There are well-known examples of Pompeius’ abandonment of his supporters: Marcus Tullius Cicero and Titus Annius Milo spring readily to mind. One could even include Pompeius’ one-time father-in-law Gaius Iulius Caesar among the number, I suppose. Theirs was a fairly spectacular falling out, leading to the final collapse of the ailing and civil-war-torn Roman republic. The bond between them, forged by the marriage of Caesar’s daughter Julia in 59 and maintained by a delicate and precarious support of each other in the first half of the 50s, was not broken by Julia’s death in childbirth in 54. Having no sons of his own, Caesar had named his son-in-law as principal heir in his will, and his name was not removed until five years later on the outbreak of the civil war (Passage 1: Suet. Iul. 83.1-2),* by which time Pompeius had manoeuvred himself – or had he perhaps been manoeuvred? – over to the side of the senatorial conservatives in his endless pursuit of their recognition and acceptance of him as the leading man in the state.

The leitmotif of Pompeius’ manoeuvres throughout his career was an overriding concern for the personal political advantage of every move he made – what would best get him ahead in this pursuit of recognition. One of the things which shows this to good effect is his series of marriages – five of them in all. So I will begin my examination of Pompeius’ abandonment of connections, not with an obvious political supporter, but with his dealings with his first two wives, which had sad consequences for both of the ladies involved, as it turned out. His treatment of them shows Pompeius’ self-interested cynicism and unfeeling (and unfailing) ambition.

Pompeius’ first marriage, to a lady called Antistia, took place c. 86. Not a great deal is known of her. She was the daughter of a praetor P. Antistius, before whom Pompeius had appeared on a charge of possessing stolen property. Antistius was so impressed with Pompeius’ rhetorical ability that he secretly offered his daughter in marriage to him; a few days after his acquittal Pompeius married her (Passage 2: Plut. Pomp. 4.2-3). When Pompeius was

* The passages referred to in the text can be found, in their original language with an English translation, in the Appendix at the end of this paper.
persuaded by Sulla to divorce her and marry his step-daughter Aemilia in 82, Antistia became a pitiable victim (Passage 3: Plut. Pomp. 9.3). Her father had already been put to death by the younger Marius because of his connection with the pro-Sullan Pompeius; as a consequence of that killing her mother had committed suicide. After the divorce nothing further is heard of Antistia.

By persuading Pompeius to divorce Antistia and marry Aemilia. Sulla no doubt wished to bind more closely to himself this ambitious young man, who once reportedly told the dictator that more people worshipped the rising than the setting sun. It no doubt suited Pompeius to be allied to the man who now controlled Rome, and he was soon rewarded with an important military command, a praetorian imperium to pursue the Marian supporter Carbo first to Africa and then to Sicily. The marriage plan apparently had the approval also of Caecilia Metella (Passages 4 (a) and (b): Plut. Pomp. 9.2, Sull. 33.3), who was at that time married to Sulla. She was the mother of Aemilia by her previous marriage to the grand old man of conservative senatorial politics, M. Aemilius Scaurus. At the time, Aemilia was actually pregnant to her former husband, M'. Acilius Glabrio, when she was divorced from him and given in marriage to Pompeius. Unfortunately for Aemilia, after being used in the game of dynastic politics, she died in childbirth soon after coming to Pompeius’ house. Interestingly, Aemilia’s brother Marcus married Pompeius’ third wife Mucia after her divorce from him in 62. Talk about keeping it in the family!

The next instance of an abandonment by Pompeius comes in 78-7 with M. Aemilius Lepidus, the consul of 78, who had profited from the Sullan proscriptions but who had now campaigned for office on an anti-Sullan platform, threatening to repeal elements of the Sullan legislation during his consulship. Pompeius had supported Sulla with a private army of three legions when the latter returned to Italy from the East in 83 to deal with what his political opponents were doing to him there. He had accepted advancement under Sulla when he became dictator and had agreed to the beneficial alliance with Sulla through marriage to Aemilia. Despite that Pompeius now turned to supporting Lepidus’ consular candidature, much to the annoyance of Sulla (Passage 5: Plut. Sull. 34.4). Yet when Lepidus, thwarted by the pro-Sullan elements in the senate over his attempts to repeal some of the Sullan legislation, broke out in rebellion in northern Italy and marched towards Rome, an army under the loyal consul of 77, Q. Lutatius Catulus, was sent against him and pushed him back to Etruria; Pompeius was appointed to operate against Lepidus’ legate, M. Iunius Brutus, also in the north of Italy, whom he defeated and put to death (Passages 6 (a) and (b): Liv. Per. 90;
Plut. Pomp. 16.2-5). He then advanced to Etruria where he defeated Lepidus at Cosa. Clearly you wouldn’t want Pompeius as a supporter if he was going to change sides as rapidly as that.

M. Aemilius Scaurus was another who got dumped. The consular elections of 54 had been chaotic. One of the four leading candidates was Scaurus, who had once been briefly Pompeius’ brother-in-law (through his marriage to Aemilia, Scaurus’ sister) and who was now married to Pompeius’ ex-wife Mucia. Scaurus had earlier served as quaestor under Pompeius in the East, and might have expected his commander’s support. But that service was before Pompeius’ divorce of Mucia and her re-marriage to Scaurus. Scaurus was also being prosecuted in 54 for extortion in his praetorian province of Sardinia the year before; despite the large number of supporters – six defence counsel and ten senators who appeared on his behalf, Pompeius was not among those present in court, content merely to send in a laudatio for him (along with eight other consulars). He had the convenient excuse that he had to stay outside the pomerium as he was currently a proconsul. It seems that relations between the two had cooled as a result of Scaurus’ marriage to Mucia (Passages 7 (a) and (b); Cic. Att. 4.15.7; Ascon. Scaur. 28.7C).

In the consular campaigning, bribery reached unprecedented and scandalous levels as the candidates made alliances which cut across their previous and present connections. Because of this Pompeius was left with only Scaurus, but he was not so keen on him and his chances had therefore diminished. The elections kept getting postponed, as the news of the bribery scandals broke and as those implicated in them were prosecuted for electoral corruption, and so the year 53 began without consuls. Eventually Pompeius was called on by the senate to conduct the elections, and Gnaeus Domitius Calvinus and Marcus Valerius Messala Rufus were successful, entering office six months late.

Then there is the case of Publius Plautius Hypsaeus, a candidate for the consulship of 52. He had been a quaestor under Pompeius in the East in the 60s, and most likely retained as proquaestor (MRR 2.153, 163 and 181). It was not unusual for a commander to have some influence over the choice of a quaestor to work with him, from the college of twenty who were elected each year. The Plautii possessed long-standing affiliations with Pompeius (Gruen, The Last Generation of the Roman Republic 108 n. 65); for example, a law proposed by a tribune Plotius in 70 (?) provided for allotments of land for Pompeius’ Spanish veterans. It is likely therefore this Plautius Hypsaeus was chosen as Pompeius’ quaestor because of those connections.
The consular elections for 52 were also disturbed by violence, and this year also began without consuls. The main candidates were: Hypsaeus, Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica, and Titus Annius Milo. Despite Milo having worked in Pompeius’ interests in recent years, for example in the recall of Cicero and in opposing the gangs of Clodius with gangs of his own, Pompeius did not favour Milo with his support for election for 52, but rather turned to Hypsaeus and Scipio, the latter soon to be his new father-in-law and later in the year his consular colleague. After the fracas on 18th January between Clodius’ and Milo’s gangs on the Appian Way near Bovillae (some 20 km south-east of Rome) which led to the killing of Clodius, Pompeius became fearful of Milo – or pretended to be – and made it known that he did not wish to see him, refusing his requests to meet with him, remaining in his gardens outside the city and not in his house, surrounded by a strong bodyguard, and on one occasion suddenly dismissing a meeting of the senate because he feared that Milo was about to arrive (Passage 8: Ascon. Milon. 36. 18-23 C).

After being thwarted in the two previous consular elections, Pompeius now vigorously supported Hypsaeus’ candidature, because his political loyalty had proved reliable. As Asconius says, Hypsaeo summe studebat quod fuerat eius quaestor (Passage 9: Ascon. Milon. 35.17-18 C). However, Hypsaeus was not elected; due to the political disturbances, the elections were continually postponed and finally cancelled, Pompeius being appointed sole consul with the support of the senatorial conservatives in March. In the aftermath of the prosecution and condemnation of Milo de vi for the killing of Clodius (the trial took place in early April), Hypsaeus was prosecuted for electoral corruption (de ambitu), as all three candidates were. The operative law on electoral corruption was one of the two statutes introduced by Pompeius himself three days after entering office to deal with the political disturbances. Milo, after being found guilty on the charge de vi and going off into exile, was also prosecuted in his absence de ambitu and found guilty. While the charge of ambitus made against Scipio, about to become Pompeius’ father-in-law, was dropped, Hypsaeus received a brutal rebuff from Pompeius when he asked for his help, and being abandoned was found guilty of the charge and went off in exile (Passages 10 (a) and (b): Val. Max. 9.5.3; Plut. Pomp. 55.6).

Let us look lastly at the example of Quintus Pompeius Rufus and some other related events. The college of tribunes in 52 had been split over Pompeius’ attitude towards Milo. Marcus Caelius Rufus in particular spoke at various public meetings in support of Milo; he was
supported – naturally – by Cicero and Cato. Three other tribunes took the Pompeian line and spoke out against Milo’s interests: Titus Munatius Plancus Bursa, Gaius Sallustius Crispus (the future historian) and Quintus Pompeius Rufus. The latter had been a close friend of Clodius. In 51 at the end of his term of office Pompeius Rufus was prosecuted by Caelius under Pompeius’ law *de vi*. Despite having worked in Pompeius’ interests in 52, Rufus received no help from him and was reduced to appealing to his mother Cornelia – unsuccessfully (Passages 11 (a) and (b): Val. Max. 4.2.7; Cic. *fam.* 8.1.5). He was convicted, going off to live in exile and poverty in Bauli. Another one bites the dust.

Plancus Bursa also bit the dust. He had been the most outspoken of the tribunes in criticising Milo, and was now prosecuted *de vi*, possibly by Cicero himself in the unusual role of prosecutor – though there is some doubt about whether he took that role. At least in this case Pompeius tried to support Milo by sending in a written *laudatio*; Cato, who was a member of the jury at his trial, pointed out that this contravened Pompeius’ own law (Passage 12: Plut. *Pomp.* 55.5). In any case, Bursa was convicted and ended up in exile in Ravenna, as we have seen. Convicted too for electoral bribery was Scaurus, who was deserted on this occasion after such a large array had supported him at his trial in 54.

Before I move to a conclusion, and lest you think that Pompeius always acted totally in his own interests – well, he almost usually did – it would be informative to consider the case of Aulus Gabinius, which acts as a sort of “control” example to moderate the survey. Gabinius was the tribune in 67 who proposed the law giving Pompeius the extensive command against the pirates in the Mediterranean, for an extra-ordinary period of three years with huge financial and military resources. Gabinius was married to a Lollia, usually taken to be the daughter, but possibly a sister, of another pro-Pompeian tribune, M. Lollius Palicanus. As tribune in 71 Palicanus supported the campaign of Pompeius to secure the consulship of 70 on a platform of restoring the tribunician powers which Sulla had taken away. Gabinius was appointed as a legate to serve under Pompeius in the East from 66 to 63. Then he was elected to a consulship for 58 with the support of Pompeius, Crassus and Caesar – the gang of three – as a colleague of Caesar’s new father-in-law, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, thus ensuring a favourable executive for the triumvirs in the year after Caesar’s consulship.

Gabinius was assigned the province of Syria, where he was governor from 57 to 54; he alienated the *publicani* by largely taking over tax collection for his own benefit, and improperly interfered in Egypt by restoring Ptolemy Auletes (supposedly for a bribe of 10,000
talents). Having contravened several laws, Gabinius was prosecuted on his return first for *maiestas* (over the restoration of Ptolemy); Pompeius worked hard to secure his narrow acquittal in that trial by 38 votes to 32 (*Passage 13*: Cic. *Att.* 4.18.1). Next he was prosecuted for *repetundae*; Pompeius again rallied to protect his associate, pressuring Cicero, who had been a trenchant critic of Gabinius for a number of years, to do an ignominious volte-face and undertake the defence (*Passage 14*: Dio 39.63.2-5). Despite Pompeius’ active support and Cicero’s defence speech Gabinius was found guilty this time and went off into exile. It is hard to understand why Pompeius so consistently supported Gabinius, particularly in the trials after the return from his governorship, when he appeared so guilty. Perhaps the trials were seen as a test of the political reputation of Pompeius himself and the other two triumvirs.

To return to the events of 52: do they represent a purge of those with whom Pompeius was linked? I don’t think so. The years 54-52 had been disturbed, scandalous and violent, and Pompeius was more than happy to impose his control to bring the chaos to an end. If that meant abandoning those who had supported him at some stage, then so be it. He saw it as more important to maintain his reputation as the leading man in the state, and he was prepared to be disloyal to his friends and to sacrifice them to ensure that. His abandonments in those years are symptomatic of his methods to advance his single-minded political ambition.

**BRUCE MARSHALL**

**ASCS HONORARY SECRETARY**

**MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY**
**GAIUS IULIUS CAESAR**

**Passage 1:** Suet. *Iul.* 83.1-2

Quintus Tubero tradit heredem ab eo scribi solitum ex consulatu ipsius primo usque ad initium civilis belli Cn. Pompeium, idque militibus pro contione recitatum. sed novissimo testamento tres instituit heredes sororum nepotes, . . .

Quintus Tubero records that from the time of his first consulship until the outbreak of the civil war Caesar had written down Gnaeus Pompeius as [principal] heir [in his will], and he used to read out this part [of his will] to his assembled troops. But in his most recent will [drawn up six months before his assassination] he named as heirs his three grand-nephews on his sisters’ sides. . . .

**ANTISTIA**

**Passage 2:** Plut. *Pomp.* 4.2-3

As soon as Pompeius [Strabo] was dead, Pompeius, as his heir, was put on trial for the theft of public property. . . . He had quite a few preliminary examinations in the case at the hands of the accuser. Since he showed in these an acumen and poise beyond his years, he secured such a great reputation and favour that the praetor and judge in the case took a great liking to Pompeius and offered him his own daughter in marriage and conferred with his friends about the matter. Pompeius accepted the offer and a secret agreement was made between them. Nevertheless the matter did not escape the attention of the populace because of the obvious enthusiasm of Antistius. Finally, when Antistius pronounced the jurors’ verdict for acquittal, the people, as if on a given signal, shouted out the ancient and traditional acclamation at marriages “Talasio!”.

**Passage 3:** Plut. *Pomp.* 9.3

As soon as Pompeius [Strabo] was dead, Pompeius, as his heir, was put on trial for the theft of public property. . . . He had quite a few preliminary examinations in the case at the hands of the accuser. Since he showed in these an acumen and poise beyond his years, he secured such a great reputation and favour that the praetor and judge in the case took a great liking to Pompeius and offered him his own daughter in marriage and conferred with his friends about the matter. Pompeius accepted the offer and a secret agreement was made between them. Nevertheless the matter did not escape the attention of the populace because of the obvious enthusiasm of Antistius. Finally, when Antistius pronounced the jurors’ verdict for acquittal, the people, as if on a given signal, shouted out the ancient and traditional acclamation at marriages “Talasio!”.

**“With friends like this, who needs enemies?”**

**POMPEIUS’ ABANDONMENT OF HIS FRIENDS AND SUPPORTERS**

**APPENDIX – PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT**
. . . since he [Sulla] admired Pompeius for his high qualities and considered him a great help in the conduct of his affairs, he was anxious to attach him to himself by some sort of marriage connection. His wife Metella shared his wishes, and they persuaded Pompeius to divorce his wife Antistia and marry Sulla's step-daughter Aemilia, the daughter of Metella and [Aemilius] Scaurus, even though she had a husband already and was pregnant to him at that time. This arrangement of a marriage was therefore characteristic of a tyranny, and suited the needs of Sulla rather than the nature of Pompeius, with Aemilia given to him in marriage when she was pregnant with another man's child, and with Antistia driven away from him in dishonour and in a piteous way, since she had recently been deprived of her father because of her husband (for Antistius had been killed in the senate-house because he was thought to be a partisan of Sulla through his association with Pompeius). When her mother learnt of this, she took her own life, and the result was that this calamity was followed by a tragedy in the second marriage when Aemilia, immediately after entering Pompeius' house, died in childbirth.

AEMILIA

Passage 4 (a): Plut. Pomp. 9.3
See Passage 3 above.

Passage 4 (b): Plut. Sull. 33.3

. . . and women were married against their will to some [of his favourites]. In the case of Pompeius Magnus, wishing to establish a relationship with him, he [Sulla] ordered him to divorce the wife he had and then gave him Aemilia, a daughter of Scaurus and his own wife Metella; he took Aemilia away from [her husband] Manius Glabrio when she was pregnant to him. The young woman died in childbirth in Pompeius' house.

M. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS

Passage 5: Plut. Sull. 34.3-5

. . . and he [Sulla] put the consular elections under the control of the people; when they were held, he did not go near them, but walked around the forum like a private individual, exposing his person to any who wished to call him to account. Contrary to his wishes a certain bold political opponent of his was likely to be elected consul, Marcus Lepidus, not so much through his own efforts, but because of the success which Pompeius had in soliciting votes for him from the people. And so, when Sulla saw Pompeius leaving the polls delighted with his success, he called him over and said to him: “What a fine policy this is of yours, young man, to get Lepidus elected instead of Catulus, the most unstable instead of the best of all! Now surely, it is time for you not to drop your guard after strengthening your antagonist against yourself.” And in saying this, Sulla was like a prophet. For soon after Lepidus became rebellious and went to war with Pompeius and his supporters.

Passage 6 (a): Liv. per. 90

When Marcus Lepidus tried to repeal the measures of Sulla, he stirred up a war. He was driven from Italy by his [consular] colleague Quintus Catulus and perished in Sardinia after vainly engineering the war. Marcus Brutus, who was in possession of Cisalpine Gaul, was killed by Gnaeus Pompeius.

**Passage 6 (b): Plut. Pomp. 16.2-5**

... but he [Catulus] was thought to be better adapted to political rather than military leadership. The situation itself demanded Pompeius, and he did not take long in deciding which course to take; he took the side of the conservatives and was appointed commander of an army against Lepidus, who had already stirred up a rebellion in a large part of Italy and was holding Cisalpine Gaul through the army of Brutus. Pompeius had easily defeated other opponents who had come up against him, but at Mutina in Gaul he took a long time in the siege of Brutus. Meanwhile Lepidus had made a sudden advance on Rome, took up a position before the city and demanded a second consulship, terrifying the citizens with a large throng of followers. But their fear was dissipated by a letter from Pompeius which announced that he had brought the war to an end without a battle. For Brutus, either because he himself betrayed his forces, or because his army changed sides and betrayed him, put himself in the hands of Pompeius; he received an escort of horsemen and retired to a small town on the [river] Po. Here, just one day later, he was killed by Geminus, who had been sent by Pompeius to carry out the deed.

**M. AEMILIUS SCARUS**

**Passage 7 (a): Cic. Att. 4.15.7 (Rome, 27th July 54) (SB 90)**

Pompeius fremit, queritur, Scauro studet; sed utrum fronte an mente dubitatur.

Pompeius is raging, and growling, and backing Scaurus – but whether ostensibly or in earnest is doubtful.

**Passage 7 (b): Ascon. Scaur. 28.7 C**

laudaverunt Scaurum consulares novem . . . Cn. Pompeius Magnus. horum magna pars per tabellas laudaverunt quia aberant, inter quos Pompeius quoque; nam quod erat pro cos. extra urbem morabatur.

Nine men of consular rank submitted supporting testimonials, . . . [eight other names] . . . Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus. Of these a large number sent in their testimonials by letter, because they were absent, among them also Pompeius; for as proconsul he remained outside the city.

**T. ANNIIUS MILO**

**Passage 8: Ascon. Milon. 36.18-23 C**

timebat autem Pompeius Milonem seu timere se simulabat; plerumque non domi suae sed in hortis manebat, idque ipsum in superioribus circa quos etiam magna manus militum excubabat. senatum quoque semel repente dimiserat Pompeius, quod diceret timere se adventum Milonis.

Now Pompeius was afraid of Milo – or pretended that he was afraid. For the most part he stayed not in his town house but on his suburban estate, and on the higher parts of it at that, around which was also stationed at night a large detachment of soldiers. On one occasion also Pompeius had suddenly dismissed [a meeting of] the senate, on the grounds, he said, that he feared the arrival of Milo.
Q. PLAUTIUS HYPSAEUS

**Passage 9:** Ascon. Milon. 35.17-18 C

Hypsaeo summe studebat quod fuerat eius quaestor.

He was giving Hypsaeus a great deal of support because he had been a quaestor of his.

Q. POMPEIUS RUFUS

**Passage 10 (a):** Val. Max. 9.5.3

Cn. autem Pompeius quam insolenter! qui balneo egressus ante pedes suos prostratum Hypsaeum ambitus reum, et nobilem virum et sibi amicum, iacentem reliquit contumeliosa voce proculcatum: nihil enim eum aliud agere quam ut convivium suum moraretur respondit; et huius dicti conscius securo animo cenare potuit.

How insolent then was the conduct of Gnaeus Pompeius! Coming from his bath he left Hypsaeus, who was a defendant on a charge of electoral corruption, a nobleman and a friend of his, lying prostrate at his feet after trampling him with a brutal insult. For he told him that he was doing nothing but holding up his dinner; and with this comment on his mind he could dine with a clear conscience.

**Passage 10 (b):** Plut. Pomp. 55.6

A few days afterwards [following Plancus Bursa’s trial], Hypsaeus, a man of consular rank, who was facing a prosecution, lay in wait for Pompeius as he was returning from his bath for dinner; he clasped his knees and begged for his favour. But Pompeius passed on contemptuously, telling him that, apart from spoiling his dinner, he was accomplishing nothing else.

T. MUNATIUS PLANCUS BURSA

**Passage 11 (a):** Val. Max. 4.2.7

Caelii vero Rufi ut vita inquinata ita misericordia, quam Q. Pompeio praestitit, probanda. cui a se publica quaestione prostrato, cum mater Cornelia fidei commissa praedia non redderet atque iste auxilium suum litteris implorasset, pertinacissime absenti adfuit: recitavit etiam eius epistolam in iudicio, ultimae necessitatis indicem, qua impiam Corneliae avaritiam subvertit. factum propter eximiam humanitatem ne sub Caelio quidem auctore repudiantur.

As corrupt as Caelius Rufus’ life was, so the pity he showed Quintus Pompeius is commendable. He had struck him down in a public trial, but when Pompeius’ mother Cornelia did not hand over properties left for him in a will and he begged Caelius’ help in a letter, Caelius supported him in his absence most staunchly. He even read out Pompeius’ letter in court, describing his desperate need, by which he frustrated Cornelia’s unnatural avarice. An act of remarkable kindness, not to be spurned even though its author was Caelius.

**Passage 11 (a):** Cic. fam. 8.1.5 (from M. Caelius Rufus to Cicero, about 26th May 51) (SB 77)

urbe ac foro toto maximus rumor fuit te a Q. Pompeio in itinere occisum. ego, qui scirem Q. Pompeium Baulis embaenetiac facere et usque eo ut ego misererer eius esurire, non sum commotus et hoc mendacio, si qua pericula tibi impenderent, ut defungeremur optavi. Plancus quidem tuus Ravennae est et magno congiario donatus a Caesare nec beatu nec bene instructus est.

All over town and in the forum there was a great rumour that you had been murdered by Quintus Pompeius on your journey. Knowing that Quintus Pompeius is operating boats at Bauli with so little to eat that even I greatly pity him, I was unperturbed, and prayed that, if there were any dangers hanging over you, we should be rid of them for the price of this lie. Your friend Plancus [Bursa] is at Ravenna; despite a massive handout from Caesar, he is the same dismal dunderhead.
Once again, therefore, Pompeius came in for criticism, and it was further increased because, although he had put a stop by law to the submission of testimonials for those who were on trial, he came into court to deliver a laudatory reference for Plancus. Cato (who happened to be one of the jurors) clapped his hands over his ears and said that it was not right for him to listen to testimonials contrary to the law. Cato was therefore rejected as a juror before he could cast his vote, but Plancus was found guilty by the other votes to the shame of Pompeius.

### A. Gabinius

**Passage 13:** Cic. Att. 4.18.1 (Rome, between 24th October and 2nd November 54) (SB 92)

quo modo ergo absolutus? omnino πρώτα πρύγνα accusatorum incredibilis infantia, id est L. Lentuli L. f., quem frement omnes praevaricatum, deinde Pompeii mira contentio, iudicum sordes. ac tamen XXXII condemnarunt, XXXVIII absolverunt. iudicia reliqua impendunt. nondum est plane expeditus.

How, you might ask, did he [Gabinius] manage to get acquitted? To be sure, the main thing was the unbelievable incompetence of the prosecution, that is, Lucius Lentulus the son of Lucius, whom everyone loud and clear accuses of collusion; add to that Pompeius’ extraordinary efforts and some corrupt jurymen. Even so, 32 voted for “guilty” and 38 “not guilty”. The other trials are still hanging over him. He is clearly not out of the woods yet.

**Passage 14:** Dio 39.63.2-5

As a result they [the jurors] found him guilty [of provincial extortion], even though Pompeius was near at hand and Cicero acted as his defence counsel. Pompeius had been away from the city looking after the corn supply, since much of it had been ruined by the river, but he hurried back in order to be present at the first trial (for he was in Italy). When he missed that, he did not retire from the suburbs until the other [trial] was also finished. In fact, when the people assembled outside the pomerium (since he was not allowed to enter the city as he already held the office of proconsul) he addressed them at length on behalf of Gabinius, and read to them a letter sent to him by Caesar in support of Gabinius, and also made entreaties to the jurymen. He also prevented Cicero from prosecuting Gabinius again, and actually persuaded him to defend the man. As a result the charge and epithet of “turn-coat” was applied to Cicero more than ever.