

JOHN NICOLS

PATRONS OF GREEK CITIES IN THE EARLY PRINCIPATE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 80 (1990) 81–100

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PATRONS OF GREEK CITIES IN THE EARLY PRINCIPATE¹

1. THE PROBLEM

It is well established in scholarly literature that the incidence of formal, civic patronage in the eastern part of the Roman Empire during the Principate decreases precisely at the same time that it dramatically increases in the West. How is this phenomenon to be explained? Was there a different policy regarding civic patronage in the eastern and western parts of the Empire?

Unfortunately, the raw data for such a study has never been systematically collected and organized. Gelzer, Touloumakos and Chiranky have collected many cases for the Late Republic; Harmand provides some data for the Republic, but stresses the developments in the Principate and Dominate. Not one of them can be said to have provided a complete list.² There is, however, general agreement on several issues. First, the bulk of the Greek evidence on civic patronage is Late Republican or Augustan. Second (and during this period), the cities of the Greek speaking part of the empire extended traditional Hellenistic titles (euergetes, soter, theos, etc.) to Roman magistrates more frequently than they extended the imported title "patron". By my count, and based on incomplete data for the Late Republic, euergetes and soter are about four times more likely to occur epigraphically than is "patron".³ Beginning with Tiberius, however, the traditional Hellenistic titles, with the exception of euergetes, cease to be used in respect to Roman magistrates. Third, formal civic patronage also continued to be offered as it had before (i.e. to governors by peregrine

¹ The patronage discussed here is the formal Roman variety which is not necessarily identical to what the sociologist might recognize. S.Eisenstadt and L.Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends*, Cambridge, 1984. For comments and suggestions I am indebted to W.Eck, J.Reynolds, to my colleagues and friends in the Seminar für Alte Geschichte in Heidelberg, and to the German Fulbright Commission.

² M.Gelzer, "Die Nobilität der römischen Republik", 1912, now in *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1983 = *The Roman Nobility*, tr. by R.Seager, Oxford, 1969; J.Touloumakos, "Zum römischen Gemeindepatronat im griechischen Osten", *Hermes*, 116,1988,304-24; G.Chiranky, "Rome and Cotys: Two Problems", *Athenaeum* 60,1982,461-81; L.Harmand, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques*, Paris 1957. Gelzer and Touloumakos do not offer a list of patrons; Chiranky does, but only for the period between 140 and 44 B.C. Also, K.Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien = Istanbuler Mitteilungen Beiheft 23*, Tübingen, 1979,61-3, and especially 196-232, for the Late Republic to the death of Augustus, but limited to Asia Minor. On the more general problem of public honors, J.Nicols, "Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt", *Chiron* 9,1979,242-60, and G.W.Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965,119-21 especially.

³ Consider the case of Julius Caesar, A.E.Raubitschek, "Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar", *JRS* 44,1954,65ff. has collected the data. The percentages are 82% for euergetes, 65% for soter and 24% for patron. For Agrippa, in contrast, they are 88%, 33% and 11% based on data collected by R.Daniel, M.Vipsanius Agrippa, Breslau 1933. For Pergamon, to take the record of one town, the percentages are 100, 50 and 22, respectively, Tuchelt, 61-3, and especially, 196-232. The calculations are based on the total number of inscriptions mentioning any one of these titles against the number of instances each is recorded.

communities), though on a reduced scale. Though the essence of the first two generalizations is substantially correct, both require clarification; the third demands substantial revision.

2. THE EPIGRAPHICAL RECORD

It will here be argued that Augustus, late in his reign, did indeed define the manner by which public honors were conferred. The regulations, with some exceptions, denied to peregrine communities the freedom to find patrons among their senatorial governors and generally tended to limit civic patronage to citizen communities. Though the legal form remains uncertain, the evidence indicates that they were indeed effective at least for the century or so following A.D. 11.

To understand the nature of the Augustan regulation of A.D. 11/12, it is necessary to review the epigraphical record on civic patronage in the East for the periods preceding and subsequent to that date.

Greek inscriptions for the late Republic indicate that many poleis claimed formal patrons among the Roman senatorial nobility. Moreover, and hardly surprising, most of these patrons were individuals who, like Lucullus and Pompeius, held special commands in the eastern part of the empire or who were at the very least, like Q.Oppius, governors.⁴ There does not appear to be any substantial change in this pattern during the first half of the principate of Augustus.⁵ Just as earlier, senatorial governors continued to receive the title in Greek cities and did so almost to the end of Augustus' reign. For example, M.Valerius Messala Potitus (in about 24 B.C.), C.Antistius Vetus (in about A.D. 3), M.Plautius Silvanus (in about A.D. 6-7) and Q.Poppaeus Sabinus (in about A.D. 13) were all honored as patrons by Greek cities.⁶

In other respects, significant changes were introduced during the second half of his principate. As Octavian, Augustus had accepted the title of patron of many Italian communities. Thereafter he seems to have preferred the title of pater. In the western provinces, however, he accepted the title in citizen communities at least until the death of Agrippa. The epigraphical record on Augustus as patronus ceases around 2 B.C., a date which suggests that, as pater patriae, the Princeps no longer wanted to be coopted by any one town.⁷ Sometime thereafter (probably under Tiberius) this decision appears to have been

⁴ For Lucullus, IGR IV 701; for Pompeius, IGR III 869; for Oppius, J.Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London 1982, No.3. For more examples, Chiranky, 474-87, Touloumakos, 321, and Tuchelt, 61-3.

⁵ The pattern for Augustus and the immediate members of his family and household is somewhat different, but cannot be reviewed here. The subject is treated in forthcoming book.

⁶ On Messala, Ihnken, *Inscr. v. Magnesia* = IK 8, No.2; on Antistius, IGR IV 399; on Silvanus and Sabinus, see Appendix A.

⁷ On the use of pater and pater patriae, A.Alföldi, "Parens patriae" *MusHel* 9,1952,204-43 = *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*, Darmstadt 1978,40-101 and L.Keppie, *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement in Italy*, Rome 1983,114. E.g.: CIL IX 2142, X 206; XII 145. F.Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diokletian*, Diss. Freiburg 1957,18-24. On this issue, Appendix A, No.23.

extended to other members of the imperial family, which suggests that the *patrocinium imperii Romani* was properly the responsibility of the Julian family.⁸

The only list of patrons of Greek communities with any claim to completeness is that of L.Harmand. It is given here (Appendix A) with numerous additions and deletions as noted.⁹ The patterns are sufficiently clear so that one may with confidence predict that new discoveries (or oversights) will not disrupt the scheme.

When one examines the epigraphical record for the period after A.D. 11/12 (the significance of this date is discussed below), one finds a decisive break in the pattern of the civic patronage. First, in terms of numbers, Table 1 demonstrates that after this date patronage was indeed less frequent in the East when compared to the West or even when compared to the East in the Republican and Augustan eras.

Table 1: Epigraphical Attested Cases of Civic Patronage¹⁰

	90 B.C.-A.D. 11/12	A.D. 13 to 117
Eastern Provinces	72	11
Western Provinces	22	61
Italy	27	44

There is then a clear and dramatic decline in the epigraphical incidence of civic patronage in the Greek speaking provinces. Moreover, references to civic patronage are at least five or six times more frequent in the western provinces than they are in the eastern ones. This figure is particularly significant because the East was always more densely urbanized.

Second, the record for both the eastern and western provinces (summarized in Appendices A and B) indicates that peregrine communities suddenly ceased to select patrons of senatorial status and that this is true also in areas, like western Asia Minor, where the tradition had been especially strong (details in Table 2). Citizen communities, however, continued to coopt patrons, if senators, the latter tended to be governors (App. A, Nos. 2 and 4), if equestrian, prominent local citizens (App. A, Nos 1, 6 and 7). In other respects, however, the pattern of *patrocinium publicum* is not discernibly different, East and West, except in terms of absolute numbers. As there were more citizen communities in the West than in the East, it follows that the incidence of public patronage would be greater in the former than in the latter.

⁸ Vell.Pat. II 120.1, Tiberius as *perpetuus patronus Romani imperii*. The last epigraphical reference in the East is to Germanicus as patron of Patras and dates to between A.D. 4 and 14, L.Moretti, RFIC 108,1980,453. As there is no reference to a dedicator, we cannot be certain that civic patronage is the subject. CIL II 609, refers to Drusus, the son of Germanicus, as patron of Medellinum in Spain.

⁹ Harmand, 199-201, includes patrons dating to the period before A.D. 11/12 and after 117, but his list for the triumviral and Augustan periods is, for various reasons, very incomplete. It would be an act of hubris to claim that Appendix A is complete even for the period indicated.

¹⁰ This list does not include members of the Augustan family, like Marcellus, Agrippa, Tiberius, etc. Moreover, no distinction is made between citizen and peregrine communities, but note Table 2.

Only after 135 do we begin to find in the epigraphical record unambiguous cases of peregrine communities acquiring civic patrons.¹¹

Geographically, the cases of patronage of cities in the eastern part of the empire are, between Tiberius and Trajan, to be found primarily in a rectangle defined by Pisidian Antioch in the northeast, Xanthos (if indeed the *Ignotus* No. 13 is properly dated to this period) in the southeast, to Cnossos in the southwest and Bithynia in the northwest. I have not found epigraphical evidence of formal patronal activity of senators in the communities of Egypt (hardly surprizing), Palestine or Syria, or of mainland Greece during the period in question.¹²

More specifically, we have eleven fairly certain cases of civic patronage in the East. Of these, five involve Roman *coloniae* and six peregrine communities.

Table 2: Patrons of Greek Communities, A.D. 11-117

(includes "reasonably certain" cases; the numbers refer to the individuals described in Appendix A, part 1)

	<u>Citizen Community</u>	<u>Peregrine Community</u>
senator as <i>privatus</i>		8
senator as governor	2, 4	3, 9, 10, 11
equestrian/ <i>decurio</i>	1, 6, 7	5

The table appears to suggest that the major hypothesis of this paper, that Augustus regulated patronage so that senators could not become patrons of peregrine communities in the province they administered, is untenable. When the material is examined more closely, however, the hypothesis is not only substantiated, but one also gains considerable insight into several central elements of Roman provincial administration. The argument will be developed in two stages. First, we need to understand the nature of the hypothetical regulation of Augustus and, second, to account for the exceptions (Nos. 3, 9, 10 and 11 in part 1 of Appendix A and for *Lepcis Magna* in Appendix B).

3. THE AUGUSTAN REGULATION OF PUBLIC HONORS

Though there is no direct evidence that Augustus was specifically interested in the regulation of *patrocinium publicum*, we do know that he was concerned about how unscrupulous governors might abuse the public honors they had received from peregrine communities. Indeed, the concern was apparently sufficient to cause him to issue a

¹¹ Note Appendix A, Nos. 19 and 21. If *Ulpia Nicopolis* is indeed a peregrine community as the evidence indicates and if Trajan did not extend some municipal privileges (including the right to name a patron, see below) to her at the time of foundation then 138 would be the first violation in the Greek East.

¹² A case for Syria may be Appendix A, No. 15 and SEG 27,1971, 976 (from *Laodiceia*), but in the latter case, *πάτρωνα* is heavily restored and the date and identities are uncertain.

regulating edict. It needs to be stated clearly before reviewing the details that this regulation was only one step in a series of attempts to resolve the problem.¹³ Cassius Dio describes the process:

"He also issued a proclamation (προσπαρήγγειλε) to the subject nations (τῶ ὑπηκόῳ) forbidding them to bestow any honours upon a person assigned to govern them either during his term of office or within sixty days after his departure; this was because some governors by arranging beforehand for testimonials and eulogies from their subjects were causing much mischief" (56,25.6).

Dio's words are unfortunately very imprecise.¹⁴ Under τῶ ὑπηκόῳ we should understand 'non-citizens' including individual provincials, civitates, provincial assemblies or any combination thereof. This interpretation is supported by Dio's use of the word at 52, 5.4: Agrippa says, "...it is difficult, when so many enemies beset us round about, to reduce again to slavery the allies and subject nations (ὑπηκόους), some of which have had a democratic government from of old, while others of them have been set free by us ourselves."¹⁵ The sense of the regulation is then that senatorial governors should not receive honors from the peregrine communities they governed. Note that Dio appears to include civitates liberae among the peregrine communities. Citizen communities were regulated in this respect by their municipal charters which included specific guidelines for cooptation.¹⁶ Hence, Pisidian Antioch and other colonies in the East could and did coopt patrons (Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6) of both equestrian and senatorial status. It is important to recognize that the very fact of regulation indicates how important civic patronage was considered to be.

Equally inexact is the key word προσπαρήγγειλε. Brunt understands it as something like 'he secured a senatus consultum.' Mason notes that παράγγελμα does often stand loosely for 'edict', which seems to be close to what Dio suggests.¹⁷

What honors did Augustus have in mind? Though Dio specifically mentions only testimonials and eulogies, honors which would require the attention of other emperors, the context and the epigraphical record suggest that Augustus may also have been concerned

¹³ The edict may have been intended to give new force to the older provision of the lex Julia repetundum, Nicols, Verleihung, op.cit., 246.

¹⁴ P.Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege*, Oxford 1970, 112, n.5, referring to similar problems at the beginning of the next chapter in Dio, notes: "Perhaps we have before us an amalgam of regulations issued at several times, and tied only loosely to A.D. 12."

¹⁵ Translated by E.Cary for Loeb Classical Library. Other examples: 52, 27.1 and 30.1. On upekooi, see also D.Nörr, *Imperium und Polis in hohen Prinzipatzeit = Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusf. und Rechtsges.* No.50, Munich 1966, and B.M.Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford 1967, 73 and 79.

¹⁶ Lex Ursonensis, cc. 97 and 130 and the lex Malacitana, c. 61. On the latter, J.González "Lex Imitana", *JRS* 76,1986,218 with recent literature.

¹⁷ P.A.Brunt, "Charges of Provincial Maladministration in the Early Principate", *Historia* 10,1961,216. H.H.Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto 1974,128, stresses that paraggelma has no technical meaning, but see Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, for examples: = "Erlass des Königs" PLond. 904.36, "kaiserl. Edikt" POx. 1411.8, "Verordnung des Statthalters" PHib 78.19.

about more general problems of provincial maladministration and the competition for those public honors which he felt defined his own position.¹⁸

Maladministration was a problem. Indeed, one possibility is to see the 'edict' in connection with L.Valerius Messalla Volesus who was prosecuted and convicted for crimes committed as governor of Asia at about this time.¹⁹ Dio does not discuss the case in any detail nor does he make any connection between the trial and the edict, but the latter may well represent the reaction of Augustus to the former.

There were however more general considerations which may have led Augustus to take this step. Titles like *soter*, *ktistes* and *theos* challenged the uniqueness of his own achievement and could not be allowed to senators. *Euergetes*, as Bowersock suggests, might be permitted because it generally indicated actual gift; in terms of performance, it tended to be more retrospective than prospective. Though *patrocinium* was an import it had become during the late Republic one of the standard honors Greek cities extended to Roman magistrates. If I am right, Augustus eventually concluded that the patronal relationship was not appropriate for peregrine communities.²⁰ Moreover, *patrocinium* involved a number of assumptions about the future behavior of both parties. Most important for this discussion is the fact that in Roman tradition it was considered immoral for clients to bring their patrons to trial (Dion.Hal. II 10.3: "For both patron and client it was impious and immoral [οὔτε ὄσιον οὔτε θέμις] to accuse each other in court"). Hence, an unscrupulous and extortionate governor, who could claim to have a significant number of provincial cities in his clientele, had the moral advantage over his clients and victims. Verres certainly understood this fact; to counter it, Cicero successfully portrayed the Claudii Marcelli as the true patrons and Verres ("the patron and *soter* of the island") as a usurper.²¹

If *patrocinium publicum* was included in this or in related legislation, we would expect to see a particular pattern in the evidence. Specifically, those cases of formal civic patronage communities in the Greek speaking East after 11/12 should involve:

1. patrons who were not senatorial governors in the province of the client community, or
2. clients who were citizen communities.

With the exception of the Bithynian material (discussed below), this is indeed, the pattern in the Greek evidence.

The epigraphical data suggests that regulation may have gone further than Dio reports. By implication Augustus allowed peregrine communities to select patrons from senators who were not their current governors. Nevertheless, communities did not take advantage of this

¹⁸ I have discussed this problem has been discussed more fully in *Verleihung*.

¹⁹ PIR¹ V 96; Kornemann, RE 8A, 170f.

²⁰ This hypothesis is developed more fully in a forthcoming book.

²¹ Cicero, *Verrines*, II,2,114 and 154.

opportunity to acquire senatorial patrons.²² That they did not do so suggests either that they were particularly interested in short-term, administrative benefactions and expected little in this respect from their ex-governors. Alternatively, parallel legislation of Augustus, or at least discretion on the part of provincials and senators, may have discouraged the formation of such connections. Against the first hypothesis is the statement of Herennius Senecio that, because he had (among other things) served as quaestor in the province of Baetica, he would continue to represent its interests at Rome (Plin., ep. VII, 33; a statement that is remarkably similar to one made by Caesar, BHisp. 42). Against the latter there is the fact that there is no parallel for such a restriction anywhere in the legal and epigraphical sources, indeed, all other such regulation forbids such honors only during the term of office and sixty days thereafter.²³ In sum, communities appear to be particularly interested in the administrative benefactions that governors could confer.

There are other patterns in the evidence on public honors that are consistent with the case made for *patrocinium*.

1. Nock and Bowersock have collected the data on the use of *soter*, a title which was frequently applied to Roman governors in the Republican and Augustan periods. After A.D. 11/12 and for the next century, we no longer find such cases, despite the fact that the title continued to be given to non-senatorial easterners.²⁴

2. As I have argued elsewhere, senators do not become patrons of provinces or of their *patriae* in this period.²⁵

3. Eck's data indicate that peregrine communities did not set up monuments to senators at Rome during this period.²⁶

4. The last known cult for a governor (C. Marcius Censorinus) in his province dates to about 8 B.C., a date that is somewhat earlier than might be predicted by my argument, but not inconsistent with it.²⁷

²² Glitius Gallus, Appendix A, No. 7, might appear to be an exception. He had been a senator and he did become patron of the peregrine community at Andros; at the time of appointment, however, he was in exile and probably not a formal member of the senate.

²³ Nicols, Chiron, 1979, op.cit.

²⁴ A.D. Nock, "Soter and Euergetes" in *The Joy of Study: Papers presented to F.C. Grant*, New York 1951, 127ff., especially 142-3 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart, Cambridge MA 1972, II 732-3 and Bowersock, op.cit., p. 120-1. There are two cases in which a senator is called *soter* during this period: Julius Quadratus was honored apparently before he was adlected into the senate and Julius Polemaeus at the time that he was governing another province. In both cases, the individual had close and long standing ties with the cities involved, note Nos. 11 and 17 in Appendix A.

²⁵ For provinces, "Patrons of Provinces in the Early Empire", forthcoming in ZPE; for their *patriae* "Pliny and the Patronage of Communities" *Hermes* 108, 1980, 365-385.

²⁶ Chiron 14, 1984, 212. There are only two for the period in question, one from a citizen community to a senator, L. Cassius Longinus (AE 1930, 70; PIR² C 350) who apparently did not govern the province (not mentioned in this capacity by Pflaum, *Fast. Narbonen.*, or in *Laterculi*). The other, published by Bartolini, is very fragmentary and the identities of the parties honored and honoring are not clear, nor is the date, Ep. e ord. sen., I, 615. For the periods before and after there are respectively six and seven secure cases.

²⁷ SEG II 549, discussed by Bowersock, *Augustus*, Appendix I, 150-1.

5. Peregrine communities cease to contract *hospitium publicum* with senatorial governors during this period, though they readily did so with others.²⁸

That these patterns are all consistent indicates that some kind of legal (or even extra-legal) framework governing public honors must have been put in place late in the principate of Augustus.²⁹

There is, it may be argued, an alternative explanation for this pattern. Could it not be the case that, under the New Order, the peregrine communities did not seek patrons because they recognized that the title was meaningless?³⁰ This explanation should be rejected for two reasons. First, references to civic patronage are frequent all through the reign of Augustus, but cease very abruptly in about A.D. 11/12. Second, the evidence from the citizen communities, East and West, and from Bithynia and Lepcis suggests that the communities of the empire did indeed wish to acquire patrons (especially governors) who were in a position to promote their individual interest. This is not, of course, to say that they were successful in their attempts to manipulate their patron-governor.

To this point, the regulation on public honors has been attributed to Augustus. Indeed, Dio is quite specific that the edict was issued by him. Nonetheless, the timing of the new policy suggests that Tiberius may also have exerted influence. Bowersock argues that the new ordinance was designed to control the competition for honors.³¹ Nonetheless, it is clear Augustus had not been unduly disturbed that governors continued to receive such honors all during his Principate and even at times when he was pursuing his dynastic goals and wanted to stress, for example, the *personae* of C. and L. Caesares. Hence, it may be that the impetus came from Tiberius. It was precisely in A.D. 11/12 that he was ascendant both in the family and in the state. He no longer faced a credible rival in Agrippa Postumus, he was in Rome to celebrate his triumph, had received the *aequum ius* with Augustus and a place between the consuls in the *curia*.³² He may already have determined that he would not become *pater patriae*, a title he continued to stress in respect to Augustus after A.D. 14.³³ Could Tiberius have had some ideas about reserving the title *patronus* for himself? Velleius, in fact, calls him *perpetuus patronus Romani imperii* (II 121).

²⁸ The most recent collection of material is by M. Dolores Dopico Caños, *La Tabula Lougeiorum*, Vitoria, 1988, 67-72. Between A.D. 12 and 117, there are seventeen *tesserae/tabulae*, but only No. 25 (= AE 1962, 287, for Sex. Curvius Silvinus, *qu. pro praetore*, dates to the period. G. Alföldy, *Fast. Hist.*, dates him to Augustus or Tiberius, but the case made here suggests a date before A.D. 11.

²⁹ These restrictions on senatorial use of such titles, with the exception of the one on cults, begin to break down, as noted above, in the Trajanic period. The material is discussed more fully in my forthcoming book, *The Patronage of Communities in the Roman Empire*.

³⁰ P. Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque*, Paris 1976, 767 writes: "...car le patronat n'est pas une chose, une fonction formelle or informelle; c'est un titre honorifique..." Cf. text here at n.40.

³¹ Augustus, 119; also R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 9.

³² On his powers in 11/12, Vell. II 121; Suet. Tib. 21; P. A. Brunt, "C. Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan *Dilectus*", *ZPE* 13, 1971, especially 171-3.

³³ The *Divus Augustus pater* coinage was the largest of the Tiberian principate, C. H. V. Sutherland, *Roman History and Roman Coinage*, 44 B.C. - A.D. 69, Oxford 1987, 39-42.

4. THE RULES AND THE EXCEPTIONS

To this point, it has been demonstrated that Augustus (and Tiberius?) attempted to regulate public honors, but that the epigraphical record is somewhat uncertain. The major problem in the East is the evidence from Bithynia: the patrocinia of four governors, Cadius, Mindius, Pasidienus and Plancius appear to represent clear violations of the Augustan edict. The fact that all these "violations" appear in Bithynia suggests, however, that the province may have been exempted from the Augustan regulations at least in respect to the appointment of civic patrons. The source of this exception may have been the *lex Pompeia* which was still the governing charter of the province under Trajan.

In brief, Pompeius, probably by virtue of the *lex Manilia*, issued a charter for Bithynia in ca. 63, which was probably confirmed in Caesar's legislation of 59 and modified, apparently in minor ways by Augustus either in 29 (when he re-established the province) or in 20. In contrast to other Pompeian provincial settlements, for example in Pamphylia, this one had considerable permanence.³⁴

The charter established twelve poleis in the province (Plin. NH V 14.3) and introduced at least some Roman usages into their civic administration. For example, admission to and tenure in the local *boulé* followed the Roman model with permanent senates enrolled by censors.³⁵ Among other provisions, it may also have established norms by which the twelve cities of the province might acquire patrons. As noted above, such provisions are characteristic of the charters of cities established on the Roman model. That Pompeius would include a section on civic patronage in his law is consistent with his well known pride in his many *clientelae* (e.g., Cic. ad fam. IX 9.2: *regnum ac nationum clientelis quas ostendere crebro solebat*). Moreover, the epigraphical record supports the hypothesis that the cities of Bithynia had a notable interest in acquiring patrons. A good example is the enormous monument (over 9 m. long) that at least nine Bithynian communities set up at Rome to their proconsul and patron, Rufus. Though it cannot be dated exactly, it probably belongs, as Eck has suggested, to the triumviral period. Notable is the fact that, though the monument is a unit, each individual city claims Rufus as a patron.³⁶

³⁴ In general on Bithynia: A.H.M.Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford 1971,159; A.N.Sherwin-White, *Roman Citizenship*, Second Edition, Oxford 1973,303 and 376; on Plin.Ep. X 114; A.J.Marshall, "The Greek City in the Roman World: Pontus and Bithynia", *Praktika of the 7. Congress for Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, Athens, 1984,120-33. Also, Abbott, and Johnson, 72. On ratification, Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, Oxford, 1966, on X 79. On Augustus' re-organization in 29 and 20 B.C., Dio 51, 20.6 and 54, 7.5; on his edict, Plin. epp. X 80 and 84. On the relative permanence of the settlement, Strabo, XII 3.1 and Jones, 166, Antonius was especially disruptive.

³⁵ Sherwin-White, *Citizenship*, 303 and 376; Jones, *Cities*, 159.

³⁶ On the date, Eck, *Chiron* 14,1984,209. Though the *koinon* is not mentioned, the unitary character of the monument does suggest collective action. This does not necessarily mean that Rufus was the patronus provinciae.

Even if this interest in civic patronage is manifest, it is not clear whether Bithynia simply disregarded the provisions the edict of A.D. 11/12 (or parallel legislation) or, alternatively, was exempted. There is evidence for both hypotheses, but the latter would appear the more likely. It has long been recognized that at least some sections of the *lex Pompeia*, e.g., the ban on plural citizenship, were not being enforced in the time of Pliny. Moreover, Pliny's correspondence indicates "the proconsuls were very much left to themselves in the century before Nerva's accession" and they may not have been concerned to enforce provisions the provincials felt were "unnatural".³⁷ Still, it may have been one thing to violate "unnatural" (for the Greeks) provisions of the Pompeian charter, it was something else to violate an edict of Augustus.

The more plausible hypothesis is that among the Roman models introduced by the *lex Pompeia*, there was also one which regulated the appointment of patrons. Augustus must have accepted this section of the charter(s) when he reviewed the provincial organization in the 20's B.C., that is, at a time when he had no open misgivings about governors becoming the patrons of peregrine communities. Even so, would Bithynia have been exempted from the edict of A.D. 11/12? This may well have been the case. Trajan, in responding to a request from Pliny for a ruling on the applicability of one item of imperial legislation in the latter's province, notes: *sed inter eas provincias, de quibus rescripsit, non est Bithynia* (ep. X, 66.2). Indeed, Pliny and Suetonius indicate that, in the first century, A.D., there was considerable variety in the details and privileges of each city's constitution.³⁸ Finally, a comparison with the province of Asia, which had a long and rich tradition of Roman patrons, is instructive: Civic patronage for governors, men who were among the most important of their age, ceases absolutely at this time.

Hence, the conclusion should be that the *lex Pompeia*, which remained essentially unchanged in Bithynia from 63 B.C. through the reign of Trajan, also defined the manner in which patrons might be acquired by cities. Such criteria may have been fairly similar to what we find in the *lex Ursonensis* (c. 130: senators must be *sine imperio*). It may well be that Pompeius included the same provision in other provincial charters, but, for one reason or another, the latter were rescinded. Hence, we find a clear epigraphic and numismatic record of civic patrons in the peregrine communities of Bithynia in the period from Augustus to Trajan, but nowhere else in the eastern provinces.

If the edict of Augustus were valid throughout most of the East, we should also expect to find traces of the same pattern in the West. Appendix B is a list of reasonably certain cases of civic patronage in the Western Provinces for the same period (A.D. 13 to 117). It is

³⁷ On un-enforced provisions, *Plin.Ep. X 114*, and Sherwin-White, *ad loc.* On the independence of governors, Sherwin-White's comments to *Plin. Ep. X 73*. Unfortunately, Sherwin-White does not make it clear whether this was characteristic of Roman provincial administration, in general, or of Bithynia, in particular. On the unnatural character of some of the provisions, Sherwin-White, *Citizenship*, 303.

³⁸ *Plin. Ep. X 84: concessa...a divo Augusto to the Nicaeans*, also *X 109. Suet. Vesp. 8.*

immediately apparent that the same pattern also prevails there: Citizen communities coopt patrons. Most of these were senators who are known to have governed in the province of the client; those of equestrian status were either prominent locals or imperial officials known to have served in the area.

As in the East, there is a notable exception. Lepcis Magna, a peregrine community, secured the patronage of many of the governors of Africa proconsularis between A.D. 13 and 117. The status of the city has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate. There is general agreement that Lepcis, as a *civitas libera et immunis*, reorganized itself and adopted a constitution on the Roman model probably as early as 5 B.C. At that time it acquired a number of privileges, including the right to issue its own coins ('*ius feriendi*'). By the time of Vespasian, there are indications that Lepcis might also have become a genuine *municipium*, or at least had the right to call itself one.³⁹ During the reign of Trajan, it achieved colonial status (IRT 353). Even if we accept the argument of di Vita-Evrard that it was a Flavian municipality, we still have to explain how it was that Lepcis acquired at least four patrons in Julio-Claudian period. The answer, as with Bithynia, should be that her constitution allowed her to coopt patrons, that this right was guaranteed in the provincial charter and was not rescinded by the edict(s) of A.D. 11/12. It should be stressed that the critical factor here was not that Lepcis was a *civitas libera*, there are many cities with this status who do not have patrons, or even that it enjoyed a number of privileges. Significant is that it had adopted a Roman style constitution, a constitution which must have contained a section similar to those found in the *leges Ursonensis* and *Malacitana* and one which defined how patrons were to be appointed. That patrons could be important to peregrine communities is demonstrated by the fact that Lepcis acquired ten of them during the first century, the highest number by far during this period.⁴⁰

It is reasonable to conclude that Nicomedia, Nicaea and Lepcis regularly secured the patronage of the provincial governor and that other peregrine communities would have done so, if they had been allowed to.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The word "*πάτρωνα*" should not be casually restored to Greek inscriptions in this period. In particular it should be replaced by *εὐεργέτην* or *κηδέμωνα* in BCH 50,1926,443 n. 80 (for Memmius Regulus) and IGR IV 125 (for Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa).

³⁹ M. Grant, *FITA*, 371; J. Reynolds, *IRT* 79f.; Sherwin-White, *Roman Citizenship*, 363; H.E. Herzig, "Die Laufbahn des Lucius Septimius Severus, Sufes", *Chiron* 2,1972,394-404; G. di Vita-Evrard, "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna", *Bull. Arch. = BCTH* 17-B, 1981,198-209. Herzig argues that it had the right to name itself a *municipium*, 400; di Vita-Evrard, that it was a "municipe latin dans la plénitude du terme", 209.

⁴⁰ They are evenly divided between the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods. Thugga had five, but they are all members of the local aristocracy, though note Licinius Tyrannus, a *libertus*, C.VIII 26518. Hippo Regius had three, all were senators and at least two were governors.

More generally, Augustus recognized that *patrocinium publicum* might serve the New Order, but he also perceived the dangers. As patron, a governor might be encouraged by his clients to promote Romanization and urbanization. But, because the Roman ethical system reckoned it as immoral for a client (community) to go to court against the patron, senators with tendencies to extortion may then have believed that they were protected from prosecution by the title. If so, they were mistaken, for the governors of Bithynia, where senatorial governors could become patrons, were the most frequently prosecuted of all.⁴¹ This not to argue that the emperors believed that provincial maladministration could be prevented by banning *patrocinium*, but that one important temptation was removed.

What, then, was the policy of Augustus? Because *patrocinium publicum* was closely associated with the history of the Republic, he could not deny citizen communities the right to coopt patrons, even if the former were in the provinces and the latter were senators. Peregrine communities, in contrast, might extend significant and extravagant honors of a secular or religious character to the Princeps and even to prominent locals, but not to senatorial governors.⁴² The diplomatic aspects of *patrocinium* were, thereby, reserved for the Princeps. In support of this argument, it should be noted that the pattern of other public honors in this period is very similar. Senators do not become patrons of provinces or of their *patria*, they are not honored as *hospites* or as *soteres*, nor do provincial communities set up "Ehrendenkmäler" to them at Rome. Moreover, and to judge by the epigraphical record, the restriction on all of these honors breaks down at about the same time. These consistent patterns indicate that there must have been some kind of legal framework governing the public honors which was instituted late in the reign of Augustus and enforced until that of Trajan.

There is then no fundamentally different policy for the East and West; the observed differences depend rather on the status of the community and the status of the patron. After A.D. 11/12, only those peregrine communities which had constitutions on the Roman model, and one which gave them (what might be called) a *ius cooptandi* or *adoptandi*, acquired patrons. That the numbers of civic patrons were so much greater in the West than in the East is a consequence of the absolutely greater number of citizen communities in the West. Moreover, if this argument is valid, then the existence of a formal patron of senatorial status in a peregrine community should indicate a change in the constitution or in the status of that community, or both.

Augustus must have been of two minds about civic patronage. On one hand, the role of patronage in the crisis of the Late Republic demonstrated that it was potentially dangerous for the Ruler, for provincials and ultimately for the State. On the other hand, he must also have seen the advantages for his urban and imperial programs. His solution was subtle and

⁴¹ Brunt, *Charges*, especially p.224. Seven cases of forty involved the Bithynians. As not one of the cases is mentioned in Book X, there is not reason to discount Pliny's evidence.

⁴² Bowersock, 119 and 150; also R.Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, esp. p.9.

effective. First, *patrocinium publicum* was to be understood as a privilege or benefaction reserved for citizen communities. Second, by taking the title *pater patriae*, Augustus could set himself above other patrons and, if he so wished, might claim to be, as was suggested for Tiberius, *patronus perpetuus Romani imperii* (Vell. II, 120). Third, by a combination of regulation and incentive, he successfully changed the expectations about the role of civic patronage. No longer was the patron associated with the levying of auxiliary forces to fight civil wars and extortionate governorships and taxes, but he now appears as a public benefactor.⁴³ Once civic patronage became equated with public benefaction there was no longer any reason to regulate the award of the title.

APPENDIX A

Patrons of Cities in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire between A.D. 11 and ca. 117

The material is divided into four groups. The first includes cases that are relatively clear in respect to date and identity of both parties. The second group consists of cases where the text is very uncertain or has been incorrectly restored and, consequently, where there is no certainty about date and/or identities. The third group consists of cases which are properly dated to periods beyond the range of this study and is not intended to be complete. The fourth lists one interesting case of imperial patronage dating to the period. Harmand, 199-201 lists other patrons not relevant for this study.

Part I: Certi

1. ... Aedituus, patron of Cnossus

AE 1900, 215.

Clearly not a senator or a governor, but a *duovir* of the Roman colony at Cnossus and a provincial *flamen*. Date cannot be determined exactly, but is post 79.

2. L. Antistius Rusticus, patron of Antiochia Pisidia

AE 1925, 126; PIR² A 765; RE Suppl. VI, 7, No.41; *Laterculi*, I 266, Eck, *Chiron* 12,1982,321, R.Syme, *Historia* 32,1983,359-74 = *Roman Papers* IV 278-94. *Legatus Augusti* for Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus, Pisidia, etc. in 92-3.

Antiochia is a Roman colony. He was active in minimizing the effects of a famine.

3. C. Cadius Rufus, patron of Nicomedia

Waddington, et al., *Recueil*, I 2 *Koinon Bithyniae*, No.6; I 3, *Nicomedia*, Nos. 20 and 23 = Bosch, II 1, 82. PIR² C 6; RE III 1170; *Laterculi*, I 244. *Proconsul* of Bithynia-Pontus at

⁴³ On auxiliaries, Caes. BCiv. I 29, 61; II 18; on governors, Cic. Verr. II 2.154, on extraordinary taxes and patronage, R.Merkelbach, *ZPE* 16,1975,39-42 and 31,1978,36-7 (in reference to L.Antonius). Also: Nicols, *Patronage of Communities in the Roman Empire*, forthcoming; on the expectations about patronage in the Principate, Nicols, id. and R.Duthoy, "Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le principat", *L'Antiquité classique*, 53,1984,145.

sometime between 43-8 (see below). CIL VI 1508, a monument in honor of a Rufus, dates to the late republic and cannot refer to Cadius, Eck, Chiron 14,1984,201ff. Also SEG 29,1979,992.

Nicomedia was a peregrine community and appears to be a clear violation of the Augustan regulation. Tacitus notes (Ann. XII, 22), that Cadius was prosecuted on the complaints of the Bithynians and convicted under the *lex repetundarum*. There is, however no specific connection made between patronage and the conviction. The Bithynian material is discussed in the body of the article.

4. P.Calvisius Ruso Julius Frontinus, patron of Antiochia Pissidia.

AE 1924,126. PIR² C 350; RE III 1411, No.10; Laterculi, I 268; Eck, Chiron 12,1982,340; R.Syme, ZPE 56,1984,173-92 = Roman Papers IV 397-417, with bibliography. Legatus Augusti for Cappadocia, Galatia, etc., in 104-7.

Antiochia is a Roman colony.

5. Q.Casellius Geminus, patron of Kaunos

SEG XIV 647. Not in Harmand. Casellius is not otherwise known. No rank is given, hence he is presumably a local. The inscription dates to about A.D. 30.

6. L.Flavonius Paullinus, patron of Pisidian Antioch

Not in Harmand. Stein, Ritterstand, 314-5; Levick, JRS 48,1958,74.

Probably of equestrian rank and a duovir at the colonia of Antioch besides being patron. Father of the following and grandfather of a senator.

7. C.Flavonius Anicianus Sanctus, patron of Pisidian Antioch

Not in Harmand. Levick, JRS 48,1958,74-8. Inschr. von Ephesus = IK 14, No.1238. PIR² F 446; SEG 26,1976/7,127.

Flavonius was not a senator, but of equestrian rank and a duovir of his patria, a colonia.

8. P.Glitius Gallus, patron and euergetes of Andros

Not in Harmand. IG XII 5, 757 = Syll.³ 811. Also mentioned by Tacitus, ann. XV 56 and 71; hist. I 90; Plut. Otho. 1. PIR² G 184; RE Suppl. 3, Glitius, No.2.

Sent into exile on Andros by Nero after Pisonian Conspiracy. Tacitus notes only that he and others exilia data, which probably included loss of senatorial dignity.⁴⁴ He was recalled (i.e., probably readmitted to the senate) by Galba and at least part of his property was restored by Otho. His wealthy wife, Egnatia Maximilla (also honored as euergetes) accompanied him. Groag (in RE) suggests that the inscription would have been set up after Galba had recalled him to Rome and Otho restored his property. The benefactions to Andros probably date to the time of their arrival on the island when Egnatia's considerable fortune was still intact. Her benefactions may have led to the subsequent confiscation of her property (Tac. ann. XV 71).

⁴⁴ Note the penalty for Pedius Blaesus, Tac. Ann. XIV 18.1. On exile, P.Garney, Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire, Oxford, 1970,111-122. The language of literary writers is not exact, suggesting that there was considerable variation in treatment.

9. L.Mindius Pollio, patron of Nicomedia

Not in Harmand. Waddington, et al., Recueil I 3, Commune Bithyniae, Nos. 1,3,4,5 = Bosch, II 1,80 = SNG (Aulock) 271. PIR² M 598; RE XV 1773,6; Laterculi I 243. Nicols, Chiron, 9,1979,256.

Proconsul of Bithynia under Claudius, probably before 48.

He was probably patron of Nicomedia (for the arguments, Nicols, Verleihung, and "Patrons of Provinces in the Early Principate", forthcoming in ZPE.

10. P.Pasidienus Firmus, patron of Nicomedia

Not in Harmand. Waddington, et al., Recueil III Nicomedia, Nos. 18 and 19 = Bosch, II, 1, 82 = SNG (Aulock) 738, 7100; (Copenhagen) 18, 550. PIR¹ P 103; RE XVIII 2058; Laterculi I 243. Proconsul of Bithynia under Claudius. The Bithynian material is discussed in the main text.

11. M.Plancius Varus, patron of Niceae (Bithynia)

Not in Harmand. S.Mitchel, JRS 64,1974,27. hahin, Bithynian Studies = IK 7,14-15; RE Suppl. XIV, 485, No.5; Eck, Chiron 13,1983,202, Laterculi I, 245; Tituli II, 642.

Citizen of Perge in Pamphylia; praetorius in 69; quaestor and later proconsul of Bithynia. He was a legatus pro praetore in Achaea and in Asia before 75, but not consul or proconsul of Asia.

II. Incerti (for reasons as noted)

12. M.Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa, Hierapolis or Comana in Cappadocia

Waddington, BCH 7,1883,128, no.3 = IGR III 125. PIR² N 56; RE XVI 2545, No.10 and Suppl. VI 7, No.10; Laterculi I 264; Eck, Chiron 12,1982,299. Legatus Augusti for Cappadocia, Galatia, etc. in 79, R.P.Hopkins, "Tituli Comanorum Cappadociae", AS 18,1968,94-5.

The word $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\nu\alpha$ has been restored at the end of line 4. As the whole right side of this inscription is missing and as there are no cases for this outside of Bithynia, the restoration should be rejected, $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ is more likely. Hopkins also questions $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\nu\alpha$.

13. Ignotus, patron and euergetes of demos of Myra (Lycia)

Not in Harmand. Büyükkonlanci, et. al., ZPE 40,1980,256-8, No.6 = IK Ephesus 17, No.3903. No trace of rank, personal name or of date. Lettering suggests the late Hellenistic period through Augustus.⁴⁵

14. Ignotus, patron and euergetes of Xanthos in Lycia

Not in Harmand. A.Balland, Fouilles de Xanthos VII 123, No.48.

Balland dates the inscription to the reign of Nero, despite the fact that his best parallel career dates to the mid 2nd century. There is no indication that he came from Lycia or governed the

⁴⁵ My thanks to Prof. F.Gschnitzer for discussing the problem with me.

province, though he did apparently command a legion in Syria, close enough for his services to be considered of value also to the people of Xanthos. Balland suggests that he may have been patronus causae, but he may also have owned property in the area or have married into a local family (cf. No.21 below and note 24).

15. P.Memmius P. f. Regulus, patron of Thespieae(?) and Pergamon(?) or of Alexandria Troas

a. = Plassart, BCH 50,1926,443, no.80, Groag, Reichsbeamten 26, for Thespieae

b. (for Pergamon) and

c. (for Alexandria Troas) = CIL III 7090 = D.962.

PIR² M 468; RE XV 626, No.29; Laterculi I 191. Legatus Augusti of Moesia, etc., from 35-41/44; Proconsul of Asia, ca. 48/9.

It has been claimed or suggested that he was patron of several Greek communities, of Thespieae (a.) and of Pergamon (b.) or of the colonia of Alexandria Troas (c.). The evidence in all instances is weak. The case for Thespieae (a.) rests on Plassart' reconstruction of line 2 (where about 15 to 19 letters are missing at the beginning of the line) to read [ἐαυτοῦ πατρωνα ἀρετ]ῆς ἕνεκεν. There is nothing compelling about this suggestion. Indeed, εὐεργέτην fits equally well into the space and, is paralleled on four other contemporary dedications to Memmius (IG II/III² 4174 and 4175; Inschr. v.Olympia, 337; IG IV 1139 = 665). There is no reason to consider him a patron of Thespieae. PIR² is cautious, mentioning only that he was honored at the town. That Memmius was patronus Pergamenorum (b.) is not suggested by Harmand, but appears, as far as I can tell, first in PIR². CIL III 7090, was indeed found at Pergamon and Memmius is named as patron, but the inscription was set up by a certain Potamon. Because the text is in Latin, Mommsen attributed the monument not to Pergamon, but to the Roman colonists of Alexandria Troas. As the text does not refer to him as patronus coloniae, or mention a colony or any community at all (as is frequently the case, cf. AE 1925, 126 for Antistius Rusticus), the most plausible interpretation is that it honors a personal rather than a public patron. As a colonia, however, there would be not conflict with the argument advanced here.

16. L.Popillius Balbus, patron of an unknown community with a Greek constitution

CIG 4697b = 4529 and p.1175 = IGR III 1209, 1540; PIR¹ P 622; RE XXII Popillius No.36; Laterculi I 306. R.Syme, ZPE 61,1981,125-44 = Roman Papers III 1381. Legatus of Claudius at some time between 41-55.

Harmand makes three different patrons out of what is one inscription.⁴⁶ There are a number of problems with this case. The man is not otherwise known. Thomasson assigns him to a

⁴⁶ P. 200, based on IGR III 1209 and 1540. It is not at all clear why IGR, which refers to the addendum CIL III, p.1175 should assign the first text (1209) to Joppe. On this inscription, E.Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135), rev. and ed. by G.Vermes, F.Millar and M.Black, II 113, n.145. There is a persistent tradition in the epigraphical literature of the 19th Century that the inscription does come from the Syrian coast. My thanks to W.Eck for this reference.

gap in the list of governors of Syria between 49 and 51, but does so reluctantly because the text does not designate him as "antistrategos". Syme, referring to C. III 6703, does not however consider this to be a serious impediment to assigning him a governorship and consulate. Both Syme and Thomasson suggest that he may have been legatus of one of the Syrian legions (for presbeutes as legatus legionis, AE 1965,320; SEG 18,216). Moreover, the name of the client community is not known. The editors of CIG and IGR think it must have been Berytus, a colonia.⁴⁷ The wording of the text is most unusual for colonies, but not unparalleled.⁴⁸ If indeed, the client community is the colony of Berytus, then there is no problem as far as this argument is concerned. Even if the client is not Berytus (Syme suggests a city on the coast of Syria or Cilicia Pedias), there are still too many questions to be answered before the text can be evaluated properly. If the thesis of this article is accepted, he should be removed from the list of governors of Syria.

III. Patrons which are not to be attributed to this period

17. C.Julius Plancius Varus Cornutus, patron and euergetes of Perge in Pamphylia

Not in Harmand. S.Jameson, JRS 55,1965,54-7; D. 1024; Syme, Historia 18,1969,365f. = Roman Papers II 787ff. Eck, Chiron, 13,1983,192; Tituli II, 642.
Consul and perhaps legate of Cilicia under Hadrian. He is not known to have been governor of Pamphylia.

18. M.Plautius Silvanus, patron of Attaleia

AE 1941,147 = SEG VI 646; PIR¹ F 361; RE XXI 30, No.43; R.Syme, Klio 27,1934,139-43. Harmand (p.201) dates him to the reign of Nero. No M.Plautius Silvanus is known to be active in the imperial administration at this time. Silvanus must be the consular colleague of Augustus in 2 B.C., and the latter's legate in the East in A.D. 6-7.

19. C.Poppaeus Sabinus, patron of Delphi

Waddington, Fast. No.68 (Delphi) also in Groag, Reichsbeamten 25. PIR¹ P 627; RE XXII 82, No.1; Laterculi I 190. Governor of Achaia from 15-35; of Moesia, from 11/12.
Patron and euergetes of Delphi. As the inscription does not mention any office, it should be dated to the period between 11/12, when he became governor of Moesia, and (if my argument here is correct) 15, when Achaia was added.

20 C.Rubrius Vinicius (?) Porcius Marcellus, patron of Ulpia Nicopolis

AE 1926,91. PIR¹ P 639; RE XXII 227, No.37; Suppl. XIV 589, No.22a; Eck, Chiron 13,1983,184; Laterculi I 164. Legatus Augusti in Thrace in 138.

⁴⁷ F.Vittinghoff, Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik. Abh.Mainz, 1954, No.14, Wiesbaden, 134-5.

⁴⁸ Rubrius Porcius Marcellus was patron of Ulpia Nicopolis and was honored by the boule kai demos, but this town may not have been a proper colonia. On this issue, B.M.Levick, Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor, Oxford 1967,73 and 79, and CIL III 6883 from Cremna in Pisidia.

Patron of Ulpia Nicopolis ad Istrum, a foundation, perhaps a colonia, of Trajan in 138.

21. Q.Voconius Sex. f. Saxa Fidus, patron of Phaselis

D.8828 = IGR III 763f = SEG 31,1987,1300. RE Suppl. IX 1834, No.14. Not in Harmand. He was leg. Aug in Lycia-Pamphylia ?143-7 (Alföldy, Konsulat, ad loc. Barbieri, speculating on the name of his son, concludes he was married to a woman from the eastern part of the empire (Albo, 614); if so, the patronage of Phaselis may indicate her origin.

22. Terentius Marcianus, patron of Termessos

AE 1900, 128 = PLRE I 557, Marcianus No.22.

Harmand dates him to the period 74-135, but was probably praeses of Lycia-Pamphylia in the late 3rd or early 4th century.

IV. Emperors as Patrons ??

23. M.Cocceius Nerva, patron of Teos in 96 ?

AE 1927,43

Harmand, 165, and Touloumakos, 322, date the inscription to immediately after the death of Domitian. It refers however, to the consul ordinarius of 36 B.C., note D.8780, to the same man.

Addendum

E.Varinliolu ("Inscripfen von Stratinokeia in Karien", EA 12,1988,93) mentions a 'neugefundenen' inscription from Stratinokeia which proclaims a M.Junius Silanus as "patron and euergetes". Varinliolu tentatively ('wahrscheinlich') identifies him as proconsul of Asia in A.D. 54(?), PIR² J 833 = RE X 1079, No.176. Proper evaluation of this text will have to wait until publication. Münzer notes the difficulty in assigning "Notizen und Inschriften" to the Junii Silani of the late Republic and Principate. The Silanus in question might also be the proconsul of Asia in 76 B.C., and patron of Mylassa, LeBas-Waddington, no.409.

APPENDIX B

Patrons of Communities in the Western Part of the Empire, A.D. 13 to 117

Date	Nomen	Cognomen	Offices in Region	Client	Status	Evidence
------	-------	----------	-------------------	--------	--------	----------

Rank:DECURIO?

37	Postumius	Chius		Thugga	citz	IL Afr 558
75	Attenius C.f.	Afer		Epora	citz	C ii 2159

Rank: DECURIO

40 Julius L.f.	Crassus		Thugga	citiz	C viii 26475
40 Praeclus L.f.	Clemens		Salona	citiz	C iii 2028=EE iv 259
42 Caesetius C.f.	Perpetuus	scrd Aesc/Jov; pr i d Kartha	Thugga	citiz	C viii 26519
48 Artorius	Bassus		Thugga	citiz	C viii 26517
80 Cornelius Q.f.	Persa	flam prov Lysitan	Ossonoba	subj	D'Encarnnação,Conimbr 84
100 Julius T.f.	Valerianus		Vienna	citiz	C xii 2608
110 Fulvius	Carisianus		Arva	citiz	C ii 1064

Rank: EQUESTRIAN → SENATOR

73 Sempronius	Fuscus	praef coh, procos Baetica	Augusta Firma	citiz	C v 5127; AE 1962 288
---------------	--------	---------------------------	------------------	-------	-----------------------

Rank:

27 Silius	Aviola	trib mil leg iii Aug	Apisa maius	subj	C v 4921
27 Silius	Aviola	trib mil leg iii Aug	Siagu	subj	C v 4921
27 Silius	Aviola	trib mil leg iii Aug	Themetra	subj	C v 4919
27 Silius	Aviola	trib mil leg iii Aug	Thimiliga	subj	C v 4920
55 Afranius Sex f.	Burrus		Vasio	citiz	C xii 5842=D.1321
65 Aufustus C.f.	Macrinus		Gurza	subj	C viii 69
100 Cominius M.f.	Aemilianus	fl Narb, fl Nem, cur Aq.	Vasio	citiz	C xii 3212/13 + add.
107 Caesernius T.f.	Status	proc Aug Maur Caes	gns Mauror Maccum	subj	AE 1904 150=D.900

Rank: LIBERTUS

25 Licinius M.l.	Tyrannus		Thugga	citiz	C viii 26518
------------------	----------	--	--------	-------	--------------

Rank: REX

35 Ptolemaeus			Caesarea	subj	C viii 20977
---------------	--	--	----------	------	--------------

Rank: SENATOR

16 Vibius C.f.	Habitus	procos Afr	Assuras	citiz	AE 1913,40
19 Aemilius	Lepidus	leg of governor	Rusguliae	citiz	C viii 9247
22 Cornelius	Lentulus	leg leg	Banasa	citiz	AE 1954,260
23 Volusius L.f.	Saturninus	leg Aug Dalm	Aenona	citiz	C iii 2975-6
24 Aemilius	Regillus	non known	Saguntum	citiz	C ii 3837=D.949
26 Pontilius	Fergellanus		Salona	citiz	C iii 8715
33 Cassius L.f.	Longinus	leg pro pr	Arelate	citiz	AE 1930 70
33 Mennius P.f.	Regulus		Ruscino	citiz	ILG 633
35 Rubellius C.f.	Blandus	procos Afr	Lepcis	libr	IRT 330

36 Etrilius	Lupercus	leg procos	Lepcis	libr	IRT 330
41 Servilius M.f.	Nonianus	procos Afr	Utica	citiz	C viii 24585a; AE 1932 24
42 Allius	Maximus		Hippo regius	citiz	AE 1935 32
42 Licinius	Crassus	leg with father in Mauret.	Volubilis	citiz	AE 1943,43
42 Marcus C.f.	Barea	procos Afr.	Hippo regius	citiz	AE 1935,32
42 Marcus C.f.	Barea	procos Afr.	Lepcis	subj	IRT 273
52 Pompeius	Silvanus	procos Afr	Lepcis	libr.	IRT 338=AE 1948,17
55 Julius Q.f.	Secundus	leg pr pr	Tupusuctu	citiz	C viii 8837=D.6103
58 Aelius M.f.	Gracilis	?	Dertosa	citiz	EE ix 385
62 Cornelius Ser f.	Scipio	procos Africae	Lepcis	libr	IRT 341
62 Ducennius	Geminus	leg Aug Dalmat	Narona	citiz	D.9484
70 Caecina	Alienus		Bosa	citiz	EE viii 227
72 Funisulanus L.f.Vettonianus		leg Aug Dalm-Pann-Moes.	Andautonia	citiz	C iii 4013=D.1005
72 Manlius	Ancharius	procos Afr	Lepcis	citiz	C viii 22671=IRT300
75 Sentius Sex f.	Caecilianus	leg Aug Mauret	Banasa	citiz	AE 1941,79;D.8979
77 Domitius	Ponticus	praetor pro pr	Lepcis	citiz	IRT 342
78 Paccius	Africanus	procos Afr	Lepcis	citiz	IRT 342
78 Paccius	Africanus	procos Afr	Hippo regius	citiz	AE 1949,76
80 Galerius	Trachalus	procos Afr	Utica	citiz	ILAFr 419
82 Avidius	Quietus	leg Aug in Thrace	Deultum	citiz	C vi 31692=D.6105
83 Nonius L.f.	Asprenas	procos Afr	Lepcis	citiz	IRT 346
90 Ignotus	BE	leg leg ?	Latobici	citiz	C iii 10804
93 Domitius Sex f.	Afer	procos Afr	Lepcis	citiz	Epigraphica 7(1945)8.4
98 Licinius Q.f.	Silvanus		Baetulo	citiz	AE 1936,66
100 Glitius P.f.	Atilius	leg Aug Pann	...enacates?	citiz	C v 6987,6986
100 Glitius P.f.	Atilius	leg iurid Hisp cit	Calagurris?	citiz	C v 6987,6986
105 Julius Sex f.	Maximus	leg iur Tarrac	Calagurris	citiz	X xii 3167=D.1016
105 Terentius	Gentianus		Sarmizege- tusa	citiz	C iii 1463
106 Minicius L.f.	Natalis	leg pr pr Africae	Cirta	citiz	C viii 7069
110 Ignotus	AP	leg Aug Germ sup?	Aventicum	citiz	C xiii 5089=D.1020
110 Larcus A.f.	Priscus	leg Aug exer.Afr	Thamugadi	citiz	C viii 17891=D.1055
116 Ignotus	AK		Avennio	citiz	C xii 3169