

# *Metellus and the Head of Sertorius*

C. F. KONRAD  
University of Colorado  
Boulder

Some time between 79 and 74 B.C., Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius (cos. 80), then governor *pro consule* of Hispania Ulterior and engaged in a war against a number of Lusitanian and Celtiberian tribes in league with the remnants of the Cinno-Marian regime under the leadership of Quintus Sertorius, issued a proclamation to the effect that he would give the sum of one hundred talents in silver and 20,000 *iugera* of land as a reward to any Roman who should murder the rebel leader. In addition, if the assassin should happen to be an exile, he was to be granted permission to return to Rome<sup>1</sup>. Even at a time when considerable rewards were handed out for delivering the heads of political enemies, this was an exorbitant prize. When was the offer made, and exactly to whom? Was it sincere? And, where did the money come from?

## 1. The Date

Plutarch (*Sert.* 22.1) reports Metellus' proclamation immediately after his account of the campaign of 75 B.C. (*Sert.* 21.5-9), and accordingly most modern authorities, e.g., Schulten, Grispo, and Ooteghem, have dated it to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *Sert.* 22.1: ἐπεκήρυξε γάρ, εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἀνέλοι Ῥωμαῖος, ἑκατὸν ἀργυρίου τάλαντα δώσειν καὶ πλῆθρα δισμύρια γῆς, εἰ δὲ φυγᾶς, κάθοδον εἰς Ῥώμην. On the equation of πλῆθρον with *iugerum*, see W. Becher, *RE* 21.1 (1951), 235.

winter of 75/4 or the spring of 74<sup>2</sup>. More recently, Spann argued that the proclamation should be dated in 78, on the grounds that *Sert.* 22.5-12 narrate events which belong in the early years of the war, and that it was during the same time (79-77) that Metellus was reduced to helplessness and hopelessness by Sertorius' guerilla warfare<sup>3</sup>.

Chronology is not generally Plutarch's principal criterium for arranging his material, and yet his narrative of the war, from Sertorius' first arrival in Spain in ch. 6 to the end of 75 in ch. 21, is remarkably in accordance with chronological sequence, as can be easily ascertained from the parallel tradition (Livy's *Periochae*, Appian, Orosius, and those Sallust fragments whose assignation to Book One or Two is safe). Only chapters 16 and 17 can reasonably (not with certainty) be argued to belong before Perperna's arrival (ch. 15) chronologically, and the events of ch. 14 presumably happened parallel to those of 12 and 13. Moreover, our chapter divisions are not Plutarch's: from the fact that 22.5-12 are out of sequence it does not follow that 22.1 is out of sequence, too, especially since it is evident that 22.2.-4 (Metellus' victory celebrations) follow in strict chronological order upon the end of ch. 21 (Pompey's letter to the Senate)<sup>4</sup>. As a matter of fact, 22.5 is one of the few instances where Ziegler in his edition indicates a chapter subdivision, certainly warranted by the drastic change in subject matter. If Plutarch found the proclamation mentioned by his source(s) in connection with Metellus' increasingly desperate situation in 78, there is no discernible reason why he should not have reported it in the same context: in ch. 13. His notice of Metellus' proclamation is best left where he put it: in the second half of 75 B.C., when Metellus retreated to His-

<sup>2</sup> A. Schulten, *Sertorius* (Leipzig, 1926), 122; R. Grispo, "Dalla Mellaria a Calagurra", *NRS* 36 (1952), 189-225; J. van Ooteghem, *Les Caecilii Metelli de la république* (Namur, 1967), 206.

<sup>3</sup> P.O. Spann, *Quintus Sertorius: Citizen, Soldier, Exile* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1976), 192.

<sup>4</sup> On Metellus' celebrations, see Sall. *Hist.* 2.70. That Pompey's letter was written at the end of 75 is evident from Sall. *Hist.* 2.98 part D. Metellus' return to Hispania Ulterior and his triumphal festivities in Corduba are usually assigned to 74, because of Plutarch's mistaken note that Metellus spent the winter of 75/4 in Gaul (*Sert.* 21.8) and the confused chronology of Appian *BC* 1.111, 112. Recent research has shown that the three great battles of the war (at Valentia, the Suero, and Segontia) were not fought in 75, as traditional opinion held, (e.g., Schulten, *Sertorius* 108, 112-116; Spann, *Sertorius* 105, 107-111), but in 76, and that the events narrated at the end of the second book of Sallust's *Histories*, including Metellus' return to his province, belong in 75 B.C. See H. Bloch, "The Structure of Sallust's *Historiae*: The Evidence of the Fleury Manuscript", in: *Didascalie. Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda* (ed. S. Prete, New York, 1961) 59-76; P. Frassinetti, "I fatti di Spagna nel libro II delle 'Historiae' di Sallustio", *StudUrb* (ser. B) 49.1 (1975), 381-398; C. F. Konrad, *A Historical Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Sertorius* (Ph. D. Diss., The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1985), 257-304.

pania and thus effectively ceased to participate in the conduct of the war<sup>5</sup>.

## 2. The Beneficiaries

In Plutarch's account, the offer of an award for killing Sertorius was limited to Romans and carried a special clause granting permission to return to Rome if the killer happened to be a *φυγάς*. Let us consider that clause first. What did Plutarch mean by *φυγάς*?

The word ordinarily denotes a fugitive, or, in a political context, a person in exile. But Metellus' edict must have been more specific. The Roman followers of Sertorius consisted of two categories with regard to their legal standing: *proscripti* and 'ordinary' *hostes publici*. *Proscripti* were all those – but only those – who had been on Sulla's Lists of Proscription, to which no names were added after June 1, 81 (Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 128). *Hostes publici* by decree of the Senate were the participants in the abortive revolt of Lepidus, most of whom had fled to Sertorius in 77<sup>6</sup>. A *hostis*-declaration pertaining to those *Sertoriani* who were neither proscribed nor *Lepidani* is not expressly recorded, but may be safely inferred from Cicero, *2Verr.* 5.146f, 151-154, and especially 155.

The distinction between a *hostis publicus* and a *proscriptus* was not merely one in name. A *proscriptus* was liable to be killed with impunity by anyone, a reward of 12,000 *denarii* (= HS 48,000) was paid for his head, his property was confiscated, and his descendants were barred from holding public office<sup>7</sup>. A *hostis populi Romani* (as the formal appellation ran) was equally liable to be killed with impunity, and his property was confiscated, but there was no fixed reward, if any, for his head, nor was the legal and civic status of his descendants affected (provided they were born before the *hostis*-declaration). Both *proscripti* and *hostes p. R.* ceased to be Roman citizens, but their inability to return to Rome was not so much due to a specific prohibition than to the fact that they had forfeited their citizenship as well as their lives<sup>8</sup>. What Metellus was promising must have been, legally, in the nature of a pardon rather than a mere permission to return.

Proscription occurred individually (Cic. *Dom.* 43: *poenam in cives Roma-*

<sup>5</sup> The events in Spain narrated in Appian *BC* 1.112.523f (Pompey's siege of Pallantia and Metellus' attack on Calagurris) and Liv. *Per.* 93 (attack on Calagurris) must be dated to 75, not 74; cf. above, note 4. No further activity of Metellus is recorded by the sources, nor is there reason to assume that he left Ulterior again for another campaign in the Celtiberian highlands. Sallust's description of his victory celebrations in Corduba (*Hist.* 2.70) plainly shows that Metellus had had enough of the war.

<sup>6</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 1.77.22; cf. Plut. *Sert.* 15; Flor. 2.10.1-3; Appian *BC* 1.107; Exuper. 7.1-4 W-L.

<sup>7</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.6; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 8.80.2; Liv. *Per.* 89; Vell. 2.28.4; Plut. *Sulla* 31.7f; and see M. Fuhrmann, *RE* 23.3 (1959), 2440-2444.

<sup>8</sup> Th. Mommsen, *StR* 3.1241-1250; cf. also R.A. Bauman, *Athenaeum* 51 (1973), 270-293, and E. L. Grasmück, *Exilium. Untersuchungen zur Verbannung in der Antike* (Paderborn, 1978), 108.

*nos nominatim sine iudicio constitutam*), and from the figures reported it is evident that the great majority of the proscribed were Senators and equestrians<sup>9</sup>. Besides Sertorius himself<sup>10</sup>, we can name a few among those with him. M. Perperna (Vell. 2.30.1) and L. Fabius Hispaniensis – a senator (Sall. *Hist.* 3.83) – are attested. Sertorius' Quaestor, L. Hirtuleius, had left Italy together with his commander in 82 and thus fell under Sulla's summary condemnation of all who had served as officers under the Marian regime after his abortive negotiations with the Consul L. Scipio at Teanum in the summer of 83 (Appian *BC* 1.95.441; cf. Oros. 5.21.10). His brother Quintus<sup>11</sup> may be numbered among the proscribed for the same reason; also Perperna's nephew (Appian *BC* 1.114.533) who probably started his career on his uncle's staff in Sicily in 83/2<sup>12</sup>. If Octavius Graecinus, C. Tarquinius Priscus, and the Instei brothers also belonged among Sertorius' original officers, as is probable<sup>13</sup>, they, too, will have been on the Lists. That is all we can tell. Certainly there were more<sup>14</sup>, but compared with the *Lepidani* and others who had fled *Sullae dominatio* their number must have been small.

All those Sertorians as were not *proscripti* would be *hostes publici*. In strict usage, the term undoubtedly included the common soldiers<sup>15</sup>, but those of them who were willing to change sides had no reprisals to fear. Upon taking *sacramentum* with Metellus or Pompeius, they would be considered Roman citizens again, as is evident from all civil wars from Sulla's onward<sup>16</sup>. In fact, Roman troops began to defect to Metellus in great numbers in 75 (Appian *BC* 1.112.520), and after Perperna's final defeat in 72, Pompeius granted pardon to all Sertorian soldiers asking for it (Cic. *2Verr.* 5.153), but not to the *proscripti*.

Did Metellus' offer extend to both *hostes publici* and *proscripti*? The Proconsul of Hispania Ulterior could probably pardon a *hostis publicus* that was willing to return to the Roman fold and thus ceased to be an enemy of the Roman People (as Lucullus seems to have done in the case of L. Magius and L.

<sup>9</sup> Val. Max. 9.2.1; Plut. *Sulla* 31.5f; Flor. 2.9.25; Appian *BC* 1.95.442.

<sup>10</sup> Liv. *Per.* 90; Oros. 5.21.3; Schol. Gron. 317.6 St.

<sup>11</sup> See F. Münzer, s.v. "Hirtuleius (4)", *RE* 8.2 (1913), 1963.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Diodor. 38/39.14; Plut. *Pomp.* 10.1f; 20.6.

<sup>13</sup> On the Instei, see Liv. *Per.* 91 frg. 22 W-M, and Münzer, s.v. "Insteius (1, 2)", *RE* 9.2 (1916) 1562; on Graecinus and Tarquinius, Frontin. *Strat.* 2.5.31 and Münzer, s.v. "Octavius (55)", *RE* 16.2 (1937) 1829f; s.v. "Tarquinius (8)", *RE* 4A.2 (1932) 2394.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Oros. 6.2.21. Some of the proscribed mentioned here will have come from Spain along with M. Marius.

<sup>15</sup> Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 126: *ut aut eorum bona veneant qui proscripti sunt... aut eorum qui in adversariorum praesidiis occisi sunt* provides a Sullan precedent: the second clause could hardly be understood as excluding *milites*.

<sup>16</sup> The troops that were slaughtered in the Campus Martius (Val. Max. 9.2.1: *quattuor legiones contrariae partis... in publica villa, quae in campo Martio erat, ...obtruncari iussit*) while Sulla gave a speech to the Senate apparently were Samnites and Lucanians: Plut. *Sulla* 29-30.1.

Fannius in the Third Mithradatic War)<sup>17</sup>. It is unlikely that he could pardon a *proscriptus*, whose death sentence was individually specified by law and not conditional upon his remaining an enemy of the State. The *hostis*-status of the *Lepidani* was formally revoked in 70 (?) by the *lex Plotia de reditu Lepidanorum*<sup>18</sup>. No *proscriptus* is known ever to have received a pardon. The Sullan proscriptions lost their legal force only in 49, with Caesar's restoration of the sons of the proscribed to their property and civic rights<sup>19</sup>. If Metellus' offer extended to the proscribed, he was breaking ranks with the attitude of the *boni* towards these people. But the material rewards he offered were equally unprecedented, and his aim was the complete isolation of Sertorius from his Roman followers, which could not be achieved except by including the *proscripti*. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how Metellus could have made good on his promise. He could not pardon a *proscriptus*. All he could do was to urge the Senate to authorize an act of repeal. Was Metellus Pius, one of the foremost pillars of the Sullan order, so influential in 75 that he could secure a senatorial pardon for the proscribed—or was he promising more than he could deliver?

There remains the puzzling limitation of Metellus' offer to the Romans in Sertorius' entourage. Why would the Proconsul exclude Iberians? Such a restriction was unusual: in their rewards, the Sullan proscriptions did not distinguish between Romans, non-citizens, and slaves<sup>20</sup>. It is tempting to suggest that in Metellus' edict, the material rewards (money and land) were offered to anyone, whether Roman or Iberian, whereas the return to Rome applied, logically enough, only to those Romans that had been declared *hostes* or proscribed; Plutarch's *ῥωμαῖος* would then be the result of his misunderstanding or, more likely, streamlining the terms of the announcement<sup>21</sup>.

Yet it must be remembered that Metellus' proclamation was far less due to despair than Plutarch would want us to believe. By 75, Sertorius had essentially lost the war; the question remaining was when he would be finally destroyed, and which of the Roman commanders would receive the credit for it: Pompeius or Metellus? Conceivably, Metellus did not feel a need to extend his offer to non-Romans. The atmosphere of suspicion and distrust it was

<sup>17</sup> Appian *Mithr.* 72.308, Dio 36.8.2; Ps. Ascon. 244.1-5 St.; cf. Cic. *2Verr.* 1.87.

<sup>18</sup> On the *lex Plotia*, see L. R. Taylor, *CP* 36 (1941) 113-132, esp. 121f, and T.R.S. Broughton, *MRR* 2.130, note 4.

<sup>19</sup> Cic. *Att.* 7.11.1 (note the phrase: *φυγάδων καθόδους*); 10.8.2, 13.1; Vell. 2.43.4; Suet. *Div. Jul.* 41; Plut. *Caes.* 37.2; Appian *BC* 2.48.198; Dio 41.18.2; 44.47.4; 45.17.1. See also V. Vedaldi Iasbez, "I figli dei proscritti sillani", *Labeo* 27 (1981) 163-213.

<sup>20</sup> The Triumvirs in 43 B.C. paid only 10,000 *denarii* to a slave (25,000 to a free man), but added freedom and his master's citizenship: Appian *BC* 4.11.44.

<sup>21</sup> On Plutarch's method of work and against the not uncommon tendency to attribute every inaccuracy in his biographies to his lack of understanding, see P. A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), *passim*, and C.B.R. Pelling's magisterial studies in *JHS* 99 (1979) 74-99 and *JHS* 100 (1980) 127-140.

bound to create between Sertorius and his Roman followers, particularly his inner circle of *proscripti*, many of whom had been his comrades-in-arms from the beginning, may have been enough for the Proconsul's purpose. It is perhaps no mere coincidence that also in 75/4, Sertorius replaced his Roman bodyguard with an all-Iberian unit (Appian *BC* 1.112.520). Soon we hear of worsening relations between Sertorius and his Roman entourage, culminating in frequent executions on charges of treason, and within a year or so, the once charismatic leader has turned into a reclusive, isolated, suspicious, and overbearing despot<sup>22</sup>. Considering all the evidence, it appears better to accept Plutarch's statement at face value.

### 3. Metellus' Sincerity

Metellus' willingness to keep his side of the bargain is not to be taken for granted. In 139 B.C., Q. Servilius Caepio (cos. 140), governor *pro consule* of Hispania Ulterior, succeeded in having the Lusitanian leader Viriatus assassinated by three of his associates; when they demanded their promised reward, he referred them to the Senate in Rome. The Senate refused to pay<sup>23</sup>. But from the sources, especially Appian, it is clear that Caepio approached the assassins specifically and in private: there was no public proclamation stating a fixed reward, to be collected by anyone who killed Viriatus. The public announcement would make it difficult for Metellus to go back on his promise. When in 121 B.C. the Consul L. Opimius publicly announced that he would give its weight's equivalent in gold to the person who would bring him the head of C. Gracchus, he kept his promise<sup>24</sup>. There is no doubt that Sulla (and later the Triumvirs) duly paid the announced awards for the heads of the proscribed<sup>25</sup>. It appears, then, that the basic sincerity of Metellus' offer need not be doubt-

<sup>22</sup> Liv. *Per.* 92, 96; Plut. *Sert.* 25.3-6; cf. 10.5-7; Appian *BC* 1.112.520-522, 113.526; and especially the revealing picture in Diodor. 37.22a. Sertorius' deterioration of character is usually dismissed as hostile tradition resulting from anti-Sertorian, pro-Pompeian propaganda (so most recently Spann, *Sertorius* [above, note 3] 118, 281, note 191). But the charges are well-attested, in particular by the sympathetic Plutarch, and must be taken seriously. Only too well do they fit the typus of the charismatic leader forsaken by good luck.

<sup>23</sup> Liv. *Per. Oxyrrh.* 55 (ed. O. Rossbach, Leipzig, 1910): *interfectores Viri [athi urbe pulsi sunt, praemium] negatum*; Appian *Iber.* 74.311-314; Eutrop. 4.16.2f; Auct. *De vir. ill.* 71.3f; Oros. 5.4.14; Ioann. Antioch. frg. 60 *FHG* 4.559; Suda s.v. Βοριανθος.

<sup>24</sup> Cic. *De orat.* 2.269; Diodor. 35.25; Val. Max. 9.4.3; Vell. 2.6.5; Plin. *NH* 33.48; Plut. *CGracch.* 17.4f; Flor. 2.3.6; Appian *BC* 1.26.119; Auct. *De vir. ill.* 65.6; Oros. 5.12.9.

<sup>25</sup> As Sertorius himself belonged to that group (Liv. *Per.* 90; Oros. 5.21.3), Metellus' proclamation, from a legal point of view, may have meant no more than raising the reward for this particular *proscriptus*, albeit to unprecedented heights.

ted, but his ability to deliver in the case of a *proscriptus* remains questionable.

#### 4. The Source of the Money

As Schulten observed <sup>26</sup>, the 20,000 *iugera* of the reward in land would certainly not have been assigned in Italy, but in Spain: to be precise, in Hispania Ulterior, where Metellus was governor. He would not have had too many difficulties in finding and assigning the land.

It is a different matter with the money. One hundred talents in silver were equivalent to 600,000 *denarii* or 2.4 million sesterces. That was fifty times the sum paid for the head of an ordinary *proscriptus* (which Sertorius was) and six times the censorial value of an *eques Romanus* (which he also was) <sup>27</sup>. We know that the Roman generals in Spain, Cn. Pompeius as well as Metellus Pius, were notoriously short of money <sup>28</sup>. The sum of HS 2,400,000 could not be conjured up from nothing, and we may ask out of whose pocket Metellus was prepared to pay it.

Surely we are not to assume that he took it from his privy purse. But we happen to know that in 75 (or late in 76), he received an unspecified amount of money, apparently raised in Gaul and designated to pay his troops <sup>29</sup>. A fragment of Sallust's *Histories* may shed some light on the matter.

*Hist.* 2.34\* M reads: *quae pecunia ad Hispaniense bellum Metello facta erat*. Maurenbrecher referred the fragment to 76 B.C., reasoning that by 75, Metellus was no longer in financial straits. While this may be right with regard to the time Metellus received the money <sup>30</sup>, it is probably not a correct interpretation of the fragment itself.

The passage begins with the relative pronoun *quae*; hence it is part of a larger syntactical structure. The preceding sentence, now lost, governing the relative clause of the fragment evidently must have dealt with the *pecunia* mentioned by the latter. The preceding sentence also cannot simply have stated that Metellus received some money (which seems to have been Maurenbrecher's assumption), for then the subsequent relative clause would be extremely clumsy, if not redundant ("the amount of x million sesterces arrived at Metellus' headquarters, which money had been made available to Metellus for the war in Spain"). Rather, the lost part of the fragment must have contained spe-

<sup>26</sup> Sertorius (above, note 2) 122.

<sup>27</sup> Plut. *Sulla* 31.7; *Sert.* 2.1; 3.1; cf. C. Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine* (2 vols., Paris, 1966-74) 2.1066 No. 324.

<sup>28</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 2.47.6, 98.2f.

<sup>29</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 2.98.9: *Gallia superiore anno Metelli exercitum stipendio frumentoque aluit*. Pompeius wrote his letter probably in December 75; *superiore anno* may mean "in the past year", cf. Spann, *Sertorius* 269, note 121.

<sup>30</sup> See above, note 29.

cific information about these funds, presumably about what happened to them—or the way in which they were spent. As the relative clause emphasizes the purpose for which the funds had been designated, i.e., the war in Spain, one may reasonably conclude that the actual use made of them as reported in the lost sentence was somewhat different from that intended purpose<sup>31</sup>. Metellus' proclamation comes to mind. Did the Proconsul announce that he would pay for the head of Sertorius the sum of 2.4 million sesterces, *quae pecunia ad Hispaniense bellum Metello facta erat*?

That the Senate would not allocate all that money to Metellus so he could withdraw from the war and let traitors do the work may be safely assumed. In Pompey's letter the money received by Metellus is clearly specified as *stipendium*, army pay. We need not suppose that Metellus withheld due payment from his troops, though. More likely, he made the funds for the reward available by disbanding part of his army—as has been shown above, the proclamation coincided with the Proconsul's effective retirement from the war.

While Metellus Pius was getting out of the fighting and used his troops' pay for putting a prize on the head of the enemy, Pompeius Magnus was desperate to obtain *stipendium* for his own army in order to continue the war; he had not received payments for two consecutive years<sup>32</sup>. The bitterness in 'his' letter to the Senate is understandable and need not be attributed to Sallust. But no open quarrel with Metellus is on record; Pompey's letter (in Sallust's words) gives barely a hint of bad feelings towards his colleague in Farther Spain.

## Epilogue

No one ever received the reward. M. Perperna, the man who assassinated Sertorius, would have qualified all right: he was a Roman and a *proscriptus*<sup>33</sup>. But he continued the struggle, was defeated by Pompeius, captured, and exe-

<sup>31</sup> F. Kritz thought that Metellus never had an opportunity for spending the money: "pecunia haud dubie ab adversariis intercepta fuit, aut alio modo eius usus Metello ereptus" (*C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum fragmenta* [Leipzig, 1856] 281 frg. 2.36). But from Pompey's letter it is evident that Metellus in fact did receive the money, and *facta erat* would seem to imply just that, not merely that money had been allocated which never reached its supposed recipient. Odd, too, that Plutarch should have passed over in silence such a spectacular feat of Sertorius. The matter was seen correctly by R. Dietsch, *Gai Sallusti Crispi quae supersunt, vol. II: Historiarum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1859) 56 frg. 2.73: "cum dictum sit, ad quid Metello pecunia decreta fuerit, inde facile conicitur, eam pecuniam in aliam rem consumptam fuisse".

<sup>32</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 2.98.2: *cum interim a vobis per triennium vix annuus sumptus datus est*. That would have been for the year 77, when he left Italy.

<sup>33</sup> Vell. 2.30.1. On the assassination, see Sall. *Hist.* 3.83; Diodor. 37.22a; Liv. *Per.* 96; Plut. *Sert.* 26; *Pomp.* 20.2; Flor. 2.10.9; Appian *BC* 1.113; Oros. 5.23.13.



cuted. So were his fellow conspirators, and probably all the proscribed<sup>34</sup>. Even if Perperna had tried to surrender and claim the award, one may doubt that he would have obtained it. Sertorius was murdered at Osca in Hispania Citerior, where Pompeius was commander-in-chief. For all we know, Pompeius had never subscribed to that proclamation of his colleague in Ulterior, and it was Pompeius who received, justly, the credit for bringing the Sertorian War to an end.

Not that Metellus had not tried. He had fought well at Italica and Segontia, he had offered an exorbitant reward, even to the point of promising a pardon to the *proscripti*, more perhaps than he could deliver. The *gloria* of having vanquished the rebel could have been his-if only someone had brought him the head of Sertorius<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>34</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 3.84f; Plut. *Sert.* 27; *Pomp.* 20.2-8; Appian *BC* 1.115.537; Oros. 5.23.13. There was no wholesale massacre of the rest of Sertorius' army. From Cic. *2Verr.* 5.151-153 it appears that a good number of his Roman followers were back to the City in 70 B.C., perhaps covered by the terms of the *lex Plotia de reditu Lepidanorum*. Some of his troops were settled by Pompeius in Aquitania at Lugdunum Convenarum (viz. Convenae): Hieron. *Advers. Vigilant.* 4; Isidor. *Orig.* 9.2.108; cf. Strabo 4.2.1f= C 150f; Plin. *NH* 4.108; and see M. Ihm, s.v. "Convenae", *RE* 4.1 (1900) 1172.

<sup>35</sup> I owe this point to Professor Jerzy Linderski. Both him and Professor Frances V. Hickson I wish to thank for kindly reading a draft of this paper and offering helpful suggestions. Thanks also to the Department of Classics of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for generously letting me use its research facilities.

