

testo bantino potrebbe bene iscriversi — ma non è detto che si tratti di fenomeni contemporanei — nell'atmosfera creatasi in Italia intorno ai provvedimenti graccani e comunque in qualche modo continuata dalle leggi agrarie post-graccane e dal collegio dei III *vir* *a. d. a. i* (20). Non sappiamo se il 'contagio' romano abbia veramente toccato anche parti della periferia italiana come Bantia: ma se così fosse, si comprenderebbe bene anche la limitazione dell'*intercessio* tribunizia della *TBO* senza dover ricorrere necessariamente a Silla (21), potendosi la cosa esser verificata localmente, come reazione di ceti interessati allo sviluppo della proprietà e della conduzione della terra secondo i nuovi indirizzi prevalenti in territorio romano, e per ciò stesso i medesimi strati sociali inclini ad una «romanizzazione» della comunità lucana. È forse in questa prospettiva, ove hanno giuocato «assimilazioni» economiche di tal fatta ed alleanze locali con gruppi emergenti della colonia latina, che possiamo, se non spiegare, intuire alcuni dei motivi della singolare defezione di Venusia in occasione della guerra sociale (22).

La *TBO* si può probabilmente meglio comprendere nel clima del decennio anteriore al *bellum sociale*, saldamente attestata com'è tra 100 a.C. data del crollo dei provvedimenti eversivi di Saturnino cui è da riferire la *lex latina* (23), e 90 a.C., momento dello scoppio della rivolta alleata. Lo stesso *auguraculum*, la cui datazione archeologica da me proposta in passato tra 80 e 60 a.C. (24) si può senza difficoltà rialzare di un decennio, vista la palese impossibilità di cronologie al decennio delle ceramiche a vernice nera, fossile guida dell'acciottolato dei *lapides augurales*, può iscriversi nella stessa temperie: non sfuggerà infatti la più avanzata latinizzazione del nome della massima divinità nell'*auguraculum* rispetto alla presente e certo più antica epigrafe, *Iovi* rispetto a *Zoves*.

In conclusione, la nuova epigrafe, con i suoi dati linguistici (sarebbe infatti impensabile un testo ufficiale osco in una comunità municipale romana), paleografici e storico-istituzionali, legittima una cronologia anteriore alla guerra sociale di tutto un processo di «romanizzazione spontanea» di questa piccola comunità lucana, avviato già in pieno II sec. a.C. e di cui *TBO* ed *auguraculum* sono gli atti finali, immediatamente prima dello scoppio della guerra sociale: una romanizzazione che si configura come un'omologazione tanto economica quanto istituzionale, che non a caso riemerge nell'immaginario «romano» degli insorti, con il loro *senatus*, e i loro *imperatores*, e di cui la microstoria bantina è una spia luminosa.

Mario Torelli

(20) Su questi argomenti, oltre ai classici lavori di Brunt, non posso che rimandare alla sintesi di E. Badian, in ANRW I, 1, p. 668 ss., e soprattutto a E. Gabba, *Esercito e società nella tarda repubblica romana*, Firenze 1973, p. 193 ss. (con ampia bibl.).

(21) E' la *communis opinio* sulle limitazioni della potestà tribunizia a Bantia (cfr. H. Galsterer, *art. cit.*); tuttavia, ad un esame accurato tali limitazioni non sono del tutto assimilabili a quelle messe in atto da Silla, ma solo a una parte di esse e per la loro semplicità possono ben essere state «pensate» indipendentemente in funzione della difesa di interessi costituiti, rappresentati dal senato bantino.

(22) Diod. Sic. XXXVII, 2; Appian. B.C. IV, 3; cfr. M. Torelli, in *Atti XIII Conv. Int. St. Etr. It.* (Manfredonia 1980); in stampa.

(23) V. bibl. a nota 12.

(24) *Art. cit.* a nota 12, con «Rend. Linc.», s. VIII, XXIV, p. 39 ss.

#### FIGLINAE MARCIANAE

In a recent, closely argued monograph, Tapio Helen has shed a flood of welcome light on the Or-

*ganization of Roman Brick Production in the First and Second Centuries A.D.* (1). Working with immense patience from the most recalcitrant of evidence — brick stamps — he has redefined the structure of an entire industry in a work whose implications go far beyond its solid and somewhat forbidding title. Two of his conclusions hold particular interest for the history of Roman property. First, he clearly demonstrates that *figlinae* do not mean «manufactory» (for which the proper term is *officina*), but rather «clay-district». That is, it is not an administrative but a territorial term, a parcel of land like *praedium* or *fundus* but more specific in its designation, akin (one might say) to *saltus*, *horti* or the like. If Helen is right, we are obliged to adjust our focus. The *dominus* of the *figlinae* becomes not (or not merely) a businessman but a landowner, not the owner of a factory but the proprietor of an estate which happens to be rich in clay and, if it is being properly exploited, to include on it an *officina* devoted to the production of bricks and related items. Nothing precludes the existence elsewhere on the property of a luxurious villa or of working farms, just as one might find a pottery or a mine at no great remove from the house of an English landlord in a later day. Second, and concomitant, Helen convincingly shows that in almost every case the *offinator* was an entrepreneur and producer, independent of the *dominus*, and not a paid foreman or manager; the *dominus* was merely the landowner upon whose property the factory happened to stand. On the simplest view, the latter would be the *locator* of a parcel of land, the former its *conductor*. Thus the *dominus* is reduced from entrepreneur to rentier. One important result of this redefinition is immediately obvious. It has long been observed that the great preponderance of *domini* recorded on the brick stamps comes from the very highest classes of the empire, including knights and senators, imperial relatives, and the emperors themselves. What should now be abundantly clear is that these people were not actively engaged in profitable if undignified industry, but rather that they were just what we know or expect them to have been: landowners on a large scale who make proper use of their estates.

If the *domini* are seen as land-owning gentry rather than businessmen, their local context becomes all the more important, as one looks for the normal bonds of rural society, patronage and marriage alliances, feuds and friendships. Unfortunately the problems of locating the 70 or 80 known *figlinae* serving Rome are immense, and what little has been done does not inspire confidence (2). Nevertheless, one can narrow the possibilities somewhat by assuming that proper clay is not to be found everywhere, that a successful *officina* had access to considerable fresh water, and that generally speaking it lay not too far from the ultimate destination of its finished product; moreover (with luck), logic and external evidence may help. A brilliant example of what can be accomplished is offered by Helen in an excursus on the site of the *figlinae Caepionianae* which, with the aid of inscriptions and of the relationships to be deduced within and among certain families of *offinatores*, he locates in the territory of Ameria on the left bank of the Tiber, across from the town of Horta; and with similar evidence he demonstrates the very strong probability that four *figlinae* — *Caepionianae*, *Marcianae*, *Subortanae*, and *Ocianae* — are to be located in general proximity to each other, and near Horta, at the confluence of the Tiber and the Nar (3).

---

(1) *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum* 5, Helsinki, 1975.

(2) The promised investigation of T. Huotari has not yet appeared in the long-awaited *Acta IRF* 9; there is a disappointing section devoted to the subject (1507-1509) in M. Steinby's admirable *Pauly-Wissowa* article, *PW Suppl. Bd. 15* (1978) s.v. 'Ziegelstempel'.

(3) Helen 76-82; not unfortunately known to R.B. Lloyd, *AJA* 83 (1979) 193-204. Add to the evidence discussed by Helen that of the Register of the Monastery of S. Silvestro de Capite, *ASRSiP* 22 (1899) 21ff.; mid-tenth century confirmations of the monastery's possessions by pope John XII, mentioning the *massa Ortana* (at Horta) with its *massa Moiana* and (*fundus*) *Occiana*, and by his predecessor Agapitus II, mentioning the *massa Maiana* and the (*fundus*) *Ocianum*. These should be sufficient to locate the *figlinae Ocianae* definitely at Horta. Possibly also the *figlinae Ma(rc)ianae*?

Further support for these hypotheses will be offered below. It should moreover be noted that the area of these two river valleys on the border of Umbria and Southern Etruria was already identifiable as *figlinae* territory, witness (in addition to the *praedia Subortana* at Horta) the *f. Narnienses* further up the Nar, the *f. Ocriculanae* further down the Tiber, and the *f. pagi Stellatini* to the West.

The earliest named owner of two of these South Etrurian and Umbrian properties, the *figlinae Marcianae* and the *praedia Subortana*, was the emperor Trajan. The identity of previous owners is obscured by one of the many problems encountered in the study of brick stamps: until the early second century, *figlinae* may be named on the stamps but their *domini* are never clearly presented as such, that is, the persons named might be *officinatores* or other figures in the industry. Nevertheless something can be deduced about the earlier proprietors of one of these Trajanic estates, taking its start from a single name: Trajan's father was an Ulpus Traianus like himself, and his sister was an Ulpia Marciana; it is therefore usually supposed with more or less caution (for no other evidence than her daughter's name has been adduced) that Trajan's mother was a Marcia. Yet there is other evidence, for it would be a natural assumption that the *f. Marcianae* in the neighbourhood of Ameria were originally the emperor's private property, inherited from his mother and her family. By chance, the *f. Marcianae* have the longest documented history of all, their existence being amply attested as late as the reign of Diocletian (after the inevitable gap in the third century) and, more importantly, as early as that of Caligula (4). That is to say, the Spanish emperor Trajan may turn out to have unexpected roots in Italian landowning society.

Investigation of the previous ownership of the *figlinae Marcianae* should begin with one of the better known sepulchral monuments in the city of Rome, that of C. Sulpicius Platorinus, which stood on the far bank of the Tiber and was later just included within the Aurelian Wall. There several urns with funerary inscriptions were discovered which hold and record the remains of Platorinus and his family and which range in date from the reign of Augustus to that of Domitian or beyond. These were eventually edited in a supplement to *CIL VI* by Huelsen, with commentary by himself and Mommsen, but several problems remain. Eight persons are commemorated:

*CIL VI. 31761*, C. Sulpicius M.f. Vot. Platorinus, *sevir* and *Xvir stlitibus iudicandis*, by Sulpicia C.f. Platorina, wife of a Cornelius Priscus and presumably daughter of Platorinus. He is sometimes tentatively identified with the homonymous *monetalis* of 18 B.C. The relationship of these people to the others in the tomb is unknown.

31762, A. Crispinus Caepio. Normally equated with a man quaestor in Bithynia shortly before A.D. 15.

31763, Minatia Polla, about whom nothing is known.

31764, Su[lpicia C.f.? Plato]rina, presumably the dedicator of 31761 (above).

31765, Anonymous, in an acephalous inscription which commences with his senatorial career: *Xvir stl. iud., tr. mil., q., tr. pl., pr. / leg. Ti. Caesaris Augusti et / C. Caesaris Augusti*. Commemorated by two persons. The first is Crispina Caepionis f. uxor, presumably daughter of the man in 31762 (above) and thus a chronological aid to identifying him with the quaestor in Bithynia, since her husband flourished at the end of Tiberius' reign. The other dedicator is M. Septicius Q.f. C.n. C et Gemini / [Artori pronepo]s Sur[a]. The restorations in his filiation are assured by 31766 (below), which was erected by a Q. Marcius Q.f. C.n. C et Gemini Artori pronepos Barea Sura (5). M. Septicius and Q. Marcius

(4) See M. Steinby's fundamental «La cronologia delle *figlinae* doliare urbane», *BCAR* 84 (1974/1975) 7-132, at 61-66.

(5) Note also the newly discovered questor pro praetore of Creta-Cyrene, T. Manlius Sura Septicianus: *PW Suppl. Bd. 15* (1978) s.v. 'Manlius 67aa' (W. Eck). If the same man as the excitable orator Manlius Sura who was ridiculed by Domitius Afer (died 59), he will fit nicely as a son of M. Septicius

should of course be brothers, one of whom was adopted out of the family while retaining the cognomen and filiation of his birth. Which one? Given their common filiation, the praenomen of Q. Marcius Barea Sura should point the way, particularly in conjunction with the contemporary Q. Marcius C.f. Barea, proconsul of Africa in 41-43 (on whom see below): our anonymous Quintus of 31765, the father of Septicius and Marcius and himself C.f. C.n., should then be a Marcius, that is «Q. Marcius (Barea?) Sura» (6). Moreover, the inscription itself need not imply that his death fell between the years 37 and 41, for other, more senior offices might be lost at its head.

31766 = ILS 953, Antonia A.f. Furnilla, wife of Q. Marcius Q.f. C.n. C. et Gemini Artori pronepos Barea Sura. Huelsen, finding no Auli Antonii elsewhere, suggested that this woman was daughter of an A. Furnius and an Antonia, but her-real father or (perhaps more likely) her brother has recently turned up on a Pompeian tablet and proves to be a person of importance: A. Antonius Rufus, suffect consul in 45 (7). His rank is welcome knowledge, for Antonia Furnilla and Marcius Barea should be the parents of Marcia Furnilla, the second wife of the future emperor Titus, a deduction confirmed by 31768 (below).

31767, Anonymous. Observing here another reference to Artorius Geminus, Mommsen made the hazardous suggestion that this virtually unreadable epitaph records Octavian's physician, M. Artorius Asclepiades, who was drowned after the battle of Actium. Be that as it may, Artorius Geminus was clearly regarded as in some way the author of the family's glory. (Possibly the same as the M. Artorius Geminus, prefect of the *aerarium militare* shortly after A.D. 10.).

31768, Hermes, slave of Marcia, wife of the divine Titus. Suetonius (*Titus* 4.1-2) outlines the sequence of Titus' early career: after glorious service as a military tribune in Germany and Britain, he retired to private life in Rome and married (first) Arrecina Tertulla and, after her death, (second) Marcia Furnilla, whom he divorced after the birth of a daughter; he subsequently held office as quaestor and then departed to Judaea as legionary legate under his father. The stay in Rome should fall roughly within the period 60 to 65, which might suggest that Marcia Furnilla was born in the (early?) 40's.

31768a. Chius Rust., presumably likewise a slave (and on whom see below) (8).

Thus far the tomb of Sulpicius Platorinus, which might better be called the *monumentum Marciorum*. Its story becomes more complicated and more interesting with the introduction of two further and closely related characters. First, the *Fasti Ostienses* record that Q. Marcius C.f. Barea, the proconsul of Africa in the early 40's, had been consul suffect in 34, his full name being Q. Marcius Barea Sor[anus]. And second, it has long been seen that this man must have been the father of the famous Barea Soranus, consul suffect in 52, proconsul of Asia in the early 60's, and a victim of Nero in 66 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 55). This man, one of the tragic protagonists of Tacitus' *Annales* XVI (which breaks off just before his suicide), had long been disliked by the emperor and it might seem with good reason, for he had definite «Stoic» connections, that is, he was a pupil, friend, and patron of the Stoic philosopher Egnatius Celer (who betrayed him in the end), and his ruin is closely connected and intertwined by Tacitus with that of Thræsea Paetus (9). Moreover, it has been suggested that Barea Soranus had married a daughter of the historian Servilius Nonianus (cos. 35), who was himself the second father of the poet Persius, a Stoic adherent and

---

Sura given in adoption (cf. Eck, loc. cit.).

(6) Thus, correctly, M. Corbier, *L'aerarium Saturni et l'aerarium militare* (1974) 350. There seems to be no particular reason for the common view that he should be a Q. [Septicius], held by (e.g.) Huelsen *apud* CIL VI, p. 3157, and W. Eck in *Hisp. Ant. Epig.* 3 (1973) 306-309.

(7) *AE* 1974.274.

(8) «Chius Rust. f.f. xxv»: there is no sure expansion of «f.f.».

(9) Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.21-35, with Juvenal 3.116f. and Dio 62.26.

a relative of Thræsea Paetus<sup>(10)</sup>. Worse, Servilia, Soranus' daughter and an unwitting agent in his downfall, had been married by him into a veritable nest of rebellion: her husband had been exiled for implication in the Pisonian conspiracy, her father-in-law had participated in the uprising of Scribonianus in 42 and had committed suicide thereafter, and her brother-in-law (himself a son-in-law of the dangerous Corbulo) would soon be detected in conspiracy at Beneventum<sup>(11)</sup>. And further, one of the charges against Soranus was his friendship with the alleged conspirator Rubellius Plautus, who had been executed in 62<sup>(12)</sup>. In sum, innocently or not, Barea Soranus was caught in a web of his own making. To Tacitus, who would praise his *iustitia* and *industria*, he and Thræsea Paetus were the incarnation of *virtus*; Nero might be pardoned for viewing them otherwise.

For centuries Barea Soranus was known to history by his cognomina alone. The Ostian fasti, showing his presumed father Marcius Barea Soranus to have been consul in 34, allowed the reasonable supposition that he was a Marcius by birth, and an inscription communicated by Gatti to Degrassi for use in his *Fasti Consulares* (and still apparently unpublished) confirmed that he was indeed likewise a Marcius Barea Soranus. At last a wax tablet from Pompeii reveals his full name: Q. Marcius Barea Soranus<sup>(13)</sup>. To be sure, he is the only consul mentioned on the tablet (for dating purposes), which might raise doubt as to whether this is the consul of 52 or of 34, but the appearance of that energetic businessman C. Sulpicius Cinnamus on the tablet should allay any doubt: he appears on some seventeen other securely dated tablets (and seven undated), all of which fall within the years 43 to 55<sup>(14)</sup>. The simple establishment of the praenomen Quintus raises two serious problems for the *monumentum Marciorum*.

Q. Marcius Barea Soranus (cos. 52), the famous Barea Soranus, stood in the first rank in birth, wealth, and virtue (Dio 62.26.1), and he was presumably a Quintus Q.f. C.n.; Q. Marcius Barea Sura (of the *monumentum*) was of brilliant birth (cf. Suetonius, *Titus* 4.2), and he was a Quintus Q.f. C.n. (CIL VI.31766, above). Unless we accept the wildly improbable coincidence of two families of very distant cousins with all but identical names leaping into prominence at the same time, the two men must be intimately connected. But how? The patterns of Roman nomenclature forbid the possibility that a Q. Marcius Barea Soranus, a Q. Marcius Barea Sura, and a M. Septicius Sura could be brothers by birth. That leaves two possibilities. First, and safer, Barea Soranus could be a half-brother or a brother by adoption of the two Surae<sup>(15)</sup>. Second, more difficult but more attractive, Barea Soranus could in fact be the same person as Barea Sura. Both have the same filiation; Soranus was a friend of Vespasian (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.7.2), Sura's daughter was married to Vespasian's son. If they were one and the same person, he will have married twice, which we could have suspected anyway: when Barea Soranus died in 66 he was *grandis aevo*, yet his daughter was only nineteen (the contrast is emphasized by Tacitus at *Ann.* 16.30.4). Barring a mistake in one of our texts, we must make the assumption that one man could employ two versions of the same name. As it is, there is something suspicious about the appearance of two such similar cognomina added at the same time to the already very unusual «Barea»: each is a common

(10) R. Syme, «The historian Servilius Nonianus», *Hermes* 92 (1964) 408-424 = *Ten studies in Tacitus* (1970) 91-109.

(11) *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 678, 701, 700.

(12) Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.23.2.

(13) No. 34 (see next note) = *AE* 1973.155, with the spelling Borea.

(14) I.e., in A.D. 43 (*TP* 1, 2, 44); 44 (30); 45 (54); 48 (9, 47, 64, 68); 51 (19, 20, 35, 39, 50), 52 (26); and 55 (23, 25). For numbering and concordance of the various editions, consult the index at *RAAN* 47 (1972) 317ff., adding *RAAN* 51 (1976) 145-168.

(15) A very close parallel would be M. Valerius Messalla Appianus (cos. 12 B.C.), M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus (cos. 3 B.C.), and M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus Messallinus (cos. A.D. 20), if it could be shown that the first was a son by adoption of the great Corvinus, as the other two were by blood: but see R. Syme, *Roman papers* (1979) 264f.

enough Roman cognomen, yet at least one of them has surrendered its meaning to its sound. And in fact considerable evidence has recently been gathered to show that some senators did bear variable cognomina: compare particularly with Sura/Soranus the consul of 81, L. Flavius *Silva* Nonius Bassus, who also appears as L. Flavius Silvanus (16). If Soranus was the father of Marcia Furnilla (or indeed an uncle), their close relationship is surely relevant to her divorce from Titus around the year 65. Titus' action may then have been mere political prudence, and one personally regretted on both sides, as indeed we might deduce from the epitaph erected long afterwards for *Hermes Marciae divi Titi servos*, found in the tomb of the Marcii (VI. 31768).

Whichever of the identifications of Barea Soranus we accept, the corollary is inescapable, that his father Q. Marcius Barea Soranus, consul in 34, must be the anonymous husband (31765) of Crispina Caepionis f. and father of Marcius Barea Sura (= ?Soranus) and of Septicius Sura. We should then envisage two lines missing from the top of VI.31765, running something like «*Q. Marcio C.f. C.n. Bareae Sorano / cos., procos. prov. Africae, XVvir s.f., fetiali /*» etc. (17).

By the mid 60's the future emperor Titus was already a young man with a promising military career and brilliant prospects, son of a consul and proconsul of Africa, nephew of a consul and prefect of the city of Rome, widower of the daughter of a praetorian prefect. Yet his second wife, Marcia Furnilla, was still a great catch and in some ways his social superior, able (as we can now say) to boast of consuls on both sides of her family and of senators several generations back in her pedigree. She proves indeed to have been, as Suetonius says, *splendidi generis*, and her family, the heirs of Sulpicius Platorinus and owners of his tomb, proves to be something more than an obscure senatorial clan. It could moreover be assumed, even if Dio had not told us, that the Marcii were extremely wealthy.

«The choice of a wife was restricted by the range of family acquaintance and considerations of status... It was the practice for gentry families to take a bride from their own social stratum and from within the neighbourhood, or at least the county» (18). Seldom can we analyze in any detail the range and nature of a county «connection» in classical Rome as we can for later societies, but for once two groups of evidence — a tomb in Rome and dozens of brick-stamps from Umbria and Etruria — converge to sketch the outline of just such a connection, one centred on the valleys of the Tiber and the Nar at and near the confluence of the two rivers. The limiting considerations of status and geography deduced from a later, English gentry, are particularly relevant to families like that of Marcia Furnilla, one only recently admitted to the highest aristocracy. The tomb of Sulpicius Platorinus contains the remains of men and women from five or six *gentes*, all surely relatives or descendants of Platorinus and their servants. Further, in the several marriages implied or reported there, all the partners were mere or less status equals. That they were also geographical neighbours can be quickly demonstrated.

First, we should note three of the marriage alliances represented in the tomb: Sulpicia Platorina married a Cornelius Priscus; a near relative of theirs married a Crispinus Caepio; and Crispina Caepionis f. married a Marcius Barea Soranus. Already Tapio Helen has demonstrated that the *figlinae Caepionianae* and the *f. Marcianae* lay near each other in the area under consideration, in or near the territory of Ameria. To these might be added the as yet unlocated *f. Sulpicianae*, and the unnamed property of a L. Cornelius Priscus in the mid first century (19). Since it is probable that most of the *figlinae* serving Ro-

(16) L. Vidman, «Variable Beinamen römischen Senatoren», *LF* 102 (1979) 93-98.

(17) This raises various problems about the presentation of the cursus on *CIL* VI.31765, none of them insurmountable. *ILS* 972 and 992 provide rough parallels for a start, in an age when there was no rigid formula.

(18) G.E. Mingay, *The gentry* (London, 1976) 112.

(19) M. Steinby, *BCAR* (n. 4 above). In fact, L. Cornelius Priscus is not explicitly a *dominus* on the stamps, but since a homonym is attested as such in the next generation, the assumption is reasonable.

me in the early empire are known, it passes mere coincidence that four proprietorial *gentes* should turn up in one family grouping in Rome. It is an attractive hypothesis that their clay-producing estates lay in the same area.

Second, the person named on *CIL* VI.31768a, Chius Rust. should, on the analogy of Hermes Marciae, be a Chius, slave of Rustius. That the *gens Rustia* is indeed to be discovered in the *monumentum Marciorum* is easily explained by association and kinship: the colleague of Marcius Barea Soranus (husband of Crispina Caepionis f.) in his consulship in 34 was a T. Rustius Nummius Gallus; a Rustius Caepio (probably a senator) died in the reign of Domitian (Suetonius, *Dom.* 9.2); and a T. Rustius Caepio was perhaps consul suffect in 173. For the *patria* one should look first to the territory of Interamna Nahars where Rustii, including a Rustius Caepio, appear among the local grandees, and where the numerous freedmen of the family include several T. Rustii (20). Interamna Nahars was the next town up the valley of the Nar from Narnia (on which see above). Thus another alliance within the landed gentry on the borders of Umbria and Etruria is reflected in a senatorial tomb in Rome: we should suspect that the consuls of 34 married sisters, daughters of Crispinus Caepio.

Third, to the South-East Interamna Nahars had for a neighbour the Sabine town of Reate, lying on the river Avens, a tributary of the Nar. This was the home of the Flavii, the family of the future emperor Titus. Reate lies less than thirty Roman miles as the crow flies from the territory of Ameria and the lands of the Marcii, the family (it is suggested) of his bride Marcia Furnilla.

Fourth, the emperor Trajan is commonly described as a native of the town of Italica in the Spanish province of Baetica, but a lone late epitomator surprisingly assigns him to the town of Tuder, which lay in Umbria near the Etruscan border, the next municipality beyond Ameria on the via Amerina, about fifteen Roman miles away (21). It has been suggested with some plausibility that Tuder may in fact have been the ultimate *origo* of the Spanish Ulpri (22). In support of this, or as an alternative, it could be added that Trajan, who later possessed estates in or near the territory of Ameria, may also have inherited lands at Tuder up the river. The presence of the Ulpri in Southern Etruria and Umbria is not particularly unusual. Ever since the Cornelii Balbi Spaniards had led the influx of provincials into the Roman ruling classes; inevitably these people bought up land in the choicer areas of Etruria, Umbria and Campania, and married into the gentry and aristocracy of Italy (23). Thus were founded some of the great family fortunes of later centuries, fortunes based on estates spanning the Mediterranean. The elder Trajan (cos. suff. 72), a man whose connections all seem to lie in Baetica, the province of his birth and his first governorship, married a Marcia, the daughter apparently of prosperous Italian landowners (24). But were they Italian? The names Q. Marcius, Soranus and Sura are far too common to help in locating the family's original home, but Barea is another matter, an extremely rare word of uncertain provenance (25). It might be Etruscan, or it might be Punic (26). Or might the first Marcius Barea Soranus have some connection with the obscure Spanish town of Barea or Baria which, although within the borders of Tarracensis, was *adscriptum Baeticae*? (27) With intermarriage and economic ties over the generations the di-

(20) *CIL* XI.4172, 4216-4218, 4299-4301, 7823.

(21) Victor, *Epit.* 13.1.

(22) R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958) 786.

(23) See especially the remarks of R. Syme, o.c. 601-602.

(24) The dates of Ulpri Traianus' consulship and of his proconsulship of Baetica have recently been resolved: *LF* 98 (1975) 60ff. and *JRS* 66 (1976) 15ff.

(25) *CIL* VI.21229, a C. Licinius Bareae lib. Leonteus; XI.6689.39, 40 (two brick stamps).

(26) W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 349f.; *REA* 60 (1965) 353-367.

(27) Pliny, *NH* 3.19. The spelling Barea appears at Cicero, *Att.* 16.4.2. Note an Ulp(ia) Marciana at neighbouring Ilici: *CIL* II.5953.

vision between Italian and provincial would be rendered meaningless. Trajan was a Roman aristocrat with roots both Italian and provincial; barring certain friends and relatives there is nothing notably Spanish about the life and career of the first «Spanish» emperor.

To conclude, first, Trajan's mother was a Marcia and it was through her that he acquired the *figlinae Marcianae* near the confluence of Tiber and Nar; and the only genteel Marcii associated with that region included in their number the renowned Barea Soranus; on the most economic hypothesis, Trajan's mother will have been the daughter of Barea Soranus and an elder sister of Marcia Furnilla, the wife of Titus. Such a connection might even have been postulated on general considerations, for a wife appropriate to the ambitious Ulpian Traianus (cos. 72) would have to be sought within a restricted milieu. And such a connection is relevant to the elder Trajan's close and profitable association with Vespasian both before and after 69, for Barea Soranus was a friend and relative by marriage of the future emperor.

Second, it can be assumed that the estate known as the *figlinae Marcianae* descended through four private owners before its absorption into the imperial patrimony: Q. Marcius Barea Soranus (cos. 34), Barea Soranus (cos. 52), Marcia, and Trajan himself. Where similar evidence is so scarce, such a descent is rarely visible, offering a glimpse at the accumulation of landed wealth and local alliances which supported any senator at Rome, hinting at the link between land and power. Here the Roman brick stamps can be made to suggest an unusually coherent body of evidence, one able to show both a succession of owners of a single estate over time and (in various ways) contemporary owners of near or adjacent estates. The correct location of all the known *figlinae* would be knowledge well worth acquiring.

Princeton

Edward Champlin

#### THE AUXILIARY PREFECT GLABRIO AND THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DUOVIRATE AT PERUSIA

M. Dondin (1) has recently presented a new text of *I.L.S.* 2685 (Perugia) as follows:

C. Atilius A.f. Glabrio /IIIuir quinq. praef. fabr. /delat(us?) a cos. praef. cohort. /[--]corum (or -]gorum?) sagittar. /E (or F) [--]m (?) A.f. minore natus.

As she points out, the current supplement «[Tyri]» before «orum» is ruled out by the C or G before the O. She says that «[Breu]corum» would be too long for the lacuna. (This would rule out another possibility, «Ituraeorum», even if the C or G could be equated with an E.) Archer regiments (2) of Breucans are unknown and her tentative suggestion of «Dacorum» or «Sacorum» is unlikely, as regiments named after these peoples are not attested in the early principate. It would seem necessary to leave the lacuna unfilled at this stage.

As far as the date of the inscription is concerned, she accepts the common assumption of a late republican or «triumviral» date. In this she follows A. Degraffi (on *ILLRP* 638) and B. Dobson (3), not to mention earlier authorities.

(1) *Les Acilii Glabrones de Pérouse: ascension sociale et relations sénatoriales de magistrats municipaux*, *M.E.F.R.(A.)* XCI, 1979, 651ff; *A.E.* 1979, 245.

(2) For these cf. H.v.d. Weerd & P. Lambrechts: *Note sur les corps d'archers au Haut-Empire*, in F. Altheim and J. Stiehl: *Die Araber in der alten Welt I*, Berlin, 1964, 661ff., and J.L. Davies, *Britannia VIII*, 1977, 269f., where this inscription is no. 31.

(3) *The Praefectus Fabrum in the Early Principate*, Festschrift E. Birley, 1965, 65ff., followed by