

SERTORIUS'S OVERLOOKED CORRESPONDENT?

Numismatic evidence can sometimes help to solve historical questions. One such coin may be the joint issue of C. Cassius and L. Salinator, dated by Michael Crawford to 84 B.C.¹). The first of this pair was probably the *cos.* 73, a member of the noble plebeian family of the Cassii Longini²). I propose connecting this particular Cassius with a report in several literary sources³). These sources tell us that, at the end of the Sertorian War in the late seventies B.C., when Pompey captured Sertorius's successor Perperna, the latter offered to show his captor letters from influential men in Rome (Plutarch's *Sertorius* specifies 'consulars') who had invited Sertorius to return home from Spain and to overthrow the Sullan regime.

A small controversy has raged concerning these reports. Was Perperna merely lying in order to save his life or is this a case of Plutarchan imprecision⁴)? If there was indeed an offer

1) M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge, 1974), No. 355.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 371. See *MRR* ii, 109. Admittedly, the identification of the *monetalis* with the *cos.* 73 is not assured; cf., e.g., E.S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1974), 126, n. 21. See also the final sentence of n. 10, below.

3) App., *B.C.* i. 115, 536: "[Perperna] ἐπιβλασφημούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὡς αὐθέντην Σερτωρίου καὶ βοῶντα πολλὰ μνηύσειν τῷ Πομπηίῳ περὶ τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ στάσεως"; Plut., *Pompey* 20. 7: "ὁ γὰρ Περπερνας τῶν Σερτωρίου γραμμάτων γερονῶς κύριος ἐδείκνυεν ἐπιστολάς τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ δυνατωτάτων ἀνδρῶν, οἳ τὰ παρόντα κινῆσαι βουλύμενοι πράγματα καὶ μεταστῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν ἐκάλον τὸν Σερτώριον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν"; Plut., *Sertorius* 27. 3: "τῶν Σερτωρίου γραμμάτων κύριος γερονῶς ὑπισχεῖτο Πομπηίῳ δεῖξιν ὑπατικῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ δυναμένων αὐτογράφοις ἐπιστολάς, καλούντων Σερτώριον εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ὡς πολλῶν ποθοῦντων τὰ παρόντα κινῆσαι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν τὴν πολιτείαν."

4) E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus*² (Florence, 1967; First Ed., 1958), Comm. ad App., *B.C.* i. 115, 536, considers "consolari", certamente un errore ... a meno che non si alluda a Lepido", *cos.* 78. Cf. M. Gelzer, 'Das erste Consulat des Pompeius und die Übertragung der großen Imperien', *Kleine Schriften*, II (Wiesbaden, 1963), 150 and n. 18 (repr. from *Abh. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1943, *Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, Nr. 1); P.O. Spann, *Quintus Sertorius: Citizen, Soldier, Exile* (Diss. Univ. of Texas at Austin, 1976), n. 197 on p. 283.

specifying consulars, who were they? One approach is to maintain that there *were* no consulars who would have written to Sertorius, for the consuls of the Sullan restoration were Sullans. As Prof. Badian has cogently argued⁵), however, many of these Sullans had simply joined what promised to be the winning side, that of Sulla. During the seventies, Sertorius also may have shown promise, at least sufficient to warrant taking out 'insurgence' via correspondence with Sertorius.

Another approach is to accept the reports, to survey the consulars still living at the time, and attempt to trace closet *populares*. M. Perperna, *cos.* 92 and the father of the Perperna in Spain, C. Valerius Flaccus, *cos.* 93, D. Brutus and Mam. Lepidus, each *cos.* 77, and the possibly surviving M. Herennius, *cos.* 93, have all been surveyed, with more or less plausibility⁶). While not denying the plausibility of Perperna's lying or the likelihood that, among others, P. Cornelius Cethegus, a *praetorius*, but also a powerful political boss and former Marian, wrote to Sertorius⁷), I suggest that the consul of 73, C. Cassius Longinus, would be an excellent choice⁸). Admittedly, Cassius was not a consular during the early to middle seventies, the period of Sertorius's great success, when such correspondence would appear most likely – or least *unlikely*⁹). However, he had risen

5) E. Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla', in *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1964), 206–234 (repr. from *JRS* 52 [1962]).

6) Spann, *Quintus Sertorius*, 196f., n. 158, believes that M. Perperna, *cos.* 92 and father of the Perperna in Spain with Sertorius, and C. Valerius Flaccus, *cos.* 93, were the only surviving Marian consuls, with the exception of M. Herennius, *cos.* 93, who *may* have been alive during the seventies. Flaccus, however, seems to have accepted the Sullan regime: E. Badian, 'Notes on Provincial Governors from the Social War down to Sulla's Victory', *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, 95f. (repr. from *PACA* 1 [1958]). Spann also follows G. V. Sumner, 'Manius or MamerCUS?', *JRS* 54 (1964), 45f., in rejecting the interpretation of E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)* (Oxford, 1958), 277, which tended to link Mam. Lepidus and D. Brutus, the consuls of 77, with the rebellion of their relatives, M. Lepidus and M. Brutus, and to see them as somewhat sympathetic to Sertorius, inasmuch as they refused to go to Spain to fight *against* him. We cannot be certain. Cf. on this question B. Twyman, 'The Metelli, Pompeius, and Prosopography', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Festschrift J. Vogt*, I, 1 (Berlin/N. Y., 1972), 844f., 848f. It seems clear that there are a number of potential consular correspondents.

7) Cf. Spann, *Quintus Sertorius*, 197; Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 280, n. 3.

8) To my knowledge, this is an entirely new suggestion.

9) Even the *end* of Sertorius's rebellion is not excluded, if one accepts the weighty arguments of W. H. Bennett, 'The Death of Sertorius and the

to a consulship before 72, when Perperna apparently spoke. Under the circumstances, Perperna surely would have been entitled to call Cassius a consular, quite apart from Plutarch's customary imprecision.

What arguments favor Cassius? First, and most fundamental is the fact that the Cassii Longini had *numerous* ties with Marius, Cinna, and their faction(s)¹⁰, from which Sertorius had emerged¹¹). Second, a moneyer who held office in 84 must, one thinks, have been on good terms with that faction, for it was then dominant in Rome¹²). Third, Cassius's own colleague in his moneyership, with whom he coined jointly, L. Salinator, was a *legatus* of Sertorius in 81¹³). Fourth, interestingly, we have no information establishing Cassius as in any way a Sullan¹⁴), i.e.,

Coin', *Historia* 10 (1961), 459-472, especially 468 f., that Sertorius was still doing well, was 'a potential winner' (468) when his erstwhile supporters struck him down.

10) As the stemma (which, in certain details, is not beyond question) on p. 50 of G. V. Sumner's *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology* (Toronto and Buffalo, 1973) indicates, L. Cassius Longinus Ravilla, colleague in the consulship with Cinna's (probable) father during 127, was grandfather of the *monetalis* of 84; L. Cassius Longinus, colleague of Marius during the latter's first consulship in 107, was father of the *monetalis*; L. Cassius Longinus, *tr. pl.* 89, who took action on behalf of creditors, presumably for the most part *equites*, a class with which Marius and Cinna were associated (Diod. 34/35. 38. 1: Marius himself a *publicanus*; and Ascon. p. 89C), was brother of the *monetalis*. Not included on Sumner's stemma are Cassius Sabaco, a senator and a close friend of Marius early in the latter's career (Plut., *Marius* 5. 4-6); and C. Cassius, proconsular governor of Asia 89/88, who co-operated with the Marian Manius Aquillius, *cos.* 101, against Mithridates VI during the early eighties (*MRR* ii. 34 and n. 6 on p. 38; see also Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, 87f. and n. 106; and T. J. Luce, 'Marius and the Mithridatic Command', *Historia* 19 [1970], 186-90). The *praenomen* 'Gaius' borne by a Cassius of proconsular rank points to the Cassii Longini, who used the *praenomina* L., C., and Q., while *MRR* ii. 543f. lists no Cassii other than Longini of such high rank in that period (apart from this governor).

11) See B. R. Katz, 'Studies on the Period of Cinna and Sulla', *AC* 46 (1976), 507-13; *idem*, 'Notes on Sertorius', *RhM* 125 (1982), 18-22, 25.

12) After all, the period from 87 to 84 was known (later, and somewhat unfairly) as the 'Cinnae Dominatio'.

13) *MRR* ii. 78 and n. 5. Gabba suggests that Salinator set out from Italy with Sertorius as quaestor (in 83): *Republican Rome. The Army and the Allies*. Trans. P. J. Cuff (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1976), 112 (Italian Ed., 1973; repr. from *Athenaeum* 32 [1954]).

14) Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, 126: 'For only three consuls in the 70s are no Sullan connections discoverable: C. Cassius Longinus, ...'. See also *MRR* ii. 109, but this information does not estab-

as fundamentally opposed to Sertorius. In order to gain election to the consulship during 74, he must have accommodated himself to Sulla's new status quo, but old loyalties, old (family) ties are apt to have persisted. Whether earlier in the decade or as late as 73, correspondence with Sertorius, I suggest, was the result.

New York

Barry R. Katz

lish political allegiance. So, too, the conjecture of Twyman, *ANRW*, I, 1, 858, that Cassius had connections with Pompey in 73 is not only questionable, but, even if true, would not decisively conflict with my suggestion concerning Cassius's *earlier* ties. Indeed, a shrewd and not overly loyal politician would attempt to remain on good terms with all potential powers, as I note above. Cf. J. Suolahti, *The Roman Censors. A Study on Social Structure* (Helsinki, 1963), 670 and 672, considering Cassius 'of moderate views' and even a possible censor of 64 or 61. W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, IV² (Leipzig, 1908; repr. Hildesheim, 1964), 389, call Sertorius's correspondents 'Optimaten', a paradoxical designation.