

CAESAR, ETRURIA AND THE *DISCIPLINA ETRUSCA*

By ELIZABETH RAWSON

I. POLITICAL LOYALTIES IN FIRST-CENTURY ITALY

In investigating the workings of the Roman *clientela* system in the first century B.C., we are accustomed to finding a complex pattern. Within a province or other area, different cities or even different families inside a city may look to different Roman magnates, or even have a plethora of patrons, who can be played off against each other. For example, Sicily in Cicero's time was particularly richly provided: various branches of the patrician and plebeian Claudii, notably the Marcelli, also Pompey, Cicero himself, and others. After the Mithridatic War, as I have tried to argue, Pompey's view of his influence and responsibilities in the East clashed head-on with that of the patrician Claudii, who had long-established interests in many parts of the area.¹ A great dynast might indeed control a city, though he would probably have some opponents in it; given inter-city and other rivalries he would find it hard to control a whole province, though his influence might be strong and widespread within it.

On the whole the same would seem to be true of Italy, both before and after enfranchisement. 'The common "regional" view of Italian allegiance, whether or not combined with a "class" view, is a misleading oversimplification.'² But Badian admits two exceptions to his wise generalization: Picenum was Pompey's, and Etruria Caesar's. I want, in view particularly of some remarkably extreme and contradictory statements recently made about Etruria, to see how far these exceptions really hold, and how far, where they are concerned, Caesar was justified in 49 B.C. in telling the Massalioes 'debere eos Italiae totius auctoritatem sequi potius quam unius hominis voluntati obtemperare'.³ He had been much encouraged, of course (and Cicero much disgusted), by the support, or at worst acquiescence, that he had received from the *municipia* on invading Italy,⁴ and subsequently he seems, from inscriptions, to have become patron of a number of Italian towns—at any rate Alba Fucens,⁵ Bovianum Undecimanorum,⁶ and Vibo⁷ (and there is a dedication to him as *pater patriae* from Brundisium).⁸ It was no doubt upon such developments, and on the interest in municipal affairs that he took towards the end of his life, that the *iuratio Italiae* of his adopted son Octavian was based.

With Picenum I will deal briefly. Pompey's hold on it in the late eighties is recognized by our sources: he owned estates there and was especially popular in the towns for his father's sake.⁹ He could impede Carbo's levies and himself raise legions from the *ager Picens*, 'qui totus paternis eius clientelis refertus erat'.¹⁰ According to Cicero, 'ille adversariorum partibus agrum Picenum habuit inimicum'; and much later, in 56, he could summon a *magna manus* from Picenum and the *ager Gallicus* to oppose Clodius, and in 49 he trusted that his recruits from the area would be loyal.¹¹ But in the event, as we know, on Caesar's appearance Pompey's support crumbled almost at a touch. The fact is,

¹ 'The Eastern Clientelae of Clodius and the Claudii', *Historia* xxii (1973), 219.

² E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (1958), 247; he notes also the coherence of Samnium till Sulla, not a matter of *clientela*.

³ *BC* I, 35, 1, cf. II, 32, 2.

⁴ *Ad Att.* VIII, 16, 1-2; IX, 5, 3.

⁵ F. De Visscher, 'Jules César patron d'Alba Fucens', *Ant. Class.* xxxiii (1964), 98, noting that Alba is in Caesar's own tribe, the Fabia, which is also that of his enemy Domitius Ahenobarbus, whose family must have lost influence in the place. The inscription dates from 48-7.

⁶ *ILLRP* 406 (48-7 B.C.). Cf. Strabo v, 249, demoted to a village by Sulla.

⁷ A. Panuccio, 'Un' Iscrizione di Cesare a Vibo Valentia', *Athenaeum* XLV (1967), 158; cf. I. Bitto,

'La concessione del Patronato nella Politica di Cesare', *Epigraphica* xxxii (1970), 172. (A Tarentine inscription not referring to patronage, L. Gasperini, *ibid.* xxxiii (1971), 48, also discussing Caesar as patron of Greek cities.) The Vibo inscription is of 46 B.C.

⁸ *ILLRP* 407 (45-4 B.C.). Degraffi, *ad loc.*, accepts it as genuine.

⁹ Plutarch, *Pompey* 6.

¹⁰ Velleius Paterculus II, 29; recruits mostly his father's veterans, *Bell. Afr.* 22, 2; Valerius Maximus v, 2, 9; Cicero, *Phil.* v, 44.

¹¹ *Ad Q. f.* II, 3, 4; Pompey still rested hopes on Picenum in 49, *ad Att.* VII, 16, 2; VIII, 12c, 2. But Caesar, *BC* I, 13, 1 f. could recruit, or take over enemy troops, here, and his clemency at Corfinium bound a large area to him, *BC* II, 32.

I think, that the situation there in the eighties was, for Italy, wholly irregular. Pompey's position was largely based on the military conquest and administration of the area during the Social War by his peculiarly ambitious and unscrupulous father (whether the family originated from the region is disputed). Anyone not supporting Pompeius Strabo could be represented as anti-Roman and eliminated; even in the later eighties force could be used. The fate of one leading family is clear: not only was the Ventidius Bassus later so famous carried off, apparently from Asculum, to be borne in Strabo's triumph, but two brothers of the name who supported Carbo were expelled from Auximum. In some place unknown, his fellow-citizens lynched a certain Vedius who supported Carbo and jeered at young Pompey, and Carbo's other friends all fled when Pompey toured the rest of the towns.¹² After Sulla and the final pacification of Italy this sort of thing became impossible; and it seems likely that rifts appeared. Firmum had been Strabo's base, and Asculum probably entered its victor's *clientela*; but Fermo and Ascoli are bitterly jealous of each other even today, and were surely more so when their differences in origin and status (one a Roman colony, the other a native Picene community) were as obvious as those in setting and architectural character still are. A C. Sornatius, whose tribe, the Velina, might suggest Picene origin, served under Pompey's rival, Lucullus.¹³ Caesar while in Gaul had Picene officers who, unlike Labienus, stuck to him thereafter—notably L. Minucius Basilus and, perhaps understandably, Ventidius Bassus—and by the late forties (though under the shadow of his *clementia* this is perhaps not surprising) possessed a number of Picene supporters: probably Nonius Asprenas, certainly a Lollius Palicanus, moneyer in 44.¹⁴

As for Etruria, it is usually assumed, as it is by Badian, that here Caesar had, from an early stage in his career, massive support, as the inheritor of the mantle of Marius and Cinna.¹⁵ This support is often thought to have come chiefly from the poorer classes, whence Marius will have drawn many of his troops and who might be supposed to appreciate his (at times) *popularis* attitude.¹⁶ Caesar was in fact suspected of sympathizing with Lepidus and Catiline, who had raised those, presumably mostly peasants, dispossessed by Sulla in Etruria. However, Professor Brunt has reminded us that the evidence for Marius' support for and from Italians before the Social War is slight (though this support may still be thought likely);¹⁷ and it is sometimes denied, though in the teeth of Appian, *BC* 1 67, that he found true Etruscan followers on landing at Telamon in 87.¹⁸ As for the upper classes, prosperous Etruscans who had become Roman *equites* by enfranchisement in or before 89, some of whom seem to have had interests in banking or business, in Italy or abroad, might have become sympathetic to Marius on account of his ties with the class

¹² Plutarch, loc. cit. *Pace* A. Gellius xv, 4, Ventidius Bassus is unlikely to have been really 'genere et loco humili', by Picene standards. *ILLRP* 382, Pompey patron of Auximum.

¹³ T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (1971), no. 406, cf. 525.

¹⁴ The Minucii Basili, Wiseman, op. cit., no. 258; Nonius, no. 274—his father and uncle may have been on Strabo's *consilium*; cf. G. W. Houston, 'Nonius Flaccus: A new Equestrian career from Firmum Picenum', *Cl. Phil.* LXXII (1977), 232. The Lollius Palicanus, *trib.* 72 B.C., was a 'humili loco Picens' (Sallust, *Hist.* IV, 43M), probably acting for Pompey; the moneyer, Crawford, *RRC* 1, 482. In general, E. Gabba, *Esercito e Società nella Tarda Repubblica Romana* (1973), 64.

¹⁵ e.g. L. Piotrowicz, 'Quelques remarques sur l'attitude de l'Etrurie pendant les troubles civils à la fin de la République romaine', *Klio* xxiii (1930), 334; R. Syme, 'Caesar, the Senate and Italy', *PBSR* xiv (1938), 1; E. Badian, 'Caepio and Norbanus', *Historia* vi (1957), 318 = *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (1964), 49, and *FC* (1958), 222; L. R. Taylor, *Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (1960), 117, 130; E. T. Salmon, *Samnum and the Samnites* (1967), 385; *Roman Colonization* (1969), 251.

¹⁶ E. Gabba writes of 'la tendenza filomariana delle classi inferiori etrusche', op. cit. (n. 14), 308; M. Sordi, 'Ottaviano e l'Etruria', *St. Etr.* xl (1972), 3 holds both 'gran parte della nobiltà etrusca' and 'le masse popolari' Caesarian. Cf. W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (1971), 251.

¹⁷ P. A. Brunt, 'Italian Aims at the time of the Social War', *JRS* lv (1965), 90. But it would have been sensible of Marius to pick up the Gracchan tradition of support for Italian claims (his silence in 91 may suggest it was hard for him to oppose Drusus) and many allied soldiers may have been devoted to him (northern barbarians were the traditional enemy of the Etruscans). His mother Fulcinia may be related to the prominent family from Tarquinii. Diodorus xxxvii, 15, Marius fraternizing with Pompaeidius in 90, has been doubted.

¹⁸ E. Ruoff-Väänänen in *Studies in the Romanization of Etruria*, *Acta Inst. Rom. Finl.* v (1975), 78: he raised slaves and Roman citizens of the area; D. B. Nagle, 'An Allied View of the Social War', *AJA* LXXVII (1973), 367. But Appian talks of *ὑποθητοὶ* attracted by the promise of support over the vote; cf. Plutarch, *Marius* 41, 4.

and his non-urban birth;¹⁹ though Harris has argued that the Italian aristocracies only came over to Cinna and Carbo when these distributed the recently enfranchised allies among all the thirty-five tribes.²⁰ He is right at least that the prominent anti-Sullans of Etruscan origin cannot be linked specifically to Marius. At any rate, no one will deny the desperate resistance to Sulla in Etruria in the late eighties, the prominent role in it of M. Perperna in particular (though Perpernae had been in Rome for a couple of generations) and the harsh treatment by Sulla of many Etruscan communities. But this last should have left pro-Sullans firmly in control, at least for a time; and it has recently been asked whether local as well as national office was not barred to the sons of Sulla's victims.²¹ Sulla also of course founded colonies in Etruria, where those of the original inhabitants who survived probably had inferior rights to the new veteran settlers.

Where Caesar is concerned, Harris is more cautious than most writers on the subject.²² He points out that there is no specific evidence that his troops were enthusiastically welcomed in Etruria in 49 (though Caesar himself claims that at near-by Iguvium in Umbria they were)²³ and he notes that Caesar later used land in the area, presumably that of opponents, for veteran allotments;²⁴ and that if he had some Etruscan supporters, there were (as we shall see) influential Etruscans, and men with *clientelae* in Etruria, on the other side.

But M. Torelli has recently gone to the opposite extreme, at least where the aristocracy is concerned, declaring that the inconspicuous Caesennius Lento is 'l'unico etrusco di parte cesariano' (though he grudgingly admits to the Volcaciai Tulli and indeed some others in a footnote), and holding that there was 'una "coscienza politica" etrusca' that made all members of the aristocracy follow the same, coherent, policy.²⁵ This reflects that belief in a strongly aristocratic social structure in Etruria which is held by most students of this people, and in the aristocrats' loathing of kingship. M. Pallottino speaks of the Etruscan 'hatred of monarchy, of which we possess few but eloquent testimonies', and thinks that the Etruscan nobility seems to have carried this tendency further even than the Roman one did.²⁶

¹⁹ Even the Etruscan aristocracy had a 'habitus mentale democratico', claims M. Cristofani, *St. Etr.* XLI (1973), 591—most unlikely, and not to be proved by Maecenas' refusal to enter the Senate, which a man 'Tusco de sanguine regum' probably thought a step down.

E. Badian, *Publicans and Sinners* (1972), 93 supposes the C. Maecenas who opposed Drusus in 91 to be a *publicanus*; Fulcinius of Tarquinii was a banker in Rome (*pro Caecina* 10); A. Caecina, no Marian probably, had *negotia* in Asia (below); a few more *negotiatores* than, e.g., A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (1966), 88 etc. allows may be Etruscans, even in the East, where in Lydia and Mysia at least they could exploit legendary connections. J. Hatzfeld, *Les Trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique* (1919), lists in his Index Arruntii, a Saenius at Corcyra, a Porsennius in Crete; a Persius, Horace, *Sat.* I, 7 and *IG XII*, 8, 205; Trebonii, see below. M. Cristofani, in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (ed. P. Zanker) II (1976), 334, is not the only archaeologist to connect the 'chiara ripresa edilizia' of many Etruscan cities in the second century with wealth brought in by *negotiatores* (booty too, perhaps).

²⁰ *op. cit.* (n. 16), 252. See Exuperantius 7 (probably from Sallust, on 83 B.C.): 'erat autem Etruria fidissima partibus Marianis, quia ab ipsis Romanam quam antea non habebant acceperant civitatem; timentes igitur Etrusci ne beneficium tantae dignitatis a Marianis acceptum Sylla revocaret, si adversae partes essent amputatae, penitus ad Sertorium se atque alios eiusdem factionis duces applicarunt'. For devotion to Marius as opposed to the Mariani, note Catiline raised the eagle of Marius in Etruria; hardly to attract the Sullan veterans who joined his revolt.

²¹ P. Harvey, 'Cicero, *leg. agr.* 2.78 and the Sullan colony at Praeneste', *Athenaeum* LIII (1975), 33: some old local families survive to hold office in the Sullan colony, more re-emerge later. P. Castrén, *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus* (1975), 92 shows Sabellian families emerging in the *ordo* of the Sullan colony here only in the fifties or even forties. For Sulla's weeding-out of opponents all over Italy, Cic., *pro Rosc. Am.* 16; Diod. Sic. xxxviii/xxxix 13; perhaps Sisenna frag. 132 (Peter).

²² *op. cit.* (n. 16), 296.

²³ *BC* I, 12.

²⁴ At Volaterrae, Veii, Capena and probably Arretium and Castrum Novum at least; for Florentia, C. Hardie, 'The Origin and Plan of Roman Florence', *JRS* LV (1965), 122.

²⁵ 'Senatori Etruschi della tarda repubblica e dell'impero', *Dial. di Arch.* III (1969), 285—speaking of course only of senators. Cf. E. Gabba, *op. cit.* (n. 14), 90, Marian officers not usually of 'i ceti più elevati della regione, in notoria connessione con l'oligarchia Romana', and 308, Sertorius' scribe Maecenas perhaps not of the great family, or he would be, like Perperna, 'una eccezione alla normale intonazione oligarchica della nobiltà etrusca'.

²⁶ *The Etruscans* (tr. J. Cremona, 1975), 133; all he adduces to prove his case is Livy's notice that the rest of Etruria refused to support Veii in its final struggle with Rome because it had put itself under a King (who tried to become priest of the League)—which may have no historical value, but could reflect a later belief that the Etruscan ruling class was hostile to monarchy. (R. Ogilvie, on Livy V, 1, 3, dismisses the passage as 'too schematic and too Roman'; M. Torelli, 'Tre Studi di Storia Etrusca', *Dial. di Arch.* VIII (1975), 58 follows M. Sordi, *I Rapporti Romano-Ceriti* (1960), 10 in thinking it a

Is there any reason, in the nature of Etruscan society, which could lead us to think that the upper class might hang together more than that in other parts of the peninsula? It is true that the Etruscans had long been conscious of their unity as a people, and the main cities had at one time combined into a League, though the extent of political as opposed to religious co-operation achieved is not clear. But it is very unlikely that Rome, which had conquered the Etruscan states piecemeal, had allowed the League to subsist in any form, though since its centre, the Fanum Voltumnae, has not been identified we cannot state certainly that some purely religious links did not still exist. In the first century B.C., too, the various Etruscan cities seem to have been in different stages of Romanization; those in the south, if their inscriptions are any guide, seem to have given up the Etruscan language, while some of those in the north, notably Volaterrae, may perhaps not yet have done so to the same extent.²⁷ Nor does there seem to be anything in the social structure at this time that could set the Etruscans apart from the other inhabitants of Italy and make the aristocracy's political reactions radically different from those of the upper class elsewhere (though it may have been prouder, retaining clear memories of ancient civilization and wealth). It is often argued that there had once been, in all or part of Etruria, a serf class on the land, in fear of which the aristocracies of various cities might co-operate; but if there had, and even if it survived anywhere till the Social War, it certainly did not do so later.²⁸ The only possible special link between members of the upper class in different cities might be a result of the organization of the *disciplina Etrusca*, for it is generally, and probably to a large extent rightly, accepted that knowledge and interpretation of this conglomeration of lore primarily concerning divination was largely in the hands of the Etruscan upper class. And by those who write on it, Thulin has been widely followed in his belief that not only were the *responsa* of the *haruspices* who were officially summoned to Rome from Etruria by the Senate to interpret prodigies visibly conservative, but they opposed the threat of monarchy, whether it came from Sulla or Augustus, or from Caesar as well.²⁹

In view of these totally contradictory statements it is full time that we looked carefully both at the social status and political outlook of demonstrably or probably Etruscan figures active in Roman public life in the first century B.C., and also at the organization, and the political role, if any, of the *haruspices*.

II. THE ROLE OF INDIVIDUAL ETRUSCANS

Whatever may be the case with Marius, Carbo certainly had support from men of Etruscan origin—most clearly M. Perperna (*pr.* by 82, whose father the consul of 92 was censor in 86 under Cinna's regime, while C. Perperna, perhaps the consul's brother, had been legate to Rutilius Lupus in the Social War).³⁰ And C. Carrinas (*leg.* 83, *pr.* 82) and C. Norbanus (*cos.* 83) may be from the same area, though their origin is much disputed.³¹ Sertorius notoriously had among his followers, and among those present at his murder, several Etruscans who are usually thought to have joined him with the younger Perperna; though in view of the frequency with which the name Sertorius is found in Etruria (the general himself was Sabine-born)³² and his own successful recruiting there in 83, this seems

reliable notice of ultimately Etruscan origin; perhaps, but her view that Virgil's story of King Mezentius (of Caere, not Veii) is a reflection of these events drawn from an old Etruscan source is not convincing.)

²⁷ Below, n. 47.

²⁸ Harris, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 114. The 'Prophecy of Vegoia', forbidding slaves to move the *limites*, is probably the best evidence for survival of the system somewhere (Perusia? Clusium?) at least till the late second century. Some believe it ended earlier in parts of the north than in the south; e.g. M. Torelli, 'La situazione in Etruria', *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* I (1976), 97.

²⁹ C. O. Thulin, *Die Etruskische Disciplin* (1905-9, repr. 1968), I, 70-1, III, 135, and in *RE* VII, 2434,

2437, s.v. 'haruspices'. Hence e.g. R. Bloch, *Les Prodiges dans l'Antiquité Classique* (1963), 52; G. Dumézil, *La Religion Romaine Archaique* (1966), 627; J. O. Lenaghan, *A Commentary on Cicero's Oration De Haruspicum Responso* (1969), 35; R. J. Goar, *Cicero and the State Religion* (1972), 69; A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Etrusca* (1975), 45.

³⁰ Badian, 'Caepio and Norbanus' (n. 15), 52 holds that all Lupus' legates were friends of Marius. But Lupus replaced Perperna with Marius himself on the former's defeat—which might cause a coolness?

³¹ For the evidence for all these figures, see Appendix.

³² Plutarch, *Sertorius* 2; note his levies from Etruria in 83, n. 20 above.

unnecessary. These men were his scribe Maecenas, a Tarquinius Priscus and another scribe, Versius, possibly Etruscan. The scribes at least were probably not great magnates at home, but they were hardly members of the 'classi inferiori'.

Among the proscribed was the father—possibly a Roman senator—of C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus (*cos.* 43), almost certainly Etruscan. But the Sullan Senate, which could show men from various Italian backgrounds, was surely not bare of Etruscan members, reflecting rivalries between or in different cities. One might note Fiducianus Falcula (*splendor ordinis*, as Cicero sarcastically calls him, so perhaps an upstart);³³ several other names are considered in the Appendix; and the quaestorship of L. Volcacius Tullus (*cos.* 66) must have been held in the early seventies.

As for the next generation, the younger Carrinas, the younger Norbanus and Vibius Pansa were all sons of men put to death by Sulla and thus inevitably dependent on Caesar for their careers. We should indeed note Torelli's Caesennius Lento, though the whole family may not have been united. There were two Volcaci Tulli in Caesar's service, one at least son to the consul of 66, who himself, however acceptable he had been to the régime in the seventies, was in 49 lukewarm in opposition to Caesar. We ought also to consider the Trebonii, strongly represented in Etruscan inscriptions. The C. Trebonius briefly consul in 45 had fought for Caesar (like an *eques* of the same name) but he was to become one of the Liberators, and his father seems to have had optimate sympathies.³⁴ We know that Caesar adlected to the Senate a C. Curtius, whose estate was at Volaterrae and who was at least a long-standing resident there.³⁵

The names of a few other senators, and of a number of officers of lower rank, might be canvassed. But probably too much stress should not be put on the latter at least. Gabba shows that Umbria and Picenum were great recruiting grounds for the legions of the late Republic, productive of a real class of professional soldiers, and Virgil's *fortis Etruria* was probably such another, as it was in the early Empire (especially for recruitment to the Praetorian Guard).³⁶ If we knew as much about Pompey's army as we do about Caesar's, we might find a good many Etruscan centurions, and even military tribunes, here too. Even centurions, it should be noted, often came from families of some local standing.

It is perhaps also worth enquiring which pro-Caesarian Roman nobles had influence in Etruria in our period. The Caesares themselves may have had a little: Caesar's father died at Pisae in 85 (where he was perhaps acting as legate and may have made connections);³⁷ C. Julius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus had a *hospes Etruscus*, one Sextilius, near Tarquinii—who betrayed him in 87 to the Marians.³⁸ Of the great anti-Sullan names, Caesar's brother-in-law L. Cornelius Cinna re-emerges as praetor in 44—only to support the Liberators.³⁹ Harris has made it seem possible that L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 91) had inherited from his conquering third-century ancestor much influence in Etruria; his son was a Caesarian, and Octavian's step-father. But some great families may well have let their early connections die out.⁴⁰

³³ *Pro Caecina* 28.

³⁴ *Ad f.* x, 28, 1 calls him a *civis acerrimus*; Cicero also thought the son, though a Caesarian, rational and cultivated, and had been supported by him when quaestor in ?60. But for hints of anti-Sullan connections, see Appendix.

³⁵ *Ad f.* XIII, 5, 2. Cicero had known the man from boyhood and, probably as patron of the city, been concerned in his restoration.

³⁶ Gabba, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 65. A. J. Pfiffig, 'Der Beitrag Etruriens zum Kaiserheer', *Mélanges Heurgon* (1976), 803; see esp. Tacitus, *Ann.* IV, 5.

³⁷ M. Gelzer, *Caesar: Politician and Statesman* (1968), 19.

³⁸ Cicero, *De or.* III, 10; Val. Max. v, 3, 3.

³⁹ Münzer, *RE* IV, 1287; he was married to a daughter of Pompey's. But note 1282, Dolabella's quaestor of the name. There was an inconspicuous Papirius Carbo who held office in the 60's, a friend, of sorts, of Cicero, *RE* XVIII, 1021.

⁴⁰ Harris, *op. cit.* (n. 16), esp. 226; the grandson of the *cos.* 91 was also Caesarian. His ancestor

triumphed *de Etruscis* as *cos.* 281. The Aurelii Cottae, close relatives of Caesar, may have had Etruscan ties; though much of the Via Aurelia (second century B.C.?) ran through territory long Roman and in its final form at least by-passed all the old Etruscan cities, a Cotta put up a milestone in Vulci in the late second century (Harris, 164) and an Aurelia L.f., perhaps daughter of a L. Cotta, married a Tarquinian magistrate L. Tercenna (*ILLRP* 672, after the Social War). But a M. Cotta in 49 fought for the Senate (*BC* I, 30; *ad Att.* x, 16, 3). The Cassii, builders of the Via Cassia in the second century, were definitely split in 49. Where older links are concerned, the Fabii, whose early interest in Clusium and elsewhere is indubitable, had turned in the third century to the Greek world and by the first seem more concerned with Gaul and Spain: two Fabii served Caesar, but others are associated with Ap. Claudius and C. Cassius. *A fortiori*, those of the Etruscan *gentes* of the regal and early republican periods who did not die out or return to Etruria may have lost touch in the course of the centuries,

The Etruscans who opposed Caesar in the Civil War are proudly led by A. Caecina, who had prophesied Cicero's return from exile, and fought for both Pompey and Cato, to be granted his life on the fall of Utica, but forbidden Italy on account of the violent attack on Caesar that he had published. He wrote a recantation, praising Caesar's *clementia*, though, as he told Cicero, he had prayed at every sacrifice for Caesar's defeat.⁴¹ The Caecinae, it would seem, resembled another great Etruscan family, the Maecenates, in not deigning to enter the Roman Senate when they could easily have done so; perhaps partly that they might occupy themselves with business affairs, but partly because it would in a sense be a step down, not up. The author of the *Bellum Africum* puts Caecina at the very head of a list of those whose lives Caesar spared when Utica was taken, who can all (save one) be shown to be senators or senators' sons.⁴² *Ad f.* VI, 6, 9 tells Caecina that he is not only 'hominem in parte Italiae minime contemnenda facile omnium nobilissimum' but also 'in communi re publica cuius summorum tuae aetatis vel ingenio vel gratia vel fama populi R. parem'—remarkable language to use, even in flattery, of a non-senator.⁴³ Cicero goes on to compare Caecina's claims to forgiveness with those of himself, M. Brutus, C. Cassius, Ser. Sulpicius and M. Marcellus, all senators of the highest birth or standing or both, of his own age or younger. But Caecina was no senator; he has business affairs in Asia, and describes himself as a client of Cicero's;⁴⁴ and Cicero describes him as a client of Servilius Isauricus' family—though we note he took the opposite side in the Civil War from the younger Servilius. The connection suggests that the Caecinae had assisted the elder Servilius at the siege of Volaterrae in 81 (Cicero calls his correspondent's father a *fortis vir*, suggesting military activity),⁴⁵ and had escaped as a result with property and influence intact; no Marian ties here. Cicero declares that *consentiens Etruria* desires Caecina's recall; this may be an exaggeration, but hardly suggests that Cicero thought Etruria solid for Caesar. Certainly Caecinae are found in various parts of the area,⁴⁶ though Volaterrae was a remote place, still, it may be, obstinately Etruscan at least in its funeral practices and perhaps in its language.⁴⁷ Whether this last fact would strengthen or weaken Caecina's influence in Etruria as a whole it is hard to say, though perhaps his expertise in the *disciplina Etrusca*, learnt from his father, will have strengthened it (it is not clear whether he had published his work on the subject before the Civil War).⁴⁸

Cicero in autumn 46 was full of hope for Caecina's return, telling him not to leave

e.g. the Licinii, usually derived from Etruscan Lecne. See R. Ogilvie, *Early Rome and the Etruscans* (1976), 50 for a fuller list. The Etruscan cities had been devoted to Scipio Africanus, Plut. *Fab. Max.*, 25; the main representative of the family now fought for the Republic.

⁴¹ See now P. Hohti, 'Aulus Caecina the Volaterran', *Studies in the Romanization of Etruria* (n. 18 above): 'wenig Neues' and some confusions. Shackleton Bailey at *ad f.* VI, 6, 8 distinguishes the *Querelae*, probably verse, from the *liber* of VI, 7, 1, possibly on oratory.

⁴² It is overwhelmingly likely that the Caecina at Utica was Cicero's friend: *Bell. Afr.* 89 does not prove he was entirely pardoned, so Münzer's doubts at *RE* III, 1237 are unnecessary. (The other *equus* is P. Atrius, a leader of the *conventus* of Utica.)

⁴³ cf. 'nobilissimo atque optimo viro' (*ad f.* VI, 6, 3) and 'claro homini et forti viro' (VI, 9, 1) of his father; and *pro Caec.* 104, 'amplissimo totius Etruriae nomine'. Pace Hohti, op. cit. (n. 41), and C. Nicolet, *L'Ordre Equestre* II (1974), no. 64, I take the Caecina of Cicero's speech to be the father; it is unlikely that Cicero's correspondent, his own contemporary or junior, married in the 70's a widow old enough to have a son who had died as an *adulescens* (*pro Caec.* 11–12). Cicero's correspondent will not be the offspring of this marriage with Caesennia (no issue is reported) but of an earlier one. His own son was *adulescens* in 46 (*ad f.* VI, 7, 5).

⁴⁴ *Ad f.* VI, 7, 4. Office, or at least curule office, extinguished clientship, Plutarch, *Marius* 5.

⁴⁵ *Ad f.* XIII, 66, 1. Servilius at Volaterrae, Gran. Licin. 32F; he also, with another Servilius, won a battle near Clusium, Vell. Pat. II, 28, 1, Plutarch, *Sulla* 28, 8.

⁴⁶ Cicero's friend perhaps inherited Caesennia's estate at Tarquinii; in the late second century Caecinae at Clusium (J. Thimme, *St. Etr.* xxv (1957), 87); Tarquinii (*CIE* 5494–5); Horta (*TLE*² 285); in the middle or late first century, Volsinii (*ILLRP* 438, cf. *TLE*² 260, a tomb nearby); a *signaculum* from Arretium of C. Caecina Tacitus, *CIL* XI, 6712. Much earlier they had crossed the Apennines to Felsina (Bologna), though it is perhaps rash to link these archaic Caecina (*TLE*² 698–9) with, e.g., Caecina Alienus, born in Vicetia and prominent in A.D. 69.

⁴⁷ The chronology of the Volaterrae urns is disputed, with the low dates of M. Nielsen, in *Studies in the Romanization of Etruria* (n. 18 above), much attacked, see *Caratteri dell'Ellenismo nelle Urne Etrusche, Prospettiva* Suppl. I (1975). But many would agree they go on to the mid first century B.C., as Etruscan inscriptions do: J. Kaimio, in *Studies* (n. 18 above), A. Degraffi, 'Il sepolcro dei Salvii a Ferento e le sue iscrizioni', *Rend. Pont. Acc. Rom. Arch.* xxxiv (1961), 59 = *Scritti Vari di Antichità* (1967), 153. F. Coarelli, *Caratteri*, 143 argues for an influx of Roman intruders after the fall of Volaterrae in 81; Cristofani sees the aristocracy surviving, 74 f.

⁴⁸ Hohti, op. cit. (n. 41), thinks not, as it is not specifically mentioned in the letters.

Sicily for Asia; but early in 45 he is writing to the younger Servilius in Asia about Caecina's now seriously projected visit and calling him *tantum et talem et calamitosum*; if Servilius had been in Rome to help him, Caecina's *salus*, of which Cicero still has hopes, would have been achieved.⁴⁹ It seems that Caesar had been unusually unforgiving. His Volaterran senator, as we saw, was someone else: C. Curtius, who had an impeccably anti-Sullan background, and was less aristocratic, and less representative of Etruscan traditions. One would like to think the situation in Volaterrae significant for other parts of Etruria; but one cannot generalize on a single instance.⁵⁰

And how many of the rest of 'all Etruria's noblest' stood beside Caecina? A rather poor collection of certainly or possibly Etruscan figures is all that can be produced. The friend of both Cicero and Pompey, P. Nigidius Figulus, was of course much more than a simple expert in the *disciplina Etrusca*, but he was that, and there is some (poor) evidence that he knew the language; arguments for Etruscan origin remain tempting. He reached the praetorship and is described by Cicero as a man of great influence. He too was not forgiven, but died in exile in 45; Caesar seemingly preferred Varro as court scholar, in spite of his crusty temper and long association with Pompey.

The violently anti-Caesarian historian Tanusius Geminus was probably a senator and almost certainly from Etruria. The Volusii possibly came from Tarquinii or Clusium, where the name occurs in Latin inscriptions; they opposed Caesar and were closely associated with Cicero. (For a few other figures who could be of Etruscan origin, see the Appendix.) If we look at possible *clientelae* of great Romans who may have been mobilized on this side, we will think of Ahenobarbus, who had property and interests on the coast of Etruria,⁵¹ and of Cicero himself, who is likely, from his early stand against Sulla's attempt to disfranchise parts of Etruria, to have retained support here; especially in Arretium, whence came the lady whose cause he pleaded *Sulla vivo*, as well as in Volaterrae, where he not only defended one of its leading citizens but opposed the distribution of land in 63 and 60.⁵² But we should remember that Caelius told Cicero shortly before the Civil War that people were neglecting personal obligations out of party spirit (or as in his own case calculation).⁵³ Indeed, we have seen that where Volaterrae was concerned, Cicero had not prevented Curtius, though under a personal obligation to himself, from accepting honours from Caesar, and Servilius Isauricus had not been able to influence Caecina to join the side he took himself. Are things likely to have been simpler in, say, Perugia, where we know that two notables took diametrically opposing views to Caesar's murder—

⁴⁹ Wiseman, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 140, thinks Caecina could probably control the vote of the small tribe Sabatina, covering only Volaterrae and a few south Etruscan towns till Mantua joined them in 49 (and once-Etruscan Mantua might respect a Caecina?). But how much would Caesar, who left little to the assemblies, worry?

⁵⁰ *Adf.* XII, 66, 1. Shackleton Bailey, on *adf.* VI, 6, supposes that Caesar finally relented, as Suetonius, *Df.* 75 says he bore Caecina's slanders 'civilis animo'. Caecina (or his son?) is last seen in Rome in 43, seconding Cicero's efforts to keep the war against Antony going, and as a friend of Furnius, which tells us little (*adf.* X, 25, 3). Was his surprising *fama* with the people of Rome due to his being the Caecina, an *eques* of Volaterrae, who provided *quadrigae* for the races and whose homing swallows, dyed in the colour of his team, brought news of victory to friends at home (Pliny, *NH* X, 34, 2)? Such racing was a fine old Etruscan tradition, believed by some in antiquity to be the origin of the practice at Rome. R. C. Bronson, 'Chariot Racing in Etruria', *Stud. in on. di L. Banti* (1965), 89. Nicolet, *op. cit.* (n. 43), no. 62 and others reject the identification, of which Pliny certainly seems unaware. But our Caecina probably at least owned the stud, presumably in the Maremma Volterrana, where large herds have often pastured, and where the family has left traces, including several imperial inscriptions: there was a family villa here visited by

Rutilius Namatianus, and a river and town are still called Cecina. There were also metals in the Cecina valley, worked in the later centuries B.C.; and it is understandable that a man with property near Vada Volaterrana, the port of Volaterrae, should have business interests abroad (*adf.* VI, 6, 2 shows he was also in Asia in 58). M. Cristofani, *Caratteri* (n. 47 above), 74 discusses the development of trade and settlement in the second century near the mouth of the Cecina. (Alternatively, Caecina's *fama* came from his eloquence, attested—only—by Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* 56, 1.)

⁵¹ *ILLRP* 915; *AE* (1957), no. 217.

⁵² *Pro Caecina* 97; G. Novaro, 'Proposta di restituzione della lezione originale *Arteminos* in Cicerone, *ad Att.* I, 19, 4', *St. Etr.* XLIII (1975), 105 thinks it was the men of modern Artimino, near Florence (an Etruscan site), not those of Arretium, whose lands, with those of the Volaterrans, Cicero protected against Flavius' Lex Agraria in 61. Since Arretium was a Sullan colony, the words 'quorum agrum Sulla publicarat neque diviserat' are certainly hard to apply to the Arretines: perhaps they only refer to Volaterrae. But we should observe that the *popularis* C. Licinius Macer spoke *pro Tuscis* as trib. in 73, and a fragment (*ORF* no. 110 fr. 5) deals with the loss of property caused, probably, by Sulla's colonies.

⁵³ *Adf.* VIII, 14, 1.

Cestius Macedonicus, the half-mad *princeps* who was intensely proud of having fought for Brutus and Cassius, and who fired the town on its fall to Octavian, and L. Aemilius, the decurion who as a *iudex* in Rome had voted for the condemnation of the Liberators? ⁵⁴ It is just conceivable that here, as in Volaterrae, the opponent of Caesar was the truer Etruscan aristocrat; Cestii are likely to be Etruscan Ceztes, and an Aemilius could, but need not, be an intruder or someone willing to Romanize his family name ruthlessly.

III. THE DISCIPLINA ETRUSCA AND THE ETRUSCAN ARISTOCRACY

There is certainly fair evidence for parts of the *disciplina* reflecting a narrowly upper-class outlook. Whenever precisely we are to date the extant prophecy of the nymph Vegoia to Arruns Voltymnus, it is pretty indubitably hostile to any kind of agrarian reform in Etruria: slaves, or masters in concert with the slaves, are not to move the *limites*.⁵⁵ Cicero himself notes the heavily loaded technical language of the *Etrusci libri*, which speak of the opponents of the *patres, principes* or *optimates* as *deteriores* and *repulsos*.⁵⁶ Thulin noted that the revelations of Tages were said to have been received and taken down by the leading men of Tarquinii or of Etruria in general, and handed down in their families; ⁵⁷ and that, as Cicero tells us, the Roman Senate (probably in the second century B.C.—‘tum, cum florebat imperium’, certainly Rome’s) encouraged noble youths in Etruria to study these traditions ‘ne ars tanta propter tenuitatem hominum a religionis auctoritate abduceretur’.⁵⁸ One of Cicero’s proposals in the conservative and archaizing *de legibus* is that ‘Etruria principes disciplinam doceto’—clearly her own *principes*.⁵⁹ The social position of that great expert Caecina is as little in doubt as his political sympathies: Thulin noted the republican turn that he (or his sources) gave to an old doctrine concerning *fulmina regalia*, thunderbolts having reference to a king: ‘cum forum tangitur vel comitium vel principalia urbis liberae loca, quorum significatio regnum civitati minatur’.⁶⁰ Tarquinius Priscus, who like Caecina translated or adapted Etruscan sacred books into Latin, probably in the middle of the first century B.C.,⁶¹ is of a prominent family: at least one member held office in Rome early in the first century B.C., and there was another in the early Empire.⁶² Unfortunately we know nothing of the author’s politics. The *haruspex* Spurinna, of whom more below, bears a name that we now know to be aristocratic in the extreme. And it is worth observing that in the *Aeneid* of Virgil, who may possibly be of partly Etruscan descent and seems to have some awareness of Etruscan traditions, one of the Tuscan chiefs, Asilas of Pisae, is also an expert in the whole *disciplina*, while ‘Tolumnius augur’, who advises the Rutuli, bears a name familiar to every Roman as that of the King of Veii killed by Cornelius Cossus, and appears to combine his prophetic role with that of a prominent warrior.⁶³ There were of course also salaried *haruspices*, attached to the staffs

⁵⁴ Vell. Pat. II, 74, 4; Appian, *BC* v, 49. A Cestius proscribed, Appian IV, 4, 26; but Cestii holding office in 44, who might or might not be Etruscans, should be acceptable to Caesar.

⁵⁵ Harris, op. cit. (n. 16), 31 gives the text, preserved by the *grammatici* (Lachmann I, 348) and a sound discussion; he disagrees with J. Heurgon, ‘The Date of Vegoia’s Prophecy’, *JRS* XLIX (1959), 41, who thinks it issued at the time of Drusus’ reforms in 91, but he accepts that *prope novissimi octavi saeculi* indicates late second or early first century B.C. (cf. Censorinus 17, 6 on the ten *saecula* granted Etruria). Torelli, ‘Senatori’ (n. 25), thinks it Gracchan; R. Turcan, ‘Encore la Prophétie de Vegoia’, *Mélanges Heurgon* (1976), 1009 places it much earlier.

⁵⁶ *De har. resp.* 53.

⁵⁷ Censorinus 4, 13: ‘disciplinam quam lucumones tum Etruriae potentes exscripserunt’; Comm. Bern. Lucan I, 636: ‘duodecim principum pueris’.

⁵⁸ Cicero, *De div.* I, 92, six from each state; Val. Max. I, I, I, who says ten (x). Tacitus, *Ann.* XI, 15: ‘primores Etruriae sponte aut patrum Romanorum impulsu retinuisse scientiam et in familias propagasse’.

⁵⁹ *De leg.* II, 21.

⁶⁰ Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* II, 49, 2.

⁶¹ If he is the Tarquinius linked with Varro and one Selius in *Catalepton* v, 3 (though the name rests on an emendation), or if he was used by Verrius Flaccus, as the lacunose passage Festus 340L has suggested. J. Heurgon, ‘Tarquinius Priscus et l’organisation de l’ordre des haruspices’, *Latomus* XII (1953), 402 has been overtaken by Torelli, *Elogia Tarquiniensia* (1975), esp. 105: the inscription commonly supposed to refer to him pretty certainly does not do so. Heurgon, ‘Varron et l’haruspice étrusque Tarquinius Priscus’, *Varron, Grammaire Antique et Stylistique Latine par/pour J. Collart* (1978), 101, not convincing.

⁶² *RE* IV A, 2394.

⁶³ *Aeneid* x, 175; xi, 429; xii, 258, 460. M. L. Gordon, ‘The Family of Virgil’, *JRS* xxiv (1934), 1; B. Nardi, ‘L’Etruria nell’Eneide’, *Atti del III Cong. Naz. di St. R.* IV (1935), 31; R. Enking, ‘P. Vergilius Maro Vates Etruscus’, *MDAI(R)* LXVI (1959), 65 exaggerates. For Tolumnius, L. A. Holland, ‘Place Names and Heroes in the Aeneid’, *AJP* LVI (1935), 211.

of magistrates, presumably of much humbler rank, and there were *vicani haruspices*, men 'qui quaestus causa hariolantur' ⁶⁴ (whose existence had doubtless provoked the intervention by the Senate recorded above).⁶⁵ But some of those claiming the profession in Republican, as well as quite commonly in imperial times, are men of substance (note *ILLRP* 582, C. Clipearios and his *cursus* in Falerii Novi). We can certainly conceive of the learned and literary *disciplina*, with its stress on sacred books,⁶⁶ as in part at least a means of social control by the upper class.⁶⁷

IV. THE *DISCIPLINA ETRUSCA* AND ROMAN POLITICS

But where this aristocratic tradition impinges on Roman political life, we have to move warily. For one thing, whatever the conservative tendency built into the language of the *haruspices* summoned from Etruria by the Senate to interpret prodigies, it is not clear precisely who these were. Were they the sons of Etruscan *principes* for whose education the Senate had been concerned? Did they form the official *ordo* of sixty members attested at least from the early imperial period, when some at any rate are *equites* (though only one, a Caesennius, from a now really distinguished family)?⁶⁸ The Emperor Claudius at least seems to have thought that the sons of *principes* for whom the Senate had been concerned, the specially summoned *haruspices*, and the *collegium*, which is perhaps the same as the *ordo*, were all the same.⁶⁹ But in Caesar's time there may not yet have been a formal *ordo*, and at the most it was a loose organization—the summoned *haruspices* came, at least on some occasions, *ex tota Etruria*. And it is strange that they are regarded in the *de haruspicum responso* as a very anonymous crew and are treated to no compliments on their learning and social position such as we might expect, although Cicero is taking their pronouncements with (supposed) total seriousness. Perhaps really great men such as Caecina found it inconvenient to be called to Rome at short notice, and left the job to somewhat less important figures. Torelli believes that we have fragments of a list of Tarquinian members of the *ordo*, some at least from the Republican period. I am not clear myself that the inscriptions must refer to a pan-Etruscan rather than a local organization, but in either case we learn that the *disciplina* was at some stage put under the care of *xviri*, who are probably the Roman *xviri sacris faciundis*, after Sulla *xviri*.⁷⁰ These were in charge of the Sibylline books and of other foreign rites and cults, so the extension of their control to Etruscan religious activities would be understandable; perhaps it occurred at the time of the Senate's educational intervention (it would have to be pre-Sullan). It is not impossible that they should be recorded in connection with a local organization at Tarquinii; under the Empire they had to approve municipal priests of Cybele.⁷¹ But even if the Tarquinii inscriptions do attest a pan-Etruscan *ordo* before Sulla, we cannot suppose that the *xviri* would permit it to be in any sense a political or nationalistic organization.

One would suppose that the *xviri* would also oversee the humbler salaried *haruspices*, the 'apparitorische Vertreter der Extispicia', attached to the magistrates to interpret

⁶⁴ *De div.* 1, 132.

⁶⁵ Dion. Hal. III, 70, 4 on Attus Navius perhaps suggests that leading experts might take humble pupils (who might, we may note, adopt their masters' outlook).

⁶⁶ How far were sacred books in Etruscan still in use? Lucretius VI, 381, 'non Tyrrhena retro volventem carmina frustra' is still, hesitantly, taken as referring to the Etruscan script, written *sinistrorsum*, by Harris and others; *haruspices* in particular may have known the language, probably not yet dead, see n. 47.

⁶⁷ In the third and second centuries at least Bacchanalian rites were popular; they might have more to offer the ignorant. Livy XXXIX, 9, 7 (cf. Virgil, *Aeneid* XI, 737). J. Heurgon, 'Influences Grecques sur la Religion Étrusque', *REL* xxxv (1957), 106; J. Pailler, 'Les Bacchanals et la Possession par les Nymphes', *Mélanges Heurgon* (1976), 731.

⁶⁸ *CIL* VI, 32439, 'L. Vinulleius L. f. Pom. Lucullus arispex de sexaginta', is one of the earliest (late first century B.C.?). *CIL* XI, 4194, a member, perhaps master, of the same date, is an ex-military tribune, thus an *eques*.

⁶⁹ Tacitus, *Ann.* XI, 15. This is the best evidence against Wissowa's view (*Relig. u. Kultus der Römer* (1912), 548, that the *ordo* was made up of the *haruspices* attached to magistrates, 'apparitorische Haruspices'). In the second century A.D. you could perhaps be in the *ordo* and specially attached to the Emperor, *CIL* VI, 2163.

⁷⁰ Torelli, *Elogia* (n. 61), 105 f. The mid-second century was probably a time of purification and revival of religious practices at Rome, see 'Scipio, Laelius, Furius and the Ancestral Religion', *JRS* LXIII (1973), 161.

⁷¹ Wissowa, *op. cit.* (n. 69), 320, 543, does not think this occurred till well into imperial times.

sacrifices. One would imagine that these were a quite separate class, in spite of Lucan's Arruns of Luca, who, perhaps by dramatic telescoping, is concerned with both portents and sacrifices.⁷² To which if either of these classes private persons turned for *responsa* is also unclear. Spurinna, for whose uncertain position see below, could be consulted, and we are often told vaguely of 'the *haruspices*'. Some may be entirely unofficial figures.⁷³

Since portents announce the breaking of the *pax deorum*, the *haruspices* called in by the Senate were bound to warn of disaster; but they do seem prone to warn of specifically political disaster, rather than of, say, plagues and earthquakes. Thulin noted that the *haruspices* consulted by the Senate probably attempted to prevent C. Gracchus' foundation of Junonia⁷⁴ and, this time in concert with the augurs, the passage of the demagogue Sex. Titius' agrarian bill in 99 B.C.;⁷⁵ but they told the consul Octavius in 88 that he would suffer no harm from Marius and Cinna.⁷⁶ And in 84 the μαντεῖς got the elections put off ὑπὲρ τὰς θηρινῶς τροπᾶς;⁷⁷ μαντεῖς, as Thulin observes, must be the *haruspices* consulted by the Senate, as the portent that had occurred was lightning striking a temple, which was always referred to them (and compare the form of the *responsum* with what the *summus haruspex* told Caesar, below). In its historical context it does look as if this advice might have been politically inspired—the culminating piece of Carbo's campaign to remain sole consul (the elections had already been delayed on an augural pretext). Several famous Sibylline oracles of the first century B.C., such as the one about restoring Ptolemy to his throne without an army, must have been political fabrications, so we cannot say *a priori* that the *haruspices* were never politically motivated; though often it may have been less a matter of conscious fabrication than of the basic tendency of their books, or of sub-consciously motivated choice between possible interpretations. At any rate, their activities in 88 and 84 hardly show the *haruspices* as backing the optimates and combating *Alleinherrschaft*; conceivably Etruscan friends of the Mariani may have been at work.

Sulla had a personal *haruspex*, with him apparently throughout his wars, who interpreted portents in a sense exceedingly favourable to him.⁷⁸ Whether this C. Postumius was himself of Etruscan descent is uncertain;⁷⁹ but it is likely that he was a salaried official rather than a man of prominent position (not certain; we remember that C. Gracchus' loyal friend Herennius Siculus, possibly father or grandfather of a consul, acted as his *haruspex*).⁸⁰ Since the source for Postumius' pronouncements is probably Sulla's own highly apologetic memoirs, the stories may be quite untrue. Sulla also asserted in that work that μαντεῖς—perhaps the summoned *haruspices*—prophesied during the Social War that ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὄψει διαφόρος καὶ περιττὸς ἄρξας ἀπαλλάξει τῇ πόλει ταραχὰς τὰς παρούσας. He of course applied the prophecy to himself, but it does not sound anti-monarchic, and must have seemed fairly plausible to his readers.⁸¹ Pliny talks of a favourable thunderbolt (from the auspicious first quarter of the sky) 'quale Sullae dictatori ostentum datum accepimus'.⁸² Again, was it Postumius or the Senate's consultants who announced that? If the latter were concerned in either of the last two events, Thulin's

⁷² He was called to interpret the horrific portents supposedly terrifying the Senate early in 49, oversaw the resulting rites, 'atque iram superum raptis quaesivit in extis', *Phars.* I, 617—'bestimmt dichterische Willkür', says Wissowa, 546.

⁷³ *Ad f.* IX, 24, 2, imaginary consultation of Spurinna on a private matter: *demonstrabat*, not *respondebat*. *De div.* I, 79, the father of Roscius the actor *ad haruspices rettulit* the snake portent concerning his infant son (it does not matter whether the story is true). Pliny, *Ep.* II, 20, 4, consultation on a general matter means a sacrifice, interpreted by the *haruspex*.

⁷⁴ Appian, *BC* I, 24.

⁷⁵ *Obsequens* 46; Cicero, *De leg.* II, 31.

⁷⁶ Appian, *BC* I, 71.

⁷⁷ *ibid.*, 78.

⁷⁸ At Nola he encouraged Sulla's march on Rome, Plutarch, *Sulla* 9, 3; he was at Tarentum when Sulla returned to Italy, 27, 4 (cf. Augustine, *CD* II, 24), so it was probably Postumius at the Piraeus too, *Obsequens* 56b.

⁷⁹ Münzer, *RE* XXII, 895 compares an 'Etruscan' pirate, Postumius, Diod. Sicul. XVI, 82, 3 and Postumius Pyrgensis, a contractor in the Second Punic War, Livy XXV, 3, 8; but Pyrgi was a Roman colony. Torelli, 'Senatori' (n. 25), notes *TLE*² 22, 'Pustminas'.

⁸⁰ Val. Max. IX, 12, 5, cf. Vell. Pat. II, 7, 2, *haruspex Tuscus*. Herennius (though the name is Italic and common) could come from Etruria, see Kaimio, *Studies* (n. 18), 32. Münzer, *RE* VIII, 679 tends to accept that the moneyer M. Herennius, who stresses Pietas and a Sicilian legend on his coins, is his son and perhaps the *cos.* 93; Crawford, *RRC* no. 308 (c. 108–7 B.C.), doubts it.

⁸¹ Plutarch, *Sulla* 6, 7. The prodigy occurred on a campaign, so in spite of the plural the interpreter might be an individual, perhaps already Postumius. Sulla of course represented every type of diviner and divination as favourable to him.

⁸² Pliny, *NH* II, 144.

theory is in ruins. It is true however that in the Social War Marius and his friends may not yet have had Etruscan support on any scale, while by the time of his dictatorship at least Sulla was representing his cause as that of the *nobilitas*, and may have won some Etruscan upper-class support that way. It is further possible that there is evidence that the consultant *haruspices* showed dislike of the proscriptions, as many Roman nobles did: a late commentator on Virgil may possibly refer to a *responsum* concerning the destruction of a sacred oak of Jupiter, making it arise from Sulla's sin in ordering the proscriptions.⁸³

To reconstruct the *haruspices'* attitude to Sulla is thus by no means the plain sailing Thulin thinks it. In the following years, their probable supervisors, now the *xviri*, will have been mostly Sullan appointees, though few names are known. Little is heard of the consultant *haruspices* till they warned the Senate of impending revolution in 65 and 63.⁸⁴ In 56 one of the disasters with which they threatened Rome was that quarrels between the optimates might lead to death and danger 'patribus principibusque', the loss of divine support, and the rise to power of a single man (the last part of the passage is corrupt, but the meaning is clear). The *de haruspicum responso*, which tells us this, is not easy to interpret. The consultant *haruspices*, at some time in 56, had drawn attention to the desecration of religious sites and the murder of ambassadors. This was at least very convenient for Clodius, who took it that the deconsecration of Cicero's house (which he had tried to make a shrine to Liberty) and the murder of Dio and the other Alexandrian ambassadors, pretty certainly by Ptolemy, who at this point was close to Pompey, were being referred to.⁸⁵ In winter 57-6 Clodius had been hand-in-glove with the die-hards (and Crassus) in opposition to Pompey; but after Luca, at any rate, he and Pompey were ostensibly reconciled.⁸⁶ The speech dates from the summer (May according to some, September according to others); probably the *responsum* was made after Luca.⁸⁷

We are left then to suppose either that the *haruspices* were under the influence of Clodius (who was a *xvir*, though Cicero does not mention it in this context, and had property in Etruria) and/or some of the extreme optimates—that is, if the *responsum* was given before Luca and aimed primarily against Pompey; or that, after Luca, the *haruspices* had not caught up with the new situation or were influenced by those still hostile to the 'First Triumvirate'; or, probably best, that they were in general support of the optimates but not closely involved in the in-fighting. Perhaps they were genuinely shocked at the murder of the ambassadors; and in anxiety over dissension among the optimates they may have been rebuking those who attacked Pompey, and also Clodius for his part in the squabbles with Milo (as Cicero claims they are doing) as well as Pompey and his friends. Their fear 'ne occultis consiliis respublica laedatur' might reflect anxiety about Luca—not that that conference was very secret; fear 'ne deterioribus repulsisque honos augeatur' sounds like the optimate estimate of Caesar's followers; fear 'ne rei publicae status commutetur' is likely, in 56, to be fear primarily of Pompey, not Caesar.

Like Alexander, says Appian, Caesar despised the portents relating to him, but did not deal harshly with the *μυντεῖς* who announced them (it is implied that the portents were hostile and anger might be expected).⁸⁸ The *μυντεῖς* seem, as often, to be *haruspices*. Not all the stories of the evil signs sent Caesar need be true or even contemporary, but the tradition is worth looking at. The best evidence is Cicero's. He tells us in the *de divinatione* that a (or the) *summus haruspex* warned Caesar in 47 not to cross to

⁸³ Junius Philargyrius on Virgil, *Ecl.* 1, 17: 'proscriptione a Sulla Romanis inlata dicuntur vastationes quercui ingestae, quae in tutela Iovis fiebat; quando peccaret quis in Iovem, ipse percutiebat quercum'. The *disciplina* had much to say of trees as well as lightning, but Thulin, *op. cit.* (n. 29), 1, 107 shows that Roman methods of procuring *fulgura* that struck trees did not always involve *haruspices*.

⁸⁴ Cicero, *Cat.* III, 19 f.; *Obsequens* 61. It is not clear what 'the Sibylline books and the *haruspices*' had said to make Lentulus think he was the third Cornelius fated to rule Rome, *Cat.* III, 9.

⁸⁵ Strabo XVII, 1, 11 says Pompey himself was involved in the murder.

⁸⁶ R. Austin, ed. Cicero, *Pro Caelio* (1960), App. v; E. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (1974), 306.

⁸⁷ Luca was in mid-April. Lenaghan, *op. cit.* (n. 29), 24, points out that Cicero talks of the gods' anger at the conduct of the Megalesia, which suggests that the portents (and certainly the *responsum*—how long did it take to get the consultant *haruspices* to Rome?) were after April 8. M. Gelzer, 'Die Datierung von Ciceros Rede *de haruspicum responso*', *Klio* xxx (1937), 1 = *Kl. Schr.* II, 229, thinks that the *haruspices'* anxiety about *discordia* shows vague knowledge of Luca.

⁸⁸ *BC* II, 488, 641.

Africa *ante brumam*; had he obeyed, 'uno in loco omnes adversariorum copiae convenissent'.⁸⁹ The advice was formally impeccable and may simply have been correct in the circumstances; ⁹⁰ but it is tempting to think that the *summus haruspex* was trying to put a spoke in Caesar's wheel. The advice was probably given not by the Senate's consultants, but at a sacrifice; Suetonius says the bull had escaped from its handlers.⁹¹ In the event, Caesar sent ahead most of his ships, went to Lilybaeum by land, and 'navem conscendit a.d. vi Kal. Ian.',⁹² which is exactly the winter solstice—if the displacement of the Roman calendar is not taken into account. Astronomically, the *bruma* was three months ahead.⁹³ It looks as if Caesar had obeyed the letter, but not the spirit—as the Romans knew he had not—of the warning.

In the same passage Cicero reveals mistaken haruspical encouragement to Pompey in 49–8: 'quae nobis in Graeciam responsa missa sunt! quae dicta Pompeio! etenim ille admodum extis et ostentis movebatur . . . vides tamen omnia fere contra ac dicta sunt evenire'.⁹⁴ Cicero would seem to be referring both to *responsa* from Rome (*missa sunt* and *ostentis*) and to what Pompey's personal *haruspex* told him (*dicta Pompeio* and *extis*). But would the 'consultant *haruspices*' be so outspoken if called in by the Caesarian Senate? Perhaps these are consultations by private sympathizers of Pompey in Rome.⁹⁵

Some have supposed that the *summus haruspex* of 47 was the head (perhaps the eldest) of the *ordo haruspicum*: we are of course not sure if it yet existed, but if it did, since a sacrifice is involved, we would probably have to agree with Wissowa that the *ordo* was made up only of the 'apparitorische Haruspices'. In any case, was he the famous Spurinna? Again according to the *de divinatione* (but Q. Cicero is here speaking) Spurinna informed Caesar at the Lupercalia in 44, 'on the day in which he first sat in a golden *sella* wearing a purple robe', that the sacrificial bull had no heart, and warned 'ne consilia et vita deficerent'.⁹⁶ This was perhaps a warning, whether meant in friendship or not, that Caesar's policy would lead to disaster; perhaps even an attempt to prevent the offer of the diadem.⁹⁷ Cicero himself at least pretends to think that the prodigy was caused by Caesar's dress and behaviour: 'an quod aspexit vestitu purpureo excordem Caesarem ipse corde privatus est?' Next day, Quintus goes on, there was no *caput* to the liver of the sacrificial beast—a fatal sign.⁹⁸ What, if anything, was Spurinna up to? Where the first occasion at least is concerned, we must agree with Cicero that no animal can live without a heart, nor can its organs disappear at the moment of death; though he allows that they could be diseased or shrunk. One doubts if Spurinna could get away with totally misreporting the *exta* or spiriting parts off (he would have had at least to square the *victimarius*?). Xenophon had claimed that he had too much personal experience for any soothsayer to mislead him, and made the hero of his *Cyropaedia* equally expert.⁹⁹ This work was a great favourite at Rome, but its readers (who included Caesar) may not have needed the lesson.¹⁰⁰

But is Cicero's account likely to be wholly false? ¹⁰¹ Certainly, it was soon elaborated:

⁸⁹ *De div.* II, 52.

⁹⁰ cf. (with S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971), 98) Terence, *Phormio*, 709: 'haruspex vetuit ante brumam autem novi/negotii incipere'; also the *responsum* of 84 B.C., above.

⁹¹ Suetonius, *Dŷ* 59; but 'profectionem . . . non distulit'.

⁹² *Bell. Afr.* 2, 2–5 (Dr. J. A. North pointed out this passage to me). It is true that the author thinks that Caesar would have embarked sooner if the weather had allowed; when he did, the journey was 'vento certo celerique navigio'.

⁹³ J. Beaujeu, 'Les Dernières Années du Calendrier pré-Julien', *Mélanges Heurgon* (1976), 13.

⁹⁴ II, 53; cf. 55: 'quid autem aut ostenta aut eorum interpretes . . . nuper nostros adiuverunt?'

⁹⁵ His belief in divination might possibly endear him to its practitioners; he was also known as a friend of Posidonius, who accepted divination and probably visited Etruria: J. Heurgon, 'Posidonius et les Étrusques', *Hommages A. Grenier* II (1962), 799.

⁹⁶ *De div.* I, 119; II, 37.

⁹⁷ Weinstock, *op. cit.* (n. 90), 345 suggests people took the warning as the reason Caesar refused the diadem. I believe that the point of the offer was that it should be refused ('Caesar's Heritage: Hellenistic Kings and their Roman Equals', *JRS* LXV (1975), 148), but not everyone realized that beforehand.

⁹⁸ Thulin, *op. cit.* (n. 29), II, 31 f.

⁹⁹ *Anabasis* V, 6, 29; *Cyrop.* I, 6, 2.

¹⁰⁰ K. Münscher, *Xenophon in d. gr.-r. Lit., Philol. Suppl.* XIII, 2 (1920), chap. 3. Suetonius, *Dŷ* 87.

¹⁰¹ In a sense he does not vouch for it, as he puts it into the mouth of the credulous Quintus, but in his own person, at II, 36, he does not declare it untrue, but implies the heart was diseased. He was writing soon after the event, at which he was probably present (at a distance); the story must have been at least widely believed and plausible.

Suetonius has Spurinna actually warning Caesar to beware of a danger that could not be deferred beyond the Ides of March, and describes an altercation between the two when the Ides had come, but not, as Spurinna pointed out, gone; at this altercation Caesar declared his disbelief in haruspicy.¹⁰² Their meeting, according to Valerius Maximus, took place in the house of Domitius Calvinus. Of course we cannot believe that Caesar and Spurinna both called on Calvinus *ad officium* on the Ides, for we know Caesar went straight from his house to the Senate.¹⁰³ But one is tempted to believe in a dispute at some point, though its date and terms will have been dramatized. There were people in Rome ready to take any measures to deflect Caesar from his chosen course.

But what, precisely, was Spurinna? Thulin thinks that he was Caesar's *Leibharuspex*, on his personal staff.¹⁰⁴ But he is probably too grand to be compared to such figures as Volusius, Verres' disreputable attendant,¹⁰⁵ let alone the municipal *haruspices* provided for in a Spanish charter of Caesar's, whose pay was less than that of a *scriba*.¹⁰⁶ The *elogia* from Tarquinii have proved the distinction and antiquity of the Spurinnae (though poor relations and freedmen are always conceivable).¹⁰⁷ We may perhaps think again of C. Gracchus' Herennius Siculus as a possible parallel; one can conceive of a friend of Caesar from a distinguished house whose aristocratic traditions made him feel at the end that Caesar was going too far. Torelli has imagined, on the basis of one of the *elogia*, a fifth-century Spurinna, 'uno strenuo campione dell'aristocrazia etrusca', who not only fought against a 're-tiranno' of Caere on the one hand and crushed a *bellum servile* at Arretium on the other, but seized Latin cities at a time when (Torelli thinks) Rome was flirting with democracy.¹⁰⁸ These events are recorded, their date and interpretation dubious. But if M. Brutus could be inspired to oppose the tyrant by family traditions going back to the sixth and fifth centuries, so could Spurinna. Etruscan nobles were at least as proud as their Roman counterparts.¹⁰⁹

If however Spurinna really had to meet Caesar by chance (not on the Ides) at Calvinus' house, he was not, or was no longer, a close friend, or part of the Dictator's household. A joke of Cicero's may indicate that his political conservatism (or that of all *haruspices* of standing) was well known. Early in 43 Cicero pretends to have consulted him about his friend Paetus giving up going to dinner parties, and to have got the reply that great danger was portended to the State if Paetus did not return to his old ways, at least in good weather.¹¹⁰ This recalls the language of the consultants; could Spurinna be one of these as well as an officiant at sacrifices? But he is obviously thought of as in Rome in 43, not Etruria. If he was the *summus haruspex* of 47, it is rather surprising that Caesar used him in 44, but perhaps he could not be passed over, especially if he was the head of some sort of *ordo* of *apparitores*.

A further question is, was Spurinna the *haruspex* whom, as Cicero not very seriously complained, Caesar put into the Senate—Cicero's plural may be rhetorical?¹¹¹ If so, the suggestion that Spurinna had been a partisan of Caesar's might be right, but he could hardly still be even at the head of an *ordo* of salaried officials. And certainly, in admitting to the Senate the bearer of so proud a name, Caesar would not have been doing anything very shocking.¹¹²

¹⁰² Suetonius, *Dŷ* 81, 2-4; Val. Max. VIII, xi, 2R. E. Bormann, 'Cn. Domitius Calvinus', *Festschr. f. O. Benndorf* (1898), 283 for Calvinus' religious interests, later at least; but he was possibly already a pontifex.

¹⁰³ N. Horsfall, 'The Ides of March: Some New Problems', *G. and R.* XXI (1974), 191. Plutarch tells us there were unfavourable sacrifices at Caesar's house on the Ides; we do not know if this is true or if Spurinna was there.

¹⁰⁴ *op. cit.* (n. 29).

¹⁰⁵ *In Verr.* II, 2, 27 and 33; 3, 28 and 54.

¹⁰⁶ *FIRA*² I, no. 21: 500 as opposed to 800HS.

¹⁰⁷ cf. Val. Max. IV, 1 Ext: a young Spurinna with whom *feminae illustres* fell in love (before enfranchisement); Varro, *LL* X, 27 links the name (MSS Purinna) with the aristocratic Perperna and Caecina. But at least one *lautni* (freedman) at Perusia, *CIE* 4045; the name is found elsewhere in Etruria, e.g. Arretium,

CIL XI, i, 847. Vestricius Spurinna, R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), App. VI.

¹⁰⁸ 'Tre Studi' (n. 26 above), cf. *Elogia*, 40 f., 67 f.

¹⁰⁹ cf. Persius III, 28, pluming yourself 'stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis'; probable documentary evidence for family history, T. J. Cornell, 'Etruscan Historiography', *Ann. della Sc. Norm. di Pisa* VI (1976), 411.

¹¹⁰ *Ad f.* IX, 24, 2.

¹¹¹ *ibid.* VI, 18, 1.

¹¹² cf. Syme's defence of Caesar's senators, *op. cit.* (n. 8) and *The Roman Revolution* (1939), 78. He wrongly thinks that Cicero is talking of *ex-haruspices*—there is a contrast between acting *haruspices* in the Senate at Rome and *ex-praecones* in municipal councils. The former need not have been actually earning their bread by the trade. Cicero's outrage is fairly superficial.

There is one other slight indication of Caesar gaining less than total support from a *haruspex*. According to Plutarch, before Pharsalus Caesar's own *haruspex* declared that the *exta* showed that a decisive battle would be joined within three days, and there would be a great reversal of fortune; if Caesar thought his present state unsatisfactory, then he would find his future one superior, but if not, not.¹¹³ Since Pharsalus was a victory, one might expect the tradition to state simply that the *exta* were favourable; does it make heavy weather of the episode because a *haruspex* was expected to be hostile to the monarchy Caesar's victory would bring? One doubts if the diviner was Spurinna. Of course, he may just have been faced with a *caput caesum* in the liver, which portended great change.¹¹⁴

On the other hand, if in 49 the sacrificial bull escaped from a sacrifice of Caesar's before he left Rome, this ought definitely to have been an evil omen.¹¹⁵ But according to Dio οὐ μὲντεῖς said (because the bull had swum across 'a certain lake') that disaster was portended only if Caesar stayed in Rome, not if he went abroad.¹¹⁶ What should we make of this? The flight of the bull might be a confusion with what is said to have happened in 47; later sources, seeing that Caesar had been unbrokenly successful in 49, might have tried to reconcile that fact with the record of a declared evil omen; or Caesar might have put out a modified version of what he was told—he wanted of course to go abroad. If this advice, however, was given him in reality, it was strongly favourable to him. Who would have given it? Does οὐ μὲντεῖς mean the *haruspex* at the sacrifice? ¹¹⁷

To sum up, the evidence is far from clear, but it does seem to have been believed in Rome, even by Cicero, that Caesar had trouble with the *haruspices* and derided divination—by baulking the *summus haruspex*, quarrelling with Spurinna, saying that it was no wonder if a brute had no *cor*.¹¹⁸ It has been claimed that 'it was not against the rules to scorn *haruspices* in public, or to question their ability to predict the future. . . . The fact that the *haruspices* were Etruscans, rather than Romans, . . . probably lay behind this exception to the rule of public deference towards Roman religion and all its tenets and institutions'.¹¹⁹ But though this may have been true in the day of Cato the Censor, or when the elder Ti. Gracchus perhaps denounced them in the Senate as 'Etrusci ac barbari',¹²⁰ and though there was memory of a time when they had been patriotically anti-Roman,¹²¹ it is improbable that it held in the first century, when, as is generally agreed, they were more employed by the State than ever before, and as we now know, probably under its ultimate control, while their books were being translated into Latin. The author of the strictly rational *Commentaries* on the Gallic and Civil Wars (so dramatically unlike Sulla's) may well have had little religious faith. But he made no public mock of his post of Pontifex Maximus, claimed divine ancestry and the favour of Fortuna, and in the end, as I believe, personal divinity.¹²² He revived ancient Latin religious institutions, such as the Luperci, and packed the Roman priestly colleges diligently, including no doubt the *xviri*, though we cannot trace many members of the board (Dolabella became one in 51, Caesar's cousin L. Cotta and C. Cassius were there in 44; Cato and L. Manlius Torquatus had vacated places by death in 46).¹²³ But almost any safe man would do for the Roman colleges; perhaps it was not so easy to find politically suitable persons among the limited number of *haruspices* (at any level) with their highly specialized training. Perhaps the best Caesar could do was

¹¹³ Plutarch, *Caesar* 43.

¹¹⁴ Thulin, *op. cit.* (n. 29), II, 32.

¹¹⁵ As shown by Festus 287L; Val. Max. I, 6, 7 and 12, etc.

¹¹⁶ Dio XLI, 39, 2, probably in Rome not Brundisium, but what is the lake?

¹¹⁷ One story suggests haruspical favour to Caesar: Suet., *DJ* 61, when a horse with toes was born on his property, the *haruspices* declared that his rider would rule the world. The prodigy was *in loco privato*, so the Senate's consultants would not take cognizance of it; but the tale is presumably *ex post facto*.

It is better not to build on the description, by Lucan I, 584 f., of portents terrifying the Senate in early 49 and the summoning of the Tuscan prophets. Though Lucan's supernatural scenery is sometimes drawn from historical sources, Plut., *Caesar* 34, I

says the consuls and senators left Rome without even any of the usual rites.

¹¹⁸ Also that he could get better omens when he wanted them. Polyaeus VIII 23, 32 and 33 has Caesar make these remarks on campaign, to encourage the soldiery.

¹¹⁹ Goar, *op. cit.* (n. 29), 39.

¹²⁰ Cicero, *De nat. deor.* II, 11.

¹²¹ e.g. *Ann. Max. frag.* 2 (Peter) (late-second-century redaction?).

¹²² 'Caesar's Heritage' (n. 97 above).

¹²³ *MRR* II, 246, 353, 369, 485. C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), 199 suggests the learned Varro. M. W. Hoffman, 'The College of *Quindecimviri (sacris faciundis)* in 17 B.C.', *AJP* LXXIII (1952), 289 is probably wrong to think that Dio XLII, 51, 4 shows Caesar was one himself.

to be slow in restoring that great expert, though probably not practising *haruspex*, Caecina, and perhaps Nigidius too, and to promote one or two who did seem favourable into the Senate. Even though we cannot be certain that there was any pan-Etruscan organization of the *haruspices*, it is perhaps true that experts in the *disciplina Etrusca*, not dependent on individual magistrates, were likely to be sympathetic to the Roman optimates; and that is likely to have meant opposition to Caesar, at least at certain times of his life.¹²⁴

V. ETRURIA AFTER CAESAR'S DEATH

After the Ides of March, Cicero, writing the *de divinatione*, seems confident that encouragement of the *disciplina Etrusca* is politically desirable.¹²⁵ When, at the time of the proscriptions, fearful portents were reported and the Senate sent for the experts in Tuscan lore, the eldest of these said that ἡ πάλα βασιλεία would return and all would become slaves except himself, who would die—as he at once did by holding his breath.¹²⁶ The political attitude is clear—if the story is true. But we have Octavian's version (from his memoirs) of what is surely the same event:¹²⁷ at the time of the comet the *haruspex* Vulcanius or Vulcatius declared at a *contio* that it signified the end of the ninth and start of the tenth *saeculum*, but that he was revealing the secrets of the gods and must die, as he promptly did. In fact the *haruspex* was probably prophesying the start of a new and ill-omened *saeculum*; secular prophecy had been gloomy in 88, when a great trumpet-call was heard and the Senate consulted the *haruspices*, who warned that a *saeculum* of class-war was about to begin;¹²⁸ in 63 there was a suggestion, again probably from the *haruspices*, that city and empire might come to an end.¹²⁹ Weinstock may be right in holding that the death of M. Perperna in 49 at the age of 98, which was certainly taken as the end of a *saeculum*, was also a portent of civil war.¹³⁰ Vulcanius will surely have taken the usual Etruscan view that a comet was a sinister sign; according to Ammianus, the *Tarquitiani libri* said that battle or similar enterprises must not be entered on when one was visible.¹³¹ Dio indeed tells us that in 43 some interpreted the comet in 'the usual way' (clearly as threatening), but οἱ πολλοί thought it Caesar's soul; elsewhere he counts it as one of the evil signs of 43.¹³² Cicero unsurprisingly ignores the question of its significance; but Octavian took up the belief of 'the many', though really, we are told, thinking it referred to his own advent.¹³³

Thus Octavian, who will have argued that Vulcanius' new *saeculum* was not to be feared, even if it was conceivably to be Rome's last¹³⁴ (and we know how a little later he used the idea of a new Golden Age)¹³⁵ was going against haruspical opinion. But it is clear that he had some Etruscan support from the start, and was to be thoroughly reconciled with the *disciplina*. His connection with Marcius Philippus has been noted, and a Caecina

¹²⁴ Caesar's Latin descent might be thought to make him unsympathetic to Etruscan religion. But N. Horsfall, 'Corythus: the Return of Aeneas in Virgil and his Sources', *JRS* LXIII (1973), 68 thinks the legend that Dardanus (and so ultimately Aeneas) came from an Etruscan city may be the invention of a late Republican antiquarian. If we accept the views of J. Heurgon, 'Inscriptions Étrusques de Tunisie', *CRAI* (1969), 526, it was known by around Sulla's time. There is no evidence however that Caesar adopted it.

¹²⁵ *De div.* II, 28.

¹²⁶ Appian, *BC* IV, 4; not impossible for an old man with a weak heart, but cf. *Vit. X Orat.* 847B, *Vit. Sophocl.* 14 (Pearson) (refs. kindly given me by Dr. J. Fairweather).

¹²⁷ Servius, *Ecl.* IX, 46. Gundel, *RE* IX A, 1 prefers the form Vulcanius; Torelli, *Elogia*, 122 equates the man with the 'C. Vulcatius C.f. har.' of *ILLRP* 186 (from Rome).

¹²⁸ Plutarch, *Sulla* 7; cf. John of Antioch, from Livy and Diod. Sicul. (or Plutarch?), who clearly sees a change for the worse; F. R. Walton, 'A Neglected Historical Text', *Historia* XIV (1965), 240;

K. Latte, 'Randbemerkungen', *Philol.* LXXXVII (1932), 269.

¹²⁹ Cicero, *Cat.* III, 9.

¹³⁰ *op. cit.* (n. 90), 193. Perperna was the last of all who had been senators when he was censor (Dio XLI, 14, 5) and perhaps the last of his family. Etruscan *saecula* were calculated, said some, from the origin of a state to the latest death among those born the same day, and so onwards.

¹³¹ *Amm. Marc.* XXV, 2, 7.

¹³² Dio XLV 7, 1; 17, 4.

¹³³ Pliny, *NH* II, 94.

¹³⁴ Etruria's tenth her last, Censorinus 17, 6.

¹³⁵ Weinstock argues, *op. cit.* (n. 90), 191, that there was already in Caesar's time New Age propaganda, as later marked for us by the *Fourth Eclogue* and the Secular Games. He admits there is no evidence, and it seems more likely that with many experts in the *disciplina* against him, Caesar avoided the subject. As far as we know, he had no plans to celebrate the Secular Games, which fell due in 46 (or on another reckoning 49); though these were more Greek than Etruscan in character (for the Games of 17, Ed. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 364).

of Volaterrae¹³⁶ (another split family here?) and a Maecenas¹³⁷ appear almost at once in his entourage; inherited from Philippus or Caesar? However, we will not now accept without some qualification M. Sordi's picture of Octavian retiring in late 44 to Etruria to recruit because much of the nobility as well as all the masses had been Marian and Caesarian.¹³⁸ At the time of the Perusine War he faced much opposition in the area;¹³⁹ on taking Perugia he put the whole town council to death (with the exception of L. Aemilius, see p. 139 above) and many other locals were killed, like a *propinquus* of Propertius, who could not forget the horror of the episode and saw it as a blow to the Etruscan nation.¹⁴⁰ During the siege however the *haruspices* with the attackers, though faced at one point with unfavourable sacrifices, prophesied encouragingly when the paraphernalia were carried off by a sally from the town that the misfortune had gone with them.¹⁴¹ More significantly, the statue of Juno survived the firing of Perugia, and according to Dio was brought to Rome following a vision seen by Octavian in a dream; it persuaded him to restore the city.¹⁴² Octavian must have claimed Etruscan Uni was favourable to him, as Juno of Veii had been to Camillus, even though this was scarcely a formal act of *evocatio*.¹⁴³

There was sympathy for Sex. Pompeius in the coastal areas of Etruria,¹⁴⁴ but after his defeat the region became quiet. In spite of further veteran settlements which may, like that before the Perusine War, have reflected or caused discontent, there is after this no evidence of opposition to Octavian (or Augustus) in this part of Italy.¹⁴⁵

Meanwhile, there had probably been Etruscan touches to the vision of a new age in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue;¹⁴⁶ and favourable portents were expounded to Octavian by, perhaps, a personal *haruspex*.¹⁴⁷ He doubtless sincerely believed in the art: 'tonitrua et fulgura expavescebat' (it is made clear that this is religious fear, not weak nerves) and 'ostentis praecipue movebatur'.¹⁴⁸ In 36 his house on the Palatine was struck by lightning, and it was in accordance with haruspical advice that he built the Temple of Apollo on the spot; in it were kept the prophecies of Vegoia or Beroe, as well as those of the Marcii and the Sibylline Books¹⁴⁹—perhaps a sign that there was to be even firmer control of the *disciplina*. It is I think still possible to hold that it was Augustus who organized the *ordo* of sixty *haruspices*, and certainly also that he revived, in an expanded form, the old Etruscan

¹³⁶ *Ad Att.* XVI, 8, 2: 'Caecinam quendam Volaterranum', clearly unknown to Cicero in spite of his links with the family and town.

¹³⁷ A Maecenas went to Campania with Octavian in autumn 44; if Nic. Dam. 31, 133 rightly gives him the *praenomen* L., perhaps father of the famous C. Maecenas L. f. (*ILS* 7848). Matius and a Saserna, for whom see Appendix, advanced money for Octavian's Games in 44, but one of the Sasernae was with Antony at Mutina, *ad Att.* xv, 2, 3, *Phil.* XIII, 28.

¹³⁸ *op. cit.* (n. 16). Maecenas' connection with Arretium could have influenced the choice of base, but Sordi recognizes its strategic position and that it may still have manufactured arms, as in Livy XXVIII, 45, 16. In fact Octavian may have recruited, as in Campania, largely from Caesar's veteran colonies, including Arretium (so Syme, *RR*, 125). We note Caesennius Lento was for Antony, *Phil.* XII, 23.

¹³⁹ Harris, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 299, the location of the fighting in a sense an accident. G. D. B. Jones, 'Southern Etruria 50-40 B.C.', *Latomus* XXII (1963), 773 suggests preliminary fighting at Veii.

¹⁴⁰ Appian, *BC* v, 48-9; Dio XLVIII, 14. Propertius II, 1, 29: 'eversosque focus antiquae gentis Etruscae'.

¹⁴¹ Suetonius, *Aug.* 14; 96, 2.

¹⁴² Dio XLVIII, 14, 5-6. Juno of Falerii may have been long ago *evocata* (like her of Veii), G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* IV, 2, 1, 139; so perhaps Minerva of Falerii, Ovid, *Fasti* III, 843. In restored Perugia Vulcan became the tutelary deity, Appian, *BC* v, 49; his temple had survived, Dio, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴³ I have not seen Y. Roé d'Albert, 'Recherches sur la Prise de Véies et sur Juno Regina', *Ann. de l'ÉPHE*, IV^e section, 1975, said to be relevant to the Perugia affair.

¹⁴⁴ Dio XLIX, 15, 1.

¹⁴⁵ Harris, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 302. The old Etruscan cities were spared settlements after Philippi, perhaps because many substantial veterans were returning to them (Pffiff, *op. cit.* (n. 34)). But there was colonization in the area, now and later, which probably reflected or caused discontent. If Florentia is triumviral, note there were (not surprisingly) *haruspices* available for the foundation rites at which they were expert, *Die Schriften der v. Feldmesser* (1848-52), 349, 15.

¹⁴⁶ The coloured fleeces of the sheep, lines 43-5, recur in a frag. of Tarquitiu's *Ostentaria*, *ap.* Macrobius, *Sat.* III, 7, 2. One would like to believe Virgil really studied with him as *Catalepton* v, 3 implies. Now that we no longer suppose that Tarquitiu was based on Tarquinii (n. 61 above) we might note that the language of Macr., *Sat.* III, 20, 2, if pressed, which perhaps it should not be, would make Tarquitiu a Roman *pontifex*. Hardly pre-Caesarian if so? The family is of sufficient standing in Rome for this.

¹⁴⁷ A *vates* told him during the Sicilian War that a fish which jumped out of the sea at his feet signified Sextus' defeat, Pliny, *NH* IX, 55. Favourable *exta* (not surprising) before Actium, *ibid.* XI, 195.

¹⁴⁸ Suetonius, *Aug.* 90, 92.

¹⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 29. That they were kept together would be some confirmation that the *xviri* were in charge of both.

League, primarily for religious purposes.¹⁵⁰ Etruria was now finally integrated into the Italy on which the new régime laid such stress. Virgil (though he may have had private reasons too, as we saw) treats the Etruscans very favourably in the *Aeneid*, as faithful allies or followers of Aeneas, inspired by hatred of the tyranny of King Mezentius, whom they have driven from his city of Caere (they could not for the legendary period be regarded as republicans, but their hatred of tyranny is perhaps meant to be typical).¹⁵¹

Scholars—Verrius Flaccus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus among them—took an interest in Etruscan history and customs; Etruscan names appear in prominent positions, Saenius (*cos. suff.* 30 B.C.) one of the first, apart from Maecenas,¹⁵² and several Caecinae. The pride of family and race in the great Etruscan houses in this period has been rightly remarked on.¹⁵³ But, *pace* Torelli again,¹⁵⁴ few of their members are to be found in opposition to the Emperors. C. Silius A. Caecina Largus was charged in 24 A.D. with *maiestas*, but appears to be a victim of his fellow-Etruscan Sejanus; ¹⁵⁵ Caecina Paetus and the Arriae (one might add the *equus* Musonius Rufus) are later exceptions, but there is no evidence at all that they harked back to Etruscan traditions of opposition to tyranny. The favour shown to Maecenas, Seius Strabo and others by Augustus, to Seius' son Sejanus by Tiberius, and the Emperor Claudius' direct interest in Etruscology are more important, though a criss-crossing of ties no doubt still remained.

VI. CONCLUSION

To draw the threads together at last, what I have been suggesting is that in the later eighties Pompey did indeed control Picenum, and the Mariani were very strong in Etruria. But thereafter, for different reasons—in Picenum the restoration of normal political circumstances, in Etruria Sulla's imposition of his own supporters, and many new settlers, the attraction of the régime he instituted to some members of the Etruscan aristocracy, the fading into the background of the issue of citizenship (where anyway Cicero now took some of the credit)—neither area is likely to have been united in support of a single Roman politician. Many ex-Mariani from Etruria must have perished with Lepidus, Sertorius and later Catiline. Though there were probably more *negotiatores* from the area than has been thought, after 70 at any rate the class was by no means politically united, and Pompey was certainly to have some adherents among them. Caesar was doubtless able to draw soldiers, including many officers, from Etruria, during the fifties (when his reputation stood high and that of his opponents low, and Gaul offered striking opportunities); but this may be partly because it was a great recruiting area. Certainly, there seems to have been little actual opposition to his invasion in 49, and he claimed general Italian support, perhaps somewhat disingenuously; but though a number of Etruscans remained in his service, there were powerful figures, notably Caecina, and Romans with influence in Etruria, on the opposite side.

After the war, he probably set about attracting and organizing support—by *clementia* and the gift of wealth and honours—in Etruria as elsewhere. There is some evidence that

¹⁵⁰ Torelli, *Elogia*, 194, and 'Per la storia dell'Etruria in età imperiale', *RFIC* xcix (1971), 489, à propos of B. Liou, *Praetores Etruriae XV Populorum*, *Coll. Latomus* cvii (1969). It is awkward that neither Cicero's six nor Valerius Maximus' ten for the number of noble youths to be taught the *disciplina* in each city (above, n. 58) will fit well into an *ordo* of 60 *haruspices* from a League either of twelve, or, as now, fifteen towns. Tacitus, *Ann.* iv, 55 mentions an *Etruriae decretum* about links with Lydia that may go back to the days of independence (the Asian cities here are all producing ancient documents), but if not it shows that the revived League must be pre-Claudian. Some of its inscriptions may be so too.

¹⁵¹ *Aen.* viii, 494–5: 'ergo omnis furiis surrexit Etruria iustis, regem ad supplicium praesenti Marte rep' oscunt'; cf. 501–2. For Virgil's integration of Etruria into Italy and the Roman tradition, see

M. Sordi and others in *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica* i (1972). She suggests that Propertius is more pessimistically aware of the death of Etruria, Horace prefers the Oscan side of Rome's heritage. D. Musti has suggested that in spite of his desire to write on Etruria Dionysius played down Etruscan traditions in Rome. For Augustus and Etruria, see also I. Bitto, 'Municipium Augustum Veiens', *Riv. Stor. dell'Ant.* i (1971), 109.

¹⁵² R. Syme, *Historia* iv (1955), 57; Torelli, 'Senatori', 299. If not from Siena (Saena), from Volaterrae, whence *CIL* xi, 1742?

¹⁵³ S. Mazzarino, 'Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità', *Historia* vi (1957), 98.

¹⁵⁴ 'Senatori', 339.

¹⁵⁵ A friend of Germanicus, he boasted of his legions' loyalty to Tiberius. He committed suicide, Tacitus, *Ann.* iv, 18. *RE* III A, 74.

this meant the rehabilitation of a number of ex-Mariani or their sons, and that in some places at least it did not rest on the very greatest Etruscan families. But there is no reason to suppose that the upper class—in part thoroughly, in part perhaps less thoroughly Romanized—should hang together more closely than its counterparts in other regions of Italy, unless there were links formed by its dominance of, and influence by, the *disciplina Etrusca*. It is uncertain whether in the late Republic there was any pan-Etruscan haruspical organization, and if there was, it was hardly a close one, and seems to have been under the direct oversight of a Roman board of priests. The exact class to which the various types of *haruspices* belonged, and the extent to which any of them tried to exert political pressure in Rome, are very hard to estimate, and stories that Caesar faced opposition in his last years from prominent *haruspices* are not easily evaluated. But it is *prima facie* likely that descendents of the great houses of the Tyrrhenian city-republics should dislike monarchy at least as much as leaders of the *municipia* elsewhere, who according to Cicero welcomed the deed of the Liberators; and some further erosion, right at the end of his life, of Caesar's Etruscan support is not improbable.

There is some truth then in both the propositions we started with, that Caesar had Etruscan support as the heir of Sulla's enemies, and that, contrariwise, the Etruscan aristocracy had optimate sympathies. But both must be carefully qualified, and we must remember not only the various shifts of opinion likely to have occurred in the forty years between Sulla's death and the Perusine War, but also the serious inadequacy of our evidence for drawing a detailed picture. The social structure, or at least the pattern of settlement, differed in the different towns, as the archaeologists show us; and for the sentiments of the poor we have no evidence at all.¹⁵⁶

New Hall, Cambridge

APPENDIX

I. Anti-Sullan Etruscans and possible Etruscans.

Perpernae and Perpernii are attested in various Etruscan towns. If the *pr.* 82 had the *cognomen* Veiento rather than Vento, he might claim connection with Veii (Plut., *Sertorius* 15, with Münzer, *RE* xix, 897, adducing *CIL* vi, 38700); but the *cos.* 92 had a non-citizen grandfather who must have come from further afield. M. Cristofani, *St. Etr.* xli (1973), 590, 'certamente volterrano', noting *CIE* 89 (Perpna) and several Latin inscriptions; but *CIL* xi 2378, 1812, 2731, respectively Clusium, Siena and Volsinii.

Carrinas and Norbanus, Harris, *op. cit.* (n. 16), App. 1: the name of which the former is often thought a Latinized form is common in Clusium and Perugia, but there are pointers to Umbria too (*CIL* xi, 6712 104, a *signaculum* from near Spoletium, Karinas). *CIL* xi, 259* 23-4 were probably brought to Volterra from Rome in modern times. Carrinas' tribe is not Etruscan, but Torelli, 'Senatori', 357 points out that if he was enfranchised before the Social War, this is natural. Cristofani, *op. cit.* above, backs Arretium or Volaterrae.

Badian, *op. cit.* (n. 15), *pace* W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904), 532 calls Norbanus, probably the first of his family to become a Roman citizen, Etruscan, but Torelli, 'Senatori', 357 derives him from Norba in Latium, apparently an obstinately anti-Sullan town. S. Panciera, 'Miscellanea Storico-Epigrafica 1', *Epigraphica* xxii (1960), 16 notes Norbani at Norba Caesarina in Spain; but *CIL* xi, 7349, Norbana Rufilla at Volsinii, and 1942, Norbana Balba at Perugia (and the *cos.* 83 may be grandfather to C. Norbanus Balbus *cos.* 19 A.D., while a late chronographer calls him Pulbo, possibly a corruption of Balbus; the *cos.* 38, probably son of the *cos.* 83, is, unhelpfully, Flaccus). *CIL* x, 814, the probably Campanian actor Norbanus Sorex.

Nicolet, *op. cit.* (n. 43), no. 210 cannot be right to understand Varro, *LL* viii, 84 to mean that Carrinas and Maecenas are names of public slaves taking on manumission a *nomen* derived from the community they served; Varro was writing after reconciliation with Caesar, among whose followers a Carrinas and perhaps a Maecenas were prominent. *Hinc quoque* simply shows that these names

¹⁵⁶ I am indebted to Dr. J. A. North for reading and criticizing an earlier draft of this paper, and for comments to the members of seminars at the

Institute of Classical Studies, London, and at Cambridge, to whom a version was read.

too are derived from places. That suggests the Maecenates were not originally from Arretium, though we cannot fix an alternative. The great Maecenas stressed his Arretine descent, and his tribe was Arretium's Pomptina, but he could have inherited property from, as well as being especially proud of, the Cilnii, probably his mother's family. Augustus' letter, quoted by Macr., *Sat.* II, 4, 12, may have indicated other central Italian towns where he had links, but the names are all restored (by O. Jahn, 'Satura', *Hermes* II (1867), 247). At all events he claimed descent on both sides from those 'olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent' (Horace, *Sat.* I, 6, 1-4). The Maecenas D.f., patron of a *sunhodos* of Greek singers (*ILLRP* 771, perhaps early first century B.C.) was only a *dissignator*—here, clearly controller of the seating at festivals, not funeral organizer—but doubtless of some standing (Schulze 529 adduces Etruscan inscriptions from Perusia).

For Tarquiti Prisci in this period, N. Criniti, *L'Épigraphie di Asculum di Cn. Pompeio Strabone* (1970), 144. Its C. Tarquiti L.f. Fal. is often identified with Sertorius' C. Tarquiti Priscus, and sometimes with the *quaest.* 81, C. Tarquiti, active in Spain *against* Sertorius (but he could have changed sides), who seems however from his coins to be P. f. The non-Etruscan tribe Falerna is again explicable by early enfranchisement; and the fact that a Tarquiti Priscus wrote on the *disciplina* suggests that the family preserved links with, perhaps, Caere (Torelli, 'Senatori', 321; also Veii in imperial times).

For Versius, Schulze compares *CIL* XI, 3505 (a Virsius at Tarquinii, cf. Harris, op. cit. (n. 16), 286). Badian, *FC*, 245 accepts (from Schulze, 105—not explicit—and 287) that Burrienus, *pr.* 83 and C. Verres, *quaest.* 84, are Etruscan: doubtful, Harris, 252.

Both Vibii Pansae and Caetronii are probably Etruscan; the former at Perusia, *CIL* XI, 1994 = *CIE* 3615; Harris, 324. Torelli, 'Senatori', 302 admits it.

II. Etruscans and possible Etruscans in the Sullan Senate.

L. Cornelius Sisenna, *pr.* 78, the historian, a thorough optimiate, must with that *cognomen* be of ultimately Etruscan origin; cf. Fulvia Sisenna, the poet Persius' mother, probably Volaterran like her husband (*Vita Persi* 1, and Fulvii an old family there). A patrician Cornelius adopting an Etruscan surname is less likely; but the first known Cornelius Sisenna in Rome was *pr. urb.* as early as 183.

Fiducianus Falcula appears in *pro Caec.* 28 as present, if conceivably not resident, at Tarquinii; he has been linked with the Fiducianus of *ILLRP* 1027 (cf. 1030), a *tessera nummularia*. Cf. the later L. Fiducianus Pelops, *sevir Aug.* at Poggi Alti, not so far off, *CIL* XI, 2645. Possible *negotiatores* in Asia, Nicolet, no. 144.

L. Voluscus L.f. Arn. and L. Lartius L.f. Pap. are witnesses to the *s.c. de Oropiis* (R. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, no. 23), and Wiseman, *New Men*, no. 510 notes that the first may be identical with his no. 507, Volscius, envoy to Bithynia (Badian, *Gnomon* (1961), 498); the tribe points to Etruria. He suggests Castrum Novum for Lartius, cf. *CIL* IX, 5150. A. Cascellius A.f. Rom. also appears on the *s.c.*, and W. Kunkel, *Herkunft u. Soziale Stellung d. röm. Juristen*² (1967), 25 thinks him Etruscan like his teacher Volcaci (for which name see below). Cascellii are found in or near Perusia, but Wiseman, no. 106 plumps for Sora, near Arpinum, which fits the tribe. (*ILLRP* 1043, *tessera nummularia* of a Cascellius; *ad Q. f.* 1, 2, 5, an Asian *negotiator*.)

Q. Considius is a senator mentioned in 74, 70 and 59 (when, as an old man, he opposed the Three); a Q. Considius *ivvir* at Clusium, *ILLRP* 569, cf. perhaps, *CIL* XI, 2316; C. Considius C.f. L.n., another *ivvir* there, *ILLRP* 570, has the Etruscan metronymic, *Cominia nat(us)*. The Roman senator may have earlier been the *publicanus* friendly with L. Crassus, Val. Max. IX, 1, 1. C. Considius Nonianus, *monetalis* in 57 B.C. (and firmly Pompeian according to Crawford, *RRC* I, 448); M. Considius Nonianus was assigned to succeed Caesar in Gaul. But C. Considius Paetus, moneyer for Caesar in 48; and the professional soldier P. Considius (*BG* I, 21, 4; 22, 2-4) fought in turn for Sulla, M. Crassus and Caesar, cf. Nicolet, no. 111.

The Volcacii Tulli pretty certainly came from Etruria, but Wiseman, no. 506 discounts Propertius' line, addressed to a later Volcaci (I, 22, 3: 'si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulchra') on the grounds that Perusia is not Volcaci's *patria*, but the Perusine War made it the grave of the whole country (but surely of Etruria rather than all Italy). He thinks the family settled in Tusculum (cf. *ILLRP* 689). M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (1974), 24 thinks the line positively proves the Volcacii did not come from Perusia, as Volcaci would be bound to know the tombs if so. Clusium, Arretium and Volsinii would all be possible. But Torelli, 'Senatori', no. 506 accepts Perusia, noting *CIL* XI, 2084 = *CIE* 4361, 'C. Volcaci C.f. Varus Antigoniae gnatus' (the Etruscan-style metronymic) and other evidence. *Haruspex* in Rome, above n. 127.

Other names are perhaps not worth detailed investigation, e.g. the Egnatii, father and son, disreputable senators in the 70's; the name is common in Etruria as well as Samnium, though Florus II, 6, 6, an Etruscan leader in the Social War, perhaps rests on a confusion (but see Torelli, 'Senatori', 320).

III. Etruscan and possibly Etruscan adherents of Caesar.

Caesennius Lento, Dio XLIII, 40 and Cic., *Phil.* XII, 23, which is explicit on his *Etruscitā*. Torelli, 'Senatori', 312 gives the archaeological evidence connecting the family with Tarquinii (as does *pro Caec.*) and suggests Etruscan skill in *agrimensura* is relevant to his post as *virvir*. Cf. R. Syme, 'Senators, Tribes and Towns', *Historia* XIII (1964), 113. The family probably split: C. Caesennius Philo prosecuted Sex. Cloelius in 52 (Ascon., *Mil.* 46 St.) and is not likely to have been close to Caesar (nor perhaps is the Caesennius proscribed for his wealth, App., *BC* IV, 27, 115).

C. Volcacius, an *eques*, fought in the Gallic and Civil Wars, *BG* IV, 4, 40, cf. 36, 3; L. Volcacius was *pr.* 46 and governed Cilicia. See Gundel, *RE* IX A, 741, accepting Etruscan origin, like J. Suolahti, *Junior Officers in the Roman Army* (1955), 397 on Gaius. The *cos.* 66 supported Pompey for the Egyptian job in 56, but does not sound from *ad f.* I, 1, 3 and 2, 1 like one of Pompey's close friends; he wished to treat with Caesar early in 49, and is perhaps, as Shackleton Bailey suggests, the *emptum pacificatorem* of *ad Att.* X, 2, 2. It was he who told Pompey he had deceived the Senate over the troops he could raise, Plut., *Pomp.* 60, 3; more or less an optimate till this point, then? But he stayed in Italy and attended Caesar's Senate (*ad Att.* VIII, 15, 2). He later blamed Caesar for forgiving M. Marcellus.

Trebonii, Münzer, *RE* VI A, 2273; perhaps Clusium, where there is a bilingual inscription of a C. Trebonius, *ILLRP* 905; cf. *CIL* XI, 2287, 2414, 2470-5, 2546, 2595; Pyrgi, 3712. Münzer links the incense firm, *ILLRP* 816, and A. Trebonius, a *negotiator* in the East, *ad f.* I, 3, 1. (According to P. Harvey, *op. cit.* (n. 21), Badian has suggested Praeneste. Wiseman is, oddly, silent.) The consul of 45, as C.f., cannot be directly descended from the A. Trebonius proscribed by Sulla (and surviving it) or his brother P. (Cic., *Verr.* I, 123); nor from the P. Trebonius (Arruntius in one version) who served Marius, Schol. Bob., *Mil.* 114 St.; but some connection is possible.

Wiseman suspects a probably Caesarian senator Rufrenus (legate to Lepidus in 43) of being connected if not identical with an early manufacturer of Arretine pottery, 'The Potteries of Vibienus and Rufrenus at Arretium', *Mnemosyne* XVI (1963), 275. The Cestii holding office in 44 and 43 might or might not be Etruscan Ceztes (Kaimio, *Studies* (n. 18 above); cf. Cestius Macedonicus of Perugia, above p. 139). A Venuleius, probably legate to Calvisius in Africa in 45, might come from Pisae and be son of a man killed in the Sullan proscriptions, *ad f.* XII, 30, 7, cf. Orosius V, 21, 7, Florus II, 9, 26; Torelli, 'Senatori', 228. But if Venuleius and Latinus should be read together in the Cicero passage, he does not sound very Etruscan. (*Haruspex*, see n. 68 above).

Below senatorial level, there was a L. Cispus, prefect in Caesar's fleet in 46, whom Wiseman, *New Men*, no. 120, tentatively links with an Arretine vase-manufacturer (but in 'Potteries', 276 he notes that M. Cispus, *tr. pl.* 57, supported Cicero). The *trib. mil.* M. Aristius, also perhaps C. Laberius Durus, who may be from Arretium, could be Etruscan (*BG* V, 15; VII, 42-3; Suolahti, 164, 345; Harris, 315). Yet another *trib. mil.*, C. Volusenus (there may have been two men of this name) could be Etruscan, but also Umbrian, and Cicero attests a Volusenus with property near Larinum. (C. Volusenus Quadratus *praef. equ.* 51 and 48; a *tr. pl.* 43, a friend of Antony.) Wiseman, no. 512, and Nicolet, no. 403, prefer Umbria, but note *CIL* XI, 7086 (Arretium) and 1442 (Pisae), and the common Etruscan form Volasenna.

The three Hostilii Sasernae, at least two of whom were brothers (and possibly senators) sound Etruscan, but the family may have been long in Cisalpine Gaul (*Bell. Afr.* 9 and 10); the agronomist Saserna, perhaps early first century B.C., had an estate in Gaul, Varro, *RR* I, 18, 6. They seem, from a corrupt passage of Varro I, 2, 27, to have recorded a charm for gout ascribed to one Tarquenna, surely Etruscan, perhaps a *haruspex*, as Münzer, *RE* IV A, 2343 suggests; perhaps they felt Etruscan, though they may have been part of Caesar's Cisalpine *clientela*. C. Felginas, a military tribune, from Placentia (*BC* III, 71, 1) may also have been of Etruscan extraction (Suolahti, 130, and Nicolet, no. 142, accepting Schulze, 529, 570).

L. Clusinas (from Clusium?) got a post in Caesar's army through favour, but lost it (*Bell. Afr.* 54, 5); cf. Clusinatia Auge from Ameria, *CIL* XI, 4421, not too far away. There were a great many Petronii in Etruria (also Umbria), and a M. Petronius was a centurion of Caesar's, *BG* VII, 50, 4-6. R. Syme, 'Who was Decidius Saxa?', *JRS* XXVII (1937), 135 follows Schulze, 137, 351, in thinking the centurion Cafo Etruscan. The equestrian officer Velanius, *BG* III, 7, 4 and 8, 2 is thought so too by the often Etruscomaniac Schulze, who compares *CIE* 130 (Volaterrae) for the name, unattested in Latin; Syme, 'Missing Persons', *Historia* V (1956), 204 suggests emending to Veianius, comparing Varro, *RR* III, 16, 10, two men *ex agro Falisco*.

Of less military persons, some scholars suppose that the *eques* M. Seius may be one of the Seii of Volsinii (Stein, *RE* II A, 1125, but see below). There are Seii elsewhere in Etruria. Shackleton Bailey takes the nickname, or conceivably *cognomen*, Calvenna, of Caesar's loyal friend Matius to indicate Etruscan descent (*ad Att.* XIV, 5, 1, with Schulze, 139); but some sort of obscure joke may be involved and there are few Matii in Etruria, though some Mattii. T. Carisius was a Caesarian

moneyer, and see *RE* III, 1592; but Wiseman, *New Men*, no. 104 thinks of Campania and Narbonese Gaul.

iv. Etruscans and possible Etruscans opposing Caesar.

Of the Caecinae no more need be said. Lydus, *Ost.* 27, seems to imply that Nigidius Figulus knew Etruscan, and there is Etruscan lore in the fragments, e.g. 68w, though the notorious Brontoscopia seems too simplified to be purely Etruscan. Nigidius Sors at Perugia, *ILLRP* 814; but Wiseman, no. 217, prefers the Nigidii of Pompeii, and Torelli, *Elogia*, 117 doubts Etruscan origin; Harris, 321, accepts it.

Münzer, *RE* IV A, 2231 regards Tanusius Geminus as a senator (and historians often were), noting Tanusia, γυνὴ ἐπιφρονής, married to one of the proscribed in 43, Dio XLVII, 7, 4; for his fragments, Peter, *HRR* II, 49. (A L. Tanusius, *eques*, perished at Catiline's hands in 81, Nicolet, no. 335.) Torelli, 'Senatori', 359, notes Tanusii in Etruria, *CIL* XI, 1802, now at Siena; *NS* (1930), 289, Ruscellae; *St. Etr.* v (1937), 544, Saturnia.

Q. Ancharius, *tr. pl.* 59 and *pr.* 56, opposed the Three; his father(?) Q. Ancharius was legate to Antonius Creticus in 73. The *pr.* 88 was anti-Marian. The Etruscan version of this name is common at Clusium and Perugia, but Ancharii in Umbria too, e.g. Cic., *pro Vareno* ap. Prisc. VII, 14, 70. See Harris, 326; Torelli, 'Senatori', 323.

The senator Vibienus, who supported Cicero in 58 and was killed by Clodius' gangs in 52, *pro Mil.* 37, Dio XXXVIII, 16, 5 is linked by Wiseman, 'Potteries', 275 to an Arretine vase-manufacturer. One of Cicero's Arretine friends? Wiseman, *New Men*, nos. 513, 514 looks to Cingulum for the Volusii, but Etruria is possible (cf. the *haruspex*, n. 105); close links with Cicero, *ad Att.* v, 11, 4; 21, 6; *ad f.* v, 20, 4. A Volusius, aedile in 43, was proscribed but escaped, Appian, *BC* IV, 27. For Considii see above, section II. The Salvius, *trib.* 43 and first victim of the proscriptions, *might* be a Salvius Otho from Ferentum; for these, Wiseman, no. 376. Volumnii are associated with both M. and D. Brutus, but also Antony and perhaps Octavian, and may or may not come from Perugia: Harris, 315 is for caution, in spite of the famous tomb there, cf. Wiseman, no. 509.

P. Selicius Corona, a senator, was the only juror voting for the absolution of Brutus and Cassius in 43, though as *tr. pl.* 44 he must then have been tolerable to Caesar. Torelli, 'Senatori', 327, 'qualche dubbio avrei per il primo gentilizio, sconosciuto in Etruria', which should perhaps be Selius, but Corona = Curunus, found at Tarquinii. Rather dubious.

Wiseman, 'Teidia's Husband', *Latomus* XXII (1963), 87 has argued that one of the Seii of Volsinii (see also section III) married the Teidia Sex. f. of *CIL* VI, 21326; her father, he suggests, was the Sex. Teidius who followed Pompey to Macedonia in spite of age and lameness. D. Hennig, *L. Aelius Seianus* (1975), 5 doubts this reconstruction but notes *ad f.* XI, 7, 1, a Seius supporting the Liberators. Teidia's husband (perhaps (L.) Seius Licinus) is likely though not bound to have supported Pompey.

C. Sentius C.f. Sab., in Lentulus Crus' *consilium* in Asia in 49, Josephus, *AJ* XIV, 229, would sound from his tribe like one of the many Etruscan Sentii, not the Atinate ones (Harris, 328); but, though Münzer, *RE* II A, 1509 does not note it, the text of Josephus is uncertain (cf. *AJ* XIV, 239).

For what it is worth, opposition to Caesar was expected in the district of Alsium, on the S. Etruscan coast, in 46, *ad f.* IX, 6. But this is near Rome, a colony and a place for villas of great Romans.

ILLRP 381 is the base of a monument in honour of Pompey at Clusium, perhaps 71 or the next decade.