

For the period from Augustus to the end of the Gordians, we have five cases of pretorian prefects as patrons of Italian municipalities, a figure which represents about 1% of a total of some 560 cases. Note, however, that all five date to the Severan era and four of the five to the reign of Severus Alexander. Six of the seven names appear in one document, the album Canusinum.

As stated above, this article is primarily concerned with the elusive relationship between administrative office and patronage. Specifically, three questions need to be answered. First, why are there (apparently) so few of the higher prefects who are also municipal patrons? Second, what is happening at Canusium and during the reign of Severus Alexander which would encourage the cooptation of so many of them at one time? Third, what kinds of benefactions did the Canusini expect to be conferred by the prefects?

This discussion is in three parts. First, there is an examination of the relevant section of the most important document, the album Canusinum.

Thereafter, there is an analysis of the status and function of prefects in the third century. Finally, there is a review of the particular conditions of Canusium and Apulia.

3. The Text

3.1 Tabula aenea

The inscription under discussion is a bronze plaque, a tabula aenea, found within the walls of ancient Canusium, modern Canosa, in 1675. The heading of the text specifies that it was promulgated in the year in which L. Marius Maximus (for the second time) and L. Roscius Aelianus were consuls at Rome, that is in A.D. 223. The *duoviri quinquennales*, the text notes, saw to it that the names of the *decuriones* should be inscribed in bronze. What follows then is a register, or album, of all members of the local senate including resident and non-resident patrons. The names are distributed hierarchically over four columns. In column I, the thirty-nine patrons of Canusium are distinguished by rank as senators, *clarissimi viri* (there are thirty-one of them), or as *equites Romani* (of whom there are eight). The *decuriones proper* are distributed over the remaining three columns.

3.2 Album decurionum

The principle by which the album is regulated is cited in the Digest under the name of the jurist, Ulpian. This is a particularly useful attribution: Ulpian was pretorian prefect under Severus Alexander and was killed by his own soldiers probably in 222 or 223. Hence, his guidelines would appear to have been in force at the time the *quinquennales* completed their work. The passage in question, 50, 3,1-2, drawn from a work entitled *de officio proconsulis*, explains the hierarchical principle governing the arrangement of names on the album. In brief, Ulpian specifies, first, that the *decuriones* be grouped according to the hierarchy of office attained, second, within each category he should precede who has actually held the office and that priority in each category of magistrates should be assigned to the most senior office holder. Thereafter should come the *pedani*, individuals who had held no actual office. In section 2, Ulpian determined that priority should be awarded those who owe their dignitates to the emperor. It is manifest that the *quinquennales* adhered to these principles in arranging the album.

What is significant for this discussion is the fact that the first five patrons of senatorial status, that is, those in the most prestigious position, are all prefects; one is a *praefectus urbi*, the other four are *praefecti praetorio*. The former, of course, was an office traditionally held by a senator; the latter four are individuals who had followed equestrian careers, but nonetheless are ranked ahead of a number of consulars.

3.3 The Prefects on the Album.

Three of the first five patrons are expressly attested as prefects in the sources. In the other two cases, this status must be deduced from the fact that, though the individuals are known to have followed equestrian careers, they

are listed on the album among the clarissimi. As will be shown below (in section 4), it is a characteristic feature of the reign of Alexander Severus that pretorian prefects became "full members" of the senate.

Appius Claudius Julianus heads the list. He is at this time clearly the most prominent and most senior senator, a clarissimus vir with an impressive cursus. He had already been consul in an earlier but uncertain year, probably under Caracalla. Around 220, he governed Africa proconsularis. He is surely the Julianus, praefectus urbi, to whom Severus Alexander addressed a letter recorded in the Digest (31, 87.3) and, if an emendation be accepted, his term of office covered the year 223. Even without the emendation, his position at the head of the list of prefects suggests that he was indeed praefectus urbi at the time the album was inscribed.

About T. Lorenus Celsus nothing further is known beyond the fact of his name on the album and the implications of the position he has been assigned. Because he is grouped together with three other pretorian prefects, it has been widely accepted that he too held that office and did so with Aedinius Julianus as a colleague. He is a good example of an obviously important imperial official about whom virtually nothing is known.

The career of M. Aedinius Julianus is well attested in epigraphical, papyrological and legal sources. Even so, there are a number of difficulties. Dietz, who has most recently analyzed the evidence, despairs that all the questions can be resolved. For this discussion, the relevant facts are first, that he was praefectus Aegypti from late 222 through March 223, so much is attested in the papyri. This suggests a successful equestrian career. Second, he is listed on the album among the clarissimi viri. As the pretorian prefecture normally conferred senatorial status in this period, we may date his prefecture to 223. And, third, he was a pretorian prefect at the time that he wrote a letter recorded on the "Marbre de Thorigny".

The lengthy career of L. Didius Marinus is also well attested. Six different inscriptions from all parts of the empire, but especially from the east, provide a secure record of his movements down to 215. The final reference to his honors is the album Canusinum and, because it places him among the clarissimi viri, it is most probable that he too had been promoted to the pretorian prefecture and that he held the office with Domitius Honoratus. There is, however, no explicit evidence for this fact in any of the existing sources.

Domitius Honoratus also belongs to this group of prefects. He is recorded to have been praefectus Aegypti on January 6, 222, which would make him the predecessor of Aedinius Julianus. An undated inscription from Egypt contains a dedication to Honoratus, praefectus praetorio (CIL III, 12025), surely the same man. Because he is listed among the clarissimi viri on the album, it is likely that he had been appointed to that office before November, 223.

3.4 Other Prefects as Patrons of Communities in the Severan Period

There are three other cases of prefects, both urban and pretorian, serving as municipal patrons in this era.

Fabius Cilo Septimius Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus was consul for the first time, suffectus, in 193 and for the second time, ordinarius, in 204. He was a close associate (comes) of Septimius Severus and governor of a number of provinces on the Danube before becoming praefectus urbi in about 201. He probably became patron of Mediolanum sometime between 197 and 204. This date may be derived from the fact that a datable inscription mentions his honors (including municipal curatorships) but does not refer to his prefecture or patronage.

Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus had been consul suffect in about 197/8, governed a several northern provinces as well as Syria, Africa and Asia. He became praefectus urbi in about 217. In 223 he attained a second consulship, this time as ordinarius. In this capacity, his name appears on the album. He was, however, patron of two communities near Rome, Velitrae and Ardea.

4. The status of the Prefects in the Severan Period

The expectations of the Canusini regarding these patrons will be discussed below (section 5), what requires comment here is the fact that not only are the pretorian prefects listed among the *viri clarissimi*, but that they are placed before six patrons of consular status. This ordering is highly suggestive of the official ranking accorded the prefects during the Severan period.

4.1 Membership in the Senate

To understand the nature and implications of the ranking of the prefects on the album, we must consider whether the prefects in question enjoyed actual membership in the senate. This is a vexing question, one which Syme allows "can be waived in this place, otherwise there will be no end to the discussion." The consensus, as represented most recently by Chastagnol and Fergus Millar, is that the prefects, at least until Alexander, were not senators *de iure*, remaining equestrians despite the fact that they enjoyed the *ornamenta consularia*. This illustrates once again, as Millar concludes, "the divorce of honor or status and function." If this were the case during the reign of Severus Alexander (namely that the prefects remained equestrians), then it is clear that the Canusini, who placed them among the *viri clarissimi*, misunderstood the status of these patrons. There is good reason to believe that their understanding was correct.

Under Severus Alexander, that is, at the very time that the album was created, the status of the prefects may have been exactly what the Canusini claimed. The *vita Severi Alexandri* of the SHA records the following:

praefectis praetorii suis senatoriam addidit dignitatem, ut viri clarissimi et essent et dicerentur; quod antea vel raro fuerat vel omnino nondum fuerat, eo usque ut, si quis imperatorum successorem praefecto praetorio dare vellet, laticlaviam eidem per libertum summitteret... Alexander autem idcirco senatores esse voluit praefectos praetorio, ne quis non senator de Romano senatore iudicaret. (21, 3-5)

Chastagnol, when comparing this passage to the album, concludes that the SHA does in this instance record a genuine item of information, namely that praetorian prefects were *clarissimi* in word and in fact.

What must be explained, however, is the positioning of the prefects before six other consulars in the ranking. According to a provision of Ulpian, those who have not actually held an office are to be ranked after those who actually had held it (Di 50, 3.1). Theoretically, then the prefects with the *ornamenta consularia* should be placed after all ordinary and *suffect* consuls. Given this principle, Chastagnol concludes, it follows that those consulars on places six through eleven must have all been *adlecti inter consulares*. There is a more satisfactory explanation. The priority assigned to the two *praefecturae*, *urbis* and *praetorio*, during the reign of Alexander placed them, I believe, among the leading consulars. How was this arranged?

That the *praefectus urbi* would have the highest rank among the patrons poses no substantial difficulty. This office went to a prominent senator and was often connected, as is the case here, with the honor of a second consulate. Their loyalty and close personal ties with emperors are well known. Tacitus regularly provides a necrology for the individual in question and, thereby, confirms the high honor associated with the office. The *praefectus urbi* was responsible for order and justice up to the one-hundredth milestone from the city was the only senator with the *ius gladii* (i.e., he commanded troops) in Italy. As will be shown, the Canusini had good reason to seek the benevolence of a man with such power and prestige.

That the pretorian prefects should stand on places two through five, and, hence, before other consulars is more difficult to explain (R,my calls it a "placement juridiquement illogique") but probably reflects the priority assigned to the prefecture during the reign of Severus Alexander. There is no evidence to support Chastagnol's contention that consular patrons listed in places six

through eleven were adlected. Degrassi, in fact, assigns suffect consulships to two of them. I suggest that when the cooptation/adlection took place, the pretorian prefects not only received senatorial and consular status, but were also assigned a ranking within the senatorial hierarchy. In the Julio-Claudian period, young princes had, at the time of their quaestorships, also been given ornamenta praetoria and the right to speak immediately after the consulars (Dio 56, 17.2-3). It is true that such specifications are not attested thereafter, but this may be due to the fact that most of those honored did not become members of the senate anyway. In the case of the reform of Alexander who was trying to place the prefects in a position in which the latter might have the status to judge senators, the statement is explicit: in order that they might judge senators, the prefects should become senators and speak as senators (essent et dicerent). Hence, a ranking before that of the consuls (but not before that of praefecti urbi) might have been considered appropriate. To understand the situation, let us consider the pattern of municipal patronage in respect to these prefects.

4.2 The Incidence of Prefects as Municipal Patrons

Table 1 provides a summary of those patrons who are known to have been praefecti urbi or praetorio and is meant to supplement that provided by Harmand.

Table 1: Prefects and their Client-communities (A.D. 14 - 250)

(Place here, see end of article)

There are four noteworthy features of this table. First, twelve of fifteen patrons date to the period between Commodus and the Gordians; of the twelve, ten patrons date to the Severan period and nine of these ten to the reign of Alexander. Second, only during this reign did pretorian prefects become patrons of communities other than their patriae. Third, only during this reign and thereafter did pretorian prefects become patrons of towns in areas they administered. Fourth, only during this reign do city prefects become patrons of towns in their administrative area. The accumulation of these indications suggests that the status of the prefects, especially the pretorian prefects, did indeed change during the reign of Alexander. Prefects, in a manner that had not been the case before, now become patrons in a manner that is comparable to that of provincial governors, that is, they become patrons of communities in the administrative area.

Given the fact that equestrian officials frequently became municipal patrons (they comprise about 50% of those known) and that those equestrians who became prefects must have been recognized as "promising" or "powerful" long before they reached the prefecture, it is noteworthy that so few cases are known. While no specific answer can be provided, it is part of a larger pattern that those equestrians who did become pretorian prefects did not hold any of the normal municipal offices (except for that of patron as noted). Presumably, their careers in the imperial service were so full that they had little time for such activities. Alternatively, those procurators who did hold municipal office probably did so after they had left the imperial service.

If there is good reason to believe that Alexander did indeed assign a new stature to the pretorian prefects, it is equally apparent that the reform was not an enduring one. On an inscription dated to 229/30, the pretorian prefect M. Attius Cornelianus is not described as a vir clarissimus (C viii, 15447). In sum, the SHA does provide reasonably accurate information about the change in the status of the pretorian prefects in the reign of Alexander. They did become members of the senate (viri clarissimi) at least in the sense that they were assigned a place in the official hierarchy (at the head of the consulars). Moreover, and perhaps as a consequence, the manner in which prefects interacted with communities in Italy also changed. Before the Severans, they had not undertaken municipal offices (except for the very occasional patrocinium of their patriae); during and after the Severan era they became, as the album

illustrates, patrons of communities with increasing frequency and became involved with communities to which (apparently) they had no personal connection beyond that of administration. In this respect, the pattern resembles that which existed between governors and their provincial clients.

5. The prefects as patrons of Canusium.

The Canusini had several compelling reasons to solicit the benevolentia of these men. Ulpian's discussion of the album appears in a treatise entitled *de officio proconsulis* and suggests that the provincial governor had the ultimate responsibility for cities in his province and for the regulation of the various *alba* (cf. Plin. ep. x, 79). In Italy, some of these functions may have been assumed by the *praefectus urbi* if the community lay within 100 m.p. of Rome, or by the *praefectus praetorio*, if beyond. The central issue here is not the supervision of the decurial order, but the nature of the benefactions the Canusini expected of this group of patrons.

Before considering the expectations of the Canusini, one important point needs to be resolved: To what extent can one speak of the prefects as a group? That four pretorian prefects would become patrons of a town that were not their *patriae* and were within their jurisdiction is so unprecedented that it is hardly likely that they would have been coopted individually and at different times in their careers. The assumptions in what follows are, first, that the Canusini must have had a particular problem which they believed could be resolved by the prefects, second, that the problem arose at a time when, through the reform of Alexander, it became possible to coopt them formally as patrons and, third, that they believed that the cooptation would secure the benevolentia needed to resolve the problem.

5.1 The situation and needs of Canusium.

During the principate and dominate, Canusium appears to have enjoyed what might be termed prosperous obscurity. With the construction of the Via Traiana, a route somewhat shorter than the Via Appia between Beneventum and Brundisium. Shortly thereafter it received a new name, Colonia Aurelia Augusta Pia.

Agriculturally, Canusium was like many other cities in Apulia. There was little water and the land was not suitable for intensive cereal production.

Apulia in general and Canusium in particular were best known for the quality of their wool and woolen cloth. The unlikely combination of Columella (7, 2.3), Juvenal (6, 150) and Pliny the Elder (8, 190) are in complete agreement that the wool of Apulia was *laudatissima*, especially that from Canusium. Equally famous was the cloth produced from the wool; indeed, it became almost the generic term for "best quality". Suetonius, describing the extravagance of Nero's entourage, notes that even the muleteers wore 'Canusinian' cloaks (30.3). Martial praises the cloth and clothing on five occasions (2, 45; 9, 22.9; 14, 127, 129, 155). Diocletian paid a compliment to its quality and reputation when he found it necessary to regulate the price of 'Canusinian' cloaks (*edictum de pretiis*, 19, 38).

Though information about the manufacture of the woolen cloth is not available, there are a number of indications relevant to transhumance. Varro, who invested in sheep, writes:

nam mihi greges in Apulia hibernabant, qui in Reatinis montibus aestivabant, cum inter haec bina loca, ut iugum continet sirpiculos, sic calles publicae destantes pastiones.

That is, each spring, the great herds were moved to the mountains of Central Italy from the lowlands of Apulia and then in autumn back again. This transhumance surely involved large numbers of animals and fiercely independent shepherds.

5.2 Order and Disorder

The evidence indicates that violence and brigandage were continuing problems in Central and Southern Italy in all periods.

Augustus had tried to establish order on a permanent basis by creating a regular military presence in the area. How effective it was and how long it remained a distinct unit is uncertain. The Digest, moreover, mentions many cases of latrones and their doings, rustling and physical violence predominating. Italy is frequently the setting.

The most notorious of these robber bands was active in the Severan period. Dio relates at length how Bulla Felix and his band of six hundred men plundered Italy for over two years (between 206-209). Indeed, the fact that Severus was winning a war in Britain, but unable to bring security to Italy was a source of considerable frustration to the emperor. Dio notes that Bulla obtained his recruits from the poorly paid freedmen on imperial estates; these numbers, Birley adds, may well have been supplemented by the several thousand pretorians discharged in June, 193. Bulla was eventually captured and, exactly as one would expect, it was the pretorian prefect and jurist, Papinian, who sat in judgment (Dio, 77, 10.7). This is perfectly comprehensible: the pretorian prefect had, as noted above, the responsibility for order in Italy beyond 100 m.p.

Bulla Felix may have been the best known of these robber barons, but he was not the only one. Dio mentions a number of uprisings in 222, the year in which Alexander Severus became emperor, suggesting that disorder was frequently associated with a violent change in rulers (80, 3.1). Certainly the chaos of the last years of the reign of Elagabalus and the pretorians' fixation on the events in the City provided latrones with ample opportunity to extend the range of their activity.

5.3 Sheep and shepherds

The newly published collection of inscriptions from the Canusium and its environs does not contain even a single reference to sheep or to wool, to shepherds or to weavers. Nonetheless, the literary evidence cited above is conclusive that the citizens of Canusium were indeed involved in such ventures. Sheep and shepherds were certainly the victims of much of the violence described above and, in the latter case, may also have been the perpetrators. The evidence indicates violence in the Appenines was a frequent problem both during the republic and the principate, Cicero, indeed, assumes as much in *pro Cluentio*. There are also numerous examples in the history of the second and early third centuries, A.D. The case of Bulla Felix has been described above, but note, too, the casual way in which the young Marcus Aurelius and his companions terrified a shepherd and his flock (*Aur. ad Fr.*, p. 35), probably a common enough event.

Crucial to this discussion is, however, the famous inscription from the central Italian town of Saepinum (CIL IX, 2438). The text documents an incident or continuing set of incidents involving sheep, shepherds and locals. The complaints were eventually forwarded to the pretorian prefect who issued an edict threatening stronger action if local magistrates could not resolve the problem. As Saepinum lies just beyond the 100 m.p. line, the jurisdiction belongs properly to the pretorian prefect. It is true that the flocks in question belong to the emperor, but flocks owned by individual investors must have faced the same difficulties. Disorder, violence, rustling in the Appenines affected the flocks directly and, ultimately, the wealth of the Canusini. Hence, the cooptation of prefects at Canusium may reflect the needs of the town to secure the good will of those men who were responsible for law and order in the Appenines, of those men, namely, who had the means, the soldiers, to guarantee the safety of flocks and herdsmen along the *calles publicae* and to bring the criminals to justice.

This theory may well account for the presence of the pretorian prefects on the album, but what of the *praefectus urbi*? The same principle applies, for, when one moves from the Apulian lowlands to the *montes Reatini*, one also crosses the 100 m.p. line and into the criminal jurisdiction of the urban prefect.

6. Prefects and Benefaction

The argument of this paper should now be clear. The wealth of the Canusini lay in herds. These herds moved up and down the Appenines in a yearly cycle. The sheep and the shepherds were vulnerable to latrones at all times, but especially during the first quarter of the third century, the problems seem to have been especially acute. What is less clear is whether the violence was on a genuinely greater scale in absolute terms, or whether, after the years of peace, the incidents merely appeared to have become serious. In some ways it hardly matters, for the anxiety, once awoken, would have been just as real. The prefects, as the chief guarantors of order in Appenines, were in a position to provide exactly the kind of service the Canusini needed.

The fact that prefects become patrons at all presumes that they had conferred benefactions on their clients, or were expected to do so. As noted in the introduction, one of the most striking features of patronage is the general reluctance of the members of the elite to be specific about their benefactions. This tendency is also a function of rank: the higher the status of the patron, the less likely it is that an epigraphical text will specify the benefactions conferred. It is then hardly surprising that we have no specific indication explaining why Canusium needed the benefactions of prefects.

To this point, the argument has proceeded in a traditional manner. First, we know that the prefects were, administratively, responsible for order in Italy. Second, it is clear that Canusium (and other communities involved with transhumance) relied on these officials to protect their property and prosperity. Third, we know that, during the Severan period, there was a genuine problem of order along the drove roads of Italy. The connection of imperial office and benefaction, though plausible, remains speculative. Fortunately, there are other considerations which tend to substantiate this case. Other patrons selected by the Canusini came from communities along the drove roads and they may have been selected to mediate differences which, as at Saepinum, might arise between shepherds and town dwellers. Moreover, there is another inscription from Canusium which, though it does not mention sheep and latrones specifically, does nevertheless make a formal connection between the patronage and the maintenance of order as a benefaction.

The album Canusinum provides, as noted above in section 3.2, a list of thirty-nine patrons of the town, five of whom have been discussed here. It is clear from the list, however that many of non-resident patrons of Canusium came from communities (Ausculum, Aeclanum, and Beneventum) along those very calles publicae which were used by shepherds to move their flocks from Apulia into the montes Reatini. Specifically, C. Betitius Pius is associated with Aeclanum, L. Lucilius Priscillianus is connected to Ausculum and T. Munatius Felix probably with Beneventum. Other roads led through the towns of Venusia, the patria of Junius Numidianus, and Luceria, the patria of the three Statii and a most important market for the products of sheep and shepherds. As the Saepinum inscription makes clear, conflicts did arise between migrating shepherds and towns along the roads, it was eminently reasonable then for the Canusini to secure protectors and mediators in those towns where their citizens and dependents might have need of such services. Indeed, the magistrates responsible for local order in the first instance were local officials; the prefects became involved only in continuing and serious cases.

The closest connection between the cooptation of patronage and the concern for order at Canusium may be seen in a text which is part of a statue base:
M. Antonio Vitelliano v(iro) e(gregrio) patr(ono) col(oniae) Canus(ii)
p(rae)p(osito) tractus Apuliae Calabriae Lucaniae Bruttior(um) ob insignem eius
erga patriam ac cives adfectionem et singularem industriam ad quietem regionis
servandam postulatu populi d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ublice) (CIL XI, 334 =
D.2768).

Antonius is then of equestrian status and a patron of his patria. He belongs to a well-known family in the town. Two Antonii are mentioned on the album Canusinum among the patrons of senatorial rank. It is not clear whether Vitellianus is related to them, though he is probably related to two other Antonii who appear on the album as decuriones, Priscus and Vindex. The inscription dates to the 3rd century, and, because Vitellianus does not appear on the album, he was probably active shortly before or sometime after 223. Though there are some questions about the function, it is generally agreed that the office of praepositus was a temporary military command of varying rank. The command was often associated with the maintenance of order especially with suppression of brigandage. Pflaum reckons the office as one of the officia centenaria.

This inscription constitutes then the connection between the need for benefaction in the form of protection and the formal cooptation of a patron who can provide the appropriate service.

This observation raises the question of the possible discrepancy between the date of the cooptation and the date of the inscription; that is, even a dated inscription may refer to a cooptation that took place years earlier. In this case, we do not know when Antonius would have become patron. Moreover, the achievement of Vitellianus may be the result of his actions as praepositus and have nothing to do with his status as patron. Hence, the benefaction of quies may be the only element connected with the statue and inscription. There is, however, some reason to believe otherwise. Vitellianus' patria is Canusinum. As noted above, it is reasonable to connect him with the other Antonii on the album. If so, he belonged to a decurial family and numbered among his relatives at least one quinquennalis. Moreover, if he had held any municipal or other imperial office, surely this would have been noted on the inscription. As such honors are not mentioned, we may suppose that he had not in fact held them. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that he is still at the beginning of his career and that his patrocinium is in some way related to his achievement as praepositus.

7. Conclusions

Though there is no clear record of expectation and/or performance in the epigraphical evidence, it is generally agreed (and confirmed in the literary evidence) that patronage involved the exchange of services between two parties of unequal status. The oldest tradition on patronage (instituted by Romulus, Dion. Hal., II, 10), makes a strong connection between role of the patron, on one hand, as a protector both in a physical and in a legal sense and, on the other hand, the role of the client as the party in need of such services. The literary evidence of the republic, especially the writings of Cicero, assumes that all communities had such patrons and that the latter, both in the courts and in private, would protect the former from rapacious governors and from both external and internal violence. Individuals and communities generally selected as patrons those senators who had governed them. Because the governor could hardly function effectively as advocate and as judge, there was some awkwardness and considerable opportunity for abuse. Eventually, Roman law and municipal charters made it illegal for communities to coopt sitting imperial officials as patrons. Theoretically, then, the services of the patron were separated from his function as an imperial official.

A similar situation may be seen in the case of the prefects as municipal patrons and as officials of enormous prestige and power. They were desirable to have as patrons because of their criminal jurisdiction and their command of troops in Italy. They alone could guarantee peace and order. The economic interests of the Canusini, especially their holdings in sheep, made them very sensitive to any rise in the rate of violence in the Apennines and encouraged them to use all means to secure the good will of those men who had it in their power to guarantee their prosperity. Down to the reign of Severus Alexander, however,

prefects could not, or at any rate did not, become patrons of communities (except of their patriae) and are not recorded to have held any municipal office at all.

The year 223 is critical. First, it was a time when, however temporarily it may have been, the pretorian prefects position in the senate was "regularized" and they were ranked apparently before the consulars. Second, and as a measure of that status, they began to interact with municipalities in a manner which was, by previous standards, unprecedented.

This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that we not only have the indirect indications based on need and legal power, but direct evidence from Canusium which suggests (however indirectly) that the guarantee of order (quies) was related to the exercise (retrospectively or prospectively) of patrocinium. This constitutes one of the rare instances in which we can make any connection between benefaction and administrative function.

Other towns of southern Italy with important investments in sheep, Tarentum and Luceria for example, probably faced at this time many of the same problems as did Canusium and may well have employed the same solutions --that is, they appealed to the prefects to use their troops to secure order and offered the honor of patrocinium publicum as an incentive to or a reward for action. There is good reason to believe that the forces encouraging the Canusini to act in this way were always present. What is significant here is that for a short time during the reign of Alexander, there was an opportunity to secure the good will of the prefects in a manner similar to that employed by provincial communities with their governors

To generalize from this conclusion, we may assume that many imperial officials who became patrons of provincial communities did so not only because they could speak on behalf of their clients (as did Pliny and Fronto), but also because of the fact that they commanded troops and guaranteed order. Quies was then a significant benefaction.

John Nicols

Department of History

University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403

Tel.: 503-686-4802 (office)

503-485-5627 (home)

Table 1: Prefects and their Client-communities (A.D. 14 - 250)

Name	Office	Date	Client	Patria	Evidence
Afranius Burrus	prf praet	55	Vesontio	Vesontio	C xii 5842
Ducennius Geminus	prf urbi	62	Narona	?	D.9484
Lollius Urbicus	prf urbi	135	Tiddis	Tiddis?	D.1065
Atilius Aebutianus	prf praet	186	Asseria	Asseria?	D.9001
Fabius Cilo	prf urbi	199	Mediolanum	Spain	D.1142
App Cl Julianus	prf urbi	223	Canusium	?	C ix 338
Didius Marinus	prf praet	223	Canusium	Syria?	C ix 338
Domitius Honoratus	prf praet	223	Canusium	?	C ix 338
Lorenus Celsus	prf praet	223	Canusium	Roma?	C ix 338
Aedinius Julianus	prf praet	223	Canusium	?	C ix 338
Marius Maximus	prf urbi	223	Ardea	Cent It?	C x 6764
Marius Maximus	prf urbi	223	Velitrae	Cent It?	C x 6567
Attius Cornelianus	prf praet	230	Uchi maius	Uchi maius	D.1334
Attius Alcimus	vice prf praet	230?	Turca?	Turca?	D.1347
Aurelius Julianus	prf praet	250?	Brixia	Latium	D.1333

This paper has been improved by the comments and suggestions of Professors Werner Eck, R. J. A. Talbert and Paul Weaver
E.g., III, 4; IV, 1; VI, 18; VII, 33.

There are over twelve hundred patrons datable to the period between about 70 B.C., and A.D. 300. Frequently cited literature: Harmand = L. Harmand, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas empire*, Paris, 1957; Engesser = F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diokletian*, Diss. Freiburg (unpublished), 1957; Nicols (1) = "Pliny and the Patronage of Communities" *Hermes* 108(1980), 365; Nicols (2) = "Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt" *Chiron* 9(1979), 243. For a list of those patrons known in the 1950's see Harmand and Engesser.

This has been observed by this author in a number of studies, e.g., Nicols (1) and "Patronae civitatis: Gender and Civic Patronage", forthcoming in *Latomus*. It has also been noted independently by other scholars, e.g., G. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria: Epigraphische Quellen*, Heidelberg, 1984, 64.

The most modern survey is S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends*, Cambridge, 1984. The lack of specifics about actual benefaction is characteristic of clientelistic societies, 250 ff.

Harmand, for example does not discuss pretorian prefects as a group.

This had been the standard method employed by Harmand and Engesser. E. Badian, working in an earlier period, applies the same principles, *Foreign Clientelae*, Oxford, 1958. During the principate, this method applies primarily to non-resident patrons; the relationship between the patron and the client when the latter is the patria of the former, is somewhat different.

Harmand's lengthy tables document the relationships, 184 ff.

Table 1 provides the basic facts. The offices and the function will be discussed below in section 4.

The details on the individuals will be provided below.

The text has been published many times: CIL IX, 338, has been definitive. The most recent and useful text is by Marcella Chelotti, et al., *Le epigrafi romane di Canosa I*, Bari, 1985, with photo and the first extensive commentary on the characteristics of the text.

Though the distinctions are somewhat arbitrary, I understand *tabula* to refer to the physical form of the inscription and *album* to the contents. Cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, 1016, and the definitions of the words in OLD.

On the arrangement, Nicols, "On the Standard Size of the *ordo decurionum*" ZRG forthcoming.

On this event and the implications, J. Modrzejewski and T. Zawadzki, "Ulpian et la préfecture du préfet", *Rev. Hist. de droit fran. et étr.* 45(1967) 565 ff.

On this point, see Mommsen *Röm. Staatsr.* III, 853, and W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserreiche*, Leipzig, 230, and R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton, 1984, 40.

Severus Alexander gave the pretorian prefects senatorial dignity *ut viri clarissimi et essent et dicerentur*. Quoted in full below in section 4.1.

PIR2 C 901; G. Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino*, Roma, 1952, No. 158 (hereafter cited as Barbieri and by the number of the individual); A. Degraffi, *I Fasti Consolari dell'Impero Romano*, Rome, 1952, p. 167; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, Oxford, 1971, 227; A. Jard, *Etudes critiques sur la vie et le règne de l'empereur Alexandre*, Paris, 1925, 60; Chelotti, 65, n. 26.

H.-G. Pflaum, *Le marbre de Thorigny*, Paris, 1948, 40; PIR2 L 343; Barbieri, 1087/8; Modrzejewski and Zawadzki, 593; Syme, *Emperors*, 152; Chelotti, 65, n. 28.

This is the theory of Pflaum, *op cit.*, but the case is not conclusive.

Barbieri, 923; PIR2 A 111; Howe, 38, Pflaum, *Marbre*, 35-9; K. Dietz, *Senatus contra principem*, Munich, 1980, 40; P. Flor. III, 382; P. Oxy. I, 35; CIL XIII, 3162.

PIR2 D 71; Barbieri, 1013; Pflaum, Carrišres, 295; Modrzejewski-Zawadzki, 593; Chelotti, 65, n. 29.

L. L. Howe, *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian*, Chicago, 1942, 37; PIR2 D 151; Barbieri, 1018; Pflaum, *Marbre* 40; Jard,, 39; Chelotti, 65, n. 30.

Though this article is primarily concerned with pretorian prefects, the careers and activities of the urban prefects are, as will be show, also relevant.

PIR2 F 27 and H. G. Pflaum, *Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise (=Gallia Suppl. 30)*, Paris, 1978, 30 ff.

On this issue, Howe, 120-3, and Talbert, 160 and 367. Syme, *Emperors*, 152.

F. Millar, *The Emperor and the Roman World*, Ithaca, 308; A. Chastagnol, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste*, Bonn, 1970, 42-48.

Pp. 47-8. Howe, noting the general reliability of information on the prefects in the SHA life of Alexander (p. 114), reaches the same conclusion (p. 120). B. Romy agrees, *Ornati et ornamenta quaestoria praetoria consularia sous le Haut-Empire romain*, REA 78/79(1976/77), p. 171.

Pp. 47-48.

Howe, 16 ff. On the superiority, both in theory and practice, of the praefectus urbi to the praetorio, M. Durry, *Les cohortes pr,toriennes*, Paris, 1938, 187.

Hist. 3, 75; Ann. 6, 11 and 13, 30. See also Mommsen, *R"m. Staatsr. II*, 1062.

Mommsen, *R"m. Staatsr. II*, 969, 1067; Eck, 20 and 62; Millar, 339. Note also: *ut Romae quidem praefectus urbis solus super ea re cognoscat, se intro miliarum centesimem sit in via commisa. enimvero se ultra centesimum, praefectus praetorio*, Collat. 14, 3.2.

P. 171.

To Statius Longinus and to Furius Octavianus, p. 61-2; cf. Chastagnol, *Recherches*, 48.

Romy provides the data.

Pp. 216-7. Harmand provides only two names for the period between Augustus and the Gordians.

Admittedly the patriae are not always known, but there are usually some indications to that fact when a patron becomes patron of his home town: e. g., *ob insignem amorem in patriam* for Attius Alcimus

Harmand provides dozens of examples of this phenomenon. It can be seen most dramatically in provinces like Numidia and Africa proconsularis. These are not the only unusual aspects of the period. Dessau and A. Stein have noted the confusion of senatorial and equestrian honors in this period, *D. 1329 and Der r"mischer Ritterstand*, Munich, 1927, 162-4, respectively.

M. Durry, *Les Cohortes pr,toriennes*, Paris, 1938 (rep. 1968), discusses the known inscriptions bearing the cursus of the various prefects, p. 159-160; Pflaum discusses the prefects and their cursus in Carrišres also fails to note even one example of a pretorian prefect who held a municipal office. On the activities of senators in municipalities, W. Eck, *Die Pr,,senz senatorischer Familien in den St,,dten des Imperium Romanum bis zum sp,,ten 3.Jahrhundert*, *Studien zur Antiken Sozialgeschichte = Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff*, edd. W. Eck, H. Galsterer, H. Wolff, Cologne 1980, 283-322.

This point cannot be demonstrated here.

There is some evidence at least on the function of the praefectus urbi in this respect, see Mommsen, *Staatsr. II*, 1076.

On the background, Hlsen, RE 3, 1501 ff., Art. "Canusium". For the epigraphical evidence, Chelotti, *op. cit.*

On the roads, G. Radke, RE Suppbd. XIII, 90, Art. *Viae publicae Romanae*, and R. Chevallier, *Roman Roads*, Berkeley, 1976, 132; on the name change, CIL IX, 344.

A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy*, London, 1965, II, 563 and K. D. White, *Roman Farming*, Ithaca, 1970, 73.

On the industry, Joan M. Frayn, *Sheep-rearing and the Wool Trade in Italy during the Roman Period*, Liverpool, 1984

RR II, 2.9; cf. III, 17.9. Toynbee, *Legacy*, II, 288. Frayn provides a wealth of data on transhumance in these parts of Italy.

For one example, Cicero, *pro Cluent.* 161. In general, O. Hirschfeld, "Die Sicherheitspolizei im römischen Kaiserreich, *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin, 1913, p. 600; R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, Cambridge, 1966, 256 ff., *Roman Social Relations*, New Haven, 1974, 1 ff.; B Shaw, "Bandits in the Roman Empire" *Past and Present* 105(1984) 1-52.

Hirschfeld, 591; MacMullen, *Enemies*, 260; note Suet. *Aug.* 32 and *Tib.* 37. One would expect units of the pretorian guard to be involved in such actions. In 246, a cohort, cooperating with a naval unit, did succeed in restoring order in Umbria, ILS 509.

Diz. ep. Art. "latrones" provides many references including to Dig 47, 8.2.21; 14.1 and .3; 48, 19.11.2. Also, ILS 2011 and 509.

A. R. Birley, *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor*, Garden City, 1972, 242 and 249, with other literature.

See above, section 3.1. These economic themes are not, of course, more common elsewhere.

161. Frayn summarizes the evidence, 55 and 61 ff.

MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 1-2.

The most recent and useful discussions of this document are: M. Corbier, "Fiscus and Patrimonium: The Saepinum Inscription and Transhumance in the Abruzzi" *JRS* 73(1983) 126-131, and Frayn, 176 ff.

The major concern here is not with the effectiveness of the actions of the prefects, but with the determination of their range of their jurisdiction. As Corbier points out, the authorities were not much humbled by the rebuke they received (p. 129).

On the criminal jurisdiction of the urban prefect, see Mommsen, *Staatsr.* II, 1063-66, 1075-6.

Note the discussion above at n. 3. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen*, op. cit., 64; Nicols (1), and "Patronae civitatis", op. cit.

On the Betitii, G. Camodeca, "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine. Regio II (Apulia et Calabria)", in *Epigrafia e Ordine senatorio (Atti)*, II, Rome, 1982, 131-2; Chelotti, op. cit., 50; on the Lucilii, Camodeca, 136, Chelotti, 51; on the Munatii, Chelotti, 52.

On Junius, Camodeca, 147, Chelotti, 51; on the Statii, Camodeca, 146, Chelotti, 50; on the market at Luceria and the roads, Frayn, 142. The protection of flocks might be one of several reasons why an individual would become patron, but what those reasons might have been cannot be re-constructed.

Eck, *Organisation*, 12 and 20.

This office is not well understood. Pflaum discusses the inscription and compares it to similar cases in *Carrişres*, 939 and 1041. W. Eck, referring to the conditions of the 2nd Century, calls it "eine sehr bescheidene Stellung", *Die staatliche Organisation Italiens in der hohen Kaiserzeit = Vestigia* 28, Munich, 1979, 273. Other known examples of the office include ILS 1146, 2769, 9201 and ILS 29. For a bibliography on this problem, see Chelotti, 18, n. 5, and M. Christol, *Essai sur l'evolution des carrişres s, natoriales*, Paris, 1986, 36. Especially to be noted are Mommsen *Röm. Staatsr.* II, 1075, n. 2, MacMullen, *Enemies*, 255 ff., and R. E. Smith, "Dux praepositus" *ZPE* 36(1979) 263-78. On the other hand, there is some evidence that in the course of the 3rd century, the status of the position improved, Christol, 37, n.3.

For example, Nicols (1); Cicero's *Verrines* are full of references to the working of this form of patronage.

On this problem, Nicols (2). It is apparent that these restrictions had been rescinded or were no longer enforced in the 3rd century.