Edward Champlin

The Richest Man in Spain

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 196 (2015) 277–295

The Richest Man in Spain

I

Sextus Marius makes three remarkable appearances in history:

First, Tacitus briefly records an incident of the year 25:

> *Ceterum postulandis reis tam continuus annus fuit ut feriarum Latinarum diebus praefectum urbis Drusum, auspicandi gratia tribunal ingressum, adierit Calpurnius Salvianus in Sextum Marium. Quod a Caesare palam increpitum causa exilii Salviano fuit.*
>
> Yet in the arraignment of defendants the year was so constant that, on the days of the Latin Festival, Drusus, as prefect of the City, having mounted the tribunal for taking the auspices, was approached by Calpurnius Salvianus with a charge against Sextus Marius. This was openly berated by Caesar and was the reason for Salvianus' exile.[1]

Then disaster in the year 33:

> *Post quos Sex. Marius Hispaniarum ditissimus defertur incestasse filiam et saxo Tarpeio deicitur. Ac ne dubium haberetur magnitudinem pecuniae malo vertisse, aurarias <aerarias>que eius, quamquam publicarentur, sibimet Tiberius seposuit.*
>
> After them [various prosecutions and condemnations], Sextus Marius, the richest man in the Spains, was denounced for incest with his daughter and cast down from the Tarpeian Rock; and, so there should be no doubt that it was the magnitude of his money which had rebounded on him so calamitously, his gold- and copper-mines (though they were publicly confiscated) were set aside by Tiberius for himself.[2]

And a strikingly different version of the same disaster in Dio's account of 33:

> (1) οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν τούτῳ ἐπῃνεῖτο, καὶ μάλισθ' ὅτι ψηφισθέντα οἱ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς πολλὰ οὐκ ἐδέξατο, ἐκ δὲ δὴ τῶν ἐρώτων, οἷς ἀνέδην καὶ τῶν εὐγενεστάτων καὶ ἀρρένων καὶ θηλειῶν ὁμοίως ἐχρῆτο, (2) διεβάλλετο. ὁ γοῦν Μάριος ὁ Σέξτος ἐκεῖνος ὁ φίλος αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πλουτήσας καὶ δυνηθεὶς τοσοῦτον ὥστ', ἐπειδὴ γείτονί τινι ὠργίσθη, δειπνίσαι τε αὐτὸν ἐπὶ δύο ἡμέρας, καὶ τῇ μὲν προτεραίᾳ τὴν ἔπαυλιν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν κατασκάψαι, τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ ἐπί (3) τε τὸ μεῖζον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ λαμπρότερον αὐτὴν ἀνοικοδομῆσαι, ἀγνοοῦντί τε αὐτῷ τοὺς ταῦτα πεποιηκότας ἑκάτερον ὁμολογῆσαι, καὶ παραδείξαντα εἰπεῖν ὅτι "οὕτω καὶ ἀμύνεσθαί τινα καὶ ἀμείβεσθαι καὶ οἶδα καὶ δύναμαι", τὴν θυγατέρα ἐκπρεπῆ οὖσαν ὑπεκπέμψας ποι ἵνα μὴ ὁ Τιβέριος αὐτὴν αἰσχύνῃ, αἰτίαν τε ἔσχεν ὡς συνών οἱ, (4) καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ συναπώλετο. ἐπὶ μὲν τούτοις αἰσχύνην ὠφλίσκανεν …
>
> For his course in these matters he (Tiberius) received praise, and especially because he would not accept numerous honors that were voted to him because of these acts. But the sensual orgies which he carried on shamelessly with persons of the highest rank, both male and female, brought him ill repute.
>
> 2 For example, there was the case of his friend Sextus Marius. Imperial favor had made the man so rich and powerful that once, when he was at odds with a neighbor, he invited him to be

[1] T 4. 36. 1. – Unless otherwise indicated, T designates Tacitus' *Annals* and D Cassius Dio's *History*. Translations are those of Woodman 2004 and Cary 1914 (Loeb). My thanks for their comments to W. Eck, W. F. Hansen, R. A. Kaster, B. D. Shaw, and A. J. Woodman.

[2] T 6. 19. 1. A word representing the second type of mine owned by Marius has clearly fallen out of the text: gold and silver (*argentarias*) or gold and copper (*aerarias*): in his forthcoming text and commentary on Book VI, Woodman rightly opts for copper. See further below.

> his guest for two days, on the first of which he razed the man's villa level with the ground and on the next rebuilt it on a larger and more elaborate scale;
>
> 3 and then, when the other could not guess who had done it, Marius admitted his responsibility for both achievements and added significantly: "This shows you that I have both the knowledge and the power to repel attacks and also to requite kindness."
>
> His daughter, a strikingly beautiful girl, he [Marius] sent away somewhere, so that Tiberius might not dishonor her. He was charged with having sexual intercourse with her, and because of this he perished together [with her].
>
> 4 All this brought disgrace …[3]

The old *Pauly–Wissowa* article on Sextus Marius came from the masterly pen of Arthur Stein, and it tells us everything we need to know about our man. After summarizing the tales about him, Stein set out the evidence for the mines mentioned by Tacitus. Lightly paraphrased:

> We find an imperial freedman as *proc(urator) montis Mariani* in Hispalis (*CIL* II 1179 = *ILS* 1591) and another imperial freedman stationed in Ostia as *proc. massae Marian(ae)* (*CIL* XIV 52 = *ILS* 1592 = *CIL* II 3527 cf. Hirschfeld *Kais. Verw.*[2] 159). Pliny *NH* 34. 4 also praises *(aes) Marianum …, quod et Cordubense dicitur*, and the epitaph of one of Marius' slaves was found in Corduba, a man who bore the "speaking name" of Corinthius (*CIL* II 2269). The *Montes Mariani* – the mountain range, still rich in ore, now known as Sierra Morena – is called ὄρος Μαριανόν at Ptol. II. 4. 15 (cf. Tzetz. *Chil.* 8. 717), and the *Itin. Ant.* names a *Mariana* station p. 212 P and a *mons Mariorum ib.* 206 in this region.[4]

There is both much more and much less to be said about Sextus Marius.

II

The richest man in Spain was very rich indeed.

His copper ore, the *aes Marianum*, was also known as *aes Cordubense*, and his name is embedded in the mountainous terrain to the North of Corduba from which he mined his fortune. In fact it defines the region. Mineral-rich, the Sierra Morena, *Mons Marianus*, the Marian Mountain, stretches 450 kilometers from East to West. A station called *Mons Mariorum* lay at the Western end of the range, on the high road North to Emerita, between Italica and Curugae. A *Mariana* marked a crossroads beyond the Eastern end of the range. And the *procurator Montis Mariani* was honored by the *confectores aeris* at Hispalis, just to the South West, but his operation was probably headquartered in Corduba, where indeed we find the epitaph of a slave of Sextus Marius.

Ditissimus Hispaniarum, Sextus Marius was the richest man not just in Baetica but in the Spanish provinces. East of Corduba, just over the border in Tarraconensis, lie the great mines of Mazarrón, near Carthago Nova. In a gallery in one of them, rich in silver-bearing lead, a wooden pit prop bears the inscrip-

---

[3] D 58. 22. 1–4 (Cary translation, considerably modified).

[4] *RE* Marius 28: a typical prosopographical entry by Stein, a model of thoroughness and concision. Published in 1930, it was followed faithfully in 1983 by *PIR*[2] M 35. – Since then *CIL* II 1179 (Hispalis) has been republished as *CILA* 2. 1. 25, and *CIL* II 2269 (Corduba) as *CIL* II[2]/7. 441. – Stein missed two small supporting items. *Mons Marianus* also appears on an epitaph from Conimbriga (cf. n. 5 below). And the crossroads *Mariana* (thus, in the *Itinerarium Antonini*, not *Marianum* as in *PW*) also appears in the itinerary inscribed on the four silver "Vicarello cups", found in southern Etruria but manufactured in Spain, and listing all of the stages on the 1,340 mile journey from Gades to Rome: *CIL* XI 3281–3284 (Sutrium): cf. Schmidt 2011 for a full description and fascinating theory. The mountains and their minerals seem to be described by Strabo at 3. 2. 3 (C 142). Domergue (1990: 235 n. 40, cf. 283) rightly concludes that the area of the Mons Marianus must have been vast. – Domergue adds two peripheral items at pp. 337 n. 14 and 235 n. 40: an inscription from the region of Alarcos to the north, in La Mancha, may or may not refer to a slave of a Sextus Marius; and the Passion of Saint Justa of Seville (Hispalis) unfolds in the *Montes Mariani*. In fact the early mediaeval "Passion of Saints Justa and Rufina" has the evil governor Diogenianus punish the women (around the year 300) by making the two humble sellers of vases follow him barefoot through the harsh terrain, *per loca aspera et confragosa*, of the *Montes Mariani*: discussed by the great Franz Cumont: Cumont 1927 (overlooked by Domergue).

tion *S • MARI* – surely the name of the owner.[5] Travelling up the coast from Carthago, we find iron bars in shipwrecks off the Camargue at the mouth of the Rhône: one is inscribed *MARI // S* – surely indicating that the owner was a S(extus) Marius.[6] And the cargo was destined for Rome – surely to be unloaded at his *massa Mariana* near Ostia.[7]

Tacitus mentions the gold mines of Sextus Marius, without indicating their location. They were almost certainly not in Baetica, and they were certainly not in the Mons Marianus, for the Sierra Morena – so rich in copper, silver, and lead – had no gold.[8] This is all the more striking because our sources shimmer with the man's Golden Touch. The *aes Marianum* which bore his name was renowned, as we shall see, for its golden sheen. Stein rightly observed that his apparent slave at Corduba bore a "speaking name": "Corinthius" (not the common Corinthus) recalls the celebrated golden *aes Corinthium*, the Corinthian bronze which Pliny tells us was valued more highly than silver and almost more than gold.[9] And the "most excellent" imperial freedman procurator of the Mons Marianus likewise bore a very rare and striking name, T. Flavius Aug. lib. Polychrysus: Rich in Gold.[10] We have it on ancient authority that King Midas owed his wealth to mines in Macedonia,[11] and there might be a hint of his golden touch in the downfall of Sextus Marius: the fabulous fortune derived from his mines brought him, like Midas, not happiness but disaster.

In fact the richest man in the Spanish provinces must have been one of the richest men in the Roman world, for he owned something more valuable than gold. Pliny the Elder, who was a boy at the time of his death, sets the stage in his *Natural History*. Copper ore is his subject and he catalogs the great copper mines. First in time and quality and name were those in Cyprus, but they are now worked out. Next in value are the Sallustian mine in the Graian Alps, and the Livian mine in Gaul. These bring us up to the very highest social and economic stratum, for, as Pliny pointedly remarks, they were named after their owners, one the friend of Augustus (in fact his intimate counselor), the other the wife of Augustus. But the Livian mine was soon almost exhausted. "The highest reputation has now gone to the Marian copper, also called Corduba copper; next to the Livian variety this kind most readily absorbs *cadmea* and reproduces the excellence of gold-copper in making sesterces and double-*as* pieces, the single *as* having to be content with its proper

[5] Gianfrotta 2004: 168–169, with fig. 3 and 4: a ligature imposes the *A* on the *M*. Domergue 1987: 2. 391–395 catalogs the stunning artifacts from these mines, including amphorae, ladders, wooden chains, support beams, picks, mattocks, pulleys, wheels, esparto ropes, esparto baskets (one filled with ore), esparto buckets, wooden troughs, two caps of woven palm fronds, a pair of esparto espadrilles, a kneepad with cords, an esparto flask lined with pitch, and two bronze statuettes (a Hercules Farnese and a sphinx)! – Lusitania to the West produces the fine epitaph of an 18-year-old who died on the Marian mountain, *defuncto Monte Mariano*: *Fouilles de Conimbriga* II (1976) 59–60, no. 32. His bones were brought home to Conimbriga by his parents.

[6] As patiently demonstrated by Gianfrotta 2004: 165–168.

[7] Known from the later *proc(urator) massae Marianae*, an imperial freedman (*CIL* XIV 52 = *ILS* 3527). O. Hirschfeld made the case for this being the former property of our Sex. Marius (1905: 159 n. 1; approved by Domergue 1990: 378): the great transports from the imperial ironworks in the West came to Ostia, as confirmed by the inscription found there of a (second century) *procurator Aug. ferrariarum et annonae Ostis* (*CIL* XIV 4459 = *ILS* 1442), and by a lead seal from the age of Commodus that names a *stat(ionis) ferr(ariarum) for(i?) Os[t(iensis)]* (*CIL* XV 7976). Add from the reign of Trajan the Ostian inscription of a *socior(um) vect(igalis) ferr(ariarum) ser(vus)* (*CIL* XIV 4326).

[8] Immediately clear from Domergue 1990: maps 1–6. Map 5, "Les mines d'or romaines de la Péninsule Ibérique" is conclusive, as is the map at Hirt 2010: 78. Marius' mines should be sought to the Northwest, in Lusitania or Tarraconensis, again confirming the plural "Spains" in Tacitus.

[9] *CIL* II²/7. 441; Pliny *NH* 34. 1. That Corinthian bronze could indeed have been, as the ancients claim, an alloy of copper with silver and gold, is strikingly demonstrated by Jacobson and Weitzman 1992. Cf. another wealthy owner of "Corinthean" bronze (so called since purchased from the *aerarius* Corinthus), who bestowed the "speaking name" of "Carpus" on the slave who carved his meat: Petronius *Satyrica* 36. 7.

[10] *ILS* 1591: *T. Flavio Aug. lib. Polychryso proc. montis Mariani praestantissumo confectores aeris*. Nomen est omen: the only other Polychrysus known to Latin epigraphy was another imperial freedman in charge of military expenditure: *ILS* 1572. There seem to be only two people named Polychrysos in all of Greek epigraphy, and the name seems not to be attested in ancient literature. – I resist the temptation to add here the duumvir of Corduba known from *CIL* II 2216 = II²/7. 243, M. Lucrius Marianus: Marcus Marian Money?

[11] Strabo 14. 28 (C 680): around Mount Bermium, apparently gold mines. The gardens of Midas lay at the foot of Mount Bermium: Herodotus 8. 138. 3.

Cyprus copper."[12] Bronze, also called *aes*, was the basis of Roman coinage and of government payments, hence words like *aerarium*, as Pliny tells us. It is an alloy of copper, and the finest copper in the world came from the Mountain of Marius. He must have been the leading supplier of the Roman mint.

Fabulously wealthy, dangerously powerful, the friend of Tiberius Caesar, his name imprinted on the landscape for eternity: curiously little is known about the man. About twenty-five years ago a small fragment of a bronze *tabula hospitalis* was published, apparently informing us that a *Sex. Marius [Sex.? f. ---] / hospiti[um fecit cum ---]*. The exact provenance and the grateful community are unknown, but the tablet certainly came from Baetica. The expert scholars who published the piece dated it on palaeographical criteria to the age of Augustus or Tiberius and tentatively identified the man with the rich and powerful friend of Tiberius. If correct, this is satisfying confirmation of the importance of his patronage in the province. However another expert has challenged this on both palaeographical and formal grounds, and suggests a second century date. This Sex. Marius remains in limbo.[13] But perhaps we are looking for the wrong man.

In their discussion of the name of the patron on the *tabula hospitalis*, the editors hesitated to identify him with the figure in Tacitus and Dio. Their reason is striking: exact reckoning of the lost space on the line after "Sex. Marius", and comparison with other such *tabulae*, demand not only the mention of filiation and tribe, but also of a *cognomen*. "In that case identity with the Tiberian Sex. Marius would be all but excluded, for he obviously did not bear one." But that is not at all obvious.[14]

III

Our story, a long and complicated one, begins two generations earlier, amidst the savage chaos of the Civil War, and was recorded by the unknown author of the Caesarian *Bellum Alexandrinum*. Confusing and garbled by a narrator of limited ability, its problems are exacerbated by defective manuscripts, but it is an exciting tale clearly based on an eyewitness account.[15] Readers should be prepared here for a lengthy digression.[16]

In 48 BC the governor of the province of Hispania Ulterior is Julius Caesar's man, the monstrous Q. Cassius Longinus. Deeply in debt and desperate for cash to win the loyalty of his troops, he overlooks no object of extortion, large or small, victims public and private, rich and poor: if they don't pay up, they will be prosecuted. Indeed, a few years earlier, while serving as quaestor there, his rapacity had provoked a plot against him and he was wounded in an ambush. Some leading men of the province now form a second plot to assassinate him. Their hatred is intensified because many in the governor's entourage are his partners in rapine – even though they despise their own friend. Caesar summons Cassius to join him in his African campaign. Dreaming of new provinces to plunder, he gathers his army near Corduba and promises them a donative. That very afternoon he enters the basilica in Corduba to conduct the assizes, deep in conversation. Here let us suppress for the moment the welter of distracting names packed into an already confusing narrative.

A client (A) of Cassius' interlocutor follows the governor and his patron (B). He pretends to be a soldier with a petition demanding a reply. He quickly slips between Cassius and B, seizes the governor with his left hand, stabs him twice with a dagger in his right. Uproar, other conspirators rush up. One (C) kills a lictor

[12] *Ib.: Summa gloria nunc in Marianum conversa, quod et Cordubense dicitur. Hoc a Liviano cadmean maxime sorbet et aurichalci bonitatem imitatur in sestertiis dupondiariisque, Cyprio suo assibus contentis.* Loeb translation of H. Rackham, modified.

[13] Eck and Fernández 1991, whence *AE* 1991. 1017; vs. González 2008. González's assertion that the text does not fit into his categories of such *tabulae* is not compelling. – It should be noted that the name "Sextus Marius" is surprisingly rare in Spain. It occurs only twice in Spanish epigraphy, in Baetica: on this inscription; and as the master of the slave Corinthius on the Corduban inscription noted above. At first glance, both seem to be our Sextus Marius.

[14] Eck and Fernández 1991: 221–222. They conclude cautiously that the man here may have been the friend of Tiberius, in which case he was probably identified in the *tabula* as *Cordubensis*, in which case he was not a senator (itself unlikely on general grounds); or that he was an otherwise unknown person who may have been in Baetica as an official.

[15] *Bellum Alexandrinum* 48–55. Gaertner and Hauburg 2013: 88–93 on the complex source question.

[16] Or can skip forward to the synopsis in section VII below.

with a sword and wounds the governor's legate.[17] Two others (D and E), fellow townsmen (of C), help him. Another conspirator (F) inflicts superficial wounds on Cassius as he lies helpless on the floor. But then his bodyguard, including both native tribesmen from the North and Roman veterans, intervenes and fends off a second wave of murderers, of whom two are named (G and H).

The first assassin (A) flees, stumbles on stones in the street, and is taken prisoner to Cassius' home, where the wounded governor has been carried. His patron (B), the man who had distracted Cassius just before the stabbing, takes refuge in the nearby home of a friend (unnamed), uncertain as to his victim's fate. Another conspirator (I), sure that the governor is dead, rushes happily to the camp and congratulates the men of the Second Legion and of a *legio vernacula*: the former, long-term residents of the province, and the latter, native Spaniards, are united in their hatred of Cassius. The soldiers promptly set this conspirator (I) on the tribunal and name him praetor, but then news arrives that the governor is still alive. More annoyed than upset, the conspirator sets off to see Cassius. Unfortunately for him, three other legions in the camp march off to support their commander; the Second Legion slinks after them; and only the native legion stays behind. Cassius sends the loyal troops back to their camp, but he retains five cohorts and begins to arrest the plotters. In fact, the first assassin (A) has denounced three men: his patron (B); the associate who has attempted to seduce the troops (I); and a new character, a man of the highest rank and influence in the province (K), a close friend of the governor. Cassius has all three executed immediately.

He then hands over two men to be tortured by his freedmen, presumably to reveal more names. One is the first assassin (A), betrayer of the three who have just been summarily executed. The other is one of the second wave of would-be assassins (G): he offers the names of further conspirators, perhaps voluntarily, perhaps under compulsion. Yet another man is tortured (E), and the would-be assassin who inflicted superficial wounds on the supine Cassius (F) betrays yet others. Cassius orders more executions. Nevertheless, true to his character, he offers to spare those who wish to buy their lives with hard cash. One of them, the second-wave plotter who has named names under torture (G), pays 6 million sesterces. Another pays 5 million (a new character, L; or possibly the F who inflicted superficial wounds and named many names).[18] The loathsome Cassius is torn between cruelty and avarice.[19] It is all very confusing. We have no idea how many died in the aftermath of the failed attempt but, melodrama aside, the ripple effect of plot and betrayals, torture and executions within the Spanish elite must have been devastating.

The greater world now intrudes into the narrative. News of Caesar's tremendous victory at Pharsalus arrives and the conspiracy fades from interest.[20] The focus broadens, but the outrageous Cassius is still part of the larger narrative. Recovered from his wounds, he invents new extortions. He summons all his creditors and compels them to change his name from "debtor" to "creditor" in their account books. He conscripts Roman knights to serve overseas, then encourages them to bribe him to evade their duty. He inspects his troops and prepares the fleet for Africa at Hispalis, but remembers to order all who still owe him money to report to him there. Legions mutiny, fight, reconcile, choose a man from Italica to lead them. The Romans in Corduba rebel, Cassius' own quaestor joins them, other troops flock to them. The mutinous legions march to Corduba, their commander declares for Pompey, they elect Cassius' lapsed quaestor as their praetor, and they throw their support to the rebels. Cassius moves in and devastates the territory. Skirmishes ensue, marches and countermarches, fighting is ferocious, battle is never quite joined. All is confusion. Most significantly, at one point the mutinous army that switched from Caesar to Pompey is persuaded to declare for Caesar again. Lepidus himself arrives in force, Caesar's right hand man, and a new proconsul appears, also sent by Caesar. Despite the wintry weather, Cassius sets off with his fleet and his ill-gotten fortune. His ship sinks at the mouth of the river Ebro (where was he going?), he dies, and all is lost.

---

[17] Also named, confusingly, Quintus Cassius, presumably a relative or client: *Bell. Alex.* 52, 56.

[18] So Valerius Maximus 9. 4. 2. The figures given at *Bell. Alex.* 55. 5 are incorrect. On these passages see below, n. 32.

[19] *Bell. Alex.* 55. 5: *Qui si maxime nocentes sunt multati, tamen periculum vitae dolorque vulnerum pecuniae remissus crudelitatem cum avaritia certasse significabat*. Read by Livy, who wrote of *Q. Cassii praetoris avaritiam crudelitatemque* (*Per.* 111). Cf. his *furor* at Livy fr. 39; his *avaritia* at Valerius Maximus 9. 4. 2.

[20] *Bell. Alex.* 56–64.

IV

The tale is badly muddled, yet it casts dazzling light on a provincial society in chaos. The names of the conspirators against Q. Cassius Longinus, some 10 or 11 of them, are unexpectedly central here, each a prosopographer's delight, either because they are rare in themselves or because they are rare combinations of familiar *nomina* and *cognomina*. The essential details are dispersed over several *Pauly–Wissowa* articles composed by another master, Friedrich Münzer, but he never drew the inherent conclusions and they have gone unremarked. Taken together, they tell a story that is indeed remarkable.

The first assassin betrayed three men, *L. Racilium et L. Laterensem et Annium Scapulam* (B, I, and K). His patron, Racilius, was deep in conversation with the governor as he walked into the basilica; Laterensis was spontaneously elected by Roman troops as their praetor; Scapula was a man of the highest reputation and influence in the province. Two of them at least displayed a disconcerting nonchalance after the failed attack. Rather than prudently leave town, Racilius "withdraws to the house of a friend nearby until he might learn whether or not Cassius was dead". Laterensis, after being named praetor by Cassius' troops, learns that their general has survived and, "more annoyed than upset, quickly recovers himself and sets off to see Cassius".[21] Lest there be any doubt as to their importance, the three men of rank were close *friends* of Cassius: *Annium Scapulam … sibique tam familiarem quam Laterensem et Racilium*. Perhaps they did not expect to die.

Annius Scapula is otherwise unknown, but our narrator defines him impressively as *maximae dignitatis et gratiae provincialem hominem*. That may suggest that his two comrades in death were *not* "provincial". Indeed, Lucius Racilius had been tribune of the plebs at Rome in 56 BC, while Lucius Laterensis was a brother of M. Iuventius Laterensis, praetor in 51.

Three factors combine to make their identity as members of Roman senatorial families close to certain. First, their intimacy with the governor, and the notable election of one of them as praetor by Roman citizen soldiers. Second, their highly distinctive nomenclature. "Racilius" is not a common name, with fewer than 30 occurrences in Latin epigraphy, all of them humble and later, and no occurrences in Greek. Except for Racilia, the wife of the legendary Cincinnatus, the *nomen* appears only in the last generation of the Republic: precisely with Lucius Racilius the tribune and Lucius Racilius the conspirator, and with no others. The two men should be one. "Laterensis" is even more restricted. The *cognomen* appears on no Latin and on just two Greek inscriptions, and its occurrence in literature is confined to members of just two generations of a single senatorial family in the first century, the Iuventii Laterenses, descendants of the noble second-century Iuventii Thalnae.[22] The nonchalant praetor Laterensis at Corduba must be one of them.

Thirdly, there is the arresting concatenation of characters in the trial of Cn. Plancius, who had been tribune of the plebs in 56. Plancius was defended by Cicero in 54 against a charge of corruption in his recent election as aedile for 55 or 54. The prosecutor was a defeated opponent, M. Iuventius Laterensis, the future praetor at Rome whom Cicero would later describe as *vir sanctissimus*. Prosecuting along with Laterensis – for reasons unknown – was a Lucius Cassius (Longinus), the brother of Quintus Cassius, the future governor in Spain.[23] And Laterensis went out of his way – for reasons unknown – to point out in court that a colleague of Plancius as tribune in 56 had in fact done much more than Plancius for Cicero in his earlier

[21] 53. 3; 54. 1.

[22] *PW* Racilius 1, with Münzer's comment on the identity as "wohl". In fact he should probably numbered Racilius 2, his father being the man at Cicero *Verr.* 2. 3. 1: *MRR* 3. 181. Racilii are attested in the Conventus Cordubensis (*CIL* II²/7. 822 and probably 790), and elsewhere in Baetica. – *PW* Iuventius 15, with Münzer's observation: "Er kann ein Bruder von Nr. 16 [the praetor] gewesen sein." Two of the family turned up after Münzer wrote the entries in *PW* (details at *MRR* 3, 115), and an inscription from Cyrene has been recently (and convincingly) restored to refer to Marcus, the praetor: Laronde 2010.

[23] At *Att.* 5. 21. 2, of 50 BC, Cicero refers to Cassius, *frater Q. Cassi familiaris tui*: that is Gaius Cassius Longinus, the future praetor and tyrannicide (*PW* 59) and our Quintus Cassius Longinus (*PW* 70). "Frater" has universally been taken as "probably cousin", but in fact we know now that Quintus was the son of a Gaius, not (as conjectured) of an otherwise unattested Quintus: *AE* 1986. 369. Gaius the tyrannicide was assuredly the brother of Lucius Cassius Longinus, the man in the *Pro Plancio* and future tribune of the plebs (*PW* 65). Which is a long way of saying that there were three brothers, C., L., and Q., all presumably sons of C. Cassius Longinus, consul in 73 (*PW* 58).

tribulations. He, Laterensis, recounted what Cicero admits were the other tribune's *divina in me merita*. Of all people, that other tribune was Lucius Racilius, *fortissimus et constantissimus vir.* There is a lost story here. We know nothing about Plancius and his history, other than what Cicero tells us in his *Pro Plancio* and in his letters, and we know nothing about the relationships among the actors in the trial of 54, but the coincidence in Corduba six years later of a Cassius Longinus and a Laterensis and a Racilius is remarkable.

In short, the conspirator Racilius was a Roman senator and the conspirator Laterensis was either a senator himself or an equestrian member of a noble senatorial family. They in turn imply something about another conspirator. We know nothing about their accomplice, L. Licinius Squillus (F), the man who wounded Cassius and who later betrayed many others. But his *cognomen* tells a tale. The noun is unique, but undeniably a version of *squilla*, a variety of crustacean, "Shrimp" or something like it.[24] Münzer saw but did not exploit the significance: "The cognomen can be compared with Murena, which is likewise found among the Licinii." Now close relatives named, say, "Ursus" and "Lupus", Bear and Wolf, are common enough, but two luxury seafoods in a single *gens* – Shrimp and Moray Eel – are unique: *affertur squillas inter murena natantis in patina porrecta*.[25] Squillus must be the third member of a Roman senatorial family involved in a Spanish conspiracy. His fate is unknown.

If Annius Scapula was indeed the leading gentleman of the province, he must have been a Roman knight.[26]

V

The fate of another conspirator brings a surprise. Munatius Flaccus (C), the violent man from Italica who killed the lictor and wounded Cassius, survived (for reasons again quite unknown) to play a role, indeed to star, in another and equally astonishing Roman drama.

Caesar arrived in Spain in late 46 for the final confrontation with the sons of Pompey. Complicated maneuvers culminated in the two armies meeting near Munda, not far from Corduba. A steadfast Pompeian garrison held the strong point of Ategua nearby, less than 20 kilometers to the South of Corduba. Caesar besieged Ategua; Cn. Pompeius the younger set up his camp nearby. Bloody encounters, acts of desperate courage, treachery, cruelty, narrow escapes punctuated the tense standoff. One of our sources here is the anonymous author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*, a reporter as colorful as the writer of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, but even less talented as an artist in prose. He tells us that during the siege of Ategua, tablets were thrown down from the city wall, with the following letter: "L. Munatius to Caesar. If you grant me life, *si mihi vitam tribues*, since I have been deserted by Cn. Pompeius, I shall assure you the same courage and constancy that I assured him, *praestiti tali virtute et constantia … praestabo.*" At the same time, our author continues, a delegation of the townsmen assured Caesar in strikingly similar language that if he allowed them life, *si sibi vitam concederet*, they would surrender the town to him the next day. He replied that he was Caesar and that he would assure them his good faith, *fidem praestaturum*. So, the story ends, on February 19th, 45, Caesar entered the town and was acclaimed imperator.[27] The sequel was, after many other adventures, his great victory at Munda on March 17th.

The surrender of Ategua is only one of many mangled tales in the *Bellum Hispaniense*. It gives no hint of whom L. Munatius might be, or what his role in the surrender might be, or what his fate might be, or even if the letter was genuinely his. But his hoax was famous. Cassius Dio tells the story, quite differently.[28]

[24] Squilla indeed turns up as a *cognomen* among members of a consular family from Verona in the second century AD, and nowhere else: *PIR*^{2} G 113, 114; I 13; cf. *ILS* 6696 (a Squillianus). A long lost inscription from Verona honored an apparently senatorial L. Calpurnius L. f. Pub. Squillius: fully discussed and dated to the triumviral age by Wiseman 1971: 220–221, but the text is highly problematic.

[25] *PW* Licinius 160; Horace *Sat*. 2. 8. 42–43. The Licinii Murenae first appear in the second century BC.

[26] Cf. Strabo 3. 5. 3 on the 500 knights of (Baetican) Gades generation later. Annii are common in Spain, in Baetica, and around Corduba. Some are clearly local dignitaries in the Conventus Cordubensis in the early principate (e.g., *CIL* II^2/5. 25, 39; 7. 798; *et al.*), and they were senatorial two centuries later (*CIL* II^2/7. 271).

[27] *Bell. Hisp*. 6–19.

[28] 43. 33. 2–34. 5.

Caesar avoids the heavily defended Corduba in the winter, instead surrounding Ategua in hopes of capturing its grain supply. Since the townspeople have no leader, Pompeius sends Munatius Flaccus to be their στρατηγός (presumably "prefect"). He gets into the city by a ruse. Pretending that he has been ordered by Caesar to visit the sentries set up around the besieged town, he learns the watchword, unknown and alone though he is. He proceeds to the other side of the circumvallation, gives the Caesarian sentries the watchword, pretends that he is there to betray the city, and is actually escorted by them to its very gates. However, once in, he cannot save Ategua from itself. Fire meant for the enemy rebounds on the city, houses burn, people die because they cannot see the Caesarian missiles for the smoke, the land around is devastated, the walls are undermined. The citizens riot. Flaccus asks Caesar for clemency for himself and his associates, but he refuses to give up his arms and no deal is reached. The Ateguans send their embassy and surrender. Dio does not record Flaccus' fate.

The trickster's tale also turns up, appropriately, in Frontinus' *Stratagems*, with yet other details. One night "Maurus" pretends to be a Caesarian, a tribune's assistant, *tribuni cornicularius*, gets the password from some sentries, passes it onto others, and so brings reinforcements right through Caesar's army to the beleaguered Pompeians in the city.

One certainty emerges from the tale: the conspirator Munatius Flaccus went on to be the Pompeian officer. Geography and chronology are a close fit – Italica and nearby Ategua; the years 48 and 45 – and nomenclature clinches the identity, for this is one of those uncommon common names. Munatius and Flaccus are widespread as *nomen* and *cognomen*, but the combination of Munatius and Flaccus is unique: in all of literature and epigraphy the commander/conspirator is the only known Munatius Flaccus.

That said, the three versions of his Ateguan adventure are awkward fragments of a curious jigsaw. Was Flaccus alone, or did he bring reinforcements? Was the letter to Caesar – if it was from Flaccus – an act of betrayal, or was it an honorable attempt to surrender when hope was gone? Was he acting with the citizens or independently? Did he share their fate or not? And then there is the fourth version of his story: the Scarlet Pimpernel morphs into Vlad the Impaler.

It deserves to be savored in full:

> Munatius Flaccus too, a more zealous than respectable defender of the Pompeian name, vented his savage cruelty in a most brutal form of madness when general Caesar shut him inside the town of the Ateguenses in Spain. For he butchered all the citizens of that place who he had thought were favoring Caesar and flung them from the walls. He also slaughtered women, proclaiming the names of their husbands who were in the opposing camp, so that these should see the murder of their wives, likewise children in their mothers' laps. He ordered infants to be dashed on the ground in sight of their parents, others to be impaled on javelins. These atrocities, intolerable even in the hearing, were carried out on Roman order by Lusitanian hands. Guarded by a force of that nation, Flaccus resisted divine power with frantic obstinacy.[29]

So Valerius Maximus. Nothing about the clever stratagem to enter the city, nothing about attempts to surrender at the end. In between, not a series of accidents out of the commander's control and ending in a riotous citizenry, but the worst possible caricature of a tyrant awash in the blood of the people. And no hint of a motive.

The conclusion must be that our glimpses of Munatius Flaccus present the sparse fragments not of one jigsaw puzzle but of two.[30] They offered radically different portraits, pro and con: the clever but unlucky

[29] Valerius Maximus 9. 2. 4 (Loeb text and translation by D. R. Shackleton Bailey). *Munatius etiam Flaccus, Pompeiani nominis acrior quam probabilior defensor, cum ab imperatore Caesare in Hispania inclusus moenibus Ateguensium obsideretur, efferatam crudelitatem suam truculentissimo genere vesaniae exercuit: omnes enim eius oppidi cives quos studiosiores Caesaris senserat iugulatos muris praecipitavit. feminas quoque, citatis nominibus virorum qui in contrariis castris erant, ut caedes coniugum suarum cernerent, maternis<que> gremiis superpositos liberos trucidavit. infantes alios in conspectu parentum humo infligi, alios superiactatos pilis excipi iussit. quae auditu etiam intolerabilia Romano iussu Lusitanis manibus administrata sunt, cuius gentis praesidio Flaccus vallatus divinis opibus vecordi pertinacia resistebat.*

[30] If not more. Shackleton Bailey, note *ad loc*., lists the sources and comments, "Perhaps some confusion."

commander, or the monster. They should reflect conflicting Pompeian and Caesarian narratives over a matter of some historical concern.

Munatius the monster recalls the wafer-thin caricature of the monstrous Q. Cassius Longinus, the very personification of avaricious cruelty from beginning to watery end. In each hostile narrative, the murderous tyrant is protected by fierce Spanish tribesmen against the more civilized Spanish locals. But if Munatius could also be a hero, perhaps there was a good Cassius. It was not clear in 45 whether Munatius was actually Caesar's agent or Pompey's. Cassius (quaestor sometime 55/51, tribune of the plebs in 49) served twice in quick succession as acting governor of Hispania Ulterior: for Pompey in the late 50s; then soon after the Rubicon for Caesar, when he is soberly attested as *tribunus plebis pro praetore* in a Baetican building inscription dated by the consuls of 49 BC. Neither Pompey nor Caesar would entrust legions and a governorship to a man without qualities. He was certainly a man of strong principles, for as tribune in 49 he stood up for Caesar with Mark Antony, at the peril of his life. Cicero, writing a few months earlier, in 50, calls him, apparently without irony, a *familiaris* of Atticus. Perhaps there was indeed a good Cassius.[31]

It is not possible to say which side Munatius Flaccus supported in the confusion of civil war. That he betrayed somebody and that people died because of his actions seem certain – the wounds could take generations to heal. And again it can be claimed that he too was a man of substance, as a "prefect" certainly a Roman knight. We are told that he came from Italica, but he was presumably a figure of provincial importance like Annius Scapula, and a familiar figure in Corduba and Ategua. Evidence has recently emerged for a *porticus Munatiana*, in the forum at Astigi, which lies between Italica and Corduba and was capital of one of the four *conventus* of Baetica. Flavian in date, it was presumably erected by a member of Flaccus' family. Munatius is not a common name in Spain, and there is only one certain attestation of it in Baetica. It happens to appear on an inscription at Carruca, a few kilometers from Astigi, the humble epitaph of a Munatius Maurus. Again, the combination of *nomen* and *cognomen* is unique: the startling coincidence of this name with the trickster "Maurus" in Frontinus' version of events at nearby Ategua suggests yet another missing story.

VI

Munatius Flaccus was not the only conspirator with an uncommon common name. Annius Scapula (K), a man of highest rank and influence in the province and close friend of Cassius, was one of the first to be denounced and executed. *Nomen* and *cognomen* are very common, but he seems to be the only Annius Scapula known to history. Similarly Manilius Tusculus (H), one of the second wave of conspirators held off by the bodyguard: again, common names, but a unique combination. Similarly Minucius Silo (A), the man who betrayed him and was afterwards tortured (presumably to betray more men). And Silo's comrade (G) has a common name whose combination of elements is not quite unique, but it is so rare that any occurrence draws attention. In fact it appears only three times in history: Calpurnius Salvianus.

First, there is the conspirator of 48 BC. Held off by the bodyguard at the attack on Cassius at Corduba, he later named yet more accomplices, under torture after the first three executions. Cassius ordered that he and others be executed unless they paid for their lives. Calpurnius openly handed over 6 million sesterces, Q. Sestius (whoever he may be) 5 million.[32] Their fates are unknown.

[31] *AE* 1986. 389 = 1987. 504 = *CIL* II 5. 521 (*Sabet(an)um*, in the territory of Corduba). The title confirms the *pro praetore* of *Bell. Alex*. 48. 1. Cicero *Att*. 5. 21. 2. – He may be the *[--]inus q(uaestor) pr pr(aetore)* who added to the outbuildings of what may have been the Temple of Aesculapius in Carthago Nova: *CIL* II 3421 = *ILS* 5574. For the argument, see Díaz Ariño 2008b, whence *AE* 2008. 727, but for a possible alternative (a different temple, and a Curvius Silvinus, attested with that title in the early principate) cf. *AE* 2010. 745. Having survived an ambush, Longinus might be grateful to the god of healing, but *non liquet*. The date of his quaestorship is uncertain, sometime in the years 55 to 51: Linderski 1975.

[32] *Bell. Alex*. 53. 2; 55. 3–5. There is a complicated textual problem here. The *Bellum Alexandrinum* in fact reports the paltry sums of 60,000 and 50,000 sesterces, rather than 6 and 5 million. Valerius Maximus has the following in his section *On Avarice*, 9. 4. 2: "But avarice showed considerably greater power in the person of Q. Cassius. In Spain Silius and Calpurnius were caught with daggers intending to assassinate him. He released them, at the price of five million sesterces from the one and six million from the other." (*Verum aliquanto maiores vires in Q. Cassio exhibuit, qui in Hispania Silium et Calpurnium, occidendi sui gratia cum pugionibus deprehensos, quinquagies sestertium ab illo, ab hoc sexagies pactus dimisit*.) That is,

Second, precisely at Corduba, the epitaph of a freedman, Calpurnius Urbanus, informs us that he was manumitted in the will of his master, Calpurnius Salvianus.[33] It is not clear who the master was: the conspirator of 48 BC, who came from Italica; the would-be prosecutor of AD 25; or another unknown member of the family.

And third, there is Calpurnius Salvianus the unlucky prosecutor, origin unknown, but the enemy of a man from Corduba, and presumably a grandson of the conspirator. He was rich enough to be absent for months and to bear the considerable expense of a long journey in pursuit of a lawsuit at Rome, and his likely grandfather was a millionaire: again, we could assume that they were Roman knights.

VII

In sum, the Corduban conspiracy of 48 BC was part of a much larger drama. We can observe in great detail how the descendants of Italian colonists struck it rich in Spain, intermarried with indigenous families, and returned to Italy generations later, many to become Roman knights and senators. Spanish mines certainly made many of them wealthy. For background we look first to the mines not of the Mons Marianus, but to those of nearby Carthago Nova, just over the border in Hispania Citerior. Following the fundamental observations of C. Domergue, and working from humble lead ingots, B. Díaz Ariño and J. A. Antolinos Marín have recently demonstrated in impressive prosopographical detail (and "the evidence is growing all the time") that

> "the profits from metals from the Cartagenan mines were key aspects in the rise in social status of a large proportion of the Italic families who had, in the 2nd century BCE, invested in the development of mining or metalworking activities, so that some of them went from being mere *domi nobiles* in the first half of the 1st century BCE to being included within the powerful group of *homines novi*, due mainly to the success of their business activities in Carthago Nova."[34]

What is observable of the elite of Carthago Nova in Citerior must be true of Corduba in Ulterior, likewise the provincial capital of a region rich in minerals.[35]

Moreover, in the last generations of the Republic, the tempests of fortune repeatedly blew the losers in the political struggle at Rome from the center to the periphery of the empire. There, in Spain, in Africa, in the Greek East, they might find refuge and plot their revenge. Where more natural to retreat than to the region of their roots and their resources? In short, we should not be at all surprised, indeed should expect, to find Roman senators and Roman knights mixing familiarly with the Roman governor in his capital. The events of 48 BC are more than a simple provincial conspiracy, more than local magnates banded together in an act of desperation against a rapacious governor.

The dizzying action recorded in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and *Bellum Hispaniense* – marches, countermarches, battles, skirmishes, repeated treachery, racial tensions, fierce feuds, conspiracies, mutinies, defections, tortures, arbitrary executions, assassinations, mass murders, extortion, looting – all this had been going on for decades and the savage instability is by no means exaggerated by our anonymous authors.[36]

---

the sums must be correct, but one of the names is different, Silius instead of Q. Sestius. A. Klotz, the editor of the Teubner text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, brilliantly resolved the discrepancy with appeal to the conspirator L. Licinius Squillus, named at 52. 4: hence he read *cum Squillo* rather than *cum Q. Sestio* in his text at 55. 5, and *Squillum* rather than *Silium* in Valerius Maximus (Klotz 1925). *Non liquet*, but Valerius' sums must stand. The man is *RE* Calpurnius 113 (Münzer).

[33] *CIL* II 2265 = II²/7. 432: *Calpurnius Urbanus / [Cal]purni Salv[i]ani l. / manumissus ex te[s]t[a]m[e]nto / [bene]ficio (?) ac(c)epto nihil praeter / praemium libertatis / [f]amulae suae / [hi]c s. s.*

[34] Domergue 1990: 327 = 330. Díaz Ariño and Antolinos Marín 2013: 543–545. I confess that I cannot follow (in both senses of the word) much of Zeidler 2005.

[35] Marius's mines aside, note the contemporary lead ingots from Baetica of a T. Iuventius T.l. Duso (Domergue 1990: 254, 256, the earlier dated to the 40s/30s, the other a generation later) and of Minucii (Domergue 257, late Republican/first quarter first century AD).

[36] In the two relatively brief Caesarian writings the ferocity is stunning, ambassadors and officers and prisoners murdered, throats slit and bodies hurled from walls, decapitation, crucifixion, clubbing to death, burning alive. Desertion is com-

The record can be matched by other sources: Dio, Appian, Plutarch. The very essence of treachery is embodied in Dio's version of the aftermath of the attempt on Cassius's life.[37] When it failed, some of the Cordubans and some soldiers who had been followers of Pompey rebelled against Cassius' new iniquities and took as their leader his quaestor, the noble M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus. The *Bellum Alexandrinum*, despising the monstrous Cassius, favors Marcellus, but Dio's source took a much dimmer view of him. The newly independent young man proceeded to play his own duplicitous game, seeming to support the younger Pompey against Cassius, the self-declared Caesarian. But when some of his soldiers wrote Pompey's name on their shields he had them erase it, and he asserted that Cassius was in fact *rebelling* against Caesar. Marcellus could then claim to have supported the winning side, whichever it might be. And inaction coincided with words, for he refused to crush Cassius' forces when he could have, or so we are told, and he arranged matters so that others took the blame. That at least is the version given us by a hostile contemporary, through Dio. Like Munatius Flaccus, Marcellus Aeserninus played a double game, yet he managed to reconcile himself with Caesar in the end, and to win the consulship under Augustus.

Or again there is the outrageous conduct attributed to the younger Cornelius Balbus, pro-quaestor of Hispania Ulterior in 43 BC, another Spanish Roman senator. It strikingly foreshadows that of Cassius Longinus, pro-praetor in 48: sailing off to Africa with enormous loot in cash and precious metals, leaving behind unpaid legions, restoring murderous exiles, roughing up a crowd with his foreign troops, flogging provincials, burying and burning a Roman citizen alive, throwing another to the beasts – and earlier, in 49, prefiguring Munatius Flaccus, he had undertaken an audacious mission as a Caesarian to infiltrate the Pompeian camp before the Battle of Pharsalus. As the indignant Asinius Pollio reported to Cicero, each succeeding rumor suggested new and outrageous plans and no one knew where he was headed.[38] Yet Balbus went on to become a *consularis*.

Spain was the Wild West of the late Republic, a land of vast wealth, passionate but kaleidoscopic allegiances, and sudden violence. Civil war and social ties confounded local struggles with global politics, generals and troops switched loyalty with dizzying frequency, alliances were formed and abandoned. As with the successive rumors about the plans of Cornelius Balbus, uncertainty reigned. Repeatedly we are given different perspectives on the same events and contemporary speculation as to motives, good or bad.[39] Wicked villains flourish, single-mindedly filling their purses and advancing their careers, deceiving enemies, betraying friends, impaling babies. Heroes suffered and died unexpectedly. In the fog of war it is often difficult to discern which is which.

VIII

Yet another conspirator of 48 points to a deep-rooted feud resurfacing seven decades later: Lucius Mercello (E), who came to the aid of his fellow-citizen of Italica, Munatius Flaccus, and was later tortured.[40] His fate is unknown, but his rare name brings us to the heart of the matter.

"Mercello" is not a *cognomen* but a *nomen gentilicium*, not Etruscan, as was long thought, but Italic. Otherwise unknown to literature and to the Greek world, it appears on seven Latin inscriptions.[41] The indi-

---

mon, deserters are punished if caught. As to mutinies, in the *Bell. Alex.* troops elect their own commanders on the spot no fewer than three times in 48 BC.

[37] 42. 15–16.

[38] Cicero *Fam.* 10. 32. 1–3; cf. Velleius 55. 2–3, *excedente humanam fidem temeritate*.

[39] E.g., *Bell. Alex.* 55, 57, 58, 63, 64. The great Asinius Pollio, whose pithy, confident and acerbic style is clear from his description of Cornelius Balbus, was surely behind much of the brilliant partisanship in the surviving sources: cf. Landgraf 1890.

[40] *Bell. Alex.* 52. 4, 55. 3.

[41] Italic: Briquel 2011, discussing a graffito, "mercelono", on a third-century BC cup in the Ager Faliscus. According to Klotz's Teubner apparatus, the name actually appears in the manuscripts as Mergelio, Mergerio, and Mergilio at *Bell. Alex.* 52. 4 and Mercelio, Mercellio, and Mergelio at 55. 4: Mercello, the proper emendation, comes from the inscriptions, as per Huebner at *CIL* II p. 146. – Given the desperate state of the text we might look for other mangled local names (such as "Q. Sestius" at 55. 5): Manilius Tusculus for instance recalls the genteel L. Mamilius Tuscus of *CIL* II²/7. 151 (Epora).

viduals remembered on these inscriptions almost certainly belong to a single group related by blood or by patronage: all of the males bear the single *praenomen* Titus; the inscriptions are restricted to Baetica and to central Italy; and since two of the men are each represented by two inscriptions, we are dealing with not seven but five Titi Mercellones:

1. At Rome we find a female slave and a freedwoman of T. Mercello Trebicius. Trebicius, a second *nomen*, is assuredly Spanish.[42]

2. Nearby Ostia produces a T. Mercello Hilarus married to a Manlia Tyche and presumably of freedman origin.[43]

3. Nearby in Etruria, 12 men presented Latin and Greek games, along with food and drink, to the people of Caere in the winter of AD 25. Nine are identified as *liberti*, three are not, one of them a T. Mercello. These three, if not freedmen themselves, are very likely to be the descendants of freedmen.[44]

4. And Brundisium has the epitaph of a slave of a T. Mercello Fuscus.[45]

5. But Baetica in Spain produces easily the most eminent member of the clan: T. Mercello Persinus Marius. He is known from two exceptionally brief inscriptions, one from Corduba and one from a town nearby, neither of them widely appreciated. In fact, he was one of the most important men in the Roman world.

The first inscription is dedicated at Corduba, *T(ito) Mercelloni Persino Mario aedil(i) IIvir(o) coloni et incolae*: "to Titus Mercello Persinus Marius, aedile, duumvir, from the (veteran Roman) colonists and the (native) inhabitants".[46] After the Battle of Munda in 45, Caesar went on to besiege and overrun the remnants of the Pompeian army that had taken refuge in Corduba. 22,000 people lost their lives and there was considerable destruction, but the city recovered and prospered as the *caput provinciae*. Under Augustus, sometime between 19 and 13 BC, it became a colony, *Colonia Patricia*.[47] The area of the city doubled, a new road system was imposed, splendid new public spaces were laid out and grand marble-clad buildings were erected, perhaps modeled on those of Augustus' Rome. Among them was a spectacular theater, the largest in Spain, built on three terraces dominating the heights over the River Baetis. Arguably, this imitated the new Theater of Marcellus in Rome, which was dedicated to the memory of Augustus' late nephew, a direct descendant of the Claudius Marcellus who had founded Corduba in the mid-second century BC. A cylindrical pedestal removed from the ruins of the theater in the sixteenth century bore the dedication from his fellow-citizens to their magistrate, Mercello. Moreover, exiguous remains indicate a truly sumptuous building. Among them are some 30 fragments of cornices from the theater's façade. Two of these bear the letters *M P* which, it has been reasonably suggested, should be expanded into *M(ercellonis) P(ersini)*, or possibly *M(arii) P(ersini)*. That is to say, there is a strong likelihood that Mercello paid for the building. And most importantly, another inscription from the theater provides the precious consular date for the year AD 5. All lettering is comfortably Augustan. In short, the theater was erected sometime within the quarter century between 20 BC and AD 5, and Mercello was a contemporary of Augustus.[48]

---

[42] *AE* 1979. 34; *CIL* VI 22410. Mainly Lusitania: *CIL* II 4970, 526 (Tarraco), II²/7. 972 (Turgalium, Lusitania); *IRCPacen* 317 (Pax Julia); *AE* 1999. 874 (Emerita), a Trebecius. But also a magistrate C. Trebecius Lucanus at Iptuc in Baetica in AD 31: *IRPCadiz* 503. Otherwise a few at Rome and in the vicinity, including owners of *figlinae*, and single attestations at Tarquinii and far-off Bostra (a late army officer). Those at Rome include an otherwise unknown senator, M. Valerius Trebicius Decianus, attested as a member of the Arval Brothers in different years from 101 through 120: *PIR* V 144. R. Syme, writing before the age of the Internet and the Epigrafik-Datenbank missed the Spanish inscriptions, but typically remarked in discussing the Italian specimens that, "The *nomen* Trebicius is portentously rare": Syme 1980: 96 n. 5.

[43] *CIL* XIV 1315.

[44] *CIL* XI 3613 = *ILS* 5052.

[45] *CIL* IX 110.

[46] *CIL* II²/7. 311.

[47] Excellent accounts of late Republican and early imperial developments at Ventura et al. 1998: 91–95 (with a good plan of Colonia Patricia), and Panzram 2002: 137–166. Key here is Ventura Villanueva 1999, with full reference to all archaeological and epigraphical evidence.

[48] *CIL* II²/7. 225 with what must be the date *[Kal. O]ctobr. Pos[tumo et Capitone cos.]*. Also II²/7. 253, *Augusto sacrum*.

The second dedication to him is equally austere, *T(ito) Mercelloni Persino Mario procuratori Augusti d(ecurionum) d(ecreto)*, "To Titus Mercello Persinus Marius, procurator of Augustus, by decree of the decurions."[49] This, presumably the inscription from a statue base, was found at Segida Augurina, a small town near Astigi, Corduba's next-door neighbor some 35 Roman miles to the southwest, and, as mentioned earlier, the capital of one of the four Baetican *conventus*. First published in 1984, the text arrived too late for treatment in standard manuals and has received no attention beyond simple notice elsewhere. In fact it places Mercello in elite company indeed, and it seems to provide us with the earliest official instance of a title which was to become famous: *procurator Augusti*. We know of nine other men who served the first Augustus as managers of his properties abroad.[50] Their profile is clear, and confirmed by subsequent generations. Where we have information about them, they were knights and they frequently had senatorial descendants. Some were intellectuals, some at least were personal friends of the *princeps* who employed them. All were powerful men, members of a political and military elite of fewer than 1,000 men in charge of an empire of tens of millions of people. The property of Caesar Augustus was immense after the civil wars, particularly in the provinces attested for these ten men in the first generation of quasi-public agents (Sicily, Asia, Syria, Africa, Baetica). At the very least we must assume that T. Mercello Persinus Marius was a Roman knight, that he controlled enormous resources in mineral-rich Baetica and was exceptionally wealthy himself, and that he knew Caesar Augustus personally.

His *cognomen* Persinus is, yet again, exceedingly rare. Unknown as such to Greek literature and epigraphy, unknown to Latin literature, it is found in only seven Latin inscriptions. One is a late outlier in Moesia, but the other six are all Spanish: one from Tarraco, the remaining five precisely from Baetica. One of those five comes from the *conventus* of Gades, two of them have presented our Mercello. Of the remaining two inscriptions, one is from Corduba itself, a fragmented list of six names in the nominative, apparently all related to each other: one of them is a Maria Persini, that is, the wife or daughter or freedwoman of a Persinus.[51] And upriver from Baetica at Epora, nestled at the base of the *Mons Marianus*, we find the freedman of a L. Marius Persinus.[52]

T. Mercello Persinus Marius acquired his curious name in one of two ways: he was born a Marius Persinus and was adopted by a Titus Mercello; or he was the son of a Titus Mercello and a Maria Persina.[53] Our Sextus Marius did not spring from nowhere. Taking him with Mercello, we have two Marii of the first rank, near contemporaries, both located in northeastern Baetica in the vicinity of the Marian Mountain – indeed, near a *statio* on the Antonine Itinerary called Mons Mariorum, the Mountain of the *Mariuses*. Titus Mercello was the personal agent of the first *princeps* Augustus; he both controlled vast wealth for his employer and was conceivably wealthy enough himself to pay for the largest theater in Spain. Sextus Marius was a friend of the second *princeps* Tiberius and the richest man in Spain. They must have been closely related, by blood or by adoption or both. On the most economical hypothesis father and son, perhaps uncle and nephew.

A Lucius Mercello had been betrayed and tortured after the failed plot of 48 BC. A Calpurnius Salvianus had betrayed names and saved his own life with cash. The text at *Bellum Alexandrinum* 55. 3 reads as follows:

---

[49] *CIL* II²/5. 296.

[50] *Viz.*, in the chronological ordering of the indispensible Demougin 1992: Athenodorus (or Theodorus) of Tarsus (*PIR*² A 1288, Demougin 48: διοικητής Sicily); P. Vitellius (*PIR* V 503, D 75: *rerum Augusti procurator* Suetonius *Vitellius* 2. 2 [possibly descriptive and/or anachronistic, rather than official]); Areius (*PIR*² A 1035, D 76: διοικητής Sicily); Volumnius (*PIR* V 640, D 87: ἐπίτροπος Syria); Sabinus (*PIR*² S 33, D 91: ἐπίτροπος Syria); Iulius (?) Graecinus (I 344, D 103: *procurator Caesaris*); Iulius (?) Procillus (I 693, D 104: *procurator Caesaris*); Cn. Pompeius Macer (P 625, D 106: ἐπίτροπος Asia); M. Bennius Rufus (B 107, D 141: *procurator imp. Caesaris Augusti* Africa). D 213, in Achaia, is to be excluded, since it is unsure whether he was procurator or proconsul; D 246, Lucilius Capito in Asia in AD 23, is presumably too late.

[51] *CIL* II²/7. 544. The relationships among the three women and three men are baffling. Carefully discussed by Remesal Rodríguez 2000, with strong arguments for a second-century date and connections with the oil trade with Rome.

[52] II²/7. 153: *P. Valerio Egerino L. Marius Persini l. Phileros*.

[53] Sure guidance through the exotic thickets of elite Roman polyonymity is provided by Salomies 1992: 24–25.

> *Minucium libertis tradit* [sc. *Cassius*] *excruciandum, item Calpurnium Salvianum qui profitetur indicium coniuratorumque numerum auget, vere ut quidam existimant, ut nonnulli queruntur coactus. Isdem cruciatus adfectus L. Mercello.*[54]

The phrasing is obscure, but note that yet again opinions about motives differ, here as to the degree of Calpurnius' culpability. Precision is impossible, it is not absolutely clear that Lucius Mercello was betrayed by Calpurnius Salvianus in 48 BC, but it seems likely. Surely the enmity of Calpurnius Salvianus and Sextus Marius in AD 25 was rooted in an ancient provincial feud.[55]

IX

This explanation of the incident of AD 25 draws attention to the salient feature of Tacitus' two-sentence account of the quarrel between the two men. Compact and elliptical, it is close to incomprehensible. The scene is the springtime festival of the *Feriae Latinae*. The senior magistrates are all out of town, celebrating Jupiter Latiaris on the Alban Mount. Drusus, Tiberius' 17- or 18-year-old grandson, is temporarily in charge of the city of Rome. The impatient Salvianus interrupts the young man while he is taking the auspices on the tribunal. Tiberius is outraged and Salvianus is exiled. Tacitus' omissions are extraordinary here, even for Tacitus. Despite his claim that prosecutions were virtually nonstop in 25, "fewer are recorded in this year than in any of the preceding or any of several others".[56] We get no hint whatsoever about the nature of Salvianus' grievance against Marius. We get no inkling of Tiberius' relationship with Sextus Marius – that comes from Dio, not Tacitus. We get no hint of what the charge against Salvianus in his turn may have been, or who brought it, indeed it is not clear from the Latin exactly what Tiberius was complaining about and how it was the reason for exile. *Exilium*, voluntary or enforced, was the punishment for a crime, but interrupting a magistrate at a religious ceremony was hardly criminal. The historian's account of the affair is thin to the vanishing point. This should prepare us for the fall of Marius himself: the more we look, the less there is to see.

Let us start with the most obvious problem, Dio's tale of the neighbor's villa: "Imperial favor had made the man so rich and powerful that once, when he was at odds with a neighbor, he invited him to be his guest for two days, on the first of which he razed the man's villa level with the ground and on the next rebuilt it on a larger and more elaborate scale." This is followed by Dio's heavy-handed moralizing, making explicit what is implicit in the story he relates, here that Caesar's friend has the power to do both good and evil. The anecdote floats free of time and space: when and where the incident occurred is unstated; the simple-minded neighbor is anonymous. Not surprisingly, no one has ever cited any historical parallel for Marius' metaphor in stone, and no commentator has noted the fundamental problem: the thing is impossible. We need not consider the rhythms and limitations of the Roman building industry, the co-ordination and deployment of labor, the innumerable accidents of weather, geography, health, and so on. No human being can empty and destroy a mansion and construct and furnish a new one overnight. But a genie can.

This is a fairy tale, well attested in a variety of versions around the world. In Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (*MI*) it can be discovered under D 1131. 1, 2, and 3, "Castle/Palace/House produced by magic", and specifically under H 1104 "Task: building castle in one night", and 1133. 1 "Task: building magic castle". Richly variant versions can be cited from Russia, Arabia, Bohemia, Albania, Denmark,

[54] It continues *Squillus nominat plures*. Klotz notes in his 1927 Teubner apparatus: *post* Mercello *lac. stat. Nipp. fort. non necessario*. (The lacuna was accepted in Du Pontet's 1908 OCT.)

[55] As stated above, seven inscriptions bear the unusual name Mercello. To these an eighth might be added. A well-carved text from Sabetum, in the territory of Corduba some 41 km to the South, names two local magistrates who paid for a gate to the town. One of them, a *Xvir Maxs(umus)*, has the bizarre name of *Binsnes Vercellonis f(ilius)*. As to the nonsensical "Binsnes", Lacourt Navarro et al. can cite nothing even remotely similar (1986: 69–78, at 73), while Castillo simply inserts "(sic)" after the name (1986: 376–381, at 377). As to "Vercellonis", the combination of letters "-ercello-" is found otherwise on inscriptions and in literature only in the name "Mercello", suggesting an error by the lapicide, "V" for "M", unlikely though that may seem. This inscription, *AE* 1986. 369 = 1987. 504 is precisely the one mentioned above (n. 31) as naming Q. Cassius Longinus as *tribunus plebis pro praetore* in 49 BC.

[56] So Martin–Woodman 1989: 184–185, quoting the comment of R. S. Rogers.

Greece, Burma, Sicily, India, Mongolia – most famously, the palace completed for Aladdin by the genie of the lamp.[57] When a villa disappears and reappears overnight it must be magic.

There seem to be three basic facts about Sextus Marius: he was very wealthy; he was accused of incest with his daughter; and he perished because of wealth and incest. It is striking that, beyond these basic facts, the two accounts of Marius' downfall from Tacitus and Dio have nothing in common except their shared belief that Tiberius was a monster. But for Tacitus his deadly sin is avarice, while for Dio it is lust. Tacitus reports with precision that Marius was charged, *defertur*, with incest and was thrown from the Tarpeian rock, and that Tiberius confiscated his mines. He says nothing about the man's power or any relationship with Tiberius, or about the hiding and death of the daughter. Dio tells us that Marius was the rich and powerful friend of Tiberius, he hid his beautiful daughter from Tiberius' lust, he was charged (apparently) with having intercourse with her, and for that reason both he and she died. He says nothing about the Tarpeian Rock or the mines. Beyond the three common facts noted above, these are two completely different versions of the same tale. Of those three facts, there can be no doubt that the man was fabulously wealthy, but both incest and execution are another matter. As with the magic villa, they cannot be true as presented, and for much the same reason.

There are two legal-historical obstacles. First, the crime of incest. Everything we know about it was considered by Mommsen in 6 pages of his massive *Römisches Strafrecht*.[58] He devoted 7 paragraphs to the subject. The first 5 long paragraphs deal precisely and only with forbidden degrees of kinship in *marriage*. The 6th, brief paragraph considers the court, "which can only have been the quaestorian-comitial" under the Republic. No evidence is cited, and Mommsen observes that for the imperial period "evidence is completely lacking". Then the 7th and last, brief paragraph:

> It cannot be doubted that according to the original regulation incest was punished with death, despite the lack of explicit evidence. The death penalty is also attested in the imperial period for the highest courts, which indeed had the right to increase the punishment; but normally incest was punished with deportation. In late antiquity a real increase in the penalties was probably sought but was not introduced indefinitely.

This striking three-sentence account of the punishment for incest by the greatest modern historian of ancient Rome is purest fantasy. There is no evidence that the original penalty for incest was death, nor indeed are any cases on record. Just three passages are cited to support deportation as the normal punishment: all clearly deal with forbidden incestuous marriages and they occur, appropriately, in discussions of Augustus' *Lex Iulia de adulteriis*.[59] Precisely *one* case is cited for the death penalty, the case of Sextus Marius, which has nothing to do with marriage. It is also the only support offered for the claim that higher courts (plural) could increase penalties, which looks rather circular. A footnote adds that Marius and his daughter were executed by the senate, citing the passages in Tacitus and Dio. In fact the senate is not named by either historian, nor is the hypothetical lower court; Tacitus does not mention the daughter; Dio does not mention the charge at all.[60] Mommsen's note concludes, "Presumably there were republican precedents for this."

---

[57] Examples in M. Lyons, *The Arabian Nights. Tales of 1001 Nights* (London, 2008) 3. 791–800 (Aladdin), cf. 806–810 (palace disappears), 821–823 (and reappears); 2. 638; 1. 847–851; A. Afanasiev, *Russian Fairy Tales* (New York, 1945) 31–37, 46–48; W. A. Clouston, *Popular Tales and Fictions: their Migrations and Transformations* (Edinburgh, 1887) 148–171; F. Anstey, *The Brass Bottle* (London, 1900) ch. 8–10. Cf. especially M. Lyons, *The Arabian Epic. Heroic and Oral Story-Telling. Vol. 2: Analysis* (Cambridge, 1995) 444–445 for versions around the world; et al.

[58] Mommsen 1899: 682–688 (the equivalent of 6 pages). Everything we know: that is, no new evidence has accrued since 1899, and there has been no historical and remarkably little (not to say consequential) legal scholarship on the subject.

[59] *Ib.* 688 n. 5: Paul (*Sententiae*) 2. 26. 15; *Digest* 48. 5. 12 pr. (Papinian), 18. 5 (Ulpian). The first includes the word *incesti* in its discussion; I confess that I can find no reference to incest in the other two passages. *Collatio* 6. 4. 3 is also cited in the same note, an edict of Diocletian and Maximian, to show that incest was a capital offence, but the passage deals explicitly with *inlicitis incestisque matrimoniis*. Finally *Digest* 48. 5. 14. 4 (Ulpian, again on the Augustan adultery law), which does not say what Mommsen says it does.

[60] *Loc. cit.* n. 4.

What this ramshackle edifice obscures is the fact that the Marius incident is the *only* apparent instance at Rome of father-daughter incest in the sense that we would understand it. When we turn to Otto Rank's classic 600-page *Incest Theme in Literature and Legend*, we find that 22 out of 24 chapters are concerned with sexual liaisons between mothers and sons or between brothers and sisters. Of the remaining two chapters, just one is devoted to "The Relationship between Father and Daughter in Myth, Folktales, Legends, Literature, Life and Neurosis", while the other considers all types of "Incest in Historical Times: Tradition, Custom, and Law", with a mere two pages on father-daughter incest.[61] Despite the allusions to "Life" and to "Historical Times", Rank cites no actual historical example or even allegation of father-daughter incest from the ancient world (missing Sextus Marius). It is not that fathers did not commit incest with daughters in the Greco-Roman world: they did, and they provided rich literary material. But there is no evidence that the act was a crime or even a delict in Roman law, other than as part of restrictions on consanguineous marriage. Or rather, the only evidence is the case of Sextus Marius.

The other legal-historical obstacle is the alleged punishment for the alleged crime, the spectacular hurling from the Tarpeian Rock. Who was thrown from the Rock and for what crime? There is no complete register of such punishments, whether historical or legendary, actual or attempted. The fullest list available cites some 17 incidents – ranging from Coriolanus, supposedly threatened with precipitation in 491 BC, to a knight condemned for conspiracy against Claudius in AD 43. To this catalog at least another 6 cases can be added.[62] Throughout the Republic, where the context is known, these executions occur invariably during a time of overt public crisis or conflict, internal or external. What is absolutely clear from these known occasions is that when we are given the reason for this particular form of execution, that reason is treason, be it defined as *perduellio* or *maiestas*, be it against the people or the *princeps*.[63] After a hiatus under the long principate of Augustus, the condemnations start up again under the conservative Tiberius at the same time as the charges of *maiestas* come into full play. Of the four Tiberian instances, three involved treason.[64] The fourth is the execution of Sextus Marius.

To frame the matter succinctly in its legal and historical context: both Marius' alleged crime of incest and his alleged punishment at the Tarpeian Rock are unique in Roman history and literature.[65] They belong, rather, like the magic villa, to the world of folklore.

In the *1001 Nights*, Aladdin's overnight palace is matched by the greatest of all tales:

> Every night for the next three years [for reasons too complicated to explain, the Sasanian king] Shahriyar would take a virgin, deflower her and then kill her. This led to unrest among the citizens; they fled away with their daughters until there were no nubile girls left in the city. Then, when the vizier was ordered to bring the king a girl as usual, he searched but could not find a

[61] Rank 1992: 300–359.

[62] *LTUR* IV (199) 237–238, 'Saxum Tarpeium' (T. P. Wiseman), noting that the references are *exempli gratia*. Pais 1905 is invaluable. The task of finding examples is complicated by inconsistent nomenclature for the site in the sources. Add to Wiseman's list: Dionysius of Halicarnassus 11. 6. 1, senator opposing decemvirs threatened in 449 BC; Livy 5. 47. 9, negligent guard on Capitol in 390; Livy 24. 20. 7, 370 deserters in 214; Dio 42. 32. 3, opponents of Mark Antony in 48; Appian *BC* 3. 1. 3, Dio 44. 50. 3, rioters after Caesar's death executed by Mark Antony in 44; Dio 48. 34. 5, slave masquerading as praetor in 39.

[63] Two relevant matters must be dealt with summarily here. (1.) There is discussion in modern legal literature about precipitation from the rock for private crimes. This is based on two passages in the Twelve Tables mentioning it for bearing "false witness" and for "theft by a slave". It must be emphasized that there is no other evidence whatsoever for either, and certainly by the last days of the republic slaves were *not* thrown from the Rock: see Plutarch *Sulla* 10. 2 and the last two passages cited in the previous note. "Witchcraft" is likewise seen as a private crime, citing T 2. 32. 3, but the punishment arose from the conspiracy of Libo Drusus, hence should be treason. That leaves only the "incest" of Sextus Marius. (2.) Where known, the accusers were tribunes or consuls or other magistrates, that is, guardians of the safety of the people or the state. *Pace* Mommsen, there is no hint that the senate played a role.

[64] T 2. 32. 2; Dio 57. 22. 5, 58. 15. 2.

[65] R. A. Kaster reminds us that *incestum* punished by precipitation from the Tarpeian Rock is the subject of Seneca's *Controversiae* 1. 3. There "incest" is actually the "unchastity" of a Vestal Virgin (a well-known *crimen* for Vestal Virgins, but nothing to do with a relative) and the punishment is sheer fantasy (unchaste Vestals were buried alive). But perhaps the simple concatenation of the two in schoolroom declamation planted the seeds of the tale of Sextus Marius in the mind that created it. And indeed, in one version the eponymous Tarpeia was a Vestal Virgin.

> single one, and had to go home empty-handed, dejected and afraid of what the king might do to him.
>
> This man had two daughters, of whom the elder was called Shahrazad and the younger Dunyazad. Shahrazad had read books and histories, accounts of past kings and stories of earlier peoples, having collected, it was said, a thousand volumes of these, covering peoples, kings and poets.[66]

Scheherazade was luckier than Marius's daughter.

According to Dio, the daughter was beautiful, he sent her away to avoid Tiberius' lust, he was accused of incest, they both died. Two folk motifs are blended here. One is that of the father, most often a king, seeking to protect his daughter's virginity, rejecting suitors, hiding her away in a cave, a hollow hill, a cellar, a tower, a forest, a sea of flames, or on an island.[67] More specifically, there are folkloric examples of the father fleeing with the daughter from an unwelcome suitor, just as the prudent subjects of King Shahriyar would do.[68] But most importantly, the father who is reluctant to allow his daughter to marry is often reluctant because he wishes to marry her himself, or even just to sleep with her.[69] That is, the father's hiding of the daughter from the desires of other men is motivated by his own desire for her: precisely what we find so brilliantly conjoined in Dio's abbreviated narrative. The tale of Sextus Marius is fiction, not history.

X

To recapitulate: we can confirm that Sextus Marius was indeed one of the richest men in the Roman world. Closely connected with the *domus Caesarum*, his Italian roots were intertwined with those of the highest stratum of a Spanish aristocracy familiar with, closely involved with, the fractured oligarchy of Rome for almost two centuries. Yet the details of his life slip away from us in the three passages in Tacitus and Dio. The altercation with Calpurnius Salvianus remains a mystery, and a clue to its solution can only be glimpsed in external sources. The crime of incest and its punishment at the Tarpeian Rock are unlikely in the extreme. The magical villa and the tables turned by the lustful suitor on the lustful father are dazzling inventions.

From this exercise in uncertainty, two conclusions might be considered, one historical and speculative, one historiographical and assured. Tacitus tells us that Marius was denounced for having polluted his daughter and that he was cast down from the Tarpeian Rock. Without knowing the historian's motives for presenting Marius' fate thus, let us decouple the two statements: the punishment does not fit the assumed but imaginary crime. But if the *fact* of execution at the Rock is real, as we have no reason to doubt, the crime *mus*t be *maiestas*. The context in Tacitus is then striking. After presenting the financial crisis of AD 33 (6. 16–17), he reverts to *priores metus* with three apparently random criminal condemnations: the sudden execution of a Considius Proculus and the probable exile of his sister, on a charge which is unstated; the exile of a Pompeia Macrina and the suicides of her father and brother, on a charge which is preposterous; and the execution of Sextus Marius, on a charge which is impossible (6. 18. 1–19. 1).[70] And then, "Spurred by these reprisals, *inritatusque suppliciis*, he ordered all who were being held in prison accused of association with Sejanus to be executed." (6. 19. 2) Now despite the vagueness of *priores metus*, we know that the death of Considius Proculus was in some way connected with the fall of Sejanus, that is, these three random disasters are bracketed with Sejanus, and indeed many of the *maiestas* trials in these years are connected,

---

[66] Lyons 2008: 7.

[67] Rank 1992: ch. 11; Lyons 1995: 288. Both with examples: cf. *ATU* 870, The Princess Confined in a Mound.

[68] Lyons 1995: 288, with five examples. Also the citizens fleeing with their daughters at the beginning of the *1001 Nights*.

[69] The point is made, with examples, at Lyons 1995: 386. Cf. *MI* T411, father-daughter incest; *MI* T411. 1, lecherous father wants to marry daughter; *ATU* 706 C, The Father Who Wanted to Marry his Daughter. Most notoriously in ancient literature, the opening of *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii*, where King Antiochus *incidit in amorem filiae suae* (*virginem speciosissimam*; cf. *incredibilem puellae speciem*). He rapes and from then on secretly sleeps with her in the palace, pretending to be a good father. He rejects all suitors; he is struck down by a thunderbolt.

[70] On all of the problems of this paragraph, see the authoritative commentary of Woodman on Book VI, forthcoming.

explicitly or often implicitly, with his historic catastrophe in late 31. If Considius Proculus, perhaps too Pompeia Macrina and Sextus Marius. If Marius was indeed condemned for treason, perhaps he was associated with Sejanus. Some of the prefect's supporters were indeed hurled from the Rock.[71]

The second conclusion is more substantial. To say that we know both more and less about Sextus Marius is to mark the deep dissonance between the common historical narrative and what we can learn from its context and from other sources. The real Marius has been lost in Tacitus and Cassius Dio. The richest man in Spain is a straw figure, and what we have in their accounts of his fall are exercises in evasion and fantasy. They differ radically, and it is modern readers who recreate a unified tale. Tacitus and Dio are indeed united in their hostility to Tiberius and have no doubt that his motives are evil, be they overt or hidden – but the motives adduced by each are very different. Here, as so often in their narratives and in the biography of Suetonius, we can discern behind our three major sources for the life of the second *princeps* the powerful vision of a brilliantly inventive historian whose work is now lost. The facts are as they may be, but his interpretation is clear. He knew and hated Tiberius, and much of what he tells us about him is malicious fiction.[72]

Bibliography

Briquel, D., 2011. Rivista di epigrafia italica, *St.Etruschi* 74: 428–431.
Castillo, C., 1986. Miscelánea epigráfica hispano-romana, *SDHI* 52: 353–394.
Champlin, E., 2015. Mallonia, *Histos* 9: 220–230.
Cumont, F., 1927. Les Syriens en Espagne et les Adonies à Seville, *Syria* 8: 330–341.
Demougin, S., 1992. *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens (43 av. J.-C. – 70 ap. J.-C.)*. Rome.
Díaz Ariño, B., 2008a. *Epigrafía latina republicana de Hispania (ELRH)*. Barcelona.
– 2008b. Un *quaestor pro praetore* republicano en *Carthago Nova*, *JRA* 21: 255–263.
Díaz Ariño, B., Antolinos Marín, J. A., 2013. The Organization of Mining and Metal Production in Carthago Nova between the Late Republic and Early Empire, *Athenaeum* 101: 535–553.
Domergue, C., 1987. *Catalogue des mines et des fonderies antiques de la Péninsule Ibérique*. Madrid.
– 1990. *Les mines de la Peninsule Ibérique dans l'antiquité romaine*. Rome.
Eck, W., Fernández, F., 1991. Sex. Marius in einem Hospitiumvertrag aus der Baetica, *ZPE* 85: 217–222.
Gaertner, J. F., Hauburg, B. C., 2013. *Caesar and the Bellum Alexandrinum. An Analysis of Style, Narrative Technique, and the Reception of Greek Historiography*. Göttingen.
García-Dils de la Vega, S., Ordóñez Agulla, S., 2015. Nueva inscripcíon edilicia de *colonia Augusta Firma Astigi* (Écija, Sevilla): Primera evidencia epigráfica de las *porticus Munatianae* y la *basilica*, *ZPE* 194: 281–289.
Gianfrotta, P., 2004. I relitti de la Camargue e *Sextus Marius Hispaniarum ditissimus* (Tac., *Ann*. VI, 19, 1), *RSL* 70: 161–176.
González, J., 2008. Fragmento de Tabula Hospitalis, *Epigrafía Jurídica de la Bética* (Rome): 317–319.
Hirt, A. M., 2010. *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World. Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235*. Oxford.
Jacobson, D. M., Weitzman, M. P., 1992. What Was Corinthian Bronze? *AJA* 96: 237–247.
Klotz, A., 1925. Zu Bell. Alex. 55, 5 und Val. Max. IX. 4, 2. *RhM* 74: 234.
Koch, M., 2010. Warum nicht Curvius Silvinus? Eine Hypothese! *Madrider Mitteilungen* 51: 360–367.
Lacourt Navarro, P. J., Portillo, R., Stylow, A. U., 1986. Nuevas inscripciones latinas de Córdoba y su provincia, *Faventia* 8: 69–109.
Landgraf, G., 1890. *Der Bericht des C. Asinius Pollio über die Spanischen Unruhen des Jahres 48 v. Chr.* Erlangen.
Laronde, A., 2010. Une inscription de Ptolémaïs, Libye, et Marcus Iuventius Laterensis, Y. Le Bohec, ed., *État et société aux deux derniers siècles de la République Romaine. Hommage à François Hinard* (Paris): 127–132.
Linderski, J., 1975. Two Quaestorships, *CP* 70: 35–38.
Lyons, M. C., 1995. *The Arabian Epic. Heroic and Oral Story-Telling*. Vol. 2: *Analysis*. Cambridge.
– 2008. *The Arabian Nights. Tales of 1001 Nights*. Vol. I: *Nights 1 to 294*. London.
Martin, R., Woodman, A. J., 1989. *Tacitus. Annals Book IV*. Cambridge.

[71] So Dio 58. 15. 2, under the year 31, but his section 58. 14–16 clearly describes the long repercussions of the great fall, which continued into the year 35, not just the last 2½ months of 31.

[72] Among many other examples, cf. the story of Mallonia at Suetonius *Tiberius* 45: Champlin 2015.

Mommsen, T., 1899. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Leipzig.
Pais, E., 1905. *Ancient Legends of Roman History*. New York.
Panzram, S., 2002. *Stadtbild und Elite: Tarraco, Corduba und Augusta Emerita zwischen Republik und Spätantike*. Stuttgart.
Rank, O., 1992. *The Incest Theme in Literature and Legend. Fundamentals of a Psychology of Literary Creation*. Baltimore. [German original 1912.]
Remesal Rodríguez, J., 2000. *L. Marius Phoebus mercator olei Hispani ex provincia Baetica*. Consideraciones en torno a los terminos *mercator*, *negotiator*, y *diffusor olearius ex Baetica*, G. Paci, ed., *ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΑΙ. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini* (Tivoli): 2, 781–797.
Salomies, O., 1992. *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 97). Helsinki.
Schmidt, M. G., 2011. *A Gadibus Romam*. Myth and Reality of an Ancient Route, *BICS* 54: 71–86.
Syme, R., 1980. *Some Arval Brethren*. Oxford.
Ventura, A., León, P., Márquez, C., 1998. Roman Cordoba in the Light of Recent Archaeological Research, S. Keay, ed., *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica* (Portsmouth, RI): 87–107.
Ventura Villanueva, A., 1999. El teatro en el context urbano de Colonia Patricia (Córdoba): ambiente epigráfico, evergetas y cult imperial, *AEA* 72: 47–72.
Wiseman, T. P., 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.—A.D. 14*. Oxford.
Zeidler, J., 2005. Onomastic Studies on Some Roman *Amici* in Hispania, A. Coskun, ed., *Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat* (Göttingen): 175–200.

Edward Champlin, Department of Classics, Princeton University
champlin@princeton.edu