



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

E. Badian The Consuls, 179-49 BC

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **20 • 1990**

Seite / Page **371-414**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1129/5496> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1990-20-p371-414-v5496.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69-71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

E. BADIAN

The Consuls, 179-49 BC*

T. R. S. Broughton
Attico nostrati
nonagenario

My purpose is to give, to the best of my ability, the correct names of the consuls from the *lex Villia* to the last elections of the free Republic, and, for each name, to provide information on the *praenomina* of father and grandfather, as far as the evidence permits, and to assess social status by descent. This information is surprisingly hard to come by, despite the excellent groundwork that has been done. (I decided not to include tribes: comparatively few are known, and that information can be obtained in: LILY ROSS TAYLOR, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* [1960], with supplements registered in MRR III.) After 154, when we lose the uninterrupted sequence of the *Fasti Capitolini*, information is harder to

* The first version of this list was presented and discussed in a seminar at Harvard University several years ago, and received its first comments and improvements from my colleagues and students who participated, especially from Dr. KATHERINE ADSHEAD, of Christchurch, New Zealand, who happened to be a Visiting Scholar at the time. It was later seen and improved by Professor T. R. S. BROUGHTON, and on part of it I had the advice of Professor D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY. (The publication of BROUGHTON's third volume of *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* [1986] was obviously of great help in revision.) A revised draft was completed during a term pleasantly and usefully spent as a Mellon Fellow at the National Humanities Center and a month as the guest of the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik in Munich. During and after that time, KARL-LUDWIG ELVERS, a Fellow at the Kommission, spent a great deal of time eliminating errors in references and alerting me to implausibilities. Finally, my old friend Professor H. B. MATTINGLY agreed to read the work with attention sharpened by his unequalled knowledge of the history, as well as the epigraphy and numismatics, both Greek and Roman, of the period here covered. Other scholars, to whom I can only express general thanks, have also made suggestions for improvement in places. However, it is entirely due to the hospitality of the institutions and the patience of the scholars named that publication has become possible. Naturally, I am solely responsible for the errors that are sure to remain. But there would have been many more without their help. I shall be very grateful if anyone noticing such errors would write to me. An attempt like this one is also sure to be overtaken in detail by new discoveries and publications. Again, I shall greatly appreciate information drawing my attention to them. The aim of the list and the conventions adopted in setting it out are explained in the introduction to the list.

come by and conjecture must be more or less extensively used. From that point on, I have underlined *praenomina* epigraphically attested, as being the most secure, but only where the information refers to the actual person, not (e. g.) to his father, however confident we are of the relationship. I have included as certain what comes from a reliable source and, to indicate degree of probability, have used different terms in my annotation. Where there is no comment, I regard the facts as attested beyond reasonable doubt. Where I think there is enough evidence to make conjecture practically certain, I have used <must be>; while <presumably> indicates that the evidence available compels the deduction, but that we may not have enough evidence to accept it with full confidence. Below this, I use (in descending order of probability) words like <probably>, <possibly>, etc., which will cause no problems. I hope that my two strongest terms will command the assent of anyone who checks the evidence. I have used them without query in assessing status by descent.

This assessment is divided into five categories, in columns following the names: C(onsular), P(raetorian), S(enatorial of lower status), N(on-senatorial: *novus* in the strict sense), U(nknown). New men are thus marked only when positively attested as such: we have no way of conjecturing that status. <Consular> includes (after GELZER) descendants of military tribunes with consular power and of dictators. The Unknown column is inevitably miscellaneous, in view of the inadequacy of our sources, especially for large parts of the second century after 166 and of the early first. It must include men of praetorian status, and occasionally perhaps one of consular birth. (That will be marked when there is reason to suspect it.)

KEITH HOPKINS's useful distinction between consular father or grandfather and more remote consular descent has been marked. It seems to have Cicero's authority, corresponding to the difference between nobility actually remembered and *ex annalium vetustate eruenda* (Mur. 16). The longer interval is indicated by parentheses (). Square brackets [] indicate a claim to descent from magistrates of the very early Republic, where the claim is known to have been made and was probably widely accepted, even though *we* might not be convinced. In these cases, a candidate would obviously face some difficulties, but they would hardly be insurmountable, especially where the names coincided and the ancestor claimed was distinguished and widely remembered. We must also note that consular descent could be claimed through natural and through adoptive ascendants, and that election to an office conferred official credit for it, even if the office was cancelled, or not held, through disqualification: thus M. Marcellus, *uitio creatus* as *cos. II* in 215, is listed as *cos. III* in 214.

P denotes Patrician status; (P) adoptive Plebeian status, with Patrician origin shown in the name.

The Notes column usually gives only brief discussion where it is needed, on name, filiation and status. Where longer discussion is needed, it will be found in

the end notes, referred to in the Notes column. The following will generally not be in the Notes:

(a) Material set out sub anno in *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 1, pp. 456 ff., unless it seems of special interest or needs discussion.

(b) References beyond what is necessary to establish name and descent: this list is not a repertorium of sources on the men listed. RE numbers are given with all names.

(c) In a few well-known cases (e. g. C. Marius and M. Tullius Cicero), evidence for *novitas*; or, in equally well-known cases (e. g. P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus), evidence for descent.

References to MÜNZER are to his entries in RE; references to DEGRASSI to his discussion in *Inscr. It.*, l. c.; references to SUMNER to *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (1973). FCC = *Fasti Capitolini Consulares*; FCTr = *Fasti Capitolini Triumphales*. <Cf.> refers to items on this list. Other abbreviations used are standard and should be recognisable.

I. The List

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
179	L. Manlius (47) L. f. L. n. Acidinus Fulvianus P Q. Fulvius (61) Q. f. M. n. Flaccus	X	X				} <i>hei fratres germani fuerunt</i> (FCC): must be sons of <i>cos. I 237</i> .
178	M. Junius (48) M. f. L. n. Brutus	[(X)]					
177	A. Manlius (90) Cn. f. L. n. Vulso P C. Claudius (300) Ap. f. P. n. Pulcher P Ti. Sempronius (53) P. f. Ti. n. Gracchus	X	X				Must be son of <i>cos. 212</i> . Must be grandson of <i>cos. 238</i> .
176	Cn. Cornelius (346) Cn. f. L. n. Scipio Hispallus P Q. Petillius (11) C. f. Q. n. Spurtinus <i>Suff.</i> : C. Valerius (208) M. f. P. n. Laevinus P	X			X		Presumably son of <i>cos. 222</i> . Must be son of <i>cos. 210</i> .
175	P. Mucius (16) Q. f. P. n. Scaevola M. Aemilius (68) M. f. M. n. Lepidus II P	X	X				Must be son of <i>cos. 220</i> ; see DEGRASSI 118ff. Presumably grandson of <i>cos. 232</i> ; had been <i>cos. 187</i> .
174	Sp. Postumius (49) A. f. A. n. Albinus (Paullulus) P Q. Mucius (20) Q. f. P. n. Scaevola	X	X				Must be grandson of <i>cos. 242</i> . Cf. <i>cos. 175</i> (brother).
173	L. Postumius (41) A. f. A. n. Albinus P M. Popillius (24) P. f. P. n. Laenas	X	(X)				Cf. <i>cos. 174</i> (brother). Must be descended from <i>cos. I 359</i> .

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
172	C. Popillius (18) P. f. P. n. Laenas P. Aelius (84) P. f. P. n. Ligus	(X)					Cf. <i>cos.</i> 173 (brother). X A q. P. Aelius (409) may be an ancestor, because of the shared <i>praenomen</i> ; but he would not be a senator. Descent from a consular Pactus is possible, since the <i>praenomen</i> P. is found among both families.
171	P. Licinius (60) C. f. P. n. Crassus C. Cassius (55) C. f. C. n. Longinus	?(X) [X]					Likely to be descended from Calvi. ¹ Descent from Sp. Cassius Vicellinus (<i>cos.</i> 502) claimed in late second century (RRC 321, 386), so will have been at this time.
170	A. Hostilius (16) L. f. A. n. Mancinus A. Atilius (60) C. f. C. n. Serranus	?X	X				X Presumably son of <i>iuuenis</i> of Livy XXII 15 (apparently not a senator). Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 218, may be grandson of C. Atilius Bulbus, <i>cos.</i> 245.
169	Q. Marcius (79) L. f. Q. n. Philippus II Cn. Servilius (45) Cn. f. Cn. n. Caepio P						Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> 281 (presumably great-grandson); had been <i>cos.</i> 186. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 203.
168	L. Aemilius (114) L. f. M. n. Paullus II P C. Licinius (51) C. f. P. n. Crassus	X	X				Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 219 etc.; had been <i>cos.</i> 182. Cf. <i>cos.</i> 171 (brother).
167	Q. Aelius (104) P. f. Q. n. Paetus M. Iunius (122) M. f. M. n. Pennus	X	X				Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 201. Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 201. ²
166	C. Sulpicius (225) C. f. C. n. Galus P M. Claudius (66) M. f. M. n. Marcellus	X X					Presumably grandson of <i>cos.</i> 243. Grandson of <i>cos.</i> I 222 (Asc. p. 12 C).
165	T. Manlius (83) A. f. T. n. Torquatus P Cn. Octavius (17) Cn. f. Cn. n.	X	X				Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> I 235. Suet. Aug. 2.2: son of <i>pr.</i> 205.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
164	A. Manlius (73) A. f. T. n. Torquatus P Q. Cassius (69) L. f. Q. n. Longinus	X	X				Cf. <i>cos.</i> 165 (brother). Cf. <i>cos.</i> 171.
163	Ti. Sempronius (53) P. f. Ti. n. Gracchus II M'. Iuventius (30) T. f. T. n. Thalna	X	X				Had been <i>cos.</i> 177. Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 194.
162	P. Cornelius (353) P. f. Cn. n. Scipio Nasica (Corculum) P C. Marcus (61) C. f. Q. n. Figulus	X ?(X)					Cic. Brut. 79: son of <i>cos.</i> 191. MÜNZER suggests (plausibly: see on 156) descent from Q. Philippus, <i>cos.</i> 281. Presumably son of <i>cos.</i> 199. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 192.
161	<i>Suff.</i> : P. Cornelius (202) L. f. L. n. Lentulus P Cn. Domitius (19) Cn. f. L. n. Ahenobarbus	X X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 188. Must be son of <i>tr. pl.</i> ?187, who may have reached the Senate.
160	L. Anicius (15) L. f. L. n. Gallus M. Cornelius (93) C. f. C. n. Cethegus P	X ?(X)		?X ?X			Perhaps connected with the family of Q. Anicius (RE 5: Pliny, NH XXXIII 17). Presumably descended (great-grandson) from M., grandfather of <i>cos.</i> 204 and 197. Note a third relative as <i>cos.</i> 181. This suggests (but does not prove) consular descent, presumably from a Cossus or a Maluginensis.
159	Cn. Cornelius (132) Cn. f. Cn. n. Dolabella P M. Fulvius (93) M. f. M. n. Nobilior	(X) X					Presumably descended from <i>cos.</i> 283. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 189.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
158	M. Aemilius (70) M. f. M'. n. Lepidus P	?(X)					By the end of the century, the <i>praenomen</i> Mam. (adoptive father of <i>cos.</i> 77) shows claim to descent from Mamercii/Mamerchini, which may well be true. The Xvirate s. f., almost hereditary in the family, confirms descent from early Aemilian consuls. (For an adventurous stemma, see SUMNER 66.) This man may possibly be a great-grandson of <i>cos.</i> 232. NB: A stemma is difficult to reconstruct, since M'. most often appears as M. in manuscripts. Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> / 359; had been <i>cos.</i> 172.
157	C. Popillius (18) P. f. P. n. Laenas II Sex. Julius (148/149) Sex. f. L. n. Caesar P L. Aurelius (179) L. f. L. n. Orestes	(X)					The Caesares were descended from the Iulii Iulli. (See, e. g., G. V. SUMNER, Phoenix 25 [1971] 264.) X We do not know of a connection with earlier Aurelii, including an ancestor of the Cottae, <i>cos.</i> / 252.
156	L. Cornelius (224) Cn. f. L. n. Lentulus Lupus P C. Marcus (61) C. f. Q. n. Figulus II	X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 201. Had been <i>cos.</i> 162. Second consulship confirms MÜNZER'S conjecture on his descent: cf. 162.
155	P. Cornelius (353) P. f. Cn. n. Scipio Nasica Corculum II P M. Claudius (225) M. f. M. n. Marcellus II	X					Had been <i>cos.</i> 162. Had been <i>cos.</i> 166.
154	Q. Opimius (10) Q. f. Q. n. L. Postumius (42) Sp. f. L. n. Albinus P Suff: M'. Acilius (36) M'. f. C. n. Glabrio	X					X A q. 294 (RE 12, unreasonably doubted by MÜNZER) died in battle and cannot have reached the Senate. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 186. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 191: see Livy XL 34,4ff.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
<i>At this point we lose the continuous record of FCC</i>							
153	<u>Q.</u> Fulvius (95) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Nobilior <u>T.</u> Annius (64) <u>T.</u> f. ? n. Luscus	X					Filiation: FCC on 136. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 189. X The first senatorial Annius known.
152	<u>M.</u> Claudius (225) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Marcellus III <u>L.</u> Valerius (174) <u>L.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Flaccus P	X					Had been <i>cos.</i> 166, 155. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 195.
151	<u>L.</u> Licinius (102) ? f. ? n. Lucullus		?X	?X			May be son or grandson of <i>aed.</i> 202 or son of <i>pr.</i> 186. (DEGRASSI has mistaken paronymic.) Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 180.
150	<u>A.</u> Postumius (31) <u>A.</u> f. <u>A.</u> n. Albinus P <u>T.</u> Quinctius (46) ? f. <u>T.</u> n. Flamininus P <u>M.</u> Acilius (25) <u>L.</u> f. <u>K.</u> n. Balbus	X		X			Perhaps son of either <i>cos.</i> 198 or <i>cos.</i> 192. ³ Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 197. ⁴
149	<u>L.</u> Marcus (46) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Censorinus <u>M.</u> Manilius (12) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n.	(X)				X	Full name: FCC on 147. Must be descended from C. Marcus Rutilius Censorinus, <i>cos.</i> 310.
148	<u>Sp.</u> Postumius (47) <u>Sp.</u> f. <u>Sp.</u> n. Albinus Magnus P <u>L.</u> Calpurnius (87) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Piso Caesonius	(X)					Must be descended from consular Albini of 5th and 4th centuries and may be great-grandson of <i>cos.</i> 242. Full name: ILLRP 452 (milestone) + FCC. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 180. ⁵
147	<u>P.</u> Cornelius (335) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Scipio Africanus Aemilianus P <u>C.</u> Livius (14) <u>M.</u> Aemiliani f. <u>M.</u> n. Drusus (P)	X				X	Widely attested as son by birth of L. Aemilius Paullus (<i>cos.</i> / 182) and grandson by adoption of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (<i>cos.</i> / 205). Adoptive grandfather must be M. Livius (33) Salmator, <i>cos.</i> / 219; natural grandfather unknown. For speculations, see MÜNZER and SUMNER 64ff.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
146	<u>Cn.</u> Cornelius (177) ? f. ? n. Lentulus P <u>L.</u> Mummius (7 a) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n.	?X (X)					Usually listed as Cn. f. L. n., i. e. younger son of <i>cos.</i> 201; rightly said by MÜNZER to be möglich, aber nicht zu beweisen, especially as the time interval is not persuasive. Alternatives do not all make him of immediate consular descent, but he must be ultimately. Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 177. Cicero never calls him <i>nomis</i> ; only Velleius does (I 13,2; II 128,2: a precedent for Sejanus); but he must be mistaken.
145	<u>Q.</u> Fabius (109) Q. f. ? Q. n. Maximus Aemilianus P <u>L.</u> Hostilius (20) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Mancinus	X		?X	X		By birth son of L. Aemilius (114) Paullus, <i>cos.</i> I 182. Adoptive father's <i>praenomen</i> confirmed FCIr for 120. Nephew of <i>cos.</i> 170: likely to be of senatorial descent, but we have no information.
144	<u>Ser.</u> Sulpicius (58) ? Ser. f. ? n. Galba P <u>L.</u> Aurelius (98) ? f. ? n. Cotta	?X (X)					Surprisingly (in view of his fame), descent not well attested. ⁶ But must be descended from consular Sulpicius of 5th and 4th centuries. Descent from <i>cos.</i> I 252 certain, but filiation unknown. May be son of RE 97 or 104 (neither known to have even been praetor) and grandson of C. (RE 95), <i>cos.</i> 200, or of M. (RE 103), aedilician.
143	<u>Ap.</u> Claudius (295) <u>C.</u> f. Ap. n. Pulcher P <u>Q.</u> Caecilius (94) <u>Q.</u> f. ? L. n. Metellus Macedonicus	X					Filiation assured by <i>termini Gracchani</i> (ILLRP 472, 474): must be son of <i>cos.</i> 177. Pliny, rightly or wrongly, calls him a son of <i>cos.</i> 206 (NH VII 142). ⁷ Patronymic: SIG ³ 680.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
142	<u>L.</u> Caecilius (83) ? <u>Q.</u> f. ? <u>L.</u> n. Merellus Calvus <u>Q.</u> Fabius (115) <u>Q.</u> f. ? <u>Q.</u> n. Maximus Servilianus P	X	X				Brother of <i>cos.</i> 143? (Cf. n. 7.) Appian (Iber. 67,283) calls him brother of <i>cos.</i> 145; confirmed by identity of patronyms. Natural father probably <i>cos.</i> 169.
141	<u>Cn.</u> Servilius (46) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Caepio P <u>Q.</u> Pompeius (12) <u>A.</u> f. ? n.	X			X		Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 169. Brother of <i>cos.</i> 140 (Val. Max. VIII 5,1). <i>Nonitas</i> attested Cic. 2Verr. V 181 et al.
140	<u>C.</u> Laelius (3) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. <u>Q.</u> Servilius (48) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Caepio P	X					<i>Praenomen</i> : RDGE 14 line 23. Son of <i>cos.</i> 190 (Cic. Phil. 11, 17). Cf. <i>cos.</i> 141.
139	<u>Cn.</u> Calpurnius (73) ? <u>C.</u> f. ? <u>C.</u> n. Piso <u>M.</u> Popilius (22) <u>M.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Laenas	?X X		?X			Cf. n. 5. ⁸ Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 173. May be <i>leg.</i> of IMagn 123.
138	<u>P.</u> Cornelius (354) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Scipio Nasica (Serapio) P <u>D.</u> Iunius (57) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Brutus Callaicus	X					Son of <i>cos.</i> 162 (Cic. Brut. 212f.). Patronymic: ILLRP 333. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 178 (patronymic: Cic. Brut. 107).
137	<u>M.</u> Aemilius (83) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Lepidus Porcina P <u>C.</u> Hostilius (18) <u>A.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Mancinus	X					Must be the <i>pr.</i> M. Aemilius M. f. of RDGE 7; for date see MATTINGLY, NC ⁷ 9 (1969) 103f.; hence presumably son of <i>cos.</i> 187. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 170.
136	<u>L.</u> Furius (78) ? f. ? <u>P.</u> n. Philus P	?X (X)					May be son of <i>pr.</i> 171 (thus SUMNER 61) or of <i>pr.</i> 174, grandson of <i>cos.</i> 223. (The <i>praenomen</i> is L.: see MRR I 488 n. 1.) In any case, descent from consular Furii of 4th century may be assumed. Must be son of <i>pr.</i> 174, nephew of <i>cos.</i> 170.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
135	<u>Ser. Fulvius</u> (64) <u>Q.</u> f. ? n. Flaccus <u>Q.</u> Calpurnius (86) <u>C.</u> f. C. n. Piso	X	X				Father either <i>cos. suff.</i> 180 or <i>cos.</i> 179. Presumably son of <i>cos.</i> 180 (cf. n. 5.) <i>Praenomen</i> : SIG ³ 683 line 42.
134	<u>P.</u> Cornelius (335) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Scipio Africanus Aemilianus II P <u>C.</u> Fulvius (53) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Flaccus	X	X				Had been <i>cos.</i> 147. Must be son of <i>cos. suff.</i> 180; may be brother of <i>cos.</i> 135.
133	<u>P.</u> Mucius (17) <u>P.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Scaevola <u>L.</u> Calpurnius (96) <u>L.</u> f. ? <u>Cn.</u> n. Piso Frugi ? <u>C.</u> n.	X		?X			Son of <i>cos.</i> 175 (Cic. Brut. 98). Patronymic: ILLRP 1088 (<i>glandes</i>). Cf. n. 5.
132	<u>P.</u> Popillius (28) <u>C.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Laenas <u>P.</u> Rupilius (5) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n.	X		?X			Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 172. Had been a <i>publicanus</i> , but this says nothing about his descent. No <i>cognomen</i> known.
131	<u>P.</u> Licinius (72) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Crassus Mucianus <u>L.</u> Valerius (175) ? <u>L.</u> f. ? <u>L.</u> n. Flaccus P	X	X				Brother of <i>cos.</i> 133 (Cic. Acad. II 13). The link between the consuls ... of 152 and 100: (MÜNZER): quite plausible, but since no filiation survives, there are other possibilities. ⁹
130	<u>L.</u> Cornelius (192) ? f. ? n. Lentulus P <u>M.</u> Perperna (4) <u>M.</u> f. ? <u>L.</u> n.	?X (X)	X				SUMNER (143) thinks him a son of the <i>cos. suff.</i> 162 – a possibility, but no more. Patronymic: IPr 108 line 225; 109 line 92. A proxy for <u>M.</u> Perperna <u>L.</u> f. (IG IX 2, 258: date unknown) is plausibly thought to provide his grandfather's name. His father, said (in an implausible story: Val. Max. III 4,5) to have survived him, should have been a senator (whether praetor, we do not know). See RE 3. Recorded as <u>Ap.</u> Claudius by Cass. and Obs. The name does not survive in the epigraphic <i>fasti</i> . For the <i>cognomen</i> see ¹⁰ . His father must be one of the <u>Ti.</u> Nerones RE ?250, 251, 252.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
129	C. Sempronius (92) C. f. C. n. Tuditanus <u>M'</u> . Aquilius (10) <u>M'</u> . f. <u>M'</u> . n.	(X) ?(X)				X	Descended from <i>cos.</i> 240. Full name in FCTI for 126. L. Aquilius (PIR ² A 990: <i>sub finem libertae rei publicae</i>) Florus seems to claim descent from this man and, by his name, implies descent of the family from C. Aquilius (20) Florus, <i>cos.</i> 259. We cannot judge the claim, but the name is rare and it may be true. (For L. Florus' inscription see ILLRP 456 and II p. 386.)
128	Cn. Octavius (18) Cn. f. Cn. n. <u>T'</u> . Annius (78) <u>T'</u> . f. T. n. Rufus	X X					Suet. Aug. 2, 2; cf. n. 22. Presumably son of <i>cos.</i> 153 (see BICS Suppl. 51 [1988] 6.) Patronymic: milestone ILLRP 454 a. C. Annius (9) T. f. T. n., <i>pro cos.</i> in Spain 81, must be his son. (Rightly KLEBS, RE.) He should not be given the <i>cognomen</i> Luscus (MRR II and III, RRC): see BICS, cit.
127	L. Cassius (72) ? f. ? n. Longinus Ravilla L. Cornelius (105) L. f. ? n. Cinna P	X [X] (X)					Cic. Leg. III 35 assures his <i>nobilitas</i> , but his descent is unknown. For speculation see SUMNER 48 ff. (stemma p. 50). His father should be a consul (171 or 164); cf. <i>cos.</i> 171. The milestone ILLRP 457 gives his patronymic. (The <i>cos.</i> 87 is unlikely to have built roads.) Patrician status assured by marriage of his granddaughter to <i>fl. Dial. des.</i> C. Caesar. This also assures descent from early consular Cornelli.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
126	M. Aemilius (71) ? f. ? n. Lepidus P L. Aurelius (180) L. f. L. n. Orestes	(X) X					Nothing known about his descent. See SUMNER 64 ff. (stemma p. 66) for speculation. Name: FCTr for 122. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 157.
125	M. Plautius (21) ? f. ? L. n. Hypsaeus M. Fulvius (58) M. f. Q. n. Flaccus	?[X] X	X				Should be grandson of <i>pr.</i> 189; L. Hypsaeus, <i>pr.</i> c. 135, must be his brother. ¹ See SUMNER 59. Name: FCTr for 123. Must be grandson of <i>cos. suff.</i> 180 or <i>cos.</i> 179.
124	C. Cassius (56) ? f. ? n. Longinus C. Sextius (20) C. f. C. n. Calvinus	X [X]					Nothing known. Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 127. X Name: FCTr for 122. No claim to descent from Sextii of early Republic known.
123	Q. Caecilius (82) Q. f. Q. n. Metellus Baliaicus T. Quinctius (47) ?T. f. ?T. n. Flaminius P	X X					Name: FCTr for 121. Various attested (e.g. Pliny, NH VII 142) as son of <i>cos.</i> 143. Cf. n. 3.
122	Cn. Domitius (20) Cn. f. Cn. n. Ahenobarbus C. Fannius (7) M. f. ?C. n.	X X				X	Name: FCTr for 120. Must be son of <i>cos. suff.</i> 162. Name: ILLRP 269. The «Fanniusfrage» has been too much debated. See (best) SUMNER 53 ff.
121	L. Opimius (4) Q. f. Q. n. Q. Fabius (110) Q. Aemiliani f. Q. n. Maximus Allobrogicus P	X X					Son of <i>cos.</i> 154 (Lucil. fr. 418 M). Name: FCTr for 120. Son of <i>cos.</i> 145.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
120	<u>P.</u> Manilius (14) ? f. ? P. n. <u>C.</u> Papirius (33) <u>C.</u> f. ? n. Carbo	?X [X]	?X				Probably son of <i>cos.</i> 149, but perhaps nephew (son of <i>leg.</i> 167). Name: ILLRP 473, 475 (<i>termini Gracchani</i>). ¹²
119	<u>L.</u> Caecilius (91) <u>L.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Delmaticus <u>L.</u> Aurelius (99) ? <u>L.</u> f. ? <u>L.</u> n. Cotta	X ?X (X)	X				Name: FCTr for 117. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 142. Should be son of <i>cos.</i> 144 (see stemma in my: Studies in Greek and Roman History 64); certainly descended from <i>cos.</i> 252 etc.
118	<u>M.</u> Porcius (10) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Cato <u>Q.</u> Marcus (91) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Rex P	X ?[X]	X				See Gell. XIII 20, 9. Name: FCTr for 117. ¹³
117	<u>L.</u> Caecilius (93) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Diadematus <u>Q.</u> Mucius (21) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Scaevola	X X	X				Son of <i>cos.</i> 143 (Pliny, NH VII 143). ¹⁴ Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 174.
116	<u>C.</u> Licinius (88) <u>P.</u> f. ? n. Getha <u>Q.</u> Fabius (111) <u>Q.</u> Serviliani f. <u>Q.</u> n. Maximus Eburnus P	X	?X				X Name: RDGE 13 line 6. As he became censor 108, he must be at least of senatorial family, especially as he did so after expulsion from the Senate. Name: Fasti Hydatiani (garbled, but certain). If he is the proconsul of RDGE 43, it would attest the patronymic. ¹⁵ Anyhow, son of <i>cos.</i> 142.
115	<u>M.</u> Aemilius (140) <u>M.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Scaurus P <u>M.</u> Caecilius (77) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus	(X) X					Name: FCTr. Status: see Asc. p. 23 C. Perhaps descendant of Barbulae. Name: FCTr for 111. Son of <i>cos.</i> 143. See on 117.
114	<u>M.</u> Acilius (26) <u>M.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Balbus <u>C.</u> Porcius (5) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Cato	X X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 150. See Cic. Brut. 108; Gell. XIII 20, 9.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
113	<u>C.</u> Caecilius (84) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Caprarius <u>Cn.</u> Papirius (37) C. f. ? n. Carbo	X	[X]				Name: FCTr for 111. Son of <i>cos.</i> 143. See on 117. Cf. n. 11. The consuls appear in reverse order in ILLRP 759 (attesting their <i>prae-nomina</i>).
112	<u>M.</u> Livius (17) C. f. M. (Aemiliani) n. Drusus ?(P) <u>L.</u> Calpurnius (88) <u>L.</u> f. C. n. Piso Caesoninus	X	X				See Cic. Brut. 109. Son of <i>cos.</i> 147. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 148, only earlier Caesoninus known (cf. n. 5). His patronymic RDGE 14 line 89 (wrongly indexed).
111	<u>P.</u> Cornelius (355) P. f. P. n. Scipio Nasica Serapio P <u>L.</u> Calpurnius (23) ? f. ? n. Bestia	X	?X				Son of <i>cos.</i> 138 (Cic. Off. I 109). <i>Praenomen</i> : CIL 1 ² 585 line 95. Sall. Jug. 85, 15 f. implies <i>nobilitas</i> , putting him alongside the Patrician noble Sp. Albinus. (Taken over Plut. Mar. 9, 3.) Though in a speech, it is unlikely to be absurd, and a link with the Pisones is likely. (<i>Praenomen</i> : see on Scipio, above.)
110	<u>M.</u> Minucius (54) <u>Q.</u> f. ? n. Rufus <u>Sp.</u> Postumius (45) ?Sp. f. ?Sp. n. Albinus P	(X)	X				Patronymic: ILLRP 517. Presumably descended either from <i>cos.</i> 221 or from <i>cos.</i> 197 (brothers). <i>Praenomen</i> : ILLRP 707. He must belong to one of the lines of the Albini shown by the <i>cos.</i> 154, 151, 148, most probably the last: cf. n. 19.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
109	Q. Caecilius (97) L. f. Q. n. Merellus Numidicus M. Junius (169) ?D. f. ?D. n. Silanus	X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 142, if Velleius (II 8,2) is right in calling him <i>frater patruelis</i> of Caerarius (<i>cos.</i> 113) and the <i>cos.</i> 143 and 142 were brothers. Cf. n. 7. Patronymic in Cic. Balb. 11. Filiation not directly attested. If he is the <i>tr. pl.</i> M. Junius D. f. of CIL I ² 2,583 line 74 (MÜNZER), then his father must be the <i>pr.</i> 141 who was the son of T. Torquatus (<i>cos.</i> 165) adopted by a Silanus. The first-century Silani may claim a link with the Junii of the early Republic. (See RRC 337.)
108	Ser. Sulpicius (59) Ser. f. ? n. Galba P ? Hortensius (2) ? f. ? n.	X					Patronymic: ILLRP 708. For further discussion of this man, see ¹⁶ ; and cf. n. 6 for discussion of ILLRP 338–339. Marked as [<i>?desig. d[?]mn.</i>]. Cic. Att. XIII 13–14,1 includes Q. Hortensius (<i>cos.</i> 69) among <i>nobilissimi</i> , and this may imply acceptance of a claim to descent from the <i>dict.</i> 287, since even direct descent from the <i>cos.</i> 108 might not suffice for the <i>su-</i> perlative. Presumably grandson of <i>pr.</i> 186 (Gaius).
107	Staff: M. Aurelius (215) ? f. ?C. n. Scaurus L. Cassius (62) ?L. f. ? n. Longinus C. Marius (14) C. f. C. n.	?X ?[X]				X	Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 127. Immediate consular descent is not unlikely, but cannot be proved. <i>Praenomen</i> in FCC on 86 et al.
106	C. Atilius (64) ? f. ? n. Serranus Q. Servilius (49) Cn. f. Cn. n. Caepio P	X				X	Cic. Planc. 12 attests <i>nobilitas</i> . Must be either son of <i>cos.</i> 136 or grandson of <i>cos.</i> 170. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 141.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
105	<u>P.</u> Rutilius (34) <u>P.</u> f. ? n. Rufus <u>Cn.</u> Mallius (13) <u>Cn.</u> f. ? <u>M.</u> n. (? <u>Maximus</u>) ? <u>M.</u> n.	?	X				Probably son of <i>pr.</i> 166 (Calvus: note <i>cognomina</i> relating to hair). Both the consuls' <i>praenomina</i> and patronymics RDGE 16A line 16. On Mallius see further ¹⁷ .
<i>104-100: The colleagues of Marius</i> ¹⁸							
104	C. Marius II <u>C.</u> Flavius (87) <u>C.</u> f. ? n. Fimbria				X		<i>Novitas</i> attested Cic. <i>Planc.</i> 12.
103	C. Marius III <u>L.</u> Aurelius (181) ? <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Orestes		X				Although SUMNER's attempt to make the <u>L. Orestes</u> of Cic. <i>Brut.</i> 94 the <i>cos.</i> 157 (45 f.) verges on the absurd, Cicero's mention of an otherwise unknown C. Orestes (who, being an orator, may have held a praetorship) along with <u>L.</u> makes it impossible to be sure of this man's father. His grandfather and status are not affected.
102	C. Marius IV <u>Q.</u> Lutatius (7) <u>Q.</u> f. ? n. Catulus	(X)					Father's name assured by <i>cos.</i> 78. Descent from <i>cos.</i> 242 seems certain.
101	C. Marius V <u>M.</u> Aquilius (11) ? <u>M.</u> f. ? <u>M.</u> n.		X				Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 129.
100	C. Marius VI <u>L.</u> Valerius (176) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Flaccus P		X				Filiation: see FCC on <i>mag. eq.</i> 82. Probably grandson of <i>cos.</i> 152, son of <i>cos.</i> 131; but conceivably son of <i>cos.</i> 152.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
99	<u>M.</u> Antonius (28) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. A. Postumius (33 = 32) ?Sp. f. ?Sp. n. Albinus P			X			Descent from <i>tr. pl.</i> 167 (who may have advanced to a praetorship) seems certain. A claim to descent from the early Antonii Merendae (which would confer nobility) is not attested. Cicero, who paints a flattering portrait of the orator (i. a. as a good Optimate), nowhere calls him <i>nobilis</i> . Cf. <i>cos.</i> 110, whose brother he must be. See MRR III 173. (Add Chiron 14 [1984] 124ff., 145ff.) ¹⁹
98	<u>Q.</u> Caecilius (95) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Nepos <u>T.</u> Didius (5) <u>T.</u> f. <u>Sex.</u> n.	X			?X		Son of <i>cos.</i> 123, oldest grandson of Macedonic (<i>cos.</i> 143): <i>Asc.</i> p. 63 C. Full name FCTr for 93. ²⁰
97	<u>Cn.</u> Cornelius (178) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Lentulus P <u>P.</u> Licinius (61) <u>M.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Crassus	X	X				Presumably son or grandson of <i>cos.</i> 146. Full name: FCTr for 93. Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 171. (His father: Pliny, NH VII 79.)
96	<u>Cn.</u> Domitius (21) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Ahenobarbus <u>C.</u> Cassius (57) <u>L.</u> f. ? n. Longinus	X	X				Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 122 (see Suet. Nero 2,2 - confused). Presumably son of a consul, certainly grandson; but we know no details. (For speculation see SUMNER 48ff.) Most probably father <i>cos.</i> 127.
95	<u>L.</u> Licinius (55) <u>L.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Crassus <u>Q.</u> Mucius (22) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Scaevola	X	X				Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 168. Son of <i>cos.</i> 133 (Cic. Leg. II 47).
94	<u>C.</u> Coelius (12) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Calvus <u>L.</u> Domitius (26) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Ahenobarbus	X			X		For <i>nouitas</i> see Cic. De or. I 117 et al. Full name: FCC on 92. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 122.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
93	<u>C. Valerius</u> (168) <u>C.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Flaccus P <u>M. Herennius</u> (10) <u>M.</u> f. ? n.	X					Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 152. Father probably moneyer RRC 228 (thus CRAW-FORD). Not <i>nouus homo</i> , since not thus called where one would expect it (Cic. Brut. 166, Mur. 36). ²¹
92	<u>C. Claudius</u> (302) <u>Ap.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Pulcher P <u>M. Perperna</u> (5) <u>M.</u> f. M. n.	X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 143: cf. n. 10. The grandfather's name helps to confirm it. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 130.
91	<u>L. Marcus</u> (75) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Philippus <u>Sex. Iulius</u> (151) <u>C.</u> f. ? n. Caesar P	(X)					Must be great-grandson of <i>cos.</i> 186, grandson of Marcus (80): see SUMNER, Phoenix 25 (1971) 252f. May be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 157, but possibly of <i>pr.</i> 166 L. Iulius. Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 157.
90	<u>L. Iulius</u> (142) <u>L.</u> f. <u>Sex.</u> n. Caesar P <u>P. Rutilius</u> (26) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Lupus	X					Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 157. His father is no. 7 on the <i>consilium</i> in RDGE 12 (129 or 101 BC). X Relationship to other Rutilii is likely, but cannot be proved.
89	<u>Cn. Pompeius</u> (45) <u>Sex.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Strabo <u>L. Porcius</u> (7) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Cato		X				Father must be praetor named SIG ³ 700 line 13. See Gell. XIII 20,13.
88	<u>L. Cornelius</u> (392) <u>L.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Sulla (Felix) P <u>Q. Pompeius</u> (39) <u>Q.</u> f. ? A. n. Rufus	(X)					Full name: FCC on 80. Patronymic: ILLRP 361. Grandfather's name based on assumption that, despite interval, he is a son of the <i>cos.</i> 141. We cannot guess when Pompeius' daughter, mother of Q. Siciinius (<i>q.</i> c. 74: see Cic. Brut. 263, with SUMNER 138), was born. A son Q., who died young, should probably be assumed.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
87	<u>Cn.</u> Octavius (20) ? <u>Q.</u> f. ? n. <u>L.</u> Cornelius (106) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Cinna P <i>Suff.</i> : <u>L.</u> Cornelius (272) ? f. ? n. Merula P	?X ?(X) X (X)					See 22. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 127. Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> 193.
<i>86-79: Cinnae dominatio and bellum/regnus Sullanum</i>							
86	<u>L.</u> Cornelius (106) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Cinna II P <u>C.</u> Marius (14) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. VII <i>Suff.</i> : <u>L.</u> Valerius (178) <u>C.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Flaccus P	X X					Filiation attested Cic. Flacc. ap. Schol. Bob. 96 St.; also now SEG 29 (1979) 1130. (Erroneously queried DEGRASSI and MRR.) Brother of <i>cos.</i> 93.
85	<u>L.</u> Cornelius (106) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Cinna III P <u>Cn.</u> Papirius (38) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Carbo	X X					Father <i>cos.</i> 113 (Cic. Fam. IX 21,3).
84	<u>Cn.</u> Papirius (38) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Carbo II <u>L.</u> Cornelius (106) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Cinna IV P	X X					
83	<u>L.</u> Cornelius (338) <u>L.</u> f. <u>L.</u> n. Scipio Asiaticus P <u>C.</u> Norbanus (5)	(X)					For form of <i>agnomen</i> see MÜNZER, RE IV 1473 f., 1484. See MÜNZER. We do not know whether there was a father's name on FCC. His son, <i>cos.</i> 38, lacks a grandfather's name on FCTr on 36 (not uniquely).
82	<u>C.</u> Marius (15) <u>C.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. <u>Cn.</u> Papirius (38) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>C.</u> n. Carbo III	X X					Widely described as son of <i>cos.</i> 107 etc. Cf. 85.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
81	<u>M. Tuilius</u> (34) <u>M. f. A. n. Decula</u> <u>Cn. Cornelius</u> (134) <u>P. f. L. n. Dolabella</u> P	(X)				X	Filiation certain (see PBSR 33 [1965] 48 ff.). His brother triumphed as <i>pr.</i> in 98. Descent from <i>cos.</i> 283 seems certain.
80	<u>L. Cornelius</u> (392) <u>L. f. P. n. Sulla Felix</u> II P <u>Q. Caecilius</u> (98) <u>Q. f. L. n. Metellus</u> Pius	X					Cf. 88. Son of <i>cos.</i> 109 (Cic. Arch. 6).
79	<u>P. Servilius</u> (93) <u>C. f. M. n. Vatia</u> Isauricus <u>Ap. Claudius</u> (296) <u>Ap. f. C. n. Pulcher</u> P	(X)					Descent from <i>cos.</i> I 252 seems certain: see PBSR 52 (1984) 51 ff. Brother of <i>cos.</i> 92 (Cic. Planc. 51): cf. 92.
<i>Free elections restored for 78</i>							
78	<u>M. Aemilius</u> (72) <u>Q. f. M. n. Lepidus</u> P <u>Q. Lutatius</u> (8) <u>Q. f. Q. n. Catulus</u>	?X (X) X					Presumably either grandson of <i>cos.</i> 158 or great-grandson of <i>cos.</i> I 187. ²³ Frequently referred to as son of <i>cos.</i> 102. His full name: ILLRP 367.
77	<u>D. Iunius</u> (46) <u>D. f. M. n. Brutus</u> <u>Mam. Aemilius</u> (80) ? <u>Mam. f. ? n. Lepidus</u> Livianus P	X X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 138. Presumably grandson (by birth) of <i>cos.</i> 147, perhaps son of <i>cos.</i> 112. (See SUMNER'S stemma, speculative as regards adoptive family.)
76	<u>Cn. Octavius</u> (22) <u>M. f. Cn. n.</u> <u>C. Scribonius</u> (10) <u>C. f. ?C. n. Curio</u>	X				X	Cf. <i>cos.</i> 75 (?cousin). Patronymic: Cic. Brut. 110 et al. Presumably son of <i>pr.</i> c. 120 (Brut. 124 et al.), a grandson of <i>pr.</i> 193: there may be a <i>pr.</i> (after 167) in the generation between them, perhaps identical with the moneyer RRC 201, put by CRAWFORD in 154.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
75	<u>L. Octavius</u> (26) <u>Cn. f. Cn. n.</u> <u>C. Aurelius</u> (96) <u>M. f. ? n. Cotta</u>	X					Perhaps son or grandson of <i>cos.</i> 128; in either case, consular descent seems certain (cf. ²⁴). May be grandson of <i>cos.</i> 144. Descent from <i>cos.</i> 1252 certain. It is unfortunate that, despite consulships by this man and two brothers, the grandfather's name does not survive.
74	<u>L. Licinius</u> (104) <u>L. f. L. n. Lucullus</u> <u>M. Aurelius</u> (107) <u>M. f. ? n. Cotta</u>	X					Grandson of <i>cos.</i> 151 (Plut. Luc. 1,1). Brother of <i>cos.</i> 75 (Asc. p. 67 Cl.).
73	<u>M. Terentius</u> (Licinius 109) <u>M. f. ? n. Varro Lucullus</u> <u>C. Cassius</u> (58) <u>L. f. ? L. n. Longinus</u>	X					Brother of <i>cos.</i> 74 (Gran. Lic. 36,6, P. 25 C). Presumably son of <i>cos.</i> 107 (SUMNER 50).
72	<u>L. Gellius</u> (17) <u>L. f. ? n.</u> <u>Cn. Cornelius</u> (216) <u>Cn. f. Cn. n. Lentulus Clodianus P</u>			?X			Patronymic assumed by FCC for 36 (son). Called <i>homo novus</i> by MÜNZER, but never by Cicero. For the <i>cognomen</i> Publícola, given to him (I have suggested) by confusion with his son, see BICS Suppl. 51 (1988) 8 n. 11. See SUMNER 124ff. for filiation and descent. His father's <i>praenomen</i> (a result of adoption) shows him to be (presumably) the son of the <i>cos.</i> 97, the only Cn. Lentulus known in his generation.
71	<u>P. Cornelius</u> (240) ? <u>f. P. n. Lentulus Sura P</u> <u>Cn. Aufidius</u> (32) <u>Cn. f. Cn. n. Orestes</u>	X					Grandson of <i>cos.</i> 162 (Dio XLVI 20,5). His adoptive father (see Cic. Dom. 35) must be the <i>pro pr.</i> of IG XII 5 (1) 722,6f., his natural father presumably the <i>cos.</i> 103.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
70	<u>Cn.</u> Pompeius (31) <u>Cn.</u> f. Sex. n. Magnus <u>M.</u> Licinius (68) <u>P.</u> f. M. n. Crassus	X					Widely attested as son of <i>cos.</i> 89. Son of <i>cos.</i> 97 (Asc. P. 23 C).
69	<u>Q.</u> Hortensius (13) L. f. ? n. Hortalus	?X (X)					Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 108, whose son or nephew he must be. (The latter CICHORIUS, Untersuchungen zu Lucilius 339ff., rejecting the former without discussion.) Cic. 2Verr. III 42 gives the patronymic. <i>Praenom.</i> : CIL I ² 2,904. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 113 (the only available C.), hence Q. n. Patronymic: ILLRP 374.
68	<u>L.</u> Caecilius (74) C. f. Q. n. Metellus <u>Q.</u> Marcus (92) <u>Q.</u> f. Q. n. Rex P ? <i>Suff.</i> : ? Servilius ? P. f. ? C. n. Vatia (not in RE)	X					Cf. <i>cos.</i> 69 (brother: Cic. Verr. I 27 et al.). <i>Praenom.</i> : CIL I ² 2,905. Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 118 (father: ILLRP 376 – unless he is the son of the son of the <i>cos.</i> 118 who died in 118 (Val. Max. V 10,3)). On this dubious person see PBSR 52 (1984) 67f.
67	<u>C.</u> Calpurnius (63) ? f. ? Cn. or Q. n. Piso <u>M.</u> Acilius (38) M. f. M. n. Glabrio	X					Grandson of <i>cos.</i> 139 or 135 ²⁵ Must be grandson of <i>cos.</i> <i>suff.</i> 154 (see ps.-Asc. 221 St. on father and AJPh 75 [1954] 382).
66	<u>M.</u> Aemilius (62) ? M. f. ? n. Lepidus P <u>L.</u> Volcaciis (8) ? f. ? n. Tullius	?X (X)					? Patronymic: ID 1659. (If this text is to be dated 65/4 rather than 78/7 [thus H. B. MATTINGLY, Chiron 9 (1979) 166f.], this Lepidus is excluded.) SUMNER, JRS 54 (1964) 42 n. 9, cautiously suggested the <i>cos.</i> 126 as grandfather, on the usual identification.

X

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
65A	P. Cornelius (386) ? f. L. n. Sulla P P. Autronius (7) L. f. ? n. ? Pactus	(X)					There is no reason to reject Dio's statement (XXXVI 44,3) that he was the Dictator's nephew. Convicted. X The <i>cognomen</i> is not well attested: see BICS Suppl. 51 (1988) 10 (correct the date to 65). Convicted.
65B	L. Aurelius (102) M. f. ? n. Cotta L. Manlius (79) L. f. ? n. Torquatus P	(X) (X)					Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 75 (brother: Asc. p. 67 C). Patronymic: see MRR II 151 n. 16 with reference to a Miletus inscription (see now K. TUCHELT, Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien [1979] 187), for which see B. E. THOMASSON, ZPE 68 (1987) 275 f. Descent from Manlius Capitolini certain.
64	L. Iulius (143) L. f. L. n. Caesar P C. Marcus (63) C. f. ? C. n. Figulus	X (X)					Patronymic: OGIS 444,3 f. Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 90. Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> I 162 and will be son or grandson of the jurist who failed to become consul (Val. Max. IX 3,2). SHACKLETON BAILEY (on Cic. Att. I 1,2 [also Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches (1988) 66]) revived the conjecture that he was a Minucius Thermus by birth. (Rejected MÜNZER, RE s. v. Minucius 60.) Cf. n. 17.
63	M. Tullius (29) M. f. M. n. Cicero C. Antonius (19) M. f. M. n. (?Hibrida)	X			X		Patronymic: RDGE 23 line 11. Son of <i>cos.</i> 99 (Asc. p. 82 C). No good attestation for <i>cognomen</i> (Pliny, NH VIII 213).

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
62	<u>D. Junius</u> (163) <u>M. f. ? n. Silanus</u> <u>L. Licinius</u> (123) <u>L. f. L. n. Murena</u>	?X ?(X)					May be son or grandson of the <i>cos.</i> 109; but there are other Silani about. For claim to descent from the Bubulci Bruti, cf. on <i>cos.</i> 109. <i>Praenomien.</i> : CIL I ² 2, 910. Cic. Mur., <i>passim</i> . SIG ³ 745 gives grandfather's name.
61	<u>M. Pupius</u> (10) <u>M. f. M. n. Piso Frugi</u> (Calpurnianus) <u>M. Valerius</u> (266) <u>M. f. M' n. Messalla</u> (Niger) P	X					Patronymic in various honorary inscriptions (MRR III 177). A Calpurnius Piso adopted by a praetorian M. Pupius (Cic. Dom. 35; see RIDGE 12 line 24 for his patronymic); must be born c. 115 and is presumably a grandson of the <i>cos.</i> 133. Filiation: ILLRP 496.
60	<u>Q. Caecilius</u> (86) <u>Q. f. ? L. n. Metellus Celer</u> <u>L. Afranius</u> (6) <u>A. f. ? n.</u>	X					Presumably adoptive grandson of <i>cos.</i> 117 (see SUMNER 132). Called new man by Plut. Mor. 806a (who may not have real information); note an Afranius, <i>pr.</i> 185. (The name is rare.) Patronymic: ILLRP 385.
59	<u>C. Julius</u> (131) <u>C. f. C. n. Caesar</u> P <u>M. Calpurnius</u> (28) <u>C. f. ? n. Bibulus</u>	(X) ?(X)					X Patronymic: IG IX 1,722. Seems to be treated and to behave as a <i>nobilis</i> ; but we have no information. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Onomasticon (cf. on 64) 29, compares the Bestiae and suggests relationship with Pisones.
58	<u>L. Calpurnius</u> (90) <u>L. f. L. n. Piso Caesonius</u> <u>A. Gabinius</u> (11) <u>A. f. ? A. n.</u>	X					Grandson of <i>cos.</i> 112 (Caesar, BG I 12.7). His father, <i>q.</i> 102 (see AJPh 104 [1983] 156f.), is presumably a son of the <i>tr. pl.</i> 139 (see Philologus 103 [1959] 86f.). Patronymic: CIL I ² 2, 2500.

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
57	<u>P.</u> Cornelius (238) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> L. n. Lentulus Spinther P	?X ?X					Probably grandson of <i>cos.</i> 130 (SUMNER 140 f.). ²⁶ The moneyer RRC 397 (presumably identical) assures grandfather's name. Son of <i>cos.</i> 98 (Asc. p. 63 C).
56	<u>Q.</u> Caecilius (96) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Nepos <u>Cn.</u> Cornelius (228) <u>P.</u> f. <u>P.</u> n. Lentulus Marcellinus P	X (X)					Son of P. Lentulus Marcelli f. (RRC 329, with SUMNER 142); details of descent unclear. Patronymic: see J. REYNOLDS, JRS 52 (1962) 97 ff. Son of <i>cos.</i> 91 (Cic. Prov. cons. 21).
55	<u>L.</u> Marcius (76) <u>L.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Philippus <u>Cn.</u> Pompeius (31) <u>Cn.</u> f. Sex. n. Magnus II <u>M.</u> Licinius (68) <u>P.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Crassus II	X X					Had been <i>cos.</i> 70. Had been <i>cos.</i> 70.
54	<u>L.</u> Domitius (27) <u>Cn.</u> f. <u>Cn.</u> n. Ahenobarbus <u>Ap.</u> Claudius (297) <u>Ap.</u> f. <u>Ap.</u> n. Pulcher P	X X					Must be son of <i>cos.</i> 96 (Suet. Nero 2,2: confused). Son of <i>cos.</i> 79 (Varro, RR III 16,1-2 is decisive).
53	<u>Cn.</u> Domitius (43) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Calvius <u>M.</u> Valerius (268) <u>M.</u> f. <u>M.</u> n. Messalla (Rufus) P	(X) (X)					Name: FC Tr for 36. Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> 283. Patronymic: see REYNOLDS, Aphrodisias (cit. n. 7), Doc. 8 with p. 67. The grandfather's name must be M., since the <i>cos.</i> 61 is M. n.
52	<u>Cn.</u> Pompeius (31) <u>Cn.</u> f. Sex. n. Magnus III <u>Q.</u> Caecilius (99) <u>Q.</u> f. <u>Q.</u> n. Metellus Pius Scipio	X					Had been <i>cos.</i> 70 and 55. Name shows adoption by <i>cos.</i> 80. SHACKLETON BAILEY (Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature [1976] 107 ff.) notes that the name Nasica was dropped after his adoption. ²⁷

Year	Names	C	P	S	N	U	Notes
51	<p>Ser. Sulpicius (95) Q. f. ? n. Rufus P</p> <p><u>M.</u> Claudius (229) M. f. M. n. Marcellus</p>	(X)	(X)				See Cic. Mur. 16; Phil. 4, 15. Must be descended from <i>cos.</i> I 166. For relationship to <i>cos.</i> 50 and 49 see MÜNZER, s. v. 216.
50	<p><u>L.</u> Aemilius (81) M. f. Q. n. (Lepidus) Paullus P</p> <p><u>C.</u> Claudius (216) C. f. M. n. Marcellus</p>	X	(X)				Son of <i>cos.</i> 78 (Vell. II 67,3 et al.). Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 51. Patronymic: Cic. Fam. XV 10, init. Grandfather's name: App. BC II 26, 100.
49	<p><u>C.</u> Claudius (217) M. f. M. n. Marcellus</p> <p><u>L.</u> Cornelius (218) P. f. ? L. n. Lentulus Crus P</p>	(X)	?X				Cf. on <i>cos.</i> 51. Probably grandson of <i>cos.</i> 130: cf. on <i>cos.</i> 57 (cf. n. 26).

Endnotes

¹ The *cos.* 205 (see Livy XXX 1,5 for his well-known *elogium*) was elected *pontifex maximus* at a remarkably early age (Livy XXV 5,4). At this period this cannot be mainly due to his wealth, however acquired: it must largely be due to status. The Crassi share the *praenomina* P. and C. with the Calvi. See also Livy XXVII 5,19 for this man's unusually early magistracies.

² That the Penni were not closely related to the Bruti is clear from Cic. Brut. 109: presumably using the genealogical tables of Atticus, he merely calls the *tr. pl.* 126 a *gentilis* of Q. Caepio Brutus, i.e. he saw no specific relationship. But the Penni, like other Iunii (cf. on the *cos.* 109 for the Silani), quite possibly claimed descent from other consular Iunii.

³ The filiation of the two T. Quinctii Flaminini, *cos.* 150 and 123, is not explicitly recorded. One of them must be the T. Quinctius T. f. of CIL I² 2,655, one the T. Quinctius T. f. Flamininus of the milestone ib. 657. If both of these refer to the *cos.* 123, then he is the son of the *cos.* 150, but we do not know the latter's father. If each is referred to in one of the inscriptions, then it is certain that they are respectively the son and grandson of the *cos.* 198; if both refer to the *cos.* 150, this is still likely, since no other Flamininus is known around mid-century, to be assumed as the younger man's father. But the two stones are not securely datable, although conjectures have been made on various grounds. Two other items must be considered. First, the funeral games given for his father (certainly the *cos.* 198, since the *cos.* 192 was still alive and no other Flamininus would be entitled to such splendid games) by T. Quinctius Flamininus in 174 (Livy XLI 28,11). If he is the *cos.* 150, his filiation is secure and that of the *cos.* 123 likely in any case. But the *cos.* 150, in that case, would have to be born in 193 or 192, after his father's return from the East. (We may exclude the possibility that he was born by 198 and was nearly 50 when he became consul.) This would make his consulship possible, but would make him eighteen or nineteen when he gave the games, which seems rather young. Unfortunately we have few parallels in the early second century and cannot judge. No sons of P. Crassus, whose games were held in 183 (Livy XXXIX 46,2), survived to hold office; but of the two sons of M. Laevinus, whose games were held in 200 (Livy XXXI 50,4), P. did not survive, and M. was praetor 182, hence born in or before 222, so that he was at least twenty-two. It is noteworthy that the third son, C., *cos. suff.* 176 after a praetorship 179 – hence no doubt three years younger than M. – is not mentioned in connection with the games: he must have been at least nineteen, but was obviously too young for official participation.

It is therefore quite possible that this son died young and that the *cos.* 150 is not identical with him. (Whether the augur appointed 167 [Livy XLV 44,3] is the giver of the games or the later consul would, in that case, be beyond conjecture.)

The second item to be considered is the fact that Pliny, NH VII 121, calls the *cos.* 150 C.: certainly erroneous, but since it is from a record, perhaps not pure fiction. MÜNZER, *Römische Adelsparteien* 120 (duly noted by GUNDEL in RE), had already suggested that the *cos.* 150 might be a son of L. Flamininus, *cos.* 192. This is possible, but there is no positive argument. It should, however, be suggested that he may be a son of a praetor of 177, whose name appears in our texts (and may have appeared in Pliny's) as C. Quinctius Flamininus, but who may in fact have been a Caeso. (For this suggestion see JRS 61 [1971] 103 – not registered in MRR III 179, where one or two other suggestions in that article are listed.) This might account for Pliny's error, and would make the *cos.* 150 K. f. and probably K. n., assigning both the inscriptions to the *cos.* 123. It was not always the progeny of the most illustrious who survived, though this tends to be assumed in our genealogies.

Whether the Macedonian shield on the coins of the moneyer RRC 267 (perhaps c. 130: see HERSH, NC⁷ 17 [1977] 26), T. Q(uinctius), shows actual descent from the *cos.* 198 or merely celebrates the family's greatest glory, is impossible to say with any confidence. (He is presumably a son of the *cos.* 123, as MÜNZER thought, and the last known Flamininus.)

⁴ The very rare *praenomen* Caeso (M'. Acilius' grandfather's) presumably points to a family link with the Patrician Quinctii, the only senatorial family in which the name is attested in the third and second centuries. It will hardly be coincidence that a Quinctius Flamininus (perhaps himself descended from Caesones: see n. 3, suggesting the possibility) shares the consulship with him. Balbus must be a son of the eminent legal scholar L. Acilius, *pr.* 197, long buried by emenders of Livy but recently retrieved. (See BICS Suppl. 51 [1988] 11 f.) The family is presumably descended in another line from the L. Acilius who is the grandfather of M'. Acilius Glabrio, *cos.* 191, or from a homonymous ascendant of his: the coincidence of *praenomina* is almost probative. For the Quinctian connection, see also JRS 61 (1971) 105.

⁵ The second-century Pisones have proved puzzling. They can hardly be reduced to a single line, descended from the *pr.* 211 through his son C. Piso, *cos.* 180, or a collateral. A decisive fact is the impossibility of regarding L. Piso Frugi, *cos.* 133, attested as L. f., as a son of the *cos.* 148 (see below). However, we are helped by the fact that some Pisones are attested with the *agnomen* Caesoninus or that of Frugi, and these names clearly became hereditary. Moreover, we are helped by accidentally hearing (in Front. Strat. III 6,5) of a Cn. Piso (RE, s. v. Calpurnius 68) defeated by a Mago, though we do not know when and where. The name is plausible, since it later recurs in the family, and there is no reason to assume he died childless. It is therefore as legitimate to assume two ancestors for the second-century Pisones as to assume one. I shall begin by listing attested filiations and *agnomina*:

C. Calpurnius C. f. C. n. Piso	<i>cos.</i> 180
L. Calpurnius C. f. C. n. Piso Caesoninus	<i>cos.</i> 148
Cn. Calpurnius Piso	<i>cos.</i> 139
Q. Calpurnius C. f. Piso	<i>cos.</i> 135
L. Calpurnius L. f. Piso Frugi	<i>cos.</i> 133
L. Calpurnius L. f. Piso Caesoninus	<i>cos.</i> 112 (<i>agnomen</i> from Chron. 354, but no reason to suspect it)

First, some preliminary sorting. The *cos.* 112 must be a son of the *cos.* 148 (the only Caesonini and the right filiation), hence C. n.

The *cos.* 148 must be a son of the *cos.* 180. The *cos.* 135 must be a younger son of the *cos.* 180, hence C. n.

The *cos.* 133 is more difficult. He obviously cannot be a son of the *cos.* 148 (and so C. n.), for the interval between the latter and his father is a perfectly normal 32 years, so we cannot have 15 for the next generation. He can be C. n. only if his father L. was a younger brother of the *cos.* 180 and died before reaching higher office. The date of L. Piso Frugi's praetorship cannot be conjectured (BROUGHTON gives 138, for no good reason), but he was presumably born between 180 and 176, so his father must be assigned a birth-date after 220. The *cos.* 180, who was *pr.* 186, will have been born 226 at the latest. The dates are compatible, but that does not suffice to make it «valde probabile» (thus DEGRASSI 125: in MRR I 492 and III 48 this probability has become certainty), in view of the attestation of a Cn. Piso during the Hannibalic War. There is also the moneyer Cn. Calpurnius (RRC 153: 180s) to be considered, long known to be a Piso and most probably a son of the man worsted by Mago (thus CRAWFORD). For he could not be the *cos.* 139 (the interval is far too long); and the latter, born in the 180s, is unlikely to be a son of the defeated Cn., since his father cannot have lived as long as that without reaching an office mentioned by

Livy. Hence the *cos.* 139 is C. f. (son of the *cos.* 180) or L. f. (brother of the *cos.* 133). The moneyer, on the other hand, will make a perfectly acceptable uncle for the *cos.* 133, i. e. a brother for L.

We obviously cannot be certain who was the grandfather of the *cos.* 133, but the alternatives must be clearly pointed out. As to the *cos.* 139, it is a reasonable conjecture that C. Piso, *cos.* 180, was his father. For he was certainly the father of Q. Piso, and the unique *praenomen* is most easily explained by the hypothesis that he had three surviving sons at the time Q. was born and had used the names C., L. and Cn.: the eldest later died, while the others survived to hold consulships in the order of their ages. We might compare the equally fortunate Ap. Claudius Pulcher, *cos.* 143, to whom, in addition to the consular sons C. and Ap., the uniquely named Q. Claudius Ap. f. of RDGE 12 must be assigned as a fourth son: a P. who died young must be assumed to explain the unique name. The descent of the *cos.* 139 is not uninteresting, since he is most probably the ancestor of a line of Cn. Pisones that leads through the *q. pro pr.* killed in Spain (RE 69: his grandson?) to the *cos. suff.* 23 who succeeded Augustus as consul and his distinguished progeny (see SYME, Roman Papers II 437). That these men did not have the *agnomen* Frugi (hence cannot be descended from the *cos.* 133) was made clear by SYME: indeed, the plentiful references to the *cos.* 23 never add it. CRAWFORD, ad RRC 547 – a unique coin in the Pesaro Museum – reasserts, against SYME, that the name there reads [C]N.PISO.FRUGI (which one must believe) and that it was probably minted by the later *cos.* 23 (which one should not: to whatever period it belongs, whether to the eighties or the Triumviral period [both have been suggested], the moneyer is simply unknown to us). To echo CRAWFORD's words: more cannot be said.

It should also be noted that the idea that the name Caesoninus denotes adoption is no longer tenable. For one thing, the adopted son's name, at this time, must be the same as the father's, and that of the *cos.* 148 is not. SUMNER (92f. and, correcting an error of mine, 141f.) illuminatingly discussed the Lentuli Marcellini, where this suffix marks descent within an adopted line. The same was suggested by SHACKLETON BAILEY for Q. Mucius Orestinus (Two Studies, cit. ad 52, 122f.); there, however, we cannot suggest a possible adopter among known Mucii Scaevolae of the right generation. (See MÜNZER's stemma, RE s. v. Mucius, coll. 413-4.) The answer must be that the suffix *-inus* was used for a variety of non-adoptive relationships. In the case of the Caesonini the *cos.* 135 must be the brother of the *cos.* 148, yet he is not given the *agnomen* by the Chronographer of 354, who registers it in all known cases (148, 112, 57). It must be the case that one of the brothers bore it while the other (not to mention the *cos.* 139) did not. The simplest suggestion is that here the suffix marks a connection in the female line, and that the eldest son (the *cos.* 148) was the only one whose mother was a Caesonina. (We have a unique instance of *-ianus* used in this way in Cato's two sons, Licinianus and Salonianus.) The *cos.* 180 will first have married a Caesonina, of undistinguished family, and later (after death or divorce) improved on her. If the *cos.* 139 is his son, as we have suggested, that must have been before 182. He had been *pr.* 186 and perhaps hoped to improve his chance of becoming consul. (He died in his consulship.)

⁶ ILLRP 338 and 339 may belong to this man or to the *cos.* 108: whichever it is is attested as Ser. f. But this consul's father may very well be the *pr.* 187 (a Ser.) and his grandfather could be either the *cos.* 211 etc. or RE 49 or 56, neither of whom reached high office. I see no reason for any preference as to his grandfather.

⁷ The Metelli, Macedonicus and Calvus, pose complex problems. Pliny, NH VII 142, makes the *cos.* 143 the son of Q. Metellus (L. f.), *cos.* 206. He does not mention the *cos.* 142, although he also had two consular and triumphal sons (hence would have been a fit companion piece to his predecessor), and one of the sons, Numidicus, would have been a

fit subject for the moralising which is the author's main purpose in this passage. No source securely gives the filiation of the *cos.* 142. The *cos.* 143 is epigraphically attested as Q. f. (see SIG³ 680). Two questions arise: (a) Is Pliny right in making Macedonicus the son of the *cos.* 206, despite the difference in age (on which he does not comment)? (b) Are the two successive consuls brothers?

(a) Pliny may well be misinformed. The *cos.* 206 does not seem to have held the office as a young man. His appointment as dictator to hold elections in 205 suggests that he was of normal age; and he had held two aedileships before his consulate. M. WENDE, *De Caeciliis Metellis* 37 f., citing ELLENDT (not accessible to me), inserted an unrecorded Q. Metellus between the two. Pliny's account is at least suspect. The grandfather's name cannot be regarded as certain, even though parallels for the age difference can be found (M. Aemilius Scaurus, *cos.* 115, and his son, *pr.* 56: see Asc. p. 18 C; and the D. Bruti, *cos.* 138 and 77).

(b) The only full attestation of the two consuls as brothers seems to be Vell. II 8,2, calling their respective sons Numidicus and Caprarius *patruales*. Val. Max. VIII 5,1 calls the two consuls *fratres*, which could mean either brothers or cousins. In any case, since he calls both *consoriii* and Calvus was never censor, his reliability must be suspect. (His source is not Cic. Font. 23 f., even though the lists are similar: Valerius omits Fimbria and adds Norbanus in the list of M. Scaurus' failures. Perhaps, as KLOTZ and his school suggested, he draws on an earlier collection of exempla, we cannot tell how compiled.) A crucial document is SIG³ 681 (Paros, from Delos), where a L. Metellus Q. f. is honoured as στρατηγός ὑπάτος without specification of benefits conferred. MÜNZER and others preferred Calvus to Diadematus (*cos.* 117 and the only relevant homonymous Metellus), since it was thought that the full terminology for a consul did not occur as late as the latter's office. That is now known to be false: see the description of C. Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 92) as στραταγός ὑπάτος at Cyrene (MRR III 57 f., with my article there cited) and compare the attestation of a στρατηγός ἀνθύπατος in 88 (J. REYNOLDS, *Aphrodisias and Rome* [1982] Doc. 2). The epimelete (as Professor MATTINGLY reminds me) is almost certainly the father of a thesmothete in 99/8, homonymous with the epimelete's father and from the same deme (and the name Dositheus is rare): this alone makes 117 more likely than 142 as the date of this stone. (His relationship to a mint magistrate is less precisely definable and unhelpful.) Historically, the only probable occasion when such a dedication might be set up for Calvus would be when he accompanied Scipio Aemilianus on his mission to the East (MRR I 481). But whatever the date of that embassy (which cannot be discussed here), it was certainly not in his consulship, and it is difficult to see why he should have been given the consular title later, or indeed why the statue should have been set up, since he apparently did nothing in particular for the Athenians. On the other hand, it seems perfectly plausible that the *cos.* 117, as a son of Metellus Macedonicus, should be honoured in Athens when he became consul. Nor can we be sure who was the L. Caecilius Q. f. who, as consul, set up a milestone (CIL I² 661) in an unknown location, or the one who, as pro-consul, settled boundaries between Patavium and Ateste *ex senati consulto* (ib. 633, 634, 2501). Thus the relationship between the two Metelli, *cos.* 143 and 142, seems to depend on a word in Velleius. Since it is crucial to the whole accepted stemma of the later Metelli, this 'disturbing fact' should be noted. Fortunately (perhaps), Velleius, in his (admittedly) few specifications of relationships within the Republican aristocracy, can nowhere be proved to be wrong, and Pliny's failure to mention Calvus, though very surprising, is not decisive. We must cautiously accept Velleius, hoping that decisive evidence will be found.

⁸ On the filiation of the *cos.* 139 see n. 5 above. Val. Max. I 3,3 gives his *praenomen* as L., and this was accepted by MÜNZER (following the communis opinio) and not retracted even after the Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy had revealed Cn. (See RE Suppl. III col. 230.) He finally recanted, convinced by the *Fasti Antiatres Maiores* (DEGRASSI 160-1): see *Klio* 24

(1931) 333 ff., unravelling the web woven around the false name. (As he incidentally notes, the order of the *cos.* 139 is uncertain.)

⁹ If he is the praetor L. Valerius L. f. of Jos. AJ XIV 145, that would clinch the matter. But there is no firm argument and (e. g.) MÜNZER is against the identification.

¹⁰ The *cos. suff.* 130 has usually been supplied with the *cognomen* Pulcher, although such a person is difficult to fit into the known stemma of the Pulchri. He is more likely to be a Nero, needed as the grandfather of a moneyer assigned by CRAWFORD to 79 (RRC 383: Ti. Claud. Ti. f. Ap. n.) who was later active in politics and the grandfather of the Emperor Tiberius. Professor MATTINGLY, accepting this identification, suggests that Ap. Claudius, moneyer assigned to 111–110 by CRAWFORD (RRC 299: whether *Illuir* or, as MOMMSEN and others have thought, *quaestor urbanus*), may be a son of this consul (i. e. also a Nero: he is universally identified as Ap. Pulcher, later *cos.* 79, which is less easy). He notes that the next moneyer (RRC 300) calls himself C. Pulcher, apparently stressing a difference from his predecessor who, on the standard identifications, should be his younger brother. This settles the paternity of the *cos.* 92 and 79: both must be sons of the *cos.* 143 (cf. n. 5 above). The interval is long, but not unparalleled (see n. 7[a] above), and it must be remembered that the *cos.* 79 was *pr.* 89 or 88 but could not reach the consulship until after Sulla's return and rewards given to other adherents.

¹¹ A connection with C. Plautius Decianus (*cos.* 329) was later claimed by two Plautii Hypsaei coining in the first century: see RRC 420, 422, now to be corrected in the light of the Mesagne hoard (ANSMusN 29 [1984] Table 1, facing p. 132, nos. 35, 37). The editors' comments (pp. 131, 134) do not note the (almost) consistently different spellings YPSAEVS and HVPSAEVS (for this significant difference see G. PERL, *Philologus* 115 [1971] 196 ff.), suggesting that these are different persons. (Professor MATTINGLY tells me he too prefers to amalgamate them and would put both RRC 420 and 421 about 60, despite their absence from the S. Gregorio and Mesagne hoards, since he sees them as small issues [70 and 56 obverse dies respectively]: I would follow the editors in regarding their size as quite sufficient to expect them to be represented if struck earlier.) For the (fictitious) claim, see MÜNZER col. 13. We do not know whether it was advanced, let alone accepted, as early as 125.

¹² Cic. De or. III 74 (*nobilissimus*) shows that he accepted the claim of the Carbones to descent from the Patrician Papirii of the early Republic. (See Fam. IX 21 and MÜNZER, col. 1016.) Cicero had no love for the Carbones, and he well knew that family histories had been falsified by imaginary *transitiones* (Brut. 62). In the light of his acceptance, we should therefore take this claim more seriously than we otherwise might.

¹³ Descent from Ancus Marcius was at some stage claimed: compare Pliny, NH XXXI 41, calling Q. Marcius Rex's building of the Aqua Marcia (Frontinus, Aq. I 7) a repair of an aqueduct built by Ancus Marcius; see also Plut. Cor. 1, 1. The claim may have been recognised as early as the building of the aqueduct, but I have found no evidence. On the other hand, there is nothing to impugn the Patrician status of the Marcii Reges (not recognised in MRR). Their *cognomen* surely claims descent from the *rex sacrorum* M. Marcius (RE, s. v. 20: see Livy XXVII 6, 16): it would be far-fetched and implausible to connect it with Ancus Marcius because he was a <king>. A *transitio* by some of the Marcian *stirpes* may in any case be accepted, but there is no reason to posit it for the Reges. MÜNZER calls M. Marcius the first Plebeian *rex sacrorum*, without argument. In fact, Patrician status was required for the office in the late Republic (Cic. Dom. 38, and see Gaius I 112: *confarreatio*). In fact, M. Marcius was succeeded by a Cornelius Dolabella (Livy XXVII 36, 5). None of the Reges is recorded in any Plebeian office, and the two consuls (118 and 68) have Plebeian colleagues. Unless contrary evidence turns up, the Reges should be regarded as Patricians.

¹⁴ This man's supposed censorship must be discussed. One censor 115 is listed in the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* (the only source) as [L.] Caecili(us) Q. F. N. Mete(llus). (I regret that I misreported the reading in *Chiron* 14 [1984] 143 n. 96, but without effect on my argument.) DEGRASSI (162f.) thought that this was a deliberate notation for Q. F. Q. N., to indicate that the grandfather had the same *praenomen* as the father. There are no parallels for this (one would at least expect Q. F. ET N., itself unparalleled) and I argued in *Chiron* (l. c.) that it is unacceptable. It has to be admitted that the engraver made a mistake. This could be emended to Q. F. (Q.) N., which would indeed give Diadematus. But once emendation is needed, alternatives must be considered. As I argued in detail (*Chiron*, l. c.), both actual attestation in Cicero and historical probability make Delmaticus a much more likely censor than Diadematus (since only one of them can have been). I therefore proposed that the error was more complex: the grandfather's *praenomen* was transferred to the father, replacing the father's, and was then omitted in its proper place. In other words, the engraver wrote Q. F. instead of L. F. Q, then simply added the N. I therefore proposed (L.) F. Q. N. for Q. F. N. (i. e., Delmaticus). I would now add that this is the sole instance of a grandfather's *praenomen* in FAM, where much of the time we do not even find a patronymic. (Indeed, DEGRASSI did not restore one for Metellus' colleague here, although it will easily fit in.) The engraver was perhaps simply puzzled by what he was asked to copy at this point.

¹⁵ Professor MATTINGLY has informed me that new texts from Delphi (which I have not seen) show that the proconsul who wrote RDGE 43 must be Servilianus.

¹⁶ MÜNZER suggested that it is Galba's *nomen* that has been lost in the place for the second witness in the SC on the Dionysiac artists. As printed by COLIN (FD III 2, p. 78: also in his earlier ed. princ. in BCH 23 [1899]), the text shows almost precisely the right space for Σε[ροῦ]ιος Σολπικίος Σερο]ύιο[υ υἱ]ός in line 5. (This is not clear in RDGE 15, owing to inaccurate notation of spaces.) However, that name is not the only one that will fit. It should be pointed out that the name of Ser. Cornelius (208b) Ser. f. (Lentulus?) will do just as well. Both he and Galba would be of praetorian status at this time. Since it is not possible to work out a precise chronology of the Spanish commands at this time on the basis of Appian (Iber. 99), we cannot say more. Galba's filiation is in any case secure.

¹⁷ (a) The full name of Cn. Mallius does not seem to be as certain as it looks in modern works. Fortunately, we can be sure of *praenomen* and patronymic. But the last letter in the surviving fragment of FCC (as it appears both in the drawing and in the photo provided by DEGRASSI) looks quite uncertain. Loss of the surface there has largely obscured the letter. I can see no reason why this should not be restored as M. n. or M'. n., to give a grandfather's name. The Chronographers's *Maximus* is no serious counter-argument. It may be a corruption for almost any name, or none at all (e. g., for *M. nepos* or *M'. nepos*): he is guilty of much worse at times. (For some of his errors, which I have collected elsewhere, see *Calibo* for 132, on the strength of which P. Rupilius has at times been credited with the name *Calvus*; *Appellate* for 123 [which no one has yet succeeded in turning into an unrecorded suffect consul or *dammatus*]; *Pulbo* for 83 [which has led to a fictitious *cognomen* for C. Norbanus].) This is why I am not fully convinced by SHACKLETON BAILEY's explanation for (64) *Turmo* (Onomasticon [cit. on 59 above] s. v. Marcius Figulus), though a historical case can be made out: he claims that there are no oddities in the Chronographer comparable to an imaginary *Turmo*, but does not deal with those listed above. If the *cognomen Maximus* is genuine after all, there would be plenty of space in the *Fasti* for a grandfather's notation plus MAXIM(us), a frequent device in FCC as elsewhere. The omission of a grandfather (whatever it may signify) is totally unjustified.

(b) As for Mallius' social rank, that is more difficult. Cicero calls him *ignobilis* (Planc. 12), which is not as clear a statement of *nouitas* as we have (e. g.) for Fimbria. If the

word is taken as merely contrasting with *nobilis*, he could be of senatorial family. (See Inv. 2,30, *nobilis an ignobilis*.) In most occurrences, even those connoting social status, the precise denotation cannot be disengaged: the word merely means 'humble' or 'obscure', which could well embrace a *parvus senator*. But in two more specific uses Cicero seems to confine it to *noui homines*. At Mur. 17, he prides himself on having brought it about *multis uiris fortibus ne ignobilitas generis obiceretur*. His list is confined to Curii, Catones, Pompeii in the past, and Marii, Didii, Coelii among recent examples – all new men. At Cluent. 111 f., he claims that there have never been better chances *hominibus nouis . . . si quis ignobili loco natus ita uiuit ut nobilitatis dignitatem uirtute tueri posse uideatur*. He goes on to add that *uitia* are more readily forgiven to an *ignobilis*, instancing L. Quinctius, who would have been thought unbearable if he had been *nobilissimus*, and stressing *humilitatem hominis*. These passages seem to show that, although Cicero is aware that *ignobilis* merely means 'not *nobilis*', he uses it specifically to denote *nouitas*.

¹⁸ It is convenient, as drawing attention to the time of *petitionis angustiae* (Brut. 175: linked with *Mariani consulatus*), to keep Marius' colleagues together. For historical periodisation, we must look at the time when Marius had the *auctoritas* to influence elections (103-99). Here the picture changes: the only *novus homo* elected as his colleague (before Marius' return to Italy!), C. Fimbria, goes out and a Patrician and an ally of Marius of (probably) senatorial standing (certainly tribunician) come in. Marius' rhetoric in Sallust, like Cicero's in Cicero, did not lead to actual support for *noui homines*.

¹⁹ BROUGHTON rightly points out that A. Albinus was not convicted by the Mamilian Commission, so that, once some time had passed, nothing stood in the way of his advancing to a consulship at a favourable time. I have argued (l. c. in text) that Metellus had been largely responsible for the disgrace of his predecessor Sp. Albinus and that A. Albinus can have been no friend of his: he was therefore a suitable person to be supported by C. Marius to be *cos.* 99, together with Marius' friend M. Antonius, at a time when it was Marius' chief personal aim to prevent the return of his *inimicus* from exile. Professor MATTINGLY has now suggested to me that the moneyer RRC 372 (81 BC) is likely to have been a son of the *cos.* 99. This is indeed highly plausible: CRAWFORD, following MÜNZER, makes him («presumably») a son of a moneyer of 96; but an interval of fifteen years between two generations is surely not to be presumed. Since the moneyer of 81 gives his name as A. f. S(p). n., we may legitimately conjecture the name of the father of the *cos.* 110 and 99 to have been Sp., which makes them grandsons of the *cos.* 148, Sp. Albinus Magnus. Professor MATTINGLY's plausible suggestion enables us to trace a line of Albini back through six generations to the *cos.* 242. MÜNZER's treatment of the Postumii, published posthumously in 1953 is (regrettably) unsatisfactory in its suggested genealogies, and the stemma coll. 915-6 should not be used. Who is the Albinus who adopted *Albinus Bruti f.* (moneyer RRC 450) can unfortunately not be certain. If it was one of these Albini (far more probably the moneyer of 81), the consul featured on Brutus Albinus' coins (RRC 450/3) would most naturally be the *cos.* 99; and this would help to explain the *Pietas* on one of his other coins (450/2), which numismatists have found puzzling. (CRAWFORD explains it as Caesarian propaganda – otherwise, however, quite unattested.) It is likely to refer to the *pietas* of the *cos.* 99 (Albinus' grandfather by adoption?) in opposing Q. Metellus Numidicus, who had caused the downfall of his brother Sp. Albinus. It might be worth remembering that *Albinus Bruti f.* was coining under Caesar in 48 and that the grandson (by adoption) of Numidicus, Q. Metellus Pius Scipio, was one of Caesar's principal opponents. The *pietas* of the moneyer's grandfather in his consulship was reflected in the *pietas* of the adopted grandson, in supporting Caesar against the hereditary *inimicus* Pius.

²⁰ T. Didius is twice, by implication, referred to as a *novus homo* by Cicero. At Mur. 17 he is on short list of new men (see n. 17 [b] above). At Planc. 61, the prosecutor is fictitious-

ly made to ask the rhetorical question whether Plancius had won triumphs like Marius and Didius to justify his election. Cicero's testimony in regarding him as a *novus homo* should normally be decisive. Yet MÜNZER, who does not cite these two passages, conjecturally made his father the *lator* of the *lex Didia* of 143, to whom he conjecturally gave the *praenomen* T. (Accepted MRR.) But soon matters were complicated by the appearance of a C. Didius C. f. on the *consilium* of the SC de Agro Pergameno (RDGE 12: see line 31 and p. 69), presumably an ancestor of Caesar's notorious commander (MRR II p. 311). There is a complication: the name is spelled Δίδιος in both copies of RDGE 12, whereas T. Didius, of course, is Δείδιος, parallel to the Latin contemporary spelling. (Thus even in App. Iber. 99,431, though the literary tradition naturally varies according to scribes: thus Δίδιος at App. BC I 40,179; both spellings in the MSS at Plut. Caes. 56,6, the fuller form only at Sert. 3,5.) The SC, however, seems to be as careful as other documents of the period in marking the long Latin vowel with a diphthong, as in contemporary Latin. To keep to personal names, we find Λευκέλιος (line 30), Σείλιος (line 33), Ἀφέντιος (line 34); similarly for all Roman tribes ending in the common *-eima*, with the sole (and inexplicable) exception of Κυγίνα (twice). I can find no exception to this for personal names, and only the one noted for tribes, where we have both copies (lines 21-37; there are slips, as also in other respects, where only one survives). We may therefore consider the hypothesis that there was a family of Didii around who pronounced the name with a short vowel, and who were therefore not related (or not closely related) to T. D(e)idius. Unfortunately all positive attestation of the quantity under the Republic, as far as I am aware of it, shows a long vowel, until that spelling disappears throughout. The first attestation of the short vowel that I have found is in the name of Didius Julianus (Aus. Caes. 20-21), which does not prove that it existed in the Republic. Since, however, it establishes the possibility of the alternative form, the hypothesis is tenable with proper caution. Thus it is possible that the tribune who passed the *lex sumptuaria* in 143 was not related to T. Didius, but was of the family of the C. Didii, perhaps even the father of the man on the *consilium*.

However, despite MÜNZER's (very rare) slip over the evidence of Cicero, his view may still be tenable even without that hypothesis. Cicero, of course, knew little about the prosopography of the mid-second century: witness his difficulties over the *decem legati* of L. Mummius. (See SUMNER 166 ff. for the texts.) He might well be ignorant of the tribune whom we know only by chance from a late source; and if that tribune was not made a senator, it is quite possible that his son (as in MÜNZER) would be regarded as a *novus homo* by Cicero and his generation. (We do not know at first hand about his contemporaries.) The problem is insoluble on our present evidence, and my concern has merely been to set out some possibilities. T. Didius was certainly not of distinguished family, but seems to have been good at making the right connections at an early stage.

²¹ But the family is unlikely to be related to that of C. Herennius, patron of the Marii (Plut. Mar. 5,7), who will have been in the lower ranges of the Senate for some time. (See the C. Herennius in RDGE 12: no. 40 on SHERK's list; and also RE s. v. 4, a century earlier.) It has often been suggested (e. g. MÜNZER) that, if this man is the moneyer (RRC 308) who displays Pietas and the Catanaean brothers on his coins, the family (which should be of Sicilian origin, for the legend must surely have a local reference) will be that of the loyal friend of C. Gracchus, the *haruspex* Herennius Siculus. Vell. II 7,2 calls this man *haruspex Tuscus*. But, first, that may not be significant: Velleius did not know his name, and *Tuscus* may be a mere conventional epithet for a *haruspex* of whom one knew nothing. However, it is also possible that the family, though Sicilian, had settled in Etruria: Herennius is not likely to have learned the *disciplina* in Catania, at any rate.

²² The identity of this man is a troubling problem. He is unquestioningly described as the son of the *cos.* 128 (hence Cn. f. Cn. n.) on the strength of his identification with the

Cn. Octavius Cn. f. in the dedication of the Posidoniasts at Delos (ID 1782). Yet this identification seems to be due to historical accident. It was first settled on because, at the time when the inscription was discovered, it was thought that the building was erected after c. 120. (BCH 31 [1907] 446 in fact contains both this statement and the editio princeps of the Octavius text. It regards the *cos.* 165 as excluded by the lettering – a point which I must accept without comment, but which is unfortunate, since a dedication more recently found at Echinus probably does refer to that man: see L. J. BLIQUEZ, *Hesperia* 44 [1975] 431 ff.) By 1937, it was clear that the building must in fact date from the middle of the second century: see ID 1520 with note (p. 31 of the unnumbered fascicule). Yet the date allotted to our text (no. 1782) remained unchanged, without discussion, except for a reference to the inscriptions honouring Roma as evidence for good relations with Rome. (The *archithiasites* of this text, like all the guild's priests, appears to be undatable.) R. MELLOR's treatment (ΘEA ΡΩΜΗ [1975] 66 and 146) is not very clear, but finally follows MARCADÉ in suggesting a date for the Roma inscriptions in 'the latter part of the second century B. C.' (in fact, after 130, it seems). They are not closely relevant to Cn. Octavius' identity.

The possibility of the *cos.* 128, about whose praetorship we know nothing, was never considered. Yet, being of consular parentage, he will have been praetor not too long before his consulship, precisely at the time of the war against Aristonicus. We unfortunately have few details about Roman forces and commanders in that war: in fact, except for two officers of M'. Aquillius honoured in Caria (and one of them perhaps elsewhere: see MRR I 505), only the consuls in charge are known. But it seems inconceivable that there would not be a fleet fitted out in 131, and the dedications to Roma now seem to fit in with such a date for Cn. Octavius; whereas it is hard to imagine why a Roman praetor should visit Delos c. 90. Yet solely on the basis of that dedication, the *cos.* 87 has been provided with a *cursus* and a filiation to which he may well not be entitled. (MRR III 151 notes that I once briefly, and without detailed argument, suggested the *cos.* 128.)

Had it not been for the dedication, the praetorian Cn. Octavius (82) Q. f. (not tribe survives), second in the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo (ILLRP 515) after L. Gellius (*pr.* 94, later *cos.* 72), would surely have been the leading candidate for a consulship in 87. This was long ago suggested by E. PAIS, *Dalle Guerre Puniche a Cesare Augusto* (1918) I 180 f., unfortunately in simple ignorance of the Delos text (see 181 n. 1). N. CRINITI, *L'Epigrafe di Asculum* (1970), accepting orthodoxy at second hand, will have none of it: 'Da escludere senza discussioni (sic), la sua identificazione col pretore del 90 (sic: no argument is given for that date) e console dell'87, figlio di un Cn. Octavius' (p. 95). His 'senza discussioni' merely makes patent what has been common to all treatments of this man. MÜNZER identifies the legate with the quaestor of 105, Cn. Octavius Ruso – who, incidentally, could well be the Cn. Octavius L. f. Aem., in twenty-fifth place in the *consilium* of RDGE 12, if this is dated 101 – and notes that the praetorship of this man must be 'quite close' to that postulated for the *cos.* 87; but his acceptance of the Delos dating precluded him from asking the right question and misled him into a strange error (see n. 24 below). There is surely no objection to taking the obvious course and making Cn. Octavius Q. f. the *cos.* 87. Cicero, unfortunately, is not helpful. He refers to the *cos.* 87 without a patronymic (Brut. 176, Tusc. Disp. V 55, and frequently in the speeches: see D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches* 72 – accepting the standard identification and adding the tribe Aem. without good reason: for its sole attestation among Octavii see above). And the *tabula Contrebiensis*, with equal perversity, refers to the *cos.* 87 without patronymics. (Suet. Aug. 2,2 tells us nothing about the *praenomina* of the more distinguished Octavii descended from Gnaeus.) See further n. 24.

²³ SUMNER (66), in a highly adventurous stemma, makes this man a grandson of the great M. Lepidus, *cos.* I 187. Even though that Lepidus only died in 152 (aged over sev-

enty), the interval of 109 years between their consulships is unacceptable for two generations. The *cos.* 78 could be a great-grandson, perhaps a grandson of the *tr. mil.* (RE 69) who won distinction at Magnesia and must have died young, since he is not heard of again. The real stemma of the Lepidi is obviously complex and cannot yet be disengaged. Q. Lepidus, father of the consul, is quite unknown. Since the whole of his career would fall well after the end of our text of Livy, at a time when our sources on persons are very poor, all we can confidently say about him is that he did not become consul. Even if he had risen as high as a praetorship, we might well not have heard of him, since fewer than half the praetors for this period are known.

²⁴ MÜNZER, by an extraordinary lapse (corrected by SUMNER 114 ff.), makes this man a son of the *cos.* 87, <despite the short interval of time> (as he disarmingly admits). That the consulship of a younger son should follow his father's after a mere twelve years, in a noble family, is of course quite impossible. Inevitably the *epigoni* have followed: most recently, LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN, in a short section on <Descendants> added to an (in part) useful discussion of the *cos.* 165 (Arctos 18 [1984] 75-92), accepts MÜNZER with a touch of surprise and entirely misses the member of Cn. Pompeius Strabo's *consilium*, no doubt since he occurs, as far away as RE 82. SUMNER's work was not known to her. His stemma is invalidated by uncritical acceptance of the conventional Delos dating, but he reasonably makes the *cos.* 75 the youngest son of the *cos.* 128. The interval fits this well: it would be too tight for a youngest grandson. With the error over the Delos text corrected, it follows from this that a Cn. Octavius, eldest son of the *cos.* 128, never held any traceable office and cannot be shown to have reached adulthood. Politically, he becomes an unperson.

²⁵ ERICH S. GRUEN, *CSCA* 1 (1968) 156 ff., confidently makes this man (whose filiation is unknown) L. f. L. n. and a grandson of the *cos.* 133. This conjecture seems implausible, since the *cos.* 67 is nowhere called Frugi and (as we saw) the name C. does not necessarily appear in the filiation of the *cos.* 133. (Cf. n. 5 above). Descent must be from one of the presumed sons of the *cos.* 180. The *cos.* 148 must be eliminated, since the *cognomen* Caesoninus clearly stayed in his family. The *cos.* 139 and 135 remain, and I cannot see how we can decide between them; nor can I assign him a patronymic, on present evidence.

²⁶ No doubt to be identified (as was long thought) with the *q.* of RRC 397: see CRAWFORD ad loc. (but without argument and badly misprinted), and in detail SUMNER 140 f. N. HORSFALL, at my request, was kind enough to check the stone at FCC fr. 39 and found that there is (and, it seems, can have been) no trace of any letter where DEGRASSI introduced a grandfather's *praenomen* which made this identification impossible: see HORSFALL, *ZPE* 65 (1986) 84, and cf. MRR III 69, where the convenient new reading reported cannot be maintained any more than DEGRASSI's. We should therefore conjecturally return to the identification with the quaestor, which provides the name of the consul's grandfather (L.) and makes SUMNER's suggestion, that Spinther should be an elder brother of the *cos.* 49, all but certain. (SUMNER himself, naturally, after suggesting what appeared to him probable, felt compelled to follow DEGRASSI's <reading> and in the end found this could only make the *cos.* 49 a third cousin of Spinther.)

²⁷ Metellus Scipio's service as *interrex* on the Ides of June 53 (ILLRP 1046: the year is certain, since it is the only year in the late Republic when the ordinary consuls entered upon office later than this) poses a problem, since *interreges* ought to be Patricians (confirmed for this period by Cic. Dom. 38). Metellus Scipio, after his adoption by a Plebeian, ought to have become a Plebeian. This was (again in this period) the method chosen by P. Clodius for his *transitio*. There is no easy solution to this problem, but it ought to be suggested that there may not have been enough Patricians available. By mid-June, Metellus must have been at least the thirty-third *interrex*, on the 162nd day, and that if none of them had become incapacitated during his tenure. And it seems that only senators who had

held a curule magistracy were qualified for the office: that was noted by P. WILLEMS, who compiled the first list (still almost complete) of known *interreges* (Le Sénat de la République romaine II [1886] 10 ff.); and E. S. STAVELEY discovered (Historia 3 [1954] 196 f.) that this seems to be confirmed by Asconius' comment on the appointment of M. Lepidus (Asc. p. 33 C). We can get an idea of the number of Patricians available from WILLEMS' list of senators for 55 (Le Sénat I [1878] 427 ff.: that the list would not now be regarded as accurate is irrelevant, since we can in any case only aim at an order of magnitude). He listed 163 senators who had at least been curule aediles; among them he found 27 Patricians. As he pointed out, the list must be practically complete: the consulars are all known (censorians as such do not matter for this purpose) and he listed 120 praetorians, i. e. 120 men who had held the praetorship without reaching a consulate – which is, on average calculation, the complete list for twenty years of praetorian colleges, since two each year advanced to a consulship. It is clear that the conjecture that 33 qualified Patrician senators could simply not be found is practically certain, especially since some would be away on active service (we need only mention C. Caesar in Gaul, two Claudii Pulchri in Asia Minor and P. Lentulus Spinther *cum imperio ad urbem*: see MRR II 229 f.). It is clear that, in this exceptional year, Plebeians would have to be used; and one who had by birth been a Patrician would be singularly well qualified when that time came.

II. Status of Men Gaining First Consulships *Summary by Periods*

This summary is slightly simplified: where the list shows alternatives, men are here counted under the higher status only. (It should be noted that, in the great majority of cases of queried consular status (?C), the alternative is remote consular descent, not a lower status.)

The status definitions are basically the same as in the list, except that recent consular descent (father or grandfather) is analysed separately from remote consular descent (marked CD). They are, of course, separately indicated in the list (the latter marked by parentheses or square brackets), though put in the same column. At each level, queried status here receives a separate column from what seems to me not to need a question-mark: on this, the conclusions reached in the list are here taken for granted.

The breakdown by periods has been guided by *prima facie* historical significance plus evidence of actual change. The length of the actual periods has not been considered. The common technique of breakdown by equal periods (usually a number of decades), while offering certain advantages, seems really useful only where there are no major historical changes. Where there are such changes, its utility is as limited as (say) an analysis of the German governing class would be, if broken down by periods of fifty years between 1810 and 1960. The method here adopted is meant to supplement, not to supersede, that sociological technique, which has been frequently applied to the Roman Republic in various forms, on the basis of whatever lists came to hand.

In noting the number of Patricians, all consulships have been counted, since iteration makes no difference to that aspect of status. The other figures are based on first consulships: for one thing, we have no ancient guidance on how we should properly classify men not already C on their first appearance if they achieve further consulships; i. e., how they would be perceived at the point of candidacy for reelection. This makes a measurable difference only for period II and the short period V. Percentages are given to the nearest half-point, and figures under 5% and single appearances are not counted. The total of percentages will therefore usually not add up to precisely 100%. No percentages are given for IV, V and VII.

Total Con- suls	First Con- suls	Patri- cians	C	?C	CD	?CD	P	?P	S	?S	N	?N	U
I From the <i>lex Villia annalis</i> to the election of the first pair of Plebeian consuls: 179-173													
15	14	8	11	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (176)
		53.5%	78.5%		14.5%								
II From the first pair of Plebeian consuls to the end of iteration: 172-152													
45	37	16	17	1	4	5	3	-	-	2	-	-	5 (172, 170, 157, 154, 153)
		35.5%	46%		11%	13.5%	8%			5.5%			13.5%
III The quiet period (no pattern of change observable): 151-108													
90	89	27+2(P)	51	11	9	4	4	1	2	3	1	1	2 (149, 124)
		30%	57.5%	12.5%	10%								
IV From Marius' first consulate to his second: 107-104													
8	7	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-
V The period of Marius' ascendancy, i. e. influence on elections: 103-99													
10	6	2	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
VI From Marius to Cinna: 98-87													
25	25	8	15	2	3	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1 (90: probably at least S)
		32%	60%	8%	12%								
VII Full analysis of the years 86-79, when consular elections were not free owing to civil war and emergency, would not yield results comparable to analysis of the other periods. However, the figures for 86-82 are worth setting out, to compare with Cicero's later description of those years as <i>equester splendor</i> , in his attempt to justify Sulla's victory as <i>res publica recuperata</i> for the traditional ruling class. The three years when Sulla controlled elections (81-79) are added for completeness.													
86-82:													
11	5	5	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
81-79:													
6	5	3	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (81)
VIII The Sullan restoration: 78-70													
18	18	4	13	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
		22%	72%	16.5%									
IX From the overthrow of Sulla's political settlement to the end of the free <i>res publica</i> : 69-49													
45/44*	42/41*	14	17/16*	5	13	1	2	1	-	-	1	-	2 (66, 65A)
		31%	40.5%	12%	31%		5%						5%

* The suffect consul of 68 may be a figment. Relevant figures are shown to take this into account. Percentages are based on the inclusive figures.

Much could be written in comment on the lists and analyses, despite all that has been written already.¹

I shall here limit myself to taking out a few points for immediate comment.

First, it is interesting that, until the age of Marius, the pattern of elections does not seem to be influenced by even the most startling political events: the tribunes of the Gracchi (not to mention their forerunners) could never be deduced from the record of elections. The only influence we can notice is due to what might be called technical factors. The end of parity between Patricians and Plebeians in the consulship (we do not even know whether a law was passed to permit it: although Livy, not surprisingly, mentions no such law, the effect is so striking that legislation cannot be excluded) marks a sudden increase in the percentage of Plebeians, due to the fact that the first wholly Plebeian pair is followed by three more in the course of five years: after this, there is normally (but not always) a Patrician consul again, until the prohibition of iteration. Over the period, the percentage of Patricians drops from 53.5% to 35.5%, and it maintains itself at almost the same level (30%) over more than forty years after that. Of the iterating consuls, six are Plebeians and two Patricians: this no doubt mirrors the success of the Plebeians in gaining the right to hold both consulships. It also, of course, raises the proportion of Patricians among first consuls, which is not in our analytical list: of the 37 first consuls, 14 (38%) are in fact Patrician. In other words, the practice of iteration, while showing the power of Plebeians as a class, was keeping Plebeian families not at the very top of the power structure out of the consulship. It was undoubtedly their pressure that led to the prohibition of iteration. The rest of the figures for this period cannot be fully interpreted, since the actual numbers of those certainly below consular status by birth (3 praetorian, 2 perhaps senatorial) are too small for percentages to be really significant, and we do not know how the 5 whom I have marked unknown are to be distributed. It is certainly worth noting that the number of men of consular background, or probably so, is the lowest for any major period: only about 70%. But it would be unwise to base major conclusions on this, except to note that, despite iteration, the number of first consuls of consular background remains high. The three men of praetorian birth are all elected in the middle of the period: 167, 165, 163. As it happens, their colleagues are of different background in each of those years, similar only in that they are all of undoubted consular descent within two generations: one is a Plebeian first consul, one a Patrician first consul, and one a Plebeian second consul. This again should discourage precipitous generalisation.

¹ Particularly valuable for detailed discussion: P. A. BRUNT, *JRS* 72 (1982) 1-17. (On the general issues he raises see, decisively, D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *AJPh* 107 [1986] 255 ff.) Largely marginal to this period, but interesting on an earlier one: R. DEVELIN, *Patterns in Office-holding, 366-49 B. C.* [nominally!] (1979), and: id., *The Practice of Politics at Rome, 366-167 B. C.* (1985).

During the following period of over forty years, men who are certainly or probably sons or grandsons of consuls obtain 70% of all first consulships; men of more remote consular descent more than 10%: this may be taken as the norm, by which other periods can be measured. The change comes abruptly in the course of 108, no doubt while Marius' consular campaign was beginning. In that year, elections for a suffect produce, for the first time (probably) since 122, a consul of subconsular family: a fitting prelude to the election, in the following year, of the *nouus homo* C. Marius. The next few years would have to be discussed in detail, and this is not the place for it. But it should be clear that Sallust's portrait of his age is fully confirmed: the period when the consular families would hardly allow anyone below that status to breach their monopoly of the highest office can be seen to grind to a halt. The years of Marius' preeminence show the contrast between his rhetoric (as relayed in Sallust) and actual practice: the *petitionis angustiae* produced by his iterations exclude (except for one of his political allies) all below consular status. (See my note 18 on the lists.)

After 99, the pattern returns to normal, down to the last free elections before the civil wars, for 87. (That Sulla did not impose his candidates in 88 is clear and well known.) During the years of what Cicero calls *equester splendor* (and many scholars have believed him), only one loyal *nouus homo*, C. Norbanus, reaches the consulate. Half the consuls are Patricians (two more besides L. Cinna), three out of five first consuls are sons of consuls, and one more is a Scipio. Criticism of pro-Sullan apologia is indeed justified.

The result of Sulla's doubling of the Senate can be seen to have led to a disastrous decline of Patricians. Under the Sullan restoration their percentage drops to 22: only four individuals. All but two consulships are held by sons or grandsons of consuls, or men of consular descent.

Finally, the last twenty years of the Republic are above all distinguished by a remarkable resurgence of Patrician consuls: the figure rises to one third of first consuls – the highest since the end of iteration, about a century earlier. There is also a remarkable resurgence of consular families not recently prominent: one third of first consuls belong to this class. The total of men of consular background, certain or probable, remains above 80%. (For some background, cf. n. 27.)

This is not the place to go into further detail, or to pursue the demographic conclusions to be drawn from the facts we have briefly surveyed. But it is perhaps fitting to conclude by reiterating the lesson to be learnt regarding the *nobilitas*: it has recently been fashionable to question GELZER's discovery of the importance of that class. Analysis of actual lists of consuls fully confirms the overriding control of the highest office, at practically all times, by men of consular background (as he defined it). Whether they called themselves *nobiles* is merely an argument about words. Sallust certainly correctly diagnosed their power, and Cicero and Sallust certainly called them by that term and expected it to be generally under-

stood. Since a word to describe that dominant class is needed, it seems perverse to discard the one that is attested in the late Republic. But my main concern has been with facts: the words can look after themselves.

*Department of History
Harvard University
U. S. A. Cambridge, MA 02138*

