

JOHN BODEL

CHRONOLOGY AND SUCCESSION 2: NOTES ON SOME CONSULAR
LISTS ON STONE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 105 (1995) 279–296

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

In memoriam
T. R. S. Broughton

Chronology and Succession 2: Notes on Some Consular Lists on Stone

In an earlier note I argued that an apparent discrepancy between the *Fasti Capitolini* and a newly discovered fragment of the *fasti* from Tauromenium in their record of the suffect consuls of 36 BC is due to the different ways in which the two lists were compiled: whereas the *F(asti) Tauromenitani* register suffects according to their dates of accession, the corresponding entry in the Capitoline *Fasti* represents who replaced whom in office.¹ The first establishes a chronology; the second marks succession. When combined their testimony sheds new light on the triumviral dispositions for 36: not two but three pairs of consuls served in office that year: L. Gellius Poplicola and M. Cocceius Nerva (Jan.-June), Poplicola and Q. Marcius (July-Aug.), and Marcius and L. Nonius Asprenas (Sept.-Dec.). The sequence can be schematically represented thus:

¹ *ZPE* 96 (1993) 259-66. Except where otherwise noted, dates are BC and consular lists are cited from A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII i (Rome 1947). It may be useful to present here a composite text of the surviving consular *F. Tauromenitani* incorporating the improvements of O. Salomies (*Arctos* 22 [1988] 130-32; *ZPE* 86 [1991] 187-92) to the edd. princ. by G. Manganaro, *Cronache di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte (Catania)* 3 (1964) 39f. (aa. 39-36, 30-28 [*AE* 1988, 626]) and G. M. Bacci, *Kokalos* 30-31 (1984-85) [1988] II.2, 724f., Tav. CLVIII, fig. 4 (aa. 36-34) and correcting (on the basis of the photograph published at Tav. CLVIII, fig. 4) the placement of the abbreviation *K.* at aa. 36-34, which in each case, along with the designation *suf.*, brackets the months named to the right:

[
[Ap. Claudius]	Iu]l. [suf. K. ?] Sept.	P. Alfen]u[s] (a. 39) C. Coc]ceiu[s] C. Norba[nus] (a. 38) L. Lentul]us
[L. Ca]ninius, K. Iul.	Iul. Sept.	L. Philipp]us (a. 37) M. Agrip]pa T. Statil]ius M. Cocce]ius (a. 36) Q. Mar]cius
L. Gellius, suf. K.	Iul. Sept.	L. Noniu]s (a. 35) Sex. Pom]peius P. Dolab]ella
L. Cornifici(us) suf. K.	Iul. Sept.	T. Peduc]aeus (a. 34) L. Atra]tinus Paul. Ae]milius
L. Scriboni(us) Iul. suf. K. Sept.	Iul. Sept.	C. Mem]mius [M. Herennius]
:	:	
[bellum cum M. Antonio] confe]ctum.]		(a. 30)
[I]mp. Caes[ar V K. Oc]t.		Sex. Appuleius] (a. 29) Potitus Valerius]
[I]mp. Cae[sar VI		M. Agrippa] (a. 28)

36 BC	Jan. 1:	L. Gellius Poplicola	M. Cocceius Nerva
	July 1:	" "	Q. Marcius
	Sept. 1:	L. Nonius Asprenas	" "

Recognizing the different principles on which the two lists were arranged allows their apparently conflicting reports to be reconciled and enables us to construct a complete picture of the consular pairs of the year. This resolution of the discrepancy encourages further experimental exploration of the method: what benefits, if any, emerge from application of the new critical tool to the other known inscribed lists of consuls of the late Republic and early Empire?²

I

We must at the outset distinguish methods of recording from methods of compiling, for it is clear that the two do not always coincide. And while it is true that, in considering the various urban and municipal consular *fasti* that survive, a knowledge of how the names were gathered can only be acquired through an understanding of the way they are arranged, it is not normally the case, given the nature of our evidence, that recognizing the latter in itself allows us to determine the former. A preliminary division of the material distinguishes three basic styles of reporting—by generic description, by date of entry into office, and by simple indentation.

Of these the first is by far the most common. Most late Republican and early imperial lists identify substitute consuls by the designation *suffectus* (variously abbreviated) prefixed to the names, a practice for which there is good Republican precedent in the famous painted *fasti* from Antium, which were probably compiled sometime in the 60s or early 50s.³ Others follow the pattern of the fifth and final tablet of the Capitoline *Fasti* in marking *suffecti* by indicating the dates of their accession to office.⁴ Occasionally the two methods are combined, as in the new Sicilian *fasti*, and in one case we can see that the hybrid form of designation is preceded in the same list by the simpler method of identifying substitute consuls with the verbal

² Professor Salomies, whose earlier suggestion for restoring the relevant entry of the Capitoline *Fasti* (*ZPE* 86 [1991] 189) prompted my initial investigation, has graciously written to say that he accepts the substance of my argument. Since the focus of this inquiry is on the consular lists rather than on the consuls themselves, discussion of prosopographical and historical issues has been limited to the minimum necessary to establish context and identity. Basic information on individual consuls can be found at the relevant entries in *RE* and *PIR*² and, of course, in Broughton's indispensable *MRR*.

³ Cf. *ZPE* 96 (1993) 266 n. 25. So the *F. Ostienses* fr. I (at aa. 45-44), *F. Colotiani* (aa. 45-40, 23-12), *F. magistrorum vici* (43 BC-AD 3), *F. Amiternini* (at aa. 43, 32-30), *F. Biondiani* (at aa. 19, 16), *F. Praenestini* (AD 5-6, 18, two *suffects* per line), *F. Caelimontani* (at AD 4-6, two *suffects* per line), *F. Arvalium* (at AD 11, 19, 26-32: *AE* 1987, 163), *F. Antiates minores* (at AD 12, 15-17, two *suffects* per line), and possibly *F. Cuprenses* (at a. 2: *AE* 1950, 93) and *F. Vallenses* (AD 31). A fragment of the *F. Urbisalvienses*, which were probably based on the *F. Capitolini*, lists the censors of 159 in similar fashion, with the abbreviation *cens.* bracketing their names to the left: G. Paci, *NSc* 1981, 63-65, fig. 27 no. 1 (= *AE* 1982, 240).

⁴ So the *F. Venusini* (aa. 35-28), *F. Ostienses* (beginning with fr. Vs, AD 15-18, and probably already in fr. III, AD 6), *F. Teanenses* (AD 46), and, apparently, *F. Caleni*, after AD 289: cf. R.S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S.R. Schwartz, K.A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta 1987) 112f. In the *F. Interamnates* the date at which local magistrates entered office (1 April) regularly (except at AD 75) precedes a list of their names.

description alone.⁵ Once, in the *F. Ostienses*, we find the generic marker *suf.* (preserved at aa. 45 and 44) subsequently replaced by the dating formula (securely attested first at AD 19).⁶ For the most part, however, these two principal methods of recording *suffects* are mutually distinct: lists showing one do not normally exhibit the other.

The third basic style, a simpler version of that employed in the first four tablets (or rather blocks⁷) of the Capitoline *Fasti*, is otherwise unattested at the capital and is only poorly represented elsewhere by the *F. Amerini* (aa. 47-42), where *suffecti* are marked by a simple system of indentation, without further specification. Known only through a faulty manuscript tradition, the *fasti* from Ameria, as transcribed, misrepresent the sequence of succession at a. 45 by recording the name of C. Caninius beneath that of C. Trebonius rather than Q. Fabius, whose sudden death on the last day of the year created the vacancy he filled, and at 44 by listing P. Dolabella beneath M. Antonius rather than Julius Caesar, who had chosen Dolabella to take his place upon his planned departure for the Parthian campaign. These inconcinnities aside, the list otherwise reproduces the sequence of entries and in one place the phrasing of the Capitoline *Fasti* and evidently derives from them. Whether or not this simplest method of distinguishing *suffects* had any tradition independent of the Capitoline *Fasti*, where the verbal explanations (notably, *in eius locum factus est*) make the purpose of the arrangement clear, is difficult to say, but we may reasonably speculate that writing the names of *suffects* directly beneath those of the men they replaced may have been the method originally employed in the lists updated annually as the magistrates changed.⁸

However that may be, the system of recording *suffects* by date seems to have come into use toward the end of the Republic—the *F. Venusini* and *F. Tauromenitani* are our earliest witnesses—originally, we may suppose, at Rome, where it eventually supplanted the earlier fashion of marking individual substitutions with the generic designation alone.⁹ Both methods

⁵ So the *F. Nolani* (*suf.* alone at AD 29 and 30, *suf.* and date at AD 31 and 32) and, possibly also the *F. Antiates minores* (*suf.* alone where appropriate at AD 9-17), where, however, Suetonius's report (*Tib.* 26.2) that Tiberius held his ordinary consulship (in AD 18) for only a few days argues against Degraasi's restoration [*suffecti*] *K.] Feb.* at the start of the relevant line: cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 304. In the *F. Tauromenitani* (aa. 39-34) and *F. Gabini* (fr. II, AD 2-6) the hybrid formula is not known to have been preceded in earlier years by the simple designation *suf.* (supplied by Degraasi in the *F. Gabini* at a. 23).

⁶ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 182-85, frs. I (aa. 49-44) VIIs (AD 19), and Vs (AD 15-18). The *F. Ostienses*, which probably went back to the time of Sulla, were first inscribed sometime before AD 2 (Degraasi, *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 174) and seem subsequently to have been updated more or less annually: cf. L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses*² (Prague 1982) 144f.

⁷ Cf. Degraasi, *RPAA* 21 (1945-46) 78f. [*Scritti vari di antichità* 1 (Rome 1962) 255f.]. The only fragment of the consular lists to survive intact (XLV) is nearly two feet (0.49 m.) thick.

⁸ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 242; *ZPE* 96 (1993) 265 n. 24. Notwithstanding my earlier confidence in Coarelli's attribution of the Capitoline lists to a Parthian arch of Augustus located north of the Temple of Divus Julius (*loc. cit.*, 265 n. 22), the position—not to say the existence—of the various arches of Augustus must be regarded as dubious, the original location of the *fasti* and their attribution to the Princeps uncertain: cf. E. Nedergaard, in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Berlin 1988) 224-39; ead., *Arch. Laz.* 9 (1988) 37-43; E.M. Steinby, *Arctos* 21 (1987) 156-67 (tentatively assigning the *fasti* to the *fornix Fabianus* shortly after its restoration in 36); and C.J. Simpson, *Historia* 42 (1993) 61-81 (returning them to the *Regia*). Fortunately, neither the placement nor the original date of the consular lists affects my observations concerning their internal arrangement.

⁹ The *F. Venusini*, extant at aa. 35-28 and first inscribed sometime after 16 (*Inscr. It.* XIII i, 250), may or may not have recorded *suffects* by date from their inception *a bello Marsico*. With what year the *F. Taurome-*

of reporting continued to be employed throughout the first century AD, but under the settled Empire the emperor's practice, first attested in the *F. Capitolini* at AD 1 but apparently instituted some years earlier, of allocating suffect consulships at regular and, with time, increasingly frequent intervals, effectively effaced the distinction between listing *suffecti* according to their dates of accession and marking the lines of succession to office: when pairs of consuls regularly replaced their predecessors on fixed dates, the question who succeeded whom ceased to have the same significance it had under the free Republic, when a newly elected suffect joined the remaining *ordinarius* in office.¹⁰ In fact, already toward the end of the Republic the prestige of eponymity was such that the names of the *ordinarii* were sometimes used to date events throughout the year, even after one or both had left office.¹¹ Originally, however, the two different methods of recording *suffecti*—by generic description and by date—reflected a meaningful distinction in the way the lists were compiled and the type of information they aimed to convey.

Where the dating formula is employed, as in the *F. Tauromenitani*, the *F. Venusini*, and Tablet V of the Capitoline Fasti, the lists were clearly drawn up on the basis of chronology, according to the times when each consul entered office, and were intended, at least in part, to serve as an accurate register of dates. Equally clearly, where suffecti are listed in separate columns beneath the names of individual *ordinarii*, as in the *F. Colotiani* and Tablets I-IV of the Capitoline Fasti, or where deaths and substitutions are individually marked, as in the Republican *F. Antiates maiores*, the arrangement is designed to indicate the lines of succession to office. When, however, the various *suffecti* of a given year are listed without dates in a single column randomly disposed beneath the names of either or both *ordinarii*, as in the *F. Amiternini*, *F. Arvalium*, *F. Biondiani*, *F. Cuprenses* (at a. 2), and *F. magistrorum vici* (at aa. 43-4), the basis on which the names were put into order is by no means immediately apparent.¹² The same is true of the early imperial lists that record two suffecti per line indiscriminately beneath the names of both *ordinarii*: the *F. Antiates minores* (at AD 9-17), *F. Caclimontani*, *F. Lucerini*, *F. magistrorum vici* (at 2 BC-AD 3), *F. Nolani* (at AD 29-30), *F. Potentini*, *F. Praenestini*, *F. Volsinienses*, and, apparently, *F. Cuprenses* (at aa. 32-31).¹³ In these lists the principal aim seems to have been to advertize, *honoris causa*, the names of those elected or appointed to the consulship. Since for this purpose neither the sequence of succes-

nitani began is unknown; the lists were perhaps set up at the same time as the local calendar (*AE* 1988, 625), probably under Tiberius: cf. G. Manganaro, *ANRW* II.11.1 (1988) 43; below, n. 59.

¹⁰ The accepted date of this innovation, a. 5, is discussed below, pp. 292f. For the trend of subsequent developments, see P.A. Gallivan, *Antichthon* 13 (1979) 66-69 (Gaius); *CQ* 28 (1978) 407-16 (Claudius); 24 (1974) 290-98 (Nero); 31 (1981) 186-99 (Flavians) with the adjustments of G. Camodeca, in *Epigrafia. Actes du colloque en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi* (Rome 1991) 43-74; F. Zevi, *PP* 184 (1979) 179-201 (Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan).

¹¹ So already in 35: cf. *AE* 1932, 22 with the *F. Tauromenitani* (above, n. 1), s.a.; also, e.g., in 5: *AE* 1926, 17 bis and the *F. magistrorum vici* (in the list of *magistri*) with Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 290; generally, Dio 48.35.3 (below, n. 48), *Sen. Brev. Vit.* 20.1, *Tac. Ann.* 3.57.2; Mommsen, *Staatsr.* II³ (1887) 91f.; and W. Eck, in *Epigrafia. Actes...Attilio Degrassi* (Rome 1991) 15-44, on the increasingly frequent use—at first, over the course of the second century AD, in private documents and finally, by the early third century, even in official records—of the names of the *ordinarii* to date events throughout the year.

¹² For the *F. Cuprenses*, see above, n. 3 and Degrassi, *Epigraphica* 8 (1946) 5-8 [*Scr. var.* 4.117-21] (fr. IX).

¹³ For the *F. Potentini*, see N. Alfieri, *Athenaeum* 26 (1948) 110-34 (*AE* 1949, 23; AD 86-93, 113-115); *AE* 1975, 366 (AD 43).

sion nor the dates of entry into office were considered significant, the underlying method of organization remains obscure.

Obscure, perhaps, but not for that reason irrelevant, nor invariably beyond recovery. For we should not assume that because an ancient compiler of a consular list did not trouble to make clear his working methods, that information is of no interest to us. And if we happen to know from independent sources either the sequence of succession or the chronology of the suffects of a year also attested in one of these undifferentiated lists, we can sometimes determine from the order in which the names are recorded not only how the list from which they derived was organized but also the manner in which the names were transcribed. If we can further assume—as I think we can, in view of the general consistency of practice observable in the lists for which the basis of organization is clear—that these lists too are internally consistent, at least within those sections that appear to have been carved in the same hand, then we can use this knowledge to reconstruct the sequence of succession or a relative chronology of the suffects of other years for which explicit testimony is lacking. The result will be a clearer understanding of the genesis of the individual lists and a more detailed picture of the pattern of office holding throughout the periods covered. Needless to say, the number of hazards involved in such a procedure and over which we have no control is disquietingly large: mistakes in copying, a change of the source being transcribed, or capricious variation in the method of recording (to mention only the most obvious) introduce the possibility of error into the reconstruction of any particular year. But if the hypothetical sequences of succession throughout a series of years are consistent with the dates, where known, when the suffects entered office, then there is no reason to reject a priori either the validity of the method or the accuracy of the model. The consular *fasti* erected on the Aventine in Rome in the time of Augustus by the newly reorganized association of ‘block chiefs’ (*magistri vici*) provide a case in point.

II. The *Fasti magistrorum vici*

When reassembled and supplemented by the record of a piece lost since the eighteenth century, the fragments of the *F. magistrorum vici* discovered in 1928 at the corner of the modern via Marmorata and via Giovanni Branca in Rome present a continuous and nearly complete register of the consuls in office during the years 43 BC to AD 3. Since many of the suffects from this period are attested in no other source, the Aventine list offers a promising opportunity for testing the utility of the new tool. At a. 36 the suffects appear in the order L. Nonius, [Q.] Marcius—that is, as the names would have been transcribed from a list similar in arrangement to the Capitoline *Fasti*, read left to right, rather than in the chronological order preserved in the *F. Tauromenitani*. It follows that this portion of the list was copied from a model designed to mark succession rather than date. Since the entries from 43 to 2 BC, according to Degrassi, were carved by a single hand, and since the same system of denoting suffects is employed throughout, we further suppose that the method of reporting likewise remained consistent and proceed to an examination of the individual entries on that hypothesis.

The list begins with Octavian’s first consulship in 43 and represents him and his colleague Q. Pedius as eponymous magistrates, thus ignoring the ordinary consulships of Hirtius

and Pansa, both of whom succumbed to battle-wounds in late April. The point of inception is perhaps not surprising, since it was Augustus who in 7 BC charged the *magistri vicorum* with cultivating not only the *lares compitales*, their original care, but also the *lares Augusti* and his own *Genius*.¹⁴ Less easy to account for is an apparent discrepancy in the record of this year between the *F. magistrorum vici* and the *F. Colotiani*, which represent C. Carrinas rather than P. Ventidius as successor to Octavian's suffect consulship. According to Appian, the triumvirs had decided that Octavian should resign his consulship in favor of Ventidius, who was to remain in office for the rest of the year, and events are generally thought to have taken this course.¹⁵ Degrassi, however, prefers to follow the *F. Colotiani*; he argues that when Octavian's colleague Pedius died unexpectedly shortly before the triumvirs entered Rome in late November, Ventidius assumed his place instead.¹⁶ In favor of this interpretation is the indisputable fact that the *F. Colotiani* were designed to mark the lines of succession to office and, where we can check (at aa. 45, 44, 23, 19, 16), do so accurately. Against is the dubious accuracy of the entry for the year 43 itself, which anachronistically styles the triumvir Octavian 'Imp. Caesar' (a not uncommon phenomenon in texts inscribed years after the events they record) and in all likelihood misreports the filiation of his colleague in the consulship.¹⁷ Unfortunately, the entry for 43 preserved in the corrupt manuscripts of the *F. Amerini* is unusually defective and singularly unhelpful in this regard. Of the record of the third and fourth suffects of the year, only the name 'Ventidius' is handed down, with lacunae of indeterminate size indicated on either side. From the misleading alignment of the entries for the suffects of 45 and 44, it is clear that the spacing in our manuscripts is no guide to the lines of succession to office. Consequently there is no telling whether Ventidius's name preceded or followed that of his colleague, Carrinas, in the list.¹⁸ According to Velleius, the pair entered office on September 22. Dio reports in the same clause the death of Pedius and Octavian's abdication of his consulship (on or before November 27, when the tribune Titius carried the bill establishing the triumvirate). Appian separates the two events by a matter of days.¹⁹ In all likelihood, Ventidius and Carrinas were appointed at the same time. Under the circumstances, an impartial weighing of the evidence concerning the order of succession at the end of 43 must issue in a verdict of *non liquet*.

Inspection of the record of the triumviral years down to 34 imports no novelties, but the order in which the suffects of 40 are reported agrees with that found in the *F. Colotiani*, the *F.*

¹⁴ Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 30-31 and Dio 55.8.6-7 with G. Mancini, *BullCom* 63 (1935) 53; Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 287; and, further on Augustus's reorganization of the *vici magistri*, G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*² (Munich 1912) 172f.

¹⁵ App. *BC* 4.2.6, followed by, e.g., Mancini (above, n. 14) 54 and Broughton, *MRR* 2.337.

¹⁶ *BullCom* 63 (1935) 174; *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 287.

¹⁷ Q. Pedius is more probably *M.f.* (so the *F. Capitolini Triumphales* at a. 45) than *Q.f.* (*F. Colotiani*): cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 134, 275. See also *ZPE* 96 (1993) 263 n. 15, on the representation of Julius Caesar as *ordinarius* in 45, and, more generally on anachronistic titles, Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII ii, 382 and *Scr. var.* 3.367.

¹⁸ W. Henzen (*CIL* I² p. 63) and E. Bormann (*CIL* XI 4345) place the latter first; Degrassi (*Inscr. It.* XIII i, 242) reverses the order, basing himself explicitly on the *F. magistrorum vici*.

¹⁹ Vell. 2.65.2; Dio 47.15.2; App. *BC* 4.6-7.

Biondiani, and the *F. sacerdotum* from the Roman Forum,²⁰ and the listing at a. 38 conforms to the sequence of succession for that year deducible from other sources.²¹ If Salomies's restoration of the fragmentary record of the end of the year 39 in the *F. Tauromenitani* is correct, we can deduce from the discrepancy between the order in which the suffecti are there reported ([*P. Alfen*]u[s], [*C. Coc*]ceiu[s]) and that preserved in the *F. magistrorum vici* and the *F. Biondiani* what most probably was the sequence of succession toward the end of the year:²²

39 BC	L. Marcius Censorinus	C. Calvisius Sabinus
	" "	P. Alfenus Varus
	C. Cocceius Balbus	" "

More secure is the picture of a. 38 obtained from a comparison of the *F. magistrorum vici* and the *F. Biondiani* with an altar base found near Verona recording the consular pair C. Norbanus and L. Lentulus and the entry for the same year in the *F. Tauromenitani*, which shows Lentulus entering office in July and L. Phillipus, the other suffect of the year, entering in September:²³

38 BC	Jan. 1:	Ap. Claudius Pulcher	C. Norbanus Flaccus
	July 1:	L. Cornelius Lentulus	" "
	Sept. 1:	" "	L. Marcius Philippus

The same procedure allows a partial and tentative clarification of the picture of a. 35, where the *F. magistrorum vici* are at odds with all other literary and epigraphic sources except Cassiodorus in the order in which they report the *ordinarii* of the year: *Sex. Pomp(eius)*, *L. Cornifi(cius)*.²⁴ If the compiler of the *F. magistrorum vici* was consistent in his recording practice—that is, if in registering the suffecti of the year (P. Cornelius, T. Peducaeus) he listed first the one who succeeded the *ordinarius* he had listed first—then the most plausible reconstruction of the year consists as follows:

35 BC	Jan. 1:	L. Cornificius	Sex. Pompeius
	July 1:	" "	P. Cornelius Dolabella
	Sept. 1:	T. Peducaeus	" "

If, on the other hand, he merely transposed the names of the two *ordinarii* but otherwise copied his model accurately, then the most probable scenario is that Dolabella replaced Cornificius and Peducaeus succeeded to Pompeius. Less attractive than either of these alternatives, in view of the pattern of alternating substitutions established already in 36 and

²⁰ For the last, see *CIL* I² p. 60 no. IIIb (*ILS* 9338 no. 3). Dio 48.32.1-2 seems to imply that the two suffecti entered office at the same time.

²¹ That is, the first suffect listed replaced the first *ordinarius* of the year and the second replaced the second. For the unconventional consular pairings of the triumphal years ('youthful careerists matched with decorative nonentities'), see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986) 27-29 (quote from p. 28).

²² O. Salomies, *Arctos* 22 (1988) 131; the suggestion that Varus and Balbus entered office together on July 1, however, seems to be refuted by the calendar from Amiternum, which records both *ordinarii* in office on September 3 (*CIL* I² p. 244), and by the *sc de Aphrodisiensibus*, which apparently has them still serving on October 2: J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982) no. 8 line 83, with pp. 64f.; but cf. above, at n. 11.

²³ Cf. *AE* 1945, 66 (*ILLRP* 203; altar base); *AE* 1988, 626a (*F. Tauromenitani*).

²⁴ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 508f. Add *ILLRP* 1271b, which shows the *ordinarii* still in office on June 19, and now, the *F. Tauromenitani*.

(apparently) 39 and 38 and continued in 34 (see below)—is the possibility that Peducaeus replaced the first suffect Dolabella, in which case Dolabella himself might have succeeded to either *ordinarius*.²⁵

In order to elucidate the record of 34, when four suffects entered office, we have recourse not only to the chronological listings preserved in the *F. Venusini* and *F. Tauromenitani* but also to Dio's report that Antony abdicated his ordinary consulship in favor of Sempronius on the first day of the year (49.39.1). Unfortunately, that is not enough. We need to know also what procedure the compiler of the *F. magistrorum vici* followed when dealing with a year in which both consular positions changed hands and at least one of them turned over more than once. Happily, our knowledge of the year 12, which saw the deaths of two consuls in office, is sufficiently complete to allow us to deduce precisely this information. The small fragment of the Capitoline Fasti preserving the entry for that year shows that the first *ordinarius*, M. Valerius Mesalla Appianus, died and was replaced by C. Valgius Rufus, who subsequently abdicated in favor of C. Caninius Rebilus, who himself died before the end of the year.²⁶ An equally small fragment of the *F. Cuprenses*, supplemented by an adjoining piece now lost, indicates that L. Volusius Saturninus held office in August, and the entry for the same year in the *F. Colotiani* makes it clear that he succeeded the other *ordinarius*, P. Sulpicius Quirinius.²⁷ Thus, any list like the Capitoline Fasti or the *F. Colotiani* designed to mark succession must have been set out more or less like this:

M. Valerius Mesalla Appianus	P. Sulpicius Quirinius
C. Valgius Rufus	L. Volusius Saturninus
C. Caninius Rebilus	

Since it was from some such list that the compiler of the *F. magistrorum vici* derived his information, it is from this sort of arrangement that we must deduce his practice in recording the suffects of each year. From the series of names C. Valgius, C. Caninius, L. Volusius, we therefore conclude that he listed first all suffects registered under the name of the first *ordinarius* before passing to those listed under the second *ordinarius*. That is, for each year he read down the columns vertically rather than across the lines left to right.

So informed—and assuming, always, that the compiler and carver behaved consistently—we can then extrapolate from the sequence of names L. Semproniu(s), Pa. Aemilius,

²⁵ The identity of this Cornelius Dolabella, long presumed to be a Scipio, is unknown: Salomies, *ZPE* 86 (1991) 190f. canvasses various possibilities.

²⁶ *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 58f., fr. XLIV (Pl. XXXVIII). In view of the regularity of the formulae employed in these lists, Degrassi's supplement *in / [mag(istratu) mort(uus) est. In eius] l(ocum) f(actus) e(st)* is virtually certain.

²⁷ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 245f. fr. IV; 273f. Unlike the relevant fragment of the Capitoline Fasti, the slab of the *F. Colotiani* exhibits ample space beneath the name of Caninius to have accommodated that of Volusius, had he filled the vacancy left at Caninius's death. *CIL* VI 21158 (*ILS* 8150), recording Sulpicius and Valgius in office on August 29, must be mistaken in the date (so Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 247); in this case the source of the error seems apparent: for *III K. Sept.* the carver meant to write *III K. Sext.*, that is, July 29: cf. *CIL* VI 17130 (*CLE* 963) of the same year: *IV K. Sext.*

C. Memmius, M. Herennius preserved in the *F. magistrorum vici* at a. 34 the lines of succession to each office, and the full picture of the consular pairings of the year falls into place:²⁸

34 BC	Jan. 1:	M. Antonius	L. Scribonius Libo
		L. Sempronius Atratinus	" "
	July 1:	Paullus Aemilius Lepidus	C. Memmius
	Sept. / Nov. 1?:	" "	M. Herennius

It has not previously been known whether Herennius replaced Lepidus or Memmius in office, or that the former succeeded to Atratinus and the latter to Libo.

With the year 33 complications arise: no fewer than six suffecti are registered in both the *F. magistrorum vici* and the *F. Venusini*, which supply their dates of entry into office, but there is no way the sequences of names in the two lists can be reconciled without presuming that one is in error. We happen to be unusually well informed from other sources about the pairings in office at the beginning and end of the year, so that it is possible to construct a partial picture of the lines of succession without resorting to the *F. magistrorum vici*. Absent their evidence, we know 1) that Octavian abdicated on the first day in favor of L. Autronius, who served for several months with the other *ordinarius*, L. Volcaci; 2) that both men were succeeded on May 1 by a new pair, L. Flavius and C. Fonteius; 3) that L. Vinicius entered office on September 1, and that Q. Laronius did so precisely a month later; and 4) that Vinicius and Laronius were in office together on November 1.²⁹ In other words, it is clear that by the end of October the two suffecti of May and the one of July had been replaced, but in what order and who by whom remains uncertain. The situation can be schematically represented thus:

33 BC	Jan. 1:	Imp. Caesar	L. Volcaci Tullus
		L. Autronius Paetus	" "
	May 1:	L. Flavius	C. Fonteius Capito
	July 1:	M. Acilius Glabrio	
	Sept. 1:	L. Vinicius	
	Oct. 1:	Q. Laronius	
		[Nov. 1: L. Vinicius : Q. Laronius]	

Corresponding to this picture the *F. magistrorum vici* list the suffecti in the following order: Autronius, Vinicius, Flavius, Fonteius, Acilius, Laronius. Comparison of the two records prompts a pair of related observations: the sequence preserved in the *F. magistrorum vici* cannot accurately reflect an arrangement designed to indicate the lines of succession, since the names of Vinicius and Laronius, who served together in office at the end of the year, are separated by three other names; on the other hand, if Vinicius's name is removed from its incorrect position in the list, the testimony of the *F. magistrorum vici* is otherwise consistent with the chronological record supplied by the *F. Venusini*. The simplest solution is to suppose that Acilius succeeded to Fonteius, Vinicius to Flavius, Laronius to Acilius, in which case we

²⁸ The *F. Tauromenitani* (*K. Sept.*) and the *F. Venusini* (*K. Novem.*) disagree on the date the last suffect of the year entered office. The latter is *difficilior* but has little else to recommend it: cf. Salomies, *ZPE* 86 (1991) 192. After *Sept.* in the *F. Tauromenitani* no trace of a name survives. Between the two there is little to choose.

²⁹ Cf. *CIL* VIII 22640.3, XV 4566, App. *Illyr.* 28.80 (Volcaci and Autronius); *F. Venusini* (Flavius and Fonteius); *CIL* IX 1554, R. Herzog, *RE* 34 (1937) s.v. 'Nummularius', 1427 no. 74 (Nov. 1; Vinicius and Laronius).

need imagine only a simple transposition of the *gentilicia* of Vinicius and Flavius (prompted, perhaps, by the column of identical *praenomina* listed beneath Caesar's name) to account for the chronologically impossible displacement of Vinicius's name in the *F. magistrorum vici*. The compiler's model may have looked something like this:

Imp. Caesar	L. Volcaci
L. Autronius	C. Fonteius
L. Flavius	M. Acilius
L. Vinicius	Q. Laronius

Where the possibilities of error are so numerous, the need for caution is acute, but the knowledge that other explanations are possible should not deter us from accepting as a working hypothesis a solution that posits a minimum of disturbance in an obviously mistaken but otherwise reliable source.³⁰

With the exception of the year 12 (discussed above), the record of the following years down to 2 provides little opportunity for gain, but we can draw a simple negative conclusion regarding the succession in 32—namely that the suffect M. Valerius Messala, who entered office on November 1, cannot have replaced the first *ordinarius* of the year, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarus, but must instead have succeeded either to the other *ordinarius*, C. Sosius, or to the first suffect of the year, L. Cornelius (Cinna?), whose term began on July 1.³¹ We note also that the record of 30, when three suffects entered office, conforms with Dio's passing remark, in discussing events of 29, that Octavian held the consulship throughout that year, as he had throughout the two previous years.³² At a. 5, a year like 30 in which three suffects served, the same sort of negative argument applies as with the year 32: the suffect named last cannot have succeeded to the first *ordinarius*.³³

With the year 2 the system of recording changes: whereas previously the suffects of each year had been listed in a single column, henceforth their names appear two per line. In fact, the carver who entered the names of the *ordinarii* of the year seems to have had difficulty in adapting this new style to the spatial requirements set by the entries for the earlier years carved above: the names of the first two suffects of the year appear *in rasura*, and the generic designation *suffectus*, elsewhere abbreviated to *suf.*, is here reduced to *s*. Degrassi noted a corresponding change on the opposite side of the slab, which preserves the *fasti* of the *vici magistri* themselves from 7 BC to AD 21: whereas the names up through the year 2/1 were evidently cut by the same hand, subsequent entries appear to be the work of several different carvers.

³⁰ With Acilius and Vinicius replacing the suffects of May, only Octavian and Antony's proxy Fonteius Capito (*Antoni non ut magis alter amicus*: Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.32; *PIR*² F 469) served less than three months in office.

³¹ This we deduce from the fact that the *F. magistrorum vici* report the suffects in the same order as the *F. Venusini*, which give the dates.

³² Dio 51.21.1. Since we know from Plut. *Cic.* 49.4 that Octavian shared the *fasces* with Cicero's son, who entered office on the Ides of September as the second suffect of the year (*F. Venusini*; Pliny, *HN* 22.13), the listing of his name second of three in the *F. magistrorum vici* ensures that the last suffect, L. Saenius, who entered office on November 1 (*F. Venusini*), succeeded to his position rather than to Octavian's. A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'impero Romano* (Rome 1952) 3 mistakenly omits Saenius's consulship during the last two months of the year.

³³ That the first two suffects entered office together, as is regularly assumed, is by no means certain.

From these discrepancies Degraasi concluded that the lists had been commissioned by the officials who entered office on August 1 (the normal day of accession for *magistri vicorum*) in 2 and were originally inscribed shortly thereafter.³⁴ In fact, we are reliably informed by Velleius that Augustus, who began the year with his thirteenth consulship, had as colleague the first suffect of the year, L. Caninius, when he dedicated the Temple of Mars Ultor (whether that was on May 12 or, more probably, August 1),³⁵ and our knowledge of the remaining consular pairings of the year is complete:³⁶

2 BC	Jan. 1:	Imp. Caesar XIII	M. Plautius Silvanus
	July 1?:	" "	L. Caninius Gallus
	Sept. 1?:	C. Fufius Geminus	" "
	Nov. 1?:	Q. Fabricius	" "

From the order in which the *F. magistrorum vici* present the suffects—L. Caninius, C. Fufius, Q. Fabricius—we must therefore conclude that the cosmetic change in recording style marks a more fundamental change in the way the names were compiled. Evidently the new carver abandoned his predecessor's practice of transcribing individual columns of names arranged according to succession in favor of listing the suffects by date.³⁷ Whether he did so by chance, because he happened to work from a new model organized in that way, or by design, because the Princeps chose that year to promote a different system of recording suffects in consular lists, is impossible to say, but the latter possibility deserves brief consideration.

The year 2 marked a watershed in the Augustan Principate. With the ordained successor Tiberius held in isolation on Rhodes and the new heir apparent Gaius Caesar setting out for the East with a higher mandate, it was indeed, as Syme has said, a time of 'crisis'.³⁸ It was also the time of a subtle but momentous shift in the ideology of the Augustan regime, away from redemption of the past toward a consolidation of the future. On January 1 the Princeps,

³⁴ Cf. *BullCom* 63 (1935) 178; *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 279, 290, and Pls. LXXXVI, LXXXVIII.

³⁵ Vell. 2.100.2. Dio states unequivocally that the Temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated on August 1 (60.5.3). This has been contested by C. J. Simpson, *JRS* 67 (1977) 91-94, who prefers to follow Ovid's account (*Fasti* 5.545-98) describing the 'Avenger's' descent from heaven to celebrate his new temple on May 12. It is not clear, however, that Ovid refers to the formal *dies natalis* (cf. F. Cassola, in L. Gasperini, ed., *Scritti sul mondo antico in memoria di Fulvio Grosso* [Rome 1981] 99-118) or that his apparent confusion of an earlier and lesser shrine on the Capitoline with the new Augustan monument is inadvertent and mistaken rather than learnedly Alexandrian and ideologically adept: see J. Scheid, *PCPS* 38 (1992) 118-31, esp. 124ff. From Suetonius's report that Augustus held his abbreviated consulships *aut novem aut sex aut quattuor aut tribus mensibus* (Aug. 26.3), G. Alföldy, *Studi sull'epigrafia augustea e tiberiana di Roma* (Rome 1992), 25 infers that he must have resigned his office in 2 at the end of June (and consequently that he dedicated the Temple of Mars on May 12); but Suetonius's figures cannot to be pressed (cf. *Inscr. Ital.* XIII i, 52ff. s.aa. 43, 23), and the duration of Augustus's consulships in 5 and 2 must remain an open question.

³⁶ Cf. *CIL* VI 36809 (*ILS* 9250), an altar dedicated on September 18 by *ministri* of the same cult of the *Lares Augusti* on the Caelian (*L. Caninio Gallo, C. Fufio Gemino*); Aug. *RG* 16.2; Herzog (above, n. 29) 1429f. no. 90: a *tessera* dated December 1 (Caninius and Fabricius). Syme (above, n. 21) 88 n. 45, following Groag (*PIR*² F 510), is mistaken in believing that Fufius's name was purposefully erased: see Degraasi, *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 289.

³⁷ Note that the *F. Cuprenses*, which seem to exhibit the dating formula in their record of the suffects of 12 (*Inscr. It.* XIII i, 245), seem also in their fragmentary record of 2 to list the suffects in the same order as the *F. magistrorum vici*; see further below, at n. 55.

³⁸ Syme, *Sitz. Bay. Ak. Wiss.* (1974) 3-34 [*Roman Papers* 3.912-36]. F. Romer, *TAPA* 108 (1978) 187-202 argues convincingly from coins (*BMCRE* I, Aug. nos. 498-502) for placing Gaius's departure in 2.

now sixty years of age, assumed the *fasces* as consul for the last time in order to preside at the induction into public life of his second adopted son, Lucius Caesar, as he had done three years previously when Gaius came of age.³⁹ On February 5 he received the title ‘Pater patriae’—by universal popular acclaim, as he was pleased to record in his *Res Gestae*, a draft of which he first drew up in this year. In the spring or summer he dedicated the temple of Mars Ultor, vowed forty years earlier at Philippi, now destined to become the hub of a new center for foreign affairs, and celebrated the event with a staged *naumachia* in which 3,000 participants reenacted the engagement of Athenians and Persians at Salamis. Finally, during the fall he embarked on a new program of social reform with a law limiting testamentary manumissions—even as he endured the public embarrassment, after the last round of legislation, of Julia’s domestic disgrace.⁴⁰

When viewed in the context of this eventful year, the commissioning by the Augustan *vici magistri* on the Aventine of a calendar and consular *fasti* from the year 43 may be seen to reflect the formal reckoning of an era begun with the assassination of Caesar and now set on a new course with a dedication that simultaneously marked the final payment of vengeance for a father’s murder (a theme gently pushed into the background) and the advent of a fresh campaign of vengeance against the Parthian menace. What is more, if the new temple and forum were indeed consecrated by the Princeps on the very day the new *vici magistri* entered office (August 1), the suspicion arises that the decision of the Aventine block chiefs to publish a calendar and consular list may not have been entirely spontaneous. The advantages of marking the dawn of a new era with a new method of officially keeping time must have appealed to the builder of the sundial complex in the Campus Martius, dedicated some seven years previously, and the consecration of a temple destined to serve as the new center of the state religion provided an ideal opportunity to introduce a change.⁴¹

Among the arcane rituals Augustus revived or inaugurated along with the new forum, Dio records a provision that a nail be driven into the Temple of Mars Ultor at the end of each *lustrum*.⁴² The source, if not the origin, of the rite has long been apparent. Livy, following the antiquarian L. Cincius, in a confused passage cites an ancient law (*vetusta lex*) affixed to the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline requiring the chief magistrate annually on the Ides of September to hammer in a nail in order to mark the passage of another year. He goes on to say that the consul M. Horatius dedicated the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus ‘according to that law’ (*ea lege* H. J. Müller : *ex lege* codd.), or ‘and the law’ (*et legem* Madvig), during the

³⁹ Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*² (Berlin 1883) 52 speculates that the ceremonies were performed on January 1, but celebrating the ascendance of Gaius and Lucius as *principes iuventutis* was a leitmotif throughout the year: cf. Alföldy (above, n. 35) 28-31. The retirement age for senators had perhaps recently been set at sixty: cf. Sen. *Brev. Vit.* 20.4 with R.J.A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984) 152-54.

⁴⁰ Cf. Aug. *RG* 23, 35.1; Ovid, *Fasti* 5.579-98, *Ars* 1.171-76; Vell. 2.100; Suet. *Aug.* 58; Dio 55.10. 1-15; Gaius, *Inst.* 1.42, 46 (*lex Fufia Caninia*) with, e.g., G. Bowersock, in *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, F. Millar and E. Segal, eds., (Oxford 1984) 170-80; C. Nicolet, *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor 1991) 19, 41-45; and, for a compelling characterization of this last, most ‘Augustan’ phase of the early Julio-Claudian era (2 BC - AD 29) as a time of ‘triumphalism and anxiety’, F. Millar, *JRS* 83 (1993) 2f.

⁴¹ Cf. E. Buchner, *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus* (Mainz 1982).

⁴² Dio 55.10.4 ἡλόν τε ἀὐτῷ (sc. τῷ ναῷ) ὑπὸ τῶν τιμητευάντων προσπήγνυθαι.

first year of the Republic, and he adds that the nail-driving ceremony was subsequently transferred from the consuls to dictators, *quia maius imperium erat* (7.3.5-8). Whatever the basis of this last claim, which purports to elucidate the obscure Republican office of *dictator clavi figendi causa*, we may infer from the first part of Livy's account a popular association in the time of Augustus of the driving of the nail, the dedication of a temple to the chief state deity, and the beginning of a new form of government characterized by annual magistrates. Onto this complex of ideas Livy (it seems) grafted the apotropaic rite occasionally performed by Roman dictators in times of pestilence, the union being effected through an alleged transfer of authority from consuls to the higher magistrates.⁴³ By reviving the nail-fixing rite and placing it in the hands of 'those who have completed the census' (οἱ τιμητεύσαντες)—effectively, under the Principate, the emperor—on the occasion of a sacrifice before the army in the Campus Martius, Augustus thus elevated Mars Ultor, as protector of the census and hence of the periodic refoundation of the *populus Romanus*, to a status previously occupied by Jupiter Capitolinus; in this respect the initiative conforms with several measures of 2 BC aimed at replacing the state deity of Republican Rome with the patron god of the new regime.⁴⁴

At the same time, the chronological significance of the ritual, its function in marking the passage of years, links the driving of the nail with the tradition of inscribing consular lists; for, appearances notwithstanding, the Republican consular *fasti* in origin had nothing to do with the constitutional reforms attending the expulsion of the kings but derived instead from the establishment of a new calendar in conjunction with the foundation of the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline. Both events were traditionally assigned to the same year, but only the latter is relevant to the genesis of the lists, which are, after all, essentially a record of eponyms.⁴⁵ The municipal *fasti* of Venusia and Tauromenium show that Romans of the late Republic associated the inscribing of consular lists with keeping a record of dates, and we need not doubt that Augustus, who knew well the ideological value of controlling the calendar, was alert to any opportunity to legitimize the new regime by manipulating the public perception of time.⁴⁶ With the official opening, long deferred, of the new center of international affairs, the moment was right to signal the advent of the new epoch by encouraging the formal adoption of the newer method of registering suffect consuls in the annual lists.

Characteristically, the vehicle chosen to promote this innovation looked back to the past. Having fallen out of use during the latter years of the Republic, the annual nail-driving ritual was susceptible to adaptation and reinterpretation, and a superficial change in the style of recording the annual magistrates might usefully screen a more fundamental change in the significance of the ceremony itself. No doubt in expanding the units of time demarcated from years to *lustra*, Augustus publicly emphasized the apotropaic character of the traditional piac-

⁴³ Cf. Paul. exc. Fest. p. 49 L. s.v. 'clavus annalis'; *F. Capitolini* at aa. 363, 331; Livy 7.3.3, 9.28.6, 9.34.12, etc., with L. Aigner Foresti, *AJAH* 4 (1979) 144-56.

⁴⁴ See M. Bonnefond, in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire* (Rome 1987) 251-78, esp. 265f.

⁴⁵ This point was well made by K. Hanell, *Das altrömische eponyme Amt* (Lund 1946) ('the most important book ever written on the fasti': R.T. Ridley, *Athenaeum* 58 [1980] 282-85), 95-144, esp. pp. 138-40 on the nail-fixing ceremonies of Jupiter Capitolinus and Mars Ultor.

⁴⁶ Massaging the data to justify the celebration of *ludi saeculares* in 17 is only the most notorious instance of interference: see A. Wallace-Hadrill, in *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble*, M. Whitby et al. eds. (London 1987) 221-30.

lar nail-driving as a link to the purificatory ceremonies that marked the completion of the census. A more subtle effect of this adjustment was the severing of the rite from the tradition of annual eponymity to which it originally belonged, that honor being henceforth reserved for the emperor. Encouraging the listing of suffectus by date in consular *fasti* would have concealed this rude separation by calling attention to the purely chronological function such documents otherwise served. From a practical standpoint, the details of consular pairings and succession mattered less in the Augustan empire than the regular progression of prospective administrators and governors through the highest civil office. Some time previously the Princeps had come to the conclusion that if new blood was to be infused into the system without thinning the old, more qualifying positions were needed, and more regularly, than the traditional pattern of annually elected pairs would allow. In order to meet this need, he conceived the idea of regularly appointing pairs of suffectus at fixed dates.⁴⁷

When precisely he introduced this expediency is not known, but the widely accepted date of a. 5 will scarcely stand up to inspection.⁴⁸ It is true that Augustus assumed the *fasces* in that year after an abstention of nearly two decades (since 23) and that suffectus served then for the first time since 12. It is by no means certain, however, that a pair assumed office on July 1, as later became standard, or indeed that any two entered office together. For all we know, the three suffectus succeeded one another in turn, each sharing the *fasces* with the Princeps, as had happened in 29.⁴⁹ In the following year one of the *ordinarii* was apparently still serving on July 7, so two suffectus cannot have entered office together on the first of the month.⁵⁰ In 3 the *ordinarii* remained in office throughout the year. Two suffectus served in 1, sometime after March.⁵¹ Our first hint of a regularly scheduled change of office comes with fragment XLV of the Capitoline Fasti, which preserves the subsequently standard formula *ex k(alendis) Iul(iis)* next to the name of the only suffectus of the following year, AD 1. This provides a *terminus ante quem* and no more. The later predominant pattern of two suffectus entering office as a pair is first attested in the Capitoline Fasti at AD 2. If we ask which year between 5 BC and AD 2 is most likely to have seen the introduction of a new imperial prerogative designed to augment the supply of senior administrators fit for provincial governorships, the year 2 BC, when Augustus held the *fasces* for the last time, must surely appear the leading candidate. When we remember that administrative changes introduced in conjunction with the

⁴⁷ The picture drawn by F.B. Marsh, *The Founding of the Roman Empire*² (Oxford 1927) 248-51 is in this respect perfectly correct.

⁴⁸ No hesitation shown by, e.g., Gallivan (above, n. 10) (1981) 186 or Talbert (above, n. 39) 21, but the orthodoxy seems to be recent; more cautious—and accurate—was H. Stuart Jones, in *The Cambridge Ancient History* X (1934) 178, ‘regular from AD 2 onwards’. Dio 48.35.2 conflates this practice with the triumviral designations of 39; hence the possible relevance of his discussion in that context (48.35.3) of the principle of eponymity residing only with the *ordinarii* (but see above, n. 11).

⁴⁹ The *ordinarii* were still in office on April 11 (Pliny, *NH* 7.60) and, if Degrassi’s interpretation (above, n. 32, p. 5) of a fragmentary cippus discovered in the Forum Boarium (*CIL* VI 9319) is correct, the last suffectus of the year served sometime between July 16 and August 13. We have no idea how or when the first two suffectus came to office.

⁵⁰ Pace Degrassi, *loc. cit.*, *CIL* XV 4588 shows only that the second *ordinarius*, L. Passienus Rufus, was in office on the Nones of July.

⁵¹ A fragmentary *tessera* (Herzog [above, n. 29] 1429f. no. 91) shows the *ordinarii* in office on or before April 1.

dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor would not have taken effect until the following year—the first since 5 when a pair of suffectus might have entered office together on July 1—the coincidence of means and opportunity makes the circumstantial case seem even more compelling.

In support of this hypothesis the most that can be said of the entries for the remaining years covered by the *F. magistrorum vici* down to AD 3, in which suffectus are registered two per line, is that the record is consistent with, if not probative of, an ordering by date of accession to office. A final tally thus will show that the reconstructed models of consular pairings derived from the *F. magistrorum vici* are consistent with other evidence in most cases where we can check, several times significantly so (at aa. 40, 38, 30, 12), and at odds with it only twice (aa. 43, 33)—once (a. 33) clearly in error, although according to the interpretation proposed here, less dramatically so than has previously been supposed. In three instances the method yields a partial (aa. 32, 5) or tentative (a. 35) clarification of the pairings throughout the year, and in one case (a. 34) application of the new tool elucidates the entire picture for the first time. Recognizing the basis on which the names of suffectus were arranged further enables us to detect a change in the record of the year 2, not only in the style of reporting but in the method of compiling, a change that fits well with other innovations of the year. To what extent this change is in fact reflective of new initiatives in foreign and administrative policy associated with the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor remains an open question, but it is fair to say that even an awareness of this possibility we owe to the improved understanding of the genesis of the lists the new method of analysis affords.

The remaining *fasti consulares minores* for which the principle of arrangement is unclear can be dispensed with more briefly.

III

It will be useful to consider the evidence roughly in chronological order, according to the dates for which the record allows any meaningful inferences about the method of compilation to be drawn, since the earliest cases are also the clearest.

The *F. Biondiani* (a single fragment of uncertain date preserving a continuous but partial record of the years 41-36 and 22-12) agree with the *F. magistrorum vici* and the Capitoline Fasti in the order of the suffectus of 36 and at aa. 40, 39, and 38 (the only other years extant in which more than one suffectus served) present a sequence consistent with an arrangement according to the lines of succession to office.⁵²

By contrast, the *F. Amiternini*, which probably, like the *F. Venusini*, recorded consuls from the time of the Social War and which seem to have been carved in the same hand, possibly in the year with which they end (28), were quite obviously organized according to date. Like the *F. Venusini* and the *F. Cupresnes*, they register not only the names of consuls, censors, and dictators, but also the various wars fought during the last fifty years of the Republic—chronologically, at the year in which each began, with a special notation reserved for marking the end of the civil conflicts between Antony and Octavian. This last entry ap-

⁵² Cf. *ZPE* 96 (1993) 265 n. 21. At a. 40, the lines of succession are confirmed by the *F. Colotiani*; at aa. 39 and 38, the *F. Biondiani* agree with the *F. magistrorum vici*.

appears at the appropriate place in the list: under the year 30, between the lines recording the suffect consulships of C. Antistius, who entered office on July 1, and M. Tullius Cicero, who replaced him on September 13.⁵³ From this we infer that, as with the *F. Venusini*, where the dates of accession are made explicit, the *F. Amiternini* listed the suffects of each year in chronological order, a supposition which the few other relevant surviving entries (at aa. 43, 32, 31) do nothing to contradict.⁵⁴ The *fasti* from Amiternum thus join those from Venusia and Tauromenium as our earliest consular lists arranged by date.

At Cupra Maritima the local consular *fasti*, carved in various hands on various pieces of limestone at various dates (beginning, it seems, sometime before 41), in their record of 12 apparently report the accession into office of the suffect L. Volusius Saturninus in ‘August’ (rather than ‘Sextilis’), from which it follows that this entry was not inscribed before a. 8, and at a. 2 list the suffects in the same order as the *F. magistrorum vici*.⁵⁵ This suggests an arrangement by chronology, at least in those entries carved toward the end of the first century BC; to judge from the surviving fragments, consistency of practice is not to be expected.

Comparison of the record of 5 in the *F. magistrorum vici* with the *F. Lucerini*, which list the suffects of the year in the same order but which record the first two in a single line beneath the *ordinarii* and give the third beneath the first, shows that the compiler of the latter was content simply to copy the names in the order in which he found them without trying to represent either the chronological sequence or the lines of succession to office. In this respect, as in others, the *fasti* from Luceria, which Borghesi assigned on the basis of the lettering to the Augustan period, resemble a section of the *F. Potentini* inscribed nearly a century later.⁵⁶ In the column of the *fasti* from Potentium preserving the years AD 86-93, the names of the *ordinarii* are recorded in the ablative case, as in the *F. Lucerini* and the *F. Volsinienses* (where too, no doubt, their names were followed by the abbreviation *co(n)s(ulibus)* in a dating formula), whereas *suffecti* are listed in the nominative. This illustrates nicely the tendency during the early Empire for the prestige of the consulship to gravitate toward eponymity and the *ordinarii* at the expense of *suffecti*, whose names are duly recorded *honoris causa* in the consular lists but, in contrast to the *ordinarii*, in the nominative case, since they were rarely used to date events even during the suffects’ own abbreviated terms.

The fragments of the *fasti* of the Arval Brethren recovered from the Grove of the Dea Dia near the fifth milestone of the Via Campana outside the Porta Portuensis in the 1860s and

⁵³ Mommsen’s restoration, *Bell[um classia]r(ium) confect(um)* (CIL IX 4191), accepted by W. Henzen (CIL I² p. 61) and Degraasi (*Inscr. It.* XIII i, 171), is rejected by G. Alföldy, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 167-71, who (following a tradition known to Velleius, 2.88.1, 2.89.3, etc.) plausibly proposes instead *Bell[a civilia p(opuli)] R(omani) confect(a)*.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 169, 510. At a. 44 the line reporting Dolabella’s term as suffect appears out of chronological order—before rather than after the entry recording the perpetual dictatorship of Caesar (conferred between January 26 and February 15)—possibly because to have reversed the sequence would have implied that Dolabella had succeeded to Caesar’s dictatorship as well as to his consulship.

⁵⁵ See G.V. Gentili, *Epigraphica* 10 (1948) 133-36 (*AE* 1950, 93 [a. 2]) and Degraasi’s remarks at *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 246.

⁵⁶ B. Borghesi, *Œuvres complètes* 5 (Paris 1869) 109; cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 259. For the *F. Potentini*, see above, n. 13; note especially the record at AD 90 with CIL XVI 36 (*ILS* 1998), attesting the suffects Albius Pullaienus Pollio and Cn. Pompeius Longinus in office on 27 October, and see further N. Alfieri, *Athenaeum* 26 (1948) 118f. for other peculiarities of this list.

again in the 1980s list the names of consuls and—uniquely among the surviving consular lists—peregrine and urban praetors for many of the years from 2 BC down to the middle of AD 37.⁵⁷ Like their more famous counterparts, the *acta* of the Brothers themselves, the consular records were evidently inscribed more or less contemporaneously with the events they record, that is (with the possible exception of the entries for AD 30-32, which appear to have been carved in the same hand), annually, as the magistrates changed.⁵⁸ Henzen supposed that the lists of magistrates began with the year (probably 29, certainly between 36 and 21) in which Octavian/Augustus reorganized the ancient priestly college, and comparable ensembles of inscribed calendars, consular *fasti*, and lists of local officials displayed in Roman sanctuaries make easy the inference that the full complement of documents found at the Grove of the Dea Dia (calendar, list of magistrates, *acta Arvalium*) was conceived and executed at the same time.⁵⁹

Unlike most of the similar sets of *fasti*, however, the lists of magistrates and the *commentarii* of the Arvals, though evidently designed to occupy slabs of similar width, were clearly not carved by the same hand; consequently, Scheid's careful reconstruction of the surviving fragments, which represents the consular *fasti* and the calendar as having been inscribed on the same slab, though possible, is far from certain.⁶⁰ If the speculation advanced above regarding the initial publication of the *fasti* from the Aventine is correct, the suggestion seems worth advancing that the Arval Brethren, like their more humble Augustan counterparts, the *magistri vicorum*, may have initiated, or revived, the custom of annually inscribing the names of the chief civil magistrates in response to the events at Rome of 2 BC. With minimal adjustment Degrassi's placement of the first surviving fragment (preserving the end of the record of 2 and the beginning of 1 BC) near the head of a column, which allows for an estimated lacuna at the top of four lines, could easily accommodate a full record of the consuls and praetors of the earlier year, whether the column itself was disposed at the head of its own slab or, as in Scheid's reconstruction, beneath the calendar.⁶¹ The order in which the suffectus are listed—normally one above the next but occasionally (as at AD 26, 31, and possibly 30) two per line—generally corresponds with that attested in other sources organized by date, but

⁵⁷ Cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 296 and P. Arnaud, *MEFRA* 98 (1986) 403-6 (*AE* 1987, 163); *Epigraphica* 51 (1989) 16-18 (AD 25-27, 33) with J. Scheid, in *Epigrafia. Actes...Attilio Degrassi* (Rome 1991) 80-87. Copious discussion of the peregrine praetor of AD 25 named in the new fragment, Marcius Hortalus (e.g., M. Corbier, *MEFRA* 103 [1991] 655-701; 104 [1992] 871-916; J. Briscoe, *ZPE* 95 [1993] 249f.; W. Eck, *ZPE* 95 [1993] 251-60), has cast no new light on the list in which his name appears.

⁵⁸ There seems to be no case in which the entries within a single year were carved by different hands.

⁵⁹ W. Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Berlin 1874) ccxlii; cf. *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 296; and J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères* (Paris 1990) 53-55, comparing, for similar ensembles, the *F. magistrorum vici*, *F. Antiaties ministrorum domus Augustae*, *F. Vallenses*, and *F. Pinciani*; add now perhaps also the *F. Tauromenitani* (although the fragments of the calendar are appreciably thicker than those of the consular lists: Bacci [above, n. 1] 724 nn. 28f.). The Augustan reorganization (better than 'restoration': cf. J. Linderski, *CP* 86 [1991] 86) of the Arval Brotherhood is plausibly assigned by Scheid (690-99) to the religious reforms of 29/28.

⁶⁰ Cf. Scheid (above, n. 59) 77-81, esp. fig. 2. At Cupra Maritima, where part of the consular list was inscribed before 33, a calendar seems not to have been added until after 9: *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 246.

⁶¹ *Inscr. It.* XIII i, 297 and Pls. XCI-XCII. On the model of the entry at AD 3, the record of a. 2 would have comprised a total of six lines, one more than Degrassi allowed.

the evidence is insufficiently coherent and compelling to stand up to any criteria of proof.⁶² Only in the entry for AD 31, when four suffectus served, is the record complete enough to allow any meaningful inferences to be drawn about the method of compilation. The pairings of the year can be drawn up as follows:⁶³

AD 31	Jan. 1:	Ti. Caesar V	L. Aelius Sejanus
	May 9:	Faustus Cornelius Sulla	Sex. Tediuss Catullus
	July 1:	" "	L. Fulcinius Trio
	Oct. 1:	P. Memmius Regulus	" "

Corresponding to this picture, the *F. Arvalium* present the suffectus in the order Sulla, Tediuss, Fulcinius, Memmius, from which it follows that this portion of the list is indeed arranged chronologically rather than according to the lines of succession.

Of the undifferentiated lists that record two suffectus per line, the *F. Cuprenses* (at aa. 32-31), *F. Caelimontani* (aa. 25-23, AD 3-6), *F. Praenestini* (AD 5-7, 18-19), *F. Nolani* (at AD 29-30), and *F. Volsinienses* (AD 38) provide insufficient basis for evaluation, and the surviving fragments of the so-called *F. Antiates minores* (AD 9-18) are so riddled with errors, omissions, and inconsistencies of one sort or another that their testimony on questions of this sort is practically worthless.⁶⁴

On balance, then, the evidence of the municipal consular *fasti* supports the view that the method of recording suffectus by date first came into use toward the end of the Republic and quickly established itself as the preferred form during the early Empire. Of the ambiguous lists for which the method of compilation can be discerned, only the *F. Biondiani* (at aa. 40-36) from the outskirts of Rome follow a model drawn up in the old style of marking the lines of succession to office. The consular *fasti* set up at Amiternum, at Cupra Maritima, and at the precinct of the Arval Brethren beside the Via Campana, like those of Venusia, Tauromenium, and Teanum Sidicinum, were organized according to date. To what extent this shift may have been fostered by an imperial initiative in 2 BC to promote the newer form and how far it may reflect a broader change in the perception of the consulship under the early Empire are matters for further discussion. That an analysis of the way suffectus are recorded in the inscribed consular lists can shed light on these larger issues has, I hope, been sufficiently demonstrated.

Rutgers University

John Bodel

⁶² Cf., e.g., at AD 3, 17, 18 (?), 26 (*AE* 1987, 163). At AD 4, the *F. Arvalium* agree with the *F. Gabini*, the *F. Caelimontani*, and *CIL* VI 1263 against the *F. Capitolini* and *CIL* VI 1264 in the order of the two suffectus who entered office on July 1. At AD 29 they agree with the *F. Nolani* against a Pompeian graffito of July 6 (*CIL* IV 1555), two waxed tablets from the Puteolan archive of the Sulpicii signed on July 14 (*TPSulp.* 62, 136; cf. Camodeca [above, n. 10] 66) and two Roman *tesserae* dated July 15 and October 6 (Herzog [above, n. 29] 1431f. nos. 118-119). The source of these discrepancies remains obscure.

⁶³ Dates are supplied by the *F. Ostienses* and the *F. Nolani*, pairings by the *F. Ostienses* (Sulla and Catullus), *Dig.* 48.2.12.Pr. (Sulla and Trio), and *Tac. Ann.* 5.11 (Trio and Regulus). Sejanus's name appears in none of the inscribed *fasti*: cf. Degrassi (above, n. 32) 10. 'Tediuss' conceals a member of the Valerii Catulli: Syme, *Roman Papers* VII (Oxford 1991) 492-94; O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Helsinki 1992) 26.

⁶⁴ Cf. Degrassi *Inscr. It* XIII i, 303. I am grateful to Prof. Jerzy Linderski, who scrutinized these notes, for saving me from several errors of fact and judgment.