Apollo and the Muses direct Propertius to quite a different kind of poetry (though oddly enough this, like the Annals, seems to be inspired by the waters of Hippocrene, 32 and 51–2), as they directed Callimachus to his Aetia (Schol. Flor. p. 11 Pfeiffer, anon. AP 7. 42).

It is a pleasure, and something of a relief, to find the manuscripts of Propertius right for once.

E. COURTNEY

Stanford University

A NOTE ON THE CONSULS FROM 69 TO 60 B.C.

by Richard J. Evans
(University of South Africa)

The consuls between 69 and 60 are an interesting group of politicians and, according to E.S. Gruen, of the twenty-one elected during this decade, no less than seventeen had ancestors in the same magistracy. His statement suggests that the citizen body at Rome preferred to vote for old and established families rather than elect to the highest office of the cursus honorum newcomers or relative newcomers to political life. Closer inspection of the individual consuls and their families, however, produces a somewhat different perspective of Roman politics in the middle of the first century B.C.

It is certainly true that the three Caecilii Metelli who won the consulship between 69 and 60 were all directly related to Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, consul in 143, who represented the third generation of his family to achieve this honour. Q. Caecilius C.f. Q.n. Metellus Creticus, consul in 69, and L. Caecilius C.f. Q.n. Metellus, consul in 68, were both sons of C. Caecilius Macedonici f. Metellus Caprarius, consul in 113. Q. Caecilius Q.f. Q.n. Metellus Celer, consul in 60, was a grandson of Q. Caecilius Metellus Balbaricus, consul in 123, and son of the consul of 98, Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos, but had been adopted by a politician who is not known to have progressed further than the tribunate. None of the Caecilii Metelli of the 60's, moreover, had descendants in the consulship, since Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus Silanus, consul in A.D. 7, the last Caecilius Metellus in the fasti, was an adopted great-grandson of the consul of 69.

It is also an undoubted fact that L. Aurelius M.f. Cotta, consul in 65, was the third member of his immediate family to win the highest magistracy in the space of ten years. But the three Aurelii Cottae, the consul of 65 and his brothers, the
consul of 75, C. Aurelius M.f. Cotta, and the consul of 74, M. Aurelius M.f. Cotta, although from a family with a consular presence since the middle of the third century, were not themselves sons of a consul. Their father, perhaps the monetalis of about 139, M. Aurelius Cotta, is not known to have risen beyond this junior status in the senate. Furthermore, the relationship between this politician and the consul of 119, L. Aurelius Cotta, cannot be determined with any certainty, although they may have been brothers. The proliferation of Aurelii Cottae in the mid-first century was not maintained; they were the last of their line to reach high office, and M. Aurelius Cotta Messallinus, consul in A.D. 20, was, as his nomenclature indicates, a Valerius Messalla by birth.

A M'. Aemilius Lepidus gained the consulship for 66, and he, of course, came from one of the most ancient and famous patrician families in the Roman senate. Nevertheless, this politician was also not the son of a consul. His putative father was the monetalis of about 114, who is not known to have progressed to any other magistracy in the cursus honorum. Either the consul of 126, M. Aemilius Lepidus, or the consul of 137, M. Aemilius M.f. M.n. Lepidus Porcina, may be regarded as his grandfather.

Two Calpurnii Pisones, consuls in 67 and 61, represent a family which achieved its first consulship in 180, but which provided only one consul between 133 and 67. This suggests that from two of the three known branches of this family one generation failed to advance to high public office. C. Calpurnius Piso, consul in 67, was perhaps a grandson of the consul of 139, Cn./L.? Calpurnius Piso, or the consul of 135, Q. Calpurnius Cn.? f. Piso. Because he displays no filiation on the fasti, however, this must remain a conjecture. Of his father absolutely nothing is attested, and so early death, a career outside politics, or even service in the senate at a more humble level are all possible. M. Pupius Piso Frugi, consul in 61, was adopted into a family which had senatorial representation throughout the second century, but he was the first Pupius to win a consulship. His natural grandfather was presumably the consul of 133, L. Calpurnius L.f. C.n. Piso Frugi, and his father the praetor of about 112 who died while proconsul in Spain.

M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul in 67, was a descendant of the novus homo of the same name who won a consulship for 191, and so was indeed a nobilis. He was, nevertheless, only the third Glabrio to achieve the senior magistracy of the res publica, since his father, responsible for the lex Acilia de repetundarum, does not seem to have advanced beyond the tribunate. The consul of 67 was praetor in 70, however, and so ought to have been born about 110, which suggests that his father may have gained further public offices, though these remain unattested.

Q. Marcius Rex, one of the consuls of 68, although his cognomen suggests an association with Rome's regal period, was, in fact, just the second consul of his family. His grandfather had reached the praetorship in 144 and had ensured the family's fame by completing the Aqua Marcia, and that politician's son became consul in 118. The first known Marcius Rex was a legate, with the praenomen ‘Publius’, and is dated to only 171, but he was not a direct ancestor of the later Marcii Reges since the consul of 118 has the filiation ‘Q.f. Q.n.’. No further
Marcii Reges attained high public office at Rome after the consul of 68, who died in 61 (Cic. ad Att. 1.16.10). The *stemma* of this family is as follows:

```
Marcius Rex
  P. Marcius Rex
    leg. 171
  Q. Marcius Rex
    Q. Marcius Rex, pr.144
      Q. Marcius Q.f. Q.n. Rex, cos.118
      Q. Marcius Q.f. Q.n. Rex, cos.67
```

Another member of the *gns Marcia* achieved a consulship in the 60's. C. Marcius Figulus, who was consul in 64 (Cic. ad Att. 1.2), also came from a family with just one consular ancestor, viz C. Marcius C.f. Q.n. Figulus, consul in 162 and 156. Since so few Marcii Figuli are attested in the Roman republic, the father of the consul of 64 was probably the *praetorius* who is known to have received a *repulsa* in a consular election (Val. Max. 9.3.2). This politician is dated to about 130, but since the evidence provided by Valerius Maximus is so vague, he may well have been a candidate for the consulship at least a decade later. Thus:

```
C. Marcius Figulus, cos.162, cos.II 156
  C. Marcius Figulus, (praetorius ca.120)
    C. Marcius Figulus, cos.64
```

Although the generations in this family's *stemma* may appear a trifle long, they are certainly neither impossible nor unprecedented. Thus, a comparison may be drawn with, for instance, D. Iunius Brutus, the consul in 77, who was a son of the consul of 138, D. Iunius Brutus Callaicus, and grandson of the consul in 178, M. Iunius Brutus. The consul of 64, if he held the consulship *suo anno*, was born no later than 107; his father the *praetorius* could easily have been born after 160.

Q. Hortensius, Cicero's famous rival in the law courts, was elected to one of the consulships of 69. He may be a son or nephew of the consul designate Hortensius who won a consular place for 108, but who was condemned, possibly for *ambitus*, before he took office. The exact relationship between the consul of 69 and the earlier Hortensius is not known, and Cicero never refers to this rather unsavoury episode in this family's history. Of course, it is quite possible that the consul designate for 108 was only a distant relation of Q. Hortensius, but this means that he was, in effect, the first member of his family to enter the office of
L. Caecilius Metellus, elected to the consulship of the following year, died either while still consul designate or very early in 68, and, states Dio (36.4.1), a successor with the cognomen Vatia was chosen, but he also died before he could assume his duties. With the name Vatia, he can only have been a younger brother, or perhaps a cousin, of the consul of 79, P. Servilius C.f. M.n. Vatia. It is most improbable that the suffect consul of 68 was this politician’s son, although the consul of 79 experienced a considerable delay to his career, having possibly received a repulsa in the consular elections in 88 (Plut. Sulla 10.3). Although the Servilii Vatiae had senatorial representation in the late second century, if not before, P. Servilius C.f. was their first consul. Thus, the consul of 68 could hardly lay claim to ancestors in the consulship.

Besides M’. Aemilius Lepidus, the consul of 66, three other patricians achieved a consulship between 69 and 60, and each is, in his own way, worthy of some discussion. L. Iulius L.f. L.n. Caesar, consul in 64 and perhaps praetor in 70, was the son of the consul of 90. He was also a great-grandson of the consul of 157, Sex. Iulius Caesar who was the first Caesar to win the consulship in a historically verifiable period, although this family liked to trace its origins back to the earliest days of Roman history. The Iulii Caesares, a family with two very distinct and separate branches, were not especially prominent in political life at Rome and, in fact, the consul of 64 was just the fourth Caesar to occupy the office of consul. Moreover, he was related only in a rather distant way to the consul of 91, Sex. Iulius C.f. L.? n. Caesar, and to his more famous relative the consul of 59, C. Iulius C.f. C.n. Caesar. Thus:

Sex. Iulius Caesar (pr.208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex. Iulius Caesar (cos.157)</th>
<th>L.?/C.? Caesar (pr.166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Caesar (pr.123)</td>
<td>L. Caesar (pr.120?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Caesar</td>
<td>C. Caesar (pr. ca.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Caesar Strabo (aed.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Caesar (cos.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L. Manlius Torquatus, consul in 65, came from a patrician family with longstanding representation at the highest levels of public life. Nonetheless, this Manlius Torquatus was the first of his family to win the consulship for a hundred years. His immediate consular ancestors were the brothers T. Manlius A.f. T.n. Torquatus and A. Manlius A.f. T.n. Torquatus, consuls in 165 and 164 respectively. Two generations, at least, of this family appear to have missed high public office, and either died prematurely or failed to make an impact with the voters. The relationship between the consul of 65 and his second century forebears is uncertain, but his father may be the quaestor of about 113. L. Manlius Torquatus, who is not known to have attained a higher magistracy. As for the consul of 65, he was also the last member from his family to gain consular honours.

An interval of a hundred years also separated M. Valerius Messalla Niger, consul in 61, from his nearest consular ancestor M. Valerius Messalla, consul in 161. Although the Valerii Messallae had fairly consistent success in elections to the consulship during the third and the first half of the second century, two generations probably missed high office between the consuls of 161 and 61. It was left to Messalla Niger and his cousin M. Valerius Messalla Rufus, consul in 53, to restore consular prestige to their family honours.

C. Antonius, consular colleague of Cicero in 63, is usually designated a nobilis, and since his father M. Antonius, the orator much praised by Cicero (de Orat. 1.7.24; Brut. 36.138–38.142), had won a consulship for 99, this view is certainly correct. But it should be remembered that M. Antonius was the first of his family to achieve this exalted position, and so the consul of 63 could not claim a long line of ancestors of consular dignity. The consul of 63 was the younger son of the consul of 99; his elder brother M. Antonius Creticus, father of the triumvir, had been praetor in 74, but had died suddenly in 71.

D. Iunius M.f. Silanus became consul in 62, having almost certainly received a repulsa in the consular elections in 65. If this assumption, based on Cicero's reference to 'Silanus' (ad Att.1.1.2), a consular candidate in 65, is correct, then the consul of 62 was praetor by 67, and his birth may be dated to about 107. As his filiation shows, he was a son of the consul of 109, M. Iunius Silanus who, like M. Antonius, consul in 99, was the first of his family to win the most senior office of the cursus honorum. Therefore, the consul of 62 could, likewise, not point to a profusion of consular ancestors.

The four remaining consuls in this decade are generally considered either to be newcomers to senior public office or to be entirely without predecessors in the senatorial order. Thus, L. Volcatius Tullus may not have been a novus homo, but his senatorial ancestors are obscure, and presumably held only relatively junior magistracies in the cursus honorum. Although he was the first Volcatius Tullus to achieve the consulship, he was not the last, for his son gained the same magistracy as consul suffectus in 33. L. Afranius, consul in 60, was certainly the first, and last, of his family to win a consulship; he may also have been a novus homo. Senatorial Afranii are attested in the second century, however, and it is possible
that the consul of 60 was related to one of these politicians.\textsuperscript{40} L. Licinius Murena, elected to the consulship for 62, may have been the first of his family to win this particular office, but he was certainly not a \textit{novus homo}. His three immediate ancestors in the paternal line had each held a praetorship.\textsuperscript{41} Finally, M. Tullius Cicero, consul in 63, was a \textit{novus homo} since his father was an \textit{eques Romanus}. But through his mother Helvia he was perhaps related to C. and M. Helvius who had held the praetorship in 198 and 197.\textsuperscript{42} While Cicero made much capital in the consular elections in 64 of his lack of consular, or even senatorial ancestors (\textit{Comm. Pet.} 2.7), he must in fact have been much less of an outsider than he claimed.

It may be correct to assert that the Roman electorate preferred a familiar name when it came to voting at consular elections, and it may have been useful for a politician who aspired to the consulship to have family or adoptive fame at his disposal. It is apparent, however, that, although seventeen of the twenty-one consuls between 69 and 60 technically possessed some relative in the consulship beforehand, very few of them could actually claim a long and unbroken family representation in that magistracy. Of course, many of these politicians may have been related to past consuls through their marriage connections or through the maternal line of their families, all of which, no doubt, they used to their advantage in an attempt to impress the voters. Unfortunately many of these relationships are unclear, and without firm evidence it is difficult to draw a definite conclusion about the effectiveness of these ties when employed by a politician in his candidacy for an office such as the consulship.\textsuperscript{43} The Roman electorate may have been aware of the direct ancestors of a politician, but it seems unlikely that the more distant relations, however famous, would necessarily have impressed the voters overmuch.

The successful candidates in the consular elections in this decade were, therefore, a rather heterogeneous and disparate group of politicians. Some possessed only recent consular ancestors, thus Q. Marcius Rex, C. Antonius, and D. Iunius Silanus. Some could claim only a distant and rather faded memory of family consular glory, thus L. Manlius Torquatus and M. Valerius Messalla Niger. Others were without a previous consul in their families, thus Q. Hortensius, Servilius Vatia, L. Volciatus Tullus, M. Tullius Cicero, L. Licinius Murena, and L. Afranius. Six of the remaining consuls were not themselves sons of consuls, although their families had provided consuls in the past, thus C. Calpurnius Piso, M'. Acilius Glabrio, M'. Aemilius Lepidus, L. Aurelius Cotta, C. Marcius Figulus, and M. Pupius Piso Frugi (in fact the first, and only, Pupius in the consular \textit{fasti}). This leaves just four consuls: Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus, L. Caecilius Metellus, Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer and L. Iulius Caesar, who were able to point to some continuity in their families' acquisition of the consulship, and only three of these, the Caecillii Metelli, with whom I began, actually had consular ancestors in each generation from the middle of the third century through to the 60's.

The result of this study suggests that the mere existence of consular ancestors
had, in fact, little obvious positive impact on the electorate. All politicians ambitious for the consulship had rather to campaign vigorously and to indulge in vast expenditure in order to win the favour of the voters. The generosity of the candidate exhibited by his lavish gifts may in the last instance have been more important than simply the possession of a famous name. Cicero, who did not possess a famous name but who presumably fulfilled all the obligations expected of a consular candidate, says that the electorate at Rome could be extremely fickle and volatile when it came to bestowing its favours on a candidate. This also seems to indicate that the results of the consular elections were, at least as far as the 60's were concerned, more dependent on the availability of a fortune than on the availability of an inherited name.

NOTES

2. I realise, of course, that the results of this study may be construed as reflecting an atypical decade in Roman republican politics. My thanks to Professor H.B. Mattingly on this point. This article does, however, form a small part of a larger examination of consular elections and the successful candidates between 218 and 49 B.C., which will, I hope, appear in due course.
5. For the relationship between the cos. A.D.? and the cos.69, see Syme, (above note 4) Table 18 following 504.
7. F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsgeschlechter*, Stuttgart 1963, 323; *RE Aurelius no.105*, suggested that the moneyer was a brother of the cos.119. A problem exists with this identification, however, if Crawford’s date for this moneyer is correct, (above note 6) no.229, he would have been born not much later than 165, while the cos.119, supposing his consulship to be suo anno, would have been born in 162. The moneyer must, therefore, have been an elder, not a younger brother of the cos.119, if they were brothers, a fact which cannot be proved. C. Cotta, cos.75, the eldest of the three Cottae, was born ca. 124, Cic. *Brut.* 48.182, 88.301; G.V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero’s ‘Brutus’: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto 1973, 109, and reached the consulship late. A delayed career must also apply to the cos.65, since he was praetor in 70, *MRR* 2.127; his birth probably predates 110.
10. For the cons.126 and 137 see *MRR* 1.508, 1.484.
12. The consul of 112 was a son of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, cos.148, who was adopted by the consul of 180. The Caesontii show a direct line of magistrates from the cos.148 to the cos.58, *MRR* 2.541, although the latter’s father failed to reach the consulship, pr 907, *MRR* Suppl. 1 (1986) 48. In this study I am concerned only with the other branches of the Calpurnii Pisones.
13. For the cons. 139 and 135 see Degrassi (above note 11) 70, 73; *MRR* 1.482, 1.488.
14. Syme (above note 4) 276; MRR.2.609, L. Pupius, pr.183, M. Pupius M.f., senator 129/101?. The latter was a member of the consilium on the S.C. de Agro Pergameno and may be the man who adopted, in his old age, the cos.61, Cic. de Dom.13.35, H.B. Mattingly, 'The Date of the “De Agro Pergameno”', AJP 93 (1979) 421.

15. Degrassi (above note 11) 73; MRR.1.492.

16. Cic. 2 in Verr. 4.25.56; MRR.1.538; Suppl.1 (1986) 48. His elder brother was L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, pr.74, MRR.2.102, who did not become consul. M. Pupius Piso was praetor in either 70 or 71, MRR.2.117 and n.1; Suppl. (1986) 177, hence born in ca.111. He reached the consulship after a considerable delay, though this was surely not caused by his being a Pupius and not a Piso. He may, therefore, have received a repulsae in the consular elections in 68 or 67 and left a second consular candidacy until he considered his chances of success much greater. Since his natural family was undoubtedly more famous than his adopted gens, he presumably exploited the name ‘Piso’ to its full advantage, as his nomenclature illustrates: M. Pupius Piso Frugi (Calpumianus), Inscr. Ital. 13.1170; CIL.1 352; Cic. Brut. 67.236: ‘M. Piso’. However, the fact that he did not win a consulship until the elections in 62 indicates that the name alone did not impress the voters.

17. The son of the cos.191 was suffect consul in 154, MRR.1.449. The lex Acilia is to be dated to 123 or 122, MRR.1.517, n.4.

18. MRR.1.471, for the pr.144; MRR.1.527, cos.118.

19. Livy 43.1.12; MRR.1.418.

20. MRR.1.441, 1.447.


22. Evans (above note 9) 77.

23. Cic. in Verr.1.7.17, pro Client. 64.179; MRR.2.131.


25. MRR.2.137.

26. The praetorship of P. Servilius Vatia is usually assigned to about 90, MRR.2.26, and n.5. The consul of 48, P. Servilius P.f. C.n. Vatia Isauricus, was certainly the son of the cos.79, Cic. ad Att. 6.1.16; Shackleton Bailey, (above note 4) 3.249, suggests that the cos.79 died about 44.

27. MRR.2.620, C. Servilius Vatia, ‘pr. or promag. before 100’; Münzer, RE. Servilius no.91; Crawford (above note 6) no.264; MRR. Suppl.2 (1986) 196.

28. For the cos.90 see Degrassi, (above note 11) 74; MRR.2.25. H.B. Mattingly, ‘L. Julius Caesar, Governor of Macedonia’, Chiron, 9 (1979) 156, suggests 70 as the date of the praetorship of the cos.64.

29. Degrassi, (above note 11) 66; MRR.1.446.

30. MRR.1.438–439.


32. Manlius Torquatus, pr.497, was probably a son of the cos.65, MRR.2.257; R. Syme, ‘Marriage Ages for Senators’, Historia 36 (1987) 321, assigns ca.110 as the birth-date of the cos.65.

33. For the cos.161, Degrassi (above note 11) 66; MRR.1.443.

34. Thus, the Valerii Messallae won consulships in 263, 226, 188, and 161, MRR.2.630. Note, however, the repulsae received by M. Valerius Messalla in the consular elections in 190, Livy, 37.47.7–8.

35. For instance, E.S. Gruen (above note 1) 136; R. Syme, The Roman Revolution, Oxford, 1939, 81.

36. The Antonii evidently had senatorial status throughout much of the second century, although they held only more junior places in the cursus honorum. Thus, e.g.168, trib.167, MRR.1.531.


38. Shackleton Bailey (above note 4) 1.292.

39. Degrassi (above note 11) 73; MRR.1.545. Junius Silani had been present in the senate from the end of the third century, at least, with a praetor dated to 212, MRR.1.268. D. Junius Silanus Manlianus, pr.141, MRR.1477, was presumably the grandfather of the cos.62.

40. MRR.2.414.

41. MRR.2.528, C. Afranius Stellio, pr.185, Sp. Afranius, mon. ca.150; cf. Crawford (above note 6)
1.252, where 'SAFRA' is preferred to the reading 'S(p) AFRA(nius)'.

42. Cic. pro Mur.7.15; MRR.2.580, pr. ca.147, ca.101, ca.88. A.C. Licinius Murena, perhaps a younger brother of the cos.62, was aedile about 59, MRR.1.189 and n.4, but no later Licini Murenae are attested in high public offices.

43. MRR.2.572.

44. For instance, C. Iulius Caesar, cos.59, was related to C. Marius through his aunt Iulia, Suet. Iul. 6.1; Plut. Caes. 1.2, 5.2, and certainly exploited this fact when he gave her funeral eulogy in 68. It may have made him popular, but whether this popularity alone was responsible for his success in later elections is a moot point. If he was so confident that his family connections could win him election to high office, why did he find it necessary to give such extravagant aedilician games, Sall. Ca.49.3; Suet. Iul. 9.2; Plut. Caes. 6.1-3? Furthermore, while T.P. Wiseman, 'Factions and Family Trees', LCM 1 (1976) 3, rightly observes that many well known political families were related to one another due to the frequent incidence of divorce and remarriage, it is debatable whether overriding importance should be attached to that fact.

45. Cic. pro Mur.17.36: 'nihil est incertius voce, nihil obscurius voluntate hominum, nihil fallacius ratione tota comitiorum'.
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