<sup>39</sup> Compare and contrast it with something like Καρρίνα, Κάρβωνος στρατηγῶ (App. 1, 87).

<sup>40</sup> For Καρβώνειοι cf. App. 1, 90; 92 where the word may be used in the sense 'belonging to Carbo rather than any other Marian leader'. In that case K. στρατηγοί are perhaps (like Καρρίνας, Κάρβωνος στρατηγός, cf. note 39) legates of Carbo.

drawn to Arrezzo,<sup>41</sup> and, if that is so, then some of them might have been technically speaking legates of Carbo; for the army defeated at Faventia perhaps included elements from Carbo's forces even if doubts exist about Carbo's presence there in person.<sup>42</sup> Coelius could, therefore, have been legate not to Norbanus but to Carbo. In that case, and if there had been no alterations in the appointments of legates since 83 B. C., he would have been detached from Carbo's forces in Picenum/Cisalpine Gaul (as was Carrinas) to assist in the abortive attack on Pompey.

It may be, however, that the supposition that he was Norbanus' legate in 83 B. C. fits Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 rather better. According to Plutarch, the three generals came against Pompey from different directions (οὐκ ἐναντίοι πάντες οὐδ' ὁμόθεν, ἀλλὰ κύκλω τρισὶ στρατοπέδοις περιχωροῦντες) and after the engagement between Pompey and Brutus the three are said to have fallen out and retreated separately (ὡς ἕκαστος ἔτυχε) while the towns in the region sided with Pompey ὡς διὰ φόβον ἐσκευασμένων τῶν πολέμιων. Allegations of στάσις among the three commanders may be tendentious, but the factual basis could be that they did indeed retire in different directions, just as they had originally come from different directions. If that is correct, Coelius will not have retired along with Carrinas, nor will he have marched out with him in the first place. Hence, if Carrinas was Carbo's legate,<sup>43</sup> Coelius was not. The picture that would then emerge of events in 83 B. C. would be this: to deal with the threat posed by Pompey, (i) Carbo detached Carrinas to attack from the north; (ii) the senate in Rome sent Brutus from the west (as is independently asserted by Diodorus);<sup>44</sup> and (iii) Norbanus detached Coelius to attack from the south or south-west. This would make a neat circle of attack and match the indications of Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 as interpreted above.

The only problem that would then remain is that of the chronological relation between the events in Plutarch Pompey 7, 1 and the other events in the war in 83 B. C., in particular the Battle of Casilinum (between Norbanus and Sulla) and the confrontation of Sulla and Scipio leading to the latter's desertion by his army. The inadequacy of the sources makes decision on this matter very difficult. The events to be fitted in are:

A. Defeat of Norbanus at Casilinum<sup>45</sup> and Norbanus' flight to Capua.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>41</sup> I accept that correction of MSS Ἀρρήγιον in App. 1, 91.

<sup>42</sup> GABBA, *op. cit.* (note 34) 242.

<sup>43</sup> A supposition admittedly based only on the fact that he was under Carbo in 82 B. C. (MRR II 67).

<sup>44</sup> 38/39, 9.

<sup>45</sup> App. 1, 84; Livy, *per.* 85; Plut. Sulla 27, 5; 28, 3, Sert. 6, 1; Sulla fr. 18 PETER; FGrHist II B, Nr. 252 (4); Vell. 2, 25, 2-4; Oros. 5, 20, 2; Flor. 2, 9, 19; Eutrop. 5, 7, 4; Exuper. 7.

<sup>46</sup> App. 1, 84; Plut. Sulla 28, 3.

- B. (i) Negotiations of Sulla and Scipio leading to Scipio's desertion by his troops and his own capture and subsequent release by Sulla.<sup>47</sup>  
 (ii) Scipio's return to Rome to take over a new army.<sup>48</sup>  
 C. Unsuccessful negotiations of Sulla and Norbanus.<sup>49</sup>  
 D. Advance of Sulla (?northwards).<sup>50</sup>  
 E. Advance of Norbanus from Capua.<sup>51</sup>  
 F. Pompey's troop-raising in Picenum.<sup>52</sup>  
 G. Meeting of Sulla and Pompey.<sup>53</sup>  
 H. Victories of Pompey over (i) Carrinas, Brutus and ?Coelius, (ii) Scipio, (iii) Carbo's cavalry.<sup>54</sup>

Of these items H (iii) is rather dubious, since it sounds like the engagement mentioned in Orosius 5, 20, 5, which belongs to 82 B. C.<sup>55</sup> H (ii) on the other hand, despite the similarity of the story to that of the confrontation of Scipio and Sulla (Scipio is once again deserted by his troops), I am inclined to accept as genuine, since the two stories are not identical and, given that there was much desertion from the Marian side during the Civil War, the mere repetition of the motif need not be suspicious. The other problem is how many separate periods of troop-raising Pompey engaged in. Appian<sup>56</sup> says there were two, yielding first one legion then, later, two more; the other sources suggest only one period, yielding a total of three legions.<sup>57</sup> Appian is probably right,<sup>58</sup> in which case the second body of troops can correspond with the ones that the three generals in Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 were attempting to defeat. This would make it quite possible that the events under H above belong later in the train of events than those under A–E; and if H (ii) is reliable, then some time must have elapsed between B (ii) and H (ii). Of course,

<sup>47</sup> App. 1, 85–6; Livy, per. 85; Plut. Sulla 28, 1–3, Sert. 6, 2; Sall. hist. 1, 34 and 91 M., Diod. 38/39, 16; Dio 30/35, frag. 107, 2; Vell. 2, 25, 2; Cic. Phil. 12, 27; 13, 2; Schol. Bobb. 126 St.; Eutrop. 5, 7, 4; Flor. 2, 9, 19; Exuper. 7.

<sup>48</sup> Diod. 38/39, 16; (?) App. 1, 95.

<sup>49</sup> App. 1, 86.

<sup>50</sup> App. 1, 86; (?) Plut. Pomp. 8.

<sup>51</sup> App. 1, 86.

<sup>52</sup> App. 1, 80; Livy, per. 85; Plut. Pomp. 6 ff.; Diod. 38/39, 10; Dio 30/35, frag. 107, 1; Vell. 2, 29, 1–2; bell. Afric. 22, 2. Other references in MRR II 64.

<sup>53</sup> App. 1, 80; Plut. Pomp. 8; Livy, per. 85; Dio 30/35, frag. 107, 1.

<sup>54</sup> Plut. Pomp. 7.

<sup>55</sup> It is contemporary with the murders carried out in Rome by Brutus (MRR II 67) and the victory of Metellus over Carrinas (App. 1, 87) both of which belong in 82 B. C.

<sup>56</sup> 1, 80.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. note 52.

<sup>58</sup> There is no obvious reason why he should have invented two periods of recruiting, whereas of the other sources some are too incomplete to reveal clearly what they thought on the matter, others operating in topical or rhetorical context have no interest in precise details.



since the organization of Plutarch, Pompey 7 is essentially topical rather than chronological, we cannot tell how much time elapsed between H (i) and (ii) (though we can take it that they occurred in that order since Plutarch says so). Therefore, fixing H (ii) as some time after B (i) and (ii) does not *necessarily* fix H (i) in the same relation to B (i) and (ii); but it is certainly possible that H (i) follows B (i) and (ii) – in other words, that the attack on Pompey is subsequent to the failure of Norbanus and Scipio to contain Sulla in Campania.

These results have a bearing on our main problem. The proposition that Norbanus detached Coelius to oppose Pompey while he himself still had Sulla to contend with (i. e. before A and indeed at any time up to C) might have seemed a doubtful one. Could Norbanus have afforded to weaken himself in such a way? But if all the opposition to Pompey under H above can be put after the clashes in Campania and after Sulla had decided to press on leaving Norbanus at Capua to his own devices, then it would be perfectly acceptable to imagine Norbanus turning over a section of his (admittedly depleted) forces to the attempt to knock Pompey out of the picture. In general, one might conclude that, although the Marians were perhaps aware quite early on of the danger presented by Pompey's activities,<sup>59</sup> they initially pinned their hopes on the line of defence created by the consuls in Campania. Only when Sulla had brushed that aside did they turn to the neutralization of Pompey. What Norbanus might have been up to while his legate Coelius was failing to contain Pompey is hard to say. Apart from a cryptic remark in Appian (ἀναστήσας Σύλλας ἐχώρει πρόσω τὰ πολέμια πάντα δηῶν· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Νωρβανὸς ἔπραττε κατ' ἄλλας ὁδοῦς)<sup>60</sup> nothing is known of him until the Battle of Faventia in 82 B. C. The conclusion of the «Periocha» of Livy 85 (*praeterea expeditiones per totam Italiam utriusque partis ducum referuntur*) may or may not refer in part to events in the latter part of 83 B. C., but in any case affords no precise information. Appian<sup>61</sup> says that much of the second half of 83 B. C. was taken up by troop-recruiting on both sides. Perhaps Norbanus was occupied in such a way in central/south Italy (there were Lucanians in the Marian forces in 82 B. C.)<sup>62</sup> but there is really no way of knowing.

I suggest therefore that a construction of the evidence can be made which allows C. Coelius Antipater to have been active in both 83 and 82 B. C. as a legate of Norbanus. It should be stressed however that this precise construction does not have to be correct to enable us to identify the third general in Plutarch with Appian's Γάιος Ἀντίπατρος. All sorts of redistribution of bodies of troops and of legates may have occurred between summer 83 and 82 B. C.; or the alternative reading of Appian on the subject of Coelius' relation to Norbanus may be correct

<sup>59</sup> This is particularly likely if Appian's version of Pompey's recruiting is correct.

<sup>60</sup> 1, 86.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> App. 1, 90.

and the supposition that Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1 excludes Coelius' being a legate of Carbo false (above p. 141 f.). In either of these cases, the necessity of making a construction such as I have proposed is removed, as far as the identification of the third general is concerned. But whatever exact decision is made on these matters, the evidence of Appian about C. Coelius Antipater surely affords a very strong substantive argument in favour of the text of S (and L) at Plutarch, Pompey 7, 1. It makes it certain that there was a Coelius who was in a position to be the third general in that passage, whereas it remains quite uncertain that there was a Cloelius who could have filled the role.

We are still, of course, left with a decision to make. Some, for example, may think that Κλοίλιος in G has merit as a *lectio difficilior* (the corruption Κλοίλιος → Κοίλιος being a more likely one than Κοίλιος → Κλοίλιος). To attempt to measure that against the existence of a stronger substantive argument in favour of Κοίλιος is perhaps to compare incommensurables. A decision in favour of Κοίλιος would, however, be quite reasonable. In any case, the neglect (among historians at least) into which S's reading has fallen of late is clearly undeserved,<sup>63</sup> and the establishment by the authority of BROUGHTON, WISEMAN and CRAWFORD of a *communis opinio* in favour of G should be firmly resisted.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>63</sup> S is, after all, «*accuratissime scriptus*» (ZIEGLER, *Plutarchus: Vitae Parallelae* I 1, Leipzig 1969, IX) and «*codex ille praeclarissimus*» (id., *op. cit.* [note 1] VI). Its reading should not, therefore, be lightly discarded.

<sup>64</sup> Warmest thanks are due to ROBIN SEAGER and JOSETTE JACKSON for helpful comments on both the substance and style of an earlier draft of this paper.

