

SOME COMMENTS ON THE *FASTI* FOR THE REIGN OF NERO¹

I. THE DURATION OF ORDINARY AND SUFFECT CONSULSHIPS UNDER NERO

IT is my intention in the first section of this paper to examine the available evidence in order to determine the lengths of tenure of the *ordinarii* and known *suffecti* for the reign of Nero. According to the latest published *fasti*,² twenty-eight *ordinarii* and some sixty *suffecti* are attested for the reign, although not all of the latter can be definitely placed in a particular year.³ It will prove most convenient for our investigation if, first of all, the relevant evidence is set out in full.⁴

A. Ordinary consuls and suffect consuls of known year

A.D. 54. *M'. Acilius Aviola; M. Asinius Marcellus*

Aviola and Marcellus were still in office on 18 June (*C.I.L.* 16. 3 = *C.R.A.I.* (1930), 131 ff.).⁵ No suffecti are listed as known for the year.

55. *Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus I; L. Antistius Vetus*

Nero is not attested in office after 22 January (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 10–14) and resigned at the end of February (Suet. *Nero* 14). N. Cestius joined Vetus in office (*C.I.L.* 4. 5513). Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus and T. Curtilius Mancina are attested in office between 6–12 December (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 15, 148; *A.F.A.* lxi = Smallwood, no. 16). Another tablet (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 16) dated to 30 December gives only Gaetulicus as consul. It is possible that Mancina left office during the last days of December.⁶

¹ I am grateful to Professor P. R. C. Weaver of the University of Tasmania for helpful discussion and valuable criticisms of the first draft of this paper. The following abbreviations have been used throughout:

A.F.A. = *Acta Fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*, ed. Henzen.

Degrassi = A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'impero romano*.

De Laet = S. J. De Laet, *De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat*.

Eck = W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian*.

Magie = D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*.

Schneider = K. T. Schneider, *Zusammensetzung des römischen Senates von Tiberius bis Nero*.

Smallwood = E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*.

Syme = R. Syme, *Tacitus*.

Thomasson = B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statt-*

halter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus.

² In this section, I follow the *fasti* as given by Smallwood, 4 ff., which is based on, but brings up to date, the list in Degrassi, 15 ff.

³ I include in my reckoning the *ordinarii* and all *suffecti* who might, on any grounds, have held office during A.D. 54 even though they were appointed by the previous emperor. (Claudius died on 13 October—cf. *P.I.R.*² C. 942.) As will be evident from Sections II and III, I disagree on a large number of the dates given by Smallwood and Degrassi, but the primary aim of this first Section is to determine the recorded months of a consul's tenure rather than the actual year, which will be dealt with in Section II.

⁴ I adopt Smallwood's practice of including the eponymous consuls immediately after the year in question.

⁵ *C.I.L.* 16. 6 even if correctly dated by Kubitschek to A.D. 54 is of no help, as the fragment containing the date has been lost.

⁶ So also Groag in *P.I.R.*² C. 1605.

56. *Q. Volusius Saturninus; P. Cornelius (Lentulus?) Scipio*

Both ordinarii were in office as late as 24 June (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 21). L. Annaeus Seneca and M. Trebellius Maximus were in office on 25 August (*Digest.* 36. 1. 1. 1 = Smallwood, no. 366; *Gai. Inst.* 2. 253 = *Inst. Inst.* 2. 23. 4). Seneca had a new colleague, P. Palfurius, on 3 September (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 46). L. Duuius Avitus and P. Clodius Thræsea Paetus are attested between 5 November and 18 December (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 22, 24-7, 32).

*57.¹ *Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus II; L. Calpurnius Piso*

Nero remained consul for the whole year (Suet. *Nero* 14 wrongly says that he resigned after six months), but Piso resigned at the end of June (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 28-33) and was replaced by L. Caesius Martialis who is attested in office between 27 July and 23 December (*C.I.L.* 10. 5204 = *I.L.S.* 5365; *C.I.L.* 6. 268; *C.I.L.* 2. 2958 = *I.L.S.* 6104; *C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 34, 36-40).

*58. *Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus III; M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus*

Nero was replaced after four months by C. Fonteius Agrippa (Suet. *Nero* 14) who is attested in office with Corvinus during May and June (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 146; *ibid.*, p. 417, where *idus Iulias* should be *idus Iunias*). A. Paconius Sabinus and A. Petronius Lurco are known to have been in office on both 14 August and 15 December (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 142, 150; *A.F.A.* lxx-lxx = Smallwood, no. 21; Th. Mommsen, 'Die pompeianischen Quittungstafeln des L. Caecilius Iucundus', *Hermes* xii (1877), 137 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, 3. 270 f.).

*59. *C. Vipstanus Apronianus; C. Fonteius Capito*

Apronianus and Capito were still in office on 23 June (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 147; *A.F.A.* lxx-lxxiv = Smallwood, nos. 21-2; *P.P.* viii (1953), 460;² *ibid.* ix (1954), 68).³ The suffecti, T. Sextius Africanus and M. Ostorius Scapula, are attested in office between 10 July and 15 December (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 143; *A.F.A.* lxxv-lxxvi = Smallwood, nos. 22, 23).

60. *Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus IV; Cossus Cornelius Lentulus*

Nero and Lentulus were in office until the end of June (Suet. *Nero* 14; Lentulus is attested as consul at least until 8 May—*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 144). No suffecti are listed as known for the year.

61. *P. Petronius Turpilianus; L. Caesennius Paetus*

No dates are available for the length of their tenure (cf. *P.I.R.*² C. 173), nor are any suffecti listed as known for the year.

62. *P. Marius Celsus; L. Afinius (or Asinius) Gallus*

Gallus is known to have been in office with Celsus at least until 2 March (*C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 151; *ibid.* 6. 16521; *P.P.* viii (1953), 460). He was still in office in late August but with a new colleague, a certain L. [A - - - -]nus

¹ An asterisk placed before a year indicates that all the suffecti are known for that year.

² G. Pugliese Carratelli, 'Tabulae Hercu-

lanenses III', *P.P.* viii (1953), 455 ff.

³ G. Pugliese Carratelli and V. Arangio-Ruiz, 'Tabulae Herculanae IV', *P.P.* ix (1954), 54 ff.

(*P.P.*, loc. cit. 458).¹ Q. Iunius Marullus is attested in office on 27 October (*C.I.L.* 10. 1549) and again, with T. Clodius Eprius Marcellus, on 4 December (*P.P.*, loc. cit. 458; *ibid.* ix [1954], 69).

63. *C. Memmius Regulus; L. Verginius Rufus*

Both were still in office on 8 May (*ibid.* ix [1954], 56). No suffectus are listed as known for the year.

64. *C. Laecanius Bassus; M. Licinius Crassus Frugi*

Both were in office on 15 June (*C.I.L.* 16. 5). No suffectus are listed as known for the year.

65. *A. Licinius Nerva Silianus Firmus Pasidienus; M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus*

The surviving evidence does not attest the pair in office after 2 February (*P.P.* viii [1953], 457); however, Atticus was still consul when he committed suicide in April (*Tac. Ann.* 15. 69. 1–2; *Suet. Nero* 35. 1). C. Pomponius Pius and C. Anicius Cerealis are known to have been in office on 13 August (*C.I.L.* 4. 2551 = *I.L.S.* 8584).

66. *C. Luccius Telesinus; C. Suetonius Paulinus (II?)*²

The extant evidence for the consulships of this pair fails to give any dates (cf. *P.I.R.*² L. 366). M. Arruntius - - - and M. Vettius Bolanus are attested in office on both 25 September and 23 November (*A.F.A.* lxxxiv = Smallwood, no. 26; *C.I.L.* 1¹. 776 = *R.E.* 17. 2. 1431, no. 131).

67. *L. Iulius Rufus; . Fonteius Capito*

Capito was certainly out of office before 20 June as Rufus had a new colleague, L. Aurelius Priscus, on that date (*A.E.* 1914, 219; cf. *C.I.L.* 6. 8639, and 10. 5405 = *I.L.S.* 6125).

68. *Ti. Catius Asconius Silius Italicus; P. Galerius Trachalus*

According to Suetonius (*Nero* 43. 2), *Nero consules ante tempus privavit honore atque in utriusque locum solus inivit consulatum, quasi fatale esset non posse Gallias debellari nisi a consule*. Inscriptional evidence points to the contrary, affirming that Nero was *suffectus* for Silius (*C.I.L.* 6. 9190; 8639 = 10. 6637).³ Silius was

¹ Gallus' tenure of the consulship for eight months was irregular for an *ordinarius* under Nero (see below), but the evidence of the tablet must be accepted as it has been by Smallwood, 5. The surviving evidence for Gallus (cf. *P.I.R.*² A. 437) is insufficient to explain his extended tenure.

² I see no reason why this cannot be the general Suetonius Paulinus (*suff.* shortly after A.D. 41). No son of the same name is attested (see *P.I.R.*¹ S. 694). For the contrary view, De Laet. nos. 1544, 1545; A. R. Birley, 'The Roman Governors of Britain', *Epigraphische Studien* iv (1967), 66.

³ According to the editors of *C.I.L.* 6. 8639 and 10. 6637, Nero's name has been erased on the inscription as a result of the *abolitio memoriae* which followed his death. A number of undated inscriptions attest

Italicus and Trachalus in office together (*I.L.S.* 5025; 9059 = *C.I.L.* 16, p. 146, 12. For an explanation of the latter see G. B. Townend, 'The Consuls of A.D. 69/70', *A.J.Ph.* lxxxiii (1962), 118). It is uncertain whether Italicus was Trachalus' colleague in *I.L.S.* 6125 = *C.I.L.* 10. 5405. Another inscription (*C.I.L.* 3. 7005) records the following—*CCC/RIII/ITALIC COS*. The editor comments: 'Fortasse, ut observat editor, *Italico cos.*, Neronis nomine scilicet suppresso.' This must remain highly doubtful as evidence since it cannot be dated, there is no trace of any colleague, and it is not even certain whether it belongs to the Italicus presently under discussion. Trust should rather be placed on those inscriptions cited in the text above. Cf. Hohl, *R.E.* suppl. 3, 391 who says Nero was consul 'ohne Kollegen'.

replaced probably in April.¹ Nero died on 9 June (cf. *P.I.R.*² D. 129). C. Bellicus Natalis and P. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus were in office between 15 October and 22 December (*C.I.L.* 6. 471 = *I.L.S.* 238; *C.I.L.* 6. 30469; *ibid.* 10. 770 = 16. 7 = *I.L.S.* 1988).

B. *Suffect consuls of uncertain year*²

C. Fuufius? (Fufius?)	}	In office during early September.
Cn. Minicius		(<i>A.E.</i> [1919], 51; <i>ibid.</i> [1920], 42)
P. Volasenna		Months unknown
Q. Futius	}	Months unknown
P. Calvisius		
L. Iunius Gallio Annaeanus	}	In office on 27 August. (<i>C.I.L.</i> 4. 3340, Tab. 45; <i>A.E.</i> [1960], 61-2)
T. (not C.) Cutius Ciltus		
M. Aefulanus		Months unknown
M. Vettius Niger		Months unknown
M. Iunius Silanus	}	Months unknown
A. [- - -]		
Lurius Varus		Months unknown
Pompeius Paulinus		Months unknown
P. Sulpicius Scribonius Proculus		Months unknown
Sulpicius Scribonius Rufus		Months unknown
C. Velleius Paterculus	}	In office on both 15 July and 2
M. Manilius Vopiscus		September. (<i>A.E.</i> 1929, 161; <i>P.P.</i> i [1946], 381 ³ = Smallwood, no. 433a; <i>P.P.</i> loc. cit. 382)
Cn. Pedanius Salinator	}	In office on both 2 July and 1 (?)
L. Velleius Paterculus		August (<i>I.L.S.</i> 1897 = <i>C.I.L.</i> 16. 4 = 3, p. 845 = Smallwood, no. 296; <i>C.I.L.</i> 1 ¹ . 776 b = <i>R.E.</i> 17. 2. 1431, no. 130)
A. Ducenius Geminus		Months unknown

¹ Galba was called to arms by Vindex at the end of March (Suet. *Galba* 9. 2; Plut. *Galba* 4-5; Dio. 63. 23) and declared himself *legatus S.P.Q.R.* on 2 April (Dio 64. 6. 52; Plut. *Galba* 5. 2; Suet. *Galba* 10. 1-2; cf. Dio. 63. 23; Plut. *Galba* 22. 2). Nero would have heard of the revolt in Spain towards the middle of the month. (Cf. the journey of Icelus from Rome to Spain in seven days—Suet. *Galba* 22; Plut. *Galba* 7. 1-3). Nero probably assumed the consulship during April, for the context of Suet. *Nero* 43. 2 suggests that the emperor took office at some time before he heard of the outcome of

the battle of Vesontio which took place probably about the middle of May. (For this date, I am largely in agreement with the arguments of H. Mattingly, 'Verginius at Lugdunum?', *N.C.*⁶ xiv [1954], 32 ff. and P. A. Brunt, 'The Revolt of Vindex and the Fall of Nero', *Latomus* xviii [1959], 541).

² I include in this place only the evidence indicating the months of a particular *suffect's* tenure. For more detailed discussion of the various individuals, see Section II.

³ G. Pugliese Carratelli, 'Tabulae Herculanenses I', *P.P.* i (1946), 373 ff.

Q. Manlius Tarquinius Saturninus	}	In office on 14 July. (<i>P.P.</i> i [1946], 381; <i>P.P.</i> viii [1953], 460)
T. Petronius Niger		
Appius Annius Gallus	}	In office on 23 August. (<i>C.I.L.</i> 6. 10055 = <i>I.L.S.</i> 5284)
L. Verulanus Severus		
Caesennius (or Caesonius) Maximus		Months unknown
(M. Annius) Afrinus	}	In office on 6 July (<i>C.I.L.</i> 4. 1544)
(C. Paccius) Africanus		
C. Licinius Mucianus	}	In office on both 10 July and 1 October (<i>P.P.</i> i [1946], 381; <i>P.P.</i> viii [1953], 456)
Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer		
Hordeonius Flaccus		Months unknown
Rubrius Gallus		Months unknown
Vibius Crispus		Months unknown
Ti. Ant{t}ius	}	In office in early June (<i>C.I.L.</i> 1 ¹ . 776 aa = <i>R.E.</i> 17. 2. 1433, no. 141); but see Section II
Q. Vibius		
M. Aponius Saturninus		Months unknown
Acilius		Months unknown

Thus far the evidence. But to what conclusions does it lead? First of all, the *ordinarii*. At *Nero* 15. 2, Suetonius records: *consulatum in senos plerumque menses dedit*—that is to say, ordinary consulships were held from the beginning of January until the end of June, at which time suffect consuls assumed the *fascēs*. His word ought not to be doubted without good reason,¹ for as the above list shows, there is abundant evidence directly attesting consuls assuming office in July under Nero—e.g. L. Caesius Martialis (A.D. 57); Paconius Sabinus and Petronius Lurco (A.D. 58); Sextius Africanus and Ostorius Scapula (A.D. 59); C. Velleius Paternulus and Manilius Vopiscus; Pedanius Salinator and L. Velleius Paternulus; Tarquinius Saturninus and Petronius Niger; Annius Afrinus and Paccius Africanus and Licinius Mucianus and Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer.² Only two of the twenty-eight *ordinarii* can be shown on the evidence presented above to have held office for longer than six months, namely Nero himself in A.D. 57 and Gallus in A.D. 62.

A table will serve to clarify the evidence for *ordinarii* presented above:

Year	<i>Ordinarii</i>	Length of tenure (months)
55	Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus I	2
	L. Antistius Vetus	6
56	Q. Volusius Saturninus	6
	P. Cornelius (Lentulus?) Scipio	6

¹ His testimony has been accepted, but without detailed examination, by M. Hammond, *The Antonine Monarchy*, 291, 305 n. 16, and Townend, *A.J.Ph.*, loc. cit., 114.

² I assume here some of the conclusions of

Section II below. The list could easily be conflated by the addition of those suffecti who are directly attested in office during August. (See what follows in Section I.)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Ordinarii</i>	<i>Length of tenure (months)</i>
57	Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus II	12
	L. Calpurnius Piso	6
58	Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus III	4
	M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus	6
59	C. Vipstanus Apronianus	6
	C. Fonteius Capito	6
60	Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus IV	6
	Cossus Cornelius Lentulus	6
61	P. Petronius Turpilianus	6
	L. Caesennius Paetus	6
62	P. Marius Celsus	6
	L. Afinius (or Asinius) Gallus	8
63	C. Memmius Regulus	6
	L. Verginius Rufus	6
64	C. Laecanius Bassus	6
	M. Licinius Crassus Frugi	6
65	A. Licinius Nerva Silianus Firmus Pasidienus	6
	M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus	4? ²
66	C. Luccius Telesinus	6
	C. Suetonius Paulinus II	6
67	L. Iulius Rufus	6
	. Fonteius Capito	? (Less than full 6)
68	Ti. Catus Asconius Silius Italicus	c. 4
	P. Galerius Trachalus	6

Thus of the fourteen years under examination, *both* ordinary consuls held office for six months in seven of those years (i.e. A.D. 56, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, and 66). If Nero's irregular consulships be discounted, the figure increases to ten years out of the fourteen (add A.D. 55, 57, and 58), and each of the remaining four years can also exhibit one *ordinarius* in office for six months (i.e. A.D. 62, 65, 67, and 68). Suetonius' statement that *ordinarii* usually held office for the first six months of the year is therefore true, with a few exceptions.¹

Next, the *suffecti*. During the reign of Nero, not only was a July suffectio regular but it is also known that towards the end of Claudius' reign, a November/December suffectio, i.e. of two months' duration, was becoming usual.² Let us propound a hypothesis. Let it be assumed that suffect consulships during the reign of Nero were normally of two, four, or six months' duration, i.e. July/August, September/October, and November/December or any combination of these which will add up to four- or six-monthly periods, e.g. July/October, September/December, etc.³

How does this accord with the evidence presented above? In A.D. 55, Cestius was *suffectus* for four months between March and June as a result of Nero's early

¹ The exceptions are: three of Nero's four

consulships (A.D. 55, 57, and 58); the extended consulship of Gallus (A.D. 62); the death of M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus (A.D. 65); the resignation of Fonteius Capito (A.D. 67), and the forced resignation of Silius Italicus

(A.D. 68).

² Suet. *Claud.* 46; *Vesp.* 4. 2.

³ The truth of this hypothesis was assumed in passing by Townend, *A.J.Ph.*, loc. cit. 114, 117 n. 11, 123, but without elucidation.

resignation, and Gaetulicus and Mancina were in office for at least November and December. In A.D. 56, Seneca and Maximus were July/August suffecti, Seneca and Palfurius were the September/October pair and Duvius and Thrasea Paetus were the November/December pair. In A.D. 57, Martialis was suffect during May and June as a result again of the emperor's shortened tenure, and Sabinus and Lurco held office for the six months between July and December. For A.D. 60 and 61, no suffecti are certainly allocated. In A.D. 62, L. [A - - - -]nus was suffect in July/August and Marullus and Eprius Marcellus were in office between September and December.¹ Smallwood allocates no suffecti to A.D. 63 or 64. In A.D. 65, Pius and Cerealis were suffecti for at least July and August. In A.D. 66, Arruntius and Bolanus were suffecti between September and December. The tenure of Aurelius Priscus in A.D. 67 is uncertain. In A.D. 68, Nero was an irregular suffect from *c.* April until perhaps the date of his death, i.e. 9 June. Natalis and Asiaticus were probably suffecti for the period September/December.²

Next, let us turn to those suffecti listed by Smallwood as being of uncertain year. Fuufius (?) and Minicius, if Neronian, were September/October suffecti; Gallio and Ciltus were a July/August pair; Paterculus and Vopiscus were a July/October pair; Salinator and Paterculus, Saturninus and Niger, Gallus and Severus, and Afrinus and Africanus were July/August suffecti. Mucianus and Macer were in office between July and October. Ti. Ant{t}ius and Q. Vibius are attested for June but they should almost certainly be expunged from the Neronian *fasti* (see Section II).

The evidence set forth above would seem to support our hypothesis. Two objections, however, must be answered. Firstly, is there any evidence for a tenure of three months, i.e. can different suffecti be detected in office during September and October? The answer from the above is clearly in the negative. Secondly, will the hypothesis accommodate all known Neronian *suffecti*? For the purposes of this investigation, let us take as our basic unit the *vacancy*

¹ Eprius Marcellus is only directly attested for November/December, but there is no cogent reason why he was not Marullus' partner for the September/October suffectation as well. Compare the four months' tenures of Mucianus and Macer and of M. Arruntius and M. Vettius Bolanus.

² This pair was not one of those designated by Nero (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 77; Plut. *Otho* 1. 2) but was installed by Galba. The appointment of Natalis who came from Vienna (cf. *P.I.R.*² B. 101) was clearly the result of Galba's efforts to honour that city for its allegiance (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 65; cf. Townend, *A.J.Ph.*, loc. cit. 117). However, *pace* Townend, it is not necessary to assume that their tenure was of only three months' duration, i.e. from October to December, just because the surviving evidence (cf. *P.I.R.*² B. 101) directly attests them in office during these months. A regular pair of Neronian suffecti would presumably have come into office on 1 July. (Unfortunately no evidence as to their identity has survived.)

If Natalis and Asiaticus did become suffecti on 1 October, their predecessors would have held office for either three months (if the regular July suffecti continued in office) or for one month (if a further pair assumed office in September). No evidence for such irregular lengths of tenure is known (cf. Smallwood, 4 ff.; Degraffi, 15 ff.). Nor should too much weight be placed on the fact that Galba did not arrive in Rome until about September (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 6). Although absent from Rome, Galba as elected emperor must surely have had the final say regarding those who would hold the consulship after the initial two months' tenure of those in office during July and August. Therefore the interpretation presented in the text is equally as plausible as that propounded by Townend. On the above view, then, Galba's system of symmetrical consular terms with periods of three months (on which see further Townend, 118 ff.) did not begin until the beginning of A.D. 69.

which we will define as the tenure of one suffect consulship for a period of two months.

If we take first of all the list given by Smallwood, the following emerges:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of vacancies</i>
54	6
55	4
56	0
57	0
58	0
59	0
60	6
61	6
62	0
63	6
64	6
65	4 ¹
66	2
67	6
68	2
Total	<u>48</u>

Thus there are forty-eight possible unfilled positions each of two months' duration. Next, from Smallwood's list of consuls who cannot be assigned with certainty to a definite year, let us count all those suffects who might be Neronian, i.e. any whose dates can be assigned on any grounds to a time after the beginning of A.D. 54. Thirty-six possible suffects are forthcoming.² Therefore, on the assumption that each of these held office for the minimum period of two months, we need at least thirty-six *vacancies*. In fact, it is necessary to reduce the forty-eight unfilled positions by four since C. Licinius Mucianus and Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer are attested in office for four months, and so are C. Velleius Paterculus and M. Manilius Vopiscus. Therefore we have forty-four *vacancies* and thirty-six candidates for them.

More important, however, is the result obtained from an examination of the revisions for the *fasti* as set out in Section III. First of all the *vacancies*, which can be examined more easily by the use of a table:

¹ There is no evidence to suggest whether Vestinus Atticus, who committed suicide in April, was or was not replaced. Nero's practice in such cases seems ambiguous, for on the one hand there is Suetonius' report (*Nero* 15. 2) that on one occasion *defunctoque circa Kal. Ian. altero e consulibus neminem substituit improbens exemplum vetus Canini Rebili uno die consulis*, while on the other hand it is known that when Fonteius Capito left office before the end of six months in A.D. 67, he was replaced by L. Aurelius Priscus.

² They are: C. Fuufius? (Fufius?); Cn. Minicius; P. Volasenna; Q. Futius; P. Calvisius; L. Iunius Gallio Annaeanus; M. Aefulanus; M. Vettius Niger; M. Iunius

Silanus; A. - - - - ; Lurii Varus; Pompeius Paulinus; P. Sulpicius Scribonius Proculus; Sulpicius Scribonius Rufus; C. Velleius Paterculus; M. Manilius Vopiscus; Cn. Pedanius Salinator; L. Velleius Paterculus; A. Ducenius Geminus; Q. Manlius Tarquitiu Saturninus; T. Petronius Niger; Appius Annii Gallus; L. Verulanus Severus; Caesennius (or Caesonius) Maximus; (M. Annii) Afrinus; (C. Paccii) Africanus; C. Licinius Mucianus; Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer; Hordeonius Flaccus; Rubrius Gallus; Vibius Crispus; Ti. Ant{t}ius; Q. Vibius; M. Aponius Saturninus; Acilius.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of vacancies</i>
54	5
55	2
56	0
57	0
58	0
59	0
60	2
61	4
62	0
63	4
64	2
65	4
66	0
67	4
68	2
Total	<hr/> 29 <hr/>

The number of possible *suffects* is now fifteen.¹ Indeed, this number might well be reduced to twelve or less as there are ten possible candidates² for the seven *vacancies* still available in the years A.D. 54 and 55.

Our hypothesis can clearly accommodate all the known *suffecti* and at the same time allow for any possible extended tenures (such as Arruntius and Vettius Bolanus in A.D. 66) or for any Neronian consuls who have perhaps so far remained unattested.³ Therefore the second objection can also be easily countered and our hypothesis can become a theory.

II. THE DATES OF KNOWN NERONIAN SUFFECTS

In this section, I intend to re-examine the dates given for those *suffects* listed as Neronian by Smallwood. I include her dates for comparison.⁴

‘Between 47 and 58’ { C. Fuufius? (Fufius?)
 { Cn. Minicius

If these two consuls are in fact Neronian, and there is considerable doubt (see Stein in *P.I.R.*² F. 508; the editor of *A.E.* (1920), 42 prefers a Claudian date and dates as early as the reign of Tiberius have even been suggested—see Fluss, *R.E.* 15. 2. 1810 f.), then Smallwood’s date (following Degraffi, 13) is far too inaccurate. The evidence for their tenure confirms them in office on

¹ C. Fuufius? (Fufius?); Cn. Minicius; Q. Futius; P. Calvisius; A. Ducenius Geminus; M. Iunius Silanus; Pompeius Paulinus; P. Sulpicius Scribonius Proculus; Sulpicius Scribonius Rufus; Hordeonius Flaccus; Vibius Crispus; Caesennius (or Caesonius) Maximus; M. Aponius Saturninus; Rubrius Gallus; Acilius Glabrio.

² See the first ten *suffects* listed in the previous note.

³ On this possibility see the sagacious remarks of R. Syme, ‘Governors of Pannonia

Inferior’, *Historia* xiv (1965), 355, referring to the reigns of Hadrian and Pius. The principle stands true for the reign of Nero as well.

⁴ In the interest of brevity, I have deliberately kept at a minimum the citation of evidence in this section and consequently I have only quoted that evidence from the careers of the various individuals which is directly relevant for the dating of their consulship.

V[i]d. S[ept.]. As can be seen below (see Section III), all the suffecti for A.D. 56, 57, and 58 are known, and so if the pair under discussion are Neronian consuls, there is space for them both in A.D. 54 and 55. Since it is not possible on the available evidence (see *P.I.R.*, loc. cit.; *R.E.*, loc. cit.) to attain further certainty, let their revised date be—'Between 47 and 55'.

'53 or 54' P. Volasenna¹

Volasenna's consular date is computed from the lapse in time between holding the consulship and holding the governorship of Asia. Under Nero this was between nine and ten years, although it could be as many as eleven.² He was governor at some time between A.D. 60 and 62/3.³ Now Volasenna definitely preceded M'. Acilius Aviola (*cos. ord.* A.D. 54) as governor of Asia and the latter can be assigned to the years A.D. 65/6.⁴ Since it was normal practice that the senior surviving consular was allotted Asia or Africa,⁵ Volasenna must have been consul before A.D. 54 and therefore cannot have been a Neronian consul.⁶

'Before 52 or between 53 and 55' { Q. Futius
P. Calvisius

The evidence (*C.I.L.* 10. 827 = *I.L.S.* 6384) for the consular date of this pair depends on the list of known *duumviri* for Pompeii. Unfortunately this list is fragmentary and the relevant section covering the period of Futius and Calvisius is missing (see Groag, *P.I.R.*² C. 344; *R.E.* 3. 1. 1410; *ibid.* 7. 1. 406 f.).⁷ No revision therefore is possible for Smallwood's date.

'55 or 56' { L. Iunius Gallio Annaeanus
T. Cutius Ciltus

Recent inscriptional evidence and a revised reading of *C.I.L.* 4. 3340, tab. 45 definitely place this pair in office during August A.D. 55.⁸ The reconstructed inscription also shows that the praenomen of Cutius should be T. not C. (as given by Smallwood, 7).

'Under Claudius or Nero' M. Aefulanus

The date of his consulship is calculated from his tenure of the governorship of Asia which took place after A.D. 66.⁹ According to the intervals operating for the reign,¹⁰ his consulship can be placed between A.D. 54 and 57.¹¹ However,

¹ Degrassi, 14, gives his praenomen as C. or P.; *P.I.R.*¹ V. 616 prefers C.; Schneider, no. 372, is uncertain, as is De Laet, no. 1166.

² See further, Thomasson, i. 22 ff.; Eck, 82 ff.

³ See the *fasti* given by Magie, ii. 1582, and his remarks at ii. 1422 n. 77. W. H. Waddington, *Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques de l'Empire Romain*, no. 90, suggested A.D. 62/3—he is followed by De Laet, no. 1166, and Schneider, no. 372.

⁴ Magie, ii. 1582.

⁵ For this principle see the list of Asian governors with consular dates given by Syme, App. 23; also *Historia*, xiv (1965), 349.

⁶ Indeed, if the *fasti* as given by Magie, ii. 1582, is correct, the consulship of Volasenna

should be placed 'before 52' as his successor in Asia, Barea Soranus, was consul in that year (Smallwood, 4).

⁷ Cf. De Laet, no. 1016, who would place them in A.D. 54 or 55.

⁸ L. Moretti, 'Vicus Cornicularius', *Arch. Class.* x (1958), 231 f. = *A.E.* 1960, 61–2 and E. M. Smallwood, 'Consules Suffecti of A.D. 55', *Historia* xvii (1968), 384, clarifying *C.I.L.* 4. 3340 tab. 45. The date is accepted in *P.I.R.*² I. 757. Cf. Degrassi, 15, who gave 'A.D. 53–5' as did De Laet, no. 1030. Syme, 839, thought 'c. A.D. 54'.

⁹ Magie, ii. 1582.

¹⁰ See above, n. 2.

¹¹ No date is given in *P.I.R.*² A. 115, by De Laet, no. 930, or by von Rohden, *R.E.* 1. 1. 476.

A.D. 56 and 57 already have their full complements of suffects (see Section III). As he follows M'. Acilius Aviola (*cos. ord.* A.D. 54) in the Asian *fasti*, he is certainly Neronian. Further, his consulship must come before that of C. Fonteius Agrippa in A.D. 58 (Smallwood, 5) and that of A. Ducenius Geminus which falls in either late A.D. 54 or during September and October A.D. 55 (see below). It must therefore be placed in A.D. 54.

'Under Claudius or Nero' M. Vettius Niger

Niger's proconsulship of Asia can be definitely placed before A.D. 61/2.¹ This is clearly too early for him to have been consul under Nero. A Claudian date must be assigned for his tenure.²

'Before 56' { M. Iunius Silanus
A. - - - -

The inscription attesting this consular pair (*C.I.L.* 14. 3471 = *F.I.R.A.* 3. 124 = Bruns⁷ 156) dates them to a time before A.D. 56. The missing colleague might hold a clue for the date. An improved reading of *C.I.L.* 14. 3471 made by Hülsen gives—*M. Iunio Silano, A. [.] cos.* It has been suggested that the hitherto unknown colleague is A. Ducenius Geminus.³ No proof was then adduced, but it was not lacking. A. Ducenius Geminus was proconsul of Asia at some time between A.D. 66 and 68, most likely in A.D. 67/8.⁴ A consular date *c.* A.D. 56–7 is immediately possible. Further, as governor he preceded C. Fonteius Agrippa who was consul in A.D. 58 (see above) and was the successor to M. Aefulanus (see above). His consulship must therefore fall before A.D. 58. As pointed out above, vacancies for suffects in A.D. 56 and 57 have already been filled. Furthermore, since both Aefulanus and Geminus succeed M'. Acilius Aviola in the Asian *fasti*,⁵ they must have held their consulships after him, i.e. most probably after June A.D. 54. The consulships of M. Iunius Silanus and A. Ducenius Geminus, therefore, belong in the latter half of A.D. 54 or in the only vacancy for A.D. 55, i.e. September/October. The consulate/proconsulate of Asia interval tends to favour A.D. 55 but until stronger evidence is forthcoming, let their new date be '54 or 55'.⁶

'Before 56' Lurius Varus

Very little survives concerning Lurius Varus (see *P.I.R.*² L. 428; *R.E.* 13. 2. 1853).⁷ At *Ann.* 13. 32. 3, Tacitus reports *redditor ordini Lurius Varus consularis, avaritiae criminibus olim percussus*. It is therefore extremely unlikely that Lurius was a Neronian consul, as the Tacitean passage is dated to A.D. 57 and the expulsion has gone unmentioned in the Neronian books of the *Annals*. His

¹ Magie, ii. 1421 n. 72, 1582.

² A date *c.* A.D. 50–1 is suggested by the normal interval. Niger's predecessor, C. (or A.) Pompeius Longinus Gallus, was *cos. ord.* in A.D. 49 (Smallwood, 3) and his successor P. Volasenna was consul most likely before A.D. 52 (see above). Hanslik's date of A.D. 47 is far too early (*R.E.* 8. A. 2. 1861). Cf. *P.I.R.*¹ V. 334, Schneider, no. 534, and De Laet, no. 1148, who prefer 'Before 63'.

³ By R. Syme, 'Missing Persons (P.–W. VIII. A)', *Historia* v (1956), 210; also in his review of A. Jagenteufel, *Die Stadt. Dalmatia, Gnomon* xxxi (1959), 518. See as well, *P.I.R.*²

I. 834.

⁴ Magie, ii. 1582. I adopt Groag's suggestion (*P.I.R.*² D. 201) of A.D. 67/8 as the correct year for his governorship.

⁵ Magie, ii. 1582.

⁶ Cf. De Laet, no. 1008, who gives 'c. A.D. 56/7', which is demonstrably wrong. Groag, *R.E.* 5. 2. 1754 f., would place Geminus in 'one of the first years of Nero'.

⁷ Groag's attempt ('Prosopographische Bemerkungen', *W.S.* 1 [1932], 202 ff.) to identify him with a personage under Gaius has found little favour; e.g. see Petersen, *P.I.R.*² L. 428.

return by Nero was presumably a gesture for acquiring popularity through the repatriation of persons exiled under the previous rule. I would suggest therefore that his date now be read as 'Before 54'.¹

'Before 56' Pompeius Paulinus

Paulinus was governor of Lower Germany definitely in A.D. 56 (*N.d.S.* 1887, 221)² and perhaps as early as A.D. 55.³ He was still there in the spring of A.D. 57 as his successor L. Duvius Avitus could not have arrived before that time.⁴

There are some indications that Paulinus might have been consul under Claudius. Firstly, his family was favoured by that emperor (*Plin. N.H.* 33. 143; *P.I.R.*¹ P. 479–80); next, prior to Paulinus' governorship, the interval between the consulship and the Lower Germany position seems always to have been quite lengthy,⁵ and finally it is worth noting that Paulinus was the brother-in-law of Seneca, who does seem to have been influential in the patronage of provincial governorships during the last years of Claudius.⁶ Perhaps a date *c.* A.D. 53;⁷ nevertheless a Neronian date cannot be discounted.⁸ The remaining unfilled suffection for A.D. 55, i.e. September/October, is clearly too late for a governor who is attested in A.D. 56 and who may have been in his province even the year before. Let his new date, therefore, be '53 or 54'.⁹

'Before 56' P. Sulpicius Scribonius Proculus

Proculus and his brother Rufus (see below) were consuls before A.D. 58 (*Tac. Ann.* 13. 48). This date can be narrowed down further as the years A.D. 56 and 57 have no vacancies (see Section III). The extant evidence for Proculus (*P.I.R.*¹ S. 217; *R.E.* 2. A. 1. 888 ff.) gives no further clue to the date of his consulship. He might be Neronian as his predecessors in Upper Germany—L. Antistius Vetus and T. Curtilius Mancia—were also Neronian consuls,¹⁰ but a Claudian date cannot be discounted.¹¹ Although I am inclined to favour a Neronian date, neither possibility seems capable of proof at present. His consular date must remain as 'Before 56'.

'Before 56' Sulpicius Scribonius Rufus

For the evidence confirming a consulship before A.D. 56 see above on Proculus. What else is known about Rufus (*P.I.R.*¹ S. 219; *R.E.* 2. A. 1. 890 f.)

¹ P. A. Brunt, 'Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate', *Historia* x (1961), 225, also prefers a Claudian date.

² See also E. Ritterling, *Fasti des römischen Deutschland unter dem Prinzipat*, 49.

³ So Hanslik, *R.E.* 21. 2. 2281.

⁴ Ritterling, *op. cit.* 50 f., no. 8; R. Syme, 'Pliny the Procurator', *H.S.C.Ph.* lxxiii (1969), 206.

⁵ Ritterling, 45 ff. On the other hand, it ought to be remembered that Duvius Avitus probably took up his governorship within a year after his consulship, which was held during November and December A.D. 56 (Smallwood, 4).

⁶ See Syme, 591; *Colonial Élites*, 20.

⁷ So Syme, 591, 786; *H.S.C.Ph.*, loc. cit. 206.

⁸ Ritterling, 49, no. 7 prefers A.D. 54, as does Hanslik, *R.E.* 21. 2. 2281. Schneider, no. 500, gives no date but thinks that the governorship came quickly after the consulate. If Paulinus was consul under Nero, he will have to have held office during November and December A.D. 54.

⁹ Whatever the year of his consulship, Paulinus was certainly designated by Claudius.

¹⁰ Ritterling, 51, prefers a Neronian date. See also Groag, *R.E.* 2. A. 1. 889. For the governorships of Vetus and Mancia, Ritterling, 16 f., nos. 8–9.

¹¹ Schneider, no. 365, would like to place him before A.D. 50, but his argument betrays an inadequate knowledge of the *fasti* for the reigns of Claudius and Nero.

gives no hint of his consular date. Possible support for a Neronian date comes from the fact that his predecessors in Lower Germany were also consuls under Nero,¹ but as with his brother, a Claudian date is also possible.² No new date can be offered.

'60?' { C. Velleius Paterculus
 { M. Manilius Vopiscus

This pair certainly belong to A.D. 60. (Sen. *N.Q.* 7. 28. 3 records the appearance of a comet *Paterculo et Vopisco consulibus*. This comet must be the same one mentioned by Tacitus, *Ann.* 14. 22. 1, under the year A.D. 60.³ They are attested in office between 15 July and 2 September (*N.d.S.* 1928, 388 = *A.E.* 1929, 161; *P.P.* i (1946), 382).

'Almost certainly 61' { Cn. Pedanius Salinator
 { L. Velleius Paterculus

Most definitely A.D. 61. (*C.I.L.* 16. 4 = *I.L.S.* 1987 = Smallwood, no. 296 attests them as consuls when Nero's titles read . . . *trib. pot. VII imp. VII cos. IIII* The emperor's fourth consulship was held in A.D. 60 and so Velleius and Salinator must have been consuls some time after Nero resigned at the end of June (see above). However Nero did not become *trib. pot. VII* until 4 December A.D. 60.⁴ Therefore the above pair must have held office between 4 December A.D. 60 and 4 December A.D. 61, that is to say A.D. 61).⁵ The same inscription places them in office on 2 July and a *tessera* shows them as consuls on 1 (?) August (*C.I.L.* 1.¹ 776b = *R.E.* 17. 2. 1431, no. 130).

'Before 62' A. Ducenius Geminus

For his date as A.D. 54 or 55, see above.

'c. 62' { Q. Manlius Tarquinius Saturninus
 { T. Petronius Niger

Convincing argument has recently shown that the Petronius Niger above should be identified with the Petronius 'Arbiter' of Tacitus (*Ann.* 16. 18. 1) and the author of the *Satyricon*.⁶ Thus the date of the above pair is of interest not only to historians.

¹ Ritterling, 49, nos. 7-8; 51.

² Cf. Schneider, no. 366. De Laet, nos. 1109-10, suggests no date for either brother.

³ For a survey of earlier scholarship on this passage from Seneca see M. Hammond, 'The Tribunician Day During the Early Empire', *M.A.A.R.* xv (1938), 28 ff. The text of Seneca has been rightly supported by its most recent editor T. H. Corcoran, Loeb edition ad loc. For acceptance of the above date, Hanslik, *R.E.* 8. A. 1. 660; R. Seager, *Tiberius*, 267; G. V. Sumner, 'The Truth About Velleius Paterculus', *H.S.C.Ph.* lxxiv (1970), 278 n. 124, 297; more cautiously, Degrassi, 16 f.; Syme, 786. C. Velleius Paterculus is known to have been *leg. Aug. leg. III Aug.* at some time after A.D. 39, possibly even after A.D. 45 (*C.I.L.* 8. 10311;

for the latter date, Thomasson, ii. 147) which is no impediment to a consulship held in A.D. 60.

⁴ Nero dated his tribunician power from 4 December A.D. 54. See further, M. Hammond, *M.A.A.R.* loc. cit., 23 ff.

⁵ For this year also, M. Hammond, *M.A.A.R.*, loc. cit. 29 ff.; Groag, *R.E.* 19. 1. 23; Hanslik, *ibid.* 8. A. 1. 660; with hesitation, Degrassi, 17. Cf. Syme, 786, suggesting '60 or 61' and G. Pugliese Carratelli, *P.P.* i (1946), 382.

⁶ See K. F. C. Rose, 'The Author of the *Satyricon*', *Latomus* xx (1961), 821 ff., with full bibliography. Also identifying Petronius as Neronian, H. D. Rankin, 'On Tacitus' Biography of Petronius', *C. & M.* xxvi (1965), 233 ff.

Saturninus and Petronius are known in office on 14 July (*P.P.* i [1946], 381; viii (1953), 458, 460). Neither of the above tablets, however, gives a year. Petronius' governorship of Bithynia gives no clue to his consular date since it cannot be dated itself,¹ but his tenure of the *fascēs* must have been before A.D. 66, the year in which he committed suicide. Saturninus' career is more fruitful, for it is known that he was governor of Africa in A.D. 71/2.² When due allowance is made for the normal lapse of time between the consulate and the proconsulate of Africa,³ a date *c.* A.D. 61 can be assumed for the former office. But two suffecti are already attested in office during July of this year (see above on Salinator and Paterculus), so a further date, A.D. 62, has been suggested⁴ and accepted.⁵ However, there is conclusive evidence against this date, for, as shown above (Section I), both *ordinarii* in A.D. 62 did not resign at the end of June as usual, but Afinius Gallus remained in office with a new colleague L. [A - - - -] - nus and they were still in office in late August. Since Saturninus and Petronius held office together in July, they cannot possibly have been suffecti in this year. In what year then? The years A.D. 57-9 already have their full complements of *suffecti*, July suffecti are known for A.D. 60 (see above on Paterculus and Vopiscus), 61 (see above on Salinator and Paterculus), and 65 (see Section I) which is the last year Petronius could have been consul. Therefore we are left with the years A.D. 63 and 64. The consulate/proconsulate of Africa interval strongly supports the former and this accords with the available evidence for C. Licinius Mucianus and Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer who are more conveniently fitted in as the regular July suffecti for A.D. 64 (see below).

'Between 63 and 68' { Appius Annius Gallus
L. Verulanus Severus

The evidence shows this pair as suffect consuls on 23 August (*C.I.L.* 6. 10055 = *I.L.S.* 5284). They were, therefore, regular July suffecti. Since T. Petronius Niger and Q. Manlius Tarquinius Saturninus were the July suffecti for A.D. 63, C. Licinius Mucianus and Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer for A.D. 64 (see below), and C. Pomponius Pius and C. Anicius Cerealis are attested for A.D. 65 (*C.I.L.* 4. 2551 = *I.L.S.* 8584), Gallus and Severus must belong to some year between A.D. 65 and 68, i.e. either A.D. 66 or 67. I have suggested below that it is most probable that C. Paccius Africanus and M. Annius Afrinus are the July suffecti for A.D. 67. Therefore we are left with A.D. 66 as the consular year of Gallus and Severus.⁶

¹ See the *fasti* given by Magie, ii. 1590 f. The only governor of the late 50s and early 60s who can be securely dated is M. Tarquinius Priscus in A.D. 59/60.

² For the date, *I. R. T.* 300; Thomasson, ii. 46 f.; Eck, 89 f.

³ The normal interval between the consulate and the proconsulate of Africa at this time was between eight and ten years—see Thomasson, i. 29 f.; Eck, 89 f. The twelve-year interval for L. Calpurnius Piso (*cos. ord.* A.D. 57; governor A.D. 69/70) is unusual (Thomasson, ii. 44 f.; Eck, 89). The interval clearly shortens after this time to the usual eight to ten years. (See the list in Eck, loc. cit.)

⁴ Syme, 743. At 387 n. 6 he says '*c.* 62'.

⁵ e.g. by Rose, loc. cit. 822, and Smallwood, 7. Degraasi, 17 f., allots Niger to '*c.* 62' but also includes a C.? Petronius Arbiter whom he assigns to 'prima del 66'.

⁶ Syme, 826, and 'Missing Persons II (P.-W. VIII. A. 2)', *Historia* viii (1959), 207, also favours A.D. 66. Cf. Schneider, no. 493, who suggests 'Between 62 and 70'; De Laet, no. 1294, prefers 'Between 62 and 69'; Ritterling, 21, opts for 'Between 64 and 68', as does Klebs, *R.E.* 1. 2. 2268, while Groag, *P.I.R.*² A. 653 thinks 'Between 62 and 64' or 'Between 66 and 69'.

'Before 65' Caesennius (or Caesonius) Maximus

Maximus is attested as a consular in A.D. 65 (Tac. *Ann.* 15. 71. 5). The fact that he was an *amicus* of Seneca (Sen. *Epist.* 87. 2; Mart. 7. 44. 6 ff., 7. 45. 1 ff.) might suggest that he was a recipient of the imperial adviser's patronage before he began to lose power c. A.D. 60. Indeed, a late Claudian date is also possible (see the comments on Pompeius Paulinus above). However, the evidence is so deficient (see *P.I.R.*² C. 172; *R.E.* 3. 1. 1307) as to permit no change to Smallwood's date.¹

'67 or shortly after' { (M. Annius) Afrinus
 { (C. Paccius) Africanus

Afrinus and Africanus are attested in office on 6 July (*C.I.L.* 4. 1544). They were, therefore, regular July suffectus and so, since July suffectus can confidently be assigned to every year before A.D. 66, they must be placed within the years A.D. 66 and 68.

C. Paccius Africanus² was governor of Africa between 1 July A.D. 77 and 30 June A.D. 78 (*I.R.T.* 342 = *A.E.* 1949, 84).³ As governor he preceded P. Galerius Trachalus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 68), who should be assigned to A.D. 78/9.⁴ Therefore Africanus must have been consul before A.D. 68. The normal interval between the consulate and the proconsulate of Africa for Neronian consuls was eight to ten years.⁵ Therefore Africanus must have been consul in A.D. 67.⁶

The known career of M. Annius Afrinus (*P.I.R.*² A. 630; *R.E.* 1. 2. 2263) produces no impediment for the date suggested above. He was governor of Pannonia certainly between A.D. 71 and 73 (*C.I.L.* 3. 4109)⁷ and he may have been

¹ So also Groag, *R.E.* 3. 1. 1307. Schneider, no. 495, thinks that he was probably Neronian, while De Laet, no. 959, attempts no date.

² For his career see now H. W. Benario, 'C. Paccius Africanus', *Historia* viii (1959), 496 ff. and Eck, 90, 124, correcting *P.I.R.*¹ P. 7-8 and *R.E.* 18. 1. 2063 ff., nos. 7, 11. Cf. T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate*, 248, no. 301.

³ First published by R. G. Goodchild, *Fasti Archaeologici* i (1946), 263 f., and with revisions, 'Two Monumental Inscriptions of Lepcis Magna', *P.B.S.R.* xviii (1950), 77 ff. See also now, Eck, 90 n. 77. For acceptance of the date, Thomasson, ii. 47 f.; Syme, 669; Degrassi, 18; Eck, 124, and Benario, loc. cit. 497.

⁴ Eck, 89; cf. Thomasson, ii. 48, who cautiously gives 'Ende Vespasianus—Anfang Domitianus'.

⁵ See above, p. 303 n. 3.

⁶ Cf. Syme, who wavers between the years A.D. 66 and 67—333 n. 6 (66); 668 (67); 787 (67), and 844 (c. 66); Benario, 498, thinks '66 or a little later'; Degrassi, 18, prefers '67 o poco dopo', as does A. Dobó, *Die Verwaltung der römischen Provinz Pannonien von Augustus bis Diocletianus*, 33, no. 20; Eck, 89, says 'c. 68' but at 90 leaves it as 'Between 66 and 68'.

It might be argued that Africanus' proconsulate of Africa was held later than usual because of his prosecution in A.D. 70 (Tac. *Hist.* 4. 41 'ad Paccium Africanum transgressi eum quoque proturbant, tamquam Neroni Scribonios fratres concordia opibusque insignis ad exitum monstravisset. Africanus neque fateri audebat neque abnuere poterat: in Vibium Crispum, cuius interrogationibus fatigabatur, ultro conversus, miscendo quae defendere nequibat, societate culpae invidiam declinavit.') That need not be the case, for Vibius Crispus was also attacked at the same meeting of the senate yet only two years later (A.D. 72/3) he was proconsul of Africa (see below). Further, there are on record a number of important Neronian ministers who became allies of the new dynasty with no interruption to their *cursus*—e.g. Eprius Marcellus (*suff.* A.D. 62; proconsul of Asia, A.D. 70-3); Vibius Crispus (*suff.* 63 or 64; proconsul of Africa, A.D. 72/3); Silius Italicus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 68; proconsul of Asia, A.D. 77/8) and P. Galerius Trachalus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 68; proconsul of Africa, A.D. 78/9). In general, see Syme, 594; App. 12.

⁷ Supporting the date, Dobó, op. cit. 33; W. Reidinger, *Die Statthalter des ungeteilten Pannonien und Oberpannoniens von Augustus bis Diokletian*, 46 f., no. 12; G. B. Townend,

there even earlier.¹ His consulship appears to have been long overdue as he was legate of Galatia between A.D. 49 and 54.²

'Before 67' { C. Licinius Mucianus
 Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer

The fortunes of Mucianus after his removal to Asia under Claudius (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 10; Plin. *N.H.* 19. 2) soon recovered and he became a legionary legate under Corbulo in the East during the reign of Nero (Plin. *N.H.* 5. 83). A praetorian province—Lycia/Pamphylia—followed shortly after A.D. 57 (*I.L.S.* 8816; *A.E.* 1915, 48).³ The evidence from other comparable senatorial careers would lead one to expect a consulship fairly soon afterwards;⁴ however, no such tenure is known for Mucianus (see *P.I.R.*² L. 216; *R.E.* 13. 1. 436 ff.). A governorship of Syria is next attested (*A.E.* 1947, 166; *P.I.R.*² loc. cit.). But when? Certainly during A.D. 68–9, but his predecessor C. Cestius Gallus is not known there after autumn A.D. 67.⁵ Mucianus, therefore, might well have assumed the governorship during the latter part of A.D. 67.⁶ His consulship must as a consequence fall before A.D. 67.⁷ But which year? A date 'around 60' has been suggested.⁸ Impossible. Mucianus and Macer are known to have been in office between 10 July and 1 October⁹ (*P.P.* i [1946], 381; viii [1953], 456). July suffectus are known for A.D. 60–3 and 65 (see Section III). The year A.D. 66 is possible but would seem to be getting too late; furthermore, another consular pair, Appius Annianus Gallus and L. Verulanus Severus, more readily fill this vacancy (see above). Therefore A.D. 64 is the most probable year for the consulships of Mucianus and Macer.¹⁰

'Before 68' Hordeonius Flaccus

Nothing concerning his career under Nero has survived (see *P.I.R.*² H. 202; *R.E.* 8. 2. 2405 ff.). He was appointed governor of Upper Germany by Galba

'Some Flavian Connections', *J.R.S.* li (1961), 60 f.

¹ Eck, 112 ff., esp. 114 n. 11, would place him in Pannonia as early as A.D. 70.

² For his governorship of Galatia, R. K. Sherck, *The Legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian*, 30. C. P. Jones, 'The Teacher of Plutarch', *H.S.C.Ph.* lxxi (1966), 208 ff., has argued cogently that the Athenian inscription, *I.G.* 2/3². 4184, refers to the Annianus under discussion. He suggests further that the consulate was held in Greece during Nero's tour and therefore must have been assumed in July A.D. 67. I concur. Groag's date of 'Under either Claudius or Nero' (*P.I.R.*² A. 630) was followed by De Laet, no. 938, but it has rightly been rejected by recent scholars, e.g. Dobó, op. cit., 33.

³ For the date, Magie, ii. 1386 n. 48, 1598; Syme, 790.

⁴ For the principle, R. Syme in his review of Degraffi, *J.R.S.* xliii (1953), 152 f.; 'Consulates in Absence', *J.R.S.* xlviii (1958), 1 ff., esp. 2 f.; *Historia* xiv (1965), 342 ff.; 'Legates of Cilicia under Trajan', *Historia* xviii (1969), 353.

⁵ See *P.I.R.*² C. 691; also the *fasti* for Syria

given by H. Seyrig, 'Légats-propréteurs de Syrie entre 63 et 137', *Syria* (1941), 174 f.

⁶ So also De Laet, no. 1042, and Schneider, no. 498; cf. Petersen, *P.I.R.*² L. 216.

⁷ Cf. G. Barbieri (*R.S.I.* lxvi [1954], 418, cited by Petersen, *P.I.R.*² L. 216) who argued for this year. A.D. 67 was established by Borghesi, but this date, which held sway for many years, has been rightly rejected by Kappelmacher, *R.E.* 13. 1. 437.

⁸ De Laet, no. 1042.

⁹ Petersen, *P.I.R.*² L. 216, rightly doubts whether *Bull. Comm.* 1885, 162 attesting a Mucianus in office during November refers to C. Licinius Mucianus. An examination of the *fasti* after A.D. 59 shows no other suffectuations of six months' duration for the reign (see Section III). For some other Muciani to whom the inscription might refer, see Degraffi, 259. Cf. Schneider, no. 598.

¹⁰ Also supporting this year, Syme, 785, 787, 790; 'Antonine Relatives: Ceionii and Vettuleni', *Athenaeum* xxxv (1957), 311; Townend, loc. cit. 54, also suggests 'c. 64'. Cf. Degraffi, 18, who prefers 'prima del 68'.

to replace Verginius Rufus and he held this position between the summer of A.D. 68 and sometime in A.D. 69.¹ According to Tacitus (*Hist.* i. 9), he was already an old man at this time: . . . *Hordeonium Flaccum . . . senecta ac debilitate pedum invalidum* . . .² This would suggest a date very early in Nero's reign at the latest, but it is perhaps more likely that his consulship fell under Claudius. Let his revised date be 'Claudian or early Neronian'.

'Before 68' Rubrius Gallus

Gallus was placed in charge of Nero's army in A.D. 68 (Dio. 63. 27. 1), and so he was obviously a consular before this date. His governorship of Moesia assumed in A.D. 70³ gives no assistance for dating his consulate, nor does anything else that survives concerning him (see *P.I.R.*¹ R. 94; *R.E.* s.n. Rubrius 20). His date must be left as 'Before 68'.⁴

'Before 68' Vibius Crispus

A recently discovered fragment of the *fasti Ostienses* lists a certain L. Iunius Vibius Crispus as *suffectus* in March A.D. 74.⁵ This person can confidently be identified with the consular who until now has been known as Q. Vibius Crispus, *delator* and *amicus* under Nero and later *amicus* of Vitellius and the Flavians.⁶ He was *cos.* II in A.D. 74 and *cos.* III most probably in A.D. 83.⁷

The date of his first consulship is nowhere attested. Borghesi⁸ placed it firmly in A.D. 61 but recent scholarship has been more cautious,⁹ although two dates have lately been canvassed — 'c. A.D. 61'¹⁰ and 'c. A.D. 62'.¹¹ Crispus was proconsul of Africa in A.D. 72/3,¹² which would mean, on the application of the usual interval between consulate and proconsulate of Africa at this time, that he was consul no earlier than A.D. 62 and not later than the end of A.D. 64.¹³ He cannot have been consul in A.D. 62 because, as has been demonstrated above when discussing Saturninus and Petronius, all the consuls for that year are known (see Section III). Next, Crispus' predecessor in Africa (i.e. A.D. 71/2)¹⁴ was Q. Manlius Tarquinius Saturninus who, as has been shown above, assumed the consulship in July A.D. 63. Since Saturninus received his posting to Africa

¹ Ritterling, 19 f.

² He may even have been a contemporary of Galba who was born in 3 B.C. (*P.I.R.*¹ S. 723).

³ See A. Stein, *Die Legaten von Moesien*, 32 f.; Eck, 115.

⁴ Münzer, *R.E.* i. A. 1. 1172 thinks 'wahrscheinlich Consul suffectus unter Nero'.

⁵ Mentioned in *P.I.R.*² I. 847; see now E. Equini, 'Un frammento inedito dei fasti Ostiensi', *Epigraphica* xxix (1967), 11 ff.

⁶ For the identification, Eck, 58 ff., 91, 118, 130 n. 82, 255; Equini, op. cit. 14 ff. It is uncertain whether Crispus was adopted by an L. Iunius (Eck) or was polyonymous (Equini). In general on Crispus, *P.I.R.*¹ V. 379; *R.E.* 8. A. 2. 1968 ff.; as an *amicus*, J. Crook, *Consilium Principis*, 188.

⁷ So also, G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses*, 18 f.; W. C. McDermott, 'Fabricius Veiento',

A.J.Ph. xci (1970), 136; Eck, 60 f.; cf. Degraasi, 24, who gives '81/2?' (certamente prima del 87').

⁸ *Œuvres*, iv. 534, 538.

⁹ Degraasi, 19, suggests 'prima del 68'. He is followed by Alföldy, op. cit. 18; Thomasson, ii. 45; Eck, 89.

¹⁰ Hanslik, *R.E.* 8. A. 2. 1968.

¹¹ Syme, 387 n. 6; *H.S.C.Ph.*, loc. cit. 209, 215.

¹² The date has now been firmly established by R. Syme, 'Deux proconsulats d'Afrique', *R.E.A.* lviii (1956), 236 ff.; *H.S.C.Ph.*, loc. cit. 215. Accepted by Alföldy, op. cit. 18; Eck, 89; cf. Thomasson, ii. 45, who prefers 'vor 77', but at 46 he notes: 'Vielleicht wird sich einmal 72/3 als das Richtige erweisen.'

¹³ See above, p. 303 n. 3.

¹⁴ For this date, *I.R.T.* 300; Syme, *R.E.A.* loc. cit. 238; Thomasson, ii. 46 f.; Eck, 89.

before Crispus, it can be assumed that he was the senior consular of the two and so Crispus must have been consul after Saturninus. Both the years A.D. 63 and 64 have vacancies for *suffecti*—September/October and November/December in the former and November/December in the latter year (see Section III). Therefore the first consulship of Vibius Crispus must be placed after August A.D. 63 but probably not later than November/December A.D. 64.

‘Before 68’ { Ti. Ant{t}ius
 { Q. Vibius

The evidence for this pair is a *tessera nummularia* (*C.I.L.* 1¹. 776 aa = *R.E.* 17. 2. 1433, no. 141) which records the following:

Albinus Sp. k. Iun. Ti. Antio.
Q. Vibio.

The editor of *C.I.L.* 1¹ notes ad loc.: ‘Londinii in mus. Brit. vidit Zumpt. Cardinali mem. II, 151 ex schedis Vettorianis, denuo dipl. n. 216 qui hanc defendit.’ Zumpt suggested the emended reading—*Ti. Anttio*. Herzog (*R.E.*, loc. cit.) lists the *tessera* under the heading ‘Unsicher’ and gives as its date ‘vor 83?’. At *ibid.* 1449, he reaffirms his doubt but identifies the Vibius as Q. Vibius Crispus, ‘*cos. suff.* vor 83’. Hanslik¹ accepts the validity of the *tessera* and states: ‘Auf einer Tessera nummularia ist an den kal. Iun. ein Consulnpaar Ti. Anttius (sic!) Q. Vibius genannt; es wird sich um V. und seinen Amtskollegen handeln.’²

There are, however, a number of obstacles to such an identification. Firstly, the date *k. Iun.* shows that the pair could not have been consuls under Nero, for it has already been demonstrated that *ordinarii* held office for six months in all the years likely for the consulship of Crispus (see Sections I, III). Next, it is known that Fabricius Veiento was the consular colleague of Crispus in A.D. 83.³ Thirdly the *tessera* cannot refer to A.D. 74 because Crispus cannot still have been in office from March (see above) until June, for the same inscription attests Q. Petilius Cerealis II and T. Clodius Eprius Marcellus II in office *Idibus Maiis*⁴ and Sex. Iulius Frontinus is attested in office on 25 June.⁵ Finally, *P.I.R.*² A. lists no Anttii at all, nor can any likely candidate for the reign of Nero be discovered among the Antii (*P.I.R.*² A. 780 ff.).

Therefore, when the large number of *falsae* already discovered among the *tesserae* is taken into account,⁶ it is extremely likely that the one under consideration here, already labelled ‘unsicher’, should be disregarded as evidence and the two *suffecti* it mentions should be expunged from the *fasti* for the reign of Nero.

¹ *R.E.* (s.n. Vibius 28), 1969.

² Degraasi, 19 suggests ‘prima del 68?’ and would also connect the Q. Vibius with Vibius Crispus.

³ McCrum and Woodhead, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors*, 11; *P.I.R.*² F. 91.

⁴ McCrum and Woodhead, 5; Equini, *Epigraphica*, loc. cit. 12, 19.

⁵ See now, S. Dušanic, ‘On the consules

suffecti of A.D. 74–6’, *Epigraphica* xxx (1968), 59 ff.; M. Torelli, ‘The *cursus honorum* of M. Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa’, *J.R.S.* lviii (1968), 174 n. 22; cf. McCrum and Woodhead, 5, who wrongly place Neratius Pansa in this year following a suggestion by R. Syme reviewing Degraasi, *J.R.S.* xliii (1953), 151.

⁶ See Herzog, *R.E.* 17. 2. 1421.

'Before 69' M. Aponius Saturninus

Saturninus was governor of Moesia at least from the beginning of A.D. 69,¹ if not from some time in the preceding year.² His term of office ended before the beginning of A.D. 70.³ He was then governor of Asia for A.D. 73/4 (*I.L.S.* 8817).⁴ Most scholars⁵ support the date for his consulship given by Smallwood, but more correct, I think, are those⁶ who would place his tenure 'Under Nero'. In fact, there is some chance of narrowing this even further.

Two points ought to be considered. Firstly his governorship of Asia. His predecessor, Eprius Marcellus, was consul in A.D. 62; his successors, M. Vettius Bolanus and Silius Italicus, held office in A.D. 66 and 68 respectively.⁷ If the normal interval between the consulship and the governorship of Asia is applicable in the cases of these three men⁸ (and there is every indication that it still is—witness the ten-year interval still operating at least until A.D. 81/29), then Saturninus' consulship will have been held at some time between A.D. 63 and 66. There are certainly vacancies in these years which might accommodate him (see Section III). Secondly, it is known that he was an Arval brother from A.D. 57 onwards (*A.F.A.* lxiv ff. = Smallwood, no. 19 ff.) and that he became *promagister* in A.D. 66 (*A.F.A.* lxxx ff. = Smallwood, no. 25 f.). Now all the known *promagistri* during the Claudian and Neronian periods held the consulship at some time¹⁰ before they became *promagister*, e.g. L. Salvius Otho (*prom.* under Claudius; *suff.* A.D. 33); P. Memmius Regulus (*prom.* A.D. 55; *suff.* A.D. 31) and L. Salvius Otho Titianus (*prom.* A.D. 57, 62?, 66, 69; *cos. ord.* A.D. 52).¹¹ This seems to support the above argument from the Asian governorship for a date after September A.D. 63 (see Section III) and before A.D. 66 for his consulship.

'Under Nero' Acilius (Glabrio? unless this is M'. Acilius Aviola, *cos.* 54)

I have argued elsewhere,¹² on the basis of *Schol. Iuv.* 4. 94, that this person is in fact Acilius Glabrio who was the father of that Glabrio who was consul in A.D. 91 (*P.I.R.*² A. 67). The evidence for his consulship, however, gives no clue as to the date of his tenure. The above date, therefore, must remain unchanged.

¹ See Stein, *Moesien*, 32; R. Syme review-
ing Stein, *J.R.S.* xxxv (1945), 111; von
Rohden, *R.E.* 2. 1. 172.

² Syme, 787.

³ Stein, *Moesien*, 32; Eck, 112; Townend,
J.R.S., loc. cit. 60.

⁴ For the date, Syme, 594 n. 1; Eck, 82,
119; Magie, ii. 1582, gives no year, but the
governorship of his predecessor Eprius
Marcellus is known to have been held be-
tween A.D. 70 and 73 (Magie, loc. cit.; Eck,
82, 115 ff.; *P.I.R.*² A. 938 and E. 84).

⁵ e.g. Degraasi, 19; Eck, 82.

⁶ De Laet, no. 1304; Syme, 787, and
Grog, *P.I.R.*² A. 938.

⁷ See Magie, ii. 1582; Eck, 82 f.

⁸ One must not fail to consider the possi-
bility that a change in dynasty might have
affected the normal pattern.

⁹ See the *fasti* in Magie, ii. 1582; Eck,
82 f.

¹⁰ To judge from the limited evidence

available (see next note), there seems to have
been no regular interval between the con-
sulate and the assumption of the promagis-
tracy of the Arval brethren. It would be
unwise to posit a minimum interval of, say,
five years, as happened with L. Salvius Otho
Titianus (see below). In the case of Aponius
Saturninus, the often proved consulate/
proconsulate of Asia interval is far more
trustworthy and it will not allow a consul-
ship c. A.D. 61.

¹¹ See the lists in Eck, 22 f., and M. W. H.
Lewis, *The Official Priests of Rome under the
Julio-Claudians*, ch. 11.

¹² 'Who was Acilius?' forthcoming in
P.P. This identification finds support from
G. B. Townend, 'The Earliest Scholiast on
Juvenal', *C.Q.* xxii (1972), 376 ff., who
argues plausibly that *Schol. Iuv.* 4. 94 is
based on a source which recounted the reign
of Nero and the early years of Vespasian as
a contemporary.

Consuls Designate who died before taking up office:

'64 or 65' Plautius Lateranus

Lateranus was executed by Nero in A.D. 65 (*P.I.R.*¹ P. 354; *R.E.* 21. 1. 30).¹ He may have been designated for A.D. 65 or as *ordinarius* for A.D. 66. (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 77 notes Nero's practice of designating consuls for at least one year ahead.)

'68' Cingonius Varro

Varro was executed by Galba in A.D. 68 (*P.I.R.*² C. 736; *R.E.* 3. 2. 2560 f.).² He was designated for either A.D. 68 or for A.D. 69 (Tac. *Hist.* 1. 77).³

III. A REVISED *FASTI* FOR THE REIGN

It remains now only to apply the results of the investigations performed in Sections I and II above. The following, then, is a revised *fasti* for the reign of Nero.⁴

A.D. 54	(Claudius XIII–XIV; Nero I)	
	{ M'. Acilius Aviola	
	{ M. Asinius Marcellus	
	{ <i>M. Aefulanus</i>	
55	(Nero I–II)	
	{ Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus I	(2 months)
	{ L. Antistius Vetus	
	{ N. Cestius	(March/June)
	{ <i>L. Iunius Gallio Annaeanus</i>	(July/Aug.)
	{ <i>T. Cutilius Ciltus</i>	
	{ Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus	(Nov./Dec.)
	{ T. Curtilius Mancina	
*56	(Nero II–III)	
	{ Q. Volusius Saturninus	
	{ P. Cornelius (Lentulus?) Scipio	
	{ L. Annaeus Seneca	(July/Oct.)
	{ M. Trebellius Maximus	(July/Aug.)
	{ P. Palfurius	(Sept./Oct.)
	{ L. Duвий Avitus	(Nov./Dec.)
	{ P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus	
*57	(Nero III–IV)	
	{ Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus II	(12 months)
	{ L. Calpurnius Piso	
	{ L. Caesius Martialis	(July/Dec.)
*58	(Nero IV–V)	
	{ Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus III	(4 months)
	{ M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus	
	{ C. Fonteius Agrippa	(May/June)
	{ A. Paconius Sabinus	(July/Dec.)
	{ A. Petronius Lurco	

¹ De Laet, no. 1084; Schneider, no. 561.

² De Laet, no. 1348; Schneider, no. 578.

³ The latter is preferred by Townend, *A.J.Ph.*, loc. cit. 118, 124.

⁴ I have adopted Smallwood's system for giving the years of tribunician power in brackets. My suggested revisions are italicized.

- *59 (Nero V–VI)
 { C. Vipstanus Apronianus
 { C. Fonteius Capito
 { T. Sextius Africanus (July/Dec.)
 { M. Ostorius Scapula
- 60 (Nero VI–VII)
 { Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus IV (6 months)
 { Cossus Cornelius Lentulus
 { *C. Velleius Paterculus* (July/Oct.)
 { *M. Manilius Vopiscus*
- 61 (Nero VII–VIII)
 { P. Petronius Turpilianus
 { L. Caesennius Paetus
 { *Cn. Pedanius Salinator* (July/Aug.)
 { *L. Velleius Paterculus*
- *62 (Nero VIII–IX)
 { P. Marius Celsus
 { L. Afinius (or Asinius) Gallus (Jan./Aug.)
 { L. - - - nus (July/Aug.)
 { Q. Iunius Marullus (Sept./Dec.)
 { Ti. Clodius Eprius Marcellus
 (Nero IX–X)
 { C. Memmius Regulus
 { L. Verginius Rufus
 { *T. Petronius Niger* (July/Aug.)
 { *Q. Manlius Tarquinius Saturninus*
- 64 (Nero X–XI)
 { C. Laecanius Bassus
 { M. Licinius Crassus Frugi
 { *C. Licinius Mucianus* (July/Oct.)
 { *Q. Fabius Barbarus Antonius Macer*
- 65 (Nero XI–XII)
 { A. Licinius Nerva Silianus
 { Firmus Pasidienus
 { M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus (till April)
 { C. Pomponius Pius (July/Aug.)
 { C. Anicius Cerealis
- *66 (Nero XII–XIII)
 { C. Luccius Telesinus
 { C. Suetonius Paulinus (II?)
 { *Appius Annius Gallus* (July/Aug.)
 { *L. Verulanus Severus*
 { M. Arruntius - - - - (Sept./Dec.)
 { M. Vettius Bolanus
- 67 (Nero XIII–XIV)
 { L. Iulius Rufus
 { . Fonteius Capito
 { L. Aurelius Priscus (Before June)
 { *M. Annius Afrinus* (July/Aug.)
 { *C. Paccius Africanus*

- 68 (Nero XIV)
 { Ti. Catus Asconius Silius Italicus
 { P. Galerius Trachalus
 Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus V (April?/June)
 { C. Bellicus Natalis (Sept./Dec.)
 { P. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus

The following also held the consulship under Nero but the year is uncertain. The nearest ascertainable dates are given. (Those who were previously claimed as Neronian suffects but have been shown above to have been of Claudian date are included in brackets.)

- (Under Claudius *M. Vettius Niger*)
 (Before 54 *Lurius Varus*)
 (Before 54 *P. Volasenna*)
 53 or 54 *Pompeius Paulinus*
 Under Claudius or Nero *Hordeonius Flaccus*
 Between 47 and 55 { *C. Fufius?* (*Fufius?*)
 Cn. Minicius
 Before 52 or between 53 and 55 { *Q. Fufius*
 P. Calvisius
 54 or 55 { *M. Iunius Silanus*
 A. Ducentius Geminus
 Before 56 *P. Sulpicius Scribonius Proculus*
 Before 56 *Sulpicius Scribonius Rufus*
 63 or 64 *Vibius Crispus*
 Between 63 and 66 *M. Aponius Saturninus*
 Before 65 *Caesennius* (or *Caesonius*) *Maximus*
 Before 68 *Rubrius Gallus*
 Under Nero *Acilius Glabrio*¹

The following consuls designate died before taking up office:

- 65 or 66 *Plautius Lateranus*
 68 or 69 *Cingonius Varro*

University of Tasmania

PAUL A. GALLIVAN

¹ J. Morris, 'Leges Annales under the Principate. Political Effects', *Listy Filologické*, lxxxviii (1965), 22 ff., at 23 f., argues that, from the beginning of Claudius' reign until A.D. 65, it was usual to have six consuls per annum, and that after A.D. 65 eight consuls per year became the norm. This generalization is not supported by the evidence presented in this paper.

The large number of possible candidates suggests that there were in fact 8 consuls in A.D. 54; there were 7 in A.D. 55 (this figure probably should be increased to 9 as Sep-

tember/October appears to be vacant); 7 in A.D. 56 (and perhaps there would have been 8 if Seneca had not taken for himself an extended tenure); 3 in A.D. 57; 5 in A.D. 58 and 4 in A.D. 59. There were possibly 6 in A.D. 60 and also in A.D. 61 (but the latter might just as easily have contained 8); 5 in A.D. 62; possibly 6 in A.D. 63 (but there may have been 8) and in A.D. 64. There may have been 6 or 8 in A.D. 65; there were 6 in A.D. 66; possibly 6 or 8 in A.D. 67; and there were probably 7 in A.D. 68.