

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. VII

HELSINKI 1972 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Anders Ahlqvist	Notes on the Silesian Lugi	5
Iiro Kajanto	Women's praenomina reconsidered	13
Saara Lilja	Odour sensations in the Roman novel	31
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Tatwines Grammatik	47
Martti Nyman	Ma(vo)lo — a generative approach.	67
Teivas Oksala	»Polymythia» in Pindars Aigineten-Oden	93
Tuomo Pekkanen	Tac.Germ. 2,3 and the name Germani	107
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman public prodigia and the ager Romanus	139
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica	163
Jaakko Suolahti	Princeps Senatus	207
Holger Thesleff	Colloquial style and its use in Plato's later works	219

PRINCEPS SENATUS

Jaakko Suolahti

Men who had held the censorship (*ensorii*) were in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. the most respected body in the Senate, and in fact attained the highest position possible in Roman public life. One of them, who ranked above the others, was known as *princeps senatus*, and his name was placed first on the *album senatorium* by the censors. At least until the time of Sulla, he was head of the Senate. Even if he was not a magistrate in office and held no *imperium*, he could, because of his position, be considered the first citizen of the state.¹ The historical development of the post of *princeps senatus*, however, ensured that it was never filled by free and competitive elections.

I. Position of *Princeps Senatus*²

1. Origin and Development

We have no definite information on the principles by which the earliest compilers of the list of senators chose the *princeps senatus*.³ Presumably the

¹ Zonar 7, 19.

² This chapter is chiefly based on the following studies, which contain further detailed references both to the original sources and later research works:

W. A. Becker, *Handbuch der römischen Altertümer* II: 2, Leipzig 1845, 399–400.

O' Brien Moore, *Senatus*, (*RE* Suppl. VI, 660–800, Stuttgart 1935) 699–700.

T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* II (Papers and Monographs published by American Philological Association 15: 2), New York 1952, 130 n. 1.

E. Herzog, *Geschichte und System der römischen Staatsverfassung* I, Leipzig 1884, 886–7.

O. Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, Leipzig 1885, 368–9.

L. Lange, *Römische Altertümer* II, Berlin 1876, 355–6.

J. N. Madvig, *Die Verfassung und Verwaltung des römischen Staates* I, Leipzig 1881, 137.

Th. Mommsen, *Die römischen Patriciergeschlechter*, *Römische Forschungen* I, 69–127, Berlin 1864, 92–4; 258 ff.

Id. *Römisches Staatsrecht* III, Leipzig 1887, 969–75.

Id. Ueber den princeps senatus, *RhM* N. F. 19 (1864) 455–7.

Fr. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, Stuttgart 1920, passim.

Id. Zu den Fasti Censorii, *RhM* N. F. 61 (1906) 19–27.

J. Suolahti, *The Roman Censors. A Study on Social Structure* (*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*. Ser. B 117), Helsinki 1963, cf. index, p. 827.

P. Willems, *Le sénat de la république romaine* I, Paris—Louvain 1878, 111–8.

Id. La présidence du sénat durant la république romaine, *RA* NS 36 (1878) 225–45.

³ Before the year 443 only one princeps senatus (number 1 on the List, page 216) is known, but he is perhaps fictive; cf. Appendix, page 217.

princeps was from the first selected from among the oldest and most venerable senators, if early lists of senators were, as the Romans themselves believed,¹ compiled in the same way as later ones. Judging by extant information, a tradition concerning the qualifications for *princeps senatus* was already well established by the year 366 B.C.² The most important condition, always strictly observed, was that the *princeps senatus* must belong to a patrician *gens maior*³, i.e. to the *gens Aemilia, Claudia, Cornelia, Fabia, or Valeria* and perhaps to the *gens Manlia*.⁴ When the censorship had become the most honoured magistracy in the *cursus honorum*, the *princeps senatus* was, if possible, expected to have held this office. Until the second Punic war the censor with the longest period of service, and belonging to one of the above-mentioned *gentes*, was traditionally elected.⁵ The position of *princeps senatus* was, however, so important, that this mechanical procedure could not continue to satisfy the families competing for primacy. In the year 209 the censor *P. Sempronius Tuditanus* bypassed *T. Manlius Torquatus*, censor of the year 231, and selected as *princeps senatus* the famous *Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus*, censor of the year 230, a colleague of *Sempronius*' uncle and a member of his party.⁶ The next *princeps senatus* was *P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus*, who in the year of his censorship evidently placed or allowed his colleague *P. Aelius Paetus*, a member of his party, to place his name first in the list, even though *ensorii* from the *gentes maiores* were available.⁷ The same method was employed by some of the following censors because *princeps senatus* had by then developed into a political instrument.⁸ Since 131, when the first plebeian college of censors was elected,

¹ *CIL* I², elog. V. (= XXIII), pp. 189–191, Degrassi, *Elogia*, 78, pp. 57–9; Mommsen, *RSt* III, 966.

² Evidently there is no question of law. Cf. Liv. 27, 11, 11: *morem traditum a patribus* (a. 209), Plin. *nat.* 7, 133.

³ The sources do not explicitly mention this; it has been concluded from the list. Cf. also Cic. *rep.* 2, 35; Willems (*Le Sénat* 115–8) indeed tries to deny it and the fact that the *Claudii* and *Fabii* belonged to the *gentes maiores*, but Mommsen (*RF* I, 92–4, *RSt.* III³, 868, 966) has convincingly proved it correct.

⁴ The supposition of Münzer (*Adelsparteien* 11), that the result of the election in 209 stemmed from the fact that the *gens Manlia* was not a *gens maior*, is not supported by the sources; cf. Liv. l.c.; O'Brien Moore, 699.

⁵ Liv. 27, 11, 11; cf. Willems, *Le Sénat* 115–8.

⁶ Liv. l.c.; cf. Münzer, 96 *Sempronius* (*RE* IV A, Stuttgart 1921, 1443–5), 1443–4. Cf. the above-mentioned supposition of Münzer, that the *Manlii* did not belong to the *gentes maiores*.

⁷ Liv. 34, 44, 4 (a. 194) and Friedenshoff's explanations (Leipzig 1881); Mommsen *RF* I, 92–4.

⁸ In the years 184, 179, 136; Mommsen, *RSt.* III, 970; O. Leuze, *Zur Geschichte der römischen Zensur*, Halle 1912, 27–9.

the number of patrician censors had begun to diminish, and there was soon a shortage of suitable persons; even earlier, on some occasions, there had been few fully qualified.¹ Now the rule that the *princeps senatus* must be a former censor had to be relaxed. Consequently, in the year 125 the censors placed first *P. Cornelius Lentulus*, the oldest *consularis* belonging to a *gens maior*, and ten years later *M. Aemilius Scaurus*, the consul of the same year.² In the year 86 there was again a fully qualified *princeps senatus*, namely *L. Valerius Flaccus*, censor of the year 97³, but he seems to have been the last official head of the senate. The position of *princeps senatus* did not suit the now fully developed rule of *optimates*, which allowed no one to place himself, even formally, above all others.⁴ It is possible that Sulla, in the course of his reorganization, removed prestige from the position of *princeps senatus* in connection with his abolition of the censorship.⁵ The name of the oldest censor or consul remained first on the list; but when the custom of first consulting *consules designati* was abandoned, the consul who acted as chairman could at the beginning of the year, and later even in the middle of it, freely choose the *consularis* whose opinion he wished to hear first.⁶ In politically restless times the chance to speak first was so important that the ancient patrician privilege could no longer be maintained, especially as the number of patricians qualified had been greatly reduced. It is certainly possible that the first man on the list, who perhaps still was a patrician,⁷ continued to hold the title of *princeps senatus*, and this had some influence on the ability of patricians of *gentes maiores* to be elected censors (cf. page 212). He had, however, neither his former status nor privileges, and there is no reliable reference to him in the sources.⁸ The man or men who had the greatest *auctoritas* in the senate and the state where by their

¹ Possibly about the year 360 it had already been necessary to elect a consul in the shortage of censors. Münzer, *Zu den fasti censorii* 20, n. 1, cf. however 16 n. 2.

² O.c. 20—2; cf. Mommsen *RSt.* III³, 970 n. 1; Broughton II, 130 n. 1.

³ Liv. *perioch.* 83.

⁴ Mommsen, *RSt.* III³, 970—5; cf. Gell. 14, 7, 9: *per ambitionem gratiamque*.

⁵ Willems, *Le sénat* 114—8 is of another opinion, but Mommsen, *RSt.* III³, 868 n. 4, observes that the quotations mentioned by Willems do not refer to an official position; Broughton II, 130 n. 1; H. Siber, *Römisches Verfassungsrecht in geschichtlicher Entwicklung*, Lahr 1952, 241.

⁶ Gell. 14, 7, 9; Mommsen, *RSt.* III, 970; Cic. *Att.* 1, 13, 2.

⁷ It is not quite certain whether the patricians were still placed first in each class; cf. Mommsen, *RSt.* III, 967—8.

⁸ Mommsen (*Ueber* 455—7) is of the opinion (I think rightly) that *Mam. Aemilius Lepidus* was a *princeps senatus* of this kind; cf. Val. Max. 7, 7, 6. Willems (*Le sénat* 118) denies this without good reason. *Aemilius* was perhaps *princeps senatus* after the death of *L. Valerius Flaccus* about 64 (I want to point out here my error in my *Censors* 663 where I supposed, that he must have died in the seventieth), and was selected either 64 or 61. Cf. Cic. *Cluent.* 99 (a. 66); Broughton II, 130 n. 1.

contemporaries sometimes called *princeps senatus* or *princeps*.¹ But it was often clearly indicated that this did not mean leader of the senate in its former juridical sense.² In the Imperial Period the Emperor was leader of the Senate, but he called himself simply *princeps* and did not use the juridical term *princeps senatus*.³ In 28 B.C. *Augustus* placed himself as *censoria potestate* at the head of *album senatorium*, as did *Tiberius* 14 A.D. and *Pertinax* 193 A.D.⁴

2. The Duties of *Princeps Senatus*

Although the *princeps senatus* had no *imperium* or set duties, the office was not merely an honorary one, as some scholars have maintained.⁵ As first member of the senate his *auctoritas* was so great that he was able both to settle disputes between the senators, and to lead them whenever joint action, e.g. against a recalcitrant magistrate, was necessary.⁶ Thus in the year 208 *princeps senatus Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus* reconciled the quarrelling consuls of the following year;⁷ in the year 121 *P. Cornelius Lentulus* led the senate against *C. Gracchus*,⁸ as did *M. Aemilius Scaurus* in 100 against *Saturninus* and *Glaucia*.⁹ In 84 *L. Valerius Flaccus*, the last *princeps senatus* known to us, made the senate send a deputation to *Sulla* to negotiate.¹⁰ It is typical of the ancient authors cited above (except *Liv. ep. 83*) not to mention these men as *principes senatus*, because they did not lead the senators officially — this was the duty of consuls¹¹ — but as the most authoritative senators. Earlier his *auctoritas* was even more evident in the debates of the senate, because his opinion was asked first of all.¹² Naturally the *princeps* was expected to possess personal ability and initiative befitting this confidence. For instance in the year 133, when *princeps Ap. Claudius Pulcher* did not oppose *Ti. Gracchus* strongly enough, perhaps

¹ M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, Leipzig 1912, 35—8; E. Lepore, *Il princeps Ciceroniano e gli ideali politici della tarda repubblica*, Napoli 1956, 259 f.

² *Vell.* 2, 24, 3; *Cic. Phil.* 14, 17.

³ L. Wickert, *Princeps* (Melanges d'archéologie d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts à J. Carcopino, Paris 1966, 979—86); cf. Botsford, *The Roman Assemblies*, New York 1909, 126.

⁴ Mommsen, *RSt.* III³, 971, *RF* I, 92—4, *Ueber den princeps*, 455—7; Madvig I, 137; Siber, 273, 289; cf. *Dio Cass.* 53, 1, 3 (a. 8); 57, 28, 2 (a. 14 A.D.) 74, 5, 1 (a. 193 A.D.); *Tac. ann.* 1, 1, 1; *hist.* 1, 15, 2—4.

⁵ Madvig I, 137: Eine reine Ehrentitel.

⁶ Willems, *Le sénat* 111.

⁷ *Liv.* 27, 35, 5—10.

⁸ *Val. Max.* 5, 3F, 2; *Cic. Phil.* 8, 4, 15: *Scauri, Metelli*.

⁹ *Val. Max.* 3, 2, 18.

¹⁰ *Liv. perioch.* 83; *Gran Lic. ed. Bonn.* 39.

¹¹ *Val. Max.* 3,

¹² *Gell.* 14, 7, 9; Willems, *Présidence* 243, supposes also without evidence that *princeps senatus* presided over the *senatus*, when the first *interrex* was pointed.

because they were related, *P. Cornelius Nasica Serapio* took the lead.¹ That is why *Diodorus* and *Valerius Maximus* suppose him to have been *princeps senatus*. When the privileged position of *princeps senatus* ceased to exist, the actual leadership of the senate passed to the person with the greatest ability, *auctoritas* and political power.

II. Information concerning the *Principes Senatus*

As the position of *princeps senatus* was highly esteemed, the names of most *principes* after the year 367 have been preserved. From the Early Republic we know only one *princeps senatus*, and his name is naturally uncertain. Up to the year 81, when the position seems to have lost its importance, we have the names of 13 other *principes*.² The series between the years 366—81 is not complete, but we know the majority of them. From the following period the sources mention 4 *principes*, but the information on them is so contradictory and uncertain that Mommsen justly maintains that the sources do not refer to a legalized position, but to the standing of these men in the estimation of their contemporaries,³ mentioning the following plebeians: *Q. Lutatius Catulus*, consul in the year 78⁴, *P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus* consul in 79⁵ and *M. Tullius Cicero*, consul in 63.⁶ Only *Mam. Aemilius Lepidus* as patrician and possibly censor might have been *princeps senatus*.⁷ Naturally there was on the *album senatorium* even in this period a »*princeps senatus*», i.e. the man whose name was first. He was probably the oldest patrician, if any, censorius in office, i.e. after *M. Valerius Flaccus* who died 64 B.C., *Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus* 64 or 61, *M. Valerius Messalla Niger* 55, *Ap. Claudius Pulcher* 50, *P. Sulpicius Rufus* 42, *Augustus* 28—14 *Tiberius* 14 A.D., *Claudius* 47 A.D., *T. Flavius Vespasianus* 71. Even the other emperors because their *ensoria potestas* were at the head of *album senatorium*.⁸

Examination of the list of *principes senatus* is made much easier by the fact that we know almost all the patrician censors and consuls from among they were chosen.

¹ Diod. 34, 33; Val. Max. 7, 5, 2; Willems, *Le sénat* 113, regards him wrongly as a *princeps*.

² Cf. the list in the Appendix, pages 216—7.

³ Mommsen, *RSt.* III, 868—9 n. 4; Herzog I, 886 n. 4.

⁴ Vell. 2, 43, 4; Cic. *Pis.* 6.; *Id Verr.* 2, 390 et 210; Ps. *Ascon.* 98; Dio. 36, 30.

⁵ Cic. *Phil.* 2, 12; Hier. *Chr. on a Abr.* 710; Val. Max. 8, 5, 6.

⁶ Cic. *Phil.* 14, 17; Cic. *epist.* 12, 24, 2.

⁷ Val. Max. 7, 7, 6; Suolahti, 763.

⁸ Cf. Appendix page 217.

III. THE SOCIAL ORIGIN OF THE *Principes Senatus*

As is evident from the previous chapter,¹ the *princeps senatus* was chosen from a very limited circle, and consequently there were very few eligible candidates at any one time. When the number of patrician censors diminished from the year 131 onwards, there was practically no choice at all. The office can justifiably be considered one of the relics of patrician rights from the period when patricians alone were citizens with full rights. That it stayed in their hands until the end, is convincing proof of the perseverance with which they defended their privileges, and also of the vigour of the old patrician *gentes*.² Naturally they were aided in this by the conservatism of the Romans, especially the senators, and by the nature of the position itself. As soon as it began to acquire political importance the rigid requirements were eased,³ later it was abolished altogether.⁴ The requirements for the position also reflect the gulf which from the very beginning formally separated the old powerful *gentes maiores* from the other patrician *gentes*. It helped members of the former to the censorship, because only they could hold the position of *princeps senatus*.

Although the leaders were chosen from a very small circle, the list shows how the patrician *gentes maiores* held the leading position in turns. It also reveals the struggle for power between different family groups in the second century. Naturally it must be constantly compared with the list of censors,⁵ which shows what choice there was. Admittedly we do not always know which former censors were still alive at the time of selection, but reasonable assumptions can be made from their ages.

Before the year 366 only one *princeps senatus* is known, *M. Valerius Volusi f. Maximus*, dictator 494 (1, which refers to my list in pages 216—7) who, however, is to some extent a legendary character.⁶ Even if he is an invention of later annalists, his name on the list proves that the title of *princeps senatus* was later considered appropriate for a prominent member of a powerful family. According to the *fasti* of the consuls, the *gens Valeria* was the most prominent *gens* in the early 5th century, producing more chief magistrates than any other.⁷

¹ Cf. pages 208—9.

² Cf. page 209; Suolahti, 599—600.

³ This was necessary because there were no eligible candidates, cf. page 209.

⁴ Cf. page 209.

⁵ Appendix page 216 and Suolahti, 689—745.

⁶ Degrassi, *Elog.* 23 = *CIL* I² *elog.* V; numbers in brackets refer to the list pages 216—7.

⁷ Fr. Münzer, *De gente Valeria*, Diss. Berlin 1892, 18—25; *CIL* I² 190—1. Suolahti, 704.

When the real list of *princeps senatus* begins about the year 360, the first five known *principes* belong to the *gens Fabia* (2—6). As authors of later times have noted with surprise, the title went in three generations from father to son.¹ *M. Fabius Ambustus* (2), *Q. Fabius Rullianus* (3) and *Q. Fabius Gurges* (4) were in further respects the most prominent citizens of the state, and the high esteem in which they were held is proved by their very long and successful career. In fact, the whole *gens* had risen to leading positions in the state a little before the time of *Ambustus*, and in the year 390 they already occupied half the consular tribune *collegium*.² The following *principes* are not known to us, but one of them was probably *M. Fabius M. f. Buteo* (5), the censor of 241, who belonged to the other branch of the *gens Fabia*. In the year 216 he was the oldest censor.³ As, according to Livy, the oldest censor belonging to a *gens maior* was automatically elected *princeps*,⁴ the powerful position of the *gens* with its 6 censorships did not directly influence the selection. It must, however, be remembered that there have been at least as many unknown *principes* 320—304, 273—220, as known. During the years 366—219 seven members of the *gens Cornelia* held the censorship, but only one of them was able to rise to the position of *princeps*, while almost all the *Fabii* held this important position.⁵ It is naturally important to note at how early an age these men became censors and how long they lived. All the *Fabii Maximi* seem to have risen with particular rapidity in their careers.⁶ It is not, however, quite certain whether the custom mentioned by Livy was already followed at the beginning of the period. The selection of *Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus* (6) in 209 goes to prove how powerful position of a candidate and his family meant more than tradition.⁷ The subsequent *principes* reflect clearly the struggle for power between different families and their dominating positions. *P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus* (7) began the glorious period of the *gens Cornelia*, which lasts with a few interruptions through the whole of the second century. This *gens* produced far

¹ Plin. *Nat.* 7, 133: *Familia Fabiorum in qua tres continui principes senatus*, does not mean that they succeeded each other, because *Ambustus* was certainly dead (last mention 322; Liv. 8, 38, 1) when his son was censor in 304. It is, however, possible that the censorship in the fourth century was not yet a necessary requirement for *princeps senatus*.

² Münzer, *Adelsparteien* 53—5; *RE* VI, 1756; Suolahti, 701.

³ Liv. 27, 11, 11; Willems, *Le sénat* 112. Before him there have been two more unknown *principes*: cf. however Münzer in *RE* IV, 1377—8, and page 217.

⁴ Liv. *l.c.*

⁵ During the years 366—219 there were 8 censors from the *gens Cornelia*, 6 from *Fabia*, 3 from *Aemilia*, 3 from *Manlia*, 2 from *Claudia* and 2 from *Valeria*.

⁶ Suolahti, 722—31.

⁷ Münzer, *Adelsparteien* 255.

more chief magistrates and censors than any other.¹ The position of *princeps senatus*, for example, was held by 4 *Cornelii* (7, 10, 13—14), 2 *Aemilii* (9, 15), 2 *Valerii* (8, 16) and one *Claudius* (12). The list also indicates the political vacillations of the time, when the censors had a larger choice.

When, in the year 199, *P. Aelius Paetus* (RE 101) as censor placed first on the list his famous colleague and supporter *P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus* (7), then at the height of his power, he probably had to by-pass older candidates, as had happened already in 209. At least *M. Cornelius Cethegus* (RE 67), censor from the year 209, was still alive,² perhaps also *C. Claudius Nero* (RE 69), censor from the year 204,³ and possibly some still older.⁴ When *Scipio* retired from public life in 184, his adversary *Cato* chose as *princeps* during *Scipio's* lifetime his own colleague and supported *L. Valerius Flaccus* (16)⁵, evidently disregarding not only *Scipio* but also *C. Cornelius Cethegus* (RE 73), censor from year 194.⁶ Perhaps *Scipio* withdrew voluntarily from the office of *princeps*, but in any case a considerable victory had been scored by his adversaries.

When *Valerius* died in 180, the censor of the following year, *M. Fulvius Nobilior* (RE 80), appointed his colleague and supporter *M. Aemilius Lepidus* (9) *princeps senatus*. Perhaps there was no other person eligible, for *C. Cornelius Cethegus* (RE 88), censor of the year 194, was probably dead. *Aemilius* held the position for 27 years, until his death in 152. *L. Marcius Censorinus* (RE 46), censor of the year 147, appointed after *Aemilius* the oldest eligible censor *P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica* (10),⁷ who shared *Marcius's* political opinions. When *Scipio* died about the year 140,⁸ *Q. Fulvius Nobilior* (RE 96) elected his own colleague and supported *Ap. Claudius Pulcher* (12), disregarding both *L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus* (RE 91), censor of the year 147, and the latter's famous relative *P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus* (RE 335), censor of the year 142. After the death of *Claudius* the plebeian censors of 131 appointed the oldest of the

¹ In the years 218—81 the censors were 6 from the *gens Cornelia*, 3 from *Claudia*, 3 from *Valeria* and 3 from *Aemilia*; Suolahti, 701.

² Died in 196 (Liv. 33, 42, 5).

³ Still living in 201 (Liv. 31, 2; Polyb. 26, 25—27).

⁴ *L. Aemilius Papus* (RE 61), censor 220, was still living in 216 (Liv. 23, 21, 6); *C. Claudius Centho* (RE 59), censor 225, was still living in 213 (Liv. 25, 3—5); cf. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics*, Oxford 1951, 61 f.

⁵ Cf. Liv. 39, 5, 2.; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 17.

⁶ Still living in 193 (Liv. 34, 62, 16).

⁷ *C. Claudius Pulcher* (RE 83), censor of the year 169, and *L. Aemilius Paullus* (RE 85), censor of the year 164, were already dead (Liv. 45, 44, 3; Liv. *Perioch.* 46).

⁸ RE 353, 1501.

censors, *L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus* (13), perhaps influenced by the fact that they were political opponents of *Scipio*.¹

The censors of 125 had no fully eligible candidate available, so they appointed the oldest ex-consul from a *gens maior*, *P. Cornelius Lentulus* (14), who was elected censor late in the year 121.² The same problem arose in 115, when the censors, evidently for political reasons, elected the consul of the same year, *M. Aemilius Scaurus* (15), disregarding one or two older ex-consuls.³ When *Aemilius Scaurus* died in 88, the consuls of the year 86 elected the only eligible man,⁴ *L. Valerius Flaccus* (16). After this the proper position of *princeps senatus* seems to have been abandoned. Men are referred to by contemporaries as leaders of the senate because of their ability and *auctoritas*, but there is no mention of a senator being specially selected for the position.

In conclusion, then it is clear that the group from which the *princeps* was chosen was already very small. The names, too, show that the patrician *gentes maiores* forming this group succeeded very well in preventing their privileges in this respect from falling into the hands of plebeian or other patrician families. Among these powerful families there was lively competition for the chief magistracies, and the clearest sign of a successful career was tenure of the position of *princeps senatus*. From the year 209 onwards it was generally in the hands of the most powerful *gentes*.

Appendix. *Principes senatus*

The following list is based firstly on that published by P. Willems in his work *Le sénat de la république romaine* I, 112—5; secondly on the corrections made by Th. Mommsen in *Römische Forschungen* I, 92—4 *Römisches Staatsrecht* III, 868—75, 969—71 and *RhM* 19, 455—57, and on Fr. Münzer in *RhM* N.F. 61, 19—22; thirdly, on my own studies in *The Roman Censors*. Doubtful cases are followed by a question mark, by scholars assumed are in brackets, and have been dealt with in the notes following the list.

¹ Cic. *rep.* 1, 31; Id. *Brut.* 81; Id. *Lael.* 77; Id. *Off.* 1, 87; Münzer, *Adelsparteien* 251.

² Cf. Münzer, *Zu den fasti censorii* 19—22.

³ E.g. *q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus* (111), cos. 116, cens. 108, *q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus* (110), cos. 121, legatus? 113.

In the year 108 *Q. Fabius E*, if alive, was in exile (Cic. *Ball.* 28).

<i>Principes senatus</i>	<i>cos.</i>	<i>cens.</i>	<i>pr.s.</i>
? 1. M'. Valerius Volusi f. Maximus (243 ¹ , W 112 ²)	494 ³		c. 493 ⁴
2. M. Fabius N. f. M. n. Ambustus (48, W 112)	360, 356, 354, 351 ³	358?	c. 358—20 ⁴
3. Q. Fabius M. f. N. n. Maximus Rullianus (114 W 112)	322, 310, 308, 297, 295	304	c. 304—p. 291 ⁴
4. Q. Fabius Q. f. M. n. Maximus Gurges (112, W 112)	292, 276	c. 289—4	c. 289—73 ⁴
? 5. M. Fabius M. f. M. n. Buteo (53, W 112)	245	241	c. 220—09 ⁴
6. Q. Fabius Q. f. Q. n. Maximus Verrucosus (116 W 112)	233, 228, 215—4, 209	230	209—3
7. P. Cornelius P f. L. N. Scipio Africanus (336, W 112)	205, 194	199	199—84
8. L. Valerius P. f. L. n. Flaccus (173, W 112—3)	195	184	184—80
9. M. Aemilius M. f. M n. Lepidus (68, W 113)	187	179	179—52
10. P. Cornelius P. f. Cn. n. Scipio Nasica Corculum (353, W 113)	162, 155	159	147—c. 141
(?11. P. Cornelius P. f. P. n. Scipio Nasica Serapio (354, W 113)	138		136—2)
12. Ap. Claudius C. f. Ap. n. Pulcher (295, W 113 ⁵)	143	136	136—1
13. L. Cornelius Cn. f. L. n. Lentulus Lupus (224, W 114)	156	147	131—a. 25
14. P. Cornelius Cn. f. L. n. Lentulus (202, W 114)	162		125—c. 120
15. M. Aemilius M. f. L. n. Scaurus (140, W 114)	115	109	115—88
16. L. Valerius L. f. L. n. Flaccus (176, W 114)	100	97	86—64?
<i>Unofficial principes senatus</i>			
?17. Mam. Aemilius Lepidus (80, Mom. 257)	77	70	61—a55
(?18. Q. Lutatius Q. f. Q. n. Catulus (8, W 114)	78	65	65—61)
(?19. P. Servilius, C. f. M. n. Vatia Isauricus (93, W 114—5)	78	65	55—44)
(?20. M. Tullius, M. f. M. n. Cicero (29, W 115)	63		43)
?21. M. Valerius M. f. M. n. Messalla Niger (206)	61	55	55—a50
?22. Ap. Claudius Ap. f. Ap. n. Pulcher (297)	54	50	50—48

¹ Refers to the number in the concerning article in RE.

² Refers to the page in Willems, *Le sénat* I.

³ Dictator.

⁴ First possible year of *princeps senatus* and last mention in sources.

⁵ Falsely supposed by some scholars to be *princeps senatus*.

<i>Principes senatus</i>	<i>cos.</i>	<i>cens.</i>	<i>pr.s.</i>
?23. P. Sulpicius P. f.-n. Rufus (93)	—	42	42—
?24. C. Iulius C. f. C. n. Caesar Octavianus (132)	43, 33, 31—23, 5, 2	c.p. 28	28—14
(?25. Paullus Aemilius L. f. M. n. Lepidus (82)	34	22	22)
?26. Ti. Iulius Aug. f. Divi n. Caesar (154)	13, 8, 18 p., 21 p.	c.p. 14	14—37
?27. Ti. Claudius Drusi f. Ti. n. Caesar Augustus Germanicus (256)	37 p., 42 p., 43 p., 47 p.,	47	47—53
?28. T. Flavius T. f. T. n. Vespasianus Caesar Augustus (206)	51 p., 70 p., 72 p., 74— 76 p., 77 p., 79 p.	71—3	71—9

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE LIST OF *PRINCIPES SENATUS*

1. *M'. Valerius Volusi f. Maximus, dict.* (a. 501: FEST. 216 L?) 494, is perhaps an invention of *Valerius Antias*.¹ It is not certain whether the position of *princeps senatus* had developed so early, and whether there was any prominent *Valerius* alive at that time. If there was, he could be, for example, *M. Valerius Volusus* (*RE* 74) *cos.* 505, instead of *M'. Valerius Volusi f. Maximus*. In any case the *Valerii* were the leading *gens* in the early fifth century.

2. *M. Fabius N. f. M. n. Ambustus, cos.* 360, 356, 354, 351 was perhaps censor in 358,² and then or later, e.g. 351, when *C. Marcius Rutilus* (*RE* 97) and *Cn. Manlius Capitolinus Inperiosus* (*RE* 53) were censors, selected *princeps*.

3—4. Between *Ambustus* and *Gurges* there may have been one or more *principes senatus* cf. page 213.

4—5. Because *Q. Fabius Gurges* died after 273³ and *Buteo* was censor in 241, there must have been at least two unknown *principes* between them. These were possibly two of the following:⁴ *Q. Aemilius Papus* (*RE* 112), censor of 275, *L. Aemilius Barbula* (*RE* 31), censor of 269, *Cn. Cornelius Blasio* (*RE* 73), censor of 265, *M'. Valerius Maximus Messalla* (*RE* 247), censor of 252, and *A. Manlius Torquatus Atticus* (*RE* 87), censor of the year 247. Of these men at least *L. Cornelius Blasio* was alive after his censorship in 257, when he was consul.⁵

5. Willems assumes *M. Fabius M. f. M. n. Buteo* to have been *princeps senatus* because in 216 he was the oldest ex-censor. If the statement of Livy⁶ that at this time the oldest ex-censor belonging to a *gens maior* was elected *princeps senatus* is true, he must have been in this office at least from the year 220.

11. *P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio* is mentioned by *Diod.* 34/35. 33 as *princeps senatus*, but at this point the text is not clear. Because *P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum* (*RE* 353) seems to have been re-elected in 142 to this position, and *Ap. Claudius Pulcher* (12) was elected in 136, there is no place for *Serapio* in the list. Cf. Mommsen, *RhM* 19, and Val. Max. 7, 5, 2. In addition it seems strange that a consul should be elected *princeps* when there were also qualified ex-censors. The text may refer to the inofficial *princeps senatus* 141—136, i.e. the oldest patrician censor from a *gens maior* *L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus* (*RE* 224).

14. *P. Cornelius Lentulus* was selected as *princeps senatus* in 125 because there was no ex-censor from the *gentes maiores* alive.

¹ Münzer, *De gente Valeria* 18—25; *CIL* I², p. 190—1; Degrassi, *Elogia*, 78, pp. 57—9.

² Münzer, *Zu den fasti Censorii* 20, n. 1; *Plin. nat.* 7, 133.

³ *Dion. Hal.* 20, 14; *Val. Max.* 4, 3, 9.

⁴ *L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus* (*RE* 343), obviously censor of the year 280, was not *princeps senatus*, which appears from his *elogium* (*CIL* I²: 2, 7 = VI 1284), nor was *L. Cornelius Scipio* (*RE* 323), censor of the year 258, for the same reason (*CIL* I²: 2. 8—9 = VI 1286—7 = Degrassi, *Elogia* 2—3).

⁵ Polyb. 1, 25, 1.

⁶ *Liv.* 27, 11, 9—11, cf; 23, 22, 10.

15. *M. Aemilius Scaurus* was chosen in 115, evidently for the same reason. (Cf. Münzer, *Zu den fasti* 19—22).

17. *Mam. Aemilius Lepidus* is mentioned by Val. Max. 7, 7, 6 as *princeps senatus*. As no 16 *L. Valerius Flaccus* (*RE* 176) died only about 64, and a fully qualified ex-censor, *Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus*, was alive in 67 (Cf. Cic. *Cluent.* 36, 39; Mommsen *RSt.* II3, 1396 n. 2.), he was possibly censor in 64, and then selected as *princeps senatus* if he outlived *Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus*.

18—20. *Q. Lutatius Catulus*, *P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus*, *M. Tullius Cicero* were not in the technical sense *principes senatus*, though Willems so maintains (cf. page 209 note 5). It is possible that *M. Valerius Messalla Niger* (*RE* 226) was selected as *princeps senatus* after the death of *Mam. Aemilius Lepidus* or an unknown previous *princeps*, and if he died before 50, he was perhaps succeeded by the censor of 50, *Ap. Claudius Pulcher* (*RE* 297). When he died in 48 (Val. Max. 4, 8, 10) he was 42 succeeded probably by *P. Sulpicius Rufus* (*RE* 93), censor in this year at the head of the album.

Panvius, *Fastorum libri a Romulo rege*, Heidelberg 1588, 96, states in addition that *G. Duilius*, cos. 260, *Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus*, cos. 143, and *Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius*, cos. 70, all held the position of *princeps senatus*, but he cannot prove this.