κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων of magistrates. (*b*) The institutions and procedures used in demes were often different from those used by the *polis*. Accordingly, the κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων attested for the deme Halimous is not evidence that the procedure was still used by the *polis* for election of magistrates.

(2) In Plato's *Laws* both the νομοφύλακες (753D) and the εὔθυνοι (946A) are appointed by κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων. In this case as well as in many others the model may well have been Athens. But we cannot infer that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων was still used in Athens when Plato devised the ideal city described in the *Laws*. When Plato explicitly copies Athenian institutions, he tends to go back to the archaic or early classical period. For example, the four property classes (744C) are explicitly attested for Athens (698B) and are strictly respected in Plato's ideal city for the election of magistrates; but in fourth-century Athens the property qualifications for magistracies were openly disregarded. Plato's regulations reflect archaic Athenian institutions, not the practices of contemporary Athens.

In conclusion, Plato *Apology* 35A–B is no proof that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων still existed in 399, and the supporting fourth-century evidence is very weak (Dem. 57. 46–48, 62; Pl. *Leg.* 753D, 946A). On the contrary, Isocrates 7. 22–23 clearly indicates that magistrates in the mid-fourth century were appointed by κλήρωσις ἐξ ἁπάντων, that κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων had been abrogated by the *polis,* and that the ideal ascribed to the ancestors was αἵρεσις ἐκ προκρίτων. *Athenaion Politeia* 8. 1 shows that archons in the 330s were elected by a double sortition, first of one hundred candidates in the tribes, then of the actual archons by a centrally conducted sortition. *Athenaion Politeia* 62. 1 is compatible with the view that πρόκρισις may have been used in the demes for prospective βουλευταί; but on this assumption we are bound to infer that it was no longer used by the demes for other magistrates. Thus, κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων was a fifth-century procedure, introduced in 487/86 (*Ath. Pol.* 22. 5) and attested no later than 458/57 (*Ath. Pol.* 26. 2). Whether or not it had been introduced by Solon (*Ath. Pol.* 8. 1) but discontinued in the period ca. 545–487 is a different problem, which I will take up in another study.[17]

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN
University of Copenhagen

17. Only after my article was accepted for publication did I see P. Rhodes' short but judicious review of Abel in *Gnomon* 57 (1985): 378–79.

CICERO'S TESTIMONY AT THE *BONA DEA* TRIAL

The *Bona Dea* trial marked a decisive turning point in Cicero's career. Because of his testimony against Clodius, a feud arose between the two men which led directly to Cicero's exile in 58 and temporarily destroyed his political influence at a crucial period in the Republic's history.[1] Why did Cicero court Clodius'

1. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "Fabula Clodiana," *Historia* 15 (1966): 65–73, discusses the course of the trial with full references to the sources.

hostility both before and during the trial, and risk the consequences that inevitably followed from the animosity of the powerful in Rome?

His own correspondence with Atticus explains his action as a selfless and public-spirited crusade to curb licentiousness and discipline the youth (*Att.* 1. 18. 2). But Cicero's first report of the scandal to Atticus has the tone of amused and cynical enlightenment rather than moral indignation: "rem [viz., Clodius' escapade] esse insigni infamia. quod te moleste ferre certo scio" (*Att.* 1. 12. 3). Elsewhere, Cicero portrays his conduct against Clodius as an extension of his struggle with Catiline, professing to see some continuity between the Catilinarians of 63 and Clodius' supporters at the trial (*Att.* 1. 14. 5). But Catiline's former supporters are unlikely to have rallied around Clodius in 61, because he had not taken part in the conspiracy and was probably Catiline's long-standing personal enemy. He had accused Catiline of *incestum* with the Vestal Virgin Fabia in 73 and had prosecuted him for extortion in 65.[2] Plutarch (*Cic.* 29. 1) goes so far as to claim that Clodius acted as Cicero's staunch supporter and protector during the Catilinarian crisis. This claim is doubtless exaggerated but may reflect Clodius' known ambivalence toward the Catilinarian movement.[3] Bitter personal animosity precluded cooperation between Clodius and Catiline, despite their political affinity.[4]

Cicero has persuaded some modern scholars that high-mindedness and anti-Catilinarian politics induced him to cooperate with Clodius' prosecutors.[5] Others, perplexed by the implausibility of these explanations, believe that the evidence currently available does not reveal why Cicero acted as he did.[6] A third group traces Cicero's appearance in court to the hostility that arose between Clodius and Cicero at the senatorial maneuvering preceding the trial,[7] when Clodius infuriated Cicero by mocking him for having "fully informed himself," a sarcastic reminiscence of Cicero's controversial tactics during the Catilinarian conspiracy.[8] But this explanation courts circularity by ignoring the hostility that Cicero had shown from the very beginning of Clodius' difficulties, a hostility that presumably helped provoke Clodius' jibe.[9] Finally, D. Stockton attributes Cicero's action to a desire to support the influential *boni* who were working to destroy Clodius.[10] But Cicero did not act as a zealous supporter of the prosecu-

2. For the accusation of *incestum,* see below. For the extortion trial, see E. S. Gruen's discussions, with full citation of the sources, in "Some Criminal Trials of the Late Republic: Political and Prosopographical Problems," *Athenaeum* 49 (1971): 59–62, and *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), p. 271.

3. Note the puzzling statement by Asconius (*Mil.* 44) that Clodius wanted to join the conspiracy but changed his mind at the last minute.

4. Cicero relied on political kinship between Clodius and Catiline to portray Clodius as an heir to Catiline's legacy of violence and revolution in the 50s: *Sest.* 42, *Har. resp.* 5, *Pis.* 11, *Planc.* 86, *Mil.* 37.

5. Balsdon, "Fabula Clodiana," p. 66; M. Gelzer, *Cicero: Ein biographischer Versuch* (Wiesbaden, 1969), p. 112.

6. D. Magnino, *Plutarchi "Vita Ciceronis"* (Florence, 1963), p. 91; E. S. Gruen, "P. Clodius: Instrument or Independent Agent?" *Phoenix* 20 (1966): 124, n. 22.

7. R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*[3], vol. 1 (Dublin and London, 1904), p. 26; E. Ciaceri, *Cicerone e i suoi tempi,* vol. 2 (Genoa, Rome, Naples, and Città di Castello, 1941), p. 24.

8. *Att.* 1. 14. 5. See D. R. Shackleton Bailey's discussion of the passage in *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 311–12.

9. *Att.* 1. 13. 3 "nosmet ipsi, qui Lycurgei a principio fuissemus."

10. *Cicero: A Political Biography* (Oxford, 1971), p. 161.

tion during the trial, despite his consistent hostility to Clodius. He feared (correctly, as it turned out) the damage that a trial might cause to the unity he was struggling to bring to the Republic.

Cicero revealed his attitude toward pressing the case in court soon after Q. Cornificius first raised the question in the senate. The senate referred the question to the Vestal Virgins and the pontiffs, who decided that a sacrilege had been committed.[11] This religious pronouncement might have sufficed as an adjudication of guilt, putting an end to the controversy.[12] But the extremists among Clodius' enemies, determined to bring him to trial, pressed for a *quaestio extraordinaria,* an *ad hominem* judicial measure unparalleled, as far as we know, during the Ciceronian era.[13] The trial was sure to be divisive because of Clodius' considerable popular support, which subsequently buoyed him at the trial.[14] Clodius fought back with pleading and intimidation, and Cicero admitted that his position was softening, despite pressure from Cato, because he anticipated that a trial would polarize the state.[15] His reservations belie any theory that he was motivated by a desire to align himself with the fanatical *boni.*

Cicero continued to maintain his distance from the approaching trial when Clodius' bitterest enemies initially failed, thanks to a veto by Fufius, a tribune sympathetic to Clodius, to enact the bill establishing a special court.[16] Clodius denounced his principal tormentors, Lucullus, Hortensius, C. Piso, and Messalla. Next he taunted Cicero by referring disparagingly to the Catilinarian conspiracy,[17] a remark which singled Cicero out and seemed to distinguish him from those senators who were maneuvering to bring the case to trial. Cicero's narrative confirms that he did not actively promote the bill that would have established the *quaestio.* Its principal advocates were Cato and Hortensius (*Att.* 1. 14. 5).

Afterward, Atticus had to prod Cicero into writing about the course of the trial, perhaps because Cicero was so depressed about its outcome.[18] When Cicero did break his silence, he emphasized that he had continued to oppose bringing Clodius to trial up until the very end (*Att.* 1. 16. 1–2). The proponents of the trial had finally come to terms with Fufius and agreed to present to the people a modified version of the original bill establishing a court to try Clodius. The compromise called for a jury selected by lot, not handpicked by the praetor, as the original bill had provided.[19] Hortensius yielded on this point, convinced that

11. *Att.* 1. 13. 3; Cass. Dio 37. 46. 1.
12. Gruen, *Last Generation,* p. 248.
13. Ibid., pp. 248–49.
14. Plut. *Cic.* 29. 6.
15. *Att.* 1. 13. 3 "vereor ne haec †iniecta† a bonis, defensa ab improbis magnorum rei publicae malorum causa sit." The text is unfortunately corrupt. *Neglecta,* the preferred reading of the majority of scholars, seems impossible. Cicero has just admitted to softening in the face of Clodius' intimidation: would he admit even to Atticus that he was part of a policy which he believed ruinous to the Republic? *Incepta,* discussed by Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* 1:305, appears the most plausible correction.
16. *Att.* 1. 14. 5. See Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* 1:311.
17. See n. 8, above.
18. Balsdon, "Fabula Clodiana," p. 73.
19. *Att.* 1. 16. 2. See Balsdon's discussion of this passage, "Fabula Clodiana," p. 70, illuminating even without the benefit of Shackleton Bailey's commentary. For the praetor's role in selecting the jury in the senatorial version of the bill, vetoed by Fufius, see *Att.* 1. 14. 1. The senate reacted to the veto by halting public transactions until the assembly had received the bill (*Att.* 1. 14. 5). The ensuing deadlock led to the compromise between Fufius and Hortensius.

no jury would acquit Clodius. Cicero, highly critical of Hortensius' judgment, believed that Hortensius had been blinded by his hatred of Clodius, and had failed to appreciate how much better it would be to leave Clodius stained with sacrilege rather than to risk judicial exoneration by entrusting him to a potentially corrupt jury.[20] As soon as the trial became inevitable, Cicero, sensing a corrupt jury, cooperated only halfheartedly with the prosecution: "contraxi vela perspiciens inopiam iudicum neque dixi quicquam pro testimonio nisi quod erat ita notum atque testatum ut non possem praeterire" (*Att.* 1. 16. 2). The prosecutors of Clodius could hardly have been contented with such support, and it is extremely unlikely that Cicero participated in the trial to please them.

The ancient evidence offers one final clue about Cicero's motivation at Clodius' trial. It involves a story that seems incredible at first sight: Plutarch's claim (*Cic.* 29. 2–3) that Cicero's wife Terentia persuaded him to appear in court against Clodius. According to Plutarch, Terentia's wrath was primarily directed against Clodius' notorious sister Clodia, whom she suspected of having designs to marry Cicero, but also embraced Clodius. It was to dispel these suspicions that Cicero appeared in court against Clodius.

Modern scholars have rejected the story overwhelmingly.[21] Plutarch reports it only as a belief, and it sounds very much like malicious gossip circulated by Cicero's enemies.[22] But for all its apparent absurdity, Plutarch's tale may accurately reflect Terentia's influence on Cicero, while failing to reveal convincingly the cause of her actions. G. de Benedetti once adumbrated a far more plausible explanation for Terentia's hostility toward Clodius.[23] Her suggestion deserves a fresh and more extensive presentation, since it has been ignored by modern scholars, who have not proposed anything very convincing in its place.

De Benedetti traced Terentia's hatred of Clodius back to 73, when Clodius gravely insulted her family by accusing Catiline of *incestum* with Fabia, a Vestal Virgin and half sister of Terentia. Little information survives about the incident. Catiline was ultimately acquitted, thanks to Catulus' help, but only after Fabia had been deeply embarrassed. She narrowly escaped conviction through the vigorous efforts of Cato, who directed his fire at the prosecutor Clodius rather than at the facts of the case. Cicero's gratitude on this occasion prompted an

20. *Att.* 1. 16. 2 "non vidit (Hortensius) illud, satius esse illum in infamia reliqui ac sordibus quam infirmo iudicio committi." Cicero's words need not imply (*pace* Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* 1:149–51) that he anticipated a future trial. He uses the term *sordes* generally, e.g., *Sest.* 60, *Pis.* 27, with no reference to a *reus'* mourning clothing. Cf. H. Kaster's translation, *Atticus "Briefe"* (Munich, 1959), p. 45.

21. Plutarch's story is rejected by O. Harnecker, "Einiges über M. Caelius Rufus und zu Ciceros Caeliana," *BPhW* 4 (1884): 226; F. Münzer, "Clodia (no. 66)," *RE* 4 (1900): 106; L. Neubauer, "Terentia," *WS* 31 (1909): 213; W. Druman and P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*^{2}, vol. 5.3 (Leipzig, 1919), p. 586; T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic,* vol. 1 (Oxford, 1923), p. 297, n. 1; E. Manni, "L'utopia di Clodio," *RFIC* 18 (1940): 167; Balsdon, "Fabula Clodiana," p. 72, n. 52; Gelzer, *Cicero,* p. 112; Stockton, *Cicero,* p. 161, n. 37; E. Rawson, *Cicero: A Portrait* (Ithaca, 1983), p. 96. Others are less skeptical: G. Boissier, *Cicéron et ses amis*^{9} (Paris, 1892), p. 96; E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und des Principat des Pompeius* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1919), p. 48; S. Weinstock, "Terentia (no. 95)," *RE* 4A (1934): 711.

22. For an example of similar gossip, see [Sall.] *Cic.* 3.

23. "L'esilio di Cicerone e la sua importanza storico-politica," *Historia* 3 (1929): 549–50.

outburst of Catonian patriotism: Cicero really ought to offer his thanks to Rome, since whatever Cato did, he did for her.[24]

The charge stuck to Catiline, and therefore necessarily to Fabia, despite the acquittal. Sallust reported the *incestum* as a fact (*Cat.* 15. 1). Cicero himself, desperate for the consulship, could not resist an oblique reference to the trial in his campaign against Catiline: "cum ita vixisti (Catilina) ut non esset locus tam sanctus quo non adventus tuus, etiam cum culpa nulla subesset, crimen afferret."[25] Asconius (*Tog.* 82) explains the clause "etiam cum culpa nulla subesset" as an attempt to spare Fabia's reputation. Cicero's clumsy effort to screen Fabia from embarrassment suggests the toll her reputation suffered from the rumors that lingered from the incident.

Even before the *Bona Dea* trial, Terentia had interceded with her husband in behalf of the Vestal Virgins, presumably including her sister. The same rites of the *Bona Dea* that Clodius allegedly violated in 62 had been held the year before in Cicero's house, at a crucial point during the Catilinarian conspiracy. The Catilinarian leaders who were in Rome had been apprehended, but Cicero was indecisive about their fate. The celebrants of the *Bona Dea* saw the altar flare up unexpectedly and believed that they had seen a portent. Terror spread among the women gathered for the rites, but the Vestal Virgins remained calm enough to ask Terentia to strengthen her husband in his inclination to execute the conspirators.[26] Weinstock has made the highly plausible, albeit unprovable, suggestion that the Vestal Virgins were driven by a grudge that originated in the charges linking Catiline and Fabia.[27] The incident certainly demonstrated Terentia's influence over Cicero, which is emphasized by Plutarch[28] and illustrated by Cicero's own correspondence. From exile he alluded to the vital role Terentia played in determining who would receive his help: "mea lux, meum desiderium, unde omnes opem petere solebant."[29]

It is a fair assumption that Terentia exerted her influence with Cicero to work against Clodius at every opportunity after the alleged *incestum*. But Plutarch refers to Clodius as a friend and supporter of Cicero during the Catilinarian conspiracy (*Cic.* 29. 1), and Clodius' presence at Cicero's house on the day of the outrage (the visit that Cicero subsequently used to destroy Clodius' alibi at the trial) has reinforced among some scholars the idea that Cicero and Clodius were actually friends before Cicero's testimony in 61.[30] As was noted above, however,

24. Plut. *Cat. Min.* 19. 5–6. The other sources for the *incestum* incident are Cic. *Tog. Cand.* frag. 22; Asc. *Tog.* 82; Q. Cic. *Pet.* 10; Sall. *Cat.* 15. 1; Oros. 6. 3. 1. Cic. *Cat.* 3. 9, *Brut.* 236 may refer to the same trial. See Broughton, *MRR,* 2:107–8, 114. For the date, see ibid.

There is some dispute about whether Catiline was formally charged. See Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* 1:319, answered by Gruen, "Some Criminal Trials," p. 61, n. 28.

25. *Tog. Cand.* frag. 82. Cf. Q. Cic. *Pet.* 10.

26. Plut. *Cic.* 20. 1–3.

27. "Terentia (no. 95)," col. 711.

28. *Cic.* 20. 3; cf. 29. 4.

29. *Fam.* 14. 2. 2. See the comments of Tyrrell and Purser on this passage, *Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*[3], 1:402. For further examples of Terentia's influence on Cicero, see *Att.* 11. 12. 1, *Fam.* 5. 6. 1. Cf. Weinstock, "Terentia (no. 95)," col. 711; Gelzer, *Cicero,* p. 112.

30. For Clodius' presence at Cicero's house on the day of the incident, see Plut. *Cic.* 29. 1; Val. Max. 8. 5. 5; *Schol. Bob.* (p. 85 Stangl). Cf. Cic. *Att.* 2. 1. 5, *Mil.* 46, *Dom.* 80; Asc. *Mil.* 43; Quint. *Inst.*

any support that Clodius expressed for Cicero during the Catilinarian crisis is more likely to reflect Clodius' detestation of Catiline than his friendship with Cicero.

Clodius' presence at Cicero's morning *salutatio* on the day of the sacrilege implies only that the two men had not declared their enmity for each other, for in that case Cicero would have barred Clodius from his house.[31] Visitors at a Roman's *salutatio* were not necessarily friends or even political allies. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero complained that a large crowd of morning callers contained not a single intimate (*Att.* 1. 18. 1). A letter to L. Papirius in 46 proves that Cicero's morning callers were not confined to his political supporters.[32]

The theory that Cicero was not Clodius' friend prior to 61, but rather was susceptible to Terentia's anti-Clodian influence, is therefore quite plausible. Indeed, a detail provided by Plutarch confirms that Terentia's hatred of Clodius had been decisive during the *Bona Dea* trial. During Clodius' tribunate in 58, Cicero was so frightened by Clodius' threats that he sought a legateship under Caesar as protection. Clodius, fearing that Cicero would escape his vengeful grasp, made friendly but insincere overtures toward Cicero in the hope of persuading him to stay in Rome, where he would remain subject to the full force of the tribunician authority. To make the request for a reconciliation more convincing, Plutarch reports, Clodius blamed all their differences on Terentia, an obvious reference to her influence on Cicero at the *Bona Dea* trial.[33]

Other sources confirm that some rapprochement occurred between Clodius and Cicero early in Clodius' tribunate. Dio suggests only a temporary truce between the two: Cicero agreed to withdraw his opposition to Clodius' legislation in return for a pledge that he would not be indicted. Clodius duplicitously renewed his attack after he had secured the passage of his legislation.[34] But Cicero himself implies that his understanding with Clodius was more than a hardheaded political pact and had led to some cooperation between the two. From exile he expressed the deepest regret that he had allowed himself to be persuaded to support Clodius' legislation legalizing the *collegia*. Unfortunately,

---

4. 2. 88. Magnino, *Plutarchi "Vita Ciceronis,"* p. 91, followed by Gruen, "P. Clodius," p. 124, n. 22, sees Clodius' presence at Cicero's house as proof of his friendship with Cicero.

31. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6. 29. 3, and see R. S. Rogers, "The Emperor's Displeasure," *TAPA* 90 (1959): 224–37. There has been some confusion about the time of day of Clodius' visit. The *Schol. Bob.* (p. 85 Stangl) states that Clodius visited Cicero during the morning *salutatio*. On the other hand, Cic. *Att.* 2. 1. 5 ("ex Sicilia septimo die Romam: at tribus horis Roma Interamnam") has been taken by Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's "Letters to Atticus,"* 1:347, as proof that the visit occurred on the evening of the sacrilege; cf. Balsdon, "Fabula Clodiana," p. 71. But Cicero's sarcasm implies only that he had seen Clodius three hours before Clodius claimed that he had arrived at Interamna. Clodius would have fixed that arrival during the daylight hours, to preserve his alibi's credibility, because of the difficulties and dangers of night travel in the ancient world: Cic. *Att.* 2. 1. 5 implies how unusual it was to arrive in Rome after dark. Cicero's words are therefore consistent with the scholiast's claim that Clodius visited Cicero in the morning.

32. *Fam.* 9. 20. 3. Cf. A. Hug, "Salutatio," *RE* 1A (1920): 2067.

33. *Cic.* 30. 1–3. According to Cic. *Att.* 2. 18. 3, 2. 19. 5, Caesar took the initiative in offering Cicero a post on his staff during the July preceding Clodius' tribunate. Cicero declined, claiming he preferred to stay and fight (Cic. *Prov. cons.* 41–42). This evidence, of course, need not contradict Plutarch's story. Cicero may have assessed the danger from Clodius and the attractiveness of Caesar's offer differently after Clodius had secured the tribunate. Cass. Dio 38. 15. 2 confirms that the legateship was discussed by Caesar and Cicero after Clodius had become tribune.

34. Cass. Dio 38. 14. 1–3.

we cannot know why Cicero had determined originally that the legislation was in his interest.[35]

Plutarch's claim that Clodius sought the reconciliation only to take more effective revenge on Cicero is doubtless oversimplified. But Cicero confirms that the two did succeed in overcoming their quarrel at least temporarily early in Clodius' tribunate. There is no reason to reject Plutarch's report that Clodius blamed Terentia for his differences with Cicero in the past or to doubt that Cicero found this explanation convincing. Clodia, presumably with her brother's encouragement, continued to harass Terentia even after Cicero's exile, a further indication that the Clodian family held her responsible for Cicero's testimony.[36] The hounding proved so effective that Terentia was obliged to take refuge with the Vestal Virgins, among whom Fabia was presumably still serving.[37]

Cicero doubtless miscalculated the risks of testifying against Clodius at the *Bona Dea* trial. But he was not acting foolishly or inexplicably. Terentia saw an opportunity to avenge the humiliation that Clodius had caused her sister and used her considerable influence with Cicero to achieve her objective. Surely no one anticipated how gravely her grudge would affect her husband's career and the history of the Republic.[38]

DAVID F. EPSTEIN
The University of Chicago

35. *Att.* 3. 15. 4. Stockton, *Cicero,* p. 187, suggests that Cicero may have favored the legislation because he believed that it would make it easier to mobilize his own supporters should the need ever arise.
36. Cic. *Cael.* 50.
37. Cic. *Att.* 14. 2. 2.
38. I am grateful to the anonymous reader and the Editor for valuable suggestions.

SUFFRAGIUM IN EXODUS *RABBAH* 37. 2

Suffragium, in the sense of the exercise of influence by a powerful man, especially to procure a government appointment for his client, was a feature of Roman government under the principate.[1] The extent and pervasiveness of its

1. For this meaning of the term, see *OLD,* s.v. *suffragium* 5, and esp. G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, "*Suffragium:* From Vote to Patronage," *British Journal of Sociology* 5 (1954): 33–48. The fullest study of the institution under the principate is R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge, 1982). Useful accounts for the dominate include A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 391–96, 568–69; C. Collot, "La pratique et l'institution du *suffragium* au Bas-Empire," *RHDFE* 43 (1965): 185–221; and, particularly on legislative efforts to restrain *suffragium,* D. Liebs, "Ämterkauf und Ämterpatronage im der Spätantike: Propaganda und Sachzwang bei Julian dem Abtrünnigen," *ZSav* 95 (1978): 158–86. Bibliography of works since the sixteenth century is given by Callot, "Pratique," p. 186, n. 6; and Liebs, "Ämterkauf," p. 169, n. 7. To these may be added J. K. Evans, "The Role of *Suffragium* in Imperial Political Decision-Making: A Flavian Example," *Historia* 27 (1978): 102–28; W. Schuller, "Ämterkauf im römischen Reich," *Der Staat* 19 (1980): 57–71; W. Eck, "Einfluss korrupter Praktiken auf das senatorisch-ritterliche Beförderungswesen in der Hohen Kaiserzeit," in *Korruption im Altertum,* ed. W. Schuller (Munich and Vienna, 1982), pp. 135–51, and see the discussion, pp. 152–61; W. Schuller, "Prinzipien des spätantiken Beamtentumus," ibid., pp. 201–8, and see the discussion, pp. 209–14; P. Veyne, "Clientèle et corruption au service de l'état: La vénalité des offices dans le Bas-Empire romain," *Annales* 36 (1981): 339–60; K. L. Noetlichs, *Beamtentum und Dienstvergehen: Zur Staatsverwaltung in der Spätantike* (Wiesbaden, 1981).