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I

There can be no serious doubts about whether or not elections to senior magisterial office took place at Rome between 218 and 49 BC. Numerous references may be found in the literature to comitial proceedings. Nonetheless, despite the fact that the citizen body voted annually, according to strictly observed and complicated procedures in the centuriate and tribal assemblies and, after 139, by ballot, relatively little has been preserved about electoral contests. Thus while the consular 'fasti' are adorned with the names of the successful contenders, the identity of their less fortunate competitors has usually been consigned to obscurity. Although campaigns for the consulship were held every year without fail, and only comparatively isolated instances of delay or disruption are attested, few details have survived regarding the highlight of the electoral year, especially considering the immense effort it took politicians to win high public office (Comm. Pet. 56: 'Et plane sic contende omnibus nervis ac facultatibus ut adipiscamur quod petimus'). Moreover, throughout the period under examination it is clear that there were, in theory at least, more aspirants to the consulship than could obtain the position as a consequence of the pyramidal nature of the 'cursus honorum'. This situation was further compounded by the gradual extension of the praetorian college from four in the Second Punic War to eight by 81. Competition in consul elections ought, therefore, to have been intense, yet ancient writers seldom note this phenomenon. Indeed, on the one hand, the evidence of Sallust has rather been taken to imply that elections, particularly for the consulship, were neither free nor fair, while, on the other hand, references to strenuous electioneering have enjoyed much less notice. The primary objective of this paper is to identify as many consular candidates as possible in elections between 218 and 49. Where evidence is available, the competition which occurred in these elections is also discussed. Due to the constraints of space, however, an examination concerning the reliability of the annalistic tradition regarding consular elections in this period, must be delayed for the time being.
II

For the Second Punic War Livy’s history is preserved more or less intact, but, understandably enough, he is absorbed with the military struggle between Rome and Carthage.⁷ Elections between 218 and 201 are, therefore, treated rather cursorily in comparison with his coverage of such affairs of state after 200. An exception is to be found in his account of the elections for the consulship of 216 when there were, initially, six candidates: P. Cornelius Merenda, L. Manlius Vulso, M. Aemilius Lepidus, C. Atilius Serranus, Q. Aelius Paetus and C. Terentius Varro (Liv. 22.35.1–2).⁸ The proceedings were conducted by an interrex P. Cornelius Asina, in the absence of the consuls who were in charge of military operations against Hannibal, and whose year in office had just expired. According to Livy (22.34.1) the elections were characterised by a great deal of rivalry, but this is perhaps not surprising considering that there were three candidates competing for each of the two vacant positions. Livy appears to have been under the impression, however, that the ‘certamen’ he mentions was between patricians and plebeians. Thus he manages to create a startling anachronism, resulting from his extraction of material from a source quite unsympathetic to the eventual plebeian winner Varro, who is portrayed as an enemy of the ‘nobiles’, especially Q. Fabius Maximus (22.34.2–11). This episode is made more peculiar because Livy equates ‘nobiles’ with patricians, and passes over in silence the more explicable hostility between the plebeians Varro, Paetus and Serranus, the first of whom was preferred in the polls because of his military qualifications. This expertise must also account for the tardy entry of L. Aemilius Paullus, the eventual patrician victor, in elections presided over by the new consul Varro. His late candidacy was thus not a senatorial ploy to provide a worthy patrician adversary in this magistracy (22.35.4), but simply arose from the urgent need to have a more experienced general than Lepidus, Vulso or Merenda in the consulship.⁹

The disaster at Cannae in 216 curtailed competition in the consular elections for the remainder of the war, at least to some extent, because it became expedient to elect, or rather to re-elect, tried and trusted generals in preference to less experienced candidates. This necessity would explain the continued presence in high office of men such as Q. Fabius Maximus, M. Claudius Marcellus and Q. Fulvius Flaccus, all political veterans from previous decades, and also accounts for Livy’s brevity when discussing elections. One or two interesting points emerge, however, which indicate that the Romans’ love of elections did not wither away entirely in these years of hardship. For example, it is clear that the election of a second plebeian for 215, soon afterwards declared invalid, was highly controversial at the time (Liv. 23.31.12–14).¹⁰ Furthermore, in the consular elections for 214 the original favourites named by the ‘centuria praerogativa’ were
rejected by the presiding consul due to their inexperience in military matters (Liv. 24.7.11–8.20). The vote had to begin again, with the result that Q. Fabius Maximus and M. Claudius Marcellus were re-elected, but only after unseemly arguments and the threat of violence (Liv. 24.9.2). In the elections for 210 the choice of the ‘centuria praerogativa’ was again overturned, this time not by the presiding consul, but by one of the consular candidates who declared himself ineligible on the grounds of old age and ill-health (Liv. 26.22.2). In the second round of voting M. Claudius Marcellus, for a fourth time (Liv. 26.22.12–13; Plut. Marc. 23.1), and M. Valerius Laevinus were elected instead.

Livy refers to only four consular elections in the Second Punic War in which there were multiple candidacies, and to just one in which intense competition is firmly attested throughout the campaign. The dire threat to Rome’s existence was bound to cause a marked decrease in the competition for public office, especially since the Senate urged eligible candidates to stand back before elections took place to preserve harmony and concord at home. Still there is abundant evidence elsewhere in Livy’s account to suggest that, while ambition was officially moribund, political aspirations were merely suppressed by the greater needs of the res publica, and not by any means extinguished.

### III

Although the consular candidacy of the ‘novus homo’, M. Porcius Cato, is unlikely to have gone unchallenged, given the controversy over the campaign of C. Terentius Varro in 217, and later the campaigns of C. Marius and M. Tullius Cicero, the consular elections in 193 were evidently the first Livy deemed worth mentioning after the defeat of Carthage. His assertion, however, that the campaign in this year was more intense than ever before (35.10.1) surely contradicts his own account of elections during the Second Punic War, which illustrates that competition could at times, even then, be fierce. His own description of political events in 217, for instance, shows how well contested elections had once been, and the prominence he had given to earlier electioneering must have been forgotten. In Livy’s defence, however, it should also be said that his renewed interest in consular elections comes after a fifteen year hiatus in his history. For the consulships of 192 Livy records that there were many influential candidates, both patrician and plebeian, (‘multi et potentes’) and names seven politicians: P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, L. Quinctius Flamininus, Cn. Manlius Vulso, C. Laelius, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, C. Livius Salinator and M’. Acilius Glabrio. Since the careers of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus and T. Quinctius Flamininus are one of Livy’s preoccupations in this decade, it is not really surprising that there should be close attention to the progress of two
of the patrician candidates, Nasica supported by his cousin, and L. Flamininus by his brother. It emerges that L. Flamininus benefited from the fame of his brother (35.13.9), which proved the decisive factor in his victory over Nasica. Scipio Africanus was perhaps the more influential figure in the Senate while Nasica, praetor in 194, was a rising star, but T. Flamininus had just celebrated a triumph (34.52.4) for his victory over Philip V. Thus L. Flamininus, probably not at first a likely winner in this contest — he was almost certainly the elder of the two brothers and had been praetor as long ago as 199 (31.49.12) — gained a useful, and distinctive, advantage. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, praetor in 194, gained the plebeian consulship unexpectedly, perhaps over C. Laelius, the ‘familiaris’ of Africanus.

In the following year there was another stiff fight for the consulship (35.24.4–6) when three of the previous year’s candidates stood for a second time. Thus the patrician candidates were P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, Cn. Manlius Vulso and the younger brother of Africanus, L. Cornelius Scipio. Nasica was victorious although Africanus presumably threw his weight behind his brother’s candidacy rather than that of his cousin, but to no avail. These elections highlight the problem of supporting two family members who wanted the same consular place, and cannot have made Africanus’ life easy. L. Scipio, praetor in 193, was a year behind Nasica, and so a defeat in the polls might not have been entirely unforeseeable. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that he did not conserve his energies and financial resources and allow his cousin a less hampered contest, but close family relationships apparently did not deter an individual from the pursuit for high office. M’. Acilius Glabrio, a ‘novus homo’ campaigning for a second time, was elected alongside Nasica, and he, too, probably faced a vigorous opposition though no other plebeian candidates are named in these elections.

In 190 Livy (37.47.6–7) gives disappointing coverage to what was undoubtedly a particularly dramatic campaign which again witnessed three patricians in contention. M. Aemilius Lepidus, later twice consul, ‘pontifex maximus’ and ‘princeps senatus’, caused a furore at Rome by leaving his province without permission from the Senate in order to canvass. By flouting tradition he made himself universally unpopular, or so Livy claims, but still came second in the patrician poll. Cn. Manlius Vulso, campaigning for the third time (37.47.7), emerged the winner while M. Valerius Messalla was an ‘also-ran’ (‘nam Messalla iacuit’). M. Fulvius Nobilior appears to have been the sole plebeian candidate and was elected unanimously. It is generally accepted that the later hostility between Lepidus and Nobilior (40.45.6–46.16) originated in these elections, for while Livy is not explicit, he does suggest that Nobilior worked hard to prevent the success of Lepidus.

M. Lepidus was again defeated in the elections in 189. And it is hardly remarkable to find that the presiding consul was none other than M. Fulvius
Nobilior (38.35.1), who, as Livy claims, was again responsible for Lepidus' 'repulsa'.\textsuperscript{23} The two successful candidates were M. Valerius Messalla, defeated twice before, and significantly even less popular than Lepidus in the previous year, and C. Livius Salinator who had been a candidate in 193.\textsuperscript{24} Lepidus went on to win the consulship for 187, but no explanation for his success or even a clue to his possible opponents is forthcoming in the evidence. Thus after he had defied convention in his first candidacy, and had been discriminated against in his second, Lepidus' eventual victory is glossed over in silence. Considering his later illustrious career, his acquisition of the consulship was certainly an immense and arduous struggle.\textsuperscript{25}

Little is said about the elections between 189 and 186,\textsuperscript{26} but Livy's expansive account of the consular campaign in 185 yields important evidence for constant and gruelling electoral competition throughout this decade. The patrician candidates were P. Claudius Pulcher, brother of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, consul in 185, L. Aemilius Paullus, Q. Fabius Labeo and Ser. Sulpicius Galba; the plebeians were represented by L. Porcius Licinus, Q. Terentius Culleo and Cn. Baebius Tamphilus (39.32.5–9). While the number of candidates was the same as in 193, the most striking point to be gathered from Livy is that P. Claudius Pulcher was the only first time candidate; his opponents had received one or more 'repulsae' beforehand. This information surely indicates that Livy was selective in his coverage of consular elections, and even when he discusses specific elections it cannot be assumed that he named all the candidates. Thus Culleo and Galba, praetors in 187, must have been candidates in the consular elections of 186 which are noted only in passing by Livy (39.23.2, 32.15).\textsuperscript{27} L. Paullus, praetor in 191, and Q. Labeo, praetor in 189, were candidates between 188 and 186, L. Licinus, praetor in 193, may well have lost to Nobilior in 190 or Salinator in 189, while Cn. Tamphilus, praetor in 199, had probably canvassed on several occasions before 185.\textsuperscript{28} Labeo and Licinus were regarded as the joint favourites in this contest, but Ap. Pulcher, the consul, stepped in to canvass forcefully on his brother’s behalf, but, since the presiding consul did not intervene, not in violation of the law. He swayed enough voters to ensure victory for his brother, though the Claudii Pulchri indulged in unprecedented violence in their campaign (Liv. 33.32.13). Still, the result came as a considerable surprise to everyone including P. Pulcher himself.\textsuperscript{29}

In 184 the successful candidates for the consulship were M. Claudius Marcelius and Q. Fabius Labeo (39.45.1). Their competitors are not named, but Livy does note that C. Valerius Flaccus, ‘flamen Dialis’, one of the successful candidates for the praetorship, had previously campaigned for that office, and this is a good indication, therefore, that competition also took place for the lesser magistracies of the ‘cursus’ (39.45.2) at this time. For 182 the consuls chosen were L. Aemilius Paullus and Cn. Baebius Tamphilus, both of whom had extremely retarded careers,\textsuperscript{30} and in these elec-
tions they were perhaps among a field of rather weak candidates who are not named by Livy (39.56.3-5). The consular elections for 180 pass with no more than a statement of the result from Livy, but an unexpected turn of events early in that year highlights what must have been another keenly fought campaign. C. Calpurnius Piso, one of the successful candidates — the other was A. Postumius Albinus — died suddenly at the beginning of his year of office and Q. Fulvius Flaccus took his place as suffect. It transpires (40.37.6) that Q. Flaccus was not only a stepson of the dead consul, but was also one of his competitors, and had received two ‘repulsae’ in earlier elections. Livy goes on to relate that Piso’s wife, a certain Hostilia, was tried for his murder, and that the reason for the crime was that she was desperate that her son Flaccus become consul.

**IV**

The *lex Villia annalis* fixed minimum ages for the curule magistracies of the ‘cursus’, and by imposing a ‘biennium’ delay between the praetorship and the consulship was meant to produce more order in the way senior public offices were held. This law may, therefore, have caused a decrease in the number of consular candidates by effectively debarring those who might have previously campaigned immediately after a praetorship. This can perhaps be inferred from the fact that Livy’s account of elections between 180 and 174 is rather brief, and implies that they may not have been particularly newsworthy. In the elections for 173, however, when the consuls elected were L. Postumius Albinus and M. Popillius Laenas, the contest was vigorous with a large number of candidates (41.28.4), which would actually suggest that the number of competitors in the elections usually remained substantial. Treatment of elections between 172 and 170 is short, and Livy proffers no reason for the absence of patricians who for the very first time were not represented in the consulship (42.9.7–8, 42.28.4–6). Of course, it is possible that there was a dearth of patricians at this time, which resulted in the elections of the plebeians C. Popillius Laenas and P. Aelius Ligus in 173, P. Licinius Crassus and C. Cassius Longinus in 172 and A. Hostilius Mancinus and A. Atilius Serranus in 171. Yet, a Ti. Claudius Nero had been praetor in 178, a C. Quinctius Flamininus was praetor in 177, a M. Cornelius Scipio had been praetor in 176, a Cornelius Sulla and an Ap. Claudius Centho are attested as praetors in 175, a L. Cornelius Scipio was praetor in 174, and a N. Fabius Buteo praetor in 173. Any of these politicians may conceivably be regarded as patrician candidates between 173 and 171, but evidently none had the influence or the popularity to carry the votes. The Third Macedonian War drew Livy’s attention away from the electoral campaigns of the late 170’s and early 160’s, at which point his history breaks off, and relatively little evidence for electoral battles in the 160’s
and 150’s remains extant. Nevertheless, it is clear that there were several candidates for the consulship of 162. Although P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica and C. Marcius Figulus were elected, they were later forced to abdicate since the presiding consul, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, had taken the auspices incorrectly. As a result, P. Cornelius Lentulus and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus were elected in their place. Lentulus, praetor in 165, was probably a candidate in this year, while Ahenobarbus, praetor perhaps in 170, had most certainly campaigned before. Moreover, one of the consuls elected for 154, L. Postumius Albinus, died early in the year (Val. Max. 6.3.8; Obseq. 17), and M’. Acilius Glabrio replaced him as suffect; he, too, may be regarded as one of the losing candidates from the recent elections. Rather more in the way of evidence for electoral competition exists for the 140’s, particularly where it adversely affected the careers of Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus and C. Laelius, two of the most famous of second century politicians. Macedonicus, praetor in 148, had suppressed the rebellion of Andricus and earned the honour of a triumph on his return to Rome (Liv. Oxy. Per. 52; Val. Max. 7.5.4; de Vir. Ill. 61.1). His success in the forthcoming elections for the consulship for 145 seemed assured, for not only was he endowed with a glorious family name and famous ancestors, but had personally won a victory for the res publica. Nonetheless, he was defeated by Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus and L. Hostilius Mancinus. The candidacy of Maximus Aemilianus was no doubt popular, and his chances good, given the fact that he was the elder brother of Scipio Aemilianus, who was on the point of winning the war against Carthage. Mancinus’ success is less explicable, though the literature, all much later, does have a salutary tale to tell. Macedonicus was not well regarded by the voters because of his ‘severitas’, and this cost him dearly, negating whatever advantages he possessed prior to the campaign. Indeed he remained so unpopular that he failed to be elected in 145, losing on that occasion to L. Aurelius Cotta and the orator Ser. Sulpicius Galba, who had obviously recovered from his prosecution before the people by the elder Cato in 150. At the third attempt in 144 Macedonicus secured his election as consul, although according to the sources it was a close-run affair; his later illustrious career very nearly ended prematurely (Val. Max. 7.5.4; de Vir. Ill. 61.3). According to Cicero (Amic. 77) C. Laelius, the ‘familiaris’ of Scipio Aemilianus, received an unexpected reversal in the consular elections for 141 in which the winners were Cn. Servilius Caepio and Q. Pompeius. Laelius’ prospects of success may originally have been favourable since he was supported by Aemilianus, but Pompeius, who is also supposed to have thrown his weight behind this candidacy, apparently began to canvass clandestinely and emerged as victor in the polls. His campaign for the consulship took Laelius and Aemilianus by surprise, which either exposes their complacency or reveals the efficiency of Pompeius’ canvass. Whatever the actual reason
for Laelius' defeat, the sources show that intense competition took place in these elections. Laelius bore his 'repulsa' with dignity and made no mistake when he secured a consulship for 140 at the second attempt.

V

The introduction of ballots in 139, due to the lex Gabinia, may have made the election results still more unpredictable, though little is attested in the sources. For instance, much is known about the events of 133 as they affected Ti. Gracchus, but few details are forthcoming for the consular elections of that year. Thus Scipio Aemilianus, though absent in Spain, was able to help his friend P. Rupilius win the consulship, but probably in the following year he was unable to influence the voters who preferred P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus and L. Valerius Flaccus to Rupilius' brother. In the elections in 131 L. Cornelius Lentulus and M. Perperna were successful, but the former died while still 'designatus', and was replaced by an Ap. Claudius (Pulcher or Nero), probably one of the losing candidates (Obseq. 28).

Evidence for candidates and competition in elections improves considerably from the tribunate of C. Gracchus down to the end of the second century. Thus Plutarch (C. Gracch. 8.2) knew of at least three candidates for the consulship of 122, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, C. Fannius, and L. Opimius. C. Gracchus, in the midst of his tribunician programme, threw his considerable prestige and 'auctoritas' behind the candidacy of Fannius in the hope that he would prove to be a sympathetic consul, and so smooth the passage of his various bills. Gracchus certainly cannot have relished the prospect of a victory for Opimius, whose outright hostility to the tribune was common knowledge. Fannius defeated Opimius, but, as events showed, he failed to live up to expectations, and Opimius achieved the consulship in the following year when Gracchus' influence was on the wane (Plut. C. Gracch. 11.2-3).

In the consular elections for 116 M. Aemilius Scaurus was defeated by Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus (Cic. Mur. 36), whose colleague was C. Licinius Geta. Scaurus, later censor and 'princeps senatus', succeeded in the next year with M. Caecilius Metellus (Cic. Brut. 113; Orat. 2.280), at the expense, however, of P. Rutilius Rufus who was forced to wait another ten years before he reached his consulship. In the elections for 108 Ser. Sulpicius Galba and a politician named Hortensius were elected, but the latter was probably prosecuted and convicted on a charge of 'ambitus'. In his place M. Aurelius Scaurus was elected (Obseq. 40), no doubt another former candidate from the elections. The vicissitudes of Q. Lutatius Catulus give further indication of the scale of rivalry for high office existing at Rome. Cicero says that Catulus received three 'repulsæ' at consular
elections before he was successful in 103 (Planc. 12). Catulus lost elections in 107, 106 and 105 to Q. Servilius Caepio and C. Atilius Serranus, Cn. Mallius Maximus and P. Rutilius Rufus, and C. Flavius Fimbria and C. Marius respectively. At the fourth attempt Catulus was elected with Marius (Plut. Mar. 14.7) and, although he was regarded as a politician who eventually succeeded through his perseverance, it is clear that he was not that exceptional in campaigning for the consulship on a number of occasions. Plutarch makes the point that there were many candidates in 103, but omits to mention them. One possible contender, however, may be inferred from Cicero (Brut. 175) who noted that a certain C. Billienus, a ‘novus homo’, deserved to reach the consulship, but was prevented from doing so by Marius’ successive consulships between 104 and 100.

Turbulent elections disturbed the years 101 and 100. In 101 Marius was returned to his sixth consulship, though not, says Plutarch, because he was especially popular, but because he employed excessive bribery to win over the voters (Mar. 28.5). The Metellus who appears in Plutarch’s account of these elections was surely Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, consul in 109, who sought a second term in order to hinder the legislation proposed by Saturninus and Glaucia. Numidicus was already at odds with these politicians after he had tried to debar them from the ‘ordo senatorius’ when censor in 102 with his cousin Metellus Caprarius. It is, therefore, likely that he realised his position would be difficult if they were ever able to pass their bills into law. As it turned out, he was defeated and later exiled through the intrigues of his political opponents (App. BC. 1.32). The consular elections for the following year became chaotic following the murder of one of the candidates, C. Memmius, and the civil disorder caused by Saturninus and Glaucia in which both were killed (Cic. Brut. 224; Har. Resp. 51). Glaucia, too, had canvassed for the consulship although his candidacy was not recognised by the presiding magistrate since he had been praetor only in 101. M. Antonius, the favourite, won the elections with A. Postumius Albinus, whose campaign attracted no notice, but who may have entered the field only after the death of Memmius (App. BC. 1.32).

The 90’s, for long a decade notorious for the paucity of its literary evidence, nevertheless yield sufficient information to illustrate that elections remained well contested. Thus C. Coelius Caldus, consul in 94 with L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, is said to have defeated an illustrious opponent (Comm. Pet. 11), possibly C. Valerius Flaccus. Moreover, Cicero says that when L. Marcius Philippus, consul in 91, received a ‘repulsa’ in the elections for 93 at the hands of M. Herennius (Mur. 36; Brut. 166), this was another instance of a completely unpredictable result.

The Social War intervened in 91 to make elections probably less competitive, but in 89 campaigning was again strenuous with the success in
the polls of L. Cornelius Sulla and Q. Pompeius Rufus (Cic. Brut. 306; Amic. 2; Liv. Per. 77; Plut. Sull. 6.10). C. Iulius Caesar Strabo was a possible candidate in this year even though he had been just an aedile in 90. Strabo contravened the ‘leges annales’ by canvassing, and his campaign was allegedly stopped only by violence, but so little is known of the actual events that it is impossible to fix his campaign definitely in 89. The civil unrest which occurred throughout 88 did not, however, bring a halt to the electoral process which seems to have continued in earnest even after Sulla occupied Rome and expelled Marius and his allies (Vell. 2.19.1; Flor. 2.9.6–8). Thus for 87 there were possibly four candidates, the eventual winners L. Cornelius Cinna and Cn. Octavius (Plut. Mar. 41.1), L. Cornelius Merula who became suffect consul after Cinna’s expulsion and P. Servilius Vatia, praetor in 90, though this last name is conjectured from Plutarch’s account (Sull. 10.3).

Disaster of a greater magnitude struck the res publica in 87 when civil unrest turned into open hostilities between the consul Octavius and Cinna, who returned from exile with Marius. Cinna and Marius besieged and took Rome and followed up this triumph with the wholesale slaughter of their political opponents (Cic. Phil. 1.34; Brut. 307; Orat. 3.9–11; App. BC. 1.71–74). If, as usual, campaigning had already begun for the consulship, it no doubt ended prematurely, for Marius and Cinna proclaimed themselves consuls for 86 (Liv. Per. 80).

VI

It is impossible to judge the extent to which free elections survived the traumatic events of 88 and 87 because the sources do not mention comitial proceedings again until after the dictatorship of Sulla. It seems probable that the traditional freedom enjoyed by the electorate was restricted when Cinna and Carbo obtained their consularii. Since Cicero was understandably concerned with the successes and failures of his contemporaries, the evidence for elections after 79 is, however, as fruitful as that for the thirty years after the Second Punic War. Thus, according to Cicero, in the elections for 78 the voters chose M. Aemilius Lepidus and Q. Lutatius Catulus in preference to Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus. The reason for Livianus’ ‘repulsa’ stemmed from the fact that he had never sought the aedileship, and so had never provided the people with the sort of entertainment they expected (Cic. Off. 2.58). Meanwhile, the election of L. Gellius Poplicola in 73 will also have astonished many since he had been a praetor of twenty years’ standing before he achieved the consulship (Cic. 2 Verr. 2.95; Baeb. 19).

The election of Cn. Pompeius Magnus as consul at the end of 71 must have put paid to the political aspirations of other politicians in this year. Unlike Pompey, who had never been a member of the Senate (Cic. 2 Verr. 120
3.203; Sall. Cat. 38.1; Val. Max. 8.15.8; Plut. Pomp. 22.1), there were surely others who possessed the necessary qualifications to hold the consulship. His colleague M. Licinius Crassus was, however, an ex-praetor and had the legal minimum age requirement; indeed he may have intended campaigning in this year if the Servile War had not intervened.\(^5\)\(^8\) Other candidates are not attested, but other politicians available and eager for high office may have included L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, praetor in 74, whose career seems not to have prospered, despite his having been astute and dependable while in office (Cic. 2 Verr. 1.119, 4.56), and Q. Arrius, praetor in 73, who campaigned for the consulship thirteen years later.

According to Dio (36.4.1) L. Caecilius Metellus, the consul designate for 68, died unexpectedly and was replaced by a suffect, probably a former competitor, with the ‘cognomen’ Vatia, doubtless related to the consul of 79, P. Servilius Vatia, but who also died before he could assume his duties.\(^5\)\(^9\) In the elections for 66 the successful candidates M'. Aemilius Lepidus and L. Volciatus Tullus were perhaps contending with M. Lollius Palicanus (Val. Max. 3.8.3).\(^6\)\(^0\) We are on firmer ground for the elections for 65 when four candidates are attested: P. Cornelius Sulla and P. Autronius Paetus were elected, but afterwards accused and convicted of ‘ambitus’ and replaced by their erstwhile competitors and prosecutors L. Manlius Torquatus and L. Aurelius Cotta (Cic. Sull. 91; Sall. Cat. 18.2–5; Liv. Per. 101).\(^6\)\(^1\) Cicero in his letter to Atticus (Att. 1.1) mentions three consular candidates in 65, L. Iulius Caesar, Silanus, and Thermus. L. Caesar, son of the consul of 90, was a firm favourite in these elections and expected to win. Less certain were the chances of Silanus, most probably D. Iunius Silanus, who later became consul in 62. Thermus, whom Cicero considered the most likely partner of Caesar, has been held to be one and the same as C. Marcus Figulus who was indeed consul in 64 (Att. 1.2).\(^6\)\(^2\) Cicero also mentions L. Turius as a possible candidate (Att. 1.1.2), and Catiline is known to have had his candidacy disallowed by the presiding consul since he was awaiting trial for ‘repetundae’ (Ascon. 89C).\(^6\)\(^3\)

In comparison with other elections, those for 63, naturally enough, have a more extensive coverage because of Cicero’s personal interest in their outcome. His lack of concern illustrates that his own candidacy was evidently well planned even before it officially began (Att. 1.1.2). There was a large number of candidates, but some were clearly rather weak while others were not especially popular. Thus P. Sulpicius Galba was not rated highly because he started his campaign too early, and the chances of M. Caesonius, if in fact he stood at all, were regarded as negligible.\(^6\)\(^4\) C. Antonius and Catiline were regarded as serious candidates certain enough to stand though the latter’s candidacy depended on his acquittal on the charge of ‘repetundae’. Cicero notes eight probable or possible competitors altogether, but just three of these seem to have undertaken strenuous can-
vassing. The author of the *Commentariolum Petitionis* (7–8) also names L. Cassius Longinus, praetor in 66, omitted by Cicero in July 65, which suggests that he began his candidacy much later than the others. Furthermore, Asconius (82C) affirms that C. Licinius Sacerdos, praetor in 75, campaigned in these elections. The result was as predicted by Cicero, himself in first place, Antonius second, with Catiline narrowly beaten into third place, and Galba, Longinus and the rest well behind.

The elections for 62 are notorious due to the participation of Catiline who failed once again, and who then took a more dangerous course to try and win power (Sall. *Cat.* 26.5). The drama was not confined to Catiline alone, however, since D. Iunius Silanus won after one previous ‘repulsa’ and L. Licinius Murena, his designated colleague, was at once prosecuted for ‘ambitus’ by another competitor Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (Cic. *Mur.* 43, 82). Cicero’s defence of Murena against a disgruntled loser illustrates the passions aroused by the competition in these elections. Sulpicius Rufus, like Rutilius Rufus over fifty years earlier, failed in his prosecution, and had to wait over another decade before he finally won a coveted consulship.

Competition in elections in the 50’s, like those in the 60’s, is well attested through the continued interest of Cicero. Thus for 59 C. Iulius Caesar hoped to have L. Lucceius, praetor in 67, as his consular colleague, but M. Calpurnius Bibulus was elected instead (*Att.* 1.17.11). In the elections for 58 no less than five candidates were known to Cicero (*Att.* 2.5.2), excluding Pompey and Crassus whose joint campaign was admittedly only a rumour. Still, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus is mentioned as a possible colleague of A. Gabinius, and Q. Arrius appears to have been something of an outsider, if indeed he pursued his canvass. Cicero says that L. Cornelius Lentulus Niger was also campaigning for the patrician place (*Vat.* 25; *Att.* 2.24.2). Eventually, Gabinius was elected with L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus who, like Cicero, was consul ‘suo anno’ and ‘sine repulsa’ (Cic. *Pis.* 2).

The First Triumvirate may have been a way of furthering the ambitions of the individuals concerned, but if the members also hoped to dominate the electoral process they were to be disappointed. The campaign for the consulship of 55 was well under way before the Triumvirate was renewed at Luca, where it was decided that Pompey and Crassus should obtain another joint consulship. The consuls of 56 objected, but were able only to postpone the election day beyond their year in office (*Q. fr.* 2.4.4; Dio 39.27.3). In the meantime, all but one of the candidates had withdrawn, leaving L. Domitius Ahenobarbus assiduously canvassing until violent opposition drove him from the forum (*Att.* 4.18a.2). The other competitors in these elections are not attested, but one very likely contender was L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus, praetor in 58, who waited another seven years before becoming consul. Ahenobarbus was, however, clearly a popular figure and was duly elected in the next year, though not without some op-
position. Ap. Claudius Pulcher, who had also been praetor in 58 and may have contested the previous year’s elections, was elected with Ahenobarbus. Two other candidates are attested, M. Valerius Messalla Rufus and T. Ampius Balbus (Cic. Att. 4.9.1; Planc. 25).

The elections for 53 involved at least five candidates who pursued their campaigns right up to the polls: M. Aemilius Scaurus, who survived a trial for ‘repetundae’ in the process, M. Valerius Messalla Rufus, who had already campaigned in 55, C. Claudius Pulcher (Cic. Att. 4.15.7, 16.6), Cn. Domitius Calvinus, and C. Memmius. Scaurus and Memmius were the initial favourites since they received the support of Pompey, Crassus and Caesar, but Calvinus and Messalla Rufus emerged the victors after a particularly bruising and vigorous contest (Plut. Pomp. 54.3; App. BC. 2.19) which extended well into the consular year.

The next year’s elections proved to be the most infamous in the history of the res publica because the campaign resulted in the poll being abandoned, and the subsequent nomination of Pompey as sole consul (Plut. Pomp. 54.4). At least three candidates battled for the voters’ favours, T. Annius Milo, P. Plautius Hypsaeus and Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio, father-in-law of Pompey. Disorder culminated in the sensational murder of Clodius, a candidate for the praetorship, by Milo, which caused a delay in the voting, and order was only restored by Pompey’s deployment of military force. With peace re-established, the consular elections for 51 took place in comparative calm and with gentlemanly decorum (Plut. Cat. Min. 49–50).

Three candidates are known, M. Claudius Marcellus, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, defeated at least once before, and M. Porcius Cato. Cato’s remote and forbidding public image, the epitome of Stoicism and old-fashioned Roman ‘dignitas’, cost him a great deal of popularity and he was easily defeated.

The last elections at Rome before the res publica erupted into civil war on a scale hitherto unseen, and thence to dictatorship and principate, were those for 49 in which three candidates are attested: Ser. Sulpicius Galba, a supporter of Caesar (Hirt. Bell. Gall. 8.50.4; Suet. Galba, 3.2), L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus and C. Claudius Marcellus, both opponents. Galba, although counted a popular candidate, was defeated, and the scene was set for war and with it the decline of elections and competition as consistent and fundamental phenomena of Roman political life.

VII

The axiom that only winners are remembered while losers are quickly forgotten as if they had never existed, is never more true than when applied to elections. Still it can readily be seen that in the consular elections between 218 and 49 there were usually more candidates than could be accommodated in the most senior magistracy of the ‘cursus’. Consequently, there was often intense competition in the consular elections, and this was clearly
more often the rule than the exception. And even if evidence is not available for each and every election which took place during this period, more than sufficient information exists to allow this postulation to be advanced with confidence. Where there is no evidence for multiple candidacies, this need not imply an absence of competition, but is rather the result of the inadequate nature of the sources. Politicians were willing to go to great lengths to win the consulship, which accounts for the rivalry and vigorous canvassing attested in the surviving literature. Moreover, it is noticeable that the political environment did not undergo radical changes, at least as far as competition is concerned, and in this respect neither the *lex Villia* nor the *lex Gabinia* had any drastic affect on the way elections were fought. Thus elections at the beginning of the Second Punic War were as bitterly contested as those at the end of the 190's or, indeed, those fought in the 60's and 50's. It is evident that electioneering and the excitement of the vote were part and parcel of the politics at Rome, and in most years the climax of the electoral year. That this came to an end was not because the electorate ceased to show an interest, but because, with the advent of sole rule at Rome, however benign and veiled, competition and multiple candidacies could simply not be allowed; the people thus lost one of their greatest spectacles, the hustle and bustle of free and competitive elections.

**NOTES**

* My thanks to Ursula Vogel and Terence Rapke for their comments and suggestions on a draft of this article. To TR I promise an examination, in the same vein, of elections to the praetorship in the near future. Any inaccuracies and misconceptions which remain here are mine alone.

1. L.R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, Univ. Michigan, 1966, 1: ‘There was hardly a season of the year when Rome was free both from the voting assemblies and from the campaign in preparation for voting on choice of magistrates...’.

2. Taylor (above note 1) 34–58, 90–91, for a discussion of voting methods and procedures.

3. As for instance in the troubled elections for 55 and 52 which are examined here in due course.

4. The number of praetors increased from four to six in 197, and six praetors were regularly elected from 176 until the college was augmented to eight in 81 through Sulla’s legislation.


9. Patterson (above note 8) 322. The account of these elections has certainly been contaminated by sources antipathetic to Varro which were used without much discretion by Livy. His narrative therefore tends to become a trifle nonsensical, cf. Gruen (above note 8) 73–74, who, on the whole, accepts the Livian tradition and sees the affair as intrigue by the consuls to delay elections in order to have their commands prolonged. M. Aemilius Lepidus appears to have received a second praetorship in 213, T. Corey Brennan, ‘C. Aurelius Cotta, Praetor Iterum (CIL 12 610)’, *Athenaeum NS* 77 (1989) 474–475; cf. G.V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero’s ‘Brutus’: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto 1973, 40, 64–66, who suggested instead a M. Aemilius Lepidus; T.R.S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, New York 1951–52 and 1986, 2 Volumes and Volume 3 Supplement, hereafter *MRR*, 1.263, and n.1, however, postulated a M. Aemilius Papus.

10. M. Claudius Marcellus was elected as suffect to replace the consul designate, L. Postumius Albinus, but was forced to abdicate, and Q. Fabius Maximus was elected to the vacant place, Plut. *Marc. 12.1; MRR*. 1.254. Thus not simply a case of who had the greater military experience in these elections, but rather the preservation of the status quo even with the war so close at hand.

11. The opposition from one of the original candidates, T. Otacilius Crassus, was overcome, while the other candidate, M. Aemilius Regillus, a ‘flamen’, Liv. 24.8.10, cf. 29.11.24, presumably withdrew his candidacy after it was made plain that he could not leave the city and command an army. For these elections see also Taylor (above note 1) 93; Patterson (above note 8) 326–327.

12. The two candidates named by the ‘iuniores’ of Voturia were T. Otacilius Crassus and T. Manlius Torquatus. Torquatus asked to be excused due to poor eyesight, and in the discussion which followed Crassus was entirely overlooked, Liv. 26.22.6–10.

13. Thus the vigorous campaigns for the position of ‘pontifex maximus’ in 212, Liv. 25.5.2–4, *MRR*. 1.271, in which P. Licinius Crassus, the youngest and least experienced of the three candidates (Q. Fulvius Flaccus and T. Manlius Torquatus) emerged the winner. It is certainly likely that the electorate who faithfully kept on re-electing senior men to the consulship took this opportunity to elect a more junior man to a position of great prestige, but which did not affect the military strategies of the Senate. Note also the election of a ‘curio maximus’ in 209, when C. Manilius Atellus won in the face of stiff opposition from other, but unnamed, patrician candidates, Liv. 27.8.1–4, *MRR*. 1.289.

characterised by a lack of available candidates due to the losses suffered by senatorial families. This position must have changed quickly, however, because Plutarch notes that L. Aemilius Paullus, *Aem.* 3.1, was elected curule aedile in 194 in an election which included twelve other candidates. Electoral competition, therefore, may have been slow to re-emerge after the defeat of Carthage, but within five years candidates were evidently already jostling again for senior magisterial offices.


16. It is worth noting that each of these candidates later won a consulship: Flamininus and Ahenobarbus for 192, Nasica and Glaebio 191, Laelius 190, Vulso 189 and Salmator 188. 'Multi et potentes' may therefore imply that there were more than the seven named candidates. See also the Appendix for a complete list of the candidates in consular elections.

17. L. Flamininus, aed. 201, pr. 199, *MRR.* 1.320, 327, while his brother became consul in 198 'ex quaestura', *Livy.* 32.7.8–12; *MRR.* 1.328, and n.2.

18. Prior to 180 the stipulation of a 'biennium' between curule offices did not apply, so both Nasica and Ahenobarbus could stand for the consulship. On the other hand it is clear that politicians like Flamininus waited much longer before they won a consulship, and it is possible that he had campaigned and failed in previous elections. C. Livius Salmator, pr. 202, *MRR.* 1.316, reappears as prætor in 191, either a case of an experienced commander required by the state, or a consolation prize for his recent failure to become consul. Thus the second praetorship conferred on T. Otacilius Crassus in the elections in 214, *Livy.* 24.8.4.

19. An important point ignored by both J. Briscoe, 'Flamininus and Roman Politics', *Latomus* 31 (1972) 49–50, in his discussion of political factions in the 190's, and H.H. Scullard, (above note 8) 124.

20. A characteristic feature of *Livy*'s coverage of consular elections between 193 and 180 is his avid interest in the fate of the patrician candidates while the plebeians are treated with indifference. It seems highly likely, given the number of plebeian praetors who were elected annually, that there was severe competition for the plebean consulship as well. *Livy*, neither an aristocrat nor a senator, was simply more interested in the glamour of the patrician names, and in the rise and fall of such personalities as Africanus, Flamininus and Aemilius Paullus. After 180 this curiosity disappears and the election of two plebeians in 172, strangely enough, passes without comment.

21. This fact does not exclude the possibility of other plebeian candidates, however, Briscoe (above note 14) 365.

22. Thus Briscoe (above note 14) 365; Scullard (above note 8) 135–136; D. Epstein, *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218–43 BC*, London 1987, 13, 59. Lepidus and Nobilior were later reconciled at the beginning of their censorship in 179, *Livy.* 40.45.6–46.15.

23. The position of the presiding magistrate appears to have been crucial especially when 'inimicitia' is attested between him and one of the candidates, as occurred in 189 and also in 215 when Fabius Maximus intervened to prevent the election of T. Otacilius Crassus, *Livy.* 24.8.1–20.

24. Once again only one plebeian candidate, the winner, is noted by name.

25. And as such is quite in conflict with the praise to be found in *Livy*, 31.18.3–4, and in Polybius, 16.34.5.

26. But *Livy*'s account of the censorial elections for 189, 37.57.9–58.2, shows the extent of the competition for that office with six candidates: P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, cos. 192, M'. Acilius Glabrio, cos. 191, T. Quinctius Flamininus, cos. 198, M. Claudius
Marcellus, cos. 196, L. Valerius Flaccus and M. Porcius Cato, coss. 195. The senior ‘consulares’ Flamininus and Marcellus were elected after a strenuous campaign in which Glabrio was forced to withdraw after being accused of embezzlement.

27. Prior to the lex Vilia, Culleo and Galba were not required to wait a ‘biennium’ before campaigning for the consulship. A.E. Astin, ‘The Lex Vilia Annalis before Sulla’, Latomus 17 (1958) 63–64, suggests, however, that the praetorship was a requirement for the consulship as early as 197. Thus Culleo and Galba can only have campaigned for the consulship in 186.

28. L. Paullus was elected consul in 183 as was Cn. Tamphilus. Q. Labeo won the elections in 184, MRR. 1.378, 381.

29. It is interesting to note that the presiding consul, M. Sempronius Tuditanus (Liv. 39.32.5), did not intervene to prevent his colleague from campaigning on behalf of another candidate. Either there was no rule against this practice or his favour had been bought beforehand.

In the censorial elections held in 184 the candidates were: L. Valerius Flaccus and M. Porcius Cato, coss. 195, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, cos. 192, L. Cornelius Scipio, cos. 190, Cn. Manlius Vulso, cos. 189, L. Furius Purpurio, cos. 186, M. Fulvius Nobilior, cos. 189, T. Sempronius Longus, cos. 194, and M. Sempronius Tuditanus, cos. 185, Liv. 39.40.1–41.4. In a vigorous campaign, with a large and distinguished field, and in an atmosphere in which Livy claims that the ‘nobilitas’ and the candidates, with the exception of Flaccus, endeavoured to defeat Cato, he and Flaccus were returned victorious.

30. It should be noted, however, that Tamphilus’ brother who had been praetor in 192 became consul in 181. He evidently benefited either from his consular brother’s eventual success or, perhaps more likely, he was aided in the election itself since Tamphilus was the presiding magistrate, Liv. 40.17.8. Livy’s comment certainly suggests the latter: ‘ita inter se consules compararunt ut Cn. Baebius ad comitia iret, quia M. Baebius frater eius consulatum petebat’. On Paullus’ election victory, Val. Max. 7.5.3; Plut. Aem. 10.1–3.

31. A possible consular candidate was P. Manlius, elected praetor ‘iterum’, Liv. 39.56.5. There is no particular reason why he, and others like him, for instance, P. Aelius Tubero, pr. 201 and 177, should aspire to second praetorships unless they regarded this office as a consolation prize. He could of course have been expelled from the senate by the censors of 184 and used this avenue as a means of regaining his position in the senatorial order. Cf. P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, cos. 72, pr. II 63; C. Antonius, trib. 68, cos. 63, but expelled from the senate in 70, Brennan (above note 9) 478. Livy does not mention this possibility, however, and since second praetorships are fairly common in this period it is more plausible to argue that consular candidates frequently switched their ambitions to the lesser office. Witness a similar though inverted occurrence when C. Marius failed to win the aedileship in 116 and turned his attention instead to the praetorship for which he was successful, Val. Max. 6.9.14; Plut. Mar. 5.2–5.


33. Since Flaccus had been praetor in 187 and was a third time candidate in 181, he will have campaigned for the consulship twice between 186 and 182. The elections in 185 may be excluded since a large number of candidates are already known, and in 186 four, at least, may be identified. This leaves 184 and 183 as the most probable dates for Flaccus’ candidacies, years in which I have suggested that the candidates were weak, allowing the election of Paullus and Tamphilus. In the next year, of course, Tamphilus aided his brother’s campaign.
34. Liv. 40.44.1; Astin (above note 27) 59; A.E. Astin, 'The Lex Villia Annalis before Sulla', *Latomus* 16 (1957) 589.

35. With the exception, that is, of 176 when of the two consuls elected, Q. Petillius Spurinus and Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispallus, the latter died early in the year to be replaced by a suffect, C. Valerius Laevinus, Liv. 41.14.4, 17.6. It is more than likely that Laevinus was one of the unsuccessful candidates in the elections in 177. I would suggest that, on the basis of the election of Q. Flaccus as suffect in 180, who is known to have been a candidate in 181, most 'suffecti' had already been candidates for the consulship. In any event they all had to satisfy the legal requirements as if they had already been candidates.

36. Three of these unnamed candidates may have been C. Cluvius Saxula, pr. 178 or 175, *MRR.* 1.389 and n.4; M. Furius Crassipes, pr. 183, and A. Attilius Serranus, pr. 192, all elected to second praetorships. Serranus eventually became consul in 170 after a delay of over twenty years after his praetorship, *MRR.* 1 419–420.

37. Livy has no account of the elections for 170 which should have occurred in the notoriously muddled Book 42, T.J. Luce (above note 14) 123.

38. In the elections in 173 Cn. Sicinius, elected to a second praetorship, may have been another plebeian candidate, Liv. 42.9.8; *MRR.* 1.141.

39. Note the complete absence of patricians in the praetorian college for 172, though two are present in 171, C. Sulpicius Galba and L. Furius Philus, neither of whom attained the consulship.

40. Cic. *Din.* 1.33, 36, 2.74; *Qfr.* 2.2.1; *Nat.* 2.10–11; Val. *Max.* 2.1.3; *MRR.* 1.441–442.


43. A.E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus*, Oxford 1967, 121, curiously refers to Laelius' candidacy as being for the 'plebeian consulship'. The ancient sources say that Pompeius defeated Laelius in the polls, Cic. *Amic.* 77; *Tusc.* 5.54; Plut. *Apopith.* *Scip.* Min. 8. The election result probably read: Caepio first, Pompeius second and Laelius third, no other candidates being attested. On Pompeius' qualities, Cic. *Brut.* 96; *Acad.* Pr. 2.13.

44. P. Rupilius died shortly after he heard news of his brother's 'repulsa', Cic. *Amic.* 77; *Tusc.* 4.46; Pliny, *HN.* 7.122. For Rupilius to fail against Crassus Mucianus must have been a double blow since the latter had been a close ally of Ti. Gracchus and brother of Q. Mucius Scaevola, consul in 133.

45. On Scaurus and Rutilius Rufus see Sumner (above note 9) 69–70. Rutilius Rufus, in his grief at failing to win the election, prosecuted Scaurus on a charge 'de ambitu', but failed, Cic. *Orat.* 2.280, to be in turn prosecuted by Scaurus on the same charge, which was also unsuccessful.

46. *MRR.* 1.548, and n.2. Trials 'de ambitu', which would also indicate the existence of unscrupulous electioneering, are not easily identifiable prior to the time of Cicero. The charge of 'ambitus' was certainly brought by M. Aemilius Scaurus and P. Rutilius Rufus in 116, and may have resulted in the condemnation of the consul designate Hortensius in 109, E.S. Gruen, *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts*, Harvard 1968, 306–307. 'Ambitus' was also the charge levelled against L. Licinius Murena in 63, but a trial for electoral corruption was not the sole legal method of ruining a politician's chances of campaigning for the highest magistracy. Thus Catiline was charged with 'repetundae' in 66 in an attempt to prevent his consular candidacy. L. Valerius Flaccus (pr. 63) was similarly charged in 59 and, although defended by Cicero, and probably acquitted, he is not attested after this date. His chances of campaigning for the consulship of 58 may have been terminated by the
trial. In the elections for 53 the younger M. Aemilius Scaurus was also charged 'de repetundis'; he survived to fight his candidacy, but his ambitions were certainly adversely affected. On 'ambitus' in general during the Republic, see most recently Lintott (above note 14) 1-16.

47. For the defeats of Catulus see also Gruen (above note 46) 161, 175-176; for Rutilius Rufus see MRR. 1.555.

48. E. Badian, Foreign Clientelae, Oxford 1957, 203, 231, claimed that Catulus was a friend and ally of Marius. Plutarch's evidence for the elections in 103 cannot be employed to support this contention, however, since he merely says that Catulus' candidacy was popular with the people.


50. L. Valerius Flaccus was Marius' consular colleague in 100, MRR. 1.574; Badian (above note 48) 201.


53. The year of Strabo's candidacy is not certain and both 89 and 88 are suggested. For a bibliography see MRR. Suppl. Vol. 3.109.

54. Plutarch refers to a candidate named 'Servius' but this has long been emended to 'Servilius', thus MRR. 2.26 and n.5.

55. Marius died on January 13, Liv. Per. 80; Plut. Mar. 46.5, and a suffect consul, L. Valerius Flaccus, succeeded to his place, Cic. Flac. 61. No election is attested, but Flaccus, pr. 93, and brother of the consul of 93, C. Valerius Flaccus, may well have been canvassing for the consulship of 86 before events overtook and terminated the campaign process.

56. For these elections see also Sall. Hist. 1.86 M; App. BC. 1.105. The elected candidates were notoriously hostile to one another, App. BC. 1.107; Epstein (above note 22) 13, 18. Note that a similar reason is offered for Sulla's failure to win a praetorship at the first attempt, Plut. Sull. 5.1.

57. L. Turius, pr. 75, may also have been a candidate in these elections, Cic. Brut. 237.

58. Crassus was sixty years of age when he was killed at Carrhae, thus born 114/3, Cic. Att. 4.13.2; Plut. Crass. 17.3; MRR. 2.126; Sumner (above note 9) 123-124.

59. Q. Marcius Rex, the other successful politician in these elections, continued as sole consul for the year. On the consuls of 68 and on elections in the 60's in general see also R.J. Evans, 'A Note on the Consuls from 69 to 60 B.C.', Acta Classica 31 (1988) 97-105. R. Syme, The Augustan Aristocracy, Oxford 1986, 22 attributes the death of public figures at this time to an outbreak of plague.

60. For the date of Palicanus' praetorship, MRR. 2.132 and n.2; Suppl. Vol. 3.127.


62. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Cambridge 1965, 1.292. He was therefore a Thermus adopted by a Figulus, and his full name was thus C. Marcius Figulus Thermus, a plausible argument to explain the complete disappearance of one candidate and the sudden emergence of another.

63. Cicero's comment, Brut. 237: 'L. Turius parvo ingenio sed multo labore, quoque nodo poterat, saepe dicesbat: itaque ei paucae centuriae ad consulatum defuuerant': may be taken to mean that he was a consular candidate in 73 and that he contemplated a second attempt in 65; MRR. 2.97, Shackleton Bailey (above note 62) 1.292-293; Sumner (above note 9) 127. On Q. Curius, MRR. 2.143 and n.1, On the candidacy of Catiline, Sall. Cat. 18.3; Shackleton Bailey (above note 62) 1.291.
Galba was campaigning in earnest in July 65, _ed Att._ 1.1.1, a full twelve months before the vote. Caesonius presumably went no further than an initial canvass. T. Aufidius and M. Lollius Palicanus, also mentioned by Cicero, probably did not become serious candidates. Q. Cornificius may well have pulled out before the elections actually took place. Cicero also noted that C. Aquillius Galus, a possible contender, would probably not enter as a candidate for the elections at all. On the would-be candidates, Shackleton Bailey (above note 68) 1.290–291.

Gruen (above note 61) 273; Epstein (above note 22) 102, 114.


They originally supported other candidates, but, since these seemed certain to be defeated, put themselves forward instead, Dio 39.27.2; Gruen (above note 67) 98.

Plut. _Cato Min._ 41.2–42.1; _Crass._ 15.2–4; _Pomp._ 52.1–2; _App. BC._ 2.17; Dio 39.31.1–2; Gruen (above note 67) 99.

Significantly, the consul who employed delaying tactics in 56 was Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, Cic. _Q._ fr. 2.4.4, a distant cousin of Lentulus Crass. For a stemma of the Corneli Lentuli see most recently Sunner (above note 9) 143. The candidacy of T. Ampius Babus is attested by a late source, _Schol. Bob._ 156 Stangl.

E.S. Gruen, 'The Consular Elections for 53', _Hommages à Marcel Renard_, Vol.2, Brussels 1969, 311–321, argues convincingly that the members of the Triumvirate were not masters of the political situation especially when it came to election-time.

On the subsequent election of Metellus Pius Scipio as Pompey's colleague, _MRR._ 2.233. Gruen (above note 61) 484.

While I acknowledge the view expressed by K. Hopkins, 'Rules of Evidence' (review of Fergus Millar, _The Emperor in the Roman World_ [31 B.C. – A.D. 337], _JRS_ 68 (1978), 183, that: 'ancient sources, like modern newspapers, reported the abnormal more than the normal', modern sources surely also report humdrum matters just as often, and who is in a position to judge objectively what is and what is not 'abnormal'? In books 20–41 of Livy's history, competition in consular elections may be identified on, or postulated for, sixteen occasions between 218 and 168, nearly one-third of the total. It is entirely plausible to suggest, therefore, that Livy chose not to recount the course of every election, and the reason may stem simply from a lack of information at his disposal, or even from a desire for variety in his narrative. Thus, on the basis of evidence obtained from roughly one-third of all consular elections between 218 and 49, it seems more likely that the ancient sources, in this instance, reported a normal occurrence rather than an abnormal phenomenon.

Freedom in elections were clearly terminated during the dictatorship of Caesar and during the domination of the triumvirs, Octavian, Antony and Lepidus. A.H.M. Jones, _Studies in Roman Government and Law_, Oxford 1968, 36, argued, however, that there was a resurgence of electoral competition, at least to a limited degree, after 23 when Augustus relinquished his hold on one of the consulships. Indeed, multiple candidacies may have continued into the principate of Tiberius though nomination by the 'princeps' became increasingly more important than comitial proceedings.
APPENDIX:
CANDIDATES IN CONSULAR ELECTIONS 218–49 BC

* : candidates elected consul;  + : suffect consul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>P. Cornelius Merenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Manlius Vulso pr.218?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Aemilius Lepidus pr.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Aemilius Paullus cos.219*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Q. Fabius Maximus cos.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Aemilius Regillus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Q. Fabius Maximus cos.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Manlius Torquatus cos.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Valerius Laevinus pr.215*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>C. Claudius Nero pr.212*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Manlius Torquatus cos.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Fabius Maximus cos.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Valerius Laevinus cos.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica pr.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Quinctius Flamininus pr.199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cn. Manlius Vulso pr.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica pr.194*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Cornelius Scipio pr.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cn. Manlius Vulso pr.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>M. Aemilius Lepidus pr.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Valerius Messalla pr.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cn. Manlius Vulso pr.195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>M. Aemilius Lepidus pr.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Livius Salinator pr.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Valerius Messalla pr.193*
186
Ap. Claudius Pulcher pr.188*
Ser. Sulpicius Galba pr.187
Q. Terentius Culleo pr.187
M. Sempronius Tuditanus pr.189*

185
Q. Fabius Labeo pr.189
Ser. Sulpicius Galba pr.187
L. Aemilius Paullus pr.191
P. Claudius Pulcher pr.188*
Cn. Baebius Tamphilus pr.199
L. Porcius Licinus pr.193*
Q. Terentius Culleo pr.187

183
L. Aemilius Paullus pr.191*
Q. Fulvius Flaccus pr.187
Cn. Baebius Tamphilus pr.199*
P. Manlius pr.195

182
P. Cornelius Cethegus pr.185*
M. Baebius Tamphilus pr.192*
Q. Fulvius Flaccus pr.187

181
A. Postumius Albinus pr.185*
C. Calpurnius Piso pr.186*
Q. Fulvius Flaccus pr.187+

176
Cn. Cornelius Scipio pr.179*
C. Valerius Laevinus pr.179+
Q. Petillius Spurinus pr.181*

174
L. Postumius Albinus pr.180*
M. Furius Crassipes pr.187
M. Popillius Laenas pr.176*
A. Attilius Serranus pr.192
C. Cluvius Saxula pr.178

173
P. Aelius Ligus pr.175*
Cn. Sicinius pr.183
C. Popillius Laenas pr.175*

163
P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica pr.165*
P. Cornelius Leutulus pr.165+
C. Marcius Figulus pr.169*
Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus pr.170+

155
L. Postumius Albinus*
Q. Opimius*
M'. Acilius Glabrio+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Q. Fabius Maximus pr.149*</td>
<td>L. Hostilius Mancinus pr.149*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus pr.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Galba pr.151*</td>
<td>L. Aurelius Cotta*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus pr.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Cn. Servilius Caepio*</td>
<td>Q. Pompeius*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Laelius pr.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>L. Valerius Flaccus*</td>
<td>L. Licinius Crassus Mucianus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Rupilius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>L. Cornelius Lentulus pr.137*</td>
<td>M. Perperna*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ap. Claudius+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus*</td>
<td>C. Fannius pr.127*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Opimius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>M. Aemilius Scaurus pr.119</td>
<td>C. Licinius Geta*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus pr.119*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>M. Aemilius Scaurus pr.119*</td>
<td>M. Caecilius Metellus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Rutilius Rufus pr.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Galba*</td>
<td>Hortensius*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Aurelius Scaurus+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio pr.109*</td>
<td>C. Atilius Serranus *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Lutatius Catulus pr.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>P. Rutilius Rufus pr.118*</td>
<td>Cn. Mallius Maximus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

133
Q. Lutatius Catulus pr.109
105
C. Marius cos.107*
Q. Lutatius Catulus pr.109
103
C. Marius cos.107*
C. Billienus pr.107
101
L. Valerius Flaccus pr.103*
Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus cos.109
100
A. Postumius Albinus*
C. Memmius pr.104
95
C. Valerius Flaccus

94
C. Valerius Flaccus*
L. Marcius Philippus pr.95
89
L. Cornelius Sulla pr.94*
C. Iulius Caesar Strabo aed.90
88
L. Cornelius Cinna*
L. Cornelius Merula+
87
L. Cornelius Cinna cos.87
L. Valerius Flaccus pr.93+
79
M. Aemilius Lepidus*
Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus
73
L. Turius pr.75

L. Gellius Poplicola pr.94*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>L. Caecilius Metellus pr.71*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Servilius Vatia+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M'. Aemilius Lepidus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>P. Cornelius Sulla*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Manlius Torquatus+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>L. Iulius Caesar*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Sergius Catilina pr.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>C. Antonius pr.66*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Sulpicius Galba pr.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Sergius Catilina pr.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Licinius Sacerdos pr.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Aufidius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Rufus pr.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Sergius Catilina pr.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>C. Iulius Caesar pr.62*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Cornelius Lentulus Niger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Rufus pr.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus pr.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Licinius Crassus cos.70*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ap. Claudius Pulcher pr.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cn. Pompeius Magnus cos.70*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Domitius Ahenobarbus pr.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Ampius Balbus pr.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 55   | Ap. Claudius Pulcher pr.58*  
      | M. Valerius Messalla Rufus pr.62 |
| 54   | M. Aemilius Scaurus pr.56  
      | M. Valerius Messalla Rufus pr.62*  
      | C. Claudius Pulcher pr.56 |
| 53   | Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio*  
      | Cn. Pompeius Magnus cos.70* |
| 52   | Ser. Sulpicius Rufus pr.65* |
| 50   | L. Domitius Ahenobarbus pr.58*  
      | T. Ampius Balbus pr.59  
      | C. Memmius pr.56  
      | Cn. Domitius Calvinus pr.56* |
| 50   | L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus pr.58*  
      | Ser. Sulpicius Galba pr.54  
      | M. Claudius Marcellus*  
      | M. Porcius Cato pr.54  
      | C. Claudius Marcellus* |
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