

PATRONAGE OF COLLECTIVES: THE RELATIONS
BETWEEN PATRONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN
NORTHERN ITALY

PATRONAGE OF COLLECTIVES: THE RELATIONS BETWEEN
PATRONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN NORTHERN ITALY

By PIERO D'ALONZO, B.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment
of the
Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts in Classics

McMaster University © Copyright by Piero D'Alonzo, August 2021

McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS IN CLASSICS (2021) Hamilton,
Ontario (Classics)

TITLE: Patronage of Collectives: The Relations Between Patrons and Local
Communities in Northern Italy.

AUTHOR: Piero D'Alonzo, B.A. (University of Toronto).

SUPERVISOR: Professor C. Eilers.

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 146.

ABSTRACT

Piero D'Alonzo: Patronage of Collectives: The Relations Between Patrons and Local Communities in Northern Italy (Under the direction of Professor Claude Eilers, Professor Michele George, and Professor Martin Beckmann).

The role of Roman patrons and their relations with local communities is investigated. Northern Italy has been chosen as the region where this investigation will be carried out. It will be shown that the institution of patronage in northern Italy underwent a process of decline as the rest of the empire. This point will be displayed by taking into consideration the legal, literary, and epigraphic body of evidence related to the institution of patronage in northern Italy. A careful reading of the sources will show that the title of *patronus* was granted by local communities as a reward for the *patronus*'s generosity. Such title did not obligate these *patroni* to benefit their communities, although many did. This gradual process of decline ultimately reached its peak under the 2nd century AD when patronage transformed into a symbolic institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Claude Eilers and the other members of my thesis committee Professor Michele George and Professor Martin Beckmann for their insight and advice.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: What is Patronage?

Chapter Two: The Co-optation of Patrons and Their Relationships with Their Client Communities in Northern Italy During the Imperial Period

Chapter Three: Patronage or Euergetism?

Chapter Four: Cities, *Collegia*, and *Patroni*: Looking at the Selections of *Patroni* in Northern Italy

Chapter Five: Conclusion

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The author declares that the content of this research has been completed by Piero D'Alonzo, with gratitude for the contributions of his supervisory committee consisting of Professor Claude Eilers, Professor Michele George, and Professor Martin Beckmann.

The author hopes that he has furthered the study of Roman patronage by the employment of a novel approach for its treatment. Further, he hopes that his thesis has shown that northern Italy provides an important case study for the decline of Roman patronage, which is contrary to prevailing scholarship.

Chapter One: What is Patronage?

The study of patronage has long been a subject of interest in Roman history. Mommsen used it in order to understand the relationships of power between patricians and plebians in early Rome.¹ He argued that patronage contributed to the transformation of the plebian class from a non-citizen to a citizen body.² Subsequently, Badian employed patronage to explain the gradual growth of Rome’s power into the Mediterranean world, as well as Rome’s foreign relationships.³ Gelzer, on the other hand, used patronage to study the internal politics of the Roman Republic and the implications that patronage brought into the gradual formation of Rome’s government.⁴ Furthermore, Premerstein and Syme explained how patronage was one of the elements that contributed to the fall of the Roman Republic and the rise of Octavian’s principate.⁵ However, Brunt criticized the fact that many scholars only studied patronage through the perspective of power politics during the republican period.⁶ Therefore, there was a shift in the study of patronage which brought scholars to study its

¹Mommsen 1864, 319-390.

²Mommsen 1864, 319-390.

³Badian 1958, 42-43; 53-54; 68.

⁴Gelzer 1912, 62-136.

⁵Premerstein 1937 and Syme 1939.

⁶Brunt 1988, 382-442.

role in the transition from the late Roman Republic to the early Empire by analyzing the social exchanges between *patroni* and *clientes*.⁷ This gave rise to a new analysis of Roman patronage; social scientists analyzed it in the context of the universal relationships of power and control also present in other societies.⁸ Indeed, the functionalists define patronage as a social institution in which the roles of *patroni* and *clientes* were regulated by social norms.⁹ In this respect, Saller’s monograph on the social relationships between *patroni* and *clientes* during the early Roman Empire represents this shift in scholarship.¹⁰ Saller describes the importance of the concept of reciprocity between *patroni* and *clientes* in Roman society, personal relationships in the Roman bureaucratic system, and the career of the elites in the early empire.¹¹ Lastly, concerning the study of patronage during late antiquity, scholars have given few attention to the development and the evolution of patronage during this period. Although not much work has been conducted about patronage during late antiquity, De Coulanges attempted to explain the origin of feudalism in Europe through the lens of Roman patronage.¹² More recently, Granter’s new monography on patronage in late antiquity has attempted to close this scholarly gap which has long been ignored.¹³

⁷Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984 and Gellner and Waterbury 1977.

⁸Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984 and Saller 1982 and 1989, 50.

⁹Saller 1982 and 1989, 50.

¹⁰Wallance-Handrill 1989, 1-14.

¹¹Saller 1982 and 1989, 50.

¹²De Coulanges 1890, 205-247.

¹³Granter 2015.

On the Different Forms of Patronage

Scholars have traditionally divided patronage into four categories.¹⁴ The first category belongs to personal patronage.¹⁵ In this category, both parties are individuals and the *cliens* is free born and of lower social standing.¹⁶ This category remained largely outside of the confine of the legal scope, as the law did not regulate the relationships between a *patronus* and a *cliens*. In the second category, we find the relationship between a *patronus* and his former slave, *libertus/a*. The third category concerns patronage acquired by the advocate / orator, *patronus causae*, to the person he was representing, when the *patronus* could have also provided services without a fee.¹⁷ Lastly, scholars also recognized a fourth form of patronage which concerns the relationships between a *patronus* and cities, also referred as patronage of collectives (or most famously described by Eilers and Nicols as patronage of communities).¹⁸ This last form of patronage is the subject of this study. On the patronage of communities, Harmand published the first monograph on this subject.¹⁹ However, more recently, Nicols has published a series of articles on patronage of

¹⁴Gelzer 1912, 62-136.

¹⁵Gelzer 1912, 62-136 and Nicols 2014, 3.

¹⁶Gelzer 1912, 62-136.

¹⁷Gelzer 1912, 62-136.

¹⁸Eilers 2002, 18.

¹⁹Harmand 1957.

communities, and a new monograph, *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*, in 2014.²⁰ Regarding the relationship between *patroni* and communities in the Eastern Roman Empire, Eilers published *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* in 2002.²¹

Definition

The patronage of communities (or also referred as civic patronage)²² has been defined as a reciprocal and mutual exchange of *beneficia* and duties between a *patronus* and his “client” community. In this relationship, the “client” community benefitted from a continual exchange of resources which the *patronus* provided for the community, while the latter recompensated the *patronus* by recognizing his *patrocinium* with the erection of a public statue and by granting him the title *patronus* through co-optation.²³ By following this definition, Nicols argues that the *patronus* acted almost as a “broker” in regulating the relationship between the community and himself.²⁴ This created a network of exchange and reciprocity between the two parties which characterized the institution of patronage during the Roman Republic and Empire.²⁵ This study will not follow this definition in describing the relationships between patrons and communities.

²⁰Nicols 1979, 1980, 1988, 2009, and 2014.

²¹Eilers 2002.

²²Nicols 2014, 4-6.

²³Nicols 2014, 4-6.

²⁴Nicols 2014, 7.

²⁵Nicols 2014, 1-19.

Before committing to this definition, it is necessary to delineate the differences and the issues that arise in defining the words: patronage, patron, client, patronize, and clientele. In the English language, the word patron usually indicates the support of artists or writers as patronage of the arts.²⁶ In Rome, the situation was similar, as important poets had personal *patroni* who supported their artistic and literary endeavours.²⁷ Nevertheless, their *patroni* did not refer to them as *clientes*.²⁸ The trouble arises when one attempts to apply the modern meanings of these words in the context of the patronage of communities.

Indeed, by returning to the primary evidence, we find a different picture of the phenomenon of patronage. The epigraphic, legal, and literary evidence do not present a clear and well-defined picture of this phenomenon. It is not always clear that a patron was expected and required to perform specific duties and benefactions for his community. The evidence points to a gradual decline of the institution of patronage which started at the end of the republic and became more widespread during the second century AD. During this decline, the institution of patronage lost its original function and became, in effect, symbolic in nature.

²⁶White 1978, 74-92 and Eilers, 2000, 2-5.

²⁷White 1978, 74-92.

²⁸White 1978, 74-92.

Patronage in Northern Italy

This study will not analyze the phenomenon of patronage of communities by taking into consideration the whole Western Roman Empire. This thesis has a humbler scope, as it will only analyze one region: Northern Italy. This region represents an interesting case study to understand the phenomenon of patronage of communities during the second century AD. Before Rome’s invasion, northern Italy was populated by different and diverse indigenous populations who spoke different dialects and had different social customs and political systems (e.g., Lepontic Gaulish, Cisalpine Gaulish, Etruscan, Ligurian, Venetic, and Illyrian).²⁹ With Rome’s conquest of this region, northern Italian society underwent through several social and political changes.³⁰ By the second century AD, northern Italy had become culturally and politically assimilated to the power of Rome, although a strong substratum of pre-Roman culture and customs had been maintained.³¹ In this cultural context, the institution of Roman patronage had gradually become a part of northern Italian society. For this reason, northern Italy will be used as an interesting case study to see the gradual development and decline of patronage in this region of the empire.

²⁹Zaccaria 2001; Adams 2003: 111-199; Sartori 2007; Haeussler 2013; Bandelli 2017; Stifter 2020, introduction.

³⁰Haeussler 2013.

³¹Bandelli 2017.

Methodology and Sources

The primary sources available in order to study the phenomenon of patronage in northern Italy are mainly literary, legal, and epigraphic.³² Regarding the literary evidence, we have the fortune to have several letters of Pliny the Younger.³³ These letters are useful in order to understand the relationship that was formed between an important senatorial individual, like Pliny, and civic communities.³⁴ This is the case of a letter where he describes his relationship with the town of Tifernus Tiberinus.³⁵ In the letter, Pliny describes a relationship of mutual affection between himself and the community of Tiberinus. This relationship of affection can also be seen in his letters from Como.³⁶ It has been argued that Pliny was a *patronus* of Como since he provided large endowments for his home town.³⁷ Nevertheless, neither the letters nor Como’s inscription dedicated to Pliny’s generosity define him as a *patronus* of his home town.

Another important source of information regarding the phenomenon of patronage is the legal evidence.³⁸ Specifically, we have two laws which describe patrons and their co-optations: the Flavian Municipal Law and the Lex Genetiva.³⁹ These laws describe the regulations that communities had to follow to co-opt a *patronus*. However, we find no

³²Cenati, Gregori, and Guadagnucci 2015, 187-240.

³³Nicols 1982, 6-7.

³⁴Sherwin-White 1998, 91.

³⁵Plin. *Ep.* 4.1.3-4.

³⁶*Epp.* I, 3, 8; II, 8; III, 6; IV, 13; V, 7; VII, 11, 18.

³⁷Nicols 1982, 6-7.

³⁸Lex Irnitana, c. 61 and *CIL* II, 5439 (*ILS* 6089).

³⁹Lex Irnitana, c. 61 and *CIL* II, 5439 (*ILS* 6089).

discussion on the roles or the functions which regulated the relationships between *patroni* and local communities.

The last form of evidence is epigraphic; we find several inscriptions which were set up either by cities or by *collegia* in northern Italy. These inscriptions will form the basis of our enquiry, as they reveal important information on the relationships between *patroni* and communities during the 2nd century AD.

It will now be analyzed the methodology used in the selection of the inscriptions related to patronage. As will be shown in chapter two, the epigraphic evidence in northern Italy is disproportionally distributed.⁴⁰ The majority of inscriptions which show the career or co-optation of a *patronus* come from the 2nd century AD.⁴¹ On the other hand, we find a fewer distribution of inscriptions during the 1st century AD and a gradual decrease of inscriptions mentioning *patroni* by the mid-third century AD.⁴² This uneven distribution of the evidence renders difficult to study this phenomenon; therefore, the data found in northern Italy will be compared with the total number of patronal inscriptions found in Italy.⁴³ This could provide a better way to approach the problem of the limitation of our evidence.

Regarding the selection of the epigraphic evidence, the database of inscriptions mentioning *patroni* was created by using the online database Clauss-Slaby

⁴⁰Lomas and Cornell 2003, intro: 1-9.

⁴¹See appendix.

⁴²Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

⁴³Duthoy 1984, 145-156 and Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

(<http://www.manfredclauss.de/>). I followed these criteria: first, I selected patronal inscriptions where there is a clear relationship between a *patronus* and a municipium, *colonia*, and / or *collegium*; second, I did not select inscriptions where there is a relationship between a private *patronus* and a *cliens* or freedmen; third, I discarded those inscriptions which were too fragmentary to be analyzed; fourth, for each inscription, I identified the honorand, his social class (i.e., Senatorial, Equestrian (Imperial or local), or municipal), location of the inscription, tribe affiliation of the individual, his “client” community, and the chronology. By following these criteria, I found a total amount of 77 inscriptions.⁴⁴

Organization of this Study

This study will be divided into three chapters. In the first chapter, I will be discussing the laws which concern the co-optation of *patroni*. Moreover, I will examine the letters of Pliny and Tiberius Tiberinus. Subsequently, I will discuss a new inscription found at Pompeii in which a local individual refused the title of *patronus* offered to him by the people of the *colonia*. In the second part of the chapter, I will analyze the main strengths and limitations of the epigraphic evidence of northern Italy. By closely examining the inscriptions found in northern Italy, I will consider how the title *patronus* was employed in the inscriptions.

⁴⁴See Appendix.

In chapter two, I will return to Pliny’s letters. His correspondence with Como will highlight the reasons which led Pliny to perform actions of liberality for his home town. In chapter three, I will come back to the epigraphic evidence. Specifically, I will conduct a geographical, diachronic, and diastratic distribution of the inscriptions which commemorate patrons. This will give a better understanding on the methods by which *patroni* were selected, and eventually co-opted in northern Italy.

Chapter Two: The Co-optation of Patrons and Their Relationships with Their Client Communities in Northern Italy During the Imperial Period

In this chapter, I will discuss the rules which surrounded the co-optation of *patroni* by municipia and *collegia*. The Flavian Municipal Law and the Lex Genetiva provide our best source of evidence regarding the co-optation of *patroni*. However, the analysis of these municipal charters reveals that the roles governing co-optation became fossilized during the Imperial period, as local decurions of municipia followed a series of fixed rules which were already in use in Republican municipal charters. These regulations, therefore, cannot be taken as evidence to describe the relations of a *patronus* and a municipium during the Imperial period. As will be shown, a letter concerning the relationship between Pliny the Younger and the local municipium of Tifernus Tiberinus highlights the phenomenon of co-optation. Although Pliny asserts that the local community of Tiberinus co-opted him with the title of *patronus*, his co-optation as *patronus* did not establish a formal relationship of duties and *beneficia* between him and the community. Rather, a competition of affection developed where Pliny acted more as a local benefactor rather than a *patronus*. That a benefactor did not necessarily need to accept the title of *patronus* in order to give *beneficia* to a local community can be also seen in a new inscription from Pompeii recently published

by Massimo Osanna in the *Journal of Roman Archaeology*.⁴⁵ In the inscription, a local grandee of equestrian status, whose identity is yet to be identified, performed many acts of euergetism towards his fellow citizens of the *colonia Pompeianorum*; however, when offered the title of *patronus*, he refused it. Therefore, the granting of this title to this individual of equestrian status from Pompeii shows the symbolic function that it held in local Italian municipia. This point will be further shown when I discuss the northern Italian evidence concerning the co-optation of patrons. Since most of the epigraphic evidence of northern Italy comes from the 2nd century AD, this chapter will focus on northern Italian *patroni* from this period. By taking into consideration the rich Italian dossier where the word *patronus* is employed, it will become evident that this title was an honorific marker which *collegia* or municipia bestowed on local benefactors who contributed to their economic development.

The Flavian Municipal Law and the Lex Genetiva

For the Imperial period, the Flavian Municipal Law provides our best evidence for the rules that regulated the co-optation of patrons; however, many of the rules displayed here had already been employed by other municipia during the republic. By the time the Emperor Vespasian issued this legislation, communities in Roman Spain and Italy had long

⁴⁵Osanna 2018.

experienced numerous regulations concerning the co-optation of patrons. Thus, the rules promulgated in such laws became fossilized.

There are three extant copies of the Flavian Municipal Law, which are referred to as the Lex Irnitana, the Lex Malacitana, and the Lex Salpensana.⁴⁶ Indeed, these charters followed some master template that was widely disseminated in Spain.⁴⁷ Although this law is Vespasianic, as Gonzalez and Crawford argue, many of its regulations come from the Augustan age.⁴⁸

Among the regulations included in the Lex Irnitana, under rubric 61, are the ways in which municipia co-opted their patrons:

<i>R(ubrica). De Patrono [c]ooptando.</i>	25
<i>Ne quis patronum {a}e municipibus municipi Flavi Irnitani.</i>	
<i>cooptato patrociniue c{i}ui deferto, nisi ex maioris partis</i>	
<i>decurionum decreto, quod decretum factum erit, cum</i>	
<i>duae partes non minus decurionum adfuerint et iurati</i>	
<i>per tab[el]lam se[n]tentiam tulerint. Qui aliter aduersusue</i>	30
<i>ea patronum public{a}e municipibus municipi Flavi Irnitani</i>	
<i>cooptaueri{n}t patro[o]ciniue cui detulerit, is HS(sestertium) X(milia) in</i>	
<i>publicum municipalibus municipi Flavi Irnitani d(are) d(amnas) e(sto), isque, qui</i>	
<i>tum erit, ne magi ob eam rem patronus municipum municipi</i>	35
<i>Flavi Irnitani esto.</i> ⁴⁹	

Rubric. Concerning the co-optation of a patron. Nobody can co-opt a patron for the citizens of the Municipium Flavium Irnitatum, or to bestow a position of patron on anyone, except by a decree of the majority of the decurions, which has been decreed when not less than two thirds of the decurions are present and they have cast their votes by ballot on oath. Whoever publicly co-opts contrary to these regulations, a patron for the municipals of the Municipium Flavium Irnitatum or bestows the

⁴⁶Gonzalez and Crawford 1986, 147.

⁴⁷Galsterer 2006.

⁴⁸González and Crawford’s 1986, 150.

⁴⁹Lex Irnitana, c. 61. All translations are mine unless specified. González and Crawford’s 1986, 166.

power of patronage on anyone, he must be condemned to pay 10, 000 sesterces to the public treasury of the citizens of the Municipium Flavium Irnitatum; and whoever has been coopted a patron or had the power of patronage bestowed on him, on account of this matter he must not be a patron of the citizens of the Municipium Flavium Irnitatum.

The law uses the Latin terms associated with the legal definition of patron, patronage, and co-optation: *patronus*, *patrocinium* *ue* *cui* *deferto*, and *patrono* *cooptando*. The earlier Lex Ursonensis already employed this terminology. Although the legislation specifies the number of penalties for those individuals who enrolled a patron in their communities without having had the decurions’ approval, the language found in the law does not describe either the relationship of a patron with the community or the reason why the community desired to co-opt a patron. Rather, the language employed appears to be formulaic, and the product of a longer development which dealt with the method of appointment, rather than the nature of the relationship.

That these laws developed gradually can be seen by comparing them to those found in the Lex Ursonensis, which was the foundation charter of the *Colonia Iulia Genetiva* near Osuna in southern Spain. This law was set up by Marcus Antonius after the death of Julius Caesar during the foundation of this Spanish colony.⁵⁰ Although the Lex Ursonensis generally has several *lacunae*, it contains some important information pertaining to the co-optation of patrons in this community:

*Ne quis Iluir neue quis pro potestate in ea coloni(ia)
facito neue ad decur(iones) referto neue d(ecurionum) d(ecretum) facito
fiat, quo quis colon(is) colon(iae) patron(us) sit atopseturue*

⁵⁰Crawford 1996, 395-396.

*praeter eum, qui c(urator) a(gris) d(andis) a(tsignandis) i(udicandis) ex lege Iulia est, eumque, qui eam coloni(iam) deduxerit, liberos posterosque eorum, nisi de m(aioris) p(artis) decurion(um) qui tum ad erunt per tabellam sententia, cum non minus (quingenta) aderunt, cum e(a) r(es) consuletur. Qui atuersus ea fecerit, (sestertium) (quinque milia) colon(is) eius colon(iae) d(are) d(amnas) esto, eiusque pecuniae colon(or)um eius colon(iae) cui volet petito esto.*⁵¹

No Ilvir or anyone with *potestas* in that colony is to act, or raise (such matters) with the decurions, or see that a decree of the decurions be passed, to the effect that anyone be or be adopted as patron to the colonists of the colony, except the person who is the *curator* for granting or assigning or adjudicating lands according to the Lex Iulia, and the person who shall have founded the colony, their children and descendants, except according to the vote by ballot of the majority of the decurions {who} shall {then} be {present}, when not less than fifty shall be present, when that matter shall be discussed. Whoever shall have acted contrary to these rules, is to be condemned to pay 5, 000 sesterces to the colonists of that colony, and there is to be suit for that sum by whoever shall wish of the colonists of that colony.

Although these rules are expressed differently from those found in the Flavian Municipal Law, both laws clearly assert that only the majority of the decurions could select and co-opt a patron in the community. Again, nothing here suggests that the patrons had legal requirements towards their municipia.

Therefore, by considering both the Lex Ursonensis and the Lex Irnitana, it becomes clear that these regulations do not reveal any information concerning the relationship between a patron and a community. The Flavian Municipal Law contains regulations which had already been in use during the Republican period. By the time of Vespasian, the

⁵¹ *CIL* II, 5439 (*ILS* 6089). Lex Ursonensis, XCVII.
Crawford 1996, 408. I followed Crawford’s translation of this law, 427.

underlying social interactions seem to be changing: civic patrons were no longer intermediaries. Rather, the title *patronus* seems to have become one of several ways in which cities rewarded their elites for good behaviour or incentivized them in that direction.

Pliny The Younger’s Letters and A New Inscription from Pompeii

In addition to the municipal charters, the best-known co-optation of an individual patron is found in a letter of Pliny the Younger. In this letter, Pliny uses the same legal language already seen in the municipal charters concerning the co-optation of patrons. For instance, in a letter addressed to Calpurnius Fabatus, his wife’s grandfather, Pliny writes that the town of Tifernus Tiberinus in Tuscany co-opted him when he was “almost still a boy”:

*Erit una sed brevis mora: deflectemus in Tuscos, non ut agros remque familiarem oculis subiciamus - id enim postponi potest - sed ut fungamur necessario officio. Oppidum est praediis nostris vicinum - nomen Tiferni Tiberini quod me paene adhuc puerum patronum cooptavit, tanto maiore studio quanto minore iudicio.*⁵²

There will be one, but brief delay. We will divert to my Tuscany property, not so that we may inspect the farms and my private matter, for it can be neglected, but we only perform our necessary duty. The town is near our properties, it is called Tifernus Tiberinus, which co-opted me as a patron when I was still young with so much more affection than judgment.

⁵²Plin. *Ep.* 4.1.3-4.

As it is used in the Lex Irnitana, Pliny employs the verb *cooptare* in order to describe his elevation as *patronus* of the town of Tifernus Tiberinus. Pliny’s use of this verb does not describe anything noteworthy or significant. Becoming a patron of a community, such as Tiberinus, was a common practice, as several towns in Italy and the provinces co-opted patrons. Moreover, as was the case with the two Spanish laws, although Pliny mentions that he was co-opted as a patron, it does not necessarily imply that he had acquired any specific duties towards the town of Tiberinus.

Nevertheless, in his article, *Pliny and the Patronage of Communities*, Nicols asserts that Pliny’s remarks clearly show the beneficial and personal relationship that this community had with Pliny.⁵³ According to Nicols, Tifernus Tiberinus elevated Pliny to the status of *patronus* because the city sought to establish an ongoing beneficial relationship in which Pliny would have regularly offered economic assistance to the town. Therefore, according to this line of argument, the town would have ultimately benefited, since Pliny, as *patronus* of the city, was legally bound to offer economic and legal services.⁵⁴

Although Nicols highlights some interesting elements in Pliny’s letter, he might be overinterpreting it. When Pliny was co-opted as patron by Tifernus Tiberinus, he was 17 years old.⁵⁵ At this age, Pliny was given the inheritance that his uncle, Pliny the Elder, had left him after his death during the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD.⁵⁶ According to Nicols,

⁵³Nicols 1982, 5.

⁵⁴Nicols 1982, 6-7.

⁵⁵Sherwin-White, 1998, 265.

⁵⁶Sherwin-White, 1998, 265.

Pliny the Younger inherited the patronage of this city from Pliny the Elder.⁵⁷ This, however, does not seem consistent with Pliny’s description of how he became a patron: The city co-opted him, a step that would not be needed with inheritances. Nicols also asserts that the case of Pliny shows that the role of patron had become one of supplying economic benefits.

A careful reading of the evidence, however, undermines the notion that the status of *patronus* was directly related to the economic benefits of the community. In the case of Tiberinus, the community gave the title *patronus* to Pliny in order to honour him. On the other hand, Pliny eventually decided to honour the city with the construction of a temple. His description outlines a competition of affection:

*Adventus meos celebrat, profectionibus angitur, honoribus gaudet. In hoc ego, ut referrem gratiam — nam vinci in amore turpissimum est —, templum pecunia mea extruxi, cuius dedicationem, cum sit paratum, differre longius irreligiosum est.*⁵⁸

It (Tifernus Tiberinus) celebrates my comings, it is distressed by my departures, it rejoices in my offices. In this village, I so that I may return their kindness—for it is the most shameful thing to have being surpassed in affection—I built a temple with my money, and now it is completed, whose dedication it is impious to put off any longer.

In Nicols’ interpretation, this passage proves that Pliny was entrusted with specific duties as a result of his co-optation as patron; this text explicates the respective duties of patrons and clients.⁵⁹ By building a new temple for Tiberinus, Pliny simply fulfilled his duty as patron. However, in looking more closely to the text, Pliny’s language does not specifically

⁵⁷*ILS* 6100.

⁵⁸Plin. *Ep.* 4.1.4-5.

⁵⁹Nicols 1982, 6-7.

point out a formal and reciprocal exchanges of favours between himself and the community; rather, it emphasizes Pliny’s kindness in returning a favour for the honour received by this Italian town. Indeed, the meaning of the verb *referrem* here highlights Pliny’s action “to pay back” a favour, *gratia*; the meaning of the verb is reinforced by the emphatic personal pronoun *ego* at the beginning of the sentence which highlights Pliny’s action. This is also emphasized by his declaration: “*nam vinci in amore turpissimum est—*“for it is the most shameful thing to have being surpassed in affection”. Specifically, Pliny wants to avoid a position of emotional inferiority; this led Pliny to return this affection with an act of kindness which consolidated the friendship between him and Tifernus Tiberinus.

As will be shown in chapter three, these acts of favoritism performed by benefactors of either senatorial or equestrian status are illustrative of the phenomenon of euergetism, instead of patronage. Before turning to the evidence concerning northern Italy, a last interesting example, which further highlights the relationship between co-optation and patronage in Italy, must be noted. A new inscription from the town of Pompeii dedicated to a noble of equestrian status discusses the career and honours attributed to an illustrious individual from the city’s elite:

*Hic togae virilis suae <die> epulum populo Pompeiano triclinis CCCCLVI
<dedit> ita ut in triclinis / quinideni homines discumberent (hedera). Munus
gladiat(orum)*

*/ adeo magnum et splendidum dedit ut cui vis ab urbe lautissimae coloniae
conferendum esset, / ut pote cum CCCCXVI gladiatores in ludo habuer(it). Et, cum
/ munus eius in caritate annonae incidisset, propter quod quadriennio eos pavit,
potior ei cura / civium suorum fuit quam rei familiaris; nam cum esset denaris
quinis modius tritici, coemit / et ternis victoriatibus populo praestitit et, ut ad omnes
haec liberalitas eius perveniret, viritim / populo ad ternos victoriatos per amicos*

suos panis cocti pondus divisit (hedera). Munere suo / quod ante / senatus consult(um) edidit, omnibus diebus lusionum et conpositione promiscue omnis generis / bestias venationibus dedit (hedera). Et, cum Caesar omnes familias ultra ducentesimum ab urbe / ut abducerent iussisset, uni / huic ut Pompeios in patriam suam reduceret permisit. Idem quo die uxorem duxit, decurionibus / quinquagenos nummos singulis, populo denarios, Augustalibus vicanos, pagan(is) vicanos / nummos dedit. Bis magnos ludos sine onere rei publicae fecit, propter quae postulante populo, cum universus ordo consentiret ut patronus / cooptaretur et Ilvir referret, ipse privatus intercessit dicens non sustinere se civium suorum esse / patronum.⁶⁰

Bodel’s translation: This man, on the day he assumed the *toga virilis*, gave a banquet to the people of Pompeii on 456 *triclinia* [three-sided couches] in such a way that 15 people reclined on each three-sided couch. He offered a gladiatorial presentation that was so large in scale and magnificent that it could easily be compared to any presentation put on by the most distinguished colony founded by the city of Rome, since he had 416 gladiators in his gladiatorial training school. And since his gladiatorial presentation had coincided with a shortage of grain, on account of which he fed them for four years, his concern for his fellow citizens was stronger than that for his patrimony; for when a *modius* of wheat was valued at five *denarii*, he brought it up and made it available to the people for three *victoriati* and, so that his generosity of his should reach everyone, he distributed to the people individually through his own friends a weight of baked bread worth up to three *victoriati*. In the gladiatorial presentation of his that he produced before the resolution of the senate, on all the days of the preliminary bouts and on the day of the pairing of the gladiators, he provided beasts of all kinds without distinction for the wild beast hunts. And when Caesar had ordered that they remove all their gladiatorial troupes beyond the two-hundredth milestone from the city, to this man alone he granted permission to bring back (his own gladiatorial troupe) to his home-town of Pompeii. The same man, on the day he married his wife, gave to each decurion fifty coins, to the people *denarii* (one each), to the *Augustales* twenty coins (each), the *pagani*, twenty coins (each). Twice he produced large-scale games without any financial burden to the community. Because of these deeds, with the people demanding it, when the entire town council agreed that he should be co-opted as a patron and the *duovir* was making the formal proposal, he himself intervened as private citizen, saying that he would not bear the idea that he be a patron of his own fellow citizens.

⁶⁰Bodel, Bendlin Bernard, Bruun, and Edmondson 2019, 150.

The identity of this equestrian noble is uncertain; while Osanna argues that he was Cn. Alleius Nigidius Maius, who was still active 24 years after he became *duovir quinquennalis*, Flohr and Hunink suggest one of the D. Lucretii as the possible candidate.⁶¹ Regardless of the honorand’s identity, it is certain that this individual was of equestrian status and that this *elogium* was set up close to the town’s destruction in 79.⁶² According to Maiuro, the inscription seems to have been organized thematically rather than chronologically “per blocchi tematici e non cronologia”.⁶³ Nevertheless, this *elogium* followed a chronological order. Indeed, as Bendlin also suggests,⁶⁴ the inscription does not include the event of the honorand’s taking of the *toga virilis* in the same section with the honorand’s marriage. If the inscription had been organized thematically, the stonecutter would have included all the events related to the honorand’s private life (e.g., his marriage and the day he took the *toga virilis*) in one block. On the contrary, the inscription gives a complete chronology of the honorand’s life and his private and public achievements; indeed, the funerary *elogium* clearly follows a chronological order: 1) the day the honorand assumed the *toga virilis*; 2) the events following after he took the *toga virilis*; 3) the 4-year period where he performed euergetic acts; 4) the period before the year 59 SC, prohibiting the gladiatorial games at Pompeii; 5) the honorand’s wedding and his distribution of gifts to the decurions, the people of Pompeii, the *Augustales*, and the *pagani*;

⁶¹Osanna 2018, 320-322 and Flohr and Hunink 2019, 28-30.

⁶²Bodel, Bendlin, Bernard, Bruun, and Edmondson 2019, 148-182.

⁶³Maiuro 2019.

⁶⁴Bodel, Bendlin, Bernard, Bruun, and Edmondson 2019, 152.

6) finally, the sponsorship of games in the colony without burdening the colony’s public treasury “*sine onere rei publicae*”, perhaps during the time he held his two magistracies.⁶⁵

The funerary inscription goes into specific details regarding the extent to which this individual contributed to the economic development of the colony. Interestingly, he was not co-opted patron of Pompeii; his acts of generosity did not entail a formal relationship between the city and himself. As attested in the *elogium*, there is no agreement that regulates the number of gifts or other forms of entrainments that he provided for the colony. The most intriguing detail comes at the end of the inscription, since many of the dynamics seen both in the regulations analyzed before and in Pliny’s letters are displayed once again in this context. If the colonial charter of Pompeii had handled patronage in the same way that we find in the Lex Ursonensis, the majority of the decurions at Pompeii would have voted that he became *patronus* of the city. However, he refused this honour.

In the first place, it is interesting that the honour which concerned his patronship comes at the end of the inscription. As we will see later in this chapter, the majority of the northern Italian inscriptions display at the end of the text the title of *patronus*. Secondly, as Bodel asserts, there is no other example in Latin epigraphy where a wealthy individual refused the title of *patronus*.⁶⁶ In *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, D’Arms argues that the choice of declining a position offered by a local *ordo* was much in line with the ethos of the equestrian class; he takes as an example the freedman Trimalchio. In the

⁶⁵Bodel, Bendlin, Bernard, Bruun, and Edmondson 2019, 151.

⁶⁶Bodel, Bendlin, Bernard, Bruun, and Edmondson 2019, 178.

Satyricon, when Trimalchio shows his fictional epitaph to his dinner guests, the freedman asserts that he refused to be part of the *decuriae* of *apparitores*, although he was enrolled in this order.⁶⁷ However, the northern Italian dossier reveals that the majority of individuals who accepted the title of *patronus* were of equestrian status.⁶⁸ Just as the senatorial class, the equestrian class accepted the honour of being patron of a community; however, sometimes, as it was the case for Trimalchio and this inscription from Pompeii, this honor was simply refused. The fact that in these two examples the two individuals were of equestrian does not demonstrate that they refused the title only because of their status; rather, the refusal of the title of *patronus* further reveals the condition that this title had come to signify during the Imperial period.

Therefore, this implies that a benefactor did not necessarily need to hold the title *patronus* to perform euergetic acts in a community: the relationship between a benefactor and a community was less formal and legal. Simply, as seen in this instance at Pompeii, those senators or equestrians who felt a personal attachment to a municipium decided, on their own accord, to help the community. The honorific title of *patronus* was granted because these communities felt compelled to return the favours provided by these local euergetes.

⁶⁷D’Arms 1981, 109-116.

Petr. 71.12: *cum posset in omnibus decuriis Romae esse, tamen noluit.*

⁶⁸See Appendix.

The Epigraphic Evidence in Context

Now that I have laid out the preliminary evidence related to the phenomenon of the co-optation of patrons in the Western Roman Empire during the Imperial period, the focus of this chapter can be turned towards the rich epigraphic dossier which comes from the regions of northern Italy. My analysis will look at the development of patronage in the following *regiones*: *Venetia et Histria, regio X, Aemilia, regio VIII, Liguria, regio IX, Transpadana, Regio XI*. The epigraphic evidence displays an interesting picture of the relations that patrons had with local communities.

At the outset, it is necessary to acknowledge one limitation in our epigraphic evidence; the epigraphic sources are not uniformly distributed in the centuries I will consider. This can be attributed to a phenomenon called by modern historians as “the epigraphic habit”.⁶⁹ This term was coined for the first time by MacMullen in his article *The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire*, where he used this phrase to indicate the intensity by which Latin inscriptions were produced during various stages in Roman history. Although MacMullen delineates the cultural disposition that led to the development of Latin epigraphy, he declines to express any definitive explanation for this phenomenon. In his article *Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire*, Woolf observes that the epigraphic habit is a modern construct which does not correspond

⁶⁹MacMullen 1982, 233-46.

to any Roman cultural category.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, Woolf recognizes the fact that the epigraphic habit can be a useful reminder of the limitation of our evidence.⁷¹ In the case of northern Italy, this is particularly true; just as in the rest of the Roman Empire, the regions of northern Italy underwent a similar evolution of the epigraphic habit. The cultural evolution that led to the birth and subsequent spread of Latin epigraphy at Rome began during the Republican period.⁷² Nevertheless, Latin inscriptions started to appear more regularly at the beginning of Augustus’ reign. Scholars identify this historical period as the moment where Latin epigraphy reached its peak both at Rome and in the provinces.⁷³ This epigraphic “boom” gave rise to different forms of epigraphic practices which remained stable until the 2nd century AD; ultimately, Latin epigraphy appears to have been less widespread during the 3rd century AD and underwent a decline during Late Antiquity.⁷⁴

Although Woolf observes that many regional studies present some variations from the general epigraphic trends, it seems that northern Italy underwent a similar epigraphic development as the rest of the empire. The epigraphic evidence gathered indicates that the majority of the inscriptions where a relationship between a *patronus* and local community is present appear for the most part during the 2nd century AD.⁷⁵ From the 3rd AD onwards inscriptions gradually become more scant, which makes it more difficult to explain the

⁷⁰Woolf, 1996, 24.

⁷¹Woolf, 1996, 24.

⁷²Bodel 2001, 35-39 and Woolf 1996, 24.

⁷³Mrozek, 1973, 113-18.

⁷⁴Mrozek, 1973, 113-18.

⁷⁵See Appendix.

development of patronage in this region during this century. Indeed, the evidence gathered from the regions of northern Italy show that most inscriptions are concentrated in the century and a half that falls between the Flavian and Severan periods; on the contrary, from mid-third century AD to late antiquity, I found fewer inscriptions:⁷⁶

	Augustan	Julian-Claudian	Nerva-Hadrian	Antonines	Severans	Mid-Third Century AD
Epigraphic ‘habit’	100	160	501	600	1267	78
Patron-inscriptions	1	9	25	20	11	15

Moreover, although for the 2nd century AD the epigraphic evidence is plentiful, the inscriptions which could help reconstruct the phenomenon of patronage in these regions are scattered and fragmentary, in a similar way to other regions in the empire during this period.⁷⁷

From the analysis of the epigraphic evidence, it has emerged that the inscriptions which display the word *patronus* do not show a bilateral relationship in which a patron offered services in return for favours by the communities which set up the dedication. On

⁷⁶ This chart was created by using the online database Clauss-Slaby (<http://www.manfredclauss.de/>). I gathered all the inscriptions of the following *regiones*: *Venetia et Histria, regio X, Aemilia, regio VIII, Liguria, regio IX, Transpadana, Regio XI*. I went under the heading “research in the database” and selected “dates” and input the dates for each period. The database generated the results shown above.

⁷⁷Lomas and Cornell 2003, intro: 1-9.

the other hand, the majority of the inscriptions mention the honorand’s name, his social status, and the dedicant’s name and status (i.e., *collegium* or a municipium). The only element available to us to understand the relationship that the dedicants had with these local *patroni* is the use of adjectives which describe the patron’s character (e.g., *eminentissimus*, *ob merito*, *eius industria*, etc.). These titles were regularly employed in honorific dedications. For this reason, they cannot display the relationship that the patron had with the community.

Furthermore, as already seen in the comparison between the municipal charters and the inscription from Pompeii, the epigraphic evidence suggests that local municipia in northern Italy operated in a similar way. In these communities, the title of *patronus* was primarily assigned for an honorific purpose. Even when we see patrons performing acts of euergetism towards their community, we do not know whether they are doing so because of their title as *patroni* or as part of their role as local euergetes. This can be seen in the local epigraphy since dedicants do not often mention a patron’s acts of generosity in correlation to his status. This is also suggested by the fact that the title of *patronus* was part of the official titlature that a prominent individual received when an honorary dedication was set up on his behalf; this was done primarily to celebrate his *cursus honourum*.

From the survey of northern Italian evidence gathered, there is an interesting inscription where a local *collegium* from the city of Flavia Fidentia honours Virius Valens.

M(arco) Nummio Albino L(ucio) Fulvio Aemiliano / co(n)s(ulibus) / Kal(endis) Apr(ilibus) Flavia Fidentia in templo Minervae collegi(i) / fabrum quod referentib(us) G(aio) Antonio Primitivo et Q(uinto) Sertorio Felicissimo

curatorib(us) verba facta sunt esse perpetuam consuetudin(em) / augendis collegi(i) n(ostri) virib(us) si optimos quosq(ue) viros et amantissimos singulor(um) universorumq(ue) pro defensione [et] tutela n(ostra) patronos / olim cooptatos tabulis patrocinalib(us) prosequamur q(uid) fieri p(laceret) d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) / et ideo cum sit Virius Valens patronus colleg(ii) n(ostri) vir eximiae indolis / praeditus municipi quoq(ue) n(ostri) decurio et omnib(us) hon(oribus) perfunct(us) sit / et collegi(i) dendrophor(um) patron(us) ad cuius tam larga et ultro semper / obferentia cumulor(um) eius innumerabilia beneficia remuneranda placuit universis tabulam aeneam patrocinal(em) ei / poni in parte domus eius qua permiserit quo plenius voluptas / n(ostra) erga eum eluceat cuius titulus scripturae perpetuitate gloriam n(ostri) consensus declaret / adfuere universi.⁷⁸

In the consulship of Marcus Nummius Albinus and Lucius Fulvius Aemilianus (AD 206), on the first of April, at Flavia Fidentia, in the temple of Minerva, (seat) of the blacksmiths’ *collegium*. Since, on the motion of the curators Gaius Antonius Primitivus and Quintus Sertorius Felicissimus, speeches were made that it is our long-standing practice to increase the importance of our *collegium* when we bestow *tabulae patrocinales* on all excellent and highly generous men who had been previously co-opted as patrons for the defence of one and all and the protection of all. The decision was taken, about the matter, as follows: since Virius Valens, the patron of our *collegium*, endowed with a very noble character, also decurion of our municipium, who has fulfilled all offices and is patron of the *collegium* of the carpenters; it has been decreed with an unanimous vote that a bronze *tabula patrocinalis* should be placed in part of his house as suggested by him to reciprocate his very abundant, always generous beyond measure, numerous benefits, in order that our devotion for him can shine completely and the inscription can always declare the glory of our agreeing decision. Everybody was present.

The text, which dates to April 1st 206 AD, is engraved on a bronze tablet erected in the city of Flavia Fidentia in the *regio* Aemilia; it honours an important and wealthy local citizen, Virius Valens, by co-opting him as patron.⁷⁹ It is the only such text where the verb *cooptare* is used. It includes a decree passed by the local *collegium* of the smiths and is noteworthy

⁷⁸*AE* 1991, 713 (*AE* 2014, 255).

⁷⁹Donati 1991, 127-132.

expressing the reasons for co-optation. This provides some evidence not only on the usage of the title *patronus* in the local epigraphy, but also that *collegia* had patrons.

As we see in this inscription, patronal co-optations were sometimes recorded in tablets which are referred to here as *tabula patrocinalis*, but which were more typically called *tabulae patronatus*. These were bronze *instrumenta* employed by communities to commemorate such co-optations. It has been suggested that in Italy such tablets often quote the decree of co-optation,⁸⁰ but this may merely assume that the decrees are the *tabulae* themselves. Such *tabulae* were issued both by cities and *collegia*. In this case, the tablet was issued by the local *collegium* of the *dendrofori*, and its language clearly mimics what is employed in *tabulae* issued by cities of this period.

Furthermore, as already seen in other instances outside of northern Italy, the inscription above does not describe what these *patroni* owed to their *collegia*; however, it vaguely asserts that they were to defend and protect the *collegium*, *pro defensione [et] tutela n(ostra)*. This seems to hint that these individuals were expected to provide services for the defence and protection of the *collegium*. However, the question still remains open to the extent by which these patrons had any actual involvement in the protection and defense of this local *collegium*. Here, it seems that these patrons were deemed meritorious for their services provided to the *collegium* and the community, and for this reason they not only were given the title *patronus*, but also a bronze plaque which attested it.⁸¹ This would entail

⁸⁰Nicols 1979, 305 and Harmand 1957, 332.

⁸¹Williamson 1987, 160-183.

that the title *patronus* was given as an additional honour for the services already performed by these patrons; however, this does not conclusively demonstrate that this title implied any further obligations.

In the northern Italian database, expressions such as *optimi viri et amatissimi* are employed by local *collegia* to honour co-opted patrons. This, however, does not point to a *unique* personal relationship between the patrons and the *collegium*; it highlights the formulaic nature of the dedications. This can be also seen in the latter part of the inscription concerning the honorand, Virius Valens. The language in this inscription does not highlight a personal relationship of friendship that this patron enjoyed with the local *collegium*, but it only uses the common expressions which were granted by *collegia* and *municipia* in northern Italy. Indeed, it is asserted that the *patronus* of the *collegium* of woodcutters offered *innumerabilia beneficia remunerate* to the *collegium*, and that these *beneficia* are alluded to in the tablets referred here as *tabula aenea patrocinalis*. The expression *innumerabilia beneficia remunerate* is employed repeatedly in the local epigraphy. Thus, there is not enough evidence to assert that such an expression indicated an economic benefit to the city; it might have been employed by these *collegia* and *municipia* simply to honour patrons.

The title *patronus* is widely used in the northern Italian inscriptions.⁸² Among the inscriptions selected, it can be clearly seen that the title of *patronus* is usually inserted after

⁸²See Appendix.

the *cursus honoum* of a senator or equestrian. A funerary epitaph dedicated to the senator Titus Caesernius Status is typical:

[T(ito)] Caese[r]nio Statio / Quincti[o] Macedoni / Quinctiano, consuli, / sod(al)i Aug[u]stali curator i / viae Appiae e[t] alimentorum, / legato legio[ni]s X Gemin(ae) / Piae Fidelis co[m]iti divi Hadria[ni] / per Orientem [et] Illyricum pra[etori] / inter cives et p[e]regrinos, t[ri]buno / plebis candida[to] comiti per [Siciliam] / Africam Mau[re]taniam, q[uaestori] / candidato t[ri]buno lati[clavio] / legionis tr[ic]ensima[e Ulpiae] / [Vi]ctricis, t[ri]umvir[o aere] / [au]ro argen[to] flando [feriundo], / [pat]rono co[lo]niae, [flamini], / d[ecur]ion[i] / [---] Servi[lius ---] / amic[o].⁸³

To Titus Caesernius Status Quincticus of Macedonia, Quinctianus, consul, *sodalis Augustalis*, curator of the Appian way and for the management of the food supply, *legatus* of the tenth legion Gemina Pia Fidelis, comrade of the deified Hadrian through the East and the Illyria, praetor between citizens and foreigners, imperial nominee of the tribune of the plebs, comrade through Sicily and Africa, and Mauritania, nominated quaestor, nominated senatorial tribune of the 13th legion Ulpia Victrix, triumvir in charge of striking the Imperial coins, patron of the colony, flamen, decurion, [---], Servilius [---], (made this memorial) to his friend.

This inscription comes from the city of Aquileia in *regio X*; although it was originally found in the city of Cittanova, in the region of Veneto, Mommsen included this epitaph among the epigraphic collection which belonged to the family of the Titii Caesernii found at Aquileia.⁸⁴ Titus Caesernius Status was the son of T. Caesernius Status Quinct(ius) Pal. Macedo (*PIR2*, C 181), who was a procurator and equestrian from Aquileia.⁸⁵ Another inscription of Aquileia was dedicated to Titus Caesernius Status;⁸⁶ both inscriptions list exactly the same offices and honours that Status received with only a difference at the end.

⁸³*CIL* V, 865.

⁸⁴Brusin 1934, 241-2.

⁸⁵Alföldy 1977, 347-350 and 1981, 333.

⁸⁶*AE* 1957, 135 (*AE* 2010, 54).

Whereas in *CIL* V, 865 the dedicant was his friend Servilius, in *AE* 2010, 54 the dedicant was his *cliens* Lucius Cervonius Hieronymus. This adds an interesting element to the narrative concerning this senator; indeed, the fact that two inscriptions are dedicated to this individual is an indicator of the importance and respect that Caesernius Stadius held at Aquileia. His funerary epitaph represents a typical example of honorific dedications which were set up by *collegia* and *municipia* in northern Italy during this period. Indeed, the format of the inscription follows the regular epigraphic patterns present in the majority of the northern Italian dedications. It starts by listing the most important offices in the *cursus honorum* from the consulship until the lower offices and titles that Caesernius Stadius acquired. By following this narrative, the senator’s career becomes clear since his rise to prominence is represented first through the achievement of civil offices in his native land, Aquileia, and subsequently followed by military duties in the Roman provinces. His career culminates with his friendship with the Emperor Hadrian; this certainly led Caesernius to advance all the way to the office of consul.⁸⁷

The long dedication ends with the last title which is the one of *patronus coloniae*. Being the patron of Aquileia was an honour in itself that evidently Caesernius’ friend, Servius, thought important to include in the list of numerous titles that this senator was awarded. By taking into consideration all the inscriptions found in the northern Italian dossier, it is evident that the title of *patronus* is typically placed at the end of honorary

⁸⁷Bruun 2015, 202-265.

inscriptions.⁸⁸ Subsequently, additional information about the honorand’s life and achievements was filled in by the dedicants. Therefore, this suggests that the inclusions of titles such as *patronus* were part of a standardized system through which honorary titles became a regular part of the local epigraphic habit. Lastly, concerning his offices and chronology, Caesernius Staius became *consul suffectus* in the year 138 AD, while his brother, Titus Caesernius Quintius Staiianus Memmius Macrinus, became *consul suffectus* in the year 141 AD.⁸⁹ Caesernius Staius would have been around the age of 38 years old when he acquired the consulship; therefore, if the consulship was his last title, then, this inscription can be dated around the early reign of the emperor Antoninus Pius (138-148 AD).⁹⁰ Since the inscription falls in the 2nd AD, it is a good representation for the majority of inscriptions which are found in the northern Italian regions during this period. If we compare the inscription that was made for his brother, Titus Caesernius Quintius Staiianus Memmius Macrinus, the same epigraphic pattern is visible:

T. Caesernio (Titi) filius Palat(ina) [tribu] Statio / Quintio Stat[ia]no Memmio Macrino co(n)s(uli), sod[al]i Augustali, leg(ato) [Augusti] pr(o) pr(aetore) / provinciae Af[ri]cae leg(ato) leg(ionis) XIII G(eminae) M(artiae) Victricis), / misso ad dilec[tum] iuniorum a Divo / Hadriano in r[e]gionem Transpadana[m], comiti eiusdem in [Ori]ente, XVvirum (sic) stlitibus / iudican]dis, / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) pat[rono] IIII [c]olon(iarum), p(ecunia) p(ublica).⁹¹

To Titus Caesernius Staius Quintius Staiianus Memmius Macrinus, son of Titus, from the Palatine tribe, consul, *sodalis Augustalis*, *legatus Augusti* propraetor of the province of Africa, *legatus* of the legion XIV Gemina Martia Victrix, sent by the

⁸⁸See Appendix with all the inscriptions in order to compare them with Caesernius.

⁸⁹Alföldy 1977, 350 and Degrassi 1952, 40.

⁹⁰Alföldy 1977, 347-350.

⁹¹*CIL* VIII, 7036 (*ILS*, 1068).

deified Hadrian to the Transpaduan region for a levy of recruits, comrade of the emperor through the East, *XVvir stlitibus iudicandis*, [this dedication was set up] by a decree of the decurions, for the patron of the four colonies, at public expense.

In a similar way to his brother’s dedication, the inscription is structured in a descending order, from the highest to the lowest office. Although Statianus Memmius Macrinus’ inscription presents fewer offices than the ones of his older brother, both individuals held the consulship, even though Macrinus became *consul suffectus* three years later, in 141 AD. The epigraphic patterns of the two inscriptions are essentially the same, as are their *cursus honorum*; both brothers were friends with the emperor Hadrian, and this, as already explained, could have been a decisive factor in their career advancement. As was the case for his brother, the inscription ends with the title *patronus*; Macrinus was the patron of four colonies.

Therefore, as demonstrated in this chapter, inserting the title *patronus* at the end of the inscription symbolically represented the honour that a municipium or a *collegium* gave to an important individual. This honorary title was conferred, as a result of the euergetic acts that an individual of equestrian or senatorial status provided for his community. As seen in the relationship displayed between Pliny and the community of Tiberinus, the title of patron did not entail any formal relationship between Pliny and the town; Pliny’s contribution for the construction of the temple is the result of his kindness towards the community, on account of the honours he acquired after receiving the title *patronus* from the city of Tiberinus. The honorific significance that the title *patronus* held can be clearly seen in the newly discovered inscription from the city of Pompeii. Although the example

from Pompeii is the only instance in the epigraphic record of a benefactor of equestrian status refusing to assume the title of *patronus*, it still highlights the symbolic function that this title held among Italian communities. This did not prevent *collegia* and *municipia* from co-opting their northern Italian benefactors. However, their co-optation was only an act of thanksgiving for the acts of kindness that these benefactors performed for their communities. For this reason, as we will see in the next chapter, the involvement that an equestrian or senator had in the economic and infrastructural growth of a city or *collegium* cannot be defined by using words such as patronage, patron, and client. Rather, as I will argue, the phenomenon of euergetism is a better expression to employ in order to clarify the relationship between communities and local benefactors who contributed to the advancement of northern Italian communities during the 2nd century AD.

Chapter Three: Patronage or Euergetism?

In this chapter, I will discuss the social, economic, and infrastructural development of cities and communities in northern Italy. As seen in the previous chapter, the concept of civic patronage should not be used to describe this phenomenon; those senators and equestrians who held the title of *patronus* did not necessarily contribute to the growth of local municipia or *collegia*. For this reason, the phenomenon of euergetism provides a better way to define the social and economic development of the northern Italian communities. In scholarship, few distinctions have been drawn between benefaction and patronage. Both social phenomena are considered more or less similar; while benefaction and the granting of *beneficia* initiated the mutual exchanges of duties and privileges from a euergetes to a community, patronage represented the final development of this process where a community fully became economically and politically attached to a wealthy *patronus*. According to this line of argument, a relationship developed between a community and a *patronus* where the obligation was continually expressed through permanent performances of *beneficia*, provided by the patron, and *officia*, given by the community.⁹²

⁹²Engesser 1957; Badian 1958, 8-9; Gelzer 1912, 69; Veyne 1976, 74; Blagg 1981, 167-188; Duthoy 1981, 295-305; Cloud 1989, 205-218; Wallace-Handrill 1989, 1-14; Leunissen 1993, 101-120; Coskun 2005, 423-425; Nicols 2009, 325-335 and 2014, 11-17.

This was not the case in the Roman Empire. Euergetism and civic patronage represented two distinctive features of the Roman system. On the one hand, civic patronage acquired primarily a symbolic function during the Imperial period. On the other hand, euergetism was one of the means by which cities and local *collegia* prospered during the 2nd century AD.⁹³ Local individuals of senatorial or equestrian status performed benefaction on local municipia; nevertheless, the title of *patronus* was not always granted as a result of a performance of benefaction.

Before turning to the primary evidence, it is important to stress that I will limit the scope of this chapter only to the 2nd century AD. As Lomas has observed, there were three important periods where the phenomenon of euergetism is most prominent in Italy: under the period of the Sullan civil wars, under the Augustan renewal, and under the emperorships of Trajan and the Antonine.⁹⁴ Euergetism developed more rapidly during these historical periods because of the vast programs of infrastructural rebuilding which were initiated.⁹⁵ As mentioned in chapter two, since the majority of the epigraphic evidence in northern Italy concentrate during the high empire, this chapter will take into consideration its development only during this period.

⁹³For an overview on Euergetism in Roman Italy: See: Badian 1958, 8-9; Gelzer 1912, 69; Veyne 1976, 74; Eck 1992, 93-98 and 1997, 305-311; Alföldy, 1997, 293–304; Panciera 1997, 249-90; Wesch-Klein 1999, 300-319; Pobjoy 2000, 77-92; Goffin 2002, 20–33; Lomas and Cornell 2003, 1-12; Nicols 2014, 11-17; Horster 2015, 515-536.

⁹⁴Lomas 2003, 28-43.

⁹⁵Thomas and Witschel 1992,135-78.

Pliny and Como: A Case Study on Euergetism in Northern Italy

We have to return to Pliny’s letters in order to understand the phenomenon of euergetism. Pliny’s correspondence does not only shed light on this phenomenon, but also, most importantly for this study, on its development in northern Italy. In a series of letters, Pliny describes several acts of generous munificence that he performed for the city of Como.⁹⁶ Throughout the letters, the author’s tone clearly shows his personal attachment toward Como; the great affection that Pliny demonstrates to his home town and its citizens represents the primary motivation behind his acts of munificence. By analyzing these letters, it is clear that there are two main factors which drove Pliny to help his community: 1) Pliny’s personal affection and attachment to the community; 2) Como’s recognition and appreciation of Pliny as benefactor. Moreover, Pliny was not the only euergetes present at Como; his friends, who were of equestrian statuses, also showed acts of munificence and liberality for the city. In this chapter, I will also trace back Pliny’s euergetistic behaviour to Pliny’s father, Lucius Caecilius Secundus, who, like Pliny, had performed acts of benefaction for the city of Como. This comparison will shed light on the practice of euergetism and the importance that family tradition played in this process.

⁹⁶The letters which will be taken into consideration here are the following: *Epp.* I, 3, 8; II, 8; III, 6; IV, 13; V, 7; VII, 11, 18.

In a number of letters addressed to his friend Caninius Rufus,⁹⁷ Pliny remarks on the natural beauty of the city of Como and its mesmerizing landscape:

C. Plinius Caninio Rufo suo s.

Quid agit Comum, tuae meaeque deliciae? quid suburbanum amoenissimum, quid illa porticus verna semper, quid platanon opacissimus, quid euripus viridis et gemmeus, quid subiectus et serviens lacus, quid illa mollis et tamen solida gestatio, quid balineum illud quod plurimus sol implet et circumit, quid triclinia illa popularia illa paucorum, quid cubicula diurna nocturna? Possident te et per vices partiuntur? An, ut solebas, intentione rei familiaris obeundae crebris excursionibus avocaris? Si possident, felix beatusque es; si minus, 'unus e multis'.⁹⁸

C. Plinius to his friend Caninius Rufus

How is yours and mine darling Comum? And that most charming villa, what of it, and that portico where it is always spring, and its shaded grove of plane-trees, and its fresh crystal canal, and the lake situated below that gives such charming view? How is the exercising ground, soft, yet firm; and how is that bath which very much the sun fills up and surrounds? And what about the big banqueting halls and the little rooms, just for few, and the renting room for night and day? Have they full possession of you, and do they share your company in turn? Or are you, as you are accustomed to, continually called away to attend to private family business? If you spend your time there, you are a lucky and happy man, if not, your case is the most of us.⁹⁹

In this encomium, Pliny praises the natural beauty of his Como and shows his personal attachment to his native town. The use of the possessive pronouns *tuae meaeque* followed by the noun *deliciae*, which refers to Como, indicates the great affection that Pliny feels towards the city; indeed, the pronouns *tua*, *mea*, and the conjunction *que* symbolically and

⁹⁷According to Sherwin-White, Caninius Rufus was a landowner who had a villa at Como; he was attached to

his estate and never visited Rome (Sherwin-White 1998, 91).

⁹⁸Pliny, *Epp.* I, 3.

⁹⁹The translations of Pliny’s letters in this chapter have been adopted and translated by following Betty Radice’s translations: Betty Radice, 1963. *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*.

grammatically bounds together Pliny, Caninius, and their native town. This affection is also expressed in the way Pliny describes the rich and variegated landscape where the villa is located. In Pliny’s depiction of Caninius’ villa, it becomes clear that the physical beauty of the villa is only secondary to its geographical location. In particular, Pliny highlights several sections of the villa: its portico, the exercising ground, banqueting halls, and each room of the house. The portico’s location represents the most unique attraction of Caninius’ villa because of the plane-trees, the fresh crystal canal, and the lake; the meticulous description of these three natural wonderings clearly shows Pliny’s profound knowledge and affection to Como’s landscape. By moving the focus inside the villa, Pliny specifically admires Caninius’ bath and points its exposure to the sun. This detail implies that it is Como’s climate and location which renders Caninus’ villa comfortable rather than its architectural design.

That Pliny appreciated Como’s climate and landscape can be seen in another letter addressed to Caninius. Here, Pliny further describes the natural beauty of Como and his desire to visit his native town:

*Studes an piscaris an venaris an simul omnia? Possunt enim omnia simul fieri ad Larium nostrum. Nam lacus piscem, feras silvae quibus lacus cingitur, studia altissimus iste secessus affatim suggerunt. Sed sive omnia simul sive aliquid facis, non possum dicere 'invideo'; angor tamen non et mihi licere, qui sic concupisco ut aegri vinum balinea fontes. Numquamne hos artissimos laqueos, si solvere negatur, abrumpam? Numquam, puto. Nam veteribus negotiis nova accrescunt, nec tamen priora peraguntur: tot nexibus, tot quasi catenis maius in dies occupationum agmen extenditur. Vale.*¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰Pliny, *Epp.* II, 8.

Are you reading, or are you fishing, or hunting, or doing everything at once? For everything can be done at the same time in the neighbourhood of our Larian lake (Como). For the lake supplies fish in plenty, the woods by which the lake surrounds are full of game, and their secluded recesses inspire one to study until you have enough. But whether you make everything at once or one of them, I cannot say “I envy your happiness”; But I feel annoyed to think that I am denied those pleasures who I long after as a sick man who longs for wine, the baths, and the fountains. I wonder if I shall ever break off these narrow snares, if I am denied to free them. Never, I think. For new businesses pile up upon the old, and that, however, before the old is finished; and, as more and more links are added to the chains, every day the assemblage of my occupations is stretched further. Farewell.

Chronologically, Pliny wrote this letter after his praise of Caninius’ villa. At this point of his life, he has been away from Como for some time.¹⁰¹ Pliny was assigned official duties by the state, and for this reason he could not leave Rome or travel without office leave. As Sherwin-White argues, the sentence “*maius in dies occupationum agmen extenditur*”, “every day the assemblage of my occupations is stretched further”, may refer to Pliny’s new duties as Prefect of Saturn and his role as public prosecutor during the years 98-100.¹⁰² Because of his busy life in the capital, Pliny might have felt nostalgia for his native Como, as he describes in the letter.

At the beginning of the letter, Pliny lays out three quintessential leisure of Roman nobles: reading, fishing, and hunting. For wealthy Romans, studying and hunting represented the most important activities of leisure.¹⁰³ Pliny sees Como as a place where these activities can be performed; this highlights the affection that he held for his home

¹⁰¹Sherwin-White 1998, 156.

¹⁰²Sherwin-White 1998, 156.

¹⁰³Dewar 2014, 51-68.

town. Indeed, Pliny strengthens this point by referring to Como’s lake. Symbolically, it represents the abundance of resources that the natural landscape has to offer, as Pliny particularly emphasizes that the lake might be a possible place, *secessus*, where to engage in intellectual enquiring and to study “until you have enough”, “*affatim*”. Pliny further highlights his intimate relationship with his native town by poetically comparing himself to a sick man, “*ut aegri vinum balinea fontes*”, “as a sick man who longs for wine, the baths, and the fountains”; this simile shows the kind of symbiotic relationship that Pliny enjoyed with Como. In this relationship, Pliny portrays himself as emotionally dependent on his home town. As the simile shows, his physical detachment from the city leads Pliny to feel psychologically deprived of Como’s leisure and pleasures.

In this relationship of deep affection between himself and Como, Pliny ultimately honours his home town by performing euergetic acts. As will be noted, there is no indication that Pliny performed these favours for Como because he had a “patronal” relationship with the community. There is mention neither of the word *patronus* nor of any kind of agreements between himself and the city. Indeed, the word *patronus* is not included in *CIL V, 5262 (ILS 2927)* which describes Pliny’s donations to Como. The strong emotional bond that united Pliny to his own native town and his strong commitment to public benefaction drove him to support the development of the city. Moreover, Pliny is not the only wealthy Roman who deeply cared and appreciated his home town; Pliny’s friend, Caninius Rufus, felt a similar bond towards Como, and for this reason he also contributed to its growth.

In an earlier letter directed to Pompeius Saturninus,¹⁰⁴ Pliny asks his friend to review a speech which he delivered to the town council of Como. In the speech, Pliny discusses the importance of public benefaction and his personal contribution for the construction of the public library in his native town:

*Petiturus sum enim ut rursus vaces sermoni quem apud municipes meos habui bibliothecam dedicaturus. Memini quidem te iam quaedam adnotasse, sed generaliter; ideo nunc rogo ut non tantum universitati eius attendas, verum etiam particulas qua soles lima persequaris ... Quamquam huius cunctationis meae causae non tam in scriptis quam in ipso materiae genere consistunt: est enim paulo quasi gloriosius et elatius. Onerabit hoc modestiam nostram, etiamsi stilus ipse pressus demissusque fuerit, propterea quod cogimur cum de munificentia parentum nostrorum tum de nostra disputare.*¹⁰⁵

I shall only ask that you find time to again look through the speech which I made to my fellow town-citizens at the dedication of the public library. I remember that you have already marked a few points, but in a general way, and I now ask that you not only consider it as a whole, but will follow perseveringly the particular details in which you are accustomed [to do] in your revision ... Although of these hesitations of my motive, it stands not so much in my writings rather than in the subject matter itself: for it is a little too laudatory and ostentatious. And this will be more than my modesty can carry, however, plain and unassuming the style in which it is written, especially because I have obliged to examine my munificence and of my relatives.

The construction of the public library at Como represents only one of the numerous distributions of gifts which Pliny donates to his home town. In addition to the public library, Pliny provided a great distribution of resources and money for the city’s *alimenta* and for

¹⁰⁴There is not much evidence regarding the profile of Pompeius Saturninus; he could have been a new friend of Pliny. Form an onomastic analysis of his nomenclature, it can be seen that Saturninus was not from Italy, but from the province of Africa (Kajanto 1965, 205-208 and Sherwin-White 1998, 103).

¹⁰⁵Pliny, *Epp.* I, 8.

the maintenance of its library. His generosity towards the city has been interpreted as the paradigmatic example of *patronatus* because of the frequency and the large number of gifts provided by Pliny.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, by analyzing this letter, it emerges that Pliny had a quite different reason in mind when he performed these euergetic acts. Interestingly, in the passage above, Pliny puts particular emphasis on the revision of the speech which he delivered in front of the local senate of Como for the inauguration of the public library, as he recounts at the end of the letter. Pliny’s main preoccupation concerns the presentation of his generosity in front of the citizens of Como, “*non tam in scriptis quam in ipso materiae genere*”, “not so much in my writings rather than in the subject matter itself”. Senatorial self-representation was a new key aspect in the way the Imperial elite was interacting with the communities, and one which certainly influenced Pliny’s public presentation.¹⁰⁷ Pliny, being a Roman senator, had to present his public image so that he avoided being too, “*gloriosius et elatius*”, “laudatory and ostentatious”; he, instead, preferred to portray himself as a modest individual, “*modestiam nostrum*”. In addition of the gifts given to the city, the display of good virtues such as modesty also guaranteed Pliny the aggrandizement of his status and fame among the people of Como. In comparison to other euergetes, this ultimately permitted Pliny to be held dearly in the collective memory of his fellow citizens.

¹⁰⁶Nicols 1980, 379 and Woolf 1990, 197-228.

¹⁰⁷Eck 1986, 129-152.

Furthermore, most importantly, Pliny refers to his and his family donations by using the word *munificentia*.¹⁰⁸ During the late Republican period, the word *munificentia* was used to indicate the gifts of significant proportions which were made by the politically powerful.¹⁰⁹ For instance, Sallust uses the word *munificentia* instead of *liberalitas* when he describes Caesar’s generosity.¹¹⁰ Likewise, Cicero, in defending Roscio on the charge of having stolen 50, 000 sesterces from a man, asserts that his client was too wealthy and generous (*munificentissimus*) for having carried out such deplorable act.¹¹¹ The use of the word *munificentia* by itself does not imply a reciprocity between two parties.¹¹² Rather, it is used to show the performance of one’s generosity towards a local community; therefore, in the speech addressed to the local senate, Pliny ultimately wished to represent himself as an *euergetes*, and not as a *patronus*.

In addition, Pliny mentions other pivotal donations which he provided for his native town:

Ac, ne longius exempla repetamus, quid utilius fuit quam munificentiae rationem etiam stilo prosequi? Per hoc enim assequemur, primum ut honestis cogitationibus immoremur, deinde ut pulchritudinem illarum longiore tractatu pervideremus, postremo ut subitae largitionis comitem paenitentiam caveremus. Nascebatur ex his exercitatio quaedam contemnendae pecuniae. Nam cum omnes homines ad custodiam eius natura restrinxerit, nos contra multum ac diu pensitatus amor liberalitatis communibus avaritiae vinculis eximebat, tantoque laudabilior munificentia

¹⁰⁸As we are going to see in final part of this chapter, Pliny’s family also played an important role in the establishment of the close relationship which Pliny enjoyed with Como. Indeed, Pliny’s father, L. Caecilius Secundus, built at Como the “Templum Aeternitatis Romae et Augusti” (Sherwin-White 1998, 104).

¹⁰⁹Forbis 1996, 34.

¹¹⁰Sallust, *Cat.* 54.

¹¹¹Cicero, *Q. Rosc* 22.8.

¹¹²Forbis 1996, 35.

nostra fore videbatur, quod ad illam non impetu quodam, sed consilio trahebamur. Accedebat his causis, quod non ludos aut gladiatores sed annuos sumptus in alimenta ingenuorum pollicebamur.

I will not any longer fall upon examples than (to ask) whether anything could have been more advantageous than my gracing in writing the reasons which prompted my generosity? Indeed, because of this, the result was that I grew familiar with generous sentiments, so that I then discern their beauty by prolonged reflection, and above all I guarded against the reaction that often follows on an impulse of handing-out gifts. From this training, a certain habit of despising money was born. For when nature bound back all men to their protection, my love of liberal giving, long and deeply reasoned, removed the common shackles of avarice, and my benefaction seems to be more praiseworthy, namely because I was drugged to this not by some impulse, but by advice. To these causes I also considered that I was promising not mere games or gladiatorial shows, but an annual subscription in the *alimenta* of freeborn youths.

In this passage, the word *munificentia* plays once again a key part in order to understand the factors which influenced Pliny’s benefaction towards Como. Indeed, two contrasting ideas are shown: the act of “handing-out gifts” too impulsively and that of distributing gifts in a thoughtful and balanced fashion. In this way, Pliny wants to show the genuine interest that he has in the economic development of Como; he is not interested in merely distributing numerous gifts for the sake of popularity, rather by giving out a balanced number of gifts, Pliny advertises his modesty and concern for the community. Indeed, as he asserts at the end of this section, Pliny particularly emphasizes the fact that he did not provide gladiatorial games for the city, but *alimenta* for freeborn youths. By choosing to offer *alimenta* instead of gladiatorial games, Pliny follows the Imperial program of public

endowments which were common in Italy during the Imperial period.¹¹³ However, we find no indication of which kind of alimentary scheme Pliny was following.¹¹⁴

The distribution of *alimenta* was a phenomenon which originally started when the Emperor Nerva instituted them during the years 98-99 AD.¹¹⁵ Unlike the public distribution of the state, the private distribution of *alimenta* operated under different schemes and the reasons for its distribution entirely depended on the decisions of a local euergetes. Luckily, Pliny’s achievements and deeds recorded in his letters also survive in an inscription dedicated by Como to Pliny. Only the upper-left corner of this text is preserved and is currently on display in the portico of the basilica of St. Ambrose in Milan, while the other part of this text was copied down and recorded in the 15th century. The honorary inscription records the following information of Pliny’s benefaction:

C(aius) Plinius L(uci) f(ilius) Ouf(entina tribu) Caecilius [Secundus co(n)s(ul)] / augur legat(us) pro pr(aetore) provinciae Pon[ti et Bithyniae pro]/consulari potesta[t(e)] in eam provinciam e[x s(enatus) c(onsulto) missus ab] / Imp(eratore) Caesar(e) Nerva Traiano Aug(usto) German[ico Dacico p(atre) p(atriciae)] / curator alvei Ti[b]eris et riparum e[tcloacar(um) urb(is)] / praef(ectus) aerari Satu[r]ni praef(ectus) aerari mil[it(aris) pr(aetor) trib(unus) pl(ebis)] / quaestor Imp(eratoris) sevirequitum [Romanorum] / trib(unus) milit(um) leg(ionis) [III] Gallica[e Xvir stili]/tib(us) iudicand(is) / . . . therm[as ex HS - - -] adiectis in / ornatum HS CCC(milibus nummum) [- - - et eo amp]lius in tutela[m] / HS CC(milibus nummum) t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit) [item in alimenta] libertor(um) suorum homin(um) C / HS XVIII(centena) LXVI(milia) DCLXVI (nummum) rei [p(ublicae) legavit quorum inc] rement(a) postea ad epulum / [p]leb(is) urban(ae) voluit pertin[ere - - -?vivu]s dedit in aliment(a) pueror(um) / et

¹¹³Woolf 1990, 197-228 and Johnson 1985, 105-25.

¹¹⁴Sherwin-White 1998, 104.

¹¹⁵Woolf 1990, 197-228.

*puellar(um) pleb(is) urban(ae) HS [D (milia nummum) - - - et] in tutelam
bybliothe/cae HS C (milia).*¹¹⁶

C. Plinius L.f. Caecilius Secundus of the (voting tribe) Oufentina, consul, *augur*, legate of praetorian rank with proconsular power the province of Pontus and Bithynia, sent into that province in accordance with a decree of the senate, by the Emperor Nerva Trajan Augustus Germanicus Dacicus, father of the fatherland, curator of the bed and banks of the Tiber and of the sewers of the city, praefect of the treasure of Saturn, praefect of the military treasure, praetor, tribune of the plebs, quaestor of the emperor, member of the board of six men for Roman equestrians, military tribune of the Third Gallic legion in the province of Syria, member of the board of ten men for judicial matters, ordered in his will that baths should be constructed at a cost of [- - -] sesterces with 300,000 sesterces added for decoration and that an additional 200,000 sesterces should be reserved for its upkeep. For the sustenance of one hundred of his own freedmen he bequeathed 1,866,666 sesterces to the community, from the interest on which he wished would be used afterwards for a banquet for the urban plebs (i.e., of Comum). [While still alive (?)], he gave 500,000 sesterces for the sustenance of boys and girls of the urban plebs and 100,000 sesterces for the upkeep of the library.

This is the one of the few examples that we have in our historical record where it is possible to compare both the literary and the epigraphic evidence in regard to the phenomenon of euergetism.¹¹⁷ In comparison to other local private euergetes, Pliny’s donations, and especially its distribution of *alimenta* reported above, seem to be above the average donations which local euergetes provided for their communities, as the Italian epigraphic evidence reports.¹¹⁸ Although the largess and generosity of Pliny might represent an exceptional case, it still highlights the importance of euergetism and the extent by which

¹¹⁶*CIL* V, 5262 (*ILS* 2927).

¹¹⁷Horster 2015, 526-530.

¹¹⁸For the distribution of inscriptional evidence of bequests to towns. See: Duncan-Jones 1974, 336-341 and Johnson 1985, 111.

private donations provided a valuable form of economic aid which contributed to the overall growth of local Italian towns such as Como. In addition to the construction of public baths, Pliny also reserved further funds for its upkeep. As the inscription reports, Pliny donated 100, 000 sesterces for the maintenance of the library. Most importantly, the inscription provides the exact amount that Pliny devolved for the *alimenta* of children at Como, specifically 500, 000 sesterces. Woolf asserts that alimentary schemes, as the case of Pliny demonstrates, were part of a patronage networks in which euergetism was an “amalgam of Hellenistic euergetism and Roman patronal institution”.¹¹⁹ Therefore, under this traditional and commonly accepted view, Woolf concludes that the institution of patronage was inherently intertwined with euergetism.¹²⁰ This ultimately implied that Como and Pliny performed reciprocal exchange of favours; while Pliny provided economic assistance to Como, in return, the local senate of Como elevated Pliny’s status and considered him the official *patronus* of their city. However, as it can be clearly seen in the inscription, there is no mention of the title *patronus* which usually is inserted at the end of a senator or knight’s *cursus honourum*.¹²¹

As already explored in the case of Pliny’s relationship with the town of Tifernus Tiberinus, this argument fails to take into consideration the actual degree of involvement that the local towns and the *patroni* had in this hypothetical exchange of duties. As seen

¹¹⁹Woolf 1990, 216. For the comparison between Hellenistic and municipal euergetism. See. Veyne 1990.

¹²⁰Engesser 1957; Badian 1958, 8-9; Gelzer 1912, 69; Veyne 1976, 74; Woolf 1990, 216; Nicols 1980, 365-80; 2009, 325-335; and 2014, 11-17.

¹²¹Bruun 2015, 202-265.

before, the picture that emerges from the primary evidence is quite different from how the phenomena of patronage and euergetism are often described in modern scholarship. As Silverman interestingly argues, the scholarly obsession for the creation of theoretical models to describe the social dynamics which took place in the ancient world resulted in the creation of the artificial model of the “patron-client” relationship which, when applied to the context of Mediterranean societies, held little to no meaning.¹²² Therefore, attempting to interpret Pliny’s letters in the light of the “patron-client” model is reductive. This may eventually result in obfuscating rather than enlightening the evidence which shows the ties of trust and personal attachment that a local euergetes, such as Pliny, could have established with municipia such as Como or Tifernus Tiberinus.

To highlight my argument, I now return to Pliny’s letter I, 8. In the last part of Pliny’s letter to his friend Pompeius Saturninus. Pliny describes the reasons which led him to perform acts of benefaction for his native town:

Sed ut tunc communibus magis commodis quam privatae iactantiae studebamus, cum intentionem effectumque muneris nostri vellemus intellegi, ita nunc in ratione edendi veremur, ne forte non aliorum utilitatibus sed propriae laudi servisse videamur. Praeterea meminimus quanto maiore animo honestatis fructus in conscientia quam in fama reponatur. Sequi enim gloria, non appeti debet, nec, si casu aliquo non sequatur, idcirco quod gloriam meruit minus pulchrum est. Ii vero, qui benefacta sua verbis adornant, non ideo praedicare quia fecerint, sed ut praedicarent fecisse creduntur. Sic quod magnificum referente alio fuisset, ipso qui gesserat recensente vanescit; homines enim cum rem destruere non possunt, iactationem eius incessunt. Ita si silenda feceris, factum ipsum, si laudanda non sileas, ipse culparis ... [in the last part of the letter, Pliny describes the deliverance of his speech in front of the local decurions of Como] Me vero

¹²²Silverman 1977, 7-9.

*peculiaris quaedam impedit ratio. Etenim hunc ipsum sermonem non apud populum, sed apud decuriones habui, nec in propatulo sed in curia. Vereor ergo ut sit satis congruens, cum in dicendo assentationem vulgi acclamationemque defugerim, nunc eadem illa editione sectari, cumque plebem ipsam, cui consulebatur, limine curiae parietibusque discreverim, ne quam in speciem ambitionis inciderem, nunc eos etiam, ad quos ex munere nostro nihil pertinet praeter exemplum, velut obvia ostentatione conquirere. Habes cunctationis meae causas; obsequar tamen consilio tuo, cuius mihi auctoritas pro ratione sufficiet. Vale.*¹²³

But just as then, I was eager for the general interests rather than my own private ostentation, when I wished the purpose and the effect of my benefaction to be known, thus then in the matter of publication, I fear, lest people should see that I served not so much the benefits of others, but my own glorifications. Moreover, I remember how much the satisfaction of respectability would be placed back with a grater mind in its conscience rather than in fame. For glory ought to be follow, not to be sought, nor, again, is a good deed any the less beautiful because owing to some chance or other no glory attends it. Those who boast of their own good deeds are credited not so much with boasting for having done them, but with having done them in order to be able to boast of them ... Beyond all this, however, there is a special obstacle in the way of publishing the speech. For I gave it not before the people but before decurions, not in public but in the local council. Therefore, I am afraid that it may look not fitting if, after I avoided the applause and cheers of the crowd when I gave the speech, I now seek for that applause in this publication, and if, after getting the common people, whose interests I was seeking, removed from the threshold and the walls of the local council, to prevent the appearance of courting popularity, I should now seem to deliberately seek the acclamations of those who are only interested in my munificence to the extent of having a good example shown them. Well, I have told you the grounds of my hesitation, but I shall follow your advice, whose authority will lay the foundation in favour of my account. Farewell.

In this final and articulated explanation of his private benefaction for Como, Pliny reveals several important details on the nature of his private munificence.¹²⁴ Two important points

¹²³Pliny, *Epp.* I, 8.

¹²⁴Quass 1993, 210–229 and Goffin 2002, 20–33.

emerge in this passage: the perception of how the citizens of Como may have regarded Pliny’s acts and his scrupulous care for the well-being of the community. Indeed, as already seen in other instances, Pliny particularly emphasizes the need to put the public above his private interests, “*communibus magis commodis quam privatae iactantiae*”. As argued above, by providing *alimenta*, which were mainly aimed to increase and assist the population of Como,¹²⁵ Pliny ensured that his benefaction had a pragmatic function within the community, and not merely, as he asserted in the other part of the letter, a liberal “handing-out of gifts”. Moreover, Pliny displays a great concern for the way the citizens of Como might perceive his actions as *euergetes*. His preoccupations lie in the fact that his actions of *euergetes* could be regarded only as means to achieve public notoriety, and therefore foster his own personal interests, rather than those of the city. This detail reveals more information on how Pliny wanted to represent his role of *euergetes* in front of the citizens of Como. Pliny does not describe specific roles or duties that he acquired; he simply chose to support the city through his generous donations.

In the last part of the letter, Pliny reveals additional interesting details about the local council of Como. Local councils were still very active during the Imperial period, especially in connection with the co-optation of patrons.¹²⁶ It is interesting that Pliny mentions that he gave a speech in the presence of the local council, instead of delivering it in public. Given the authority that the local senates had in Italy, this detail highlights the

¹²⁵Sherwin-White 1998, 105.

¹²⁶Lex Irmitana, c. 61 and *CIL* II, 5439 (ILS 6089). Lex Ursonensis, XCVII (Crawford 1996, 408).

relationship which formed among local decurions and benefactors.¹²⁷ However, we find that Pliny is more concerned with the opinions of his fellow citizens rather than those of the local decurions. Pliny’s disregard for the opinions of the local council might suggest that Como’s decurions had a minimal involvement in their relationship with local euergetes, as they could have been involved only in the formal approval of Pliny’s donations. Therefore, the relationship between Pliny and the community operated outside the parameters of an orderly defined system of patronage.

In addition, the strong bond of affection felt by Pliny for Como is also shown in another letter which Pliny sent to the historian Cornelius Tacitus. In this letter, Pliny shows his interactions with Como’s citizens. Having learned that the city of Como needed schoolteachers to educate its youths, Pliny asks Tacitus to send teachers from Rome:

Interim ne quid festinationi meae pereat, quod sum praesens petiturus, hac quasi praecursoria epistula rogo. Sed prius accipe causas rogandi, deinde ipsum quod peto. Proxime cum in patria mea fui, venit ad me salutandum municipis mei filius praetextatus. Huic ego 'Studes?' inquam. Respondit: 'Etiam.' 'Ubi?' 'Mediolani.' 'Cur non hic?' Et pater eius - erat enim una atque etiam ipse adduxerat puerum -: 'Quia nullos hic praeceptores habemus.' 'Quare nullos? Nam vehementer intererat vestra, qui patres estis' - et opportune complures patres audiebant - 'liberos vestros hic potissimum discere. Ubi enim aut iucundius morarentur quam in patria aut pudicius continerentur quam sub oculis parentum aut minore sumptu quam domi? Quantulum est ergo collata pecunia conducere praeceptores, quodque nunc in habitationes, in viatica, in ea quae peregre emuntur - omnia autem peregre emuntur - impenditis, adicere mercedibus? Atque adeo ego, qui nondum liberos habeo, paratus sum pro re publica nostra, quasi pro filia vel parente, tertiam partem eius quod conferre vobis placebit dare. Totum etiam pollicerer, nisi timerem ne hoc munus meum quandoque ambitu corrumperetur, ut accidere multis in locis video, in quibus praeceptores publice conducuntur. Huic vitio occurri uno remedio potest, si parentibus solis ius conducendi relinquatur,

¹²⁷Goffin 2002 and Forbis 1996.

*isdemque religio recte iudicandi necessitate collationis addatur. Nam qui fortasse de alieno neglegentes, certe de suo diligentes erunt dabuntque operam, ne a me pecuniam non nisi dignus accipiat, si accepturus et ab ipsis erit. Proinde consentite conspirate maioremque animum ex meo sumite, qui cupio esse quam plurimum, quod debeam conferre. Nihil honestius praestare liberis vestris, nihil gratius patriae potestis. Educentur hic qui hic nascuntur, statimque ab infantia natale solum amare frequentare consuescant. Atque utinam tam claros praeceptores inducatis, ut in finitimis oppidis studia hinc petantur, utque nunc liberi vestri aliena in loca ita mox alieni in hunc locum confluant!*¹²⁸

Meanwhile, that I may lose no time, I am sending this letter as a sort of forerunner to make a request which, when I am in town, I shall ask you to grant. But first of all, let me tell you my reasons for asking it. When I was last in my native town, a son of a fellow citizen of mine, a minor, came to pay his respects to me. I said to him, "Do you keep up your studies?" "Yes," he replied. "Where?" I asked. "At Mediolanum," he replied. "But why not here?" I asked. Then the child's father, who was with him, and indeed had brought him, replied, "Because we have no teachers here." "How is that?" I asked. "It is a matter of urgent importance to you who are fathers" and it so happened, luckily, that a number of fathers were listening to me "that your children should get their education here on the spot. For where can they pass the time so pleasantly as in their native place; where can they be brought up so virtuously as under their parents' eyes; where so inexpensively as at home? If you put your money together you could hire teachers at a trifling cost, and you could add to their stipends the sums you now spend upon your sons' lodgings and travelling money, which are no light amounts. I have no children of my own, but still, in the interest of Como, which I may consider as my child or my parent, I am prepared to contribute a third part of the amount which you may decide to put together. I would even promise the whole sum, if I were not afraid that if I did so my generosity would be corrupted to serve private interests, as I see is the case in many places where teachers are employed at the public charge. There is but one way of preventing this evil, and that is by leaving the right of employing the teachers to the parents alone, who will be careful to make a right choice if they are required to find the money. For those who maybe would be careless in dealing with other people's money will certainly be careful in spending their own, and they will take care that the teacher who gets my money will be worth his payment when he will also get money from them as well. So put your heads together, make up your minds, and let my example inspire you, for I can assure you that the greater the contribution you lay upon me the better I shall be pleased. You cannot make your children a more beautiful present than this, nor can you do your native place a better favour.

¹²⁸Pliny, *Epp.* IV, 13.

Let those who are born here be brought up here, and from their earliest days accustom them to love and know every foot of their native soil. I hope you may be able to attract such distinguished teachers that boys will be sent here to study from the neighboring towns, and that, as now your children flee to other places, so in the future other people's children may flee here."

As we read from this interesting account, at Como Roman children did not have the possibility to pursue academic studies since the city did not have enough schoolteachers. For this reason, they had to travel to Milan to receive their education. During Pliny’s time as well as in later historical periods, the city of Mediolanum (Milan) had indeed been an important academic and intellectual centre where Roman nobles sent their youths to study.¹²⁹ Because of the lack of public funded education at Como, Pliny decides to help his fellow citizens. Most significantly, this episode reveals the interesting dynamics about the nature of euergetism which took place at Como. We learn that Como’s request for schoolteachers in the city happened casually; this is evident in the dialogue between Pliny and a student from Como. By spontaneously agreeing to support Como’s educational program, Pliny shows not only his euergetic qualities, but also that he is acting according to the political events of his time. Indeed, under the Flavians, there was a reorganization of the education system in Italy. For instance, Vespasian founded seats of Greek and Latin rhetoric at Rome and started a program of endowments for municipal schools by providing economic benefits for *medici* and *grammatici*.¹³⁰ Moreover, going forward during the second century AD, emperors continued to fund the education of local communities. For

¹²⁹St. Augustine, *Conf.* 5. 13 (23).

¹³⁰Sherwin-White 1998, 287.

instance, under the Emperors Nerva and Trajan, Vespasianic and Domitian general charters of education have been reutilized and rewritten.¹³¹ Seizing this opportunity of change, Pliny also decided to establish educational programs in his home town. By doing so, Pliny hoped that Como might become an intellectual centre as Milan where young aristocrats might immigrate to, “*utque nunc liberi vestri aliena in loca ita mox alieni in hunc locum confluent*”.

Therefore, the example of Pliny and Como provides a useful case study to analyze the dynamics of private euergetism present in local municipia such as Como. In these local realities, the strong bond of affection displayed by Pliny towards Como ultimately ensured the social and economic development of the city. Nevertheless, Pliny was not the only local euergetes present at Como. As we are going to learn from two important letters in Pliny’s correspondence,¹³² Caninius Rufus and a certain Saturninus, whose identity cannot be confirmed,¹³³ also played an interesting role in the distribution of public benefaction at Como, as they left large inheritances to the community. The reasons which led Pliny’s friends to perform these euergetic acts seem to be similar to Pliny’s motives.

In another letter to Caninius Rufus, Pliny tells his friend that Saturninus left an inheritance to the municipium of Como after his death. Pliny is particularly concerned with the legal mechanisms regarding the inheritance of Saturninus:

¹³¹Sherwin-White 1998, 287.

¹³²Pliny, *Epp.* V, 7 and VII 18.

¹³³Sherwin-White 1998, 331.

*Nec heredem institui nec praecipere posse rem publicam constat; Saturninus autem, qui nos reliquit heredes, quadrantem rei publicae nostrae, deinde pro quadrante praeceptionem quadringentorum milium dedit. Hoc si ius aspicias irritum, si defuncti voluntatem ratum et firmum est. Mihi autem defuncti voluntas — vereor quam in partem iuris consulti quod sum dicturus accipiant — antiquior iure est, utique in eo quod ad communem patriam voluit pervenire. An cui de meo sestertium sedecies contuli, huic quadringentorum milium paulo amplius tertiam partem ex adventicio denegem? Scio te quoque a iudicio meo non abhorrire, cum eandem rem publicam ut civis optimus diligas. Velim ergo, cum proxime decuriones contrahentur, quid sit iuris indices, parce tamen et modeste; deinde subiungas nos quadringenta milia offerre, sicut praeceperit Saturninus. Illius hoc munus, illius liberalitas; nostrum tantum obsequium vocetur.*¹³⁴

It is agreed that a community cannot be appointed heir and cannot take a share of an inheritance before the general distribution of the estate. However, Saturninus, who left us as his heirs, donated a fourth share to our municipium (Como), and then, on behalf of that fourth share, gave them permission to take 400,000 sesterces before the division of the estate. Since this is null and void from a legal perspective, if you look at the will of the deceased, it is sound and valid. I am afraid what the lawyers will think of what I am going to say, however, for me the will of the deceased carries more weight than the law, especially in the fact that he wished to go to our common birthplace. Moreover, I, who gave 1,600,000 sesterces from my own money to my native place, am not the man to refuse it a little more than a third part of 400,000 sesterces which have come to me by a lucky windfall. I know that you as well will not shudder at my judgment, as you value the same community as the best citizen. I shall be glad, therefore, if at the next meeting of the decurions, you will lay before them what the state of the law is, and I hope you will do so in a short amount of time and modestly. Then add that we make them an offer of the 400,000 sesterces, just as Saturninus ordered. But be sure to point out that the munificence and generosity are his, and that all we are doing is to comply with his wishes.

¹³⁴Pliny, *Epp.* V, 7.

As we learn from this letter, inheritances were another way by which local euergetes could show their benefaction.¹³⁵ Indeed, in Italy alone, there can be found a number of inheritances which local benefactors left for their community.¹³⁶ In this case, the person who left the inheritance to Pliny and to the city of Como is Saturninus. Although he has been identified to be Pompeius Saturninus, Pliny’s literary friend,¹³⁷ Sherwin-White clearly argues that he was not the same Pompeius Saturninus and that the identity of this individual cannot be known on the basis of the sources.¹³⁸ Despite the lack of information, it can be clearly seen that he might have been a close friend of Pliny since he left part of his inheritance to him and Caninius Rufus, *qui nos reliquit heredes*. Pliny highlights the kind of affection that his friend felt towards the community by pointing to the fact that he left a large donation of 400, 000 sesterces for the city. Most importantly, Pliny specifically describes his friend’s monetary liberality as an act of kindness for the community of Como. For this reason, he suggests to Rufus to state clearly, in the front of the local council, that the 400, 000 sesterces were a personal donation of Saturninus. As we have already seen in Pliny’s own munificence to the municipium, Pliny is particularly concerned with the way he was perceived and seen by Como’s citizens, a preoccupation which Pliny’s friend might have shared as well, given that he entrusted his inheritance and donation to someone such

¹³⁵Johnson 1985, 105-25.

¹³⁶Duncan-Jones 1974, 336-341.

¹³⁷Schultz 1899, 28 and 33.

¹³⁸Sherwin-White 1998, 331.

as Pliny who has often shown to be conscious in his demonstration of his public benefaction.

The same preoccupation regarding inheritance can be seen in the way Caninius Rufus wanted to portray himself to Como. Indeed, in another letter which is addressed again to Caninius Rufus, Pliny brings up the question of inheritance and advises Rufus on how he could offer public benefaction to Como after his death:

*Deliberas mecum quemadmodum pecunia, quam municipibus nostris in epulum obtulisti, post te quoque salva sit. Honesta consultatio, non expedita sententia. Numeres rei publicae summam: verendum est ne dilabatur. Des agros: ut publici neglegentur. Equidem nihil commodius invenio, quam quod ipse feci. Nam pro quingentis milibus nummum, quae in alimenta ingenuorum ingenuarumque promiseram, agrum ex meis longe pluris actori publico mancipavi; eundem vectigali imposito recepi, tricena milia annua daturus. Per hoc enim et rei publicae sors in tuto nec reditus incertus, et ager ipse propter id quod vectigal large supercurrit, semper dominum a quo exerceatur inveniet. Nec ignoro me plus aliquanto quam donasse videor erogavisse, cum pulcherrimi agri pretium necessitas vectigalis infregerit. Sed oportet privatis utilitatibus publicas, mortalibus aeternas anteferre, multoque diligentius muneri suo consulere quam facultatibus. Vale.*¹³⁹

You ask me how the money which you have given to our native town for an annual feast may be secured after you are dead. It is an honour to consult me on such matter, but it is not easy to give an answer. If you hand over the money in sum to the community, the danger is that it may be squandered, and if you give lands, they will be neglected as all public lands are. Indeed, I can find no more satisfactory plan than that which I used myself. For instead of paying down the 500,000 sesterces which I had promised for the *alimenta* of free-born boys and girls, I transferred some land of mine, which was worth considerably more, to the municipal agent and received it back from him, after he had arranged a rent for it, the arrangement being that I should give 30,000 sesterces a year. By this plan the principal is secured to the community and the interest is also safe, while the land in question will always find a tenant to

¹³⁹Pliny, *Epp.* VII, 18.

keep it in good order, as it is worth much more than the rent placed upon it. Of course, I am aware that I appear to have paid out more than the sum I have given, seeing that the fixed rent charge, for the selling price of that fine bit of land has been diminished by the obligation to pay the reserved rent. However, it is necessary to prefer public interests to private ones, and interests which will go in perpetuity to those which perish with us, and we should give much more careful consideration to our benefactions than to merely growing rich. Farewell.

Rufus shows concern for his inheritance and the legal difficulties involved in donating part of his patrimony to the community of Como. If we take into consideration the letters previously analyzed, we could consider that Saturninus’ episode could have influenced Rufus’ decision in revising his inheritance. Interestingly, Rufus chooses to consult Pliny because of his experience and legal expertise. By choosing Pliny as his advisor, Rufus wanted to make sure that his inheritance would have been well spent for the benefit of the city and would not have run the risk of ending up as his friend Saturninus, as Pliny points out “*Deliberas mecum quemadmodum pecunia, quam municipibus nostris in epulum obtulisti post te quoque salva sit*”, “You ask me how the money which you have given to our native town for an annual feast may be secured after you are dead”. Rufus’ preoccupation describes two interesting points: Rufus had a genuine interest to help the local community and he wanted to be remembered among his fellow citizen as a generous and scrupulous benefactor. Pliny’s language is crucial here; as seen in the previous letters, Pliny puts the interests of the community above his and Rufus’. Pliny shows support for a system of donations which benefited the community, but penalized the euergetes.

Pliny’s scheme displays some resemblances with the scheme of donations which emperors devised to help municipia in Italy. Indeed, this scheme of donations based on rental property, which Pliny advises Rufus to use, was employed for the first time during the Neronian period. Indeed, in an inscription which comes from the town of Atina, 400,000 sesterces were left to the municipality by the Imperial administration: “*Ut liberis eorum ex reditu dum in aetate(m) pervenirent frumentu(m) et postea sesterti(a) singular millia darentur*”.¹⁴⁰ However, in this case, Pliny seems to follow the scheme which was based on rent-change; this particularly resembled the large-scale *alimenta Italiae* established by the Emperors Nerva and Trajan. These alimentary tables were found near Beneventum and Veleia, and were dated between the 101 and 104 AD.¹⁴¹ By advising Rufus to use a similar method in administering his inheritance, Pliny wanted to ensure that Rufus’ inheritance would have benefited the public, as he clearly points out at the end of the letter, “*Sed oportet privatis utilitatibus publicas, mortalibus aeternas anteferre, multoque diligentius muneri suo consulere quam facultatibus*”, “However, it is necessary to prefer public interests to private ones, and interests which will go in perpetuity to those which perish with us, and we should give much more careful consideration to our benefactions than to merely growing rich”. By contrasting the idea of “public” and “private” interests, Pliny advertises his strong commitment as euergetes for Como. Thus, similarly to Pliny, by leaving his part of inheritance to Como, Rufus wished to advertise his public image as benefactor.

¹⁴⁰ *ILS* 977.

¹⁴¹ *ILS* 6509 and 6676.

The letters of Pliny about Como show the importance that benefactors held in local communities. Local benefactors such as Pliny had a strong relationship of affection with the local communities which they chose to support. The artificial model of the “client and patron” relationship cannot be applied in Pliny’s case; as seen from the primary evidence, there is no description of exchanges of duties between Pliny and his “client community”; Pliny never describes himself as *patronus* of Como in his letter and he is never described as such in the epigraphy. Rather, we find a relationship based on affection where Pliny, just as his friends Saturninus and Caninus Rufus, were more concerned with the performance of public acts of benefaction and the way that these acts might have been viewed by their fellow citizens.

The Donation of Pliny’s Father to Como

Family connections and traditions also led to the spread of the phenomenon of euergetism in Italy. Indeed, Pliny’s euergetistic behaviour was not novel in the city of Como, as there had been already a number of local benefactors who contributed to its economic development. Among these benefactors, there was also Pliny’s father, Lucius Caecilius Secundus. In 1983, an inscription found outside the garden of a high school at Como has brought to light a temple’s dedication which belonged to a certain Lucius Caecilius Secundus. The dedication would have been probably set up in front of a temple that Caecilius Secundus built to the Eternity of Rome and its emperors:

[Caeci]liae filiae) suae nomin[e] L(ucius) Ca[eciliu]s C(ai) filius)
Ouf(entina tribu) Secundus praefectus) [fabr(um)] a co(n)s(ule)
(quattuor)uir i(ure) d(icundo) pontif(ex) tem[plum] Aeternitati Romae et
Augu[stor(um) c]um porticibus et ornamentis incohauit

[—Caeci]lius Secundus filius) dedic[auit].¹⁴²

In the name of his daughter Caecilia, Lucius Caecilius Secundus, son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina, chief of engineers on the nomination of the consul, magistrate for the administration of justice, priest, began a temple to the Eternity of Rome and the Augusti [i.e. emperors] with porticoes and decorations.

. . . Caecilius Secundus, his son, dedicated it.

Before this inscription was discovered, Mommsen had argued that the father of Pliny the younger was Lucius Caecilius Clio.¹⁴³ However, the discovery of this inscription changed the picture; on the basis of this dedication, Alföldy clearly showed that Pliny the younger’s father might have been Lucius Caecilius Secundus.¹⁴⁴ In the inscription, the name Caecilius does not appear entirely, as only the letters “Ca” and “s” and “liae” have been identified; it has been concluded that the names “Caeciliae” and “Caecilius” seem to fit the remaining spaces.¹⁴⁵ However, the most important clue in the inscription, which scholars have identified is the word “Aug”. The ending of “Aug” has been interpreted either to be “usti” or “storum”. Alföldy concludes that the word *Aug* has to be interpreted as the plural form “Augustor(um)”.¹⁴⁶ According to this interpretation, the temple was dedicated to the

¹⁴²CIL 5, 745 (AE 1983, 443).

¹⁴³Gibson 2020, 36-39.

¹⁴⁴Alföldy 1983, 362-73.

¹⁴⁵Alföldy 1983, 362-73.

¹⁴⁶Alföldy 1983, 362-73.

Eternity of Rome and a plurality of emperors rather than one single Augustus. The cult of the “emperors” was present during the Flavian period; it was one of the several evolutions of the ruler cult which started its development under the reign of the Emperor Augustus.¹⁴⁷ It was indeed during the final years of Vespasian reign that Pliny became formally old enough to dedicate a temple as Caecilius Secundus (i.e., in the time between the early death of his father and the adoption of his uncle as Plinius).¹⁴⁸ Moreover, as we learn from the inscription, Pliny’s father was a *praefectus fabrum*, chief of the engineers; this title shows the extent of the wealth that some local euergetes like Caecilius Secundus could have had access to, as the title *praefectus fabrum* clearly indicates his equestrian status.¹⁴⁹ He also held the most distinguished title of the local annual magistrate, *quattuoruir*, in charge of the administration of justice. This title would have probably required a great availability of wealth because of the administrative mansions and duties which were associated with it.¹⁵⁰

By putting together these important elements, it is clear that the Pliny’s family was already influential at Como and had already provided a contribution for the community. This dedication illustrates the kind of importance and influence that the family of the Caecilii held at Como even before Pliny’s time. This kind of importance would have probably influenced Pliny’s education and upbringings as well as his euergetic nature.

¹⁴⁷Fritz 2006.

¹⁴⁸Gibson 2020, 36-39.

¹⁴⁹Syme 1985c, 195 (*RP* 5.644).

¹⁵⁰Galsterer 2006.

As stated above, whereas his father provided a temple for the city of Como, Pliny offered a bath and a public library.

Thus, as shown in this chapter, scholars have often described the relationships between a municipium and an individual of equestrian or senatorial status by using the model of the “patron and client” relationship. By taking into consideration as case study the example of Pliny and Como, it has been shown that such model did not represent the kind of relationship that Pliny shared with Como. On the other hand, the phenomenon of euergetism better describes the relationships which took place between Pliny and the municipium of Como. As seen in his earlier letters to his friend Caninius Rufus, Pliny’s description of Como highlights the personal attachment that he had for his home town; this attachment certainly influenced Pliny when he performed acts of munificence to Como. In performing his benefaction, as the letter to Cornelius Tacitus shows, Pliny does not refer to himself as *patronus* or to Como or its citizens as clients; the letter, rather, emphasizes the nature of the relationships that Pliny enjoyed with his fellow townsmen. Furthermore, Pliny’s relationship of affection was also shared by other local euergetes such as Caninius Rufus and Saturninus who left inheritance gifts to Como. However, Pliny’s euergetistic behaviour was not novel at Como; Pliny’s father already showed his kindness towards the municipium by building a temple to the cult of Eternal Rome and the Emperors. Therefore, family tradition held an important role in the spreading of euergetism in local Italian communities. Influential local families could establish strong ties of attachment with their native communities; these strong ties influenced the granting of benefactions that these

families distributed to their native municipia. For this reason, in the next chapter, we will return to the epigraphic evidence of northern Italy in order to understand the ways by which *patroni civici* were selected by *collegia* and municipia. In particular, by analyzing the tribe of a *patronus*, we will be able to determine the total percentage of local *patroni* who came from the same municipium or region in which they were honoured as *patroni*. This will show whether the *patronus*'s place of origin influenced the relationship that he enjoyed with his local community which set up a dedication in his honour.

Chapter Four: Cities, *Collegia*, and *Patroni*: Looking at the Selections of *Patroni* in Northern Italy

Patronage underwent a profound transformation by the 2nd century AD. In chapter two, I defined this change as the gradual atrophy of patronage.¹⁵¹ As argued, this transformation led patronage to acquire a symbolic function.¹⁵² In this chapter, I will identify some of the changes which led to the transformation of patronage in northern Italy. In order to identify these changes, I will look at the ways in which *patroni* were chosen and selected by municipia, *coloniae*, and *collegia*. At the outset, it is necessary to differentiate between these four groups. In the general discussion of patronage, *patroni* of urban centres and *collegia* have usually been divided into two different categories.¹⁵³ On the one hand, the phenomenon of patronage of communities has been treated by exclusively analyzing *patroni* of cities.¹⁵⁴ On the other hand, *patroni* of *collegia* were studied only in connection with the emergence of *collegia* in the Roman Empire.¹⁵⁵ Here, I will not discuss in details the functions that these *collegia* had in the empire during this century, as it is not the focus

¹⁵¹On the “decline” of Patronage. See: Eilers 2015, 321-322.

¹⁵²See chapter two.

¹⁵³Engesser 1957; Badian 1958, 8-9; Gelzer 1912, 69; Blagg 1981, 167-188; Duthoy 1981, 295-305; Cloud 1989, 205-218; Wallace-Handrill 1989, 1-14; Leunissen 1993, 101-120; Coskun 2005, 423-425; Nicols 2009, 325-335 and 2014, 11-17.

¹⁵⁴Nicols 2009, 325-335 and 2014, 11-17.

¹⁵⁵Jinyu 2009, 13.

of this study.¹⁵⁶ However, I will suggest that *patroni* of *municipia*, *coloniae*, and *collegia* can all belong to one collective group. Indeed, cities and *collegia* share several similarities in the ways by which they honour their *patroni*: the selection of *patroni*, the honours granted to their *patroni*, and the function that these *patroni* had in the communities. It is in this context that patronage started to gradually decline. As will be argued below, although the number of dedications to patrons increased during the Severan period, this cannot be taken as evidence for the growth of patronage during this period.¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, by looking closely at the data, two fundamental factors will become clear: *patroni* started to be increasingly recruited from lower social ranks (e.g., equestrian and municipal classes) and cities and *collegia* preferred *patroni* from their native towns. That cities and *collegia* selected local *patroni* is evident from the tribe of the *patronus* which is often included in his official onomastics.¹⁵⁸ It must be always remembered that this might be coincidental. Having the same tribe as the community in which a *patronus* was honoured did not necessarily mean that he was from the same town. However, by looking at each inscription from northern Italy, it will become evident that the majority of patrons during the 2nd century AD had the same tribal association to the municipium, *colonia*, and/or *collegia* in which they were honoured with the title *patronus*.¹⁵⁹ This phenomenon was, however,

¹⁵⁶On *Collegia* See: Waltzing 1895-1900; De Robertis 1938, 1955, 1963, and 1971; Harmand 1957; Cracco Ruggini 1971, 59–64; Clemente 1972, 142-229; Ausbüttel 1982; Salamito 1987, 163-177 and 1990, 164; Royden 1988; van Nijf 1997, 179-181 and 1999, 201-202; Kneissl 1994, 142-43; Perry 2001, 205–16 and 2006; Tran 2001, 185–86; Jinyu 2009, 4-6.

¹⁵⁷Nicols 1980, 365-385.

¹⁵⁸Ross Taylor 1960, 27-40.

¹⁵⁹See Appendix.

different during the late Republic where *patroni* came from Rome and functioned as the main link between Rome and communities in Italy and the rest of the empire.¹⁶⁰

Geographical, Diachronic, and Diastratic Distributions of Patroni’s Inscriptions in Northern Italy

The end of the Republic and the beginning of the Principate had impacted the political, social, and cultural system of Rome.¹⁶¹ The Roman senate, one of the most ancient institution in the Roman world, had also transformed. Tacitus specifically notes this change in his *Annals*:

*Luxusque mensae, a fine Actiaci belli ad ea arma, quis Servius Galba rerum adeptus est, per annos centum profusis sumptibus exerciti paulatim exolevere. causas eius mutationis quaerere libet. dites olim familiae nobelium aut claritudine insignes studio magnificentiae prolabebantur. nam etiam tum plebem socios regna colere et coli licitum; ut quisque opibus domo paratu speciosus per nomen et clientelas inlustrior habebatur. postquam caedibus saevitum et magnitudo famae exitio erat, ceteri ad sapientiora convertere. Simul novi homines emunicipiis et coloniis atque etiamprovinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti domesticam parsimoniam intulerunt, et quamquam fortuna vel industria plerique pecuniosam ad senectampervenirent, mansit tamen prior animus. sed praecipuus adstrictimoris auctor Vespasianus fuit, antiquo ipse cultu victuque. obsequium inde in principem et aemulandi amor validior quam poena ex legibus et metus.*¹⁶²

From the end of the battle of Actium to the struggle in which Servius Galba came to power, extravagant dinners were practised through many years and

¹⁶⁰Eilers 2002, 161-181.

¹⁶¹Syme 1939, 78-96; 367; 495-7 and Wiseman, 1971, 13-32.

¹⁶²Tac. *Ann.* 3. 55.

great sums spent. Then by little it faded away. The causes of this transformation are worth inquiring. Wealthy families, noble or of clear renowned, at one time were often ruined by their desire for greatness. Even at that time, it was acceptable to court the plebians and allies and kingdoms and be courted. Each man’s prestige was based on his riches, home, and furniture and increased by his reputation and *clientelae*. After the massacres in which greatness of renowned was fatal, the survivors turned to wiser ways. At the same time, new men from municipia and *coloniae* and even the provinces were increasingly admitted into the senate, introducing with them frugal habits, and although many of them by luck or hard work enjoyed wealth in their old age, nevertheless their earlier habits remained. Vespasian especially encouraged a more restrained lifestyle, old-fashioned both in his dress and dining habits. For a respectful feeling towards the prince and a love of emulation proved more effective than legal penalties or terrors.

Tacitus’ moralizing view of history highlights what he saw as the gradual moral decadence of Roman society, a theme which was employed in Latin historiography.¹⁶³ Although moral decadence is the dominant reason for change in his historical analysis, Tacitus’ remarks on the political changes of the early empire are still, nevertheless, useful.

In the beginning, he focuses his narrative on the Principate and the causes which brought corruption to the Roman state.¹⁶⁴ Specifically, he believes that the Roman political class changed because of the corrupted political regimes of the emperors. Tacitus, indeed, identifies this transformation in the context of the moral decadence of the empire; this historical period is characterized by “extravagant dinners” and expenditure of “great sums”. In this new political environment, the consumption of wealth was one of the means by

¹⁶³Woodman and Martin 1996, 403; Griffin 1991, 19-46; Edwards 1993, 200-204.

¹⁶⁴Syme 1959, 444.

which individuals acquired political and social standing.¹⁶⁵ Here, the historian sets out a clear contrast between the old Roman Republic and the new Empire: Whereas political prominence was achieved on the basis of traditions, honours, equality, and the number of *patronus’ clientelae* during the Roman Republic, these fundamental values have been gradually disintegrating during the empire.¹⁶⁶ This ultimately also impacted the political formation of the Roman senate.¹⁶⁷ Tacitus, indeed, highlights that *novi homines* from municipia, *coloniae*, and provinces started to be recruited as senators. Some of Tacitus’ historical observations reflect the political changes of the Imperial period. Indeed, as will be noted below, the epigraphic evidence shows that the majority of senatorial *patroni* in Italy increasingly came from their home towns.¹⁶⁸

At the outset, it is necessary to show the chronological distribution of inscriptions honouring *patroni* in order to put into perspective the political transformation which Tacitus addressed in the aforementioned passage. As table one will show below, there is a spike of *patroni’* inscriptions during the 2nd century AD in Italy (this is also true for the western provinces during this period although I did not report this data in the table below).¹⁶⁹ However, this should not be taken as evidence of the further spread of patronage in the west, an argument which has already been suggested.¹⁷⁰ On the other hand, the

¹⁶⁵Syme 1959, 444.

¹⁶⁶Woodman and Martin 1996, 403.

¹⁶⁷Syme 1939, 78–96; 367; 495–7.

¹⁶⁸See table 2 below.

¹⁶⁹Nicols 1980, 365-385 and 2014 (see appendix of inscriptions).

¹⁷⁰Nicols 1980, 365-385.

increase of inscriptions honouring patrons should be read according to the frequency by which Latin inscriptions were produced during the empire.¹⁷¹ As noted in chapter two, there is a lower frequency of production of Latin inscriptions during the Augustan period.¹⁷² Starting from A.D. 14 the production of Latin inscriptions gradually rises until it reaches its peak during the 2nd century AD.¹⁷³ The danger lies in using the “epigraphic habit” as a way to measure the production of inscriptions mentioning *patroni* throughout centuries.¹⁷⁴ This phenomenon can be clearly noted below in the distribution of inscriptions honouring *patroni* from A.D. 1 to 300:

	Augustus-Domitian	Nerva-Commodus	Severus-Diocletian
Senatorial <i>patroni</i> of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> in northern Italy and Italy	4 (16)	12 (65)	7 (38)
Imperial equestrian <i>patroni</i> of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> in northern Italy and Italy	4 (15)	8 (36)	4 (26)
Local equestrian <i>patroni</i> of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> in northern Italy and Italy	4 (14)	14 (53)	3 (34)
Municipal <i>patroni</i> of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> in northern Italy and Italy	1 (3)	14 (28)	2 (23)

¹⁷¹Eilers 2002, 167.

¹⁷²Mrozek, 1973, 113-18 and MacMullen 1982, 233-46.

¹⁷³Mócsy 1966, 387-421; Mrozek, 1973, 113-18; Bíró 1975, 13-58; MacMullen 1982, 233-46; Jongman 1988, 67-71; Meyer 1990, 74-86; Thomas 1992, 162-165; Woolf, 1996, 24.

¹⁷⁴Eilers 2002, 167.

In the chart reported above, these numbers show a qualitative rather than a quantitative change.¹⁷⁵ The increase of senatorial, equestrian, and municipal *patroni* during the A.D. 100 to 200 reflects the increase of the spread of Latin epigraphy; it does not, however, reveal a global image of the spread of patronage in Italy during the Imperial period. Indeed, Duthoy’s numbers on the *patroni* in Italy clearly match my data from northern Italy.¹⁷⁶ The highest numbers mainly come from the 2nd century AD where we have a total of 182 *patroni* in Italy, followed by 48 *patroni* in northern Italy alone. Eventually, these numbers decrease during the third century in northern Italy as well as in the rest of Italy. This also matches the figures usually provided for the spread of Latin epigraphy during the third century AD.¹⁷⁷ Therefore, table one provides a partial picture of the distribution of inscriptions honouring patrons, as it shows the total amount of inscriptions in a chronological context. However, it does not show the diastatic distribution of *patroni* during the centuries; this limits our understanding of the decline of civic patronage in northern Italy.

Although patronage was being practiced in Italy during the empire, its nature, nevertheless, changed. This transformation can be traced by looking at the ways in which communities honoured their patrons. During the 2nd century AD, the majority of municipia, *coloniae*, and *collegia* started to honour local patrons from lower social classes.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁵Eilers 2015, 327.

¹⁷⁶Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

¹⁷⁷Mrozek, 1973, 113-18; MacMullen 1982, 233-46; Meyer 1990, 74-86.

¹⁷⁸See table two below and Appendix.

Nonetheless, this has not always been the case; indeed, a great difference can be noticed by comparing late Republican and Imperial *patroni*. During the Republic, the majority of *patroni* usually came from Rome; we find 58 *patroni* in Italy.¹⁷⁹ Moreover, the majority of *patroni* are senators during the Republic whereas *patroni* from the Imperial period are mostly equestrians and decurions.¹⁸⁰

Indeed, as seen above with Tacitus’ passage, the Roman political class changed between the end of the late Republic and the beginning of the empire. The network of patronage which was established down to the age of Augustus had broken down, as *patroni* less commonly came from Rome during the high empire. This point can be illustrated by comparing the numbers of late Republican *patroni*, reported above, with the numbers of *patroni* found in northern Italy. The comparison shows that the majority of *patroni* were recruited from their home towns:

¹⁷⁹This is Bispham’s list of *patroni* in Italy before Actium (2007, 457–458).

¹⁸⁰Duthoy 1984, 145-156 and Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

	Augustan	Julian-Claudian	Nerva-Hadrian	Antonines	Severans	Mid-Third Century AD
Local Senatorial, equestrian, and municipal patrons of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> .	1	6	17	9	7	5
Non-local Senatorial, equestrian, and municipal patrons of cities and / or <i>collegia</i> .	0	2	3	4	3	4
Uncertain	0	1	5	7	1	6

The chart above gives a better perspective of the distribution of inscriptions mentioning *patroni* according to location and chronology. As expected, the Augustan period does not reveal much information on the distribution of *patroni* because of the scarce frequency of inscriptions’ production.¹⁸¹ Nevertheless, the numbers subsequently rise in the next centuries. Indeed, from the Julian-Claudian to the Severan period, the total number of *patroni* who were recruited from their home towns increased. However, as will be shown below, although these *patroni* do not come from the same city in which they were honoured, they, nevertheless, still come from nearby communities in northern Italy.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹Mrozek, 1973, 113-18; MacMullen 1982, 233-46; Meyer 1990, 74-86; Woolf, 1996, 24.

¹⁸²See appendix.

Furthermore, another important change which took place during the 2nd century AD lies in the distribution of *patroni* in various social classes.¹⁸³ By following Duthoy’s diastratic analysis, I divided *patroni* into four social classes: senators, equestrians who pursued imperial careers, equestrians whose careers were only local, and local men of decurional class.¹⁸⁴ While the identification of senatorial *patroni* is fairly obvious, the problem arises in the identification of Imperial and local equestrians.¹⁸⁵ Whereas an Imperial equestrian usually worked for the Imperial house and held important magistracies such as the title of curator, procurator, or legionary services, local equestrians only held local offices.¹⁸⁶ It is not clear, if at all, the extent to which Imperial equestrians could have acted as representatives of their communities. Nevertheless, in the series of inscriptions reported in the chart, there is no particular mention that their connection with the Imperial house brought any benefits to the local municipium, *colonia*, or *collegia*.¹⁸⁷ The last category is that of the local decurions who held local magistrates in the local senate of their municipia or *coloniae*.¹⁸⁸

In the senatorial group of inscriptions, we find a total of only 11 senatorial *patroni* which come from northern Italy. On the other hand, we see that the greatest number of inscriptions mentioning patrons belongs to Imperial and local equestrians, as we find 24

¹⁸³Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

¹⁸⁴Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

¹⁸⁵Millar 1977, 101; Eck 1986, 129-152; Bruun 2015, 202-265.

¹⁸⁶Mennen 2011, 135-138.

¹⁸⁷See appendix.

¹⁸⁸Pflaum 1960, 890-99 and Parma 2003, 167-171.

inscriptions in total from the Julio-Claudian to the Severan period. Although 24 equestrian versus 11 senatorial inscriptions do not provide a great display of data, the diastatic distribution of inscriptions still provides a hint to the transformation that took place in the institution of patronage. However, if we compare Duthoy’s numbers, the picture which emerges is clearer. Indeed, Duthoy reported 65 senatorial *patroni* in Italy versus a total of 89 equestrian *patroni* during the 2nd century AD.¹⁸⁹ This shows that the institution of patronage was not only reserved to senators from Rome. On the other hand, it gradually became open to other social classes who did not have the same kind of representation and importance that senators had at Rome during the Republic.

Venetia et Histria: Regio X

Since I discussed the general distribution of inscriptions in northern Italy, I will now conduct a micro analysis of each region of northern Italy. As will be shown, this analysis will provide a better understanding of the relationships and selections of *patroni* in the northern Italian regions. The region which provides the richest majority of the evidence for the phenomenon of patronage is *Venetia et Histria*.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, in this region, I found a total of 35 inscriptions related to patronage.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁹Duthoy 1984, 136-153.

¹⁹⁰Sartori 1960, 159-259.

¹⁹¹See appendix under “*Venetia et Histria: Regio X*”.

Aquileia has reported seven inscriptions that mention *patroni*.¹⁹² Only two *patroni* were natives of Aquileia: *CIL* V, 40 and *CIL* V, 1012. As will be noted below, the other five *patroni* cannot be identified as natives of Aquileia since they come from a different tribe¹⁹³ However, a closer analysis will reveal that these other *patroni* are either natives of Aquileia (although it cannot be determined on the basis of their tribes) or come from nearby cities (this is also the case for other *patroni*’s inscriptions in northern Italy).

In *CIL* V, 40, the honorand is a certain Gaius Veratius Italus, an Imperial equestrian *patronus* from Aquileia:

*C(aio) Veratio c(ai) filio Vel(ina) (tribu) / Italo Aquileiensi / iiiivir(o) quinq(uennali), pont(ifici) / equit(i) praef(ecto) clas(sium) / praef(ecto) coh(ort)i(s) [primae] Dalmatar(um) / cur(atori) viar(um) praef(ecto) aliment(orum) / leg(ato) prov(inciae) Africae / cur(atori) Illyr(iae) et Histriae / patrono coloniar(um) / Concord(iae) et Altinat(is), / colleg(ium) fabr(um) centonar(iorum) / dendrophor(orum) navicular(iorum) / et plebs urbana / ob merita eius / ex aere conlato / decr(eto) dec(urionum) / publice.*¹⁹⁴

To Gaius Veratius Italus of Aquileia, son of Gaius, from the Velina tribe, *se(x)vir quinquennalis*, priest, knight, prefect of the fleet, prefect of the first cohort of Dalmatia, curator of the streets, prefect for alimentary programs, legate of the province of Africa, curator of Illyria and Istria, *patronus* of the *coloniae* of Concordia and Altinum, the *collegium* of smiths, of the textile dealers, of the timber workers, of the ship workers, and the urban population [dedicated this monument] on behalf of his merits collected from the treasury with the public decree of the decurions.

¹⁹²*CIL* V, 40 (*AE* 1994, 6680); *CIL* V, 865 (*CIL* V, 429) (*AE* 2010, 54); *CIL* VIII, 7036 (*ILS*, 1068); *CIL* V, 877; *CIL* V, 1012; *CIL* V, 8972 (*AE* 2016, 19); *AE* 1960, 191 (*AE* 1961, 213) (*AE* 2000, 605).

¹⁹³Ross Taylor 1960, 27-40.

¹⁹⁴*CIL* V, 40 (*AE* 1994, 6680).

The inscription above, which can be roughly dated to the 2nd century AD, is dedicated to Gaius Veratius Italus. As it can be seen from his career, he was an Imperial equestrian and native of Aquileia, as his tribe, *Velina*, was also the voting tribe of Aquileia.¹⁹⁵ At the end of the inscription, we learn that he was also *patronus* of Concordia and Altinum.¹⁹⁶ Veratius’ *cursus honoum* represents the typical career of Imperial equestrians during this period.¹⁹⁷ Indeed, he started his political life by holding a few local offices such as the one of *se(x)vir quinquennali* and priest. Typically, these offices represented the beginning of a local municipal career.¹⁹⁸ However, Veratius advanced his career by serving in the Imperial army.¹⁹⁹ Indeed, his career slowly rose when he undertook military offices abroad, as it was usually the case with most Imperial equestrians.²⁰⁰ As we learn from the inscription, he served in the provinces of Dalmatia and Africa. However, despite his military posts, this *patronus* had still a strong connection with his fellow citizens at home. Indeed, he was *patronus* of two nearby *coloniae*, Concordia and Altium. During the 2nd century AD, it was not uncommon for *patroni* to be honoured by several communities.²⁰¹ Moreover, the cities of Concordia and Altinum were located in the *Venetia et Histria* region, nearby

¹⁹⁵Duthoy 1984, 127 and Kubitschek 1923, 106.

¹⁹⁶Alföldy 1981, 331.

¹⁹⁷Stein 1963, 444-459; Rémondon 1970, 100-101; Alföldy 1984, 193.

¹⁹⁸Vandevoorde 2012, 407.

¹⁹⁹Thomas 2004, 427.

²⁰⁰Duthoy 1984, 123-125.

²⁰¹Nicols 1980, 365-385.

Aquileia.²⁰² Veratius Italus’ case was not uncommon in northern Italy where local *patroni* were selected not only by their home towns, but also nearby communities.

Furthermore, this inscription was dedicated to Veratius by the *collegia* of smiths, of the textile dealers, of the timber, and ship owners. In northern Italy, the *collegia* of smiths, of the textile dealers, of the timber workers are highly represented in the local epigraphy.²⁰³ On the other hand, the *collegium* of ship owners is not often represented in the epigraphy, although there are few examples from Pesarum.²⁰⁴ Veratius’ dedication by the *collegium* of the ship owners could be connected with his military service as prefect of the fleet, as his expertise could have been useful for this *collegium*.²⁰⁵ However, it is difficult to assert that Veratius actively helped the four *collegia* and the three cities. At the end of the inscription, we find the usual epigraphic formula *ob merita eius ex aere conlato*. As seen in chapter two, this formula is often used to assert that the *patronus* provided monetary aid to his community.²⁰⁶ Nevertheless, it could have simply referred to acts of euergetism that the *patronus* performed for either one of the *collegia* or the cities. On the other hand, Concordia and Altinum could have selected Veratius as *patronus* because of the close relationship and the prominence that he had in his home town and in the region of the *Venetia et Histria*.

²⁰²Scarpa Bonazza et al 1962; Brusin & Zovatto 1960, 242 and 135; Egger 1947, 14-58; Stillwell et al 1976, 46.

²⁰³Jinyu 2009, 50.

²⁰⁴*CIL* XI, 6362 (*ILS* 7364); *CIL* XI, 6369; *CIL* XI, 6378.

²⁰⁵Saddington 2009, 123-132.

²⁰⁶Nicols 1980, 365-385.

We find a similar pattern in *CIL* V, 1012, an inscription dedicated to the senator Gaius Valerius Eusebetus whose tribe was also *Velina* (2nd century AD).²⁰⁷ Furthermore, in addition to be *patronus* of Septimia Aurelia Augusta, he was also honoured by the *collegia centonariorum et dendrophorum* of Aquileia.²⁰⁸ However, we find five *patroni* whose tribal affiliation cannot be used as an indicator to show their connection with Aquileia. Among these, there are the two brothers: Titus Caesernius Status Quincticus of Macedonia Quinctianus and Titus Caesernius Quintus Statianus Memmius Macrinus.²⁰⁹ Although they are identified with the *Palatina* tribe, they, nevertheless, were still natives of Aquileia, as seen in chapter two.²¹⁰ Indeed, the Casernii were a distinguished and important family at Aquileia.²¹¹ For this reason, Titus Casernius Status is attested as *patronus* of Aquileia in the years 138-148.²¹²

Nevertheless, this was not the case for the senator Aulus Platorius Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus Gaius Licinius Pollio, whose origin seems not to be connected with Aquileia:

A(ulo) Platorio A(uli) f(ilio) / Serg(ia tribu) Nepoti Aponio Italico / Maniliano / C(aio) Licinio Pollioni, co(n)s(uli), auguri, legat(o) Aug(usti)/ pro praet(ore) provinc(iae) Britanniae, leg(ato) pro pr(aetore) pro/vinc(iae) German(iae) inferior(is), / leg(ato) pro pr(aetore) provinc(iae) Thrac(iae), / leg(ato) legion(is) I Adiutricis, / quaest(ori) provinc(iae) Maced(oniae), / curat(ori) viarum Cassiae / Clodiae Ciminiae novae / Traianae, candidato Divi / Traiani, trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII / Primigen(iae) P(iae)

²⁰⁷Zaccaria 2008a, 755.

²⁰⁸Zaccaria 2008a, 755.

²⁰⁹*CIL* V, 865 (*CIL* V, 429) (*AE* 2010, 54) and *CIL* VIII, 7036 (*ILS*, 1068).

²¹⁰Alföldy 1981, 333 and 1984, 96-97.

²¹¹Alföldy 1981, 333 and 1984, 96-97.

²¹²Alföldy 1984, 96-97.

*F(idelis), praet(ori), trib(uno) / pleb(is), IIIvir(o) capitali, / patrono, / D(ecurionum) d(ecreto).*²¹³

To Aulus Platorius, son of Aulus, of the voting tribe *Sergia*, Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus Gaius Licinius Pollio, consul, augur, legate of the emperor with praetorian powers of the province of Britain, legate with praetorian powers of the province of Lower Germany, legate with praetorian powers of the province of Thrace, legate of the legion I Adiutrix, quaestor of the province of Macedonia, curator of the Cassian, Clodian, Ciminian and New Trajanic Roads, a candidate nominated by the emperor Trajan, military tribune of the legion XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis, praetor, tribune of the plebs, one of the Board of Three in charge of capital sentences, Patronus. (This monument was set up) by decree of the councillors.

This inscription, probably set up in the year 125 AD, records the life and achievements of the senator Aulus Platorius Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus Gaius Licinius Pollio.²¹⁴ As it can be seen from the dedication, he had an illustrious military and political career abroad. Nevertheless, his origins are not that clear. From his onomastics, it can be seen that his name was originally Gaius Licinius Pollio; he was later adopted by a certain Aulus Platorius Nepos.²¹⁵ His tribe, *Sergia*, might indicate that he might have been a native of the *colonia Augusta Praetori*, in the Transpadana region.²¹⁶ Indeed, *Augusta Praetoria* is the nearest *colonia* to Aquileia whose tribe is *Sergia*.²¹⁷ It could have been the case that the senator might have immigrated from *Augusta Praetoria* to Aquileia where he was adopted by Aulus Platorius Nepos. However, it is difficult to prove this line of argument, as I found few

²¹³*CIL* V, 877.

²¹⁴Gordon 1958, 47-48; Calderini 1968, 11-14; Alföldy 1984, 99; Panciera 1987, 89; Brusin 1991, 234-236; Keppie 1991, 72-73; Eck 1995, 110-11; Lettich 2003, 64-65.

²¹⁵Keppie 1991, 72-73.

²¹⁶Ross Taylor 1960, 27-40.

²¹⁷Kubitschek 1923, 117.

inscriptions at Augusta Praetoria, reporting the *nomen* Platorius or the *cognomen* Nepos.²¹⁸ Regarding his career, the inscription displays his offices in a descending order. The most important office is the one of Consul who Nepos held in the year A.D. 119.²¹⁹ However, before achieving the office of consul, Nepos held different military and political posts. He probably began his career at Rome in 95 AD; he was a member of the board of *IIIvir capitalis*.²²⁰ He subsequently continued his civil career since he became tribune of the people and looked after the renovation and construction of several important roads.²²¹ He eventually started his military career where he held several military posts in the western provinces, culminating in his nominee as governor of Britain in the years 122-24 A.D.²²² Although the inscription does not mention this detail, the senator Nepos also distinguished himself for having built Hadrian’s wall in Britain, as his name appears on numerous inscriptions commemorating his work.²²³ Lastly, Nepos was also nominated honorary *patronus* by Aquileia’s local senate.

Regarding the final two inscriptions from Aquileia, *CIL* V, 8972 (*AE* 2016, 19) and *AE* 1960, 191 (*AE* 1961, 213) (*AE* 2000, 605), we do not have the tribe of Quintus Axilius Urbicus and Tiberius Claudius Magnus, as the inscriptions do not mention their tribes. On

²¹⁸*AE* 2007, 583 and *CIL* V, 876.

²¹⁹Gordon 1958, 47-48; Calderini 1968, 11-14; Alföldy 1984, 99; Panciera 1987, 89; Brusin 1991, 234-236; Keppie 1991, 72-73; Eck 1995, 110-11; Lettich 2003, 64-65.

²²⁰Keppie 1991, 72-73.

²²¹Brusin 1991, 234-236.

²²²Eck 1995, 110-11 and Lettich 2003, 64-65.

²²³Keppie 1991, 72. For Nepos’ involvement in the construction of Hadrian’s wall. See: SHA, *Hadr.* 4.2, 15.2, 23.4.

the one hand, in the case of Tiberius Claudius Magnus, he was a local decurion and only held local offices; he, therefore, might have had local relationships with Aquileia.²²⁴ On the other hand, Quintus Axilius Urbicus was an equestrian who had an Imperial career, as he was nominated to be part of the board of *magistrus sacrarum cognitionum a studiis et a consiliis Augustorum*, master of sacred inquiries.²²⁵ However, he was also honoured *patronus* of Aquileia. His origins are difficult to identify, as the honorary inscription does not provide any further details about his identity.²²⁶ However, in the *Regio X*, 8 inscriptions report the *cognomen* Urbicus; among these, seven can be found at Aquileia.²²⁷ Therefore, because of the attestation of this *cognomen* at Aquileia, it could have been the case that Urbicus was also a native of the city.

In the *Venetia et Histria* region, we find other municipia and *coloniae* in which the majority of *patroni* were honoured by their local communities. This is especially the case for Concordia and Verona. At Concordia, four *patroni* out of five are from the tribe *Claudia*, which was also the municipium’s voting tribe.²²⁸ On the other hand, the fifth *patronus*, the senator Gaius Arrius Antoninus is from the *Quirina* voting tribe.²²⁹ A similar pattern can be identified in the municipium of Verona where four *patroni* out of five come

²²⁴Brusin 1991, 88-89; Hornum 1993, 231-232; Fortea López 1994, 265-266; Boffo 1996, 137-151.

²²⁵Pflaum 1960 (vol.2), 889-890; Calderini 1968, 11-12; Alföldy 1984, 95; Panciera 1987, 91-92; Brusin 1991, 218; Forbis 1996, 220; Lettich 2003, 68-69.

²²⁶Pflaum 1960 (vol.2), 889-890.

²²⁷*CIL* V, 1555; *CIL* V, 1718; *CIL* V, 1719; *CIL* V, 8972; *InscrAqu* 1, 1191; *AE* 1982, 384 (*AE* 2013, 6); *CIL* V, 4031; *CIL* V, 2556.

²²⁸*CIL* V, 8659; *CIL* V, 1875; *CIL* V, 8660 (*ILS* 1364); *CIL* V, 8667; Kubitschek 1923, 109.

²²⁹*CIL* V, 1874; Corbier 1974, 253; Brusin 1960, 29; Broilo 1980, 32-36; Alföldy 1984, 108; Lettich 1994, 57-63.

from the municipium’s tribe, the *Poblilia*.²³⁰ In this case, the fifth *patronus*, the senator Petronus Probus does not report his tribal affiliation.²³¹ Nevertheless, in comparison to Aquileia, Concordia, and Verona, we find fewer *patroni* which come from the same *coloniae* or municipia.²³² Indeed, this can be seen by analyzing the remaining distribution of municipia and *coloniae*: Brixia (2 / 3 local *patroni*); Parentium (1 / 2); Tridentum (1/3); Feltria (1/1); Opitergium (1/1); Bellunum (1/1); Sirmione (1/1).²³³ However, the municipium of Pola is the only unusual instance in northern Italy.²³⁴ Although Kubitschek identifies Pola with the tribe *Camilia*, he highlights that Pola’s tribe is still, nevertheless, uncertain. Indeed, we find a number of *patroni* from Pola who belong to the voting tribe of *Velina*.²³⁵ For this reason, I believe that the original tribe of Pola might be *Velina*, instead of *Camilia*.

Aemilia: Regio VIII

In the region Aemilia, the number of inscriptions mentioning *patroni* is slightly lower than the *Venetia et Histria* region, as 22 dedications were recorded.²³⁶ The *colonia* of

²³⁰Kubitschek 1923, 116.

²³¹*CIL* V, 3344.

²³²See appendix.

²³³See appendix.

²³⁴(*AE* 2005, 542) (*AE* 2009, 49) (*AE* 2014, 483); *CIL* V, 47; *CIL* V, 60; *CIL* V, 61.

²³⁵*CIL* V, 47; *CIL* V, 60; *CIL* V, 61.

²³⁶See appendix.

Ariminum records the highest number of dedications mentioning *patroni*.²³⁷ Six *patroni* out of a total of nine report *Aniensis* as their tribe which was also Ariminum’s voting tribe.²³⁸ However, among these inscriptions, there is also *CIL* XI, 373 where we find no tribal identification:

M(arco) Aelio Aurelio | Theoni, v(iro) c(larissimo), | iurid(ico) de infinito per Flam(iniam) | et Umbriam, Picenum, sodali | Hadrianali, praetori, tribun(o) plebis, | adlecto inter quaestorios, trib(uno) | militum laticlavio leg(ionis) (undecimae) Claud(iae) | item tribuno militum laticl(avio) | leg(ionis) (duodecimae) Fulm[i]natae, decem | vir(o) sclitibus iudicandis, | ob singularem abstinentiam | industriamq(ue) exhibita(m) iudicat, | ordo Ariminensium, | patrono.

To Marcus Aelius Aurelius Theo, senator, prefect of all the administration of justice though the [regions of] Flaminia, Umbria, and Piceno, priest of the Emperor Hadrian, praetor, tribune of the plebs, adlected among the questors, tribune *laticlavius* of the soldiers of the 11th Claudia legion, and tribune *laticlavius* of the soldiers of the 12th legion Fulminata, Decemviri stlitibus iudicandis, on account of his unique firmness and proved industry, the ordo of Ariminum decided (to set up this dedication) (to their) patronus.

The inscription (225-250 AD)²³⁹ celebrates the life of the senator Marcus Aelius Aurelius Theo.²⁴⁰ Although the career of the senator Theo is presented, it is difficult to identify his place of origin.²⁴¹ Hächler argues that he could have been a native of Italy.²⁴² Indeed,

²³⁷*CIL* XI, 373 (*ILS* 1192); *CIL* XI, 377; *CIL* XI, 378; *CIL* XI, 379; *CIL* XI, 386 (*ILS* 6659); *CIL* XI, 395; *CIL* XI, 421; *CIL* XI, 414; *CIL* XI, 417.

²³⁸Kubitschek 1923, 94.

²³⁹Corbier believes that this inscription should be dated around the beginning of the third century AD because another Greek inscription from Epheso, using the title *iudicandis*, dates around the same period (Corbier 1973, 659–661).

²⁴⁰*PIR* 2 A 150; Lambrechts 1937, 61; Barbieri 1952, 245; Degrassi 1952, 70; Pflaum 1957, 141; Pflaum 1966, 280; Corbier 1973, 659–661; Eck 1974a, 537–538; Eck 1975b, 162–163; Roda 1977, 37–62; Christol 1982, 43 and 1986a, 137–139; Sartre 1982, 92; Christol and Mahjoubi 1987, 931–932; Rémy 1989, 274–275; Rüpke, Nüsslein, Glock 2005 II, 728; Gerhardt and Hartmann 2008, 1099; Hächler 2019, 243–244.

²⁴¹Corbier 1973, 659–661.

²⁴²Hächler 2019, 243–244.

Corbier specifically highlights that the *ordo* of Ariminum rewarded Theo with this dedication because of his *abstinentia* and *industria* in his administration of justice throughout the regions of Flaminia, Umbria, and Piceno.²⁴³ However, it is difficult to identify the kind of relationship that Theo had with Ariminum. Because of the senator’s prominence in Italy, and especially in the nearby region of Umbria and Piceno, the local senate of Ariminum could have honoured Theo in order to recognize his authority. However, the inscription does not point to a service that the senator performed for the *colonia*.

Nevertheless, we only find one inscription in Ariminum where a senator was honoured because of the services he granted to the city:

*C(aio) Cornelio | C(ai) filio Quirin(a tribu) | Felici Italo, | iurid(ico) per Flamin(iam) | et Umbri[am], leg(ato) | prov(inciae) Achaiae, praet(ori), | [t]r(ibuno) pl(ebis), quaest(ori) prov(inciae) Sicil(iae), | patrono coloniae, | vicani vicorum (septem) et | co[ll]eg(ia) fabr(um), cent(onariorum), dendr(ophorum) | urb(is), iuridicatus eius ob eximiam | moderationem et in sterilitate | annonae laboriosam erga ipsos fidem | et industriam ut et civibus anno[n(a)] | superesset et vicinis civitati|bus subveneretur. | L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).*²⁴⁴

To Gaius Cornelius, son of Gaius, from the voting tribe Quirina, Felix Italus, in charge of administrating justice through [the regions of] Flaminia and Umbria, legate of the province of Achaia, praetor, tribune of the plebs, quaestor of the province of Sicily, *patronus* of the colony, the *vicani* of the seven vici and the *collegia* of smiths, of the textile dealers, of the timber workers of the city, having decided on behalf of his exceptional moderation and the laborious faith in the sterility of the treasure that he advocated for the treasury for the citizens and aided the neighbouring municipia. This place was granted by a degree of the decurions.

²⁴³Corbier 1973, 659–661.

²⁴⁴*CIL* XI, 377.

The inscription can be dated around the years of Marcus Aurelius’ reign, 165-166.²⁴⁵ As it is shown in the inscription, the senator Felix Italus comes from the tribe *Quirina*; he was originally a native of the *municipium* of Simitthu in Africa.²⁴⁶ From his career, it can be seen that he held several important military and civil posts until the Emperor Marcus Aurelius put him in charge of the administration of justice in the Italian regions of Flaminia and Umbria.²⁴⁷ The office of *iurid(ico) per Flamin(iam) | et Umbri[am]* was originally created by the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. The emperor selected the senator Felix Italus in order to fulfill the duties associated with this office.²⁴⁸ It is probably during this time that Felix Italus helped the *colonia* of Ariminum. Because of his involvement with the *colonia*, he was honored by the *colonia* as well as the *collegia* of smiths, the textile dealers, and the timber workers.

The last inscription honouring another patron presents an interesting narrative:

*L(ucio) Betutio L(uci) f(ilio) / Pal(atina) Furiano / p(rimo) p(ilo)
leg(ionis) I Ital(iae) Ilviro / quinq(uennali) Ilvir(o) i(i)ure d(icundo) Ilvir(o)
/ aedili cur(uli) pontif(ici) / flamini divi Nervae / patrono colon(iae) /
colleg(ium) centonarior(um) / amantissimo patriae / l(ocus) d(at)us d(ecreto)
d(ecurionum).*²⁴⁹

To Lucius Betutius Furianus, son of Lucius, from the voting tribe Palatina, *primus pilus* of the I legion Italia, *Ilvir quinquennalis*, *Ilvir* in charge of the administration of justice, curial aedile, pontifex, flamen of the deified Nerva, *patronus* of the *colonia*, *collegium* of the textile dealers, to a man especially

²⁴⁵Donati 1967, 28; Corbier 1973, 637-638; Forbis 1996, 213-214; Minak 2006, 197-198; Jinyu 2009, 358.

²⁴⁶Corbier 1973, 637-638.

²⁴⁷Minak 2006, 197-198.

²⁴⁸Corbier 1973, 637-638.

²⁴⁹*CIL* XI, 385.

loving towards the fatherland. This place was granted by the decree of the decurions.

Lucius Betutius Furianus was a member of the *ordo magistralis*.²⁵⁰ The inscription can be dated during the years 136-250 AD since Betutius Furianus was the *flamen* of the Emperor Nerva.²⁵¹ Although he was not from Ariminum, he was an important individual in the *colonia*. At Ariminum, we, in fact, find two other inscriptions honouring Furianus.²⁵² In these two dedications, it was the *urbs urbana* and *collegium fabrum* which celebrated Betutius Furianus.²⁵³ As we read from the dedication aforementioned, he served in the *Legio I Italia*. After his military service, he retired to Ariminum and received the honorary citizenship by the *colonia*.²⁵⁴ For this reason, he offered benefactions and services to Ariminum and the *collegia*, where he was honoured.²⁵⁵ Therefore, although Betutius Furianus was not a native of Ariminum, he had still participated and became part of the *colonia*’s cultural and social life.

The remaining recorded *patroni* come from Ariminum, as their tribes show.²⁵⁶ Among these inscriptions, two interesting dedications show the development of patronal relationship at Ariminum.²⁵⁷ In the first inscription, we find the career of the equestrian

²⁵⁰Donati 1967, 27-28.

²⁵¹Mansuelli 1940, 183-185; Donati 1967, 27-28; Forbis 1996, 214; Jinyu 2009, 359.

²⁵²*CIL* XI, 386 (*ILS*, 6660) and *CIL* XI, 387.

²⁵³Donati 1967, 27-28.

²⁵⁴Mansuelli 1940, 183-185 and Donati 1967, 27-28.

²⁵⁵Donati 1967, 27-28.

²⁵⁶*CIL* XI, 378; *CIL* XI, 379; *CIL* XI, 395; *CIL* XI, 421; *CIL* XI, 414; *CIL* XI, 417.

²⁵⁷*CIL* XI, 395 and *CIL* XI, 421.

Marcus Vettius Valens.²⁵⁸ He was native of the city and had an illustrious career in the army since he acquired numerous military titles in the provinces under the Emperor Nero.²⁵⁹ Because of his career, he was honoured as *patronus* by the *colonia* in the year 66 AD.²⁶⁰ Furthermore, we find a later inscription, commemorating another Marcus Vettius Valens:

*M(arco) Vettio M(arci) filio / Ani(ensi) Valenti / <comiti>
Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Nerv(ae) / Traiani Opt(imi) Aug(usti) Ger(manici) /
Dacici Part(hici) Ilvir(o) quinq(uennali) / praef(ecto) flamine auguri /
patrono coloniae, / vicani vici Aventin(i) / optimo civi / patrono suo.*

To Marcus Vettius Valens, son of Marcus, from the voting tribe Aniensis, companion of the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajan the best Augustus Germanicus Dacicus Parthicus, *duovir quinquennalis*, prefect, flamen, augur, *patronus* of the colony, the *vicanii* of the vicus Aventinus best citizen, to their *patronus*.²⁶¹

The inscription of Marcus Vettius Valens can be dated to the years 116-117 AD; it has been argued that this Marcus Vettius Valens might have been the son of the equestrian Marcus Valens from 66 AD.²⁶² Although this detail cannot be proven with certainty, it still highlights the importance of this family in the *colonia*. Indeed, like his father, Marcus Vettius Valens was honoured by the *vicanii* of the *vicus Aventinus*.²⁶³ Having been *duovir* of the *colonia*, Vettius Valens participated in the local decisions of the senate, as he also

²⁵⁸*CIL* XI, 395.

²⁵⁹Donati 1982a, 301-305 and Forbis 1996, 220.

²⁶⁰Devijver 1976, 81-82 and Donati 1982a, 301-305.

²⁶¹*CIL* XI, 421.

²⁶²Donati 1982a, 301-305.

²⁶³For the definition and function of *vicanii*. See: MacMullen 1974, 68; 82; 129; 174; 181; and Stek 2008, 153-154.

held a number of different local political offices. Vettius Valens’ political ascension might have been favoured by the previous political career of his father who, as seen above, was already an active member of the community. Therefore, because of Vettius Valens’ importance and fame within the *colonia*, he was honoured as *patronus*. Interestingly, the inscription does not specify the reason by which Valens was honoured.²⁶⁴ Vettius Valens might have been dedicated this inscription because of his political prominence and his family name, connected to the first Valens, but not necessarily because of his status as *patronus*.

The remaining inscriptions which honour patrons in the *Aemilia* region show a less uniformly distribution pattern in comparison to the *Venetia et Histria*. As will be noted below, this is also the case with *Liguria: Regio IX* where the evidence is more scant.²⁶⁵ In the *Aemilia* region, we find the following distribution pattern: Mutina (1/2); Parma (0/1);²⁶⁶ Placentia (0/1); Ravenna (1/2); Regium Lepidum (1/2); Fidentia (0/1); Veleia (1/4).²⁶⁷ As can be seen from the data reported above, the *Aemilia* region has fewer *patroni* who were honoured by municipia, *colonia*, and *collegia* in which they were natives. Nevertheless, the context of the evidence has to be taken into account. The majority of our data come from the *Venetia et Histria* region.²⁶⁸ On the other hand, the other regions in northern Italy do

²⁶⁴*CIL* XI, 421.

²⁶⁵Oberzinger 1902, 5-28; 81-115; 191-250 and Balbo 2016, 247-255.

²⁶⁶Although I included zero *patroni* for Parma, I found only one inscription in this municipium. However, I could not determine its tribal affiliation; it might be *Pollia* on the basis of the patronus’ offices and onomastics.

²⁶⁷See appendix.

²⁶⁸Zaccaria 2008b, 375-412 and 2010, 65-87

not often provide enough evidence.²⁶⁹ Indeed, in the case of Parma, Placentia, and Fidentia, we only have one inscription in each town commemorating a *patronus*; nevertheless, it is difficult, for both cases, to trace the *patronus*’ home town. As seen in chapter two, the *patronus* of the *collegia* of Fidentia was Virius Valens.²⁷⁰ In the dedication, we find no evidence which might reveal the *patronus*’ place of origin.²⁷¹ The number of inscriptions honouring patrons in each municipium and *colonia* of *Aemilia* is not enough in order to find an overall pattern. However, by looking only at the *colonia* of Ariminum, where we have a better distribution of inscriptions, it is clear that the majority of the *patroni* were natives of the *colonia*.

Liguria: Regio IX

The limitation of our evidence is clearer in the *Liguria* region. Here, only six inscriptions commemorating a *patronus* were found.²⁷² In the municipium of Industria, we find two *patroni* whose tribal affiliation corresponds with the municipium’s tribe.²⁷³ The first inscription commemorates the *patronus* Lucius Pompeius Herenianus who was honoured both by Industria and by the *collegium pastophorum*:

²⁶⁹Zaccaria 1999, 193-210.

²⁷⁰*AE* 1991, 713 (*AE* 2014, 255).

²⁷¹Donati 1991, 127-132.

²⁷²*CIL* V, 7782; *CIL* V, 7784; *CIL* V, 7468; *CIL* V, 7478; *CIL* V, 7428; *CIL* V, 7375.

²⁷³*CIL* V, 7468 and *CIL* V, 7478.

*Genio et honor(i) / L(uci) Pompei L(uci) fi(li) Pol(lia) Heren/niani. Eq(uiti) rom(ano) / eq(uo) pub(lico), / q(uaestori) aer(ari) p(ublici) et alim(entorum), aedil(i), / Ilviro, curator / kalendarior(um) rei p(ublicae) / collegium pasto/phororum Indus/triensium patro/no ob merita; / T(itus) Grae(- - -) Trophimus Ind(ustriensis) fac(it).*²⁷⁴

To the genius and honor of Lucius Pompeus Herennianus, son of Lucius, from the Pollia voting tribe, Roman knight with a public horse, quaestor of the public treasure and of the alimentary scheme, aedile, duovir, *curator kalendariorum rei publicae*, *patronus* of the collegium pastophorum of Industria, to its *patronus*, on behalf of his merits, Titus Grae (---) Trophimus of Industria set up (this monument).

This inscription (101-200 AD) commemorates the life of the local equestrian Lucius Pompeius Herenianus.²⁷⁵ The formula *genius et honor* is also reported by other *collegia* setting up honours for other *patroni*.²⁷⁶ It is difficult to determine the function of the formula *genius et honor* (e.g. whether or not it indicated the virtue of the *patronus*); here I will limit the scope of the argument only to Pompeius Herenianus function as *patronus*.²⁷⁷ In this case, the dedication is private, as Titus Trophimus set up the dedication to his *patronus*. Nevertheless, the inscription summarizes the career of Herenianus. From his titles, it is clear that his career was local. Indeed, he was nominated quaestor of the public treasure; he was also in charge of the food supply of Industria, titles which usually were granted to local magistrates.²⁷⁸ Furthermore, he was *curator kalendariorum rei publicae*;

²⁷⁴CIL V, 7468.

²⁷⁵Jinyu 2009, 261.

²⁷⁶CIL V, 5612, 5892, 7468.

²⁷⁷For an overview of the formula *genius et honor*. See: Bieber 1945, 30-31; Fears 1981, 851-859; Sartori 2003, 301-304.

²⁷⁸Curchin 2013, 271-287.

this office indicated officials of the central government.²⁷⁹ Emperors usually appointed *curators*; these were of high social ranks (senatorial, equestrian, or provincial status).²⁸⁰ Their main function was to supervise the finances of civic communities.²⁸¹ In the case of Herennianus, he was a *curator kalendariorum*, perhaps in charge of supervising the municipium’s calendar and public events at Industria. Moreover, Pompeus Herennianus was honoured *patronus* by the *collegium pastophorum*. This *collegium* was religious in nature since it concerned the worshipping of Egyptian gods. In his *Golden Ass*, Apuleius briefly notes the role that a *pastophorus*, the priest of the *collegium*, had.²⁸² However, his explanation is not quite clear, as he gives references to this cult, but does not explain its function. In the northern Italian epigraphic evidence concerning patronage, this is the only inscription which was found where a *patronus* was honoured by such *collegium*. Indeed, as we saw, the majority of the *patroni* were mostly honoured by the *collegia* of smiths, of the textile dealers, of the timber workers.²⁸³ Allowing a local *patronus* such as Herennianus to be part of such *collegium* highlights the importance of this equestrian in the municipium. Indeed, as we read from Apuleius, Egyptian cults such as the cult of Isis were exclusive, as membership was only granted to few selected individuals.²⁸⁴ The second local *patronus* of

²⁷⁹Burton 1979, 465.

²⁸⁰Burton 1979, 465.

²⁸¹Burton 1979, 465.

²⁸²Apul. *Met.* 11, 16-19; 24-27; 28-30.

²⁸³See appendix.

²⁸⁴Watson 2014, 141.

the municipium of Industria is another equestrian, Gaius Avilius Gavianus. His career is similar to Herennianus, although he also held a military post in Gaul.²⁸⁵

Apart from Pompeus Herennianus’ dedication, the *Liguria* region does not record any other particular *patroni*’s cases. However, despite the lack of evidence, we find another interesting dedication in the municipium of Albingaunum. This dedication commemorates the Imperial equestrian Publius Mucius Verus.²⁸⁶ He was probably a native of Albingaunum, since he was in the voting tribe *Publilia*:

P. Muc(io) P(ubli) f(ilio) / Pub(lilia tribu) Vero, / equiti Romano / equo publico, / patrono municipii, / trib(uno) leg(ionis) (tertia) Gallic(ae), / censori / provinc(iae) Thraciae. / Civi optimo, / semper pro municipi(um) / incolumitat(e) sollicit(o), / Plebs urbana.

To Publius Mucius Verus, son of Publius, from the voting tribe *Publilia*, Roman knight, with a public horse, patronus of the municipium, tribune of the third legion of Gaul, censor of the province of Thracia, to his best citizen, always acted on behalf of the safety of the citizens of the municipium. The urban plebs [dedicated this monument].

This inscription, dated to the years 217-300 AD, describes the equestrian career of Mucius Verus.²⁸⁷ Differently from our previous *patronus*, Verus was an Imperial equestrian. Indeed, he held two military commands abroad; the first one as tribune of the third legion of Gaul, while the second one as the censor of the province of Thrace.²⁸⁸ The inscription was inscribed below an equestrian statue which was set by the urban plebs.²⁸⁹ The motive

²⁸⁵*CIL* V, 7478.

²⁸⁶*CIL* V, 7784.

²⁸⁷Pflaum 1960-61 (vol. 3), 1069; Devijver 1976. 80 (vol. 2), 583; Le Glay 1981, 182; Alföldy 1969, 53.

²⁸⁸Alföldy 1969, 53.

²⁸⁹Alföldy 1969, 53.

for its erection was Verus’ involvement with the public life of the municipium, as we read at the end of the inscription, *civi optimo, / semper pro municipi(um) / incolumitat(e) sollicit(o)*. Interestingly, the title *civis optimus* is used to indicate Verus’ merits, as well as to acknowledge his pre-eminence and civic virtue.²⁹⁰ Indeed, we find that Verus was celebrated because he “had acted in the interests and safety of the municipium”, a virtuous deed that the people of Albingaunum recognized and honoured by offering him the title of *patronus*.

Nevertheless, from Albingaunum, we find another *patronus* who may not have been native of the municipium. Indeed, the senator Publius Metilius Tertullinus Vennonianus was honoured *patronus* in Albingaunum during the years (190-220 AD).²⁹¹ However, he came from the tribe *Falerna*.²⁹² In comparison to the other inscriptions found, he represents the only case in *Liguria* of a *patronus* honoured outside of his native community. Indeed, at Dertona, we find another local equestrian who was selected as *patronus* by his home town, the equestrian Gaius Metilius Marcellinus.²⁹³ Finally, the last *patronus* found in this region is the decurion, Cnaeus Atilius Serranus from the *colonia* of Libarna.²⁹⁴ Unfortunately, his voting tribe is not reported. However, since he only held local offices, I suggest that he might have also been a native of this *colonia*.

²⁹⁰Beltrán, Martín-Bueno and Pina Polo 2000, 125–126; Sillières et al. 1995; Beltrán Lloris 2014, 92-93. A typical example of this formula can be found in the following inscriptions: *CIL* II, 5837 and *AE* 1995, 890.

²⁹¹*CIL* V, 7782. (*PIR*2, 394).

²⁹²*CIL* V, 7782.

²⁹³*CIL* V, 7375.

²⁹⁴*CIL* V, 7428.

Transpadana: Regio XI

In comparison to the *Liguria* region, we find more inscriptions mentioning patrons in Transpadana. On the one hand, in the *Venetia et Histria* and *Aemeilia* regions, inscriptions honouring patrons were widely distributed not only in the main civic centres such as Aquileia, but also in smaller civic centres and rural areas.²⁹⁵ On the other hand, in Transpadana, the distribution of inscriptions honouring *patroni* concentrates, for the most part, in cities.²⁹⁶ There are reported inscriptions which commemorate *patroni* in the following cities: Bergomum, Comum, Mediolanum, Ticinum, and Augusta Taurinorum.²⁹⁷ Since the majority of the evidence concentrate in these major civic centres, we have a more focused representation of inscriptions honouring *patroni* in these cities. However, this advantage also presents a limitation. Differently from the regions *Venetia et Histria* and *Aemilia*, the Transpadana does not provide a global picture of the entire area; this limits our understanding of the region.²⁹⁸

In the first municipium, Bergomum (voting tribe: *Voturia*),²⁹⁹ we find three *patroni*, all belonging to the *Voturia* tribe: Gaius Cornelius Minicianus, Publius Marius

²⁹⁵Eck 1971, 71-79; Luraschi 1979; Bandelli 1986, 43-64 and 1992, 31-45; Vedaldi Iasbez 1985; Buchi 1989, 191-310.

²⁹⁶Bandelli 1986, 43-64 and 1992, 31-45.

²⁹⁷See appendix.

²⁹⁸Bandelli 1986, 43-64 and 1992, 31-45.

²⁹⁹Kubitschek 1923, 118.

Lupercianus, and Marcus Maesius Maximus.³⁰⁰ Gaius Cornelius Minicianus, whose inscription can be dated to 118-130 AD, was an Imperial equestrian.³⁰¹ As seen before with other Imperial equestrians, Minicianus held several military and political offices and titles.³⁰² Indeed, he was prefect of the first cohort of Damascus, tribune of the third military legion of Augustus, curator of the municipium of Otesinum, third man on the board for the administration of justice, *pontifex, flamen* of the divine Claudius and divine Trajan, and finally *patronus* of Bergomum.³⁰³ His career, titles, and place of birth presumably provide the main reasons which led Bergomum to honour him as *patronus*. In the inscription, indeed, we find no indication of a favour or task performed by this *patronus*.³⁰⁴ On the other hand, the other two *patroni*, Publius Marius Lupercianus, and Marcus Maesius Maximus were part of the order of the decurions.³⁰⁵ These two individuals only held one local office as *IIIvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) q(uinquennali?)*.³⁰⁶ Although their political role in the municipium was less prominent, they, nevertheless, were honoured by Bergomum.

At Como, we only find two inscriptions commemorating the *patroni* Lucius Calpurnius Fabatus and Lucius Alfus Marcellinus.³⁰⁷ From his career, it can be seen that

³⁰⁰*CIL* V, 5126 (*ILS* 2722); *CIL* V, 5128; *CIL* V, 5138.

³⁰¹*CIL* V, 5126 (*ILS* 2722).

³⁰²Vavassori 1994, 153.

³⁰³*CIL* V, 5126 (*ILS* 2722).

³⁰⁴Vavassori 1994, 153.

³⁰⁵*CIL* V, 5128 and *CIL* V, 5138.

³⁰⁶Vavassori 1994, 208.

³⁰⁷*CIL* V, 5267 (*ILS* 2721) and *CIL* V, 5275.

For Pliny the Younger’s relationship with Como: See chapter 3.

Lucius Calpurinius Fabatus was a local magistrate.³⁰⁸ His dedication, probably dated around 112 AD, simply alludes to the title of *patronus municipi*, but does not go into many details about possible Fabatus’ benefaction at Como.³⁰⁹ On the other hand, his political career is clearly listed in the inscription, highlighting his involvement not only in Como’s local politics, but also in various military posts in Lusitania, Numidia, and in the nation of the Gaetuli.³¹⁰ On the other hand, the *patronus* Alfus Marcellinus held fewer political offices.³¹¹ Differently from Fabatus, he was honoured *patronus* by the *collegium dendrophorum* of Como.³¹² On the other hand, the dedication is made by a private individual, his father, Alfius Restitus.³¹³

In the municipium of Mediolanum (*Oufentina* voting tribe)³¹⁴, we find a more complex situation than at Como. Only one inscription reports the voting tribe of the local equestrian, Marcus Atusius Glycerus.³¹⁵ He belonged to the *Oufentina* tribe and was the *patronus* of the *collegium aerariorum* of *Mediolanum*.³¹⁶ Mommsen identified this *collegium* as a joint association between the *fabrii* and the *centonarii*; Waltzing and De Ruggiero, on the other hand, argued that the *aerarii* were the *collegium* of the bronze

³⁰⁸Zeza 1983, 19; Luraschi 1986, 14; Sartori 1994, 35-36.

³⁰⁹Sartori 1994, 35-36.

³¹⁰*CIL* V, 5267 (*ILS* 2721).

³¹¹Sartori 1994, 25 and Sartori 2003, 223; Boscolo 2001, 33-48.

³¹²Sartori 2003, 223.

³¹³*CIL* V, 5275.

³¹⁴Kubitschek 1923, 120.

³¹⁵*CIL* V, 5847.

³¹⁶Calderini 1946, 112.

workers.³¹⁷ This *collegium* does not often appear in inscriptions which honour *patroni*, as not many epigraphic examples have been found.³¹⁸ At Mediolanum, we only find another inscription where this *collegium* is mentioned, an inscription dedicated to the *patronus* Publius Tutilius Callifontus, whose tribe is uncertain.³¹⁹ He, like Glycerus, was honoured by this local *collegium*.³²⁰ Furthermore, as the local equestrian Glycerus, Callifontus had a local career in the *colonia*.

Moreover, for *CIL* V, 5812, which commemorates the life of the *colonia*’s *patronus*, Publius Galerius Trachalus, and the anonymous *patronus* in *CIL* V, 5908, we do not have enough information to identify their tribes and social profiles at Mediolanum. The last *patronus* is the senator Lucius Fabius Clio Septiminus (his inscription can be dated to the years 202-203 AD).³²¹ Differently from the other *patroni* in the *colonia* seen thus far, the senator held several important political offices in the provinces such as being nominated *propraetor* in the regions of Pannonia, Moesia, and Galatia.³²² His tribe, *Galeria*, indicates that he was not a native of the city.

Differently from Mediolanum, the last two cities in the Transpadana region, Ticinum and Augusta Taurinorum present a better representation of inscriptions honouring *patroni*. Although we find only one inscription at Ticinum, the one about the senator Titus Didius

³¹⁷*CIL* V, 635 and 1191; Cracco Ruggini 1996, 17; Jinyu 2009, 144.

³¹⁸Jinyu 2009, 143-144.

³¹⁹*CIL* V, 5892.

³²⁰Calderini 1946, 114.

³²¹*CIL* VI, 1409 (*ILS* 1142) (*PIR*2, 20).

³²²Alföldy 2000, 15-24.

Priscus,³²³ the onomastics show that he was a native of the city when he was honoured.³²⁴ On the other hand, the *colonia* Augusta Taurinorum (voting tribe *Stellatina*)³²⁵ reports a total of three equestrian *patroni*, whose tribe is *Stellatina*,³²⁶ and one local decurion, whose tribe is unknown.³²⁷

As seen in this chapter, this was the case for the majority of northern Italian municipia, *coloniae*, and *collegia*. From the geographical, diachronic, diastratic analysis, it has emerged that during the 2nd century AD there was a shift in the way *patroni* were selected; local communities selected and honoured native *patroni*. With the appearance of local *patroni*, patronage lost its original function which had during the Republic when *patroni* acted a representative of communities at Rome. Indeed, the honour of local *patroni* meant that they acted less as representatives and acquired more of a symbolic function within the community. As seen from the distribution of the data, the majority of *patroni* came from the equestrian and municipal class, whereas the majority of *patroni* were of senatorial class during the Republic. Local *patroni* meant less representation at Rome since, as seen in the local epigraphy, the offices that these new *patroni* held were based in their own municipia or *coloniae*. This is in contrast with the senatorial *patroni* of the Republic who were active in Rome, and therefore had a direct interaction with the Roman senate. This shift seemed to have taken place not only in the way municipia and *coloniae* selected

³²³*CIL* V, 6419.

³²⁴Kubitschek 1923, 121.

³²⁵Kubitschek 1923, 117.

³²⁶*CIL* XI, 3949; (*CIL* VI, 1635); *CIL* V, 7003; *CIL* V, 7007.

³²⁷*CIL* V, 7039.

their *patroni*, but also in the way *collegia* honoured their *patroni*. As seen from the epigraphic analysis, *collegia* selected and honoured their *patroni* in a similar way that municipia and *coloniae* did by choosing local important individuals of their own or nearby communities. Lastly, this analysis reported an unequal distribution of the epigraphic evidence. The *Venetia et Histria* region has a greater number of inscriptions in comparison to other regions in northern Italy where the phenomenon of patronage is less recorded. Nevertheless, although the other regions present more limitations, it has been shown that their data can still be valuable. Although the *Aemilia* region presents fewer inscription, *Ariminum* reports a high number of inscriptions and provides interesting instances of local *patroni*. This is different in *Liguria* where fewer inscriptions have been found. However, from a qualitative point of view, some of those patronal dedications offer valuable data, especially in regard to the different representation of *collegia* in the region. Lastly, the *Transpadana* region follows more or less a similar epigraphic pattern in comparison to the other regions of northern Italy.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

Patronage of collectives is a complex phenomenon. As I attempted to show in this study, the relationships between collectives and important individuals of senatorial, equestrian, and decurion ranks are difficult to define. That these relationships resemble the ones between a *patronus* and a *cliens* is difficult to assert. It is equally hard to describe how Romans considered these relationships.

As seen in the legal evidence, the laws which regulate the co-optation of *patroni* do not describe the relationship, but only the methods of co-optation. The first legislation is the Flavian Municipal Law. Although the legislation specifies the number of penalties for those individuals who were co-opted as a *patroni* in their communities without having had the decurions’ approval, the language found in the law does not describe either the relationship of a *patronus* with the community or the reason why the community desired to co-opt a patron. Rather, the language employed is formulaic, and the product of a longer development which dealt with the method of appointment, rather than the nature of the relationship. Indeed, the same regulations can be found in an earlier law, the Lex Genetiva. However once again, nothing in this law suggests that patrons had legal requirements towards their municipia.

Similarly, the example of Pliny, Tifernus Tiberinus, and Como provides a unique depiction of this phenomenon. In the first instance, the town of Tifernus Tiberinus co-opts

Pliny as *patronus*, but the latter simply returns this favour by budling a temple for the town. However, the temptation to identify this favour as patronage might obfuscate the evidence, as Pliny clearly states that he does this because of “affection”. This, indeed, might be the same kind of affection which led Pliny to perform munificence and acts of liberality for his home town. In the case of Como, his correspondence shows the profound attachment that Pliny felt for his native land. Nevertheless, both his correspondence as well as a fortuitous inscription which enlists Pliny’s benefaction and *cursus honoum* do not address Pliny as *patronus*. Indeed, it was not necessarily the case that influential individuals had to be co-opted *patroni* in order to provide services and offer munificence to cities. Indeed, as seen in chapter two, when the citizens of Pompeii asked their equestrian benefactor the honour to be co-opted *patronus* of the *colonia*, the equestrian simply refused the title, asserting that he could not be *patronus* over his fellow-citizens.

Therefore, becoming a *patronus* did not obligate patrons to materially benefit their communities, although many did. Patrons granted benefaction out of their own will, and not because they were bounded by a social “contract”. These changes contributed to the transformation of the institution of patronage in the west, and to the gradual atrophy of the title *patronus*. In particular, the epigraphic evidence is especially illuminating on this point. Among the inscriptions analyzed, it seems that the title of *patronus* assumed an honorific meaning in the local epigraphy during the second century AD. These local *patroni* did not always perform services for their communities; on the other hand, it seems to be the case that the title of *patronus* was regularly granted to important individuals in the community.

Indeed, this can be noticed by looking at a *patronus*’s place of origin. During the second century AD, most patrons came mainly from their local towns. The increased use of the title *patronus* to honour local individuals shows how the institution of patronage changed and evolved into a symbolic institution; this transformation contributed to the decline of patronage.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge.

Alföldy, G. 1969. *Fasti Hispanienses: Senatorische Reichesbeamte und Offiziere in den spanischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches von Augustus bis Diokletian*. Wiesbaden.

———. 1977. *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen: prosopograph. Unters. zur senator. Führungsschicht*. Bonn: Habelt.

———. 1981. “Senatoren Aus Norditalien Regionen IX, X, Und, XI,” In *Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIEGL su Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio*. (14-20 maggio, 1981). Roma.

———. 1983. “In Tempel des Herrscherkultes in Comum,” *Athenaeum* 61: 362-73.

———. 1984. *The Social History of Rome*. Translated by David Braund and Frank Pollock. London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

———. 1984. *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlad.

———. 1997. “Euergetismus und Epigraphik in der augusteischen Zeit.” In Christol and Masson 1997, pp. 293–304.

———. 1999. *Städte, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina. Epigraphisch-historische Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart.

———. 2000. “Eine verkannte inschrift des senators L. Fabius Clio aus Rom,” In *Acta Antiqua* vol., 40 (1-4), pp., 15-24.

Ausbüttel, F. M. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Western des römischen Reiches. Frankfurter Althistorische Studies 11*. Kallmünz.

Bandelli, G. 1986. “Il governo romano nella Transpadana orientale (90-42 a.C.),” In *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, 28, pp. 43-64.

———. 1992. “Le classi dirigenti cisalpine e la loro promozione politica (II-I sec. a.C.),” In *Conquista romana y modos de intervencion en la organizacion urbana y territorial, Dialoghi di archeologia*, III serie, Anno 10, 1-2, pp. 31-34.

———. 2017. “Le comunità della Transpadana dalla guerra gallica del 225-222 a.C. alla Lex Pompeia dell’89 a.C. Dati recenti e problemi aperti su alcuni aspetti di ordine istituzionale,” *Gerión* 35. 2: 373-400.

Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientela (264-70 BCE)*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Balbo, M. 2016. “Tra Galli e Liguri: l’etnogenesi dei Libui di Vercellae,” In S. Solano (ed.), *Da Camunni a Romani. Archeologia e storia della romanizzazione alpina. Atti del Convegno (Breno-Cividate Camuno 2013)*, pp. 247-255. Roma.

Barbieri, G. 1952. *L’albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193-285)*. Roma.

Beltrán Lloris, F. 2015. “Latin Epigraphy: The Main Types of Inscriptions,” In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* edited by Bruun, C. and Edmondson J. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beltrán, F. and M. Martín-Bueno, and F. Pina Polo. 2000. *Roma en la cuenca media del Ebro*. Zaragoza.

Bispham, E. 2007. *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social Wars to Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biró, M. 1975. “The Inscriptions of Roman Britain,” In *AArchHung* 27, 13–58.

Bieber, M. 1945. “Honos and Virtus,” In *AJA*, 49, pp. 25-34.

Blagg, T.F.C. 1981. “Architectural Patronage in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire in the 3rd Century,” In *the Roman West in the Third Century*, edited by A. King and M. Henig, 167–188. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Blok, A. 1969. “Variations in patronage,” In *Sociologische Gids* 16, no. 6 365–378.

Boscolo, F. 2001. “Patavium,” In *Gnomon* 18, pp. 33-48.

Bodel, J., Bendlin A., Bernard S., Bruun C., and Edmondson, J. 2019. “Notes on the *Elogium* of a Benefactor at Pompeii,” In *JRA*, Vol. 32, pp. 148-182.

Bodel, J. 2001. “Epigraphy and the Ancient Historian,” In *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from inscriptions*, edited by J. Bodel. London and New York: Routledge.

Boffo, L. 1996. “Religione e caccia: un'iscrizione efesina ad Aquileia,” In *Italia sul Baetis: studi di storia romana in memoria di Fernando Gascó* edited by Emilio Gabba. Torino.

Burton, G. P. 1979. “Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des deutschen archäologischen Instituts,” In *Chiron*, p. 465.

Buonopane, A. 2009. *Manuale di Epigrafia Latina*. Roma: Carocci editore.

Buchi, E. 1989. “Tarvisium e Acelum nella Transpadana,” In *Storia di Treviso, I, Venezia a cura di E. Brunetta*, pp. 191-310.

Bruun, C and Edmondson J. 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruun, C. 2015. “Senators and Equites: Prosopography,” In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* edited by Bruun, C. and Edmondson J. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brusin, G. 1934. *Gli scavi di Aquileia; un quadriennio di attività dell'Associazione nazionale per Aquileia*. La Panarie: Udine.

———. 1991. *Inscriptiones Aquileiae, vol. I*. Udine.

Brusin, G. and Zavatto, P. L. 1961. *Monumenti romani e cristiani di Iulia Concordia*. Pordenone.

Brunt, P. A. 1988. “Clientela.” In *the Fall of the Roman Empire and Related Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broilo, F. 1980. *Iscrizioni Lapidarie Latine del Museo Nazionale Concordiese di Portogruaro*. Roma.

Calderini, A. 1946. *Silloge delle iscrizioni latine della raccolta milanese*, Milano

———. 1968. *Aquileia romana: ricerche di storia e di epigrafia*. Roma: L’erma di Bretschneider.

Cenati, C., Gregori, G. L., and Guadagnucci, A. 2015. “Abitare in campagna in età romana: indizi epigrafici dai territori di Brixia, Verona e Mediolanum,” In *Studi Classici e Orientali* vol., 61, no. 1., pp. 187-240.

Chelotti, M. 1993. “Proprietari e Patroni Tra Canosa e Venosa,” In *L’Epigrafia Del Villaggio*, edited by Calbi, A., Donati, A., and Proma, 445-55. Faenza.

Chelotti, M., Gaeta, R., Morizio, V., and Silvestrini., M. (eds.). 1985. *Le Epigrafi Romane di Canosa I*. Bari.

Christol, M. 1982. “Les réformes de Gallien et la carrière sénatoriale,” In Silvio Panciera (Hg.): *Atti del colloquio internazionale AIEGL ‘Epigrafia e ordine senatorio’ I*, Roma, 14–20 maggio 1981, Rom 1982 (Tituli 4), 143–166. Roma.

———. 1986a. *Essai sur l’évolution des carrières sénatoriales dans la 2e moitié du IIIe s. ap. J.-C. (Études Prosopographiques 6)*. Paris.

Christol, M. and Mahjoubi, A. 1987. “Une carrière sénatoriale du deuxième quart du IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.,” In *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Antiquité* 99 (2), pp. 921–935.

Clemente, G. 1972. “Il Patronato Nei Collegia Dell’Impero Romano.” *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 1972, Vol. 21 (1972), pp. 142-229.

Cloud, D. 1989. “The Client-Patron Relationship: Emblem and Reality in Juvenal’s First Book,” In *Patronage in the Ancient Society*, edited by A. Wallace-Hadrill, 205–218. London: Routledge.

Coskun, A. 2005. “Zum Feldherrnpatronat in der römischen Republik: (Cic. Off. 1.35)”, *Mnemosyne* 58, no. 3: 423–429.

Corbier, M. 1973. “Les circonscriptions judiciaires de l’Italie de Marc Anrèle à Aurélien,” In *Mélanges d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de l’École Française de Rome*, Antiquité, 85, pp. 609-690.

———. 1974. *L’Aerarium Saturni et l’Aerarium Militare. Administration et prosopographie sénatoriale*. Rome.

Crawford, M.H. 1996. *Roman Statues*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Cracco Ruggini, L. 1971. “Le associazioni professionali nel mondo romano-bizantino.” In *Settimane di Studi nel Centro Italiano di Studi sull’alto Medioevo*, 59–193. Spoleto.

———. 1996. “Milano nei primi tre secoli dell’impero: Potenzialità e sviluppi.” In *Milano in età imperiale I–III secolo: Atti del convegno di studi 7 Novembre 1992*, 11–26. Milano.

Curchin, L.A. 2013. “The end of Local Magistrates in the Roman Empire,” In *Gerión*, vol. 32, pp, 271-287.

D’Arms, J.H. 1974. “Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study,” In *JRS*, Vol 64: 104-124.

———. 1981. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: MA.

Damon, C., 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

De Coulanges, F. N. D. 1890. *Histoire des institutions politiques de l’ancienne France*. Vol. 5, *Les origines du système féodal: Le bénéfice et le patronat pendant l’époque mérovingienne*. Paris: Hachette.

Devijver, H. 1976. *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum, I-IV*. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.

Degrassi, A. 1952. *I fasti consolari dell’impero romano dal 30 a.C. al 613 d.C.*, Roma.

Dexheimer, D. 1998. *Oberitalische Grabaltäre. Ein Beitrag zur Sepulkralkunst der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Bonn: Oxford Hadrian Books.

Dewar, M. 2014. *Leisured Resistance Villas, Literature and Politics in the Roman World*. Oxford: Bloomsbury Academic.

De Robertis, F. M. 1938. *Il diritto associativo romano dai collegi della Repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*. Bari.

Donati, A. 1967. *Aemilia tributim discripta. I documenti delle assegnazioni tribali romane nella regione romagnola e cispadana*. Faenza.

———. 1982a. “Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d’origine. Italia: Regio VIII (Aemilia),” In *Tituli*, 5.II, pp. 301-308.

———. 1991. “Fidentia: municipium e Borgo,” In *Aevum inter utrumque, Mélanges offerts à G. Sanders, Instrumenta Patristica*, XXIII, edited by M. Van Uytfanghe and R. Demeulenaere, pp. 127-132. Steenbrugis.

Duthony, R. 1981. “Quelques Observations Concernant La Mention D’un Patronat Municipal Dans Les Inscriptions,” In *AC* 50, 295-305.

———. 1984. “Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire,” In *AncSoc* 15-17, 121-54.

———. 1984. “Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie,” In *Epigraphica*, 46, 23-48.

———. 1984. “Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le Principat,” In *AC* 53, 145-56.

Duncan-Jones, R. 1974. *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Data*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1974. *The Roman Economy: Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History*. Edited by P.A. Brunt. Oxford: Oxford Basil Blackwell.

Eck, W., Groag, E., Heil, M., Heinrichs., J., and Horster, M. 1933-2015. *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I. II. III*. Berolini et Lipsiae: Apud Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Eck, W. 1971. “Zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Italiens unter Mark Aurel. Ein iuridicus per Flaminiam et Transpadanam,” In *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 8, pp. 71-79.

———. 1974a. “Ein senatorischer Cursus honorum aus der Mitte des 3. Jh. n. Chr.,” In *Chiron* 4, pp. 533-540.

———. 1975b. “Die regionale Organisation der italischen Iuridikate,” In *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 18, pp. 155-166.

———. 1986. “Senatorial Self-representation: Developments in the Augustan Period,” in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* edited by F. Millar and E. Segal. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1992. “Kaiserliche Städte und Euergetismus (vorläufige Charakterisierung des Themas),” in *Xe congrès international d’ épigraphie greque et latine: Rapports préliminaires, résumés des communications* (Nîmes, 4-10 octobre 1992), 93-98. Nîmes: Ville de Nîmes (Musée Archéologique).

———. 1995. “Concordia e la X Regio,” In *Giornate di studio in onore di Sario Bertolini nel centenario della morte. Atti del Convegno (Portogruaro, 22-23 ottobre 1994)*, pp. 110-111 (W. Eck), *AE* 1995 (11). Padova.

———. 1997. “Der Euergetismus im Funktionszusammenhang der Kaiserlichen Städte,” in *Actes du Xe congrès international d’ épigraphie greque et latine*, ed. M. Christol and O. Masson, 305–331. Paris: Sorbonne.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.

Egger, R. 1947. “Der heilige Herahoras,” In *Carinthis I, Mitteil. d. Geschichtsvereins für Karnten*, 14-58.

Eilers, C. 2015. “Change and Decline in Civic Patronage of the High Empire,” In *Foreign Clientelae in the Roman Empire: A Reconsideration* edited by M. Jehne and F. Pina Paolo, pp. 321-335. Stuttgart.

Eilers, C. 2002. *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. and Roniger, L. 1984. *Patrons, Clients, and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engesser, F. 1957. *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diokletian* Diss. Universität Freiburg i. Br.,

Fears, R. 1981. “The cult of virtues and Roman imperial ideology,” In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.17, pp.827-948.

Flohr, M. and V. Hununk. 2019. “Eem gulle geveer zonder naam. De nieuwe grafinscriptie uit Pompeii,” In *Hermeneus* 91, 26-32.

Fortea López, F. 1994. *Némesis en el occidente romano: ensayo de interpretación histórica y corpus de materiales*, Monografías de historia antigua. Zaragoza.

Forbis, E.P. 1996. *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire. The Evidence of Italian Honorary Inscriptions*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Fritz, G. 2006. “Ruler Cult,” In *Brill’s New Pauly, Antiquity volumes* edited by: Cancik, H. and, Schneider, H. English Edition by Salazar, C. F. *Classical Tradition volumes* edited by:

Landfester, M. English Edition by Gentry, F.G. Consulted online on 08 March 2021 http://dx.doi.org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e605340.

Galsterer, H. 2006. “Lex Malacitana” In *Brill’s New Pauly, Antiquity volumes* edited by: Cancik, H. and, Schneider, H. English Edition by Salazar, C. F. Classical Tradition volumes edited by: Landfester, M. English Edition by Gentry, F.G. Consulted online on 05 October 2020 http://dx.doi.org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e605340.

———. 2006. “Quattuorviri,” In *Brill’s New Pauly, Antiquity volumes* edited by: Cancik, H. and, Schneider, H. English Edition by Salazar, C. F. Classical Tradition volumes edited by: Landfester, M. English Edition by Gentry, F.G. Consulted online on 05 March 2021 http://dx.doi.org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e605340.

Ganter, A. 2015. *Was die römische Welt zusammenhält: Patron-Klient-Verhältnisse zwischen Cicero und Cyprian*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Garnsey P. and Saller R. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.

Gerhardt, T. and Hartmann, U. 2008. “Fasti,” In *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser II*, edited by Klaus-Peter Johné, Udo Hartmann, and Thomas Gerhardt. Berlin.

Gellner, E. and Waterbur, J., eds., 1977. *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Gelzer, M. 1912. *The Roman Nobility*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Gibson, R. K. 2020. *Man of High Empire: The Life of Pliny the Younger*. United States: Oxford University Press.

González J. and H. Crawford M. 1986. “The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Municipal Law.” In *JRS*, 76, pp. 147-243.

Goffin, B. 2002. *Euergetismus in Oberitalien*. Bonn.

Gordon, A.E. 1958. “A. Platorius Nepos as *Tribunus Plebis*,” In *JRS* 48, pp. 47-49.

Griffin, M. T. 1991. “Urbs Roma, Plebs and Princeps,” In *Images of Empire* edited by Alexander, L., pp. 19–46. Sheffield.

- Hächler, N. 2019. *Kontinuität und Wandel des Senatorenstandes im Zeitalter der Soldatenkaiser: Prosopographische Untersuchungen zu Zusammensetzung, Funktion und Bedeutung des amplissimus ordo zwischen 235–284 n. Chr.* Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Harmand, L. 1957. *Le Patronat Sur Les Collectivités Publiques: Des Origins au Bas-Empire: Un Aspect Social et Politique du Monde Romain.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Haeussler, R. 2013. *Becoming Roman? Diverging Identities and Experiences in Ancient Northwest Italy.* Walnut Creek.
- Hemelrijk, E. A. 2004. “City Patroness in the Roman Empire,” In *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Bd., 53., H. 2., pp. 209-245.
- Horster, M. 2015. “Urban Infrastructure and Euergetism Outside the City of Rome,” In *the Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* edited by C. Bruun and J. Edmonson, pp. 515-536. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornum, M.B. “Nemesis, the Roman State, and the Games,” In *EPRO* 117, pp. 231-232.
- Jinyu, L. 2009. *Collegia Centonariorum: The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West.* Brill: Leiden and Boston.
- Johnson, D. 1985. “Munificence and *Municipia*: Bequests to Towns in Classical Roman Law,” In *JRS* 75: 105-25.
- Jongman, W. 1988. *The Economy and Society of Pompeii.* Amsterdam.
- Kajanto, I. 1965. *The Latin Cognomina.* Helsinki: Societas scientiarum Fennica.
- Keppie, L. 1991. *Understanding Roman Inscriptions.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kneissl, P. 1994. “Die fabri, fabri tignuarii, fabri subaediani, centonarii, und dolabrarii als Feuerwehren in den Städten Italiens und der westlichen Provinzen.” In *E. Fontibus Haurire: Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*, edited by R. Günther and S. Rebenich, 133–46. Paderborn.
- Kubitschek, W. 1923. *Imperium Romanum Tributim Discriptum.* Pragae and Vindobonae: F. Tempsky; Lipsiae; G. Freytag.

Lembrechts, P. 1936, *La composition du sénate romain de l’accession au trône d’Hadrien à la mort de Commode (117-192)*. Antwerpen.

Lettich, G. 1994. *Iscrizioni romane di Iulia Concordia (sec. I a.C.-III d.C.)*. Trieste.

———. 2003. *Itinerari epigrafici Aquileiesi*. Trieste: Editreg.

Leunissen, P.M.M. 1993. “Conventions of patronage in senatorial careers under the principate”, In *Chiron* 23: 101–120.

Le Glay, M. 1981. “Les Censitores Provinciae Thraciae,” In *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 43, pp. 175-184.

Lomas K. and Cornell T. 2003. “Introduction,” In *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and municipal patronage in Roman Italy*, edited by Lomas Kathryn and Cornell Timothy. pp. 1-9. London and New York: Routledge.

Luraschi, G. 1979. *Foedus Ius Latii Civitas: Aspetti costituzionali della romanizzazione in Transpadana*. Padova.

———. 1986. *Aspetti di vita pubblica nella Como dei Plini*. Como.

Mansuelli, G.A. 1940. “Nuove iscrizioni riminesi,” In *Epigraphica*, 2, pp. 183-191.

Maiuro, M. 2019. “*Caritas annonae* a Pompeii,” in M. Maiurom G.D. Merola, M. de Nardis and G. Sorcelli (edd.), *Uomini, istituzioni, mercati, Studi di storia per Elio Lo Cascio*. Pragmateiai 30: Bari.

MacMullen, R. *Roman Social Relations: 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

———. 1982. “The epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire,” In *AFP* Vol. 103, 233-46.

Meyer, E. A., 1990. “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs,” In *JRS* 80, 74–96.

Mennen, I. 2011. *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193-284*. Leiden: Brill and Boston.

Millar, F.G. B. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World: 31 B.C.–A.D. 337*. London.

Minak, F. 2006. “Ariminum. Il territorio al microscopio,” In *Epigraphica* nr. 91, pp. 197-198.

Mommsen, T. 1864. “Das römische Gastrecht und die römische Clientel,” In *Römische Forschungen*. Berlin.

Morzek, S. 1973. “À Propos De La Répartition Chronologique Des Inscriptions Latines Dans Le Haut-Empire,” In *Epigraphica* 35, 113-18.

———1990. *Die städtischen Unterschichten Italiens in den Inschriften der Römischen Kaiserzeit*. Wrocław.

Modrzejewski, J.M and Zawadzki, T. 1967. “La Date De La Mort D’Ulpian et La Préfecture Du Prétoire Au Début Du Règne D’Alexandre Sévère,” In *RD* 45, 592-99.

Mócsy, A. 1996. “Die Unkenntnis des Lebensalters im römischen Reich.” In *Acta Antiqua*, 14, 387–421.

Nicols, J. 2014. *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

———. 2009. “Epictetus, the rhetorician from Cnossos, and the practice of civic patronage in the principate,” In *Historia* 58: 325–335.

———. 1988. “Prefects, Patronage, And the Administration of Justice,” In *ZPE* 72, 201-17.

———. 1980 “Pliny and the Patronage of Communities,” In *Hermes*, 108. Bd., H. 3, 365-385.

———. 1980. “Tabulae patronatus: a study of agreement between patron and client-Community,” In *ANRW* 2.13, 535-61.

———. 1979. “Patronum cooptare, patrocinium deferre. Lex Malacitana c. 61,” In *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*, XCVI 303-306, pp. 303-306.

Oberziner, G. 1902. “I Liguri antichi e i loro commerci. Ricerche storiche,” In *Giornale Storico e Letterario della Liguria* 3, pp. 5-28, 81-115, 191-250.

Osanna, M. 2018. “Games, Banquets, Handouts, and the Population of Pompeii As Deduced from a New Tomb Inscription,” In *JRS*, 31, pp. 310-322.

Pancieria, S. 1977. “L’Evergetismo civico nelle iscrizioni latine d’età repubblicana,” In *Actes du Xe Congrès International d’Épigraphie Grecque et Latine: 249-90*, edited by Christol and O. Masson. Paris: Sorbonne.

———. 1987. “I patroni di Aquileia fra la città e Roma,” In *Aquileia e Roma* (Atti della XVII Settimana di Studi Aquileiesi - Aquileia 1986; Ant. A. Adr., 30), Udine, pp. 77-95.

Parma, A. 2003. “Per un nuovo corpus dei decretal decurionum delle città romane d’Italia e delle province occidentali,” In *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz*, Vol. 14, pp. 167-171.

Perry, J.S. 2001. “Ancient *Collegia*, Modern Blacksmiths: The Study of Roman Corporations in Fascist Italy.” *IJCT* 8: 205–16.

Pflaum, H.-G. 1948. *Le Marbre De Thorigny*. Paris.

———. 1957. “Les gouverneurs de la province romaine d’Arabie de 193 à 305,” In: *Syria* 34, pp. 128–144.

———. 1960. *Les carrieres procuratoriennes equestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

———. 1966. “Un nouveau sodalis Aurelianus Antoninianus à la lumière d’une inscription de Philippopolis Thraciae,” In *Raymond Chevalier (Hg.): Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire offerts à André Piganiol*, pp. 275–282. Paris.

Pobjoy, M. 2000. “Building Inscriptions in Republic Italy: Euergetism, Responsibility, and Civic Virtue.” In *the Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy*, edited by Cooley, A. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Premmerstein, A. 1937. *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats (Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung, ns 15)*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissen Schäften.

Quass, F. 1993. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in Den Städten Des Griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen Zur Politischen und Sozialen Entwicklung in Hellenistischer und Römischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.

Radice, B. 1963. *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*. United States: Penguin Books.

Rémondon, R. 1970. *La crise de l’Empire romain*. PUF, Coll. “Nouvelle Clio – l’histoire et ses problèmes”. Paris.

Rémy, B. 1989. *Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d’Anatolie au Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C.–284 ap. J.-C.) (Pont-Bithynie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Lycie-Pamphylie et Cilicie)*. Istanbul, Paris: Varia Anatolica.

Roda, S. 1977. “Magistrature senatorie minori nel tardo impero romano,” In *Gabrieus Lombardi (Hg.): Studia et documenta historiae et iuris, (Pontificium Institutum Utriusque Iuris 43)*, 23–112. Roma.

Royden, H. L. 1988. *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century ad*. Pisa.

Ross Taylor, L. 2013. *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*. The University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Rüpke, J., Nüsslein, B., and Glock, A. 2005. *Fasti sacerdotum I–II. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.*, Stuttgart: Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 12.

Saddington, D. 2009. “Problems in the Nomenclature of the Personnel and the Questions of the Marines in the Roman Fleets,” In *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Vol. 52, pp. 123-132.

Salway, B. 2000. “Prefects, *Patroni*, and Decurions: A New Perspective on The Album of Canusium,” In *the Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy* edited by Cooley, A. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Salamito, J. 1987. “Les Collèges de Fabri, Centonarii et Dendrophori Dans Les Villes De La Regio X À L’Époque Impériale.” In: *La Città nell’Italia settentrionale in età romana. Morfologia, strutture e funzionamento dei centri urbani delle Regioni X e XI Atti del convegno di Trieste (13-15 marzo 1987)* Rome: École Française de Rome, 1990. pp. 163-177.

———. 1990. “Les collèges de fabri, centonarii et dendrophori dans les villes de la regio X à l’époque impériale.” In *La città nell’Italia settentrionale in età romana: Morfologie, strutture e funzionamento dei centri urbani delle regioni X e XI*, 163–77. Trieste.

Saller, R. 1989. “Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction.” In *Patronage in Ancient Society*, edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 49-62. London and New York: Routledge.

———. 1982. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sartori, F. 1960. *Verona romana: storia politica, economica, amministrativa*. Verona: Istituto per gli studi storici Veronesi.

———. 1994. *Le iscrizioni romane. Guida all'esposizione*. Como.

———. 2003. “La promozione del consenso: Autorappresentazione e modelli epigrafici nelle comunità municipali cisalpine,” In C. Castillo García, J. F. Rodríguez Neila, F. J. Navarros, *Sociedad y economía en el occidente romano*, pp. 283-308. Pamplona.

———. 2007. *Dedicanti e cultores nelle religioni celtiche*. VIII Workshop F. E. R. C. A. N. gargnano del garda (9-12 maggio 2007). Milan.

Sartre, M. 1982. *Trois études sur l'Arabie romaine et byzantine. Publié avec le concours du Centre national de la Recherche scientifique*. Brüssel.

Schultz, M. 1899. *De Plinii Epistulis Quaestiones Chronologicae*. Berlin.

Scarpa Bonazza, B, Forlati Tamaro, B., Coletti, L, Cessi, R, and Zille, G. 1962. *Iulia Concordia dall'età romana all'età moderna*. Treviso: Casa Editrice.

Sherwin-White, A.N. 1998. *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sisani, S. 2021. “Il duovirato nei municipia italici: contributo allo studio della fase finale del processo di municipalizzazione nell'Italia centrale e meridionale,” In *Gerión*, 39 (1), pp. 41-93.

Sillières, P., M., Magallón, Á., and Navarro Caballero, M. 1995. “El municipium Labitulosanum y sus notables: novedades arqueológicas y epigráficas,” In *AEspA* 68: 107–130.

Silverman, S. 1977. “Patronage as a Myth,” *In Patrons and Client in the Mediterranean Societies* edited by E. Gellner and J. Waterbury, pp. 7-19. London: Duckworth.

Stoddart, S. and J. Whitley. 1988. “The Social Context of Literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria,” *In Antiquity*, 62, 761-72.

Stifter, D. 2020. *Cisalpine Celtic. Language, Writing, Epigraphy*. Zaragoza.

Stein, A. 1963. *Der römische Ritterstand, ein Beitrag zur sozialund personengeschichte des römischen Reiches* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, no. 10), Munich.

Stek, T. D. 2008. *Sanctuary and society in central-southern Italy (3rd to 1st centuries BC): a study into cult places and cultural change after the Roman conquest of Italy*. Unpublished Thesis: University of Amsterdam.

Stillwell, R, MacDonald, W. L., and McAllister, M.H. 1976. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Studies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.

———. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford.

———. 1959. “Livy and Augustus,” *HSCP* 64, 27–87 = *RP* i. 400–54.

———. 1985c. ‘The paternity of polyonymous consuls’, *ZPE* 61: 191–8 = *RP* 5.639–47.

———. 1968/9. “Three Jurists,” *In Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium*, 309-23. Edited by Straub, J. Bonn.

Thomas, E. and Witschel, C. 1992. “Constructing reconstruction: claim and reality of Roman rebuilding inscriptions from the Latin West.” *PBSR* 60: 135-78.

Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

Thomas, C. 2004. “Claudius and the Roman Army Reforms,” In *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 53, H. 4, pp. 424-452.

Tran, N. 2001. “Le collègue, la communauté et le politique sous le Haut-Empire romain. Historiographie du droit à la fin du XIXe siècle, « tradition sociologique » et quelques recherches contemporaines.” In *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 12: 181–98.

Vavassori, M. 1994. “Le antiche lapidi di Bergamo e del suo territorio,” In *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 1, nr. 17 (2), p. 153.

Vandevorde, L. 2012. “ ‘Augustales’ and ‘Decuriones’: Sixteen Inscriptions from Narbonese Gaul,” In *Latomus* , T. 71, Fasc. 2, pp. 404-423.

Van Nijf, O. M. 1997. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam.

———. 1999. “Verenigingsleven en stedelijke identiteit: de rol van fabri, centonarii en dendrophori.” *Lampas*: 198–210.

Vedaldi Iasbez, V. 1985. “La problematica sulla romanizzazione della Transpadana negli studi dell’ultimo quarantennio,” In *Quaderni Giuliani di Storia*, 6, pp. 7-47.

Veyne, P. 1976. *Le Pain et le Cirque*. Paris: Seuil.

Watson, N. “Dreams and Superstition: A Reinterpretation of Satire in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 11,” In *Ancient Narratives*, Vol., 11, 133-158.

Wallace-Handrill, A. 1989. “Introduction.” In *Patronage in Ancient Society*, edited by A. Wallace-Handrill, 1-14. London and New York: Routledge.

Waltzing, J.-P. 1895–1900. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu’à la chute de l’Empire d’Occident*. 4 vols. Louvain.

Wesch-Klein, G., 1999. “Equites Romani und Euergetismus, in L’ordre équestre,” In *Histoire D’une Aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, edited by S. Demougin et al. Rome: École Française de Rome.

White, P. 1978. “Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome,” *JRS* 68, pp. 74–92.

Wiseman, T.P. 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C. A.D. 14*. Oxford

———. 1971. “Celer and Nepos,” *QS* ns 21, 180-2.

Williamson, C. 1987. “Monuments of Bronze: Roman Legal Documents on Bronze Tablets,” *In Classical Antiquity* 6, 160-183.

Wooman, A. J. and Martin, R.H. 1996. *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3*. Cambridge: Classical Texts and Commentaries 32.

Woolf, G. 1996. “Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire,” *In JRS* 86: 22-39.

———. 1990. “Food, Poverty, and Patronage: The Significance of the Roman Alimentary Inscriptions in the Epigraphy of Early Imperial Italy,” *In PBSR* 58: 197-228.

Zaccaria, C. 1999. “Documenti epigrafici d’età repubblicana nell’area di influenza aquileiese,” *In G. Cresci Marrone and M. Tirelli (eds.), Vigilia di romanizzazione. Altino e il Veneto orientale tra II e I sec. a.C.. Atti del Convegno (Venezia 1997)*, pp. 193-210. Roma.

———. 2001. “Alla ricerca di divinità “celtiche” nell’Italia Settentrionale in età romana: Revisione della documentazione per le Regiones IX, X, XI.” *Veleia* 18: 129-164.

———. 2008a. “Iscrizioni inedite del culto di Cibele rinvenute nelle fondazioni del battistero di Aquileia,” *In Epigrafia 2006. Atti della XIV rencontre sur l’epigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera [Roma dal 18 al 21 ottobre 2006]*. Con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori. A cura di Maria Letizia Caldelli, Gian Luca Gregori, Silvia Orlandi. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.

———. 2008b. “Cultores Beleni,” *In A. SARTORI (ed.), Dedicanti e cultores nelle religioni celtiche, in VIII Workshop F.E.R.C.A.N. (Gargnano del Garda 2007)*, pp. 375-412. Milano.

Zeza, M.G. 1983. “I materiali lapidei impiegati in età romana nell’area compresa fra il Ticino e il Mincio,” *In Economia Lariana*, 3, p. 90.

Appendix of Inscriptions

The following appendix reports the inscriptions honouring *patroni*. In the first table, I reported the name of the *patronus*, his social class, location, tribe, the community in which he was honoured as *patronus*, and the chronology of the inscriptions. In the second table, I reported the benefactions that each *patronus* performed.

CIL, AE, ILS #	Honorand	Social class	Location	Tribe	“Client” Communi ty/ies	Chron ology
<i>CIL</i> V, 40 (<i>AE</i> 1994, 6680).	Gaius Veratius Italus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial Equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Velina</i>	<i>Concordia et Altinum.</i>	2 nd century AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 865 (<i>CIL</i> V, 429) (<i>AE</i> 2010, 54)	Titus Caesernius Staius Quincticus of Macedonia, Quinctianus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Palatina</i>	<i>Aquileia</i>	138-148 AD
<i>CIL</i> VIII, 7036 (<i>ILS</i> , 1068).	Titus Caesernius Quintus Staius Memmius Macrinus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Palatina</i>	<i>Coloniae*</i> ³²⁸	141-148 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 877.	Aulus Platorius Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus Gaius Licinius Pollio, son of Aulus.	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Sergia</i>	<i>Aquileia</i>	125 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 1012.	Gaius Valerius Eusebetus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Velina</i>	<i>Septimia Aurelia Augusta, collegia centonariorum et dendrophorum (Aquileia)</i>	2 nd century AD

³²⁸The Communities’ identities cannot be identified or are uncertain.

<i>CIL</i> V, 8972 (<i>AE</i> 2016, 19)	Quintus Axilius Urbicus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial Equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Velina</i> * ³²⁹	<i>Aquileia</i>	286-305 AD
<i>AE</i> 1960, 191 (<i>AE</i> 1961, 213) (<i>AE</i> 2000, 605)	Tiberius Claudius Magnus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Velina</i> *	<i>Aquileia</i>	256 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 8659	Publius Cominius Clemens, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Claudia</i>	<i>Concordia, Aquileia, Parentium, Venafrantium</i>	180-190 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 1874 (<i>ILS</i> 1118)	Gaius Arrius Antoninus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Quirina</i>	<i>Concordia</i>	167-169 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 1875	Titus Desticius Iuba, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Claudia</i>	<i>Concordia</i>	170-180 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 8660 (<i>ILS</i> 1364)	Titus Desticius Severus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Claudia</i>	<i>Concordia</i>	192-235 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 8667	Quintus Decius Mettius Sabinianus, son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria / Concordia	<i>Claudia</i>	<i>Pola et Collegia fabrum et centonarium (Pola)</i>	130-170 AD

³²⁹The tribe is uncertain.

<i>AE</i> 1976, 252a (<i>AE</i> 2007, 571)	Marcus Carminius Pudens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Bellunum	<i>Papiria</i>	Tergeste et Vicetia, Bellunum, Collegia dendrophorum et fabrorum (Bellunum)	201-300 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 4341	Marcus Nonius Arrius Paulinus Aprus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Fabia</i>	Collegium dendrophorum (Brixia)	230-250 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 4338	Gaius Maesius Picatianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Ignota</i>	Brixia	160-170 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 4477	Sextus Sextius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Fabia</i> *	Collegia fabrorum et centonarium et dendrophorum (Brixia)	1-2 nd century AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 4484	Sextus Valerius Pobicola Vettillianus, son of Sextus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Fabia</i>	Vardagate ntium et Dripsinalium	2 nd century AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 4323	Marcus Aurelius Iulianus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Ignota</i>	Brixia	201-300 AD

<i>CIL V, 1812</i>	Gaius Firmius Menenia Rufinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Feltria	<i>Menenia</i>	<i>Collegia fabrum, centonarium, dendrophorum (Feltria) et (Berua) et collegium fabrum (Alinum)</i>	131-170 AD
<i>CIL V, 1978</i>	Marcus Laetorius Paterclianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: <i>Opitergium</i>	<i>Papiria</i>	<i>Collegia (Opitergium)</i>	71-130 AD
<i>CIL V, 331</i>	Gaius Praecellius Augurinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Parentium	<i>Papiria</i>	<i>Aquileia et Parentium Opitergium</i> <i>Hemonensium</i>	3 rd century AD
<i>CIL V, 335</i>	Lucius Cantius Septimius, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Parentium	<i>Lemonia</i>	<i>Parentium et collegium fabrum (Parentium)</i>	2 nd century AD
<i>AE 2005, 542 (AE 2009, 49) (AE 2014, 483)</i>	Titus Prifernius Paetus Settidianus Firmus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Pupinia</i>	<i>Pola</i>	110-130 AD

<i>CIL V, 47</i>	Lucius Menacius Priscus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Velina</i>	<i>Pola</i>	1-100 AD
<i>CIL V, 61</i>	Quintus Musius Plinius Minervianus, son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Velina</i>	<i>Pola et collegium dendrophorum (Pola)</i>	227 AD
<i>CIL V, 60</i>	Cnaeus Papirius Secundinus, son of Cnaeus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Velina</i>	<i>Collegium fabrorum (Pola)</i>	100-200 AD
<i>AE 2017, 513</i>	Gaius Herennius Caecilianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Sirmione	<i>Poblilia</i>	<i>Verona</i>	120-130 AD
<i>CIL V, 5036</i>	Gaius Valerius Marianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Papiria</i>	<i>Tridentium</i>	171-230 AD
<i>CIL V, 531</i>	Gaius Calpetanus Rantius Valerius Festus, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Pompatina</i>	<i>Tridentium</i>	80-85 AD
<i>CIL V, 545</i>	Lucius Varius Papirius Papirianus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Collegium fabrum (Tridentium)</i>	138-150 AD
<i>CIL V, 3335</i>	Lucius Calpurnius Squillus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Poblilia</i>	<i>Verona</i>	1-2 AD
<i>CIL V, 3336</i>	Gaius Calvisius	<i>Ordo Equester</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Poblilia</i>	<i>Verona</i>	160-169 AD

	Statianus, son of Gaius	(Imperial equestrian)				
<i>CIL V, 3342</i>	Marcus Nonius Arrius Mucianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Poblilia</i>	<i>Verona</i>	201-250 AD
<i>CIL V, 3343</i>	Marcus Nonius Mucianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Poblilia</i>	<i>Verona</i>	2 nd century AD
<i>CIL V, 3344</i>	Petronus Probus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Verona</i>	371-383 AD
<i>CIL XI, 831</i>	Lucius Nonius Verus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Mutina	<i>Pollia*</i>	<i>Mutina, Aquileia, Brixis, Apulia et Calabria*</i>	324-330 AD
<i>CIL XI, 838</i>	Lucius Faianus Sabinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Mutina	<i>Pollia</i>	<i>Mutina</i>	27-37 AD
<i>CIL XI, 1059</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Parma	<i>Pollia*</i>	<i>Parma, Foro Druentinorum et Forum Novum. Collegia fabrum et centonarium et dendrophorum (Parma)</i>	100-200 AD

<i>CIL V, 1230</i>	Quintus Albinus Secundinus son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Placentia	<i>Oufentina</i>	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Mediolanum), Mediolanum</i>	217-230 AD
<i>CIL XI, 19</i>	Marcus Apicius Tiro	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ravenna	<i>Camilia</i>	<i>Ravenna</i>	2 nd century AD
<i>CIL XI, 124</i>	Marcus Aurelius Demetrius Sarapammonius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ravenna	<i>Camilia*</i>	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Ravenna)</i>	TPQ 180 AD
<i>CIL XI, 970</i>	Tuttilius Iulianus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII:Regium Lepidum	<i>Pollia*</i>	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Regium Lepidum)</i>	190 AD
<i>CIL XI, 969</i>	Titus Pomponius Petra, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII:Regium Lepidum	<i>Pollia</i>	<i>Regium Lepidum</i>	17-19 AD
<i>CIL XI, 373 (ILS 1192)</i>	Marcus Aelius Aurelius Theo	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Ariminum</i>	225-250 AD
<i>CIL XI, 377</i>	Gaius Cornelius Felix Italus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Quirina</i>	<i>Ariminum et Collegia fabrum centonariorum dendrophororum</i>	165-166 AD

					(<i>Ariminum</i>)	
<i>CIL XI, 378</i>	Lucius Faesellius Sabinianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Imperial equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum et Collegium centonario rum (Ariminum)</i>	138- 161 AD
<i>CIL XI, 379</i>	Gaius Fasellius Rufio, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester (local equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum, et Collegia fabrum et centonario rum (Ariminum)</i>	151- 200 AD
<i>CIL XI, 385</i>	Lucius Betutius Furianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Magistralis (Magistratur al class)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Palati na</i>	<i>Ariminum et collegium centonario rum (Ariminum)</i>	136- 250 AD
<i>CIL XI, 395</i>	Marcus Vettius Valens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester (Imperial equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum</i>	66 AD
<i>CIL XI, 421</i>	Marcus Vettius Valens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum et Vicanii vicus Aventinus</i>	116- 117 AD
<i>CIL XI, 414</i>	Gaius Galerius Iulianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum</i>	201- 300 AD
<i>CIL XI, 417</i>	Gaius Memmius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Anien sis</i>	<i>Ariminum</i>	101- 250 AD

	Marianus, son of Gaius					
<i>AE</i> 1991, 713 (<i>AE</i> 2014, 255)	Virius Valens	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Fidentia	<i>Pollia</i> *	<i>Collegia fabrum et dendropho rorum (Fidentia)</i>	206 AD
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1183	Lucius Coelius Festus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Galeri a</i> *	<i>Veleia</i>	148- 250 AD
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1185	Gaius [Coeli]us Sabinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Galeri a</i> *	<i>Veleia</i>	1-100 AD
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1188	Ignotus	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	Ignotu s	<i>Veleia</i>	1-50 AD
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1192	Lucius Sulpicius Nepos, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Galeri a</i>	<i>Veleia</i>	138- 200 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 7782	Publius Metilius Tertullinus Vennonianus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Albingaunum	<i>Faler na</i>	Albingaun um	190- 220 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 7784	Publius Mucius Verus, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Equester (Imperial equestrian)</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Albingaunum	<i>Poblil ia</i>	Albingaun um	217- 300 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 7468	Lucius Pompeius Herennianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Industria	<i>Pollia</i>	<i>Collegium pastopho rorum (Industria)</i>	101- 200 AD
<i>CIL</i> V, 7478	Gaius Avilius Gavianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Industria	<i>Pollia</i>	<i>Industria</i>	1-50 AD

		(Imperial equestrian)				
<i>CIL V, 7428</i>	Cnaeus Atilius Serranus, son of Cnaeus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Libarna	Maecia*	<i>Libarna</i>	101-150 AD
<i>CIL V, 7375</i>	Gaius Metilius Marcellinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Liguria, Regio IX: Dertona	<i>Pomptina</i>	<i>Foro Iulii Iriensium et collegium fabrum (Dertona)</i>	131-230 AD
<i>CIL V, 5126 (ILS 2722)</i>	Gaius Cornelius Minicianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Voturia</i>	<i>Bergomum</i>	118-130 AD
<i>CIL V, 5128</i>	Publius Marius Lupercianus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Voturia</i>	<i>Bergomum et collegia fabrum centonariorum dendrophorum (Bergomum)</i>	51-125 AD
<i>CIL V, 5138</i>	Marcus Maesius Maximus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Voturia</i>	<i>Bergomum</i>	90-120 AD
<i>CIL V, 5267 (ILS 2721)</i>	Lucius Calpurnius Fabatus	<i>Ordo Magistralis</i> (Magistratura I class)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Comum	<i>Oufentina</i>	<i>Como</i>	112 AD
<i>CIL V, 5275</i>	Lucius Alfus Marcellinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Comum	<i>Oufentina</i>	<i>Collegium dendropho</i>	101-200 AD

					<i>rorm (Como)</i>	
<i>CIL V, 5847</i>	Marcus Atusius Glycerus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Oufen tina</i>	<i>Collegium aerarioru m (Mediolan um)</i>	101- 217 AD
<i>CIL V, 5892</i>	Publius Tutilius Callifontus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Oufen tina*</i>	<i>Collegia centuriaru m aerarioru m (Mediolan um)</i>	117- 268 AD
<i>CIL V, 5812</i>	Publius Galerius Trachalus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Mediolanu m</i>	68-69 AD
<i>CIL V, 5908</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Mediolanu m</i>	117- 217 AD
<i>CIL VI, 1409 (ILS 1142)</i>	Lucius Fabius Clio Septiminus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Latium et Campania I: Roma	<i>Galeri a</i>	<i>Mediolanu m</i>	202- 203 AD
<i>CIL V, 6419</i>	Titus Didius Priscus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Ticinum	<i>Papiri a</i>	<i>Ticinum</i>	51-130 AD
<i>CIL XI, 3949 (CIL VI, 1635)</i>	Titus Vennonius Aebutianus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Stellat ina</i>	<i>Augusta Taurinoru m</i>	101- 200 AD 101- 200 AD
<i>CIL V, 7003</i>	Gaius Gavius Silvanus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Imperial equestrian)</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Stellat ina</i>	<i>Augusta Taurinoru m</i>	65 AD
<i>CIL V, 7007</i>	Gaius Valerius	<i>Ordo Equester</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI:	<i>Stellat ina</i>	<i>Augusta Taurinoru m</i>	79-100 AD

	Clemens, son of Gaius	(Imperial equestrian)	Augusta Taurinorum			
<i>CIL V, 7039</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Ignota</i>	<i>Augusta Taurinorum</i>	1-100 AD

CIL, AE, ILS #	Honorand	Social class	Location	“Client” Community/ies	Benefactions
<i>CIL V, 40</i> (<i>AE</i> 1994, 6680).	Gaius Veratius Italus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial Equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Concordia et Altinum.</i>	<i>Ob Merita Eius Ex Aere Conlato</i>
<i>CIL V, 865</i> (<i>CIL V, 429</i>) (<i>AE</i> 2010, 54)	Titus Caesernius Staius Quincticus of Macedonia, Quinctianus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Aquileia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL VIII, 7036</i> (<i>ILS, 1068</i>).	Titus Caesernius Quintius Statianus Memmius Macrinus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Coloniae</i> ^{*330}	None reported
<i>CIL V, 877.</i>	Aulus Platorius Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus Gaius Licinius Pollio son of Aulus.	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Aquileia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 1012.</i>	Gaius Valerius Eusebetus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Septimia Aurelia Augusta, collegia centonariorum et dendrophorum (Aquileia)</i>	<i>ob insignem eius erga se largitionem et liberalitatem suffragiis universis ex aere collegii fabrum</i>
<i>CIL V, 8972</i> (<i>AE</i> 2016, 19)	Quintus Axilius Urbicus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial Equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Aquileia</i>	None reported

³³⁰The Communities’ identities cannot be identified or are uncertain.

<i>AE</i> 1960, 191 (<i>AE</i> 1961, 213) (<i>AE</i> 2000, 605)	Tiberius Claudius Magnus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Aquileia	<i>Aquileia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 8659	Publius Cominius Clemens, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Concordia, Aquileia, Parentium, Venafrantium</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 1874 (<i>ILS</i> 1118)	Gaius Arrius Antoninus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Concordia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 1875	Titus Desticius Iuba, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Concordia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 8660 (<i>ILS</i> 1364)	Titus Desticius Severus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria	<i>Concordia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 8667	Quintus Decius Mettius Sabinianus, son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Concordia Sagittaria/Concordia	<i>Pola et Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Pola)</i>	None reported
<i>AE</i> 1976, 252a (<i>AE</i> 2007, 571)	Marcus Carminius Pudens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Bellunum	<i>Tergeste et Vicetia, Bellunum, Collegia dendrophorum et</i>	<i>ob merita</i>

				<i>fabrorum</i> (Bellunum)	
<i>CIL V, 4341</i>	Marcus Nonius Arrius Paulinus Aprus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Collegium</i> <i>dendropho</i> <i>rum</i> (Brixia)	<i>quod</i> <i>eius</i> <i>industria</i> <i>immunita</i> <i>s collegii</i> <i>nostri</i>
<i>CIL V, 4338</i>	Gaius Maesius Picatianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Brixia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 4477</i>	Sextus Sextius	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Collegia</i> <i>fabrorum et</i> <i>centonarioru</i> <i>m</i> <i>et</i> <i>dendropho</i> <i>rum</i> (Brixia)	None reported
<i>CIL V, 4484</i>	Sextus Valerius Poblicola Vettillianus, son of Sextus	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Vardagatenti</i> <i>um et</i> <i>Dripsinalium</i>	<i>ab eis</i> <i>dilectus</i> <i>avis</i> <i>rarissimi</i> <i>s</i>
<i>CIL V, 4323</i>	Marcus Aurelius Iulianus	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Brixia	<i>Brixia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 1812</i>	Gaius Firmius Menenia Rufinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Feltria	<i>Collegia</i> <i>fabrum,</i> <i>centonarioru</i> <i>m,</i> <i>dendropho</i> <i>rum (Feltria)</i> <i>et (Berua)</i> <i>et collegium</i>	None reported

				<i>fabrum (Altinum)</i>	
<i>CIL V, 1978</i>	Marcus Laetorius Paterclianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: <i>Opitergium</i>	<i>Collegia (Opitergium)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 331</i>	Gaius Praecellius Augurinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Parentium	<i>Aquileia et Parentium Opitergium Hemonensiu m</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 335</i>	Lucius Cantius Septimius, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Parentium	<i>Parentium et collegium fabrum (Parentium)</i>	None reported
<i>AE 2005, 542 (AE 2009, 49) (AE 2014, 483)</i>	Titus Prifernius Paetus Settidianus Firmus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Pola</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 47</i>	Lucius Menacius Priscus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Pola</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 61</i>	Quintus Musius Plinius Minervianus, son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Pola et collegium dendrophoru m (Pola)</i>	<i>ob merita eius ex aere conlato</i>
<i>CIL V, 60</i>	Cnaeus Papirius Secundinus, son of Cnaeus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Pola	<i>Collegium fabrorum (Pola)</i>	None reported
<i>AE 2017, 513</i>	Gaius Herennius Caecilianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Sirmione	<i>Verona</i>	None reported

<i>CIL V, 5036</i>	Gaius Valerius Marianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Tridentum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 531</i>	Gaius Calpetanus Rantius Valerius Festus, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Tridentum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 545</i>	Lucius Varius Papirius Papirianus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Tridentum	<i>Collegium fabrum</i> (<i>Tridentum</i>)	None reported
<i>CIL V, 3335</i>	Lucius Calpurnius Squillus, son of Lucius`	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Verona</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 3336</i>	Gaius Calvisius Statianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Verona</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 3342</i>	Marcus Nonius Arrius Mucianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Verona</i>	<i>ob largitionem eius</i>
<i>CIL V, 3343</i>	Marcus Nonius Mucianus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Verona</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 3344</i>	Petronus Probus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Venetia et Histria, Regio X: Verona	<i>Verona</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 831</i>	Lucius Nonius Verus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Mutina	<i>Mutina, Aquileia Brixis, Apulia et Calabria*</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 838</i>	Lucius Faianus Sabinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Mutina	<i>Mutina</i>	None reported

		(Imperial equestrian)			
<i>CIL XI, 1059</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Parma	<i>Parma, Foro Druentinarum et Forum Novum. Collegia fabrum et centonariorum et dendrophorum (Parma)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 1230</i>	Quintus Albinus Secundinus son of Quintus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Placentia	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Mediolanum), Mediolanum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 19</i>	Marcus Apicius Tiro	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ravenna	<i>Ravenna</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 124</i>	Marcus Aurelius Demetrius Sarapammonius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ravenna	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Ravenna)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 970</i>	Tutilius Iulianus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Regium Lepidum	<i>Collegia fabrum et centonariorum (Regium Lepidum)</i>	<i>ornatum et liberale m oportere</i>
<i>CIL XI, 969</i>	Titus Pomponius Petra, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Regium Lepidum	<i>Regium Lepidum</i>	None reported

<i>CIL XI, 373</i> (<i>ILS 1192</i>)	Marcus Aelius Aurelius Theo	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum</i>	<i>ob</i> <i>singulare</i> <i>m</i> <i>abstinent</i> <i>iam</i> <i>industria</i> <i>mque</i>
<i>CIL XI, 377</i>	Gaius Cornelius Felix Italus	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum et</i> <i>Collegia</i> <i>fabrum</i> <i>centonarioru</i> <i>m</i> <i>dendrophoro</i> <i>rum</i> (<i>Ariminum</i>)	<i>eius ob</i> <i>eximiam</i> <i>moderati</i> <i>onem et</i> <i>in</i> <i>sterilitat</i> <i>e</i> <i>annonae</i> <i>laborios</i> <i>am erga</i> <i>ipsos</i> <i>fidem et</i> <i>industria</i> <i>m</i>
<i>CIL XI, 378</i>	Lucius Faesellius Sabinianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum et</i> <i>Collegium</i> <i>centonarioru</i> <i>m</i> (<i>Ariminum</i>)	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 379</i>	Gaius Fasellius Rufio, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo</i> <i>Equester</i> (local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum,</i> <i>et Collegia</i> <i>fabrum et</i> <i>centonarioru</i> <i>m</i> (<i>Ariminum</i>)	<i>optimo et</i> <i>rarissim</i> <i>o civi</i> <i>quod</i> <i>liberalita</i> <i>tes in</i> <i>patriam</i> <i>civesque</i> <i>a</i> <i>maioribu</i> <i>s suis</i> <i>tributas</i> <i>exemplis</i> <i>suis</i> <i>superave</i>

					<i>rit dum et annonae populi inter cetera beneficia saepe subvenit et praeterea a singulis vicis munificentia sua HS XX(milia) n(ummum)</i>
<i>CIL XI, 385</i>	Lucius Betutius Furianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Magistralis (Magistratual class)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum et collegium centonarium (Ariminum)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 395</i>	Marcus Vettius Valens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester (Imperial equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum</i>	<i>ob res prospere gestas</i>
<i>CIL XI, 421</i>	Marcus Vettius Valens, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum et Vicanii vicus Aventinus</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 414</i>	Gaius Galerius Iulianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester (Local equestrian)</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 417</i>	Gaius Memmius Marianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Ariminum	<i>Ariminum</i>	<i>ob merita eius</i>

<i>AE</i> 1991, 713 (<i>AE</i> 2014, 255)	Virius Valens	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Fidentia	<i>Collegia fabrum et dendrophorum (Fidentia)</i>	<i>eius innumerabilia beneficia remuneranda</i>
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1183	Lucius Coelius Festus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Veleia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1185	Gaius [Coeli]us Sabinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Veleia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1188	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Veleia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> XI, 1192	Lucius Sulpicius Nepos, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Aemilia, Regio VIII: Veleia	<i>Veleia</i>	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 7782	Publius Metilius Tertullinus Vennonianus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Albingaunum	Albingaunum	None reported
<i>CIL</i> V, 7784	Publius Mucius Verus, son of Publius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Liguria, Regio IX: Albingaunum	Albingaunum	<i>pro municipium incolumitate sollicito</i>
<i>CIL</i> V, 7468	Lucius Pompeius Herennianus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Liguria, Regio IX: Industria	<i>Collegium pastophorum (Industria)</i>	<i>ob merita</i>
<i>CIL</i> V, 7478	Gaius Avilius Gavianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Liguria, Regio IX: Industria	<i>Industria</i>	None reported

<i>CIL V, 7428</i>	Cnaeus Atilius Serranus, son of Cnaeus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Liguria, Regio IX: Libarna	<i>Libarna</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 7375</i>	Gaius Metilius Marcellinus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Liguria, Regio IX: Dertona	<i>Foro Iuli Iriensium et collegium fabrum (Dertona)</i>	<i>ob insignem circa singulos universo sque cives innocenti am ac fidem</i>
<i>CIL V, 5126 (ILS 2722)</i>	Gaius Cornelius Minicianus, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Bergomum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5128</i>	Publius Marius Lupercianus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Bergomum et collegia fabrum centonarium dendrophorum (Bergomum)</i>	<i>cuius eximia liberalitas post multas largitiones et tam ingentia merita</i>
<i>CIL V, 5138</i>	Marcus Maesius Maximus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Bergomum	<i>Bergomum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5267 (ILS 2721)</i>	Lucius Calpurnius Fabatus	<i>Ordo Magistralis</i> (Magistratural class)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Comum	<i>Como</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5275</i>	Lucius Alfus Marcellinus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Comum	<i>Collegium dendrophorum (Como)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5847</i>	Marcus Atusius Glycerus, son of Marcus	<i>Ordo Equester</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Collegium aerariorum</i>	<i>ob merita eius</i>

		(Local equestrian)		(<i>Mediolanum</i>)	
<i>CIL V, 5892</i>	Publius Tutilius Callifontus	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Collegia centuriarum aerariorum (Mediolanum)</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5812</i>	Publius Galerius Trachalus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Mediolanum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 5908</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Mediolanum	<i>Mediolanum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL VI, 1409 (ILS 1142)</i>	Lucius Fabius Clio Septiminus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Latium et Campania I: Roma	<i>Mediolanum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 6419</i>	Titus Didius Priscus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Senatorius</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Ticinum	<i>Ticinum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL XI, 3949 (CIL VI, 1635)</i>	Titus Vennonius Aebutianus, son of Titus	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Local equestrian)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Augusta Taurinorum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 7003</i>	Gaius Gavius Silvanus, son of Lucius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Augusta Taurinorum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 7007</i>	Gaius Valerius Clemens, son of Gaius	<i>Ordo Equester</i> (Imperial equestrian)	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Augusta Taurinorum</i>	None reported
<i>CIL V, 7039</i>	<i>Ignotus</i>	<i>Ordo Decurionum</i>	Transpadana, Regio XI: Augusta Taurinorum	<i>Augusta Taurinorum</i>	None reported