REVIEW ARTICLE

MAGISTERIAL REVISIONS*

It is difficult for most of those who now consult the two large and well-worn green volumes of *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* to imagine a world without *MRR*. Not in itself revolutionary, this most basic of reference works has profoundly affected the study of republican history through its clear, concise, patient, and honest marshaling of all the ancient evidence and modern opinions (not least of them the author's own) concerned with the public careers of Rome's ruling class. Some thirty-five years after its appearance in 1951 and 1952, Robert Broughton has produced a *Supplement* so substantial as to constitute a volume in its own right, *MRR* 3. This subsumes a similar but much briefer pamphlet of 1960 (subsequently bound into *MRR* 2), and follows the same format as the earlier supplement on a formidable scale. The text itself takes the form of a list of additions and corrections, in alphabetical order from C. Aburius Geminus to Q. Volusius, running to some 225 pages with hundreds of entries and thousands of references. Then ten pages of errata and, significantly, no fewer than forty-five pages of bibliography listing "with a few exceptions . . . only works that have appeared since 1952." For this mass of scholarship over the last three and one-half decades, much of it representing major advances, no single scholar is more responsible than B. himself.

The reader can confidently expect to find the fruits of these decades registered here, as the voluminous contributions of Badian, Shackleton Bailey, Gruen, Linderski, Nicolet, Sumner, Syme, and Wiseman—to name but the most prominent in the field, all of them in B.'s debt—are summarized and dissected with astonishing clarity. Many new inscriptions (especially the series from Aphrodisias), new readings of old inscriptions (e.g., p. 110, the names of the censors of 61), new interpretations of old inscriptions (e.g., pp. 5–6, the non-"elogium of Aemilius Barbula"), even new coins (pp. 27–28, on Ephesian cistophori), and a new literary text (p. 84, the Sallust fragment published in 1979): dozens of such novelties are presented to the reader. Interested students can even chart and explain the fortunes of favorite figures in the eyes of modern historiographers: Pompey earns five pages, Sulla three, Caesar three, Marius less than one, Saturninus almost three, Crassus only one-half (despite the recent appearance of two biographies), Lucullus two. All this is laid out briefly, clearly, judiciously. How to evaluate it? Other, more competent reviewers may discuss such errors of

* *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 3: *Supplement*. By T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON. American Philological Association: Philological Monographs, 15.3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986. Pp. x + 294.

Permission to reprint this review article may be obtained only from the author.

commission as they may perceive in the work, and rightly. Arguments perhaps incorrectly presented, conclusions perhaps wrongly drawn, disputes over fact, date, or identity: on the thorough discussion and proper understanding of such data may hinge our understanding of large issues in the constitutional, political, social, even religious history of Rome. The aim of the present review is much more modest. The value of *MRR* is beyond all doubt. But inevitably, in an undertaking of such size, B. has missed some material altogether or overlooked relevant items in the hundreds of works he has consulted. Some of these omissions large and small, all of them venial, will be considered here.

At this late date we can expect little more of significance to emerge from ancient literature, so thoroughly has it been combed. *MRR* set out to cite every source for every office of state held in every year of the Republic, additions and corrections appeared in both of its first two volumes and in the first supplement, and yet further references are scattered through the new *Supplement:* the value for scholarship has been inestimable, as everyone who has written with confidence "For sources, see *MRR sub anno*" will testify. Nevertheless, a few small items can be added for completeness, one or two of them bearing wider significance.

The early first-century polymath L. Manilius (or Manlius, or Mamilius: *RE* 4) deserves recall, "senator ille maximis nobilis doctrinis doctore nullo," an elusive but important figure in literary history, best remembered for his work on the phoenix (Pliny *HN* 10. 4–5, with other references at Schanz-Hosius 1:605–6). Similarly, there is the learned Q. Sextius Niger (*RE* 10), of whom Seneca wrote "honores reppulit pater Sextius, qui ita natus ut rem publicam deberet capessere, latum clavum divo Iulio dante non recepit" (*Epist.* 98. 13): the man remained a knight, but his father before him could well have been a senator—how far should *deberet* be pressed?—and a close contemporary, T. Sextius, was praetor in or soon before 45. A stray Mummius (*RE* 1), probably named Achaicus and a descendant of the conqueror of Greece, and apparently a senator, was driven into lifelong exile at Delos after condemnation in 90 under the *Lex Varia de maiestate* (App. *BCiv.* 1. 37, with the note of E. Gabba in his edition, *Appiani "Bellorum Civium" Liber Primus*[2] [Florence, 1967], pp. 125–26). And then there is a trio of noble priests, easily overlooked. Q. Servilius Caepio (*RE* 49), cos. 106, was allegedly nothing less than pontifex maximus at the time of his debacle at Arausio (Val. Max. 6. 9. 13); if so, he is to be inserted between Metellus Delmaticus and Domitius Ahenobarbus (*MRR* 1:564–65); if not, he should probably be registered as a pontifex. The unknown patrician augur of the college as reconstructed at *MRR* 1:495–96 (*s.a.* 133) will be Ser. (Sulpicius) Galba (*RE* 58), *collega noster* of Scipio and Laelius in Cicero *De republica* 3. 42, and the consul of 144. And a shadowy [Sul]picius Ser. f. (*RE* 1) was inaugurated into a priesthood in the time of a Metellus *pontifex* [*maximus*], possibly Q. Metellus Pius (cos. 80, pont. max. ca. 81–63: see Festus 462–64 L., a text cited for that Metellus in the supplement of 1960, p. 11, but not at *MRR* 3:41).

Other odd nuggets of erudition may yet turn up in the mass of late antique literature. Thus, the scholiast Porphyrio (ad Hor. *Serm.* 1. 8. 25) preserves memory of a Pompeius or Pomponius, a senator proscribed by the triumvirs: not readily identifiable. Or Themistius, defending his own public career by noting earlier philosophers and men of letters who had held high office, cites the quaestor Cato, the praetor Brutus, the tribune of the plebs Favonius, the praetor Varro, the consul Rutilius Rufus (*Or.* 34. 8): as it happens, no tribunate is recorded elsewhere for Favonius (cf. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, ed., *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* vol. 1 [Cambridge, 1965], p. 350, and vol. 7 [Cambridge, 1970], p. 85); but it is eminently plausible, and Themistius is otherwise quite accurate here.

Such items are useful additions, but little further can be expected from the literary remains, except from the very occasional new papyrus or manuscript, or from stray emendations in works long available.[1]

Since the publication of *MRR* 1 and 2, discussion of the numismatic evidence has of course been placed on a new level by M. Crawford's indispensable *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge, 1974). B. has carefully noted each date and identification proposed by Crawford, and on a rough count such entries run to about one-fifth of the total in the *Supplement*. These are by and large presented neutrally, as items to be added to the list of proposed dates in appendix 1 ("Monetales") and the "Index of Careers" in *MRR* 2. The danger here, hardly B.'s fault, is that Crawford's great work will be taken as definitive by nonspecialists; and *MRR* 3 confirms us in our timidity by ignoring most (but not all) contributions made after—and usually building on or reacting to—*RRC*. The concerned amateur must look elsewhere for guidance, which is certainly not lacking.

Take for instance the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1977 (vol. 137), which published two substantial reactions to *RRC*, the rather testy "Notes on the Chronology and Interpretation of the Roman Republican Coinage" by C. A. Hersh (pp. 19–36), and the review article, "Coinage and the Roman State," by H. B. Mattingly (pp. 199–215). Neither paper appears in B.'s bibliography. Both of them offer serious comments on much larger aspects of Roman and numismatic history, with serious criticisms of Crawford's methods, but each also offers relevant material on individual monetales and colleges of monetales. Much of this requires close reading with *RRC* at hand, but particularly interesting is Hersh's insistence (p. 35) on dating the coinage of C. Calpurnius L. f. Piso Frugi to 63 rather than to 67, as in *RRC;* Hersh's earlier paper ("A Study of the Coinage of the Moneyer C. Calpurnius Piso L. f. Frugi [*sic*]," *NC* 136 [1976]: 7–63) finds a place in the bibliography of *MRR* 3, but there is no hint of its existence in the note on Piso Frugi (p. 47), which repeats the date of 67. En passant, Mattingly (pp. 203–6) suggests numerous revisions to *RRC* that should affect *MRR:* the *monetalis* D. (Iunius) Silanus should move from 91 to 90, C. Allius Bala may go from 92 to 91, the college of A. (Postumius) Albinus, C. (Publicius) Malleolus, and L. (Caecilius) Metellus should move from 96 to 93 or 92, L. Pomponius Molo from 97 to 93 or 91, and the famous Saturninus perhaps from 104 to 101. By ignoring such reactions to *RRC, MRR* 3 tacitly forces us to trust Crawford's results completely or to search out the information for ourselves. Neither alternative is to be recommended, particularly to amateurs.

Among our sources, inscriptions alone offer a steady accession of fresh prosopographical material. B. knows the evidence and deploys it admirably. First,

1. One very difficult general problem concerns the sources for the early Republic. With a clear and brief statement of his position at *MRR* 1:xi–xii, B. excluded consideration of the "involved and far-reaching problems of the early chronology and reliability of the lists of magistrates," thus avoiding much of the quagmire of early republican chronology and prosopography: cf. the fair evaluation of his position by R. T. Ridley at pp. 285–87 in his very useful survey, "Fastenkritik: A Stocktaking," *Athenaeum* 68 (1980): 264–98. *MRR* 3 accordingly passes over most of the more recent work, although a few useful items on individual magistrates of the fifth and fourth centuries do appear (e.g., at pp. 52–53, 70, 95, 175, 201). Similarly, the works of Alföldi, Suolahti, Ogilvie, Poucet, Palmer, Drummond, Develin, and many others appear in the bibliography, although almost no use is made of them. Since this reflects a policy set thirty-five years ago, it would be impertinent to question it here. Nevertheless, the reader who sits down with, for instance, R. M. Ogilvie's *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965) next to *MRR* may be persuaded to make serious revisions to the lists in *MRR* 1 (consulting, e.g., Ogilvie, pp. 229, 232, 282, 368–69, 377, 461–63, 495–97, 543, 609, 617).

again for the sake of completeness, some items possibly worth adding, a few of which appeared too late for inclusion in the *Supplement*.

L. Caesius L. f. imp. received the *deditio* of a tribe in Hispania Ulterior in 104: *AE* 1984, 495; cf. J. S. Richardson, *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of the Roman Empire, 218–82 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 199–201 (the *Tabula Alcantarensis*). Presumably the father of the monetalis L. Caesius (*RRC* no. 298, 112 or 111 B.C.).

L. Calpurnius L. f. Pub. Squillius(?), qu. imperatorum, tr. pl., praef. (*sic*): *CIL* 5.3335 (Verona), known only from a Renaissance copy. If the form of his quaestorship is properly transmitted, he should belong to the triumviral period: T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.–A.D. 14* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 220–21. Interesting as the first ancestor of a great senatorial family of the principate.

Caninius Niger, honored in the late second or first century by four Sicilian cities for his leadership against the pirates: G. Scibona, "Epigraphia Halaesina I (Schede 1970)," *Kokalos* 17 (1971): 5–11 = *AE* 1973, 265 (Halaesa). Surely a Roman officer or magistrate.

Ti. Claudius C. f. Antiatas on one of the Entella tablets: *SEG* 32, 914. Ἐπιμελητής, possibly a Roman prefect, in third-century(?) Sicily.

Cornelius L. f. Lentulus, *legatus pro praetore* in Macedonia, second or first century: *ISamothrace* 28. Not closely identifiable.

[L. L]icinius L. f. Crassus et al. (for the list, see below): *CIL* 10.44 + p. 1003 (Vibo Valentia). Cichorius' identification of this list of at least eight men as a land commission appointed under the law of Livius Drusus in 91 was registered noncommittally at *MRR* 2:23, but receives no further attention in *MRR* 3. In a paper published in 1969 ("Epigraphica IV," *MAL* 14 [1969]: 111–41, at 129–33), A. Degrassi showed that the text in *CIL* 10 differed considerably from that actually on the stone, most importantly in its complete omission of the last line, "---]murum reficiundum e[---"; and by chance soon thereafter another inscription turned up at Vibo, bearing at least four of the same names in the same order and ending "ostia in portas faciend[a] / muros reficiend. locaru[nt]" (*AE* 1973, 225). Degrassi, who could find no analog, suggested that these were private citizens and supporters of Caesar digging into their own purses to repair the town walls in 48. The names (as restored by combining the two inscriptions) are now as follows: L. Licinius L. f. Crassus; P. All. . . . ; . . . .Pollio; Q. Anicius L. f. . . . . ; .Decidius C. f. Rufus; C. M. . . . ; C. Egnatius Rufus; C. M. . . . Most look like senators.

L. Otacilius P. f. Rufus, *tribunus plebis* late second or early first century: *Tituli* 4 (1982): 668–71 = *AE* 1984, 176 (*ager Praenestinus*).

M. Porcius Cato (*RE* 11), son of the consul of 118, himself curule aedile and praetor, died in Narbonese Gaul: Gellius *NA* 13. 20. 12. *MRR* assigned the aedileship to around 94, the praetorship to around 92, and a governorship in Gaul to around 91. It now appears probable from a new inscription from Lindus that M. P[orcius] Cato was praetor in 101: *JRS* 64 (1974): 202 and 210, also pointing out that there is no evidence for a Gallic command. The notice on M. Cato at *MRR* 3:170 remarks on this lack of evidence for office in Gaul but omits the new inscription.

C. Quinctius C. f. Trogus, propraetor in Achaea, honored at an unknown date by the damos at Megara: *BCH* 102 (1978): 656 = *Bull. épigr.* 1979, 205.

C. Rabirius, proconsul of Asia: *ILLRP* 399. *MRR* 3:181, expanding a notice in the previous supplement, identifies this man with the notorious Rabirius Postumus and assigns his tenure to some point in 48–46. Yet R. Syme, in a review of *ILLRP,* cast very strong doubt on the date and the identification, suggesting instead a grandparent of Postumus, holding the province at some time in the last third of the second century: *JRS* 57 (1967): 262–63 = *Roman Papers,* vol. 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 638–41.

Rubrius, author of "La Lex Rubria de Gallia Cisalpina": U. Laffi's important paper of that title (*Athenaeum* 74 [1986]: 5–44), although arriving too late for *MRR* 3, should be signaled here. If his arguments are accepted, as they should be, there are two minor results

of prosopographical interest: the *Lex Roscia* incorporating Gallia Cisalpina into Italy should be transferred from L. Roscius Fabatus (pr. 49) to a hitherto unknown Roscius, *tribunus plebis* in 41; and the presumed tribune Rubrius, author of the subsequent *Lex Rubria* defining the competence of local magistrates in Cisalpine Gaul, should be reassigned from 49 to 41.

C. Valerius C. f. Flaccus, cos. 95: an inscription from Clarus, republished by K. Tuchelt in *Frühe Denkmäler Roms aus Kleinasien: Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung in der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus,* vol. 1: *Roma und Promagistrate* (Tübingen, 1979), p. 160, reveals an otherwise unattested proconsulship of Asia for this man. F. Coarelli, in an important paper on Asian chronology in the late second and early first centuries ("Su alcuni proconsuli d'Asia tra la fine del II e gli inizi del I secolo A. C. e sulla politica di Mario in oriente," *Tituli* 4 [1982]: 435–51), assigned him to the years 98–95. Coarelli further argued that the governor L. Valerius L. f. Flaccus, also honored on a better known inscription at Clarus (Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler,* 1:164) was not the known proconsul Lucius (pr. 63 and subject of the *Pro Flacco*) but the consul of 100, governor around 99; and he offered a revised sequence of proconsuls between 104 and 86.

L. Vettius L. f. Vel., on the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo in 89: *ILLRP* 515. Degrassi ("Epigraphica IV," pp. 133–36) offered strong reasons for identifying him with the L. Vettius L. f. Vel. Aninianus (tr. mil. leg. VI) of *CIL* 9.6383 (Auximum): in fact from Picenum, the region where Pompeius recruited several of his legionary officers.

Chance finds and overlooked items will continue to appear, but there is one group of inscriptions that will amply reward systematic investigation, those recording men who held military prefectures or tribunates in the last twelve, anxious years of the Republic, under the second triumvirate. Not great *nobiles,* usually not even senators, these officers were nevertheless highly representative of the world struggling to be born, the aristocrats of municipal Italy who sooner or later, whatever their inclinations, would join *tota Italia* in swearing allegiance to Octavian. Inscriptions offer most of the evidence for them, sometimes directly, by naming a commander or a campaign, more commonly indirectly, with reference to a legion demobilized or a veteran colony founded after Philippi or Actium.

These men turn up sporadically in the latter pages of *MRR* 2, very new and palpably different magistrates of the Roman Republic: Q. Horatius Flaccus, the freedman's son from Venusia who fought on the wrong side at Philippi; or T. Marius C. f. Stell. Siculus of Urbinum, once Sextus Pompey's man in Sicily (hence the cognomen), then a follower of Antony and Octavian, in the end notorious as one who cheated his great benefactor Augustus in his will (*CIL* 11.6058, Val. Max. 7. 9. 2); or C. Baebius T. f. Clu., later a magistrate at Forum Livi, who loyally guarded the shore of Hither Spain in 31 B.C., while the fate of the world was being decided far away (*ILS* 2672, "praef. orae maritimae Hispan. citerioris bello Actiensi"). To the twenty-five or thirty men gathered in *MRR* 2, most of them knights, some senators, some founders of senatorial families, B. has now in the *Supplement* added such excellent specimens as the military tribune Q. Caecilius Atticus, honored by *coloni leg. XXXXI* at Tuder in the trumviral era (*ILS* 2230), and L. Firmius (add the filiation L. f. at p. 91), *primus pilus* and military tribune, honored by the *legio IIII Sorana* at Sora, where he was quattuorvir and, on the settlement of the colony after Philippi, its first *pontifex* (*ILS* 2226).

It is easy to overlook such men. Most of them were ordinary members of the municipal elite, called to the service of the state in extraordinary times and only too happy to revert to their local status under the Augustan peace of which they were the bedrock. *MRR* is very much a book of the glorious past. Its "Index of Careers" ruthlessly denies the future, cutting short at 31 B.C. the *cursus* of even

the greatest *nobiles,* who went on afterward to priesthoods or consulships all unaware that the Roman Republic had ended. Them at least we know, but some of their humbler colleagues deserve rescue.

C. Aclutius L. f. Ter. Gallus, military tribune in *legio Prima* and in *legio Secunda Sabina,* and an active local magistrate at Venafrum: *ILS* 2227.[2]

L. Appuleius L. f., *tribunus militaris,* a significant figure. His funerary relief at Nomentum (*CIL* 14.3948) displays him in heroic uniform, flanked by his freedmen parents. A very neat parallel then for Horace, since his monument is to be dated between 40 and 30 B.C.: P. Zanker, "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener," *JDAI* 90 (1975): 304–5.

L. Sergius L. f. Lepidus, military tribune in the twenty-ninth legion, which was disbanded after Philippi, aedile at Pola, and the son and nephew of local magistrates: *ILS* 2229.

A man whose unrecoverable name is preserved only as . . .us Fabia / Sab. M. f., also tribune in the twenty-ninth (and the sixth): *AE* 1931, 95.

The all but anonymous man of Arretium, . . .ius L. f. Pom. . . .us, a Roman praetor who held three posts in the vigintisexvirate, a military tribunate, a quaestorship in Achaia, and a tribunate of the plebs, all before being adlected into the patriciate no later than 29: *CIL* 11.1837, with Wiseman, *New Men,* p. 278.

The brothers C. Tillius C. f. Cor. Rufus and L.(?) Tillius C. f. of Pompeii, tribunes in Antony's *legio X Equestris:* unpublished inscriptions from Pompeii; cf. P. Castren, "About the *Legio X Equestris,*" *Arctos* 8 (1974): 6.

Several others are also worth considering, such as L. Ancharius C. f. Rom., military tribune, duumvir and augur at Ateste (*NdS* 1905, p. 219); M. Cincius L. f. Hor., tribune in the *legio Gemella* and quattuorvir at Falerii (*CIL* 11.7495); or M. Volcius M. f. Sabinus, military tribune and local benefactor at Rufrae (*ILS* 5759), probably before 27 B.C. (cf. *ILS* 80). One might even add P. Aufidius L. f., former military tribune and *praefectus fabrum,* and magistrate at Placentia (*CIL* 11.1217 + p. 242), or M. Vecilius M. f. L. n. Campus, *praefectus fabrum,* military tribune, and magistrate and priest at Luceria (*AE* 1938, 110). And finally, a conjecture that will perhaps carry us back to the stratum of Horace and L. Appuleius, with A. Castricius Myriotalenti f., "the son of a thousand talents," *tribunus militaris, praefectus equitum et classis, magister* of two or three minor priestly colleges at Rome, and vigintisexvir (*ILS* 2676). This man raised an inscription at Lanuvium, the hometown of the conspirator Varro Murena, whose downfall in 23 was precipitated in part by an informer named Castricius; and the name of his father, Myriotalentus, if not a nickname, points to a freedman of the great Italian trading family in the East, the Castricii: thus Wiseman, *New Men,* pp. 222–23. The vigintisexvirate existed only from the time of Caesar to the early years of Augustus, being replaced by the vigintivirate no later than 13 B.C. and perhaps as early as 23 (Wiseman, ibid., p. 151). If the latter date is correct, the man's military service would best be placed, or at least have started, in the tumultuous 30s, an era in which such characters flourished.

New or overlooked sources aside, modern treatments of individual problems may occasionally be missed or scanted, not surprisingly in a work of such scope. It will be useful to signal some of the worthier suggestions, following the alphabetical order of *MRR* 3.

L. [Aelius? C.? or T.?] f. Arn. Capito, in the *SC de Aphrodisiensibus:* probably an Ateius; cf. E. Badian, "Notes on a New List of Roman Senators," *ZPE* 55 (1984): 109–10.

L. Aemilius Paullus (81), qu. 60 or 59: the suggested dating to 60 should be attributed to

2. For him and many of these figures there is the fine recent study by L. Keppie, *Colonization and Veteran Settlement in Italy 47–14 B.C.* (London, 1983). Compare the valuable paper of S. Demougin, "Notables municipaux et ordre équestre à l'époque des dernières guerres civiles" (in *Les "Bourgeoisies" municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C.* [Paris and Naples, 1983], pp. 279–98), which arrived after the present review was written.

E. Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1962), p. 142. L. Aemilius (Paullus) (118), cos. 219, ambassador 218: G. V. Sumner ("The Chronology of the Outbreak of the Second Punic War," *PACA* 9 [1966]: 24, n. 63) identified the ambassador L. Aemilius more plausibly as L. Aemilius Papus (108), cos. 225. Aquilius, author of the *Lex Aquilia:* add the reference from p. 258 to the paper by A. M. Honoré, dating the legislator's tribunate to 209–195; and add now J. A. Crook, *"Lex Aquilia," Athenaeum* 62 (1984): 67–77. M'. Aquillius (10), cos. 129: consensus in the debate over the date of the *SC de agro Pergameno,* turning on the identity of a consul Aquillius in the document, is now swinging toward 101, when this man's son was consul; add E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1984), pp. 607–8, and G. Petzl at *IK* 24.1 (= *ISmyrna* 2.1) 589 (pp. 51–64, esp. pp. 58–60). M. Atius Balbus (11), land commissioner in 59, or possibly augur in that year: cf. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Recensuit et Emendavit . . . ," *Philologus* 108 (1964): 110–12.

M. (Caecilius) Metellus: Florus 1. 46. 3 gives this name to the tribune opposed to Crassus' eastern command, who is elsewhere named as Ateius Capito (*MRR s.a.* 55); cf. T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester, 1974), p. 179. M. (Caecilius) Q. f. Metellus: *RRC* 1:387–88, no. 369, assigns a monetalis of this name to the years 82–80 B.C., distinguishing him from a homonym (*RE* 77) in 115. C. Caelius, tr. pl. 87 or 86: as E. Courtney ("Notes on Cicero," *CR* 10 [1960]: 97–98, n. 2) pointed out, the form of the name, "Celius," as it appears in the Berne scholia to Lucan 2. 25, could represent either "Caelius" or "Coelius." L. Calpurnius Bestia (24), tr. pl. 62 and aed. around 59, and L. Bestia (25), aed. by 57: E. S. Gruen ("Some Criminal Trials of the Late Republic: Political and Prosopographical Problems," *Athenaeum* 49 [1971]: 67–69) maintained with Münzer, against *MRR,* the distinction between these two. L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (90), procos. Macedonia 57–55: add *ISamothrace* 18. Canidius (1), qu.(?) Cyprus 58: J. Geiger ("Canidius or Caninius," *CQ* 22 [1972]: 130–34) identified this man with L. Caninius Gallus (3), tr. pl. 56. A. Cascellius (4), qu., pr.(?): A. Rodger ("A Note on A. Cascellius," *CQ* 22 [1972]: 135–38) denied the praetorship, probably rightly. Cassius, tr. pl. 56: D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* [State College, Pa., 1976], p. 23) suggested that this was the same man as L. Caninius Gallus (above). Ap. Claudius Pulcher (294), pr. 187, cos. 185, and his brother P. Claudius Pulcher (305), pr. 188, cos. 184: G. V. Sumner (in conversation) neatly explained the anomaly of the inverted praetorships by reading *Ap.* for *P.* at Livy 38. 35. 5, to make Appius the curule aedile of 189 (not Publius), hence pr. 187, cos. 185. T. Cluilius (5), legate(?) 83: C. Tuplin's identification of this man with C. (Coelius) Antipater (6), legate 82 ("Coelius or Cloelius?" *Chiron* 9 [1979]: 137–45) deserves mention. L. Cornelius Cinna (106), patrician consul with a patrician colleague in 86: Cadoux's explanation that the old law against this was repealed or obsolete has been discounted by Shackleton Bailey (*Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* vol. 2 [Cambridge, 1967], p. 202) citing *Scaur.* 34 and *Att.* 4. 16. P. Cornelius Scipio (see 331), *flamen Dialis:* G. Bandelli ("P. Cornelio Scipione, *Prognatus Publio* (*CIL,* 1^2, 10)," *Epigraphica* 37 [1975]: 84–99) demonstrated that this should be a Scipio Asina, not the son of Africanus. P. Cornelius Sulla (387): Shackleton Bailey (*"Letters to Atticus,"* 2:175–76) suggested that the Caesarean general Sulla of 48–47 was this man acting as quaestor and proquaestor, not the homonymous consul designate of 65 (386). C. Cosconius (4), pr. 63: it is generally assumed that this man was the orator C. Cosconius Calidianus (12) of Cic. *Brut.* 242; cf. A. E. Douglas, ed., *M. Tulli Ciceronis "Brutus"* (Oxford, 1966), p. 178.

L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (27), qu. 66: the emendation of *praetura* to *quaestura* at Asconius 45C, on Cic. *Mil.* 22, was rejected by Badian (*Studies,* p. 143), who suggested that the praetorship concerned was Cicero's.

Cn. Heius (3), senator in 74: Shackleton Bailey (*Two Studies,* p. 43) suggested reading "Heiulius."

C. Iulius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus (135), aed. 96: E. Gabba (*Republican Rome, the Army and the Allies* [Oxford, 1976], pp. 198–99, n. 157) plausibly suggested that he was quaestor in Sardinia around 104–103. L. Iulius Caesar (143), cos. 64: H. B. Mattingly ("L. Julius Caesar, Governor of Macedonia," *Chiron* 9 [1979]: 147–67) conjectured that the Macedonian proconsulship should be assigned to him in 69 rather than to his homonym (cos. 90) in 94.

Licinius Regulus (149), senator removed in 18 B.C.: since Regulus is nowhere else found among the Licinii, the emendation to Livineius Regulus at Cassius Dio 54. 14. 2 is very tempting. Livius (2), tr. pl. 146: E. Badian (*Foreign Clientelae 264–70 B.C.* [Oxford, 1958], p. 138, n. 2) cast strong doubt on his existence. M. Livius M. f. M. n. Salinator (32), X vir s. f. 236: R. E. A. Palmer (*Roman Religion and Roman Empire: Five Essays* [Philadelphia, 1974], p. 95) made a likely case for identifying him with the exactly homonymous consul of 219.

C. Mamilius Atellus (5), *curio maximus* 209–174: R. E. A. Palmer (*The Archaic Community of the Romans* [Cambridge, 1970], p. 146) pointed out that this man could not be the praetor in Sicily of 207, since *curiones* could not serve in the army or hold other *munera,* and that the praetor, a C. Mamilius, should be a Turrinus, son of the consul of 239 (Gaius Q. f. Q. n.) and brother of the praetor of 206 (Quintus). L. Manlius Torquatus (80), pr. 49(?): T. P. Wiseman ("Mallius," *CR* 15 [1965]: 263) suggested that he may have been military tribune with C. Antonius in Macedonia in 61. P. Mat(ienus), mon. around 150–125: delete him, since his coin is an unofficial copy of that of P. Maenius M. f. Antiaticus; cf. Crawford, *RRC,* 1:547. L. Minucius Thermus (not in *RE*): the paper of J. Heurgon cited by B. ("Sur un édile de Terence," *REL* 27 [1949]: 106–8 = *Scripta Varia* [Brussels, 1986], pp. 9–11) showed that this man should be Q. Minucius (Thermus) (25), aed. cur. 135(?).

M. Plautius Hypsaeus (11, 21), cos. 125: P. A. Brunt (*Italian Manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14* [Oxford, 1971], p. 568) suggested a command in Gallia Cisalpina. Sex. Pompeius (18), brother of Pompeius Strabo (cos. 89): G. V. Sumner ("The Pompeii in Their Families," *AJAH* 2 [1977]: 18) made a case for seeing this man as a senator, possibly even praetor in 90. Q. Publicius (13), pr. 67: B. W. Frier ("Urban Praetors and Rural Violence: The Legal Background of Cicero's *Pro Caecina,*" *TAPA* 113 [1983]: 228–29) is cited as suggesting that this man originated the *actio Publiciana,* though in fact Frier called the attribution "doubtful" and "hard to justify." C. (Publicius) Malle(olus) (18) and C. (Publicius) C. f. Mall(eolus) (19), monetales: the attributions of *RRC* have got muddled in *MRR:* (18) was the monetalis of 118 and probably father of (19), mon. 96(?) and qu. 80 (but see above, on Mattingly, "Coinage").

Sex. (Quinctilius Varus), pont. in the 60s: N. Marinone ("Il banchetto dei pontefici in Macrobio," *Maia* 22 [1970]: 271–78) plausibly eliminated this man, seeing in Macrobius' Sextus (*Sat.* 3. 13. 10) the *flamen Quirinalis* Sex. Julius Caesar (152). T. Quinctius Flamininus (47), cos. 123: Brunt (*Manpower,* p. 568) suggested a command in Gallia Cisalpina.

P. Septimius (11), qu.: Shackleton Bailey (*Two Studies,* p. 65) would identify this man with P. Septimius Scaevola (51), senator in 74. C. Servilius (12; cf. 11) and M. Servilius (18): B. has not completely digested E. Badian's intricate paper, "The House of the Servilii Gemini: A Study in the Misuse of Occam's Razor" (*PBSR* 52 [1984]: 49–71); as I understand it, C. Servilius (12) should be two men, one praetor in 102, the other augur (and a Marcus), while M. Servilius (18) should be three, the military tribune of 181, the pontifex of 170, and a legate of 203 (not L. Sergius). Cn. Servilius Caepio (47), qu. 105(?): Wiseman (*Cinna,* p. 181, n. 127) pointed to the likelihood of a date around 120. L. Sestius P. f. L. n. Quirinalis Albinianus (2 [not 3]), cos. suff. 23: Shackleton Bailey (*Two Studies,* pp. 6–7) argued that the cognomen should be "Albanianus" (contra, G. V. Sumner, in a review of Shackleton Bailey, *CP* 73 [1978]: 159). P. Sextilius (13), qu. 61: rather,

P. Sestullius; cf. S. Mitchell, "R. E. C. A. M. Notes and Studies No. 5: A Roman Family in Phrygia," *AS* 29 (1979): 13–22. C. Sextius Calvinus (210), pr. by 92: E. Badian (review of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Auctarium. Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae: Imagines* edited by A. Degrassi, *JRS* 58 [1968]: 244) showed that the praetorship (*ILS* 4015) should probably be reassigned to this man's homonymous father, the consul of 124.

Q. Terentius Culleo (43), pr. 187: L. R. Taylor (*Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: The Thirty-Five Urban and Rural Tribes* [Rome, 1960], p. 308, n. 30) noted that 188 was more likely than 189. A. Terentius Varro (82), legate 82: Badian (review of Degrassi, pp. 245–46) referred *ILS* 8773 to a quaestorship in 88 or 87. Tillius (1), senator before 35: Wiseman (*New Men,* p. 266) denied that this man was a brother of the conspirator.

M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (268), cos. 53: C. Cichorius (*Römische Studien* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1922], p. 234) dated his fifty-five-year augurate from 82/81 to 27/26. L. (Veturius?) Philo (21), qu. 102: E. Badian ("Three Non-Trials in Cicero," *Klio* 66 [1984]: 291–95) identified him as a L. (Sempronius) Pitio. L. Voluscius (1), aed.(?) before 73: E. Badian (*Gnomon* 33 [1961]: 498, in a review of the previous supplement) would emend to Volscius.[3]

The two volumes of *MRR* were and remain remarkable for their high standards of accuracy and fairness, and the *Supplement* is in no way inferior. Criticism of the work at this stage is rather beside the point. The only purpose of reviews now should be to make it even more useful, and this is but inadequate repayment for the hours of use and pleasure that these volumes have afforded. Thirty-five years and two supplements on, there can be only one major complaint: if we have read our Broughton diligently, annotation will have rendered certain pages almost illegible. But that is also something for which we should be grateful.

EDWARD CHAMPLIN
Princeton University

3. In a work of this nature there are inevitably misprints and minor addenda. *Page 15,* *L. Ampius Balbus: read "T. Ampius Balbus." *Page 18,* C. Antistius Reginus: add a reference to p. 181, on Reginus. *Page 26,* Atilius?: read "*RRC* 1. 241, no. 192 (with the date 169–158 B.C.)" (not 1. 192, no. 101 [with the date 211–210 B.C.]). *Page 36,* line 7: read "C]aecilius M. f. M[etellus]." *Page 44,* Caesetius Rufus (59): read "(5)." *Page 45,* Q. Calidius (5): correct "C." to "Q." at *MRR,* 2:83. *Page 58,* P. Claudius Pulcher (395): read "*MRR* 1 [not 2]. 374." *Page 61,* Considius (2): read "C. [not M.] Considius Longus (11)." *Page 62,* L. Cornelius L. f. Vot.: note that Q. Catulus was consul in 78 and censor in 65. *Page 65,* P. Cornelius Dolabella (139): read "cos. 283." *Page 72,* P.(?) Cornelius Scipio Salvitto Pomponianus: on the problems of identification add R. A. Billows, "The Last of the Scipios," *AJAH* 7 (1982): 53–68. *Page 76:* delete the entry on M'. Cordius Rufus (cf. p. 61). *Page 77:* read "Q. [not M.] Crepereius Rocus," and refer to *MRR,* 2:438 (not 439). *Page 81,* Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (20): read "*MRR* 1. 442" (not 422). *Page 100:* add reference to Cn. Hedius Thorus (cf. p. 187). *Page 104,* C. Hostilius Tubulus (25): the "Index of Careers" (*MRR,* 2:573) should read "Tarentum 207, Capua 207–204." *Page 111,* T. Iunius (32): read "*MRR* 2. 470" (not 490). *Page 116,* C. Laelius (2): cos. 190 (not 90). *Page 139,* Q. (Marcius) Philippus (13): read "(83)." *Page 152,* L. Octavius Ligus (69): read "(68)." *Page 152,* C. Oppius (8): read "*MRR* 1. 255" (not 155). *Page 154,* C. Papirius Carbo (33): on the family add D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "On Cicero Ad Familiares (II)," *Philologus* 114 (1970): 95. *Page 155,* M. Perperna Veiento (6): read "*MRR* 2. 67" (not 87). *Page 157,* M. Pinarius Rusca (21): at *MRR,* 2:601, read "pr. 181" (not 161). *Page 159,* L. Plautius Hypsaeus (20), pr. 138(?): in *MRR* 1 and 2 the conjectural date is 139. *Page 170,* M. Porcius Cato (16), pr. 54: note should be taken of the graffito at Rome "M. Cato quei petit tribunu plebei" (*AE* 1979, 64; cf. ibid., 63, on Catiline). *Page 176,* C. Publilius (6): read "168" (not 167). *Page 179,* Caeso Quinctius Flamininus (41): read "*MRR* 1 [not 2]. 245." *Page 190,* M. (Sempronius) Rufus?: read "*MRR* 2 [not 3]. 310." *Page 197,* P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus (93): the inscription mentioned is also *AE* 1977, 816. *Page 202,* P. Sulpicius (Rufus) (92): read "*MRR* 2. 41–42" (not 42–43). *Page 210,* Uttiedius Afer (Tedius 1): read "*MRR* 2. 466" (not 446). *Page 219,* Decius Vibellius (1): the date should be 282 (not 182). *Page 220,* C. Vibienus (3): at *MRR,* 2:498 and 634, read "58" (not 52), and refer to T. P. Wiseman, "The Potteries of Vibienus and Rufrenus at Arretium," *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963): 271. *Page 220,* Vibius (3): read "(5)."