



P. CALPURNIUS LANARIUS, A NEW NAME ON THE SULLAN PROSCRIPTION LISTS*

ABSTRACT

According to Plutarch (*Sert.* 7.1–2) and Sallust (*Hist.* 1.83–4), a certain P. Calpurnius Lanarius killed L. Livius Salinator, a member of Sertorius' staff in charge of military operations in the Pyrenees, in the early stages of the Sertorian War (82–72 B.C.). Through the analysis of the verb δολοφονέω in Plutarch's and St. Jerome's use of Sallust's *Histories*, this article seeks to demonstrate that Lanarius was an exile of the Sullan regime who treacherously assassinated his superior Salinator. The article puts forward the suggestion—not hitherto considered—that Lanarius was one of those proscribed.

Keywords: Sertorian War; C. Annius Luscus; Livius Salinator; δολοφονέω; Sallust's *Histories*; St Jerome; Sullan proscriptions; treason and civil wars

Plutarch provides a brief survey of P. Calpurnius Lanarius'¹ involvement in the struggle between Q. Sertorius, the commander who resisted the Sullan regime in the Iberian Peninsula in the 70s B.C., and C. Annius Luscus, the proconsul dispatched by the Dictator to end the revolt in 82–81 B.C. (*Plut. Sert.* 7.1–2):

When the news reached him [*sc.* Sertorius] that Sulla had captured Rome and that the cause of Marius and Carbo was lost, he expected that it would not be long before a general and an army were on their way to fight out the issue with him. He therefore sent Livius Salinator with a force of six thousand infantry to block the passes of the Pyrenees. Soon after this Gaius Annius was sent out by Sulla, and when he saw that Salinator had taken up an impregnable position, he was at a loss to know what to do next and encamped at the foot of the mountains. However, at this point a certain Calpurnius, surnamed Lanarius, assassinated Salinator, whose soldiers then abandoned the heights of the Pyrenees. Annius proceeded to cross the mountains and marched on with his large force, brushing aside the weak resistance he encountered.²

* I am very grateful to Federico Santangelo for his comments on previous versions of this paper. Athanassios Vergados and David Espinosa read sections of this article and offered valuable insights and advice. Claudia Lega helpfully clarified my doubts regarding *AE* 1993,258. Finally, thanks are due to the anonymous referee and the editor of *CQ* for their thorough feedback.

The original version of this article was published with a spelling error in the article title. A notice detailing this has been published and the error has been rectified in the online and print PDF and HTML copies.

¹ F. Münzer, 'Calpurnius 49', *RE* III.1 (1897), 1374. Even though Plutarch only gives the *nomen* and the *cognomen* of P. Calpurnius Lanarius, he may be identified with a man with the same onomastics who was involved in a dispute over the property of a house in the 90s B.C. (*Cic. Off.* 3.66; *Val. Max.* 8.2.1); hence the suggestion that his *praenomen* was *Publius*: C.F. Konrad, *Plutarch's Sertorius. A Historical Commentary* (Chapel Hill, 1994), 100–1. For Sallust's *Histories* I follow J.T. Ramsey, *Sallust's Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2015). For the chronology of the Sertorian conflict I follow C.F. Konrad, 'A new chronology of the Sertorian War', *Athenaeum* 83 (1995), 157–87.

² *Plut. Sert.* 7.1–2 ὡς δὲ Σύλλαν μὲν ἐπυνθάνετο τῆς Ῥώμης κρατεῖν, ἔρρειν δὲ τὴν Μαρίου καὶ Κάρβωνος στάσιν, αὐτίκα προσδοκῶν στρατιᾶν διαπολεμήσουσαν αὐτῷ μεθ' ἡγεμόνος ἀφιζέσθαι φράγγυνται τὰ Πυρηναῖα ὄρη διὰ Ἰουλίου Σαλινάτορος ἐξακισχιλίουσ ὀπλίτας ἔχοντος, καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ Γάϊος Ἄννιος ἐκπεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Σύλλα καὶ τὸν Ἰούλιον ἀπρόσμαχον ὄρων ἐν ἀπόρῳ καθήστο παρὰ ταῖς ὑπὸρειαί. Καλπουρνίου δὲ τινος ἐπικλησιν Λαναρίου δολοφονήσαντος τὸν Ἰούλιον

Two fragments from Sallust's *Histories*, 'Calpurnius with Lanarius as his cognomen' (*Calpurnius cognomento Lanarius*, 1.83) and 'Salinator is killed while on the march' (*Salinator in agmine occiditur*, 1.84), shed further light on the historical events.

As far as can be established on a preliminary basis, Sertorius, after settling the last stronghold of the Marians in Hispania, had to face the imminent arrival of Annii in 81 B.C. The rebel commander decided to send his legate Livius Salinator with a legion to block the Pyrenees, but the assassination of Salinator by a certain Calpurnius Lanarius (Καλπουρνίου δέ τινος ἐπέκλησιν Λαναρίου δολοφονήσαντος τὸν Ἰούλιον) disrupted the plans of Sertorius and obliged him to flee Spain towards North Africa.³ This much-debated event can be understood in two ways: either Lanarius was in the entourage of Salinator and killed him as an act of treason, or he was an officer of Annii and destroyed the Sertorian officer as a military tactic.⁴ The former option, which will be defended in this paper and has not been hitherto considered, would turn Lanarius into a treacherous exile who killed his commander and hence he would be a proscribed of the Sullan regime.

Sir Ronald Syme, pondering the fragments of Sallust and an isolated excerpt from the *Histories* ('a few men occupying a defile', *paucos saltum insidentis*, 1.82), argued that Lanarius was a legate of Annii who deceived Salinator through 'some Thermopylean flank movement' into a fatal ambush (*Salinator in agmine occiditur*).⁵ By combining the biography of Sertorius and the *Histories*, Syme claimed that Plutarch might have misunderstood his Latin source, which would have included a term such as *fraus* or *astus*, and used the verb δολοφονέω ('to slay by treachery') as a translation.

As a preliminary observation, it must be noted that the Sallustian fragment *paucos saltum insidentis*, which derives from a reference in Arusianus Messius, cannot be safely linked to the Sertorian War.⁶ Although Arusianus only points out that the sentence was inserted in the first book of the *Histories*, Maurenbrecher and the subsequent editors of Sallust have associated this excerpt with the campaign of Livius Salinator in the

καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τὰ ἄκρα τῆς Πυρρήνης ἐκλιπόντων, ὑπερβολῶν Ἄννιος ἐπέη χειρὶ μεγάλῃ τοὺς ἐμποδῶν ἀνιστάς. Transl. C. Pelling and I. Scott-Kilvert, *Rome in Crisis. Nine Lives by Plutarch: Tiberius Gracchus, Gaius Gracchus, Sertorius, Lucullus, Younger Cato, Brutus, Antony, Galba, Otho* (London, 2010).

³ Plutarch gives the *nomen* Ἰούλιος, but, as C. Cichorius, 'Zwei Gegner Caesars', in *Römische Studien* (Leipzig, 1922), 253–7, at 256 demonstrated, *Liuius* and *Iulius* are often confused in Greek manuscripts. As no *Iulius Salinator* is recorded in the ancient sources, *Liuius* must be the genuine *nomen* of the character (Konrad [n. 1], 99; F. Münzer provides *Iulius* [L. Iulius Salinator] in his entry on 'Iulius 453', *RE* X.1 [1918], 798). He could be identified with the moneyer of 84 (L. SALINAT.) during Cinna's government (*RRC* 355).

⁴ Calpurnius Lanarius as a treacherous Sertorian: W.P.C. Stahl, *De bello Sertoriano* (Erlangen, 1907), 42; A. Schulten, *Sertorius* (Leipzig, 1926), 44–5; P. Treves, 'Sertorio', *Athenaeum* 10 (1932), 127–47, at 132; Konrad (n. 1), 101; A. Manchón Zorrilla, 'Generales enviados contra él: Actores secundarios en el sur peninsular a comienzos de la Guerra Sertoriana. Una aproximación a las operaciones militares de 81 a.C. – 78 a.C.', *Saldvie* 16 (2016), 63–71, at 64–5. Lanarius as a Sullan legate: R. Syme, 'Missing senators', in R. Syme (E. Badian [ed.]), *Roman Papers, Volume I* (Oxford, 1979), 271–91, at 278; *MRR* 2.78; P. McGushin, *Sallust. The Histories. Volume I, Books I–II* (Oxford, 1992), 164; J. Martos Fernández, *Gayo Salustio Crispo. Obras* (Madrid, 2018), 422. Caution is advised in P.O. Spann, *Quintus Sertorius and the Legacy of Sulla* (Fayetteville, NC, 1987), 47–8, 187; F. García Morá, *Un episodio de la Hispania republicana: La guerra de Sertorio, planteamientos iniciales* (Granada, 1991), 32. No explanation is given in Münzer (n. 1).

⁵ Syme (n. 4), 278.

⁶ A. Della Casa, *Arusianus Messius. Exempla elocutionum* (Milan, 1977), 156.

Pyrenees.⁷ However, since Sallust related in the first book of the *Histories* the revolt of Lepidus, the conflict in the Iberian Peninsula in 82–78 B.C., the pirate war in Cilicia and the military clashes in Macedonia, a manoeuvre involving the occupation of a mountain pass (*saltus*) could have taken place in any of the aforementioned conflicts, not least given the mountainous nature of the last three regions. To assert that Sallust's *paucos saltum insidentis* was related to the fight between Livius Salinator and Annius Luscus seems quite arbitrary,⁸ and the fragment should therefore be considered of uncertain location within the text.

Furthermore, while the fact that Salinator fell during the military operations does not entail that the legate was the victim of an ambush, neither does it exclude the possibility of an assassination. Given that a narrative of the events in Latin has not survived, Syme's supposition, which is based on an unsupported inaccuracy of Plutarch, depends on an argument from silence. Even though Plutarch clearly followed Sallust's *Histories*—inasmuch as the same sentence, Καλπουρνίου δέ τινος ἐπίκλησιν Λαναρίου/*Calpurnius cognomeno Lanarius*, is recorded in both authors (Plut. *Sert.* 7.2; Sall. *Hist.* 1.83)—it seems unlikely that the biographer confused a series of military movements with a treacherous murder. Plutarch's misunderstanding would not be limited to the transferral of an otherwise non-existent noun such as *fraus* or *astus* into his mother tongue, but would rather imply that the reading of a military campaign led him to summarize a chain of historical events by simply referring to a mere assassination.⁹

As Konrad has conclusively shown, the fragment *Salinator in agmine occiditur* does not necessarily refer to a 'tactical manoeuvre or ruse' devised by the enemies of the legate of Sertorius.¹⁰ Even if one were to link it with Sallust's *paucos saltum insidentis* (Sall. *Hist.* 1.82), the evidence is not strong enough to assert that Salinator was a victim of an ambush or deception, while a laconic sentence such as *in agmine occiditur* cannot encompass the series of complex military strategies that Syme envisioned. The fragment 'killed while on the march' does not automatically imply an ambush; neither does it exclude other alternatives. Lanarius could have served under Salinator and have assassinated his commander when the army was moving from one point to another.

Adolf Schulten proposed that the passages of Plutarch and Sallust pointed to a betrayal perpetrated from within the Sertorian army, entailing that Lanarius murdered (δολοφονέω) his superior, Salinator, while being a member of his council. Thus, Salinator would have been protecting one of the passes of the Pyrenees on the arrival of Annius but, led on by a deception of Lanarius, marched with his army towards a

⁷ B. Maurenbrecher, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1893), 42, fr. 97; McGushin (n. 4), 164; Ramsey (n. 1), 80; caution is advised in R. Funari and A. La Penna, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiae I: Fragmenta 1.1–146* (Berlin and Boston, 2015), 314–15.

⁸ Konrad (n. 1), 101.

⁹ Although Plutarch was not a proficient user of Latin and committed some errors, it is generally agreed that he had sufficient knowledge to understand and interpret the Roman accounts he consulted: Plut. *Dem.* 2.2–3; A. De Rosalia, 'Il latino di Plutarco', in I. Gallo and G. D'Ippolito (edd.), *Strutture formali dei "Moralia" di Plutarco* (Naples, 1991), 445–59; A. Strobach, *Plutarch und die Sprachen: Ein Beitrag zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1997), 33–9; A. Setaioli, 'Plutarch's assessment of Latin as a means of expression', *Prometheus* 33 (2007), 156–65; P.A. Stadter, 'Plutarch and Rome', in M. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Plutarch* (Chichester, 2014), 13–31, at 14–16; P.A. Stadter, *Plutarch and his Roman Readers* (Oxford, 2015), 133–7. On Plutarch's adaptation of his historical sources, see C. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (London, 2011), 91–115; M.A. Schettino, 'The use of historical sources', in M. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Plutarch* (Chichester, 2014), 417–36.

¹⁰ Konrad (n. 1), 101; McGushin (n. 4), 164: 'a tactical manoeuvre or ruse'.

new location, where he was fatally trapped.¹¹ Although the aforementioned objections to the interpretation of Syme may also be applied to Schulten's approach, Schulten rightly stressed that Lanarius probably betrayed the Sertorian legate Livius Salinator.

This conclusion can also be drawn from the detailed scrutiny of Plutarch's use of *δολοφονέω* within the sentence *Καλπουρνίου δέ τινος ἐπικλησιν Λαναρίου δολοφονήσαντος τὸν Ἰούλιον* (Plut. *Sert.* 7.2). The verb has different meanings and connotations, and although it is invariably a synonym for murder, it often involves perfidy or deceit to some extent.¹² Plutarch, moreover, employed this term in a more restricted manner to indicate that the homicide in question had been committed treacherously, as can be inferred from the following list of instances where the Greek author resorted to *δολοφονέω*:

- 1) Plut. *Parallela minora* 37: Fabia killed her husband, Fabius Fabricianus, because she had a lover.
- 2) Plut. *Amat.* 2: Archias is assassinated by his beloved partner, Telephus.
- 3) Plut. *Tim.* 16.3: The attempted murder of Timoleon by two foreigners who had infiltrated the city of Adranum.
- 4) Plut. *Arat.* 3.3: Pseas, a tyrant of Sycion, is treacherously slain by Nicocles.
- 5) Plut. *Per.* 10.6: Pericles is accused of having killed his friend and partisan, Ephialtes, in an act of treason.
- 6) Plut. *Phil.* 15.2: An episode explained in Livy 35.35 as well. The Aetolians sent Alexamenus with soldiers to aid Nabis. Having managed to enter the royal court and earn the trust of the king, they killed the Spartan ruler during a military drill.
- 7) Plut. *Pomp.* 20.2: Plutarch uses *δολοφονέω* in narrating the murder of Sertorius at the supper of Osca by his fellows and friends.

Plutarch employs the verb *δολοφονέω* up to eight times—including the case of Calpurnius Lanarius—to describe assassinations or attempted assassinations that involved a betrayal of the victim. In all the cases above, the killer, in order to 'slay by treason', always tries to approach the victim personally (*Tim.* 16.3), that is, if he or she is not already within his close circle, either in an intimate sense (*Parallela minora* 37, *Amat.* 2) or in a context of political or military resonance (*Per.* 10.6, *Arat.* 3.3, *Phil.* 15.2). Plutarch's use of *δολοφονέω* in two passages framed in the Sertorian War from the different biographies of Sertorius and Pompey represents the rule rather than the exception: on the basis of Plutarch's usage of the verb, for Lanarius to *δολοφονεῖν* his commander, he must necessarily belong to the Sertorian army and therefore be in Salinator's entourage.

In his surviving works, Plutarch never reported military operations or the fall of a commander in battle with the word *δολοφονέω*. Consequently, the death of Livius Salinator as a result of combat should be discarded—whether Lanarius was a legate of Annus who trapped Salinator by a martial ruse or whether he was a Sertorian who deceived his superior into an ambush. Plutarch's description of Annus waiting

¹¹ Schulten (n. 4), 44–5.

¹² See the entry on *δολοφονέω* in LSJ and H. Torres, 'Los compuestos y derivados de *δόλος*: estudio lexicográfico', in F.R. Adrados and A. Martínez Díez (edd.), *Actas del IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos. Volume II* (Madrid, 1997), 249–52. Instances of slaying by treachery: Strabo 5.3.2; Polyb. 32.5.11. Examples of assassinations without implied treachery: App. *Syr.* 69; Dem. 19.194; *Mir. ausc.* 836a16; *P.Oxy.* 12r–v8.

at the foot of the Pyrenees and Sallust's fragments (*Salinator in agmine occiditur* and *paucos saltum insidentis*) do not represent sufficient evidence for the military campaigns that Syme and Schulten envisaged. Once the prospect of an ambush has been rejected, the sentence 'Salinator is killed while on the march' recovers its full significance. In the event that Lanarius was a Sullan, he could not have slain Salinator from outside the Sertorian army, either by crossing the Pyrenees and thereupon infiltrating the Sertorian camp or in the context of a truce or negotiations between the two parties: both scenarios require that the army of Salinator was static rather than in motion at the moment of the homicide. The appearance of the verbs *occido* and *δολοφονέω* in Sallust and Plutarch lead to the inevitable conclusion that we should consider Calpurnius Lanarius as a traitor to the Sertorian camp who slew Livius Salinator while the army was on the move.

Lanarius' betrayal can be confirmed by scrutinizing the sources from which the fragment *Calpurnius cognomento Lanarius* (Sall. *Hist.* 1.83) derives. The sentence is an excerpt from St Jerome, who quotes Sallust's words in two of his *Letters* (*Ep.* 70.6.2, 102.3.1) and alludes to a *Sallustianus Calpurnius* in the *Apologia aduersus libros Rufini* (1.30).¹³ Jerome invokes the name Calpurnius Lanarius in the context of his polemic with Tyrannius Rufinus over the dogmatic validity of Origen's work: Jerome and Rufinus had been close, but towards the end of the fourth century they bitterly clashed over differences in the interpretation of Christian doctrine, exchanging in the course of the controversy all kinds of insults and attacks.¹⁴

Jerome, who ranked Rufinus as a traitor, called his enemy derogatory epithets such as sea serpent, scorpion, grunting pig, Nero, Sardanapalus, Judas and, finally, Calpurnius Lanarius.¹⁵ If he considered the latter as an appropriate insult to define the unfaithfulness of his former friend, it might be concluded that Lanarius, the same figure mentioned in the biography of Sertorius and in the *Histories*, had perpetrated some terrible crime such as the murder of his own commander, Livius Salinator. Plutarch's passage probably mirrored what Sallust reflected in the *Histories*—namely, the depiction of a perfidious assassination, whose reading led Jerome to regard the name of Lanarius as the epitome of treason and a suitably offensive title to attribute to his foe Tyrannius Rufinus.

Even though an analysis of the literary accounts permits considering Lanarius as a traitor to Salinator, the reasons behind his actions are seemingly obscure: it is not

¹³ In the same book, Jerome refers to *Calpurniani* (3.28.25) and to an unknown *Calpurnius* (3.32.1) who is likely to be identified with Lanarius.

¹⁴ On the polemic between Jerome and Rufinus, see F.L. Cross, *The Early Christian Fathers* (London and Southampton, 1960), 127–8; H. von Campenhausen, *The Fathers of the Latin Church* (London, 1964), 131–2, 137–8, 173–8; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London, 1975), 246–58; S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis* (Stuttgart, 1992).

¹⁵ For the insults, attacks *ad hominem* and treason charges, see von Campenhausen (n. 14), 176–8; Kelly (n. 14), 254–7. Although some scholars have claimed that Jerome confused Calpurnius Lanarius with Calpurnius Bestia, the greedy consul who led the Roman armies in the Jugurthine War (J. Labourt, *Saint Jérôme. Lettres* [Paris, 1949], 215 n. 1; P. Lardet, *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: un commentaire* [Leiden and New York, 1993], 127), it must be noted that the Church Father not only mentions the *cognomen* *Lanarius* but also makes direct reference to the *Histories* of Sallust as the work in which the character is mentioned: B. Jeanjean, 'La correspondance de Jérôme, une autre chronique?', in F. Guillaumont and P. Laurence (edd.), *La présence de l'histoire dans l'épistolaire* (Tours, 2012), 221–38, at 225–6. Erasmus of Rotterdam noted that Calpurnius Lanarius had to be 'immoderate, arrogant and tyrannical' to be treated in such a way by Jerome: D. Erasmus, J.F. Brady and J. Olin (edd.), *Patristic Scholarship: The Edition of St Jerome* (Toronto, 2016), 206.

possible to determine whether he slew his superior owing to a personal enmity, to a divergence of opinion regarding the progression of the military operations, or because Lanarius aimed to obtain a pardon from the dictator and switch to the Sullan side by killing his commander.¹⁶ Nevertheless, while we lack sufficient information to establish why Lanarius killed Salinator, the scrutiny of the ancient sources does allow us to recognize Lanarius as likely to have been proscribed by the Sullan regime.

P. Calpurnius Lanarius has been securely identified with a man of the same name who was involved in a dispute over the property of a house in Rome in the 90s B.C.¹⁷ Lanarius could also be a relative of P. Calp(urnius), moneyer in 133 B.C. (*RRC* 247), as these are the only two members of the *gens Calpurnia* with the *praenomen* of *Publius* known so far for the Republican period. Regarding the appellation *Lanarius*, which means ‘wool-worker’, it could be a nickname rather than a *cognomen*—*Calpurnius cognomento Lanarius*, Sall. *Hist.* 1.83—that made reference to the family profession,¹⁸ a lineage of *mercatores*¹⁹ who would have been equestrians. According to his name and surname, Calpurnius Lanarius was at least an *eques*, but he could have developed a political career and entered the Senate. As far as can be established on a preliminary basis, P. Calpurnius Lanarius was a Roman knight who enjoyed a high social and economic position in the *Vrbs* and arrived in the Iberian Peninsula accompanying Sertorius, presumably on the commander’s staff, in 82 B.C. Since Lanarius likely belonged to Sertorius’ entourage, his proscribed status should be analogous to that of other exiles who followed the rebel commander during the war in Spain.

The literary sources refer to at least four Sertorians with the term *proscriptus* or its derivatives: Sertorius himself, M. Perperna, L. Fabius Hispaniensus and M. Marius.²⁰ However, modern scholars have reasonably assumed that, apart from the Roman citizens settled in the *Citerior* who were recruited by Sertorius in 82–81 B.C., and the remnants of

¹⁶ If Lanarius killed Salinator in order to abandon the cause of the exiles, his example could be contrasted with that of L. Fabius Hispaniensus, Anniius’ *quaestor* who switched to the Sertorian side: *RRC* 366/1–3; Sall. *Hist.* 3.57; C.F. Konrad, ‘Some friends of Sertorius’, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 519–27, at 519–22; B. Antela Bernárdez, ‘The coinage of C. Anniius Luscius’, in F. López Sánchez (ed.), *The City and the Coin in the Ancient and Early Medieval Worlds* (Oxford, 2012), 37–47, at 40–3; B. Antela Bernárdez, ‘Annio, Fanio y Tarquitio en las Guerras Sertorianas’, *Latomus* 76 (2017), 575–93, at 579–87; J. García González, ‘*Quintus Sertorius pro consule*: connotaciones de la magistratura proconsular afirmada en las *glandes inscriptae Sertorianae*’, *Anas* 25/26 (2019), 189–206, at 198–200. *Contra*: F. Hinard, ‘Prosopographie et histoire à propos de Lucius Fabius Hispaniensus’, *Historia* 40 (1991), 113–19; J.-M. Roddaz, ‘D’une péninsule à l’autre: l’épisode sertorien’, in A. Sartori and A. Valvo (edd.), *Hiberia-Italia, Italia-Hiberia. Convegno internazionale di epigrafia e storia antica* (Milan, 2006), 99–115, at 106.

¹⁷ Cic. *Off.* 3.66; Val. Max. 8.2.1; Konrad (n. 1), 100–1.

¹⁸ Funari and La Penna (n. 7), 314. The appearance in Rome of a funerary inscription dated to the second half of the first century B.C. (*AE* 1993,258 = *AE* 1995,146) which records a freedman, Aristonicus, who not only had belonged to a certain P. Calpurnius but also had the profession of *lanarius*, could point towards considering this appellation as a nickname rather than as a *cognomen* in the case of the treacherous Sertorian. Aristonicus has been linked to the exile P. Calpurnius Lanarius and his occupation has been connected to the economic activity of the family. On the inscription, see C. Lega, ‘Alcuni inediti dal magazzino ex-Ponteggi’, *Bollettino Monumenti Musei e Galerie Pontificie* 14 (1994), 53–79, at 72–5.

¹⁹ D. Nonnis, ‘Prospettive mediterranee dell’economia romana. L’apporto di una banca dati’, *Archeologia e Calcolatori* 18 (2007), 383–404, at 393.

²⁰ Sertorius: Livy, *Per.* 90.4; Oros. 5.21.3; Val. Max. 7.3.6; Flor. 2.10.2. Perperna: Vell. Pat. 2.30.1. Fabius Hispaniensus: Sall. *Hist.* 3.57. Marius: Oros. 6.2.20–2. On the proscription of these characters, see F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine* (Rome, 1985), 351–2, 392–3, 398–9, 404–6; Konrad (n. 1), 182, 200–1.

the Lepidan army who, after being declared *hostes*, arrived into the Iberian Peninsula in 77 B.C., a significant proportion of Sertorius' entourage was placed on the proscription lists.²¹

This is the conclusion that can be drawn when we address the relationship between the associates of the rebel commander who found refuge in Spain in 82 B.C. and the Sullan regime. Right after taking over the city of Rome, in Appian's striking account (*B Ciu.* 1.95), 'Sulla himself called the Roman people together in an assembly and made them a speech, vaunting his own exploits and making other menacing statements in order to inspire terror. He finished by saying that he would bring about a change which would be beneficial to the people if they would obey him, but of his enemies he would spare none, but would visit them with the utmost severity. He would take vengeance by strong measures on the praetors, quaestors, military tribunes, and everybody else who had committed any hostile act after the day when the consul Scipio violated the agreement made with him. After saying this he forthwith proscribed about forty senators and 1600 knights.'²²

Sertorius and his staff—that is, the same *consilium* that accompanied the rebel *dux* to Spain in 82 B.C.—were those chiefly responsible for the breach of the truce that Sulla and Scipio had agreed in 83 B.C.: while both commanders were negotiating the peace, Sertorius unilaterally decided to attack the city of Suessa Aurunca in Campania with the aim of prompting the resumption of hostilities.²³ Since the Sertorians who eventually fled to the Iberian Peninsula had, according to Sulla, sabotaged any chance of agreement between his camp and the Marian one, it is very hard to imagine that the officers who followed Sertorius into exile after serving in Italy escaped the wrath of the new ruler of Rome. Accordingly, those persons known to have pertained to the entourage of the rebel commander in 82 B.C. in the Iberian Peninsula—L. Livius Salinator, L. and Q. Hirtuleius, C. and L. Insteius, C. Tarquitiu Priscus and C. Octavius Graecinus—have been rightly considered by modern scholars as *proscripti*:

²¹ Hinard (n. 20), 52, 156–60; Spann (n. 4), 87; Konrad (n. 1), 182. Florus' definition of the Sertorian War is relevant here: *Bellum Sertorianum quid amplius quam Sullanae proscriptionis hereditas fuit?* (2.20.1). I have excluded from the analysis a number of Sertorians whose proscription, although possible or probable, cannot be confirmed—e.g. M. Antonius (Sall. *Hist.* 3.57; Plut. *Sert.* 26.5; Diod. Sic. 38/39.22a; Livy, *Per.* 96.3), Aufidius (Plut. *Sert.* 26–7), L. Cornelius Cinna (Suet. *Jul.* 5), C. Herennius (Livy, *fr.* 22.7–8; Plut. *Pomp.* 18.3; Sall. *Hist.* 2.86.6), Manlius (Plut. *Sert.* 26.1–4) and Perpenna's nephew (App. *B Ciu.* 1.114). On Sertorius' recruitment of the Roman citizens and the Italian *socii* who settled in the *Citerior* province, see Plut. *Sert.* 6.5; E. Gabba, 'Le origini della Guerra Sociale e la vita politica romana dopo l'89 a.C.', *Athenaeum* 32 (1954), 293–345, at 293–311; C.F. Konrad, 'Plutarch on Roman forces in the Sertorian War', in J. Alvar and J. Mangas Manjarrés (edd.), *Homenaje a José María Blázquez* (Madrid, 1998), 225–30; D. Espinosa Espinosa, *Plinio y los oppida de antiguo Lacio. El proceso de difusión del latium en Hispania Citerior* (Oxford, 2014), 97–113.

²² App. *B Ciu.* 1.95: αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Σύλλας Ῥωμαίους ἐς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγὼν πολλὰ ἐμεγαληγόρησεν ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ καὶ φοβερὰ ἐς κατάκληξιν εἶπεν ἕτερα καὶ ἐπήνεγκεν, ὅτι τὸν μὲν δῆμον ἐς χρηστὴν ἄξει μεταβολήν, εἰ πείθοιντό οἱ, τῶν δ' ἐχθρῶν οὐδενὸς ἐς ἔσχατον κακοῦ φείσεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς ἢ ταμίαις ἢ χιλιάρχους ἢ ὅσοι τι συνέπραξαν ἄλλοι τοῖς πολέμοις, μεθ' ἣν ἡμέραν Σκιπίων ὁ ἕπατος οὐκ ἐνέμεινε τοῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμολογημένοις, μετελεύσεσθαι κατὰ κράτος. ταῦτα δ' εἶπὼν αὐτίκα βουλευτὰς ἐς τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἱπέων ἀμφὶ χίλιους καὶ ἑξακοσίους ἐπὶ θανάτῳ προύγραψεν. Transl. B.C. McGing, *Appian. Roman History* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2019), Cf. Ors. 5.21.10.

²³ On the incident of Suessa Aurunca, see App. *B Ciu.* 1.85, with J. Strisino, 'Sulla and Scipio "not to be trusted"? The reasons why Sertorius captured Suessa Aurunca', *Latomus* 61 (2004), 33–40. Sources for the negotiations between Sulla and Scipio: Cic. *Phil.* 12.27; Plut. *Sert.* 6.2; Iulius Exuperantius 7; Livy, *Per.* 85; Flor. 2.9.19; Sall. *Hist.* 1.79; Vell. Pat. 2.25.2.

they were not only leading men of the Cinnan regime but also officers of the last Marian leader who dared to challenge the supremacy of the dictator.²⁴ Their inclusion in the proscription lists would thus be in keeping with Sulla's threat of taking vengeance on his enemies.

The case of P. Calpurnius Lanarius should not have been different than the circumstances of those who served under Sertorius in Spain at the beginning of the war. Once it has been confirmed that Lanarius, while accompanying Sertorius in his flight from Italy, belonged to the entourage of the rebel *dux* and betrayed and killed Livius Salinator, his status as *proscriptus* emerges as a very likely prospect: as a man who held a wealthy position in Rome, was of at least equestrian and perhaps even of senatorial rank, and belonged to Sertorius' *consilium*, he should be included, just like the other refugees who arrived in Hispania in 82 B.C., in the list of senators and knights outlawed by Sulla. Even if it is not possible to ascertain why Lanarius assassinated Salinator, his status and deeds would demonstrate that he was, in all probability, both an exile and a proscribed man.

The restricted meaning of *δολοφονέω* as 'to slay by treason', which Plutarch employed to describe the actions of Calpurnius Lanarius, along with the nefarious picture of the character that St Jerome exploited to defame his adversary Rufinus, suggests that Lanarius was originally a Sertorian, who went on to treacherously kill his superior Salinator. As a proscribed individual, P. Calpurnius Lanarius would be a new name to add to the prosopography of those who were condemned by Sulla; as a murderer, Lanarius is an addition to the considerable catalogue of betrayals that characterizes the civil wars of the Roman Republic.²⁵

Newcastle University

JUAN GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ
j.garcia2@newcastle.ac.uk

²⁴ While Livius Salinator fought as legate of Sertorius in the *Citerior*, being in charge of one legion in 81 B.C., L. Hirtuleius became the most important *quaestor* of the rebel *dux*, fighting under his command from the beginnings of the war in Spain and achieving various successes on the battlefield between 80 and 77 B.C. (Plut. *Sert.* 12.3–4; Flor. 2.10.6–7; Eutr. 6.1.2; Frontin. *Str.* 4.5.19; Livy, *Per.* 90.6; Oros. 5.23.3–4). Regarding Q. Hirtuleius ([Aur. Vict.] *De uir. ill.* 63.2; Sall. *Hist.* 2.29; Oros. 5.23.12; Flor. 2.10.7), L. Insteius (Livy, fr. 22.3) and C. Tarquinius Priscus (Frontin. *Str.* 2.5.31; Sall. *Hist.* 3.55, 3.57; Diod. Sic. 38/39.22a), the three men served as *contubernales* within the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo during the Social War (*ILS* 8888) but, in the course of the siege of Rome of 87 B.C., they switched to the Marian camp and joined the army of Sertorius (Plut. *Pomp.* 3.1–5; Konrad [n. 1], 56; Konrad [n. 16], 522–4; Gabba [n. 21], 312–13). Afterwards, Hirtuleius, Insteius and Tarquinius went to Spain as officers of the rebel proconsul and led military forces in the course of the Sertorian War. C. Insteius, *praefectus equitum* of Sertorius in 77–76 B.C. (Livy, fr. 22.13), probably arrived in *Hispania Citerior* with his brother Lucius. Finally, C. Octavius Graecinus (Frontin. *Str.* 2.5.31; Plut. *Sert.* 26.4), lieutenant of Sertorius at the battle of Lauron in 77 B.C., has been identified with a magistrate recorded twice at Tibur (*CIL* 14.3629, 3664); since the town supported Cinna, Marius and Sertorius in 87 B.C. (App. *B Ciu.* 1.65), it has been assumed that Graecinus joined the Marians and, once the Cinnan regime collapsed, accompanied Sertorius to the Iberian Peninsula in 82 B.C. All these Sertorians are listed as *proscripti* in the prosopography of Hinard (n. 20), 358–60, 366–7, 387, 400–1.

²⁵ Hinard (n. 20) does not refer to Calpurnius Lanarius in his monumental work. Lanarius' treason emulates the different betrayals within the Marian camp recorded in the First Civil War: C. Flavius Fimbria (Livy, *Per.* 82.3; Mem. *FGrHist* 434 F 1.24.1–3; App. *Mith.* 8.52; Dio Cass. fr. 104.3–5), P. Cornelius Cethegus (App. *B Ciu.* 1.80), Q. Lucretius Ofella (Vell. Pat. 2.27.6), C. Verres (Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.35–8) and P. Albinovanus (App. *B Ciu.* 1.91).