

Lunds universitet  
Historiska institutionen  
HISK37  
Examinator: Lars Berggren  
Handledare: Dick Harrison  
2020-01-16

# *Staying Relevant in the Roman Republic*

Old Age, Retirement and Magistrates in the Early to Middle Republic

Viktor Wretström

## **Abstract**

This essay explores the magistrate lists (*fasti* etcetera) covering the period of 509 to 219 BC by looking at an accumulation of political capital and the length of magistrates' careers. This essay attempts to give evidence to several theories for the early and middle Republic, primarily the fact that retirement of consulars occurs around the age of sixty to sixty-five and that one started one's consular career around the age of forty to forty-five. Secondly this essay looks on what the author has coined as *pseudo*-retirements, where one's active career ends after about fifteen to twenty years of *imperium*-holding but the career is extended after retirement by a return to politics after a hiatus of several years, usually to handle a crisis in the Republic. This essay's theoretical basis lies in Hölkeskamp and Hammars use of political culture in the Roman republic and this essay attempts to draw a correlation between accumulated political capital and length of career. This focus lies on how different prestigious posts (*dictator* or *ensor*) or awards (*triumphs*) affected career length, and if being part of a *gentes maiores* influenced career length.

The results are as previously mentioned further evidence towards extending the concept of retirement towards the early and middle Republic and that Sulla's reforms regarding a minimum age for becoming consul was more or less a consolidation of an established praxis. Further this essay shows that certain posts, especially that of *dictator* and *interrex* had a large political capital attached to them and effected the length of one's career to a larger extent than other factors such as that of *triumph*, being *ensor* or belonging to one of the *gentes maiores*.

**Keywords:** political culture in ancient Rome, retirement, Roman republic, consuls, *fasti*

# Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Purpose</i> .....	3
<i>Subject and Method</i> .....	3
<i>Earlier Research and Historical Context</i> .....	4
THE CONCEPT OF IMPERIUM AND HIGH AUSPICES .....	4
<i>Major magistrates</i> .....	5
Office of Consul .....	5
Office of the Consular Tribunes (tribuni militum consulari potestate).....	6
Office of Praetor.....	7
Office of the Propraetor and Proconsul .....	7
Office of Censor .....	8
Office of Dictator & magister equitum .....	8
Office of Interrex & Praefectus urbi.....	9
Repeated elections.....	9
ON THE QUESTION OF AGE .....	10
POWER OF THE SENATE & THE CONSULARES .....	12
<i>The Patriarch versus the Magistrate</i> .....	12
IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION AND CEREMONIES .....	14
<i>Triumphs, Ovations and Similar Ceremonies</i> .....	15
POLITICAL CULTURE IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC .....	17
<i>Aspect of Political Power</i> .....	19
SOURCES .....	22
<b>RETIREMENT IN THE POLITICAL ELITE: AN ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
HYPOTHESIS 1: RETIREMENT .....	24
<i>Pseudoretirement - “Everyone loves a comeback story”</i> .....	28
HYPOTHESIS 2: POLITICAL OFFICES AS A DIRECT CORRELATION TO POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL .....	32
<b>SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>36</b>
OLD AGE & RETIREMENT .....	36
POLITICAL CAPITAL AND MAGISTRATES .....	38
ENDING REMARKS: USEFULNESS OF THE DATA .....	40
<b>SOURCES &amp; LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>41</b>
SOURCES .....	41
LITERATURE .....	41
<i>Appendix 1</i> .....	42
<i>Appendix 2</i> .....	45
<i>Appendix 3</i> .....	49

# INTRODUCTION

## **Purpose**

1. Studying the amount of time, a senator could expect to stay politically relevant as well as when he was expected to enter a phase of retirement. In addition, how common was it to return from this apparent retirement.
2. Comparative analysis of social capital as a direct correlation with political achievements of individuals within the Roman Republic from 509 to 219 BC.

The purpose of this essay is to better understand the concept of retirement within the political elite in the early to middle periods of the Roman Republic and to contribute to mapping out a typical career of those who succeeded in staying relevant for extended periods of time within the magistrate and senatorial system. The essay is also an attempt to better understand these “great men” who won election after election within the Republic and how they differ from their less successful contemporaries who commonly faded away from relevance (or at least from our sources) after their first major magistrate.

## **Subject and Method**

The focus of this essay will be on Broughton’s compilation of magistrates in a two-step analysis: firstly, a quantitative study to help with the selection of relevant individuals within the time period, secondly a qualitative study of these selected individuals. The essay will only focus on the career a senator had after his first major magistrate post. A major magistrate post in the case of the essay is defined as one of the following: Censor, Consul, Magister Equitum, Dictator, Praetor, Interrex, Praefectus Urbi, Military Tribune with Consular Powers [Consular Tribunes] and Decemviri with Consular Powers.

The quantitative study will result in a list containing the following information: full name of the individual, father, and grandfather’s name (if available), Patrician or Plebeian status, first year achieving a major magistrate, last year of gaining any magistrate, presumed year of retirement/year of death, as well as the period between first major magistrate and last magistrate. From this list, every individual who succeeded in gaining at least three major magistrates during their lifetime will be selected to provide the base for the qualitative study. Additional selection within this group

will be made based on statistical variations such as career length, number of major magistrates during one's career and observed career patterns. Further, this study will discuss expected lifespan, expected age of retirement and value the achievements of the individual within his active lifespan and then make comparisons with other contemporary individuals.

## **Earlier Research and Historical Context**

In a field with little to no primary sources, the historical context and earlier research easily blend together for a period such as the early and middle Republic of ancient Rome. The dominant theory of one day, may be rejected the next day, and with it our views and understanding of the Republic. So, to make this quite theoretical field with not only a low number of sources, but also sources of poor quality, it is obvious that we need to primarily focus on what earlier researchers can provide us with. Complications with this approach in earlier research involves accessibility, with a substantial portion of research being carried out and written in German or Italian and the primary sources in either Latin or ancient Greek. Among the earlier researchers we find the monumental works of Mommsen and that of later researchers' such as Wittmann & Kunkel's works on the Roman constitution. Considering that my own linguistic ability with German and Italian is severely lacking I have instead relied on secondary accounts or translations of these monumental works. This has limited the essay in a minor way, but as these works are reliably presented and represented as sources within my literature the damage is minimal. The sources, as discussed later, rely on the translation and compilations made by Broughton. Earlier research and historical context/background has been combined and discussed based on subject for clarity and to make this essay easier to approach and understand.

### *The Concept of Imperium and high auspices*

Imperium can loosely be translated as "legitimate power" and represents the right of a magistrate to lead armies among other things.<sup>1</sup> A Consul had both the right to full public auspices and unlimited/undefined imperium.<sup>2</sup> If a Dictator was appointed his imperium trumped both the elected con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Brennan, T. Corey. 'Power and Process Under the Republican "Constitution"', in *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. pp.36-37

<sup>2</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.37

suls' imperium. The consuls' imperium was in turn made dormant during the period of the Dictator.<sup>3</sup> Several other magistrates had limited *imperium* and high auspices (lesser than full public auspices) such as proconsuls, propraetors, specially appointed magistrates in the city of Rome (praefectus urbi and interrex) and special legates and magistrates assigned to colonize lands.<sup>4</sup> *Imperium*, in the words of Beck, is a mainly military power that is supported by religious and ceremonial denotations.<sup>5</sup> He also emphasizes the importance of the *imperium* as a method to gain access to several areas which could increase one's social capital, such as the Triumph but also the possibility to erect statues, monuments and temples that would give one *dignitas*, *honor* and *gloria*.<sup>6</sup> Imperium was generally not dilutable and could only be ranked by comparison to other magistrates with imperium.

*Potestas* is a concept that determined the hierarchy between magistrates and members of the senate and can be split into: *maior potestas* (greater than another), *par potestas* (equals), *minor potestas* (lower ranked).<sup>7</sup> Most research focuses on either *dignitas* or imperium and therefore little research has been conducted on *potestas*. This essay will use *imperium* as a measurement of power within a post.

## Major magistrates

### *Office of Consul*

Traditionally established in 509 BC the office itself might have been initially known as "Praetor" but would eventually come to us in the sources as the consul (with the Praetor a later addition in the magistrates lists as an office of lower rank).<sup>8</sup> Initially, the post was described as exclusive to the Patricians, but the fact that several Plebeian family names (*gens*) were included among the early consuls leads us to the conclusion that we should regard this with scepticism.<sup>9</sup> Officially

---

<sup>3</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.38

<sup>4</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.41

<sup>5</sup> Beck, Hans. 'Consular power and the Roman constitution: the case of imperium reconsidered' in *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.95

<sup>6</sup> Beck (2011) pp.95

<sup>7</sup> Beck (2011) pp.81

<sup>8</sup> Oakley, Stephen P. 'The Early Republic', in *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. pp.19

<sup>9</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.19

Plebeians were first allowed into the consulship by the *lex Licinia Sextia* in 367 BC and was guaranteed one of the consular posts by the *lex Genucia* in 342 BC.<sup>10</sup> Among the responsibilities of the Consuls were the holding of elections of magistrates with *imperium* and *potestas*. Being re-elected to the consulship several times was common until the 290s BC and after the Second Punic War (218 - 201 BC) it was rare to see more than three consulships per individual.<sup>11</sup> The Consulship itself has seen little focused research with the exception of *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic* (2011), a fact discussed by Beck and his fellow co-authors.<sup>12</sup>

*Office of the Consular Tribunes (tribuni militum consulari potestate)*

Adding confusion to the consular lists is the office of the consular tribunes, existing and replacing the consuls from 444 BC to 367 BC (with a few gaps containing true consulships). The consular tribunes are explained by Livy as either created to allow Plebeians access to consular powers or to fill the need of commanders needed for the expanding Rome.<sup>13</sup> Oakley is of the opinion that both these explanations offered by Livy are unsatisfactory and suggests that one should look on the Consular Tribunes as an anomaly of which we still lack the facts and sources in order to explain its existence.<sup>14</sup> The office was open to both Plebeians and Patricians, but was mainly occupied by Patricians.<sup>15</sup> Consular Tribunes did not have *imperium* but rather held equal *potestas* to the Consulship, this resulted in that they did not have the right to full public auspices but were allowed to lead armies and other consular duties. The lack of full public auspices resulted in Consular Tribunes not being able to celebrate Triumphs.<sup>16 17</sup> There is no consensus on how elections were held, nor on who held them, during this period and what level of auspices the consular tribunes held.

---

<sup>10</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.18

<sup>11</sup> Bergk, Alexander. 'The development of the Praetorship in the third century BC' in *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.70-71

<sup>12</sup> Beck, Hans, Duplá, Antonio, Jehne, Martin & Pina Polo, Francisco (red.), *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.1

<sup>13</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.19

<sup>14</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.19

<sup>15</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.18-19

<sup>16</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.38

<sup>17</sup> Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan, *Contested triumphs: politics, pageantry, and performance in Livy's Republican Rome*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2008. pp.62-63

### *Office of Praetor*

The office of Praetor was established in 367 BC together with the changes brought forth by the *lex Licinia Sextia*. Initially it was reserved for the Patricians but became open for Plebeians somewhere after *lex Publilia* in 339 BC with the first Plebeian Praetor being elected in 336 BC.<sup>18</sup> The Praetor held full auspices and *minus imperium*. This lesser imperium was only lesser in relation to the consuls, otherwise functioned in a similar way.<sup>19</sup> Originally, only one single person held Praetorship every year but a second Praetor was introduced in 247 BC, third and fourth in 228 BC and a fifth and sixth in 197 BC.<sup>20</sup> There are arguments that the Praetorship was the actual origin of the Consulship (*Praetor maximus*) and other arguments that with the Praetorships establishment in 367 BC it was rather a collegiate of three equal Praetors (instead of two equal consuls and a subordinated Praetor) that made up the highest magistrates of the Roman Republic.<sup>21</sup> The early Praetors were generally former consuls with distinguished military careers, which would give strength to this claim. The post became a prerequisite for the consulship after the First Punic War.<sup>22</sup> Research on the Praetorship can be divided between either monography such as Brennan's "*The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*"<sup>23</sup> or as part of a more general analysis of *imperium* and high magistrate such as presented in "*Consuls and the Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*" edited by Hans Beck.<sup>24</sup>

### *Office of the Propraeator and Proconsul*

By 327 BC it was put into law that a magistrate could extend his period of *imperium* for an additional year, this extension would be known as *prorogatio* and was limited to a specific region. Were one to leave this region it would result in the temporary loss of *imperium*.<sup>25</sup> Propraeators became increasingly common after 295 BC as a result of Consulars being able to delegate *imperium* in fields and through several other methods. The use of *prorogatio* became intensified during

---

<sup>18</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.18

<sup>19</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.39

<sup>20</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.39

<sup>21</sup> Bergk (2011). pp.62-63

<sup>22</sup> Beck, Hans. *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

<sup>23</sup> Brennan, T. Corey. *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.

<sup>24</sup> Beck, Duplá, Jehne & Pina Polo (2011). pp.1

<sup>25</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.39



the years of the Second Punic War (218-201 BC).<sup>26</sup> Although limited to a specific region their powers were equal to that of their corresponding posts.

### *Office of Censor*

The office of Censor was established in 443 BC and was in the beginning exclusive to Patricians.<sup>27</sup> It was later opened for Plebeians after *lex Licinia Sextia* in 367 BC. The first Plebeian censor was elected in 351 BC and a law declaring that one of the censors were required to be Plebeian came in to effect from 339 BC.<sup>28</sup> Censors had the high auspices but held no *imperium*.<sup>29</sup> Further their auspices were not allowed to occur as “military” auspices and was a sort of lesser auspices compared to those of consular auspices.<sup>30</sup> Originally the term was set to a full *lustrum* (five years) but was later changed to 18 months.<sup>31</sup> Some of the responsibilities of the censor were selecting members for the senate (senatorial roll), conducting the census of citizens and expelling senators due to “immoral conduct”.<sup>32</sup> To their official roles should be added the large amount of privileges that came with the office.<sup>33</sup> In addition they became eligible to the semi-official office of *Princep Senatus* (first in the senate, reserved for the most senior of the censors). The largest and most thorough research on the Censorship as a prestige carrier, important political position and its social impacts is the monumental work of Suolahti in “*The Roman Censors: A Study on Social Structure*”.<sup>34</sup>

### *Office of Dictator & magister equitum*

Initially the dictatorship was reserved for Patricians but seem to have become open for Plebeians with *lex Licinia Sextia* in 367 BC as the first Plebeian dictator was appointed in 356 BC.<sup>35</sup> The Dictator had full auspices and undefined *imperium* (ranking over the consular *imperium*).<sup>36</sup> *Magister equitum*, or Master of Horse, was a supportive magistrate to the Dictator and would act as co-

---

<sup>26</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.40

<sup>27</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.40

<sup>28</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.18

<sup>29</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.40

<sup>30</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.41

<sup>31</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.65

<sup>32</sup> Patterson, John R., *Political life in the city of Rome*, Bristol Classical, London, 2000. pp.22

<sup>33</sup> Suolahti, Jaakko, *The Roman censors: a study on social structure*, Helsinki, 1963. pp.70-73

<sup>34</sup> Suolahti (1963)

<sup>35</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.18

<sup>36</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.40

dictator with *imperium* similar to that of a Praetor, it is unclear if a *magister equitum* could celebrate a triumph. The Dictator was appointed by the senate while the *magister equitum* was chosen by the Dictator.

#### *Office of Interrex & Praefectus urbi*

The office was held by a Patrician senator and had *imperium* and full auspices but was limited to a short appointment of five days.<sup>37</sup> Their main purpose of appointing an Interrex was to have an individual with *imperium* and high auspices that could call and complete the elections of consuls and other high offices. Generally, this was not completed by a single Interrex and several cycles were required. In theory the first interrex of a cycle was represented by the *curio maximus* who could only assemble (and not complete) an election and had a lower grade of auspices and no *imperium*, in reality the office of *curio maximus* was often vacant as the office by rule forbade one from any further political offices. Interrex became an increasingly rare office after *lex Licinia Sextia* in 367 BC because of the Patrician limitation to the office and the political backlash that arose from the Plebeian elite after an Interrex was appointed.

The Praefectus urbi, an office with little to no research surrounding it, had similar *imperium* and prestige to the Interrex and had an unclear length of appointment. It was generally used as a temporary solution when the need arose to have an individual with *imperium* leading the defence of Rome while the consuls were in the field. The office of praefectus urbi fell out of use shortly after the changes brought forward by Decemvirate of 451-449 BC.

#### *Repeated elections*

In 342 BC the *Lex Genucia* was implemented which prevented repeated (of the same type) high office holding within a ten-year period. This law was in effect until the Second Samnite War (326-304 BC), reimplemented again from 290 to 216 BC and again by 180 BC, where after 152 BC there were no repeated offices until Sulla and Marius.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.65

<sup>38</sup> Patterson (2000). pp.50-51

## *On the question of age*

When did one become a consular and when did one retire? By approximation, the age one was expected to achieve one's first consulship would be in their late thirties or early forties. This is held rather consistent from the consulship's introduction in 509 BC to its inclusion in Sulla's reforms, becoming part of the *cursus honorum* (setting the age to a minimum of forty-two years old).<sup>39</sup> Astin provides a table of fourteen consules who held the consulship prior to the *cursus honorum*, and their average age is given as 39.7-41.0 with the youngest being around 39 and the oldest being 49.<sup>40</sup> Astin, Harlow and Laurence's studies show that the assumption made in this essay of using a broad term of early forties as the standard age of a first time Consul is not baseless, but it remains somewhat problematic as most of the data of these earlier studies stem from the late Republic.

Romans did not define nor limit old age or retirement with a set age, but a general trend can be seen with retirement being around the age of sixty to sixty-five.<sup>41</sup> This retirement coincide with an expectation of withdrawal from public life and office holding, the retiree also lost eligibility for military service (which resulted in the loss of participating and voting in the voting assembly the *comitia centuriata*) and were excused from attending the Senate and juridical duties.<sup>42 43</sup> Although some of these changes due to retirement seem to have only been put in effect after the fall of the Republic.<sup>44 45</sup> Harlow and Laurence argue that at least until the late Republic, the elders of the senatorial class "retained the reins of power and we might expect that old age was a time to be cherished".<sup>46</sup> There is of course a large difference between paying respect to an elder's achievements and granting him actual political power in a field otherwise dominated by ambitious middle-aged men. Ancient writers such as Livy writes that military duty was expected to be performed until the age of fifty, and Ovid adds that at later stages of life, one was instead expected to act in

---

<sup>39</sup> Harlow, Mary & Laurence, Ray, *Growing up and growing old in Ancient Rome: a life course approach*, Routledge, London, 2002. pp.104

<sup>40</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.105

<sup>41</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.117

<sup>42</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.118

<sup>43</sup> Cokayne, Karen, *Experiencing old age in ancient Rome*, 1. ed., Routledge, London, 2003. pp.94

<sup>44</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.118

<sup>45</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.94-95

<sup>46</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.121

an advisory capacity. Cokayne argues that the use of the elderly in war and magisterial posts generally coincided with emergencies during which there was a need of experienced politicians and generals.<sup>47</sup>

That senators during the Republic could remain influential past his sixties is affirmed by the fact that senators could be summoned to senatorial meetings for as long as they lived.<sup>48</sup> However, the loss of his vote in combination with not being allowed active military duty would generally result in the *consulares* fading into obscurity past this point. Unless he was made relevant again by a son or grandson in the political arena. A good example of this kind of political power expressed through a son or close relative is the case of Appius Claudius Caecus who as an elderly, blind and infirm man was carried into the senatorial house by his sons and sons-in-law where he held a long speech and successfully changed the mind of the senate in the regards of a potential peace with Pyrrhus in 280 BC.<sup>49</sup> As with every generalization there are those who do not fit the mould; several of the more powerful senators stayed in power far beyond their sixties, among these are Cato the Elder, the two Quintus Fabius Maximus and Valerius Corvinus.<sup>50</sup> These facts combined, give way to the generalization that an individual who achieves his first major magistrate can be presumed to be around his forties and to remain in the senate for around twenty years before being presumed retired. The general approach should therefore be that a *consulares* could expect to remain relevant until his middle sixties.

Earlier research focusing on old age and retirement within the Roman Republic includes “*Growing Up and Growing Old in Ancient Rome*”<sup>51</sup> by Harlow and Laurence, “*Old Age in the Roman World*”<sup>52</sup> by Parkin, “*Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*”<sup>53</sup> by Saller and “*Experiencing Old Age in Ancient Rome*”<sup>54</sup> by Cokayne. These works, like most works on ancient Rome, focus on either the late Republic or the imperial period. No research has been conducted

---

<sup>47</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.95

<sup>48</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.95

<sup>49</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.97-98

<sup>50</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.97

<sup>51</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002)

<sup>52</sup> Parkin, Tim G., *Old age in the Roman world: a cultural and social history*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md., 2003

<sup>53</sup> Saller, Richard P., *Patriarchy, property, and death in the Roman family*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994

<sup>54</sup> Cokayne (2003).

focusing on large scale comparisons of magistrates in later stages of their careers and retirement during the early and middle republic.

### *Power of the Senate & the Consulares*

The senate functioned as both the decision-making body and the gathering of collected political wisdom and social capital in Rome, its actual authority is however somewhat obscure.<sup>55</sup> The senate was officially a *consilium* (advisory body) consisting of mainly ex-magistrates counting 300 until reforms in the first century BC. The senate was usually presided over by the most senior magistrate (later by the *Princeps senatus*). A senatorial decision, known as a *senatus consulta*, was officially a recommendation but acted unofficially as an absolute decision.<sup>56</sup> Even senior magistrates were checked by the power of the senate, and few carried out actions that were perceived as lacking ample backing in the senate.<sup>57</sup> The forefront of this powerful senate was the *consulares*, the former consuls, spending their time on the “good of the state” instead of “personal ambition” which drove them as consuls and aspiring consuls.<sup>58</sup> This assumption of the “good of the state” regarding the *consulares* is of course an oversimplification and probably incorrect, as stated by Jehne.<sup>59</sup>

### **The Patriarch versus the Magistrate**

The head of the *familia* (family) was the *paterfamilias* who held legal power in the form of *patria potestas* (paternal power), which gave him judicial power over all descendants, wives and members of his *familia*.<sup>60</sup> Hölkeskamp discusses the following influences on aristocratic values: superiority of age, rank, authority, talent and achievements in the *res publica*.<sup>61</sup> Further, he argues that the patriarch with the use of *patria potestas* ruled supreme over the household, even over those of his sons who held magistrate posts and *imperium*.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Patterson (2000). pp.21

<sup>56</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.61

<sup>57</sup> Brennan (2004) pp.56

<sup>58</sup> Jehne, Martin. ‘The rise of the consular as a social type in the third and second centuries BC’ in *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.211

<sup>59</sup> Jehne (2011) pp.211

<sup>60</sup> Hölkeskamp, Karl-J. ‘Under Roman Roofs: Family, House, and Household’, in *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. pp.122-123

<sup>61</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004). pp.113

<sup>62</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004). pp.114

Although the elderly patriarch would hold this *autocritas* in his own house (*domus*), I agree with the modern consensus when arguing that this power was severely limited outside of that *domus*, and that true political power lay with the adults who still had power in public. Thus, the elderly patriarch of a large *domus* can be seen to have large private power, but little public power (limited by retirement and expulsion from public occurrences such as jury duties, senatorial duties, and military service).

Juridically and privately within his own *familia*, the patriarch can be described as having “total” power and could theoretically kill or condemn anyone within this sphere.<sup>63</sup> This total power was checked by several institutions such as social conventions and moral norms. If broken, it could result in loss of *dignitas* (reputation) and even formal sanctions.<sup>64</sup> Hölkeskamp argues that the power of the *paterfamilias* outside the *domus* was mainly ideological, symbolic and formal, rather than a reality.<sup>65</sup> A symbolic show of these two powers in conflict is discussed by Beck through the words of Claudius Quadrigarius: “When the consul of 213, Quintus Fabius Maximus, arrived at the Roman camp in Apulia, there he unexpectedly met his father the renowned Fabius Maximus “Cunctator,” cos. IV in 214 and now proconsul. Since neither made a move to dismount from his horse, the consul asked the proconsul: *quid postea*, “what thereafter?” (“so what’s now?...” what arrogation comes next?”). The latter dismounted immediately and praised his son for maintaining the “*imperium*, which belonged to the people (*quod populi esset*)”.<sup>66</sup> Beck and contemporary authors, such as Claudius Quadrigarius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus took this as proof that *imperium* trumped the *patria potestas*.<sup>67</sup> The Roman family as an object of study is an increasingly popular discipline with a focus on social structures and gender roles. Former research surrounding the family in the form of *factiones* and *gentes* as the leading political units are described and discredited in the later chapter on political culture in Rome. Research on the patriarchy and *patria potestas* in comparison with the political powers of the magistrate has been done by the earlier mentioned Hölkeskamp but also through the sole object of study in “*Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*” by Saller.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004), pp.123–124

<sup>64</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004), pp.124

<sup>65</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004), pp.125

<sup>66</sup> Beck (2011) pp.87

<sup>67</sup> Beck (2011) pp.87

<sup>68</sup> Saller (1994)

## *Importance of Religion and Ceremonies*

Cicero defines two distinct types of “religious” roles: the *sacra* and the *auspicia*. The *auspicia* was a sort of divination that could be performed by anyone, but the higher auspices were practiced by magistrates and augurs.<sup>69</sup> The higher magistrates would hold *maxima auspicia* while Augurs were required to advise and to give judgement in these.<sup>70</sup>

Most senators also held religious offices or had similar functions in one of the many different religious orders of the city of Rome, usually performing these duties as part-timers.<sup>71</sup> All minor offices such as the Arval brethren, Sodales Titii and the minor *flamines* among others are barely present in any of our surviving sources. About one third of the augural college is known to us which is similar to the surviving records of pontiffs (especially the *pontifex maximus*).<sup>72</sup> The pontiffs appears to be the most senior and important position from a political perspective, they supervised the major cults and had exclusive knowledge over processional law, property rights and calendrical duties.<sup>73</sup> The augurs and pontiffs can be described as parallels to each other in prestige.<sup>74</sup> Other major priesthoods include the *decemviri sacris faciundis* and the *tresviri eupulorum*, both whom have little representation in the sources.<sup>75</sup> Gordon on his research about the different collegiates within the Roman religious system draws parallels between the importance of religious offices to that of the political offices with the example of how Augustus in his forming of the principate accumulated both political and religious offices to his person.<sup>76</sup> The importance of religion in ancient Rome is the subject of a large amount of research although it should be noted that the focus in general lies on the late republic or during the empire. Even rarer are analyses of different religious offices as part of the political system. To the more influential compilations that gives an overview of Roman religion should be mentioned “*Roman Religion*” edited by Clifford

---

<sup>69</sup> Rüpke, Jörg. ‘Roman Religion’, in *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. pp.180-181

<sup>70</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.181

<sup>71</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.188-189

<sup>72</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.189

<sup>73</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.189-190

<sup>74</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.190

<sup>75</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.190

<sup>76</sup> Gordon, Richard, ‘From Republic to Principate: Priesthood, Religion and Ideology’ in *Roman religion*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2003. pp.66-67

Ando<sup>77</sup> and the frequently updated “*Cambridge Companion to The Roman Republic*” edited by Harriet I. Flower.<sup>78</sup>

While the priests of the different religions and cults were important, they can be seen as taking on more advisory roles. The actual religious responsibility was within the senate and performed by the magistrates with high auspices.<sup>79</sup> In the end, this, combined with both the normality of holding religious offices within the aristocracy and the lack of records of specific religious offices within the sources means that little to no weight will be given to the religious offices held by the individuals represented in this essay. Although a short comparison will be done regarding augurs and pontiffs compared with career lengths.

### **Triumphs, Ovations and Similar Ceremonies**

In a society with a heavy focus on one’s presentation in public the activities of public ceremonies became even more important. Public ceremonies would work as prime generators of political and social capital. These public performances were centred around its major magistrates whom both dressed uniquely but were also followed by lictors and an entourage of people associated with his post (such as the carriers of his cerule chair if he was entitled to such an object).<sup>80</sup>

The most important public ceremony in Rome was the Triumph, consisting of a triumphal procession, the right to wear triumphal dress, erection of triumphal arches, statues and a burial place within city limits.<sup>81</sup> Flower argues that the triumph was the apex of any political career and would be something every public profile would thrive to achieve.<sup>82</sup> Flower further implies that the Triumph would prove the magistrates ultimate rank in society.<sup>83</sup> The control of who could triumph was tightly in the hands of the senate, further increasing proof of the relevance of both the senate

---

<sup>77</sup> Ando, Clifford (red.), *Roman religion*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2003

<sup>78</sup> Flower, Harriet I. (red.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

<sup>79</sup> Polo, Pina Francisco. ‘Consuls as *curatores pacis deorum*’ in *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.97

<sup>80</sup> Flower, Harriet I. ‘Spectacle and Political Culture in the Roman Republic’, in *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. pp.324

<sup>81</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.183

<sup>82</sup> Flower (2004). pp.327

<sup>83</sup> Flower (2004). pp.329-331



and the triumph itself.<sup>84</sup> This is further proven by Rüpke who argues that the *fasti triumphales Barberiniani* (a list of triumphs) was the first list of officials to be publicly displayed in Rome.<sup>85</sup>

Pittenger argues that the Triumph allowed the triumphant to not just show his success in war, but also to show values of great social capital, such as courage (*virtus*), duty (*pietas*) and loyalty (*fides*).<sup>86</sup> Pittenger discusses the value of the Triumph from the four requirements of being granted a Triumph listed by Livy: *imperium*, *auspicium*, *ductus* and *felicitas*.<sup>87</sup> The last requirement: *felicitas* (“divine favour”) usually was the hardest to fulfil and generally devolved into a show of family connections, personal prestige, *gratia*, *autocritas* and associations.<sup>88</sup> There seems to have been three ways to achieve a Triumph: voted by the senate, voted by the popular assembly (in opposition to the senate) or by the individual's own *imperium*.<sup>89</sup> Triumphs achieved without a successful vote in the senate are generally counted as minor Triumphs and would not be allowed to follow the traditional triumphant path through Rome. The Consular Tribunes and possibly the Magister equitum both lacked the *auspicium* of the high magistrate and was therefore not allowed to Triumph.<sup>90</sup> Additionally the senate could vote directly for a minor Triumph which was called an ovation.

A similar but smaller ceremony to the Triumphs where the *supplicatio* which were held for a few days after a victory (usually held while the victor was in the field and thus not present) and can be seen as a prerequisite of being granted a Triumph.<sup>91</sup>

Triumphs have been and remains a popular research area both within the Republic and Empire, focused research includes Pittenger's “*Contested Triumphs, Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*”<sup>92</sup> and Beard's influential “*The Roman Triumph*”<sup>93</sup>. Research focusing on a more general level of public performance and ceremonies include Scullard's “*Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*”. Research focusing on the Triumph as a builder of social

---

<sup>84</sup> Flower (2004). pp.327

<sup>85</sup> Rüpke (2004). pp.183

<sup>86</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.1

<sup>87</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.28

<sup>88</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.28

<sup>89</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.35

<sup>90</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.54-55

<sup>91</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.128-129

<sup>92</sup> Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan, *Contested triumphs: politics, pageantry, and performance in Livy's Republican Rome*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2008

<sup>93</sup> Beard, Mary, *The Roman Triumph*, Belknap, Cambridge, Mass., 2007

capital and as part of the political culture is discussed in the chapter on political culture in the Roman Republic.

### *Political Culture in the Roman Republic*

This essay will be using the theory of political culture as presented in “*Making Enemies: The logic of immorality in Ciceronian Oratory*” by Isak Hammar<sup>94</sup> and “*Reconstructing the Roman Republic*” by Karl-Johan Hölkeskamp.<sup>95</sup> Hammar defines political culture as “the framework within which a political agent acts” and further adds that political culture is the visible or invisible set of rules that set the guidelines for those involved within the political machinery.<sup>96</sup> This type of political culture includes mentality, rules, attitude and characteristics that defines the selected historical period.<sup>97</sup> This gives rise to the quite complex situation where the agent within the selected historical period both shape the political culture and is himself shaped by it. Political culture is therefore not something rigid, but rather liquid and changeable depending on the agents active within its system, as argued by Hammar.<sup>98</sup> To add to the complexity within the system one should consider the influence of ideas, traditions and norms within the society that is studied, both on the political and non-political arenas. Hammar argues that mentality, morality and character analysis within individuals to help define political culture is especially useful within the Roman republic as he uses Earls quote that the Romans saw “no sharp distinction between morality, politics or economics”.<sup>99</sup> Even in the judicial arena (a highly political arena within the Roman republic) the importance of the charge lies not in the guilt of the defendant, but rather in the character and achievements of the individuals involved in the dispute.<sup>100</sup> In summary, it was better to be of good character and a successful individual than innocent or correct.

This essay will use political culture from the perspective of how agents achieve political legitimacy within the political culture of the early and middle Republic of Rome and how different political

---

<sup>94</sup> Hammar, Isak, *Making enemies: the logic of immorality in Ciceronian oratory*, [Department of History], Lund University, Diss. Lund : Lunds universitet, Lund, 2013

<sup>95</sup> Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: an ancient political culture and modern research*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 2010.

<sup>96</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.51

<sup>97</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.51

<sup>98</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.52

<sup>99</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.65

<sup>100</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.68

actions and patterns affect the agent within this culture. The election of certain individuals to the higher magistrates of Rome can be seen as self-evident proof of the goodness of their character and they fit the “mould” within the Roman political system and thus Roman political culture. Even though several individuals were elected to high magistrates and then “revealed” to have been insufficient of character to be worthy of this high office. Few or even any such individuals were re-elected to high magistrates in such cases. Therefore, the focus will be on these individuals that held repeated high magistrates between 509 BC to 218 BC, with the minimum limit set at three major magistrates. All these individuals will thus be characters with extremely high social credit and prime members of a political elite who both shaped and were shaped for the political culture of their respective periods within the Republic.

To this discussion on political culture should be added the voice of Millar, who initiated the critical discussion around political culture in Rome in 1984 with his challenge of the view on Roman politics being completely dominated by a senatorial aristocracy that had a sort of hereditary claim to the higher magistrates.<sup>101</sup> This senatorial aristocracy, by dominating the highest magistrates, also thereby dominated the senate which would in theory give them close to full control over all politics in Rome.<sup>102</sup> In his challenge, Millar also included scepticism towards the theory proposed by Gelzer of the patron-client system as the leading factor of elections among the *nobilitas*.<sup>103</sup> Millar pointed out that Gelzer together with several other early researchers were guilty of creating the “modern myth” surrounding politics in the Republic. Millar’s conclusion and the proof provided in both his and later research towards it has shown that even the most “noble” of Patricians still had to compete for offices and that there never existed a true aristocracy or an oligarchy.<sup>104</sup> In his critique Millar even goes so far as to declare that the Republic was truly a “direct democracy” and that most if not all of its decisions were discussed with the public, not behind the closed doors of the senate.<sup>105</sup> This one-sided counter-view provided by Miller is, as he himself later admitted, not the truth or even a valid theory. Instead, one should view the “democracy” within the Republic as a mixture of both earlier theories providing an elite within the wealthier citizens of Rome that

---

<sup>101</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.1–2

<sup>102</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.2

<sup>103</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.2

<sup>104</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.2–3

<sup>105</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.3–4

had large networks of clients under them and support from earlier high magistrates and senators, but in the end had to compete with other such powerful elite for the election within the *populus romanus*.

Hammar highlights three main aspects within the political culture of Republican Rome: 1. Power, 2. Oratory and 3. Morality.<sup>106</sup> The second aspect, oratory, is not visible through the limited sources of the early and middle Republic and of the limited insight into these provided by Broughton. The third, morality, is sporadically mentioned in the early and middle Republic. These off-handed mentions within the narratives of the early historians makes this aspect impossible within the scope of this essay. We are therefore left with the simplest of these aspects: power. Hammar in his attempt to comprehend this aspect asks the following questions: who could play, what arenas existed and what acts were possible within this political system?<sup>107</sup>

### **Aspect of Political Power**

The political arena at the birth of the Republic in 509 BC was exclusively reserved for the old aristocracy of Rome, known as the *Patricians*. The other powerful social group within the Republic were known as *Plebeians* that through a series of events slowly gained access to the political arena. The first step was the creation of the office Tribune of the Plebs in 494 BC, secondly the inclusion of Plebeians within the second Decemviri in 450 BC and subsequent changes in laws in favor of the *Plebeians*. The creation of the consular tribunes soon after the fall of the Decemvirate technically allowed Plebeians (few were elected for the post) access to the *imperium*. The most important opening of the political playground was in 368 BC with the re-establishment of the consulship and opening of the magistrate by law to *Plebeians*. In the aftermath the other major magistrates were opened and later had the inclusion of one *Plebeian* as a mandatory and by the end of this essay every single major magistrate was open for *Plebeians* except for the Patrician exclusive Interrex which would instead become an increasingly rare office.

The political power of Republican Rome was as written by ancient writers split between three powers: the magistrates, the senate, and the voting assemblies. The magistrates wielded executive power, the senate functioned as advisor for the magistrates and the voting assemblies gave the

---

<sup>106</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.73

<sup>107</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.74

people power to elect their representatives as magistrates. All these represented the possible political arenas for an individual of high standing and economy in Rome.

Mommsen, in the words of Hammar, argues that office holding was a crucial element among the elites and that this was the primal shaper of the political culture that grew in Rome.<sup>108</sup> Later researchers such as Gelzer instead chose to prioritize the concepts of *amicitia* (friendship/alliance) and *clientela* (patron→client) as the primal shaper and power of politics in Rome.<sup>109</sup> Both concepts gave the individuals within the elite complete power over all three institutions of political power within the Roman Republic and it was thought that the elites simply decided through the uses of their alliances and clients the outcome of every election. This theory remained in large a theoretical one with little to no empirical proof. Researchers such as Munzer and Syme succeeded with discovering connections between groups of magistrates and *gens*, calling these grouping *factiones*.<sup>110</sup> These *factiones* as argued by Syme, Münzer and Gelzer formed for the sole purpose of dominating the dual consulship and competed with other powerful *factiones* in this, but were as added by Miller in large limited by public opinion and their own ambitious members.<sup>111</sup> Although the concept of *factiones* still at large remain in modern research and *amicitia* and *clientela* are both thought to affect the political landscape, it is no longer seen as the sole power behind elections.<sup>112</sup> The most important power, as argued by Hammar, would be the public opinion.<sup>113</sup>

Public opinion, together with *factiones*, *amicitia* and *clientela* were all important within the political system. Hölkeskamp argues for the existence of a meritocratic consensus within the elite that was controlled by the culturally symbolic “social capital”.<sup>114</sup> This social capital can be seen as derived directly from actions that are seen as either morally positive or negative and could be generated by being skilled in oratory, succeeding in war or good performances within one's magistrate. It is within this aspect of gaining or losing social capital that a new perspective was created, aristocratic competition.

---

<sup>108</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.82

<sup>109</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.82–83

<sup>110</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.83

<sup>111</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.5–7

<sup>112</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.84–85

<sup>113</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.85

<sup>114</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.86

This aspect of the political culture within the Roman Republic became its main driving force relating to the magistrate elections. The political elite was locked in a constant rivalry with their peers over elections. This in turn forced them to turn to the people for support, which gave the people and the voting assemblies a significant role within the political landscape. The political elite, through attempts to secure important social capital, coveted the high magistrates as they gave both a latent prestige (the success of being elected was itself an important generator of social capital) and the possibilities of gaining prestige through public acts which gave glory to both Rome and the individual.<sup>115</sup> This loose concept of social capital can be connected to four contemporary concepts: *gloria*, *fama*, *dignitas* and *auctoritas*. *Gloria*, public distinction, and glory and *Fama*, good reputation, were both important primarily for their creation of the third concept: *dignitas*. *Dignitas*, social or moral worth, was an individual's accumulated social capital gained from magistrates, merits, and achievements.<sup>116</sup> The last, *auctoritas*, political authority, was closely linked to the power of the magistrates themselves and to the power of the *imperium*.

Thus, by studying this direct accumulation of *dignitas* of these elites through their magistrate posts, one can get a hold of the power of the individuals within this political system with little descriptive writing about them. This way of thinking is supported by Hölkeskamp when it comes to the study of political culture in ancient Rome, where one is to focus not on the individual actions and decisions of magistrates and the senate, but rather the electoral system as a whole.<sup>117</sup> Thus, in summary this essay will look at political culture as a competitive culture within the Roman aristocracy which ultimate achievement is not one's actions during the political life, but rather the success proven by ones repeated elections to high magistrate.

The proof of the magistrate's supremacy in the creation of *dignitas* can be shown by the example of Quintus Metellus who in 221 BC held the funeral oration to his father.<sup>118</sup> In this oration Metellus lists the achievements of his father in order of importance: first comes his political offices, then his achievements in these offices, then his personal virtues and skills and finally his achievements outside of the political system.

---

<sup>115</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.88

<sup>116</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.89

<sup>117</sup> Hölkeskamp (2010). pp.53–54

<sup>118</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.90

## Sources

The original sources concerning the Republic consists almost entirely of literary sources written 300 to 400 years after the events they portray.<sup>119</sup> Later authors such as Livy (64 BC - 12 AD) base most of their facts on these writings instead of searching for original sources.<sup>120</sup> To further complicate this is the fact that the consular lists (*fasti*) that make the basis of this study might be incorrect in several matters. Prior to the 440s BC the lists might be entirely fabricated and the names they contain might be highly unreliable.<sup>121</sup> The lists and sources that are past the year 300 BC can generally be seen as more reliable.<sup>122</sup> The reliability of the early magistrates in the consular lists have been viewed with great scepticism. A thorough analysis of the usefulness of the *Fasti* is provided by Smith in his chapter “The magistrates of the early Roman Republic” as part of *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*.<sup>123</sup> Smith lists the four main arguments used against the *fasti* as 1: The fictitious events surrounding the years between 509 and 449 BC, 2: The lack of primary sources surviving the sack of Rome in 390 BC, 3: Interpolation with fictitious ancestors and 4: The mentions of the Praetor maximus.<sup>124</sup> In the end Smith mainly argues for the truthfulness and usefulness of the *fasti*, but to be careful in relying on sources during 509 to 449 BC because of the insecurities until 449 BC.<sup>125</sup>

Broughton, who provides the main part of the source material for this essay, argues that the majority of the consular lists can be trusted with the exception of a few interpolations and the controversial “dictator years”<sup>126</sup> His main arguments being the following: The existence of extinct Patrician families and the difficulty in finding a period in which the list would have been invented from scratch.<sup>127</sup> Broughton, although positive to the consular lists, is somewhat more sceptical towards some of the triumphs, dictatorships (and thus *magister equitum*) and early censorships.<sup>128</sup> Further

---

<sup>119</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.15

<sup>120</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.16

<sup>121</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.19

<sup>122</sup> Oakley (2004). pp.16

<sup>123</sup> Smith, Christopher. ‘The magistrates of the early Roman Republic’ in *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. pp.19-40

<sup>124</sup> Smith (2011). pp.20

<sup>125</sup> Smith (2011). pp.26

<sup>126</sup> Broughton, Thomas Robert Shannon, *The magistrates of the Roman Republic. Vol. 1, 509 B.C. - 100 B.C.*, American Philological Association, New York, 1951. pp.xi

<sup>127</sup> Broughton (1951). pp.xi

<sup>128</sup> Broughton (1951). pp.xi

problems are found among the consular tribunes where there is clearer evidence of interpolation and harder to determine what sources contain the most correct accounts.<sup>129</sup>

This essay will be using the magistrates provided by Broughton in his massive compilation from 1951.<sup>130</sup> Broughton's work, "*The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*", lists the different civic, military, and religious offices within the Republic from its start in 509 BC. The sources compiled in Broughton come from a myriad of different ancient writers, among these Broughton has favoured Livy as the "best record of the magistrates of the Roman Republic"<sup>131</sup> This essay mainly follows the arguments of Broughton and to a lesser degree Suolahti. For discussions on specific individuals and choices made to make clear the statistics within this essay will either be part of the subchapter of the specific individual or be found in Appendix 3, covering every major decision made in this essay regarding the reading of the sources.

The names present in both Broughton and this essay will follow the *tria nomina* as presented hereafter. The name of an individual followed in the republic period of Rome a unified system among the aristocracy of three names (*tria nomina*), the first name (*praenomen*) which was selected from about seventeen different names, the middle name (*nomen gentile*) which defined what family (*gens*) one belonged to, and the surname (*cognomen*) which was a sort of personal or familiar distinction.<sup>132</sup> Surnames were usually earned and some members of the aristocracy ended up with several surnames, such as the case of Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus Cunctator: Quintus (*praenomen*) Fabius (*gens*) Maximus (*cognomen* of family distinction) Verrucosus (*cognomen* from his personal attributes) Cunctator (*cognomen* earned during the Second Punic War)

---

<sup>129</sup> Broughton (1951). pp.xi

<sup>130</sup> Broughton (1951)

<sup>131</sup> Broughton (1951). pp.xii

<sup>132</sup> Hölkeskamp (2004). pp.119



# RETIREMENT IN THE POLITICAL ELITE: AN ANALYSIS

Data was collected from Broughton with the following selection criteria: individuals who has achieved at least one of the following magistrates Dictator, Magister Equitum, Censor, Consul, Praetor, Military Tribune with Consular Powers, Proconsul, Proprator Decemviri with Consular Powers, Praefectus urbi or Interrex during the period 509 BC to 219 BC. This results in a list consisting of approximately 527 individuals. Further selection is made with the following criteria: individuals who have achieved any of the earlier mentioned posts on at least three occasions, which results in a total of 134 (25 %) individuals.<sup>133</sup> These individuals are identified by their names and annotations of previously held magistrates (such as notes of repeated magistrates and mentions of previous held magistrates). These individuals can be viewed in Appendix 1.

In short, by looking at these 134 individuals we can observe the following data: The average length in years of their magistrate careers is 18.2 years, the median of the same data is 16 years Looking at the extremes we find Aulus Cornelius Cossus, who had a magistrate career consisting of three years, reaching the consulship in 428 BC and becoming consular tribune and magister equitum in 425 BC and Gaius Marcius Rutilius Censorinus, who had a magistrate career consisting of 46 years, first becoming consul in 310 BC and ending with becoming the first and only censor to be elected to a second censorship in 265 BC. On average these 134 individuals held 4.7 major magistrates during their careers, 55 of the individuals held 3 posts (41 %), 32 individuals held 4 posts (24 %), 27 held 5 to 6 posts (20 %) and 11 individuals had 7 to 9 (8 %) posts while 9 individuals held 10 or more posts (7 %), the maximum being the 15 posts held by Marcus Furius Camillus, active 403 - 367 BC.

## *Hypothesis 1: Retirement*

An individual who achieves his first major magistrate is assumed to be around his early forties and will therefore be expected to retire within twenty to twenty-five years after his first major magistrate.

---

<sup>133</sup> Appendix 1

Among these 134 individuals, without any specific perimeters, we find that the average career length is 18.2 years. This would mean that on average a highly successful individual within the Roman political system could not or would not remain an active member of the magistrate for a longer period than twenty years.

These 134 individuals will be split into four groups to further our analysis. Group A consists of those that has a career length of less than 10 years. Group B of those that have a career length of 10 to 14 years. Group C of those that have a career length of 15 to 19 years. Group D of those that have a career length of 20 to 24 years. Group E with those that have a career length longer than 25 years.

**Table 1.**

Table showing the Group A to E, split into numbers of individuals per group and the % of all individuals 134 this group represents.<sup>134</sup>

Length of career	Number of individuals	% of all individuals
Group A: Less than 10 years	24	18 %
Group B: 10 - 14 years	31	23 %
Group C: 15 - 19 Years	26	19 %
Group D: 20 - 24 years	22	16 %
Group E: 25+ years	31	23 %

Table 1 shows that of these 134 extraordinary individuals, 103 or 77 % disappear from our records and hold no further magistrate posts within the expected span of twenty to twenty-five. This leaves us with close to a quarter of the individuals (the thirty-one individuals within Group E) who had careers exceeding the expected lengths. The specific details of these individuals and where the raw

---

<sup>134</sup> Appendix 1

data can be found within Broughton can be seen in Appendix 2. These thirty-one individuals are as follows:<sup>135</sup>

1. Spurius Larcius Rufus (506-482 BC)
2. Titus Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatus (471-439 BC)
3. Lucius Valerius Potitus (414-387 BC)
4. Marcus Furius Camillus (403-367 BC)
5. Marcus Cornelius Maluginensis (393-367 BC)
6. Servius Cornelius Maluginensis (386-361 BC)
7. Gaius Sulpicius Peticus (380-351 BC)
8. Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus (377-352 BC)
9. Titus Quinctius Poenus Capitolinus (361-334 BC)
10. Gaius Poetelius Libo Visolus (360-319 BC)
11. Marcus Fabius Ambustus (360-322 BC)
12. Gaius Plautius Proculus (358-328 BC)
13. Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (353-320 BC)
14. Aulus Cornelius Cossus Arvina (353-320 BC)
15. Marcus Valerius Corvus (348-308 BC)
16. Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus Privernas (342-316 BC)
17. Lucius Papirius Cursor (340-309 BC)
18. Quintus Publilius Philo (339-315 BC)
19. Gaius Maenius (338-314 BC)
20. Gaius Sulpicius Longus (337-312 BC)
21. Quintus Fabius Maximus Rullianus (298-263 BC)
22. Appius Claudius Caecus (312-287 BC)
23. Gaius Marcius Rutilus Censorinus (310-265 BC)
24. Gnaeus Fulvius Maximus Centumalus (298-263 BC)
25. Gaius Duilius (260-231 BC)
26. Lucius Caecilius Metellus (251-224 BC)
27. Marcus Fabius Buteo (245-214 BC)
28. Gaius Claudius Centho (240-213 BC)
29. Quintus Fulvius Flaccus (237-207 BC)
30. Titus Manlius Torquatus (235-208 BC)
31. Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (233-204 BC)

Among these 31 individuals we can remove Marcus Cornelius Maluginensis (393-367 BC) because of the large uncertainty if the censor of 393 indeed is the same person as the consular tribune in 369 and 367 BC.<sup>136</sup> Similarly we can remove Gaius Sulpicius Peticus (380-351 BC) due to the difficulty of identifying the consular tribune of 380 BC and the repeated consular and censor of

---

<sup>135</sup> Appendix 2

<sup>136</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 111

366 BC as the same person.<sup>137</sup> Another individual that will be removed is Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus (377-352 BC) since the sources regarding the Consular Tribune of 377 BC and the Consular of 366 BC being the same individual are uncertain.<sup>138</sup> This essay will also remove Marcus Valerius Corvus (348-308 BC) because of the confusion of several of his later posts with that of his son Marcus Valerius Corvinus.<sup>139</sup> Further, since the hypothesis rests on the presumed age of one achieving consulship and higher posts, any individual that rest their long careers on the basis of an early Magister equitum will be removed, as it seems the magister equitum follows different electoral trends than the Consulship. This removes Aulus Cornelius Cossus Arvina (353-320 BC)<sup>140</sup> & Lucius Papirius Cursor (340-309 BC)<sup>141</sup>. Similar arguments can be made with the quite unknown and little researched post of consular tribunes, but for the sake of this essay the consular tribunes will be treated as following the same electoral trends as the Consuls. The same argument will be made for those few individuals whose first post is either a dictatorship or a censorship. This leaves us with twenty-five individuals.

If we study these individuals centred around the expected time of retirement, we can split them into two groups: pseudoretirements and delayed retirements. The first group, pseudoretirement, consists of individuals who seemingly has a period of retirement followed by a return to politics in the later stages of their lives. The second group, delayed retirements, consists of those few individuals who have extraordinarily long careers with no long gaps and continued re-elections.

The first group, pseudoretirements, consists of nineteen individuals: Spurius Larcius Rufus (506-482 BC), Titus Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatus (471-439 BC), Marcus Furius Camillus (403-367 BC), Servius Cornelius Maluginensis (386-368 BC), Titus Quinctius Poenus Capitolinus (361-334 BC), Marcus Fabius Ambustus (360-322 BC), Gaius Poetelius Libo Visolus (360-319 BC), Gaius Plautius Proculus (358-328 BC), Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (353-320 BC), Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus Privernas (342-329 BC), Gaius Sulpicius Longus (337-312 BC), Appius Claudius Caecus (312-287 BC), Gaius Marcius Rutilus Censorinus (310-265 BC), Gnaeus Fulvius Maximus Centumalus (298-263 BC), Gaius Duilius (260-231 BC), Lucius Caecilius Metellus

---

<sup>137</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 105-106

<sup>138</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 107-108

<sup>139</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 170-173

<sup>140</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 125, 129, 132-133, 141-142, 150, 153

<sup>141</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 136-137, 142, 146-149, 152-154, 156-158, 162-163

(251-224 BC), Marcus Fabius Buteo (245-214 BC), Gaius Claudius Centho (240-213 BC), Titus Manlius Torquatus (235-208 BC)

The second group, delayed retirements, consists of six individuals: Lucius Valerius Potitus (414-387 BC), Quintus Publilius Philo (339-315 BC), Gaius Maenius (338-318 BC), Quintus Fabius Maximus Rullianus (325-291 BC), Quintus Fulvius Flaccus (237-207 BC), Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (233-204 BC)

Each of these individuals and their career paths deserve a deeper analysis than this essay has the possibility to do, so instead we will have to be content with discussions about the groupings and selected individuals within these groups.

### **Pseudoretirement - “Everyone loves a comeback story”**

To reconnect with the earlier discussed political culture of the Roman Republic we can without a doubt assume that every single one of these individuals were the *crème de la crème* of the Roman aristocracy, and when extraordinary situations arose, extraordinary individuals were required. Thus, these members, who had faithfully served the state in both senate and repeated magistrates, were in their presumed retirements recalled to once again serve the state when the situation required an experienced hand or a prestigious touch to lend legitimacy to changes and unique events. This coincides with the arguments brought forward by Cokayne that in emergencies the state needed experienced politicians and generals.<sup>142</sup> These returns to the political arena should not be considered as proof against the hypothesis brought forth by this essay, but rather as confirmation of the same. Here follows a short dive into four of these individuals and the circumstances surrounding their return to politics. These individuals have been selected to give a broad representation covering the whole period of this essay: Spurius Larcius Rufus for the early fifth century BC, Marcus Furius Camillus for the early fourth century BC, Appius Claudius Caecus for the late fourth and early third century BC and Titus Manlius Torquatus representing the end of the third century BC.

---

<sup>142</sup> Cokayne (2003), pp.95

**Spurius Larcius Rufus**<sup>143</sup> (506-482 BC): 506 BC Consul, 505 BC Legate, 504 BC Legate II, 490 BC Consul II, 488 BC Legate III, 487 BC P.Urbi, 482 BC Interrex.

Should be presumed to be in his late fifties or early sixties with his last ordinary magistrate as a second time Consul in 490 BC, this post was followed in 488 BC and 487 BC as the extraordinary appointments as an envoy and praefectus urbi respectively. He can be presumed to have retired or taken a less active role in government from this point and his return in 482 BC is only to act as the second interrex that completed the election of the consuls. The first interrex, one Aulus Sempronius Atratinus, was also a highly distinguished individual and twice consul. The situation that had built up to 482 BC gave rise to a severe lack of experienced politicians among the *consulares*. Two major events factored into this lack of experienced politicians, primarily the aftermath of the supposed coup attempt by Spurius Cassius Vecellinus in 486 BC had led to a large group of *consulares* being exiled, banished from politics, or even executed. Those involved gens that survived the purge would first return after 478 BC and the fall of the Fabii. Secondly, all the *consulares* from the years after 486 BC were either of the Fabii gens or strongly connected to it, and as the main and eventual successful contestant to the consulship was a Fabii, there seems to have been an attempt to keep the interreges separated from the gens. Thus, the experienced but elderly Spurius Larcius Rufus was recalled to act as the second interrex to complete the elections. It should be noted that there is some uncertainty about Larcius consulships and for this essay the consul of 506 BC will, as argued by Broughton, be considered the same individual as the consul of 490 BC.<sup>144</sup>

**Marcus Furius Camillus**<sup>145</sup> (403-367 BC): 403 BC Censor, 401 BC C.Tribune, 398 BC C.Tribune II, 396 BC Dictator, Triumph, Interrex, 394 BC C.Tribune III, 391 BC Interrex II, 390 BC Dictator II, Triumph II, 389 BC Dictator III, Triumph III, Interrex III, 386 BC C.Tribune IV, 384 BC C.Tribune V, 381 BC C.Tribune VI, 368 BC Dictator IV, 367 BC Dictator V, Triumph IV.

Camillus, sometimes called the second founder of Rome, was elected for his last ordinary magistrate in 381 BC, his sixth and final term as consular tribune and would by then be in his sixties, having started his career in 403 BC as one of the first censors. Closely following his retirement, an internal threat within the Roman aristocracy was brewing which is known as “Conflict of the

---

<sup>143</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 6-8, 18-20, 23

<sup>144</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 6-7

<sup>145</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 82-91, 93, 95-97, 100-102, 104, 112-113

Orders". The growing power of the Plebeians and demands of equal political representation would bring forth a clash with the old aristocracy in the form of the Patricians. This turned into a lock-down of elections during the period 375 to 371 BC by the two Plebeian tribunes who tried to implement *lex Licinia Sextia*, which would allow Plebeians into the consulship. The situation was left to be solved by dictators. Camillus, as a celebrated war hero, thrice triumphant and thrice before dictator was recalled, now most likely closing in on his middle or late seventies to first an unsuccessful dictatorship in 368 BC and a fifth and final (but successful) dictatorship in 367 BC applying the *lex Licinia Sextia*, introducing both the Praetorship and Curule aedileship. His prestige gave weight and legitimacy to the changes and the circumstances surrounding the period led to a lack of other qualified individuals. This lack can be attributed to a combination of the lock-down of elections, the lack of Patricians who could hold the dictatorship that was not active in the conflict with the Plebeians and the high number of losses among the aristocracy during the Battle of the Attia and the subsequent sack of Rome in 390 BC. A final remark should be that both a son and nephew of Camillus were active politicians at the time of his appointment which could factor into his return.

**Appius Claudius Caecus**<sup>146</sup> (312-287 BC): 312 BC Censor, 307 BC Consul, 305 BC C.Aedile, 298 BC Interrex, 297 BC Praetor, 296 BC Consul II, 295 BC Praetor II, 287 BC Dictator

Caecus, after quite a problematic first magistrate as Censor in 312 BC, would make an early comeback into the limelight of politics after his consulship in 307 BC. His last ordinary magistrate came in 295 BC with his second Praetorship, which would place him in his late fifties or early sixties. The date of his dictatorship is unclear but has been suggested by Broughton and Mommsen as being in 287 BC following the death of the previous dictator, Hortensius.<sup>147</sup> The situation in 287 BC seems to have been a delicate one. Hortensius, a Plebeian, had been appointed to solve a crisis involving a secession of the Plebs and carried through the *lex Hortensia* which demanded that plebiscites (laws proposed by the Plebeian tribunes) would apply not only to Plebeians, but rather to all citizens of Rome. The law, although popular among the Plebeians, would with all likelihood be opposed by the Patricians and with the premature death of Hortensius a Dictator Suffect was

---

<sup>146</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 160-162, 164, 167, 174-176, 178, 187

<sup>147</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 187

appointed. With the *lex Hortensia* already passed little could be changed, but to please the Patricians no better choice existed than the old Caecus, who would be in his late sixties or early seventies. Caecus had as an interrex in 298 BC refused to accept any Plebeian candidates and quarrelled with the Plebeian tribunes and had during his censorship in 312 BC refused to recognize his Plebeian colleagues authority (which resulted in his colleague resigning). He was thus a fitting dictator *suffectus* to placate the Patricians and whom the Plebeians would grudgingly accept thanks to the achievements of the *lex Hortensia*.

**Titus Manlius Torquatus**<sup>148</sup> (235-208 BC): 235 BC Consul, Triumph, 231 BC Censor, 224 BC Consul II, 215 BC Cum Imperio, <212 BC Pontiff, 208 BC Dictator

Torquatus was elected for his last ordinary magistrature as a second time consul in 224 BC, which would put him in his early fifties, far too early for an expected retirement. As a two-time consul and censor, few offices would seem lucrative for a politician in the late third century and a man like Torquatus would be expected to instead be an active member of the senate. Most likely waiting for his turn to become eligible to become *princeps senatus* (generally given to the eldest living and active censor). The start of the Second Punic War in 218 BC gave rise to an enormous change within the political system of the Republic, among them were a high frequency of prorogations and a sharp increase of commanders with *imperium*. These early *imperiums* were mainly handed out to younger and ambitious members who still actively sought the magistrature. When the tides of war clearly turned away from the Romans after disastrous losses at Lake Trasimene in 217 BC and Cannae in 216 BC the senate and popular assemblies instead turned towards the older and experienced men who remained. 215 BC the Praetor Quintus Mucius Scaevola succumbed to sickness while holding command over Sardinia. Quintus Fulvius Flaccus, Praetor Urbanus, the only remaining individual with *imperium* in Rome (the remainder, including the Consuls, were in the field leading armies) turned to his old consular colleague Torquatus and in a pitched solution gave him as a citizen *imperium* to help defend Sardinia. Torquatus succeeded and most likely retired after this event but would again be recalled after the disaster in 208 BC that killed both the Consuls of that year. Few, if any, experienced politicians remained in Rome. Among the three most influential active politicians at the time two were in the field (Quintus Flavius Flaccus and Quintus

---

<sup>148</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 223, 226, 231, 256-257, 271, 290



Fabius Verocossus) and the third was the killed consul himself (Marcus Claudius Marcellus). The senate turned to the elderly Torquatus who now most likely was in his late sixties or early seventies and it fell to Torquatus as dictator to stabilize the situation and hold elections for new consuls.

As can be seen, these extraordinary careers were equally the result of extraordinary individuals and extraordinary events, and would, if not for these unique circumstances have retired and faded out of our sources far earlier like so many of their colleagues.

We are thus left with the final six individuals of our initial 134. They represent about 1 % of all consulares from 509 to 218 BC and should rather be viewed as the exceptions that prove the rule. They are, in many ways, similar to the earlier discussed examples with the exception that the extraordinary events surrounding their careers started during their active years. Thus, their careers would continue past the point of retirement until either the extraordinary event seceded, or their health declined.

*Hypothesis 2: Political offices as a direct correlation to political and social capital*

By studying the direct accumulation of political capital of these elites through their magistrate posts, one can analyse the importance of both the post and the individual within this political system with little to no descriptive writing about the individuals.

**Table 2.**

Table sorting the 134 individuals into groups based on number of major magistrates achieved and a comparison of average career lengths of these groups.

Major magistrates (nr)	Number of individuals	% of all individuals	Avg. Length of Career
3	55	41 %	15.1 years
4	32	24 %	16.2 years
5 - 6	27	20 %	19.9 years
7 - 9	11	8 %	22.8 years
10 or more	9	7 %	33.7 years

Table 2 shows and proves a basic assumption, the more magistrates one achieves, the longer one's career becomes. An increasing amount of magistrate posts means increased political capital which in turn makes the individual more likely to be appointed or elected even past the individual's expected retirement age. It is also, quite obviously, a self-confirming effect: the longer one stays alive, is active and healthy, the more major magistrates one can possibly accumulate. The table also shows that it is increasingly uncommon for individuals to achieve major magistrates beyond the third election. There are few individuals who get past their sixth major magistrate. Finally, one can note that the individuals within the last group all have exceptionally long careers, going far beyond the earlier discussed and expected twenty years.

**Table 3.**

Comparison between different magistrates in relation to average career length and average amount of major magistrates per individual.

Group	Individuals	%	Average Career Length	Average Major Magistrates	+/- Career Length
Everyone	134	100 %	18.2 years	4.7	-
Censors/Census	62	46 %	19.9 years	5	+1.7 years
Dictators	38	28 %	24.2 years	6.2	+6.0 years
Triumph	59	44 %	20.8 years	5.4	+2.6 years
Interrex	25	19 %	23.0 years	6.8	+4.8 years
Magister Equitum	34	25 %	20.3 years	6.0	+2.1 years
None of the Above	28	21 %	14.7 years	4.0	-3.5 years
Augur/Pontiff	9	7 %	24.4 years	5.8	+6.2 years

The data of Table 3 shows us that not only does the amount of major magistral posts one achieves matter but rather that the quality and prestige of the post matters of a similar weight. This table also proves the fact that Triumphs, an achievement rather than a magistrate post, has a large positive effect on one's political capital and further success, even more so than becoming a censor. Dictators as the highest imperium holder also seems to be connected to the largest amount of political capital, which is to be expected. The oddity of the data is the Interrex which is the second highest valued position among the ones analysed. This often-ignored post would flourish from further research and analysis that is beyond the scope of this essay to tackle.

This data also shows the fact that close to half of these remarkably successful individuals managed in becoming elected censor or celebrate Triumphs. Censorship itself provided slight difference between average career length and average amount of major magistrates, which should probably be attributed to both how common the office is among these 134 individuals and that it was more or less a requirement for many politicians if they had a successful career. Because of the small sample size of Augurs and Pontiffs represented within these 134 individuals no real conclusions can be made except that the offices show a tendency to favor longer and more successful careers.

**Table 4.**

Comparison between Patricians and Plebeians and different gentes. Major gentes are the following gentes: Aemilii, Claudii, Cornelii, Fabii, Manlii, Valerii. Minor gentes are the remaining gentes not belonging to any of the major gentes. Cornelii, Valerii and Fabii have been selected specifically as they represent the three largest gentes includes in this essay.

Group	Individuals	%	Average Career Length	Average Major Magistrates	+/- Career Length
Everyone	134	100 %	18.2 years	4.7	-
Patricians	109	81 %	17.6 years	4.7	-0.6
Plebeians	25	19 %	21.0 years	4.6	+2.8
Major gentes	55	41 %	19.5 years	4.9	+1.3
Minor gentes	79	59 %	18.0 years	4.6	-0.2
Cornelii	13	9 %	15.9 years	3.7	-2.3
Valerii	12	9 %	19.3 years	5.5	+1.1
Fabii	11	8 %	22.0 years	6.0	+3.8

This data shows the expected discrepancy between Patrician and Plebeian representation, mainly connected with the Patrician exclusivity of the *imperium* offices for close to two hundred years. Interestingly enough, it can be observed that the Plebeians that made it into this exclusive group of repeated *imperium* holders in comparison to their Patrician colleagues had longer careers by an average of more than three years. There is no noticeable difference between the average amount of offices held compared to if you belonged to a Patrician *gens* or a Plebeian *gens*, or even between a major or minor gentes. Generally, the major gentes enjoyed large representations within the selected *imperium* holders, especially the three largest major gentes the Cornelii, Valerii and Fabii. These three gentes also serve as good examples that even though a major gentes could help its

members enter the political arena, it did not mean automatic success. The Cornelii show that even though they are the gentes who has the most members among these 134 selected individuals they have by far the shortest average career lengths compared to other gentes. Politically successful and dominant gentes such as the Fabii have an enormous advantage compared to the other gentes, both major and minor. Belonging to the Fabii, as can be seen, have a larger effect on ones expected career than a triumph in both average length and average amount of major magistrate appointments.

**Table 5.**

Comparison of representation of different magistrates and achievements among the individuals of Group E, the twenty-five individuals within the 134 that had a career longer than twenty-five years.

Group	Group E	%
Total	25	100 %
Dictator	18	72 %
Censor	17	68 %
Triumph	18	72 %
Interrex	10	40 %

This final table shows that among those with the most extreme careers in both length and total magistrates that they follow similar paths of having held the most prestigious achievements such as the dictatorship, censorship, or triumph. Uncommon offices such as interrex is overrepresented here compared to the remainder of the 134 analysed individuals.

# SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

## *Old Age & Retirement*

This essay, as is shown, gives strength to the theories surrounding retirement among the magistrate core during the Roman Republic. Unlike previous research which solely focuses on the late Republic or the senatorial class during the Empire, this essay shows that the phenomenon can be stretched to include even the earliest parts of the Republic. Further this essay sheds light to what I have decided to call “pseudoretirements”, a phenomenon where elderly and retired ex-magistrates were recalled to active duty to solve extraordinary situations.

As earlier discussed, Astin, Harlow and Laurence’s studies show that the assumption made in this essay of using a broad term of early forties as the standard age of a first time Consul is not baseless.<sup>149</sup> Similarly Harlow and Laurence adds that there seems to be a general trend of retirement around the age of sixty to sixty-five.<sup>150</sup> These two statements both strengthens and is given strength by this essay. If a magistrate was in his early forties at his first consulship the career trends observed in this essay confirms that most magistrates entered a phase of retirement during their sixties. This is proven by the fact that the average career length sits at eighteen years and the large abundance of “pseudoretirements” among those who surpassed twenty-five years of magistrate service.

One should note that these conclusions are in many ways dependent on each other. To give ample proof towards a presumed retirement age the presumed age of electoral success to major magistrates must be assumed to be around forty. The presumed age of electoral success is in turn confirmed by the fact that it would seem that individuals on average would leave magistrate duties after a period of close to twenty years, which if the retirement age is as other researchers have assumed to be sixty, would make the newly elected magistrate aged around forty.

Looking at those who here has been defined as “pseudoretired” we have to answer two important questions: Why did they return and why were they chosen and not someone younger?

---

<sup>149</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.105

<sup>150</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.118

The simplest answer would be that extraordinary circumstances forced them to return, often reliant on a case-to-case basis such as in the four examples shown in the subchapter on “pseudoretirements”. Similar cases are discussed in Cokayne who uses a few examples from the later part of the Republic and notes that “when the need arose for experienced generals” senior members of the senate were recalled for active duty.<sup>151</sup> This use of the elderly as a valuable resource coincides with the thought that with age came an increase in prestige, such as shown by Harlow, Laurence, Cokayne and Parkin.<sup>152</sup> The data shown in this essay indicates that this increased prestige by age was also translated into accumulation of prestigious offices as seen in Table 1 and Table 5. Through their old age and success within their magistral career these recalled individuals represented the *crème de la crème* within the political culture of Rome. Finally of great importance should be discussed the concept of aristocratic competition<sup>153</sup> which drove and dominated Roman politics to an endless stream of rivalries, internal conflicts (lawsuits etc.) and senatorial debates. Thus, in situations of crisis the aristocracy instead turned to the seniors who no longer competed for magistral posts, those who had both intimate knowledge of the system and experience for the situation. These individuals were also “safe” choices with little political fallback that would hit those responsible for the appointment.

In summary, the data shows and tries to prove the existence of retirement within the political core from the beginning of the Republic to the second Punic War. This approach differentiates it from earlier research which takes most or all of its data from the late republican or imperial period. This essay in many ways shows that the assumptions made in Hypothesis 1 (an individual who achieves his first major magistracy is assumed to be around his early forties and will therefore be expected to retire within twenty to twenty-five years after his first magistracy) can be assumed to be correct for the whole of the republican period of ancient Rome. Additionally, the data shows that it was common for elderly and retired ex-magistrates to be recalled during extraordinary circumstances.

---

<sup>151</sup> Cokayne (2003). pp.95

<sup>152</sup> Harlow & Laurence (2002). pp.121, Cokayne (2003). pp.97, Parkin (2003) pp.58, 67-68

<sup>153</sup> Hammar (2013). pp.87–88, Patterson (2000). pp.29–31

## *Political Capital and Magistrates*

Political capital as a form of symbolic capital within Roman political culture is a fact established by several previous researchers. Similar to earlier discussions a majority of earlier research focuses on the later stages of the republic or skips the republic in favor of the better sources these later periods of ancient Rome provide. This essay attempts to tackle political culture and the concept of aristocratic competition in its most basic form: power. Power in this case is symbolized by the accumulation of different political posts within the magistral system of Rome.

Without much reliable descriptive accounts about individuals during the studied period we must instead compare them to each other by their accumulated achievements. Table 2 shows that there is a clear and expected correlation between achieved major magistrates and average career length. By comparing the different achievements, a political individual could accumulate during his career we can see a noticeable difference in prestige between different achievements as shown in Table 3.

As shown in the data, the censorship is an indicator for success, both in that it seems to be one of the essentials for achieving a successful and lengthy career, but also in the fact that it is represented in close to half of all studied individuals within this essay. Suolahti argues for the censorship as the most influential of all posts within the political system of Rome<sup>154</sup>, this essay would disprove this and instead point towards the Interrex or Dictator as the most influential posts during the studied period. Suolahti's argument seems to ring truer after the Second Punic War when the use of both Interrex and the Dictatorship were discontinued.

The triumph is described by Beard as the most important achievement in a politician's life during the Republic.<sup>155</sup> This statement is in a similar fashion to Suolahti and his view on the censorship disproved by the data. But, similarly to Suolahti, Beard bases her research on the descriptive accounts of the late republic when the dictatorship and interrex had been discontinued. Pittenger in her work on the triumphs as part of the aristocratic competition within the political culture of Rome defined the triumphs as "coveted prizes for those who competed on the public stage".<sup>156</sup> The data shows that her arguments made for the late republic can be applied to the early and middle republic.

---

<sup>154</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp.18–19,

<sup>155</sup> Beard (2007) pp.1

<sup>156</sup> Pittenger (2008). pp.295

The data provided by this essay reaffirms that the triumph was one of the most important parts of having a successful career, ranking over the censorship, but under such coveted positions as the Dictatorship.

We now need to reconnect with the political system and culture as we discussed in our earlier chapter on Political culture in the Roman republic. Our earlier conclusion to follow the idea of aristocratic competition instead of earlier theories on the power of *factiones* and *gentes* can here be evaluated against the collected data as shown in Table 4. Here it is shown that even the powerful major *gentes* show little difference in career paths and average success compared to the minor *gentes* and there is minor difference between the Patricians and Plebeians. Suolahti, belonging to an older school, sees the election of the censorship through the works of *gentes* and *factiones*<sup>157</sup> As earlier mentioned this can easily be disproved by the sampled data where such families as the powerful Corneli, although frequent, often have comparatively mediocre or unremarkable careers. His reasoning, like the theory on *factiones*, functions in a few select cases such as for the Fabii. The collected data, on similar arguments brought forth against Suolahti, confirms those of Hammar and Hölkeskamp in that both *factiones* (which relies on powerful *gentes*) and *gentes* had little actual effect on the political climate of the Roman Republic. Adding to this discussion could be the data from Table 5 which shows that the struggle to achieve an ever-growing accumulation of prestigious titles led many of those with long careers to collect most if not all of the different “high value” posts described in this essay, a prime example of aristocratic competition even by those who have reached the top of the political pyramid.

In summary the collected data proves that the theory of aristocratic competition can be applied to the early and middle republic and that *factiones/gentes* play a lesser role than earlier researchers believed. In general, the data shows the expected outcome of extraordinary magistrates as positive effects on an individual's political capital, while a lack of extraordinary magistrates or achievements show a negative effect, although even lacking this, these individuals still made it among the 134 individuals within this essay. The essay also confirms the effect of Hypothesis 2 (by studying this direct accumulation of political capital of these elites through their magistrate posts, one can analyse the importance of both the post and the individual within this political system with little

---

<sup>157</sup> Suolahti (1963), pp.90-91



to no descriptive writing about the individuals) is a functional study of power within the early and middle Republic of ancient Rome.

### *Ending Remarks: Usefulness of the data*

In the end one should look at the data with a grain of salt. The data does not say much or change much about our view on the Roman Republic. What it does instead is open the possibility for further and deeper analysis within an otherwise under-researched area such as the early and middle Republic of ancient Rome. The data shows the possibility of making conclusions and good guesses about both the political culture and views of the aristocracy of the early Republic and allows analysis of these times that are otherwise reliant on unreliable sources filled with myths and legends. The data also opens several questions that would benefit from further research, such as the magistrate post of Interrex and the explanation of gaps within political careers of the senatorial elite. Although this essay studied the effects of different gentes, further research could be done in this area as well as researching the older concept of *factiones* in comparison with this data.

During this essay it has been shown that political culture and its focus on aristocratic competition tends to ignore those who are affected by the competition but no longer takes an active part in the competition. Further research upon these returning individuals into the competitive environment would be of great interest. In addition, the data is useful in discussions regarding identification of individuals within the magistrate lists with unclear or dubious readings.

# SOURCES & LITERATURE

## *Sources*

Broughton, Thomas Robert Shannon, *The magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Vol. 1, 509 B.C. - 100 B.C., American Philological Association, New York, 1951

## *Literature*

Ando, Clifford (red.), *Roman religion*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2003

Beard, Mary, *The Roman triumph*, Belknap, Cambridge, Mass., 2007

Beck, Hans, Duplá, Antonio, Jehne, Martin & Pina Polo, Francisco (red.), *Consuls and res publica: holding high office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011

Cokayne, Karen, *Experiencing old age in ancient Rome*, 1. ed., Routledge, London, 2003

Flower, Harriet I. (red.), *The Cambridge companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004

Hammar, Isak, *Making enemies: the logic of immorality in Ciceronian oratory*, [Department of History], Lund University, Diss. Lund : Lunds universitet, 2013, Lund, 2013

Harlow, Mary & Laurence, Ray, *Growing up and growing old in Ancient Rome: a life course approach*, Routledge, London, 2002

Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: an ancient political culture and modern research*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 2010

Orlin, Eric M., *Temples, religion, and politics in the Roman Republic*, Brill, Boston, 2002

Parkin, Tim G., *Old age in the Roman world: a cultural and social history*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md., 2003

Patterson, John R., *Political life in the city of Rome*, Bristol Classical, London, 2000

Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan, *Contested triumphs: politics, pageantry, and performance in Livy's Republican Rome*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2008

Saller, Richard P., *Patriarchy, property, and death in the Roman family*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994

Scullard, H. H., *Festivals and ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1981

Suolahti, Jaakko, *The Roman censors: a study on social structure*, Helsinki, 1963

## Appendix 1.

List of the 134 individuals included in the essay with Name, Gens, Filiation (father and grandfather), Cognomen, Tribe, Career Length, First and Last Magistrate, Presumed Retirement Year (or if a / the first year is the year of death) and chronological order of achievements after the first held major magistrate.

Name	Gens	f.	n.	Cognomen	Tribe	Period	First	Last	End	Total	Imperium
Aulus	Manlius	T.	A.	Capitolinus	Pat.	20	389	370	370	4	389 C.Tribune, 385 C.Tribune II, 383 C.Tribune III, 370 C.Tribune IV
Lucretius	Papirius	?	?	Mugilanus	Pat.	14	389	376	370	4	389 Censor, 382 C.Tribune, 380 C.Tribune II, 376 C.Tribune III
Lucretius	Postumius	?	?	Albinus Regillensis	Pat.	24	389	366	366 / 370	3	389 C.Tribune, 381 C.Tribune II, 366 Censor
Tiberius	Quinctius	T.	L.	Cincinnatus Capitolinus	Pat.	9	388	380	369	5	388 C.Tribune, 387 DISF, 385 C.Tribune II, M.Equitum, 384 C.Tribune III, 380 Dictator, Triumph
Servius	Supplicius	?	?	Rufus	Pat.	12	388	377	369	4	388 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 383 C.Tribune III, 377 C.Tribune
Loisus	Menerius	T.	T.	Lanatus	Pat.	12	387	376	368	4	387 C.Tribune, 380 C.Tribune II, 378 C.Tribune III, 376 C.Tribune IV
Gnaeus	Sergius	?	?	Fidenas Covo	Pat.	8	387	380	368	3	387 C.Tribune, 385 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III
Servius	Cornelius	P.	M.	Maluginensis	Pat.	26	386	361	367	7	386 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III, 376 C.Tribune IV, 370 C.Tribune V, 368 C.Tribune VI, 361 M.Equitum
Publius	Valerius	L.	L.	Pothus Poplicola	Pat.	20	386	367	367	6	386 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III, 377 C.Tribune IV, 370 C.Tribune V, 367 C.Tribune VI
Quintus	Servilius	Q.	Q.	Fidenas	Pat.	14	382	369	363	3	382 C.Tribune, 378 C.Tribune II, 369 C.Tribune III
Marcus	Fabius	K.	M.	Ambustus	Pat.	19	381	363	362	3	381 C.Tribune, 369 C.Tribune II, 363 Censor
Lucretius	Furius	Sp.	L.	Medullinus	Pat.	19	381	363	362	3	381 C.Tribune, 370 C.Tribune II, 363 Censor
Gaius	Supplicius	M.	Q.	Pellius	Pat.	30	380	351	361	10	380 C.Tribune, 366 Censor, 364 Consul, 362 Minor, 361 Consul II, Triumph, 358 Dictator, Triumph II, 355 Consul III, Interrex, 353 Consul IV, 351 Consul V, Interrex
Publius	Manlius	A.	A.	Capitolinus	Pat.	13	379	367	360	3	379 C.Tribune, 368 Dictator, 367 C.Tribune II
Lucretius	Aemilius	L.	Mam.	Mamerchinus	Pat.	26	377	352	358	6	377 C.Tribune, 368 M.Equitum, 366 Consul, 363 Consul II, 355 Interrex, 352 M.Equitum II
Servius	Supplicius	?	?	Praetextatus	Pat.	9	376	368	368	3	376 C.Tribune, 370 C.Tribune II, 368 C.Tribune III
Quintus	Servilius	Q.	Q.	Ahaia	Pat.	24	365	342	346	7	365 Consul, 362 Consul II, 360 Dictator, 355 Interrex, Interrex II, 351 M.Equitum, 342 Consul III
Titus	Quinctius	?	?	Poenus Capitolinus	Pat.	28	361	334	348	4	361 Dictator, Triumph, 360 M.Equitum, 354 Consul, 351 Consul II, 334 Trumvir
Marcus	Fabius	N.	M.	Ambustus	Pat.	39	360	322	341	10	360 Consul, M.Triumph, 358 Censor, 356 Consul II, 355 Interrex, Interrex II, 354 Consul III, Triumph, 351 Dictator, Interrex III, 340 Interrex IV, 334 Trumvir, 322 M.Equitum
Gaius	Poetelius	C.	Q.	Libo Visolus	Pleb.	42	360	319	341	4	360 Consul, Triumph, 358 Minor, 346 Consul II, 326 Consul III, 319 Censor
Marcus	Popillius	M.	C.	Laenas	Pleb.	12	359	348	340	4	359 Consul, Pontiff, 357 Minor, 356 Consul II, 360 Consul III, Triumph, 348 Consul IV
Gnaeus	Manlius	L.	A.	Capitolinus Imperiosus	Pat.	15	359	345	340	5	359 Consul, 357 Consul II, 355 Interrex, 351 Censor, 345 M.Equitum
Marcus	Valerius	L.	L.	Poplicola	Pat.	6	358	353	339	3	358 M.Equitum, 355 Consul, 353 Consul II
Gaius	Plautius	P.	P.	Proculus	Pleb.	31	358	328	339	3	358 Consul, Triumph, 356 M.Equitum, 328 Consul II
Gaius	Marcius	L.	C.	Rufinus	Pleb.	16	357	342	338	6	357 Consul, Triumph, 356 Dictator, Triumph II, 352 Consul II, 351 Censor, 344 Consul III, 342 Consul IV
Aulus	Cornelius	P.	A.	Cossus Arvina	Pat.	34	353	320	334	5	353 M.Equitum, 349 M.Equitum II, 343 Consul, Triumph, 332 Consul II, 322 Dictator, Triumph II, 320 Minor
Titus	Manlius	L.	A.	Imperiosus Torquatus	Pat.	34	353	320	334	6	353 Dictator, 349 Dictator II, 347 Consul, 344 Consul II, 340 Consul III, Triumph, 320 Dictator III
Lucretius	Cornelius	P.	?	Scipio	Pat.	13	352	340	333	3	352 Interrex, 350 Consul, 340 Censor
Publius	Valerius	P.	L.	Poplicola	Pat.	21	352	332	333	4	352 Consul, 350 Praetor, 344 Dictator, 332 M.Equitum
Lucretius	Furius	M.	L.	Camillus	Pat.	6	350	345	331	3	350 Dictator, 349 Consul, 345 Dictator II
Marcus	Valerius	M.	M.	Corvus	Pat.	41	348	308	329	12	348 Consul, 347 Praetor, 346 Consul II, Triumph, 345 Minor, 344 Praetor II, 343 Consul III, Triumph II, 342 Dictator, 340 Interrex, 335 Consul IV, Triumph III, 332 Interrex II, 325 Minor, 320 Interrex III, 312 Trumvir, 310 Minor, -308 Praetor III, 308 Praetor IV
Lucretius	Aemilius	L.	L.	Mamerchinus Privernas	Pat.	27	342	316	323	6	342 M.Equitum, 341 Consul, 335 Dictator, 329 Consul II, Triumph, 326 Interrex, 316 Dictator II
Lucretius	Papirius	Sp.	L.	Cursor	Pat.	32	340	309	321	12	340 M.Equitum, 326 Consul, 325 Dictator, Triumph, 324 Dictator II 320 Consul II, Triumph II, M.Equitum II, M.Equitum III, 318 Consul III, Triumph III, 315 Consul IV, 313 Consul V, 310 Dictator III, Triumph IV, 309 Dictator IV
Lucretius	Papirius	L.	L.	Crassus	Pat.	16	340	325	321	4	340 Dictator, Praetor, 336 Consul, 330 Consul II, 325 P.uror
Quintus	Publius	Q.	Q.	Philo	Pleb.	25	339	315	320	9	339 Consul, Triumph, Dictator, 336 Praetor, 335 M.Equitum, 332 Censor, 327 Consul II, 326 Proconsul, Triumph II, 320 Consul III, Triumph III, 315 Consul IV
Gaius	Maenius	P.	P.	?	Pleb.	25	338	314	319	4	338 Consul, Triumph, 320 Dictator, 318 Censor, 314 Dictator II
Gaius	Supplicius	Ser.	Q.	Longus	Pat.	26	337	312	318	5	337 Consul, 323 Consul II, 319 Censor, 314 Consul III, Triumph, 312 Dictator
Spurius	Postumius	?	?	Albinus Caudinus	Pat.	14	334	321	315	4	334 Consul, 332 Censor, 327 M.Equitum, 321 Consul II
Quintus	Fabius	M.	N.	Maximus Rullianus	Pat.	35	325	291	306	14	325 M.Equitum, 324 M.Equitum II, 322 Consul, Triumph, 320 Interrex, 315 Dictator, 313 Dictator II, 310 Consul II, Triumph II, 309 Proconsul, Triumph III, 308 Consul III, 307 Proconsul II, 304 Censor, 299 Minor, 297 Consul IV, 296 Proconsul III, 295 Consul V, Triumph IV, 292 Minor, 291 Minor
Quintus	Aulus	Q.	Q.	Cerretanus	Pleb.	9	323	315	315 / 304	3	323 Consul, 319 Consul II, 315 M.Equitum
Marcus	Folius	C.	M.	Flaccinator	Pat.	8	320	313	301	4	320 M.Equitum, 318 Consul, 314 M.Equitum II, 313 M.Equitum III
Gaius	Iunius	C.	C.	Bubulcius Brutus	Pleb.	16	317	302	298	8	317 Consul, 313 Consul II, 312 M.Equitum, 311 Consul III, Triumph, 310 M.Equitum II, 309 M.Equitum III, 307 Censor, 302 Dictator, Triumph II
Publius	Decius	P.	Q.	Mus	Pleb.	18	312	295	295 / 293	7	312 Consul, Triumph, 310 Minor, 308 Consul II, 306 M.Equitum, 304 Censor, 300 Pontiff, 297 Consul III, 296 Proconsul, 295 Consul IV
Appius	Claudius	C.	Ap.	Caecus	Pat.	26	312	287	293	7	312 Censor, 307 Consul, 305 Minor, 298 Interrex, 297 Praetor, 296 Consul II, 295 Praetor II, 287 Dictator
Marcus	Valerius	M.	M.	Maximus Corvinus	Pat.	24	312	289	293	7	312 Consul, Triumph, 307 Censor, 302 Dictator, Triumph, 301 Dictator II, 300 Consul II, 299 Consul III, 297 Minor, 289 Consul IV
Gaius	Marcius	C.	L.	Rufinus Censorius	Pleb.	46	310	265	291	3	310 Consul, 300 Pontiff, Augur, 295 Minor, 294 Censor, 265 Consul II
Lucretius	Volumnius	C.	C.	Flamma Violens	Pleb.	15	307	293	288	3	307 Consul, 296 Consul II, 295 Proconsul, 293 Minor
Publius	Cornelius	A.	P.	Arvina	Pat.	19	306	288	287	3	306 Consul, 294 Censor, 288 Consul II
Lucretius	Postumius	L.	Sp.	Megellus	Pat.	24	305	282	286	5	305 Consul, Triumph, 295 Proprietor, 294 Consul II, Triumph II, 293 Minor, 291 Consul III, Triumph III, Interrex, 282 Minor
Publius	Sempronius	P.	C.	Sophus	Pleb.	9	304	296	285	3	304 Consul, Triumph, 300 Censor, Pontiff, 296 Praetor

Name	Gens	f.	n.	Cognomen	Tribe	Period	First	Last	End	Total	Imperium
Aulus	Manlius	T.	A.	Capitolinus	Pat.	20	389	370	370	4	389 C.Tribune, 365 C.Tribune II, 363 C.Tribune III, 370 C.Tribune IV
Lucius	Papirius	?	?	Mugillanus	Pat.	14	389	376	370	4	389 Censor, 382 C.Tribune, 380 C.Tribune II, 376 C.Tribune III
Lucius	Postumius	?	?	Albinus Regillensis	Pat.	24	389	366	366 / 370	3	389 C.Tribune, 381 C.Tribune II, 366 Censor
Titus	Quinctus	T.	L.	Cincinnatus Capitolinus	Pat.	9	388	380	369	5	388 C.Tribune, 387 D.S.F., 385 C.Tribune II, M.Equitum, 384 C.Tribune III, 380 Dictator, Triumph
Servius	Suppicius	?	?	Rufus	Pat.	12	388	377	369	4	388 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 383 C.Tribune III, 377 C.Tribune
Lucius	Menenius	T.	T.	Lanatus	Pat.	12	387	376	368	4	387 C.Tribune, 380 C.Tribune II, 378 C.Tribune III, 376 C.Tribune IV
Gnaeus	Sergius	?	?	Fidenas Cocio	Pat.	8	387	380	368	3	387 C.Tribune, 385 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III
Servius	Cornelius	P.	M.	Maluginensis	Pat.	25	386	361	367	7	386 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III, 376 C.Tribune IV, 370 C.Tribune V, 368 C.Tribune VI, 361 M.Equitum
Publius	Valerius	L.	L.	Potitius Poplicola	Pat.	20	386	367	367	6	386 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 380 C.Tribune III, 377 C.Tribune IV, 370 C.Tribune V, 367 C.Tribune VI
Quintus	Servilius	Q.	Q.	Fidenas	Pat.	14	382	369	363	3	382 C.Tribune, 378 C.Tribune II, 369 C.Tribune III
Marcus	Fabius	K.	M.	Ambustus	Pat.	19	381	363	362	3	381 C.Tribune, 369 C.Tribune II, 363 Censor
Lucius	Furius	Sp.	L.	Medullinus	Pat.	19	381	363	362	3	381 C.Tribune, 370 C.Tribune II, 363 Censor
Gaius	Suppicius	M.	Q.	Petius	Pat.	30	380	351	361	10	380 C.Tribune, 366 Censor, 364 Consul, 362 Minor, 361 Consul II, Triumph, 358 Dictator, Triumph II, 355 Consul III, Interrex, 353 Consul IV, 351 Consul V, Interrex
Publius	Manlius	A.	A.	Capitolinus	Pat.	13	379	367	360	3	379 C.Tribune, 368 Dictator, 367 C.Tribune II
Lucius	Aemilius	L.	Mam.	Mameronius	Pat.	26	377	362	368	6	377 C.Tribune, 368 M.Equitum, 366 Consul, 363 Consul II, 355 Interrex, 352 M.Equitum II
Servius	Suppicius	?	?	Praetextatus	Pat.	9	376	368	368	3	376 C.Tribune, 370 C.Tribune II, 368 C.Tribune III
Quintus	Servilius	Q.	Q.	Anala	Pat.	24	365	342	346	7	365 Consul, 362 Consul II, 360 Dictator, 355 Interrex, Interrex II, 351 M.Equitum, 342 Consul III
Titus	Quinctus	?	?	Poenus Capitolinus	Pat.	28	361	334	348	4	361 Dictator, Triumph, 360 M.Equitum, 354 Consul, 351 Consul II, 334 Trumviri
Marcus	Fabius	N.	M.	Ambustus	Pat.	39	360	322	341	10	360 Consul, M.Triumph, 358 Censor, 356 Consul II, 355 Interrex, Interrex II, 354 Consul III, Triumph, 351 Dictator, Interrex III, 340 Interrex IV, 334 Trumviri, 322 M.Equitum
Gaius	Poellius	C.	Q.	Libo Visolus	Pleb.	42	360	319	341	4	360 Consul, Triumph, 358 Minor, 345 Consul II, 326 Consul III, 319 Censor
Marcus	Popillius	M.	C.	Laenas	Pleb.	12	359	348	340	4	359 Consul, Pontiff, 357 Minor, 356 Consul II, 350 Consul III, Triumph, 348 Consul IV
Gnaeus	Manlius	L.	A.	Capitolinus Imperiosus	Pat.	15	359	345	340	5	359 Consul, 357 Consul II, 355 Interrex, 351 Censor, 345 M.Equitum
Marcus	Valerius	L.	L.	Poplicola	Pat.	6	358	353	339	3	358 M.Equitum, 355 Consul, 353 Consul II
Gaius	Plautius	P.	P.	Procius	Pleb.	31	358	328	339	3	358 Consul, Triumph, 356 M.Equitum, 328 Consul II
Gaius	Marcus	L.	C.	Rutilius	Pleb.	16	357	342	338	6	357 Consul, Triumph, 356 Dictator, Triumph II, 352 Consul II, 351 Censor, 344 Consul III, 342 Consul IV
Aulus	Cornelius	P.	A.	Cossus Arvina	Pat.	34	353	320	334	5	353 M.Equitum, 349 M.Equitum II, 343 Consul, Triumph, 332 Consul II, 322 Dictator, Triumph II, 320 Minor
Titus	Manlius	L.	A.	Imperiosus Torquatus	Pat.	34	353	320	334	6	353 Dictator, 349 Dictator II, 347 Consul, 344 Consul II, 340 Consul III, Triumph, 320 Dictator III
Lucius	Cornelius	P.	?	Scipio	Pat.	13	352	340	333	3	352 Interrex, 350 Consul, 340 Censor
Publius	Valerius	P.	L.	Poplicola	Pat.	21	352	332	333	4	352 Consul, 350 Praetor, 344 Dictator, 332 M.Equitum
Lucius	Furius	M.	L.	Camillus	Pat.	6	350	345	331	3	350 Dictator, 349 Consul, 345 Dictator II
Marcus	Valerius	M.	M.	Corvus	Pat.	41	348	308	329	12	348 Consul, 347 Praetor, 346 Consul II, Triumph, 345 Minor, 344 Praetor II, 343 Consul III, Triumph II, 342 Dictator, 340 Interrex, 335 Consul IV, Triumph III, 332 Interrex II, 325 Minor, 320 Interrex III, 312 Trumviri, 310 Minor, -308 Praetor III, 308 Praetor IV
Lucius	Aemilius	L.	L.	Mameronius Privernas	Pat.	27	342	316	323	6	342 M.Equitum, 341 Consul, 335 Dictator, 329 Consul II, Triumph, 326 Interrex, 316 Dictator II
Lucius	Papirius	Sp.	L.	Cursor	Pat.	32	340	309	321	12	340 M.Equitum, 326 Consul, 325 Dictator, Triumph, 324 Dictator II, 320 Consul II, Triumph II?, M.Equitum II, M.Equitum III, 319 Consul III, Triumph III?, 315 Consul IV, 313 Consul V, 310 Dictator III, Triumph IV?, 309 Dictator IV
Lucius	Papirius	L.	L.	Crassus	Pat.	16	340	325	321	4	340 Dictator, Praetor, 336 Consul, 330 Consul II, 325 P.urbi
Quintus	Publius	Q.	Q.	Philo	Pleb.	25	339	315	320	9	339 Consul, Triumph, Dictator, 336 Praetor, 335 M.Equitum, 332 Censor, 327 Consul II, 326 Proconsul, Triumph II, 320 Consul III, Triumph III?, 315 Consul IV
Gaius	Maenius	P.	P.	?	Pleb.	25	338	314	319	4	338 Consul, Triumph, 320 Dictator, 318 Censor, 314 Dictator II
Gaius	Suppicius	Ser.	Q.	Longus	Pat.	26	337	312	318	5	337 Consul, 323 Consul II, 319 Censor, 314 Consul III, Triumph, 312 Dictator
Spurius	Postumius	?	?	Albinus Caudinus	Pat.	14	334	321	315	4	334 Consul, 332 Censor, 327 M.Equitum, 321 Consul II
Quintus	Fabius	M.	N.	Maximus Rullianus	Pat.	36	325	291	306	14	325 M.Equitum, 324 M.Equitum II, 322 Consul, Triumph, 320 Interrex, 315 Dictator, 313 Dictator II, 310 Consul II, Triumph II, 309 Proconsul, Triumph III, 308 Consul III, 307 Proconsul II, 304 Censor, 299 Minor, 297 Consul IV, 296 Proconsul III, 295 Consul V, Triumph IV, 292 Minor, 291 Minor
Quintus	Aulius	Q.	Q.	Cerretanus	Pleb.	9	323	315	315 / 304	3	323 Consul, 319 Consul II, 315 M.Equitum
Marcus	Folius	C.	M.	Flaccinator	Pat.	8	320	313	301	4	320 M.Equitum, 318 Consul, 314 M.Equitum II, 313 M.Equitum III
Gaius	Iunius	C.	C.	Bubulcius Brutus	Pleb.	16	317	302	298	8	317 Consul, 313 Consul II, 312 M.Equitum, 311 Consul III, Triumph, 310 M.Equitum II, 309 M.Equitum III, 307 Censor, 302 Dictator, Triumph II
Publius	Decius	P.	Q.	Mus	Pleb.	18	312	295	295 / 293	7	312 Consul, Triumph?, 310 Minor, 308 Consul II, 306 M.Equitum, 304 Censor, 300 Pontiff, 297 Consul III, 296 Proconsul, 295 Consul IV
Appius	Claudius	C.	Ap.	Caecus	Pat.	26	312	287	293	7	312 Censor, 307 Consul, 305 Minor, 298 Interrex, 297 Praetor, 296 Consul II, 295 Praetor II, 287 Dictator
Marcus	Valerius	M.	M.	Maximus Corvinus	Pat.	24	312	289	293	7	312 Consul, Triumph, 307 Censor, 302 Dictator, Triumph, 301 Dictator II, 300 Consul II, 299 Consul III, 297 Minor, 289 Consul IV
Gaius	Marcus	C.	L.	Rutilius Censorinus	Pleb.	46	310	265	291	3	310 Consul, 300 Pontiff, Augur, 295 Minor, 294 Censor, 265 Censor II
Lucius	Volumnius	C.	C.	Flamma Volens	Pleb.	15	307	293	288	3	307 Consul, 296 Consul II, 295 Proconsul, 293 Minor
Publius	Cornelius	A.	P.	Arvina	Pat.	19	306	288	287	3	306 Consul, 294 Censor, 288 Consul II
Lucius	Postumius	L.	Sp.	Megellus	Pat.	24	305	282	286	5	305 Consul, Triumph?, 295 Proprietor, 294 Consul II, Triumph II?, 293 Minor, 291 Consul III, Triumph III?, Interrex, 282 Minor
Publius	Sempronius	P.	C.	Sophus	Pleb.	9	304	296	285	3	304 Consul, Triumph, 300 Censor, Pontiff, 296 Praetor

Name	Gens	f.	n.	Cognomen	Tribe	Period	First	Last	End	Total	Imperium
Publius	Sulpicius	Ser.	P.	Saverrio	Pat.	7	304	298	285	3	304 Consul, Triumph, 300 Censor, 298 Interrex
Marcus	Aemilius	L.	L.	Paullus	Pat.	20	302	283	283	4	302 Consul, M.Equitum, 301 M.Equitum II, 283 Censor
Lucius	Cornelius	Cr.	?	Scipio Barbatus	Pat.	19	298	280	279	3	298 Consul, 297 Minor, 295 Propraeator, 293 Minor, 280 Censor
Gnaeus	Fulvius	Cr.	Cr.	Maximus Centumalus	Pleb.	36	298	263	279	3	298 Consul, Triumph, 295 Propraeator, 263 Dictator
Spurius	Carvilius	C.	C.	Maximus	Pleb.	22	293	272	274	3	293 Consul, Triumph, 292 Minor, 289 Censor, 272 Consul II, Triumph II
Lucius	Papirius	L.	Sp.	Cursor	Pat.	22	293	272	274	3	293 Consul, Triumph, 292 Praetor, 272 Consul II, Triumph II
Quintus	Fabius	Q.	M.	Maximus Gurgus	Pat.	20	292	273	265 / 273	4	292 Consul, 291 Proconsul, Triumph, 289 Censor, 276 Consul II, Triumph II, 273 Minor
Publius	Cornelius	Cr.	P.	Rufinus	Pat.	14	290	277	275 / 271	3	290 Consul, Triumph, 285 Dictator, 277 Consul II
Manius	Curius	M.	M.	Dentatus	Pleb.	21	290	270	270 / 271	5	290 Consul, Triumph, Triumph II, M.Triumph, 283 Praetor, 275 Consul II, Triumph III, 274 Consul III, 272 Censor, 270 Triumvir
Gnaeus	Domitius	Cr.	Cr.	Calvinus Maximus	Pleb.	4	283	280	264	3	283 Consul, Triumph, 280 Dictator, Censor
Quintus	Aemilius	Cr.	L.	Papus	Pat.	8	282	275	263	3	282 Consul, 280 Minor, 278 Consul II, 275 Censor
Galus	Fabritius	C.	C.	Luscius	Pat.	8	282	275	263	3	282 Consul, Triumph, 280 Minor, 279 Minor, Minor, 278 Consul II, Triumph II, 275 Censor
Lucius	Aemilius	Q.	Q.	Barbula	Pat.	13	281	269	262	3	281 Consul, 280 Proconsul, Triumph, 269 Censor
Quintus	Marcus	Q.	Q.	Philippus	Pleb.	19	281	263	262	4	281 Consul, Triumph, 280 Praetor, 269 Censor, 263 M.Equitum
Gnaeus	Cornelius	P.	Cr.	Bisio	Pat.	14	270	257	251	3	270 Consul, Triumph, 265 Censor, 257 Consul II
Marcus	Attilius	M.	L.	Regulus	Pleb.	13	267	255	255 / 248	3	267 Consul, Triumph, 256 Consul II, 255 Proconsul
Lucius	Postumius	L.	L.	Megellus	Pat.	10	262	253	253 / 243	3	262 Consul, 253 Censor, Praetor
Gnaeus	Cornelius	L.	Cr.	Scipio Asina	Pat.	8	260	253	241	3	260 Consul, 254 Consul II, 253 Proconsul, Triumph
Galus	Dullius	M.	M.	?	Pleb.	30	260	231	241	3	260 Consul, N.Triumph, 258 Censor, 231 Dictator
Aulus	Attilius	A.	C.	Calatinus	Pleb.	12	258	247	239	5	258 Consul, 257 Praetor, Triumph, 254 Consul II, 249 Dictator, 247 Censor
Galus	Aurelius	L.	C.	Cotta	Pleb.	22	252	231	233	4	252 Consul, Triumph, 248 Consul II, 241 Censor, 231 M.Equitum
Lucius	Caecilius	L.	C.	Metellus	Pleb.	28	251	224	221 / 232	5	251 Consul, 250 Proconsul, Triumph, 249 M.Equitum, 247 Consul II, 243 Pontiff, 224 Dictator
Aulus	Manlius	T.	T.	Torquatus Atticus	Pat.	7	247	241	228	3	247 Censor, 244 Consul, 241 Consul II, Triumph
Marcus	Fabius	M.	M.	Buteo	Pat.	32	245	214	226	3	245 Consul, 241 Censor, 216 Minor, 216 Dictator, 214 P.senatus
Galus	Attilius	A.	A.	Bulbus	Pleb.	12	245	234	226	3	245 Consul, 235 Consul II, 234 Censor
Quintus	Valerius	Q.	P.	Falto	Pat.	4	242	239	223	3	242 Praetor, 241 Propraeator, N.Triumph, 239 Consul
Galus	Claudius	Aq.	C.	Cenitho	Pat.	28	240	213	221	4	240 Consul, 225 Censor, 216 Interrex, 213 Dictator
Quintus	Fulvius	M.	Q.	Flaccus	Pleb.	31	237	207	205 / 218	13	237 Consul, 231 Censor, 224 Consul II, 217 Minor 216 Pontiff, 215 Praetor, 214 Praetor II, 213 M.Equitum, 212 Consul III, 211 Proconsul, 210 Dictator, Proconsul II, 209 Consul IV, 208 Proconsul II, 207 Proconsul III
Titus	Manlius	T.	T.	Torquatus	Pat.	28	236	208	202 / 216	5	236 Consul, Triumph, 231 Censor, 224 Consul II, 215 Promperio, -212 Pontiff, 208 Dictator
Lucius	Postumius	A.	A.	Albinus	Pat.	20	234	215	215 / 215	5	234 Consul, 233 Praetor, 229 Consul II, 216 Praetor II, 215 Consul III
Quintus	Fabius	Q.	Q.	Maximus Verucosus	Pat.	30	233	204	203 / 214	10	265 Augur, 233 Consul, Triumph, 230 Censor, 229 Consul II, 222 Interrex, 221 Dictator, 218 Minor, 217 Dictator II, 216 Pontiff, 215 Consul III, Triumvir, 214 Consul IV, 213 Minor, 209 Consul V, Triumph, P.senatus, 208 Interrex, 204 P.senatus
Galus	Fiaminius	C.	L.	?	Pleb.	11	227	217	217 / 208	5	227 Praetor, 223 Consul, Triumph, 221 M.Equitum, 220 Censor, 217 Consul II

## Appendix 2.

These individuals, ordered after first year of office is as follows: (total years between first and last magistrate shown) and a. Achievements and offices held, b. Order of offices and achievements. The individuals presented here are the individuals who had a career length of at least twenty-five years from the first major magistrate to last magistrate.

1. 506 - 482 Spurius Larcius Rufus (25)<sup>158</sup>
  - a. Consul II, P.Urbi, Interrex, Legate III
  - b. 506 Consul, 505 Legate, 504 Legate II, 490 Consul II, 488 Legate III, 487 P.Urbi, 482 Interrex
2. 471 - 439 Titus Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatus (33)<sup>159</sup>
  - a. Consul VI, Interrex, Proconsul, Triumph, Censur<sup>160</sup>, Quaestor, Triumviri
  - b. 471 Consul, 468 Consul II, Triumph, 467 Triumviri, 465 Consul III, Censur, 464 Proconsul, 458 Quaestor, 446 Consul IV, 444 Interrex, 443 Consul V, 439 Consul VI
3. 414 - 387 Lucius Valerius Potitus (28)<sup>161</sup>
  - a. Censur<sup>162</sup>, Consul II, C.Tribune V, Interrex III, M.Equitum, Legate II, Triumph
  - b. 414 C.Tribune, 410 Censur 406 C.Tribune II, 403 C.Tribune III, 401 C.Tribune IV, 398 C.Tribune V, 398-397 Legate, 396 Interrex, 394 Legate II, 393 Consul, 392 Consul II, Triumph, 391 Interrex II, 390 M.Equitum?, 387 Interrex III
4. 403 - 367 Marcus Furius Camillus (36)<sup>163</sup>
  - a. Dictator V, Censur<sup>164</sup>, C.Tribune VI, Interrex III, Triumph IV
  - b. 403 Censur, 401 C.Tribune, 398 C.Tribune II, 396 Dictator, Triumph, Interrex, 394 C.Tribune III, 391 Interrex II, 390 Dictator II, Triumph II, 389 Dictator III, Triumph III, Interrex III, 386 C.Tribune IV, 384 C.Tribune V, 381 C.Tribune VI, 368 Dictator IV, 367 Dictator V, Triumph IV
5. 393 - 367 Marcus Cornelius Maluginensis (27)<sup>165</sup>
  - a. Censur<sup>166</sup>, C.Tribune II
  - b. 393 Censur, 369 C.Tribune, 367 C.Tribune II
6. 386 - 361 Servius Cornelius Maluginensis (26)<sup>167</sup>
  - a. C.Tribune VII, M.Equitum
  - b. 386 C.Tribune, 384 C.Tribune II, 382 C.Tribune III 380 C.Tribune IV, 376 C.Tribune V, 370 C.Tribune VI, 368 C.Tribune VII, 361 M.Equitum
7. 380 - 351 Gaius Sulpicius Peticus (30)<sup>168</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censur<sup>169</sup>, Consul V, C.Tribune, Interrex II, Legate, Triumph II
  - b. 380 C.Tribune, 366 Censur, 364 Consul, 362 Legate, 361 Consul II, Triumph, 358 Dictator, Triumph II, 355 Consul III, Interrex, 353 Consul IV, 351 Consul V, Interrex II
8. 377 - 352 Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus (26)<sup>170</sup>
  - a. Consul II, M.Equitum II, C.Tribune, Interrex

---

<sup>158</sup> Broughton, Thomas Robert Shannon, *The magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Vol. 1, 509 B.C. - 100 B.C., American Philological Association, New York, 1951 pp. 6-8, 18-20, 23

<sup>159</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 30, 32-34, 40, 51, 53, 56

<sup>160</sup> Suolahti, Jaakko, *The Roman censors: a study on social structure*, Helsinki, 1963. pp. 157-158

<sup>161</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 74, 79-88, 90-93, 95, 100

<sup>162</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 619

<sup>163</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 82-91, 93, 95-97, 100-102, 104, 112-113

<sup>164</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 176-177

<sup>165</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 92, 111, 113

<sup>166</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 180-181

<sup>167</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 100-106, 108-112, 119

<sup>168</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 105-106, 115-116, 118, 121-122, 124-127

<sup>169</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 191-192

<sup>170</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 107-108, 112, 114-117, 124, 126

- b. 377 C.Tribune, 368 M.Equitum, 366 Consul, 363 Consul II, 355 Interrex, 352 M.Equitum II
- 9. 361 - 334 Titus Quinctius Poenus Capitolinus (28)<sup>171</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Consul II, M.Equitum II, Triumviri, Triumph
  - b. 361 Dictator, Triumph, 360 M.Equitum II, 354 Consul, 351 Consul II, 334 Triumviri
- 10. 360 - 322 Marcus Fabius Ambustus (39)<sup>172</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor<sup>173</sup>, Consul III, M.Equitum, Interrex IV, Triumviri, Triumph, Ovatio
  - b. 360 Consul, Ovatio, 358 Censor, 356 Consul II, 355 Interrex, Interrex II, 354 Consul III, Triumph, 351 Dictator, Interrex III, 340 Interrex IV, 334 Triumviri, 322 M.Equitum
- 11. 360 - 326/319 Gaius Poetelius Libo Visolus (35/42)<sup>174</sup>
  - a. Censor<sup>175</sup>, Consul III, P.Tribune, Triumph
  - b. 360 Consul, Triumph, 358 P.Tribune, 346 Consul II, 326 Consul III, 319 Censor
- 12. 358 - 328 Gaius Plautius Proculus (31)<sup>176</sup>
  - a. Consul II, M.Equitum, Triumph
  - b. 358 Consul, Triumph, 356 M.Equitum, 328 Consul II?
- 13. 353 - 320 Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (34)<sup>177</sup>
  - a. Dictator III, Consul III, Triumph
  - b. 353 Dictator, 349 Dictator II, 347 Consul, 344 Consul II, 340 Consul III, Triumph, 320 Dictator III
- 14. 353 - 320 Aulus Cornelius Cossus Arvina (34)<sup>178</sup>
  - a. Dictator, M.Equitum II, Consul II, Triumph II, Fetialis
  - b. 353 M.Equitum, 349 M.Equitum II, 343 Consul, Triumph, 332 Consul II, 322 Dictator, Triumph II, 320 Fetialis
- 15. 348 - 308 Marcus Valerius Corvus (41)<sup>179</sup>
  - a. Dictator I, Consul IV, Praetor IV, C.Aedile, Interrex II, Triumviri, Legate II, Triumph III
  - b. 348 Consul, 347 Praetor, 346 Consul II, Triumph, 345 C.Aedile, 344 Praetor II, 343 Consul III, Triumph II, 342 Dictator, 340 Interrex, 335 Consul IV, Triumph III, 332 Interrex II, 325 Legate, 320 Interrex III, 313 Triumviri, 310 Legate II, ,<308 Praetor III, 308 Praetor IV
- 16. 342 - 316 Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus Privernas (27)<sup>180</sup>
  - a. Dictator II, Consul II, M.Equitum, Interrex, Triumph
  - b. 342 M.Equitum, 341 Consul, 335 Dictator, 329 Consul II, Triumph, 326 Interrex, 316 Dictator II
- 17. 340 - 309 Lucius Papirius Cursor (32)<sup>181</sup>
  - a. Dictator IV, Consul V, M.Equitum III, Triumph IV
  - b. 340 M.Equitum, 326 Consul, 325 Dictator, Triumph, 324 Dictator II 320 Consul II, Triumph II, M.Equitum II, M.Equitum III, 319 Consul III, Triumph III, 315 Consul IV, 313 Consul V, 310 Dictator III, Triumph IV, 309 Dictator IV
- 18. 339 - 315 Quintus Pubilius Philo (25)<sup>182</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor<sup>183</sup>, Consul IV, Proconsul, M.Equitum, Praetor, Triumph III
  - b. 339 Consul, Triumph, Dictator, 336 Praetor, 335 M.Equitum, 332 Censor, 327 Consul II, 326 Proconsul, Triumph II, 320 Consul III, Triumph III, 315 Consul IV
- 19. 338 - 314 Gaius Maenius (25)<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 114, 119-120, 124, 127, 141

<sup>172</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 120, 123-124, 127, 136, 141, 150

<sup>173</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 197-198

<sup>174</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 120, 122, 131, 146-147

<sup>175</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 212-213, 632-636

<sup>176</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 121-123, 145

<sup>177</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 125, 129-130, 132, 135-137, 153

<sup>178</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 125, 129, 132-133, 141-142, 150, 153

<sup>179</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 129-134, 136, 139-140, 142, 148, 153, 159, 163-164, 169-173

<sup>180</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 134-135, 140, 144, 146, 156

<sup>181</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 136-137, 142, 146-149, 152-154, 156-158, 162-163

<sup>182</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 137-140, 142, 145-146, 152-153, 156

<sup>183</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 206-210

<sup>184</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 138, 152-153, 155, 157

- a. Dictator II, Censor<sup>185</sup>, Consul, Triumph
- b. 338 Consul, Triumph, 320 Dictator, 318 Censor, 314 Dictator II
- 20. 337 - 312 Gaius Sulpicius Longus (26)<sup>186</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor<sup>187</sup>, Consul III, Triumph
  - b. 337 Consul, 323 Consul II, 319 Censor, 314 Consul III, Triumph, 312 Dictator
- 21. 325 - 292 Quintus Fabius Maximus Ruillianus (34)<sup>188</sup>
  - a. Dictator II, Censor<sup>189</sup>, Consul V, Proconsul III, M.Equitum II, Interrex, C.Aedile, Legate II, Triumph IV
  - b. 325 M.Equitum, 324 M.Equitum II, 322 Consul, Triumph, 320 Interrex, 315 Dictator, 313 Dictator II, 310 Consul II, Triumph II, 309 Proconsul, Triumph III, 308 Consul III, 307 Proconsul II, 304 Censor, 299 C.Aedile, 297 Consul IV, 296 Proconsul III, 295 Consul V, Triumph IV, 292 Legate, 291 Legate II
- 22. 312 - 287 Appius Claudius Caecus (26)<sup>190</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor<sup>191</sup>, Consul II, Praetor II, Interrex III, C.Aedile
  - b. 312 Censor, 307 Consul, 305 C.Aedile, 298 Interrex, 297 Praetor, 296 Consul II, 295 Praetor II, 287 Dictator
- 23. 310 - 265 Gaius Marcius Rutilus Censorinus (46)<sup>192</sup>
  - i. Censor II, Consul<sup>193</sup>, Pontiff, Augur, Legate
  - ii. 310 Consul, 300 Pontiff, Augur, 295 Legate?, 294 Censor, 265 Censor II
- 24. 298 - 263 Gnaeus Fulvius Maximus Centumalus (36)<sup>194</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Consul, Propractor, Triumph
  - b. 298 Consul, Triumph, 295 Propractor, 263 Dictator
- 25. 260 - 231 Gaius Duilius (30)<sup>195</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor, Consul, N.Triumph
  - b. 260 Consul, N.Triumph, 258 Censor, 231 Dictator
- 26. 251 - 224 Lucius Caecilius Metellus (28)<sup>196</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Consul II, Proconsul, M.Equitum, P.maximus, Triumph
  - b. 251 Consul, 250 Proconsul, Triumph, 249 M.Equitum, 247 Consul II, 243 P.Maximus, 224 Dictator
- 27. 245 - 214 Marcus Fabius Buteo (32)<sup>197</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor, Consul, P.senatus, Legate
  - b. 245 Consul, 241 Censor, 218 Legate, 216 Dictator, 214 P.senatus
- 28. 240 - 213 Gaius Claudius Centhos (28)<sup>198</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor, Consul, Interrex
  - b. 240 Consul, 225 Censor, 216 Interrex, 213 Dictator
- 29. 237 - 207 Quintus Fulvius Flaccus (31)<sup>199</sup>
  - a. Dictator, Censor, Consul IV, Proconsul III, M.Equitum, Praetor II, Legate, Pontiff
  - b. 237 Consul, 231 Censor, 224 Consul II, 217 Legate, 216 Pontiff, 215 Praetor, 214 Praetor II, 213 M.Equitum, 212 Consul III, 211 Proconsul, 210 Dictator, Proconsul II, 209 Consul IV, 208 Proconsul II, 207 Proconsul III

---

<sup>185</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 218-220

<sup>186</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 138, 149, 154, 157, 159

<sup>187</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 215-216

<sup>188</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 147-150, 153, 156, 158-159, 161-162, 164-165, 167-168, 170-171, 173-177, 182-183

<sup>189</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 229-232

<sup>190</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 160-162, 164, 167, 174-176, 178, 187

<sup>191</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 220-223

<sup>192</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 161-162, 172, 178-179, 202

<sup>193</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 239-240

<sup>194</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 174, 178, 204

<sup>195</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 205-206, 226

<sup>196</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 213-216, 218, 231

<sup>197</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 217, 219, 239, 248, 259

<sup>198</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 221, 231, 250, 263

<sup>199</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 221-222, 226, 231, 245-247, 252, 254, 259, 263, 267, 274, 278, 280, 285, 292, 296



30. 235 - 208 Titus Manlius Torquatus (28)<sup>200</sup>
- a. Dictator, Censor, Consul II, Cum Imperio, Pontiff, Triumph
  - b. 235 Consul, Triumph, 231 Censor, 224 Consul II, 215 Cum Imperio, <212 Pontiff, 208 Dictator
31. 233 - 204 Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (30)<sup>201</sup>
- a. Dictator II, Censor, Consul V, Interrex II, Legate III, P.senatus II, Augur, Pontiff, Triumph II
  - b. 265 Augur, 233 Consul, Triumph, 230 Censor, 228 Consul II, 222 Interrex?, 221 Dictator, 218 Legate?, 217 Dictator II, 216 Pontiff, 215 Consul III, Legate II, 214 Consul IV, 213 Legate III, 209 Consul V, Triumph II, P.senatus, 208 Interrex II, 204 P.senatus II?

---

<sup>200</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 223, 226, 231, 256-257, 271, 290

<sup>201</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 202, 224, 227-228, 233-235, 239-241, 243, 245-246, 252, 254, 257-259, 265, 285, 291, 306

### Appendix 3

Conflicting magistrates: A discussion on picking sources, filling gaps and some other guesswork together with professors Broughton and Suolahti.

Here follows discussions on several conflicting situations concerning the length of career or number of posts of several individuals relating to this essay.

**Spurius Larcius Rufus**, will be counted as the consul of 506 BC together with Titus Herminius Aquilinus as argued by Broughton.<sup>202</sup> He will also be counted as the same individual as Spurius Larcius Flavus, the consul of 490 BC as assumed by Broughton.<sup>203</sup>

**Spurius Cassius Vecellinus**, consul in 502 BC will not be counted as being tribune of the plebs in 486 BC, which is only supported by a dubious account mentioned by Valerius Maximus.<sup>204</sup>

**Appius Claudius Crassinus Inregillensis**, consul 471 BC will be treated as the same individual as the consul and decemviri of 451 BC as discussed by Broughton<sup>205</sup>

**Lucius Minucius Esquilinus Augurinus**, consul in 458 BC is assumed to have been Praefectus Annonae in 440 and 439 BC, not a Tribune of the Plebs.<sup>206</sup>

**Marcus Geganius Macerinus**, consul in 447 BC is assumed to have been a Legate in 431 BC.<sup>207</sup>

**Gaius Iulius Iullus**, consul in 447 BC and Lucius Verginius Tricostus, consul in 435 BC is assumed to not have been consuls in 434 BC, instead I would favour the college of consular tribunes consisting of Servius Cornelius Cossus, Marcus Manlius Capitolinus, Quintus Sulpicius Camerinus as argued by Broughton.<sup>208</sup> This will reduce Iulius to two major magistrate and leaving him outside of this essay, similarly Verginius will be reduced to one major magistrate.

---

<sup>202</sup> Broughton, Thomas Robert Shannon, *The magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Vol. 1, 509 B.C. - 100 B.C., American Philological Association, New York, 1951 pp. 6-7

<sup>203</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 18

<sup>204</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 21

<sup>205</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 30-31, 45-46

<sup>206</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 55-57

<sup>207</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 63-64

<sup>208</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 61-62

**Agrippa Menenius Lanatus**, consul 439 BC will be treated as the same individual as the consular tribune of 419 and 417 BC as discussed by Broughton.<sup>209</sup>

**Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus**, consular tribune in 438 BC will be treated as consul in 428 BC, as will his relative **Titus Quinctius Poenus Cincinnatus**, consul in 431 BC, so will also **Aulus Cornelius Cossus**, consular tribune in 426 BC and **Aulus Sempronius Atratinus**, consular tribune in 425 BC, as these two consular pairs are both mentioned in ancient texts and cannot be reasonably determined which one is the true pair of 428 BC.<sup>210</sup> Similarly the brothers Quinctius cannot be separated within reason in the year of 420 BC as to who was consular tribune and will therefore both be counted as having held the post in 420 BC for this study.<sup>211</sup>

**Lucius Papirius Crassus**, consul in 436 BC will be treated as the Censor in 430 BC as suggested by Suolahti.<sup>212</sup> His relative Gaius Papirius Crassus will instead be considered the Consul in 430 BC as indicated by Diodorus Siculus.<sup>213</sup>

**Quintus Servilius Priscus Fidenas**, dictator in 435 BC and 418 BC will be treated as the missing censor of 418 BC as recommended by Suolahti.<sup>214</sup>

**Lucius Pinarius Mamercinus**, consular tribune in 432 BC will be considered the same individual as Publius Pinarius, censor in 430 BC, an option discussed by Suolahti.<sup>215</sup>

**Gaius Servilius Ahala**, consul in 427 BC will be assumed to be the same individual as Gaius Servilius Axilla, consular tribune in 419, 418 and 417 BC as discussed by Broughton.<sup>216</sup>

**Quintus Fabius Vibulanus**, consul in 423 BC is assumed to be a different individual from the Quintus Fabius Ambustus Vibulanus who was consul in 412 BC as argued by Degraasi.<sup>217</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 71-72

<sup>210</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 65-66

<sup>211</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 70-71

<sup>212</sup> Suolahti, Jaakko, *The Roman censors: a study on social structure*, Helsinki, 1963. pp. 174

<sup>213</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 64

<sup>214</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 609-614

<sup>215</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 174-175

<sup>216</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 66, 71-73

<sup>217</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 68-69

**Spurius Nautius Rutilus**, C.Tribune in 419 BC will be treated as one of the missing censors of 410 BC as suggested by Suolahti<sup>218</sup>

**Lucius Valerius Potitus**, C.Tribune in 414 BC will be treated as one of the missing censors of 410 BC, this from a choice of eleven candidates given by Suolahti.<sup>219</sup> Other feasible choices include Mamercus Aemilius Mamercinus, dictator in 438 BC, Quintus Fabius Vibulanus, consul in 423 BC and Aulus Sempronius Atratinus, consul in 428 BC. Valerius was picked as the individual for his modest track record prior to the censorship but with an impressive career after the censorship. This early censorship in the career of Valerius would explain why he did not achieve or seek such a magistrature between the years of 406 and 387. Suolahti would prefer Manius Aemilius Mamercus as censor but gives few arguments for his choice.<sup>220 221</sup> To this should be added that he and his relative **Gaius Valerius Potitus Volusus** are indistinguishable in the situation of legates sent as ambassadors in 398 BC and will both be assumed to have participated in this essay.<sup>222</sup> Additionally in the case of the position of Magister Equitum in 390 BC Lucius Valerius Potitus will be presumed to have held this post, on the suggestion of Degrossi, not his relative **Lucius Valerius Poplicola**.<sup>223</sup>

**Gaius Servilius Ahala**, consular tribune in 408 BC is presumed to be the same individual as the Gaius Servilius Ahala that was Magister equitum in 389 BC, this is not discussed in Broughton and remains a personal assumption based on the lack of other alternatives.<sup>224</sup>

**Caeso Fabius Ambustus**, consular tribune in 404 BC is presumed to be the legate sent as ambassador in 398 BC instead of his relative Numerius Fabius Ambustus, consular tribune in 406 BC.<sup>225</sup>

**Appius Claudius Crassus Inregillensis**, consular tribune in 403 BC is presumed to not be the same individual as the dictator in 362 BC and consul in 349 BC, who will instead be assumed to be a son or relative. This was based partly on Broughton and the fact that he would be around 95

---

<sup>218</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 617-619

<sup>219</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 617-619

<sup>220</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 176

<sup>221</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 617-619

<sup>222</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 86-87

<sup>223</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 95

<sup>224</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 97

<sup>225</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 86-87

years of age in 349 BC.<sup>226</sup> This will result in that both the senior and minor Appius Claudius Crassus Inregillensis will not be part of this study as both lack the required number of major magistrates.

**Publius Cornelius Maluginensis**, consular tribune in 397 BC is presumed to be the same individual as Publius Cornelius (-----) who was consular tribune for a second time in 394 BC, this after arguments brought forth by Broughton.<sup>227</sup>

**Publius Cornelius Scipio**, consular tribune in 395 BC will be assumed to be the same individual as Publius Cornelius (-----) consular tribune in 385 BC.<sup>228</sup>

**Marcus Cornelius Maluginensis**, censor in 393 BC will be assumed to be the same individual as the consular tribune of 369 BC and 367 BC.<sup>229</sup>

**Lucius Papirius Mugillanus**, censor 389 BC is assumed to be the same individual as the consular tribune of 382 BC, 380 BC and 376 BC.<sup>230</sup>

**Lucius Postumius Albinus Regillensis**, consular tribune in 389 BC is presumed to be the same individual as consular tribune of 381 BC and the censor of 366 BC.<sup>231 232</sup>

**Servius Sulpicius Rufus**, consular tribune in 388 BC is presumed to be consular tribune for a fourth time in 377 BC, therefor Servius Sulpicius Praetextatus first consular tribunate is in 376 BC.<sup>233</sup>

**Gaius Sulpicius Peticus**, censor 366 is assumed to be the same individual as the consular tribune of 380 BC.<sup>234</sup>

**Lucius Manlius Capitolinus Imperiosus**, Dictator of 363 BC will be treated as the second missing censor of 358 BC, this as the other Manlii candidates proposed by Suolahti are either to old

---

<sup>226</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 117

<sup>227</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 90-91

<sup>228</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 101

<sup>229</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 111

<sup>230</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 97, 103-104

<sup>231</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 96-98, 104, 115

<sup>232</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 192-193

<sup>233</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 108

<sup>234</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 105-106

(Aulus Manlius Capitolinus, active from 389 to 370 BC) or later elected as censors (Gnaeus Manlius Capitolinus Imperiosus, censor in 351 BC) or not mentioned at all (Publius Manlius Capitolinus, active from 379 to 367 BC).<sup>235</sup>

**Titus Quinctius Poenus Capitolinus**, dictator in 361 is not assumed to be the magister equitum of 367 BC, that post instead belonging to Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus Capitolinus as argued by Broughton.<sup>236</sup>

**Marcus Fabius Ambustus**, Consul in 360 BC will be treated as one of the missing censors of 358 BC as recommended by Suolahti.<sup>237</sup> Ambustus is also inseparable from his relative Marcus Fabius Durso for the interrex of 340 BC and the Triumviri of 334 BC, as such, both will be assumed holding these positions.<sup>238</sup> Ambustus is assumed to be the same individual as the magister equitum of 322 BC as described by Broughton.<sup>239</sup>

**Gaius Poetelius Libo Visolus**, Consul in 360 BC will be considered the same individual as the consul in 326 BC although other alternatives exist as discussed by Broughton<sup>240</sup> This validates the reasoning behind having him as the missing censor in 319 BC brought forth by Suolahti and will thus be considered to be the elderly but popularly elected Plebeian censor who died in office in 319 BC.<sup>241</sup>

**Gaius Plautius Proculus**, consul in 358 BC is assumed to be the same individual as the consul of 328 BC, this among four different options as presented by Broughton.<sup>242</sup>

**Lucius Furius Camillus**, dictator in 350 BC will be assumed to be the same individual as the dictator in 345 BC, thus his relative also named **Lucius Furius Camillus**, consul in 338 BC, will not be assumed to have held the post of dictator in 345 BC.<sup>243</sup> The consul of 338 BC will also not be assumed to be the same individual as the Lucius Furius (-----), Praetor in 318 BC, this will

---

<sup>235</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 628-630

<sup>236</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 114

<sup>237</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 626-627

<sup>238</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 136, 141

<sup>239</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 150

<sup>240</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 146

<sup>241</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 635-636

<sup>242</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 145

<sup>243</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 131-132

result in the consul in 338 BC having less than three major magistrates and thus not be part of this essay.<sup>244</sup>

**Marcus Valerius Corvus:** Consul in 348 will not be considered the same individual as the dictator of 302-301 BC or the consul of 300-299 BC, which will instead be attributed to his son, **Marcus Valerius Maximus Corvinus**, meaning that Marcus Valerius Corvus last magistrate will be his Praetorship in 308 BC. This change is argued for by Broughton but goes against some ancient traditions which state that Corvus achieved six consulships during his career.<sup>245</sup> The younger Valerius will not be assumed to be the same individual as Marcus Valerius Maximus, consul in 286 BC.

**Lucius Papirius Crassus,** dictator in 340 BC will be assumed to not be the same individual as the Praetor in 332 BC which will instead be attributed to his son, **Lucius Papirius Crassus**, censor in 318 BC.<sup>246</sup> The elder Crassus will be assumed to be the holder of the praefectus urbi in 325 BC.<sup>247</sup>

**Gaius Sulpicius Longus,** Consul 337 BC will be treated as Censor in 319 BC as proposed by both Broughton and Suolahti.<sup>248 249</sup>

**Quintus Aulius Cerretanus,** consul in 323 BC will be treated as the same individual as the magister equitum in 315 BC.<sup>250</sup>

**Appius Claudius Caecus,** censor in 312 BC who is known from the ancient sources to have been dictator between 292 and 284 will, as suggested by Broughton and Mommsen, be placed as dictator in 287 BC.<sup>251</sup>

**Marcus Aemilius Paullus:** Consul in 302 BC will be treated as the magister equitum under Marcus Valerius Maximus Corvinus in 302 and 301 BC as based on the arguments by Broughton.<sup>252</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 155

<sup>245</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 170-173

<sup>246</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 142

<sup>247</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 148

<sup>248</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 630-631

<sup>249</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 154

<sup>250</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 156-157

<sup>251</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 187

<sup>252</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 169-171

Given as the second best choice by Suolahti for the missing censor of 283 BC, I will instead consider him a more likely choice than Servius Cornelius Lentulus, consul in 303 BC.<sup>253</sup> Other feasible choices that can be disregarded would be the three older candidates: Lucius Papirius Cursor who last held office in 309 BC (presumably around eighty-four to eighty-eight years old at 283 BC), Quintus Aemilius Barbula who last held office in 311 BC (presumably around seventy-five years old at 283 BC) and the legendary Marcus Valerius Corvus who last held office in 308 BC (presumably 106 years old and quite dead by standard calculations or seventy-three years old and still alive for another twenty-seven years if one believes Valerius Maximus, who states that Corvus was twenty-three at his first consulship and lived to his hundredth birthday).<sup>254</sup>

**Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus**, consul in 298 BC will be treated as being propraetor in 295 BC, not a legate.<sup>255</sup>

**Spurius Carvilius Maximus**, consul in 293 BC and **Quintus Fabius Maximus Gurges**, consul in 292 BC will as suggested by Broughton and Suolahti be considered the censors in 289 BC.<sup>256</sup> <sup>257</sup> Gurges will in the case of the consulship in 265 BC not be assumed to be the holder and the post will instead be attributed to his son also named **Quintus Fabius Maximus Gurges**.<sup>258</sup>

**Manius Curius Dentatus**, consul in 290 BC will be considered having held the Praetorship in 283 BC as Praetor suffectus.<sup>259</sup>

**Publius Cornelius Rufinus**, consul in 290 BC whose dictatorship occurred at an unknown time between 292 and 284 will be placed as dictator in 285 BC, the latest possible date.<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>253</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 639-644

<sup>254</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 639-644

<sup>255</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 178

<sup>256</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 184

<sup>257</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 241-244

<sup>258</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 201-202

<sup>259</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 188-189

<sup>260</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 187



**Quintus Marcius Philippus**, consul in 281 BC will be assumed to have been Praetor in 280 BC as argued by Broughton.<sup>261</sup> Similarly he will be assumed to have been censor in 269 BC, this is supported by both Broughton and Suolahti.<sup>262 263</sup>

**Lucius Postumius Albinus**, consul in 234 BC is assumed to have held the Praetorship in 233 BC as proposed by Broughton.<sup>264</sup>

**Manius Aemilius Lepidus**, consul in 232 BC is described as having been consul twice prior to his death at Cannae in 216 BC and Broughton argues that the only possibility of this being as a consul suffectus in 221 BC.<sup>265</sup> He will thus be treated as such in this essay. He will not be treated as the same individual as the Praetor of 218 BC, this will mean that he will not be part of this study, lacking the required number of magistrates.<sup>266</sup>

---

<sup>261</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 191-192

<sup>262</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 199

<sup>263</sup> Suolahti (1963). pp. 265-266

<sup>264</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 225

<sup>265</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 234-235

<sup>266</sup> Broughton (1951) pp. 238, 240