

Civic Religion and Civic Patronage

By
John Nicols

It is manifest in the *Res Gestae* and in the art of the Augustan Period that the restoration of the Republic was closely tied to a program of moral renewal; and that moral renewal was closely tied to the re-establishment of the *pax deorum*. Much attention has been given to attempts of Augustus to limit luxury, to control manumissions, and to encourage the procreation of citizens. On the whole much less scholarly attention has been devoted to problem of religious renewal. Here the concern is not so much with the problem of belief, but rather with the role of formal religion in the development of a new self identity for patriotic individuals and loyal cities in the in Roman Empire. Specifically, I would like to argue here that the example set by Augustus for *pietas* (**Image1**: Augustus veiled¹) and benefaction was to a considerable degree followed by the elites of the cities of Italy especially and of the Empire. Just as Augustus held the highest offices in the constitutional order and served as a member of all the priestly colleges, so too did the leading members of the Roman communities accept similar offices, honors and functions in their *patriae* and in their client communities. Just as Augustus worked as a benefactor of Rome, so too did the local elites serve as patrons and benefactors of their own communities.² I argue here that local elites legitimized their status through imperial and community service, through their leadership in ritual and cult, and by using their time, energy and wealth to benefit their communities. I am not of course the first to argue that these services were significant, what I do wish to explore is how the components built a coherent whole.

In what follows I would like to review the basics of what we may label the Augustan model first in respect to Augustus' behavior and then broaden the investigation to include behavior of senators, equestrians and decurions. There are, however, some words of caution about the limits of this investigation

1. The quality and variety of evidence declines as we move down the social pyramid.

¹ An index of images may be found in Appendix A.

² "Die Präsenz senatorischer Familien in den Städten des Imperium Romanum bis zum späten 3. Jahrhundert," *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte* = Festschrift Vittinghof, (edd.) W. Eck, H. Galsterer, H. Wolff (Köln-Wien 1980), 283 ff.

2. Are we speaking of “patronage” as a universal concept or of a particularly formal and Roman institution? It is easy, and often confusing, to allow oneself to cross the line on this point, but *patrocinium* was a very flexible institution with many nuances; indeed though we may identify some general rules, there were as many local variations as there were cities in the Empire.³ In my opinion both ancients and moderns, though keenly aware of the legal problems (and formal civic patronage was legally regulated⁴), also used the term *patronus* and its cognates fairly loosely and to satisfy immediate and long-term needs. Even so, one needs to be candid about which perspective is relevant at each step of the argument.
3. Augustus was never called patron of Rome, either of the city or of the empire.⁵ As the founder of colonies, he did ipso facto enjoy that title in many communities, but generally avoids the use of the word in reference to himself after 12 BC. After he became *pater patriae*, there may have been no need for the title. On the other hand, Velleius claims that Tiberius was the *patronus perpetuus* of the Empire and that Dio states the same about Caesar.⁶ This is a good example of the usage problem just mentioned. Specifically, there is no reason to believe that Tiberius was ever formally given such a title, yet it was evident to some Romans that his position was at least analogous to such a status. Moreover, and in contrast to Augustus, Tiberius never accepted the title of *pater patriae*.⁷ It is equally true that individuals at the local level functioned as patrons and benefactors in a sociological sense even though they may not have held the title *patronus* formally.

³ For a different perspective, see Claude Eilers’ introductory chapter in *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* (Oxford 2002).

⁴ J. Nicols, "Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt", *Chiron* 9(1979) 243-6; Gonzáles, J., "The *lex Irnitana*: A new copy of the Flavian Municipal Law", *JRS* 76(1986) 147-243.

⁵ Ibid. Also, the Roman calendar for 30 January, the date of the dedication of the *ara pacis*, refers to Augustus as the “custodian /guardian of Roman citizens and of the world” [*iii k. Febr. Eo die ara Pacis Aug. dedicata*] est. *Supplicatio imperio Caesaris Augusti cust[odis civium Romanorum orbisque terrar] um*, *ILS* 108.

⁶ Dio’s version of Anthony’s eulogy to the dead Julius Caesar: "For these and for all his [Caesar’s] other acts of legislation and reconstruction, great in themselves, but likely to be deemed small in comparison with those others which I need not recount in detail, you loved him as a father and cherished him as a benefactor, you exalted him with such honors as you bestowed on no one else and desired him to be continual patron (*prostates*) of the city and of the whole domain hearing of the" (44.48.2). Velleius Paterculus uses similar language to describe Tiberius’s status in the last years of the Augustan Principate: "On these events (the defeat of Varus), [Tiberius] Caesar, the constant patron of the Roman empire (*perpetuus patronus imperii Romani*), hurried to his father... (2.120).

⁷ I cannot make the case here, but suspect that reference in Velleius might have been a “trial balloon” to profile Tiberius.

4. The mechanism by which patterns of behavior associated with moral renewal were transmitted to members of the senate and from them down to equestrians and decurions remains to some degree uncertain. Clearly there was no mandate or (as best we can tell) any formal recommendation. Three forces may be at work: the desire to emulate an emperor perceived as virtuous had a powerful effect on behavior, second, the notion of *pietas* clearly resonated with the local elites of Italy and the empire, and third formal religion was perceived as civilizing and humanizing. These concepts will be discussed below.

In what follows, I want to focus on two aspects of the Augustan model that are most relevant to the practice of civic ritual and civic patronage in the communities of the empire, namely on the role patrons in those rituals of a religious character.

Paul Zanker in *Power of Images* has shown in some detail how Augustus operated to encourage the reform of ritual and religion.⁸ The devices were often anachronistic including, for example, the recitation of verses that were incomprehensible to their contemporaries and the leather hats with metal spikes worn by the *flamines* (**Image2**: a *flamen* on the *ara pacis*), but even if Augustus acted in a way that was sometimes naive, it was astonishingly effective. The civic and ritual calendars were filled with events of religious significance commemorating especially (though not exclusively) the achievements of the imperial house. Prayers, sacrifices, processions, and feasts all served to place the emperor and his family at the center of Roman civic religion. All of these features are vividly displayed on the *ara pacis*: note the focus on sacrifice, the procession of priests, the presence of the imperial family and the connection to abundance, peace and traditional values [**Image3**: procession]. The annual celebrations of such events served to reinforce these connections. There are several official and annual celebrations or *feriae* associated with the *Ara Pacis Augustae*: 4 July commemorating the placing of the cornerstone, and 30 January, for the formal dedication of the altar (also Ovid, *Fasti* I 709-22). The *ara pacis* was clearly central to the Augustan program, but it was also not the only monument that references civic religion. In the *Res Gestae* 20, Augustus notes that he repaired and/or restored 82 temples in Rome itself. Given the sums involved in these restorations, repairs and new structures, he clearly believed that such an investment was

⁸ P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich 1987), Chapter 4, 107ff.

useful and indeed efficacious. He surely wished to be foster the idea that Rome ruled by serving the gods (Horace, *carmina* 3.6).

How important were the priesthoods in this process⁹? By assuming a membership in each of the most important priestly colleges himself [**Image4a: Augustus veiled; 4b shows Aurelius sacrificing**], Augustus let it be known that he placed a high value on this service. To reinforce the importance, the priesthoods, life-long appointments, were given to those of the highest rank and best families.¹⁰ Indeed the competition for such appointments was intense. Tacitus notes the case of the disappointed candidates who considered their failure to receive a promised appointment to be the equivalent to a death sentence (*annales* 6.40). Pliny, who did not receive the augurate until after his consulship, wrote to Trajan: “As I am sensible, Sir, that the highest applause my actions can receive is to be distinguished by so excellent a prince, I beg you would be graciously pleased to add either the office of *augur* or *septemvir* (both which are now vacant) to the dignity I already enjoy by your indulgence; that I may have the satisfaction of publicly offering up those vows for your prosperity, from the duty of my office, which I daily prefer to the gods in private, from the affection of my heart.” (*epistulae* 10.13) and took special pride in his cooption among the augurs: “My advancement to the dignity of augur is an honor that justly indeed merits your congratulations; not only because it is highly honorable to receive, even in the slightest instances, a testimony of the approbation of so wise and discreet a prince, but because it is, moreover, an ancient and religious institution, which has this sacred and peculiar privilege annexed to it, **that it is for life**” (4.8)

Now it may be true that members of the imperial house received positions in the priestly colleges early in their lives. But for senators in general the appointment typically came late in one’s career, as a kind of capstone.¹¹ Indeed, it is apparent from the note in Tacitus, that emperors sometimes made (perhaps private?) commitments in advance, establishing a kind of “waiting list” for these life-long appointments.

⁹ I am primarily concerned with the municipal priesthoods, including the *flamines perpetui* as well as the cults established for individual emperors at the local level. The latter were common throughout Italy and are to be found in provincial cities as well. J. B. Rives, *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine* (Oxford, 1995), 51-63, notes cults at Carthage for Augustus, Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, Antoninus Pius and Septimius Severus.

¹⁰ As will be discussed below, the civic *flamines* belonged to a group of *perpetui*.

¹¹ When one compares these two letters, it is apparent that Pliny’s first letter /petition was not successful. It was only several years later that he became an *augur*. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny the Younger* (Oxford 1966), 79-80.

When we turn to Roman cities, we also find that there is a high correlation between municipal patrons of the decurial and equestrian orders, priests (especially of the imperial cults) and *quinquennales*. Indeed, at the local level, patronage, priesthoods and high office (both civic and imperial) are all closely associated.

Table 1: Civic Patrons, Priesthoods and Rank

rank	patrons	<i>flamines</i>	<i>pontifices</i>	other priests	<i>qq</i> /patron ¹²	Rank in imperial service ¹³
decurions	69	33	23	20	24 / 35%	22/32%
equestrians	56	28	14	14	22 / 40%	30 /54%

That is, of the 125 patrons of “equestrian” status and who held priesthoods in their client community, more than one-third of them were also *quinquennales*. [If we included *IIviri* or *IVviri*, the number would be above 70%]. Bear in mind that this table may be somewhat misleading. If the pattern articulated above holds, then the priestly office might well come very late in life.

Moreover, and as a check on our data, we have a complete list of patrons and magistrates of Canusium (in southeastern Italy) from the early third century.¹⁴ The *album* [Image5] records eight patrons of equestrian status. Of these four are *quinquennales* (three in Canusium, one in a neighboring town); one is an aedile and presumably younger. Two are otherwise unknown, possibly from neighboring towns to judge by their names and may have been *quinquennales* in their *patria*e. The last is the brother of a *praefectus Aegypti*. Eleven *quinquennales* are recorded on the inscription (seven elected; four are *adlecti*), suggesting that patronal status (with eight entries) was more selective than quinquennial. Priesthoods are not listed on the album.

¹² The higher the rank of the patron, the less likely he would be a native, and therefore the less likely he would be to hold local office.

¹³ This is an approximation, for the values are not complete in all cases. In general, decurions appear more often as *primus pilus*; while equestrians appear as *tribuni* or *praefecti*.

¹⁴ *CIL* IX 339; from ca AD 221. The *album* and its contents have been discussed in many contexts, in general, Chelotti, M., et al., *Le epigrafi romane de Canosa*, I (Bari, 1985), and most recently by B. Salway, “Prefects, *patroni*, and decurions: A new perspective on the *album* of Canusium”, in *The Epigraphical Landscape of Roman Italy*, ed. by Alison Cooley (London 2000), 115-171.

The 4th Century *album*¹⁵ of Thamugadi records its members in this order:

- 10 *patroni* of senatorial standing,
- 2 patrons of equestrian standing,
- 2 provincial *sacerdotes*,
- 1 *curator reipublicae*
- 34 *duoviri* almost all of whom are listed also as *FL P = flamen perpetuus*.
- 4 *pontifices*
- 3 *augures*

Admittedly, this *album* is much later (ca. AD 360) than the other evidence cited here, but it clearly demonstrates that significant numbers of the local aristocracy, indeed all of the *duoviri* also were priests, and overwhelmingly *flamines*.

These arguments make it quite clear that the accumulation of titles (*patronus*, *flamen* and *quinquennalis*) were extended to only a very exclusive group of equestrians. So much is also confirmed by the fact that most of these individuals also held important positions in the imperial service. They were then individuals who must have performed or were expected to perform exceptional services for their communities even if we do not know what those services might have been. The fact that patrons and priests included individuals who had reached lower offices [as happens on both of the *alba*] is not an argument against this thesis. The individuals in question may have been coopted for expected rather than actual benefits (as certainly applies to Pliny whose case I will discuss below) and not yet have reached the higher offices. The important point is this: at the time that the inscription was authorized, well over 70% of municipal patrons had already reached the two of the highest offices (*IIvir*; priest) their communities had to bestow.¹⁶

But what did these priests do? They were responsible for the regulation of sacrifices and ceremonies, for dedications and consecrations [**Images 6a-e**]; they managed the calendar and pontifical archives; and had some legal responsibilities.¹⁷ But the major focus of activity was clearly the imperial cults. As augur, Pliny writes, "...I may have the satisfaction of publicly offering up those vows for your prosperity, from the duty of my office, which I daily prefer to the gods in private, from the affection of my heart." Similar focus on the emperor and on the members of the imperial house may also be seen in the

¹⁵ *CIL VIII*, 2403. A. Chastagnol, *L'album municipal de Timgad*, (Bonn 1978), 22-26; Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the West*, Leiden 2002) Vol. III, 2, page 9.

¹⁶ Some examples: T. Flavius Germanus = *CIL IX* 2922; M. Gabinius Bassus = *CIL VIII* 26467-8.

¹⁷ Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 2.1, 500ff. provides a summary of the activities of priests; admittedly he is focused on the provincial cults, but given the parallel structure of the municipal and provincial cults, there is good reason to believe that the activities were similar. Also, *RE Suppl XV*, 331. Art. "pontifex" Szemler

records of the Arval Brethren (*CIL VI 2041*). Moreover, it is readily apparent in the epigraphical evidence that at the municipal level the *flamines* were especially constituted to administer the imperial cult. Approximately half of all patrons and priests were also *flamines*. Cults honoring Augustus, Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, Trajan, Hadrian, Pius are all recorded on the same inscriptions that record civic patronage. On some occasions, such sacrifices involved victims, but on other ones wine and incense may have been sufficient. It seems reasonable to conclude that priests at all levels participated in or administered sacrifices on behalf of the emperor and his family, that their role was a very public one, and that they may have been responsible for providing the sacrificial victims and for sponsoring the social events (public banquets: *epulones*) that surrounded the festivities.¹⁸ At the provincial level, the same activities may also be identified.¹⁹ Priestly patrons and patronal priests had a very public role in the civic and ritual life of a community.

In respect to benefaction and patronage, let us consider also the pattern of temple construction among the elite. As Zanker notes, Augustus had reserved this task for himself in Rome, but throughout Italy and the provinces there was ample opportunity to emulate Augustus.²⁰ Agrippa set the pattern by building many structures including the Maison Carée in Nimes (dedicated to his sons, Caius and Lucius). In this case too, Pliny offers a splendid example of how a senator and patron of an Italian community could emulate Augustus and construct a temple for the benefit of a client community (*epistulae* 4.1). He writes to his grandfather-in-law that a long promised trip to Comum will be delayed so that he can visit Tifernum “which adopted me as its patron when I was scarcely more than a child, its enthusiasm outrunning its discretion. The people always celebrate my arrivals, regret my departures, and rejoice in my official titles, and so to express my gratitude (one always feels disgraced at being outdone in friendly feeling) I defrayed the cost of building a temple in the town. As this is now completed, it would be a sacrilegious to postpone its dedication any longer.” Emulation of Augustus may not be explicit, but the analogies are readily apparent. Note that the celebration of Pliny’s comings and goings resembles the celebrations on the Roman calendar, for example, 12 October, commemorating the return of Augustus from the overseas provinces, or the accounts in

¹⁸ Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 2.1, 502 ff.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ See also, Eck, note 1.

Tacitus and Suetonius of how the whole population went out to greet a returning emperor.²¹

There is however a major problem. Epigraphical evidence simply does not provide much indication of a connection between civic patronage and the construction of buildings of a religious character. Indeed of 125 cases I have collected, the construction of temples is mentioned twice (e.g., *CIL VIII* 26467 and 8) while the overwhelming majority of inscriptions [76 cases of 61%] make no mention of any benefaction at all and another 23 [10%] employ some variation of the common but vague formula *ob merita*.

	temples	buildings	other	<i>ob merita</i>	no mention
dec – 69	2	8	3	12	46
equ - 56	0	6	1	11	31

Does this mean that members of the elite did not build temples or even confer material benefactions? Probably not. Duncan-Jones notes that 23 cases in Italy of “miscellaneous building works and restorations” where we have specific information on the amount spent. Of those 22 cases, 7 were relate to the construction of bathing facilities and 6 to temples (the remaining involve the construction of porticos, roads, and other structures). In this sample, some 27% of the structures are temples. In Africa, he identifies 76 structures, of which 28 have some religious significance.²² If this is a normal distribution then we ought to expect that patrons also conferred benefactions of a religious character in a similar proportion.

The conundrum, namely that there is very little direct evidence to support a connection between formal *patrocinium* and benefaction, has been a major problem for many scholars who have studied formal civic patronage. The literary evidence about Augustus and his successors and the official propaganda (e.g., the many coins) places a

²¹ In reference to Tiberius, Suetonius, *Tiberius* 72; Tacitus, *annales* 4.67 and 74. Eilers, 102-4 argues that there is no connection between the benefaction and the fact of patronage in this passage; but such a interpretation is too narrow, for Pliny clearly means that he defrayed the cost of constructing the temple because of the accumulation of honors including not only the celebration of his comings and goings but also his cooption as patron.

²² R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1976), 90-93 for Africa; 160-63 for Italy.

great deal of emphasis on the construction of temples and the administration of the state rituals and cults as a means to secure the good will of the gods. Moreover, the literary evidence emphasizes the power of emulation. Consider the statement of Tacitus on moral reform: “The new men who were often admitted into the Senate from the towns, colonies and even the provinces, introduced their household thrift ... But the chief encourager of strict manners was Vespasian, himself old-fashioned both in his dress and in his diet. Henceforth a respectful feeling towards the prince and a love of emulation proved more efficacious than legal penalties or terrors” (*annales* 3.55). And indeed, Tacitus reinforces this perception in the *Agricola*, 15, when he describes how his father-in-law pacified the Britons: “Agricola gave private encouragement and public aid to the building of temples, courts of justice and dwelling-houses, praising the energetic, and reproofing the indolent. Thus an honorable rivalry took the place of compulsion.” This pattern of emulation, Zanker has shown, may also be seen in the visual arts.²³ It is no wonder that scholars have expected to find the local elites doing exactly that: emulating Augustus as *pater / patronus*/ benefactor of the Roman Empire and building temples and supporting the state cults (traditional and imperial) in their communities, just as Augustus did in Rome.

But if these arguments have any validity, how are we to explain the dearth of epigraphical data explicitly linking formal patronage with benefaction? Eilers’ recent book on civic patronage argues that patronage in the Principate was in decline, the fact that we have such minimal evidence on benefaction demonstrates that patrons simply were not the benefactors we might have expected.

The critique does carry considerable weight and it has forced me to rethink my own perceptions on civic patronage. While it cannot be proven as directly as one might like, I do think there are several considerations that suggest that patrons and communities did not like to list specific benefactions.

First, the focus of Eilers study is on the formal patronage of Greek communities in the late middle and late republic. Such relationships virtually disappeared under Augustus. Whatever the nature of the benefactions conferred or anticipated, temple building and cult in the Augustan sense surely were not in the forefront (i.e., Roman patrons in the late republic did not build temples in their client communities; indeed the opposite may be closer to the truth). Second, comparative studies of patronage have demonstrated that the lack of specificity in respect to benefaction is a characteristic phenomenon of the

²³ *Power of Images*, 32-40.

institution.²⁴ Indeed, and what needs to be stressed here, the degree to which the responsibilities of the two parties have been generalized is typical of long term 'clientelistic' relationships.²⁵ In my opinion, however, we must distinguish between actual performance and expectation. That is (regarding the latter), communities might use honors in general and that of patronage specifically to generate a sense of obligation in the patron, as *ILS* 6106 puts it in respect to the cooption of Pomponius Bassus that as patron he would assist Ferentinum, the client community [...*vir auxilio sit futurus municipio nostro...in clientelam amplissimae domus suae municipium nostrum recipere...*]. In this case, the client community could not specify services because it hoped to secure many advantages over the longer-term. Alternatively, if the honor were used discretely, it could also serve as a reward or incentive for a series of benefactions; Seneca (e.g., *de beneficiis* 4.30.3; 4.15.3) and Pliny (*inter alia* also *ep* 5.11) offer many examples. Clearly, the status and the wealth of the patron, actual or potential, were significant factors in both scenarios but in the former, benefactions could not be specified. Patrons may have been ready to confer benefactions, but clearly could not meet all expectations.

Consider the case of Nonius Balbus [*CIL* X 1425 and *AE* 1976, 0144 – Appendix B]. We read on the latter inscription from Herculaneum that Balbus was patron of the town but nothing is said about any of his benefactions. On the former inscription, however, we learn that he had given Herculaneum its gate, walls and basilica, significant benefactions by any standard, but the text does not refer to him as *patronus*. There appears to be a tendency to avoid specific reference to benefactions in connection with inscriptions referring to *patroni*. We may guess at a reason: Because the title was prestigious, communities did not want to suggest that it could be had for a specific price, for example, for funding of a temple. Rather, they wished to stress the continuing nature of benefaction and obligation (as Pliny and Seneca indicate, see above). Allow me to mention here one other well known example of this phenomenon. Calpurnius Fabatus was the grandfather in law of Pliny; he had a successful career as an equestrian officer as *praefectus* and *tribunus* in a number of legions and cohorts, became *IIIvir iure dicundo* in

²⁴ S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends* (Cambridge 1984) 248ff.

²⁵ Eisenstadt and Roniger, 250ff. So much is also indicated in the *tabulae patronatus* (the formal text of cooption), which typically stress that the relationship should extend to future generations, J. Nicols, "Tabulae Patronatus: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, (Berlin 1980) 2.13.535-61

his *patria* of Comum. He was also *flamen* of Augustus and patron of his city (*CIL* V 5267 = *ILS* 2721). No benefactions are recorded on this inscription, but Pliny *ep.* 5.11 tells us he [Fabatus] built a portico to honor himself and his son and, on the occasion of the dedication, made an additional and significant monetary gift to the citizens of Comum. Characteristically (and important for our purposes), Pliny urges Fabatus to continue his generosity. In brief: the inscription which must have been set up fairly late in Fabatus' life, notes his status as patron and priest but does not mention any benefaction; Pliny's letter specifies the benefactions but does not note the patronal or priestly status. If this pattern has any general validity, then we may have to conclude that at least some of the many of the benefactors recorded on Latin inscriptions may also have been formal patrons; at the same time, we must also be aware that the reference to benefactions and achievements does not alone demonstrate the existence of formal patronage. Conclusions based then on lists of patrons will inevitably be more tenuous than one might wish. Even so, let us extend the argument a bit further. As noted above, Duncan-Jones found that a quarter of public benefactions involved religious structures of some kind, suggesting that patrons too may have devoted a similar proportion to structures of a religious character. Did Pliny confer a benefaction on his *patria* similar to the one he gave to Tifernum? Unfortunately, the fragmentary inscription summarizing Pliny's gifts to Comum does not mention any religious structures, but another inscription records that he was a *flamen* of Titus in Comum, so he may well have done something to support the cult.²⁶

What were the rewards? To judge by the two *alba* patrons were given a special place the head of the decurions and presumably enjoyed the same priority at official functions. Specifically, as significant numbers of civic **patrons** were also *quinquennales* and **priests** in the civic cults and had held leading positions in the **imperial equestrian** service, we may indeed identify a four-legged "chair" that allowed the leading men in the communities to play a highly visible role in the public, civic, and ritual life of their communities. If we cannot be certain about the exact nature of the benefactions provided, at the very least this combination served to generate and support civic *benevolentia* by cultivating an honorable rivalry.

In sum, I believe patrons provided their communities with a range of benefactions. Legal services, access to the court and the senate, mediation are all recorded activities. Moreover, even if there is no direct connection made, patrons also provided benefactions

²⁶ Another example of this phenomenon is A Gabinus Datus of Dougga, *CIL* VIII 26468 and *IL Afr* 569.

in the form of civic buildings *inter alia*, the construction of markets, porticos, roads, altars, temples and the support of other ritual events in the civic calendar. Of course, one does not have to be the formal patron of a community to provide such benefactions, but communities, the literary evidence (especially the letters of Pliny and Fronto, e.g., *ep.* 2.11) suggests that the latter used the honor as a way to encourage benefaction.

Fundamentally I am reluctant to speculate on such issues over the longer eras of Roman history, but we may conclude this investigation with the following observation. Patronage and civic religion in the Early Republic may have little to do with the practice of either in the time of Augustus. So it is with some caution that I mention the following. Peter Brown makes a compelling case for a connection between the local elites, civic patrons, bishops and the cult of “patron” saints in the practice of late Roman Christianity.²⁷ Indeed, one sees how easy it was for the local patrons, now as bishops to embrace elements of the Christian religion that allowed them to legitimize their authority and to profile their social position. Functionally, the cult of the saints and the cult of the emperors were not that far removed from one another. Indeed, the primary duty of the local patron and bishop was the proper veneration of the saint, just as patrons earlier venerated deified emperors through the control of ritual and sacred buildings.

Eugene, Oregon
31 December 2004

²⁷ Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago 1981), 32-36; more generally, chapters 2 and 3.

Appendix A: Index of Images.

Please go to: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~nic/civic_religion

- Image1: Augustus veiled
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image1.jpg
- Image2: *Ara pacis, flamen* in the procession of senators.
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image2.jpg
- Image3: *Ara pacis*, overview of procession and of “Italia”.
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image3.jpg
- Image4a: Augustus functioning as a priest.
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image4a.jpg
- Image4b: Aurelius sacrificing.
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image4b.jpg
- Image5: Album Canusinum
= http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/nic/civic_religion/image5.jpg
- Images6a-d: low resolution scans of sacrificial scenes from various sources. For high resolution images, see the plates in Fishwick, II 1, plates LXXXIa-b; LXXXIIa; LXXIXa-d; XCa-c; XCIIa-b; also the plates in Zanker, Nos. 86; 93; 95 - 97; 99- 102; 108-11.

Appendix B: the case of M. Nonius Balbus

M NONIVS M F BALBVS PROCOS
BASILICAM PORTAS MVRVM PECVNIA SVA

CIL 10, 1425 (Naples, national museum)

[QV]OD M(ARCVS) OFILLIVS CELER IIVIR ITER(VM) V(ERBA) F(ECIT) PERTINERE AT
MVNICIPI /
DIGNITATEM MERITIS M(ARCI) NONI BALBI RESPONDERE D(E) E(A) R(E) I(TA)
C(ENSVERT) /
[CV]M M(ARCVS) NONIVS BALBVS QVO HAC VIXERIT PARENTIS ANIMVM CVM PLVRIMA
LIBERALITAT(E) /
SINGVLIS VNIVERSISQVE PRAISTITERIT PLACERE DECVRIONIBVS STATVAM EQVESTREM
EI PONI QVAM /
(5)CELEBERRIMO LOCO EX PECVNIA PVBLICA INSCRIBIQVE M NONIO M F MEN BALBO
PR(AETORI) PROCO(N)S(VLI) **PATRONO** VNIVERSVS /
ORDO POPVLI HERCVLANIESSIS OB MERITA EIVS ITEM EO LOCO QVO CINERES EIVS
CONLECTI SVNT ARAM /
MARMOREAM FIERI ET CONSTITVI INSCRIBIQVE PVBLICE M(ARCO) NONIO M(ARCI) F(ILIO)
BALBO EXQVE EO LOCO PARENTALIBV(S) /
POMPAM DVCI LVDISQVE GVMNICIS QVI SOLITI ERANT FIERI DIEM EDICI VNVM IN
HONOREM EIVS ET CVM IN THEATRO /
LVDI FIENT SELLAM EIVS PONI C(ENSVERT)

AE 1976, 0144

[qu]od M(arcus) Ofillius Celer Iivir iter(um) v(erba) f(ecit), pertinere at municipi
dignitatem meritis M(arci) Noni Balbi respondere d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) : [cu]m
M(arcus) Nonius Balbus, quo hac vixerit parentis animum cum plurima liberalitat(e),
singulis universisque praestiterit, placere decurionibus statuam equestrem ei poni quam
celeberrimo loco ex pecunia publica inscribique : « M(arco) Nonio, M(arci) f(ilio),
Men(enia) Balbo, pr(aetori) proco(n)s(uli), **patrono**, universus ordo populi Herculaniensis
ob merita eius » ; item eo loco quo cineres eius conlecti sunt aram marmoream fieri et
constitui inscribique publice : « M(arco) Nonio M(arci) f(ilio) Balbo » exque eo loco
parentalibu(s) pompam duci ludisque gumniceis qui soliti erant fieri diem edici unum in
honorem eius et cum in theatro ludi fient sellam eius poni c(ensuerunt).