
EXTRAIT

COLLECTION LATOMUS

Fondee par Marcel RENARD

VOLUME 206

Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History

V

Edited by

Carl Deroux



LATOMUS
REVUE D'ETUDES LATINES
BRUXELLES

1989

Patrona duitatis :
Gender and Civic Patronage (1)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. *The Problem*

The role of women in the public life of the Roman Empire has been the subject of increasing discussion in recent years. Among the many useful studies, R. MacMullen has surveyed the range of activity of women in the public life of the cities of the Empire, while Riet Van Breman has argued that personal wealth and the willingness to use it in a traditionally masculine way allowed women to gain positions of eminence in the communities of the Greek speaking east ⁽²⁾. These studies, and others cited by the authors, make it abundantly clear that women attained the highest religious offices in city (e.g. : *sacerdos publica*) and in province (e.g. : *flaminica*), East and West. Regarding the more secular offices and honors, both provide numerous examples of women who had reached the highest civic positions (e.g. : archon and gymnasiarch) in the East ; neither they, nor indeed any other,

(1) The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Center for the Study of Women in Society at the University of Oregon, of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung and the comments of an anonymous reader.

(2) R. MacMullen, Women in Public in the Roman Empire, *Historia*, 19 (1980) 208-218 and Women's Power in the Principate, *Kilo*, forthcoming, and Riet Van Breman, Women and Wealth, in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, edd. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, London, 1983, 223-243. Both have useful summaries of the state of the problem and of the literature. Other literature : Engesser = F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in 'when und den Westprovinzen des rOmischen Reiches bis Diokletian*, Diss. Freiburg (unpublished), 1957 ; Harmand = L. Harnand, *Le patronat sur les collectivites publiques des origines au has empire*, Paris, 1957 ; Nicols (1.) = J. Nicols, Pliny and the Patronage of Communities, *Hermes* 108 (1980), 365 ; Nicols (2.) = Zur Verleihung Offentlicher Ehrungen in der rOmischen Welt, *Chiron* 9 (1979), 243 ; Nicols (3.) = *Tabulae Patronatus, in Aufstieg und Niedergang der reimischen Welt*, Berlin, 1980, II, 13 ; B. H. Warmington, The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa, *BSR* 22 (1954) 39 ff. ; and the very useful study of R. Duthoy, Quelques observations concernant la mention d'un patronat municipal dans les inscriptions, *L'Antiquith classique* 50 (1981), 295-305.

have presented evidence of female activity in the more "secular" offices (e.g. : *duumvir*) of any western community.

While I have not found any evidence that women did indeed reach the *duumvirate*, there is a body of data which places them very much in the middle of the "secular" and public life of the community, indeed, places them among the municipal *decuriones* : Women did become patrons of communities in the Latin West and, because municipal patrons were coopted and listed among the *decuriones* on the various registers (*alba*)⁽³⁾, *patronae*, through personal achievement and generosity, could also obtain a formal and official position in a municipality.

The arguments presented here concern two issues : The role of women in public life, in general, and, more specifically, the role of women as municipal *patronae*. Regarding the latter, the evidence suggests that women, having been coopted as patrons, became, as did their male counterparts, honorary members of the town council. Second, the willingness of communities to coopt *patronae* varied from region to region and reflects different local traditions. This suggests, third, that civic patronage, despite the consistent pattern of its forms and formulae, was a remarkably flexible institution, one which the various regions of the empire easily adapted to their particular traditions and needs. Indeed, the very persistence, frequency and varieties of the phenomenon demonstrate just how flexible this institution could be. Regarding the more general role of women, it is apparent that at least some western communities were ready to extend to women such high honors (patrons have the highest ranking on the *alba*) as had traditionally been reserved for men. Moreover, the temporal pattern associated with the *patronae* appears to be part of a more general willingness to provide public honors for women in the 3rd century.

1.2. *The Background*

Few institutions are so widely attested throughout the Latin West as is the patronage of communities. Indeed, over 1200 individuals are known from the epigraphical record and can be dated to the period between 50 B.C. and A.D. 327. Among this number, as many as twenty-one cases have been noted in which the patron is actually a *patrona*. Patronage is, for purposes of analysis, generally divided into four categories. There is the patronage exercised by an individual of higher status over one of lower status, that

(3) *CIL* ix, 338 and *CIL* viii, 2403.

exercised by the advocate over the party (an individual or a collective) whom he represents, that of the liberator over his/her freedmen/-women, that of a prominent Roman over a collective entity (province, municipality, college) ⁽⁴⁾. As to the role of women in this scheme, there is a considerable body of evidence indicating that women did indeed become patrons of individuals (the great ladies of the imperial courts offer numerous examples) ⁽⁵⁾. There is also abundant epigraphical evidence testifying to the relations between freedmen/-women and their *patronae*. On the other hand, Roman tradition did not allow women to serve as advocates, hence, this form of patronage was not open to them. This paper is concerned with the fourth form of patronage, namely that involving women of rank, *patronae*, and their municipal clients ⁽⁶⁾.

Though patronage was essentially a private contract between two parties, Roman law had established a number of regulations governing its municipal form. Beginning with Julius Caesar, if not earlier, there is a distinct legal tradition governing the cooptation of a municipal *patronus/a* ⁽⁷⁾. Municipal charters and imperial decrees specified the legal procedures governing the cooptation and defined how those procedures varied according to the status of the individual. To coopt an individual (whether male or female) as patron of a community required a formal resolution of the local senate (*decretum decurionum*) ⁽⁸⁾.

2. THE DATA

2.1. *Patronae certae*

Although twenty-one women have been identified as *patronae municipii* by one scholar or another, there are only thirteen certain cases ⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, Leipzig, 1912 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1, 68 = *The Roman Nobility*, tr. by R. Seager, NY, 1969, at note 51.

⁽⁵⁾ See J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women*, New York, 1963.

⁽⁶⁾ Women also became patrons of *collegia*, that is of institutions which adopted the forms of municipalities. Though this phenomenon does have a bearing on the theme, see below, it is not a major issue here.

⁽⁷⁾ See Nicols (2).

⁽⁸⁾ On the decrees, see Nicols (3). These restrictions of course affected citizen communities, but peregrine communities, insofar as they were ready to adopt Roman conventions, might well have followed similar procedures.

⁽⁹⁾ Table A (in the Appendix) provides a summary of the evidence on the names and rank of the women and notes temporal and geographic detail associated with the position. For an example of an *incerta/falsa*, cf. *AE* 1972, 142, with *AE* 1979, 402.

The methodological problem associated with the determination of the *patronae certae* involves the identification of some official formula by which the *patrocinium* is associated with a community. There are several varieties of formulae, but it is clear from the provisions of the *lex Ursonensis* (cc. 97 and 130) and the *lex Malacitana* (c. 61) that the cooptation proceeds from an action of the *decuriones* ⁽¹⁰⁾. Hence, all inscriptions which were authorized by a *decretum decurionum* and which also refer to patronage may properly be said to involve patrons of communities (e.g., No. 11). In the cases cited here, however, the official agency, the *ordo*, was acting not necessarily to confer *patrocinium*, but rather to authorize the text of the surviving inscription.

When the text refers to an individual as the patron of the community (e.g. *patrona municipii*, No. 1) and the *ordo* has authorized the inscription, then there can be no doubt that we have an official *patrona* (for example, Nos. 6, 10, 11, and 13). In other cases, we may assume that the woman is indeed a patron of the community when two conditions have been met : first, when there is a grammatical connection (usually the dedicatory dative) linking the woman to the title and, second, when the *decuriones* have officially authorized the text. An example of this test may be seen in No. 2 : *Galloniae et Acciae ... et Acciae patronis perpetuis ddp.p.*

2.2. The Temporal and Geographical Distribution

The evidence indicates that the phenomenon was limited, temporally, to the third century, A.D., and, geographically, to North Africa and to Central Italy. That is, these are the only regions in which *patrocinium publicum* is attested to have been extended to women. This is not to suggest that women could not become municipal *patronae* in other parts of the empire; we are rather dealing with an institution that is well attested in certain places at one particular time, and, if known at all, was certainly rarer in other places and at other times. Though not much can be done about the small number of surviving texts, one can minimize the statistical difficulties by considering the evidence in its own context.

Consider the temporal distribution. All instances of women as civic *patronae* are datable to the 3rd Century (more exactly, from ca. 190 to 310, hereafter referred to as the "third" century). Abeiena Balbina and Seia Potitia

(10) Nicols (2), 245 ff.

have been placed in the 190's (¹¹), while Acadia Roscia has been dated as late as the very early fourth century (¹²). The rest are securely dated to the period between 200-299. How representative are these data ?

Duncan-Jones notes that the bulk of dated African inscriptions is concentrated in the period from Trajan to the Gordians and overlaps much of the period under discussion (¹³). Assuming that these inscriptions are evenly divided chronologically, it is significant that we have no case before the 190's. Another way of arranging the data leads to a similar conclusion : There are more patrons who date to the first and second centuries combined than who date to the third century : 1st century = 120 patrons, 2nd century 290, and third century = 320 (¹⁴). Hence, given this distribution, one would legitimately expect to find some instances datable to the period before 190, if, indeed, the phenomenon were at all as common earlier as it became later.

As to the geographical distribution of the phenomenon, the instances we do have indicate that women were honored as *patronae* in only two areas of the Roman Empire. Ten of the thirteen *patronae* are connected to African communities located along a five hundred kilometer line drawn between Utica in the northeast and Lambaesis in the southwest, incorporating the province of *Africa proconsularis* and the eastern regions of Numidia. The remaining three *patronae* were so honored by the Italian communities of Pitinum Pisarense, Tarquinia, and Peltuinum, respectively. All four of the communities are located in adjacent *regiones* of Central Italy, the first in Umbria just south of Rimini (*regio vi*), the second in Etruria (*regio vii*) and the third one northwest of Corfinium (*regio iv*).

When one considers that only three inscriptions out of almost fifty-five thousand in Italy relate to municipal *patronae* and that only three of some three hundred eighty patrons of Italian communities are women, one might well conclude that the phenomenon was indeed rare and perhaps on an order close to that in other parts of the West. When, however, we consider municipal patronage as it was practiced in these *regiones* of Central Italy and in the provinces of *Africa proconsularis* and Numidia the ratios are more

(11) Abeiena and her husband, Petinius Afer, can be dated to the 190's. The inscription bearing their names has an erasure of an imperial name, probably Commodus. On Seia, see Barbieri, No. 839 and Eck, *RE*, Supplbd. xiv, Sp. 657, Seius, 24.

(12) *MR*' A 1018 ; Harmand, 282 ; Eck, *RE*, Supplbd. xiv, Sp. 588, Roscius 25a and.

(13) *The Roman Economy*. Cambridge, 1976, 361.

(14) These figures are based on independent studies of the epigraphical record by Engesser, Harmand and myself. Though there is variation in the date assigned to individual texts, there is general agreement on the totals.

suggestive. The ratio of dated 3rd century *patronae* to *patroni* in the relevant Italian regions is : 1:22, 1:16 and 1:7 ; in Africa it is 1:8 and 1:11. That is, when one considers the phenomenon in the context of the areas in which it is found, the incidence, especially for 3rd century Africa, is striking. The incidence for 3rd century central Italy is not *as* high, but may lie somewhere between that of Africa and of the rest of the western provinces. This suggests that the cooptation of women was a reasonably frequent event in at least some parts of the 3rd century Roman Empire.

2.3. *On the Form and Language of the Inscriptions*

There is nothing in the physical form of the inscriptions or in the language of any of the texts to suggest that the cooptation of women was in any way an unusual event. In respect to form, the material used is generally marble and occasionally bronze (the *tabula patronatus* for No. 10, Nummia Varia). Half of the texts are stone *tabulae* and half are statue bases. The lettering is of a consistently high quality. In terms of the language, the standard formulae (usually in the dedicatory dative) are employed to describe both women and men, the Latin is excellent and, though the origins of the parties are not always known, the names of the individuals honored are all Latin or Italian.

The very normality of these inscriptions and texts suggest that the cooptation of municipal *patronae* at least in those areas where it is attested, followed the standard procedures established for men.

Conclusions. — In sum, though these arguments proceed, at least in part, *ex silentio*, there is some indication that the pattern of the surviving data corresponds to the actual historical pattern, that women became *patronae* of communities in the 3rd century and, geographically speaking, in Italy and especially in North Africa. This will be the assumption of the greater part of the following discussion. These observations are not meant to suggest that municipal *patronae* might not have been coopted at other times and in other places, only that the incidence of such activity was very low.

3. TEMPORAL CONSIDERATIONS

The emergence of *patronae municipii* in the epigraphical record coincides closely with the beginning of the Severan dynasty. That is, the earliest of the *patronae*, Abeiena and Seia, are datable to the period (the 190's A.D.) when Septimius Severus became emperor (193). Though it is not easy to determine what is "cause" and what is "effect," this coincidence appears to be more than

accidental. That is, it is not clear whether the prominence of women in this and the immediately succeeding period was wholly or in large part due to the changes instigated by the new dynasty or whether the existing trends were merely given a new impetus by the personalities and events of the period. We are on firmer ground with the observation that the evidence consistently indicates that, beginning in the 190's, women began to enjoy a prominence in the public life of the communities of the west that had not been theirs before. This pattern can be observed at both the imperial and at the municipal levels.

3.1. *The Role of the Severan Court*

Though female members of earlier dynasties had achieved public prominence (Agrippina, Plotina, Faustina, to name but a few), the women of the Severan family participated in public events and received a public recognition that is quite unparalleled for all previous Augustae⁽¹⁵⁾. This prominence can be observed in the numismatic, epigraphical and literary evidence. Coins struck in the honor of Septimius Severus' wife, Julia Domna, notes Williams, "exceed in number and variety those bearing the name of any other empress"⁽¹⁶⁾. On inscriptions, Domna appears as the first empress accorded an *acclamatio* by the *fratres Arvalium* (*CIL* VI, 2086, 1. 16) and as the first to receive dedications *pro salute* in her name alone (*CIL* II, 2529 ; VI, 786) ; indeed, "the name of no other empress appears so frequently in the prayers and dedications for emperors and their heirs"⁽¹⁷⁾. Her titles include, for example, the widely attested variations on *mater aug net castrorum et senatus et patriae* (18).

The literary evidence confirms this impression. For example, during Caracalla's eastern campaign, Dio reports that Domna was allowed to receive petitions and to answer most of the official correspondence addressed to the emperor. Dispatches to the senate were also sent in her name and in that of

(15) On this recognition both generally and specifically, M. G. Williams, *Studies in the Lives of Roman Empresses : Julia Domna*, *AJA* 6 (1902), 259-305, and Baldson, *op. cit.*, 151 ff.

(16) Williams, 304.

(17) *Id.* 297.

(18) E.g. *CIL* VI, 1035. Williams gives other forms, pp. 272, 277, 286. Note, too, A. Birley, *Septimius Severus : The African Emperor*, New York, 1972, 182-183. For a summary of the titles, see *PM Mater castrorum* was first applied to Faustina, the wife of Aurelius, Williams, 262 ; this suggests that some honors for women do, indeed, pre-date (though not by much) the rise of the Severans,

the army (Dio 78, 18.2, 23.2 ; 79, 24, 1-2). Elagabalus, on the other hand, allowed his grandmother into the senate, something which (we are told) had never before occurred. There she helped to draft *sententiae* and gave her opinion ⁽¹⁹⁾. The author(s) of the *SHA* stress that until the reign of Elagabalus, women were not even allowed to enter the senate but then the situation changed : *nec ante eum senatum mulier ingressa est ita, ut ad scribendum rogaretur et sententiam diceret* (his grandmother) ⁽²⁰⁾. Herodian, too, frequently notes the prominence and power of Julia Mamaea during the reign of Severus Alexander (VI, 1.1 and 9.8).

3.2. *The Status of Elite Women during the Severan Period*

Though the women of the imperial family may have achieved special prominence, to what extent is it true that this prominence might have been transferred to women of the senatorial elite ? Here too the evidence suggests that women did indeed receive similar public recognition. The *SHA* reports that Elagabalus provided new prominence for the *conuentus mulierum*, indeed, he established a *senaculum* for his *senatus mulierum* on the Quirinal Hill. This "senate," though long in existence, had primarily met *si unquam aliqua matrona consularis coniugii ornamentis esset donata, quad ueteres imperatores ad finibus detulerunt et its maxime quae nobilitatos maritos non habuerant, ne innobilitatae remanerent*. It now began to pass *senatus consulta ridicula* (Elag. 4.3-4). Johannes Straub has shown that there is no reason to doubt the essence of the story, indeed the details can generally be verified in the literary, epigraphical and legal sources (21).

One of the specific functions of this senate was, apparently, to deal with the status of women of senatorial and consular families when they married individuals of lower rank. It is significant therefore that it is the Severan jurist, Ulpian, who authored the legal definitions of *clarissima femina* and *offemina consularis* ⁽²²⁾. That is, the legal status of female members of the elite was

(19) *SHA*, *Elag.* 12.3, note Mommsen's understated horror, *Rom. Staatsr.*, III, 874. R. J. A. Talbert, who is generally suspicious of such stories, denies that these women were full members of the senate, but concedes that they were probably present on solemn occasions, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton, 1984, 161.

(20) *SHA*, *Elag.* 12.3 ; cf. Dio 57, 12.18 and Tac., *Ann.* 13.5 and 14.11 ; also Mommsen, *Rom. Staatsr.*, III, 874.

(21) *Senaculum, id est mulierum*, *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*, 1964/5, edd. J. Straub and A. Alfaldi, Bonn, 1966, 221-241. See also Mommsen, III, 914. More skeptical is Talbert, 162.

(22) *Di.* 1, 9.8 and 1, 9.1.1.

very much an issue in Severan Rome (²³). It is significant that the first known Latin use of the title *consularis femina* was employed by a *patrona municipi*, Aelia Celsinilla (here no. 4). It is also interesting to note that the first appearance of the title in Greek dates to the reign of Commodus (*IGRR IV*, 911) suggesting once again that the trend toward greater prominence for women in public life began in the immediately preceding period, but was given definition under the Severans.

3.3. Role of Women at the Municipal Level — In Italy

At the municipal level, similar patterns may be identified. First, the appearance of *patronae* coincides with the apogee of the institution of *curator rei publicae* and its variations and, second, it coincides with the appearance of women as *patronae* of the many and various *collegia* (24).

Regarding the *curatores*, Eck notes that 130 of 206 cases may be dated to the years between the rise of Severus and the end of the 3rd century (²⁵), that is, two-thirds of the datable Italian *curatores* were active at a time when municipalities coopted women. Moreover, *curatores* were especially frequent in the very *regiones* in which *patronae* are found : regions VI, VII and IV place second, third and fourth in frequency of *curatores* (²⁶). As the function of the *curator* was closely related to the function of the *patronus* it is not surprising that there are many cases in which one individual held both titles (²⁷). These data suggest that the increasing use of the office of *curator* may have led to a significant change in the way municipal patronage was perceived. That is, as men were always *curatores* and as *curatores* assumed at least some of the traditional functions of patrons and as they are described in a language similar to that employed for patrons (²⁸), the notion of patronage may well have begun to change and to allow for the inclusion of women. Once again, the changes appear to have begun before the Severan dynasty, but to have been accelerated after 190.

(23) On this problem, see A. Chastagnol, *Les femmes dans l'ordre senatorial : titulature et rang social à Rome*, *Rev. hist.* 262 (1979) 3-28, and Talbert, *op. cit.*, 494.

(24) On the *curae*, W. Eck, *Die staatliche Organisation Italiens*, Munich, 1979 - *Vestigia* 28 ; on the *collegia*, J.-P. Waltzing, *Études historiques sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, IV, 408 ff., Louvain, 1895, ff.

(25) Eck, 193.

(26) Eck, 201. These three regions provide about one-third of the total.

(27) Engesser, 246. One of them involves the husband of our *patrona*, Domitia Melpis, No. 6 here.

(28) Warrington, 46 and 53.

As to other forms of patronage, it is clear that the patronage of women over collectives in Italy was not restricted to municipalities; rather, this practice of *paurocinium collegiorum*, that is in the patronage of the many and diverse trade and religious associations of the imperial period, reflects the same tendency already observed in the discussion of civic patronage. Waltzing provides a list of 249 *patroni* of *collegia* in Italy⁽²⁹⁾. Of these, 21 cases concern communities and individuals from peninsular Italy, 18 come from the east, 20 from the West-European areas of Germania, Gallia and Hispania, and but one from Africa. Consistent with the pattern of civic patronage, there are eleven cases of women as *patronae collegiorum* and all but one come from Italy⁽³⁰⁾. The geographical distribution of the cases is approximately that as noted for municipal patronage, namely, the communities extend from Comum to Beneventum. Moreover, in the six cases (01 eleven) which can be directly or indirectly dated⁽³¹⁾, the date is consistently in the first half of the 3rd century.

3.4. *The Role of Women at the Municipal Level — Provinces*

Indications which might help to explain the incidence of *patronae* in Africa and the lack thereof in other provinces are, unfortunately, not readily apparent. As noted above, *patronae* of communities are more common in *Africa proconsularis* than in any other part of the empire. On the other hand, the patronage of *collegia* is a rarity⁽³²⁾. *Curatores*, on the other hand, are first attested in Africa in 196, a date which corresponds nicely to the appearance of *patronae*⁽³³⁾.

Is it possible that the high incidence of municipal *patronae* reflects instead a native tradition? It is conceivable that the high ratio of women to the total number of civic patrons reflects such a tradition, but it is not at all clear why the indigenous pattern would suddenly emerge after three centuries of Roman

(29) Waltzing, IV, 388 ff G. Clementi, [I patronato nei collegia dell'impero romano, *SCO* 21 (1972), 142-229, provides an up-to-date list of *patronae/patroni* and of *patres/matres* of *collegia*. As some *collegia* have both *patres* and *patroni* it is evident that the two titles are not equivalent, p. 177, n. 103, note also *AE* 1977, 265. Clementi can only add one new and anonymous *patrona*, *CIL* v, 4432, from Brixia. Because the text is very uncertain, I have not included it here.

(30) From Italy, nos. 11, 77, 80, 88, 96, 104, 105, 123, 210, 239; the exception is Valeria Severa, no. 225, from Spain.

(31) Waltzing, Nos. 80, 88, 105, 123, 210 and 239.

(32) Waltzing notes only one case.

(33) G. P. Burton, *The curator rei publicae: Toward a Re-appraisal*, *Chiron* 9 (1979) 473. He also notes that there are few cases of curatorships before A.D. 260.

domination. Given the frequency of female patronage in the third century, when one of eight patrons was a woman, one might reasonably expect to find at least one example of a *patrona* dating to an earlier period. But this is not the case. R. G. Collingwood has suggested a model for such cultural survival. Despite three centuries of Roman rule in Britain, artistic patterns and preferences remain essentially 'Celtic and become prominent after the withdrawal of the Roman army (³⁴). More recent scholarship in other areas has stressed the continuity of native tradition in an otherwise Romanized context (³⁵). It is possible that the tendency was always present, but had not yet been fully re-worked in the Roman tradition, or that there was till then no Roman model for providing women with such honors.

Against this interpretation there is the fact that there is **no sign of indigenous survivals** in the African texts. All parties bear good Italian names, the Latin is of a consistently high quality, and the form of the inscription reflects standard Roman practice. Indeed, all the communities appear to be well-organized on the Roman municipal model and individuals, even if of African origin, appear to be thoroughly Romanized. There is, then, no evidence to suggest that the cooptation of women reflects native tradition or any anti-Roman activity (36).

Warmington notes several changes in the epigraphical record regarding the pattern of public patronage in the third century (³¹). First, the earlier concern for the benefits of (legal) protection was replaced by the more suggestive notion of *amor* (e.g. : *ob eximium amorem in patriam*, *CIL* viii, 25808c). Clearly *amor* is a quality women might demonstrate as easily as men. Second, the increasing use of the adjective *perpetuus* to describe patrons reflects concern that benefaction of a particular family be continuous. Third, it was during this period that the number of influential and wealthy Africans who could serve the interests of client communities reached its highest point. All three of these factors are compatible with the cooptation of women.

We do know that a public role for women was more widely available to women in the eastern and Greek speaking part of the Roman Empire. Van Breman observes that women "appear to have rendered the same social,

(34) *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, Second Edition, with J. N. L. Myres, Oxford, 1939, 247

(35) E.g. : 1. Nicols, *Indigenous Culture and the Process of Romanization in Iberian Galicia*, *AJPh*, forthcoming.

(36) Regarding such attitudes, see M. Benabou, *La resistance africaine a la romanisation*, Paris, 1976, especially, 412

(37) Pp. 47, 48, and 51.

political and financial services to their cities as their male fellow citizens" and "many public offices and liturgies performed by men were also performed by women" (38). She concludes that female participation in public life and the acquisition of public office was a consequence of wealth and became a constant element of civic life in the first, second and third centuries, A.D. (39). It is beyond the scope of this paper to review all this material. Suffice it to say that it is possible that these Hellenistic influences (and they appear to be more common in the asiatic parts of the Hellenistic world) may particularly have affected the cities of North Africa and that the contact between the African communities and their Phoenician mother-land may well have provided the inspiration for such honors (40). If this is indeed a relevant factor then the very origins of Severus and of Julia Domna and of their successors may well have encouraged them to propagate in Italy and the West those forms they knew from Africa and from the East.

4. CONSIDERATIONS OF RANK AND STATUS

Generally speaking, the *patrona* and her family belong to the most prominent of the Italian and provincial elite. Vibia Aurelia Sabina (no. 13, Table C), of course, was the daughter and sister of emperors. The families of the *patronae* of *Africa proconsularis* (nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11) are all well known in the epigraphical literature and all have consular connections (41). The status of the two *patronae* from Numidia is lower, while the three Italian cases range from the well-attested to the obscure, from the imperial to the municipal elite.

4.1. *The Status of the Patrona*

The texts usually provide exact information about the status of the individuals involved : We have explicit statements that eleven of the thirteen *patronae* are of senatorial rank, *clarissima feminae* (42). For example, No. 8 (in the dedicatory dative), reads *GALLONIAE OCTAME MARCELLAE*

(38) *Op. cit.*, 224-225.

(39) It can be traced back to the second century, B.C., van Breman, 229, 233. MacMullen, working with different evidence, reaches a similar conclusion. *Women's Power, op. cit.*

(40) On this point, see below, the discussion of benefaction.

(41) The most recent summary of their status is ; M. Corbier, *Les familles clarissimes d'Afrique proconsulaire, Epigraphia e ordine senatorio = Tituli 5*, Rome, 1982, p. 689-738.

(42) On the senatorial titles, see A. Chastagnol, *Les femmes*, 3-28.

Cf. and her two daughters are designated as *C. P.*, that is, *clarissimae puellae*. Julia Merninia, No. 9, is described as *CIARISsimae et nobilisSimae fEMINAE*. In one case (No. 4), the status may be inferred from the designation *CONSULAR' FEMINAE*. The equestrian status of the remaining three *patronae* must be deduced from the status of the spouse (⁴³) or, alternatively, from the failure to specify rank at all. The status of Fabia Jovina, No. 7, is also unstated, but that of her husband, L. Lucceius Hadrianus is revealed by the equestrian title *V.P. Rationalis*. In general, then, the status of the *patronae* of senatorial status is made explicit, while that of the *patronae* of equestrian status may be deduced from other indicators (44).

Taken as a group, one might conclude that women who become *patronae* are most likely to be of senatorial status as, indeed, 11 of the 13 are. When, however, the material is divided by area, Africa and Italy, one finds significant differences. Nine of the ten *patronae* of communities in North Africa (and all of them from *proconsularis*) are of senatorial status as are two of the three of the *patronae* of Italy. Admittedly, the number of cases is small, but some perspective may be gained by comparing these data on rank to that for males. For third century Italy, Engesser counts 174 patrons, 81 of them of senatorial status and 93 of them belonging to the equestrian order or to the municipal aristocracy (⁴⁵). In third century Africa, Engesser and Warmington, though arriving at somewhat different totals, nevertheless, also find a one-to-one ratio when patrons of senatorial rank are compared to those of equestrian rank. In Africa then it was much more important that the prospective patron, if a woman, have senatorial (indeed "consular") rank; for men, senatorial or equestrian rank was equally valued. This is confirmed by the fact that the consular status of the male relatives of the *patrona* is mentioned prominently in most of the inscriptions even when the latter are NOT noted as patrons. Conversely, when a male is the subject of the honor, one rarely finds a reference to his female relatives by name. At best, they are incorporated under such general titles as *domus* or *liberos posterosque* (⁴⁶). The implication is that African communities, in so far as they coopted women, specifically preferred those of senatorial status and those with consular relatives. But, as not all women with consular connections became *patronae*, it follows that

(43) This issue will be discussed below.

(44) Chastagnol, id., notes that the extension of analogous titles to the wives of equestrian officials did not occur.

(45) Some of these dates are approximate. Harmand and I have independently come to similar conclusions on the dates of the patrons, but the details cannot be given here.

(46) *ILS* 6094-6110 illustrate the *formulae*, cf. Nicols (3).

those who did had some special claim to the title. Unfortunately, the inscriptions in question give no indication what that special claim may have been.

4.2. *The Patronae and their Relatives* — see Table C

In twelve of the thirteen inscriptions under discussion, at least one relative of the *patrona* is mentioned. If we eliminate the duplication of material involving the three *patronae* of the family of L. Accius, then there are eleven cases, nine of which mention relatives. These figures suggest that, when communities bestowed public honors on women (and *patrocinium* is one such honor), they felt it appropriate to mention male relatives of significant status. The data on the status of the relatives are summarized on Table D which should be considered in conjunction with Table C.

It is immediately apparent in these tables that the principal relationship associated with female *patrocinium* is that of marriage ; indeed, almost half of the relatives mentioned (seven of sixteen) are husbands. Fathers, sons, mothers and brothers are also recorded. It is noteworthy that in only four of these cases are the male relatives also known to be a patron of the community (this is indicated on Table D by the "p" following the number).

In terms of status, the relatives of the *patronae* are usually noted to have held the highest office(s) commensurate with their rank. Hence, virtually all the senators are said to be consulars⁽⁴⁷⁾. So too are the equestrians stated to have held high honors. No. 1.1 was a *quinquennialis* in the community.

There are, however, numerous variations in the manner in which these male relatives are mentioned in the texts. The dedication to Abeiena is to her alone ; it notes her titles, that the honor was conferred in the year in which her husband was *quinquennialis* and refers to the *merita* of both (*eorum*) in general terms. In the case of nos. 2, 3 and 8, we have a dedication to a nuclear family, to L. Accius Julianus, his wife Gallonia and their two daughters, all of whom are referred to *as patroni perpetui*. The dedication to Aelia, on the other hand, is to her alone, but her role as wife and mother of consulars, appears prominently. Her son was also curator of the client community. Aradia, too, is honored alone, though her father's name, without titles, is given in full. Domitia is honored alone and her husband's name and rank are given in the genitive. Fabia is honored equally with her husband in

(47) The one exception, Aradius, may also be, but, because of the incompleteness of the text, certainty is impossible. For the details, Corbier, 689.

the dative plural as *patronis*, Julia Memmia is honored alone but the filiation refers to her father who was also a patron. Nummia is honored alone and her *parentes* are referred to without specifics. Modesta is honored alone and no relatives are mentioned (⁴⁸). Seia is honored alone, but reference is made to her son. Though no titles are given beyond the fact that he is a *clarissimus uir*, they probably belong to the prominent family of the Roscii (⁴⁹). Finally, Vibia is honored alone, but her father and brother, both deified emperors, also appear prominently. As Vibia's husband came from this area, it is noteworthy that he is not mentioned. Perhaps he was honored in a parallel inscription (5°).

To appreciate these data fully one must realize that similar texts recording public honors for men do not generally include references to spouses or to other female relatives. Even the *tabulae patronatus*, which regularly refer to the *liberi posterique* of the new patron, do not mention females by name (51).

4.3. *Patronae and decuriones*

The *album Canusinum* (CIL IX, 338 = ILS 6121), the official register of *decuriones* of the *ordo* of Canusium, begins with the names of the patrons of the town. As it is generally recognized, the number of *decuriones* was, typically, one hundred in towns of any substantial size (⁵²). As the *Album Canusinum* includes about 160 members of the *ordo*, it seems likely that the Romans made a distinction between actual and potential members. The former included all those of appropriate residence, age and status and are divided by rank (*quinquennialicii*, *Ifuiralicii*, etc.) over the second, third and part of the fourth columns of the document. Patrons, who appear in the first column, and the under-aged *praetextati* named at the bottom of the fourth, should be considered honorary members, possessing all the formal advantages and immunities, and, moreover, should the impediment (residence, age, etc.) be removed, having the right to become full, voting members of the *ordo* (53).

(48) Admittedly, we do not have the full context of the original dedication ; there may have been adjacent texts which referred to the honors and benefactions of male relatives.

(49) Corbier, 733.

(50) This case illustrates the dangers of interpreting without full knowledge of the context.

(51) On the form of the *tabulae*, see Nicols (3).

(52) See Duncan-Jones, 281 and Nicols, On the Standard Size of the *ordo decurionum*, ZRG, 105 (1988), 712-9.

(53) There is overlap in that some of the equestrian patrons are listed a second time as *quinquennialicii*. The very fact that they are listed twice suggest that the patrons, though decurions, were somehow different from the regular members of the *ordo*.

Could women become "honorary" members of the *ordo*? Were indeed patrons of the community noted on the *album*? Two considerations suggest a "no" to both questions. First, women are not named on the *album* of Canusium or of Tingad and, second, it is improbable that the *album* included all descendants of all the patrons ever coopted by Canusium and Tingad even though the *tabulae patronatus* expressly include their *liberi poster*, among the future patrons of the town⁽⁵⁴⁾. The first consideration is inconclusive. In reference to the second, it may well be that, when the *album* periodically revised, new patrons were added and the inactive descendants of deceased patrons were dropped. But, regardless of how the Macpatrons were treated, those recently coopted surely must have been included. On the other hand, there is an analogous situation involving *collegia*. Val Severina is noted as the *patrona* of a collegium and is listed among the female patrons⁽⁵⁵⁾. Hence, it is entirely possible, even probable, that an important *patrona*, like Nummia Varia or Vibia Aurelia Sabina, would appear on the *album* among the other patrons of the town. There is, moreover, sufficient precedent for otherwise ineligible individuals to achieve *sini* status among the decurions. We know, for example, that the *ornamenta* of a *decurio* were regularly extended to individuals who were not otherwise eligible for membership in the *ordo*. This group included, among other things, centurions and actors⁽⁵⁶⁾. Indeed, it is reasonable to believe that all "honorary" members of the *ordo* had received the appropriate *ornamenta*. That these decorations are not specifically mentioned in epigraphical texts involving *patronae* is probably due to the fact that those coopted as patrons are already members of *ordines* higher than the decurial and, hence, could have received no additional immunities. *Patroni* of equestrian or senatorial status probably also received the *ornamenta*, but they, too, do not record additional honors.

5. BENEFACTION

Patronage is associated with benefaction, direct or indirect, tangible or intangible, prospective or retrospective. Tangible benefactions include the *sportulae* and construction of public buildings; service as a *patronus causae* or as a mediator, etc. constitute the more intangible. Unfortunately, then

(54) Nicols (3).

(55) Waltzing, No. 255.

(56) Nicols, *Ordo Decurionum*, 717

little information in the epigraphical texts that explains, in terms of benefaction (actual or potential), why a particular woman became the *patrona* of a municipality. The evidence is summarized on Table E (in Appendix).

5.1. *Patronae as Benefactors*

It is immediately apparent that the texts make no reference at all to the reason for the honors in seven of the eleven cases (note that Nos. 2-3-8 are considered as one). And, indeed, even in those cases when some notion of benefaction appears, the language is generally unspecific and even formulaic. There is at least one substantial reason for this phenomenon : In ten of the eleven cases, the text is not concerned to record the reasons for the cooptation of the *patrons*. The texts are rather of the general and honorific variety and the references to patronage, though prominent, constitute only one aspect of the whole (57).

It is particularly significant that the only two cases in which we can identify a specific benefaction, the indication is to the construction of *thermae*. No. 9 states so much explicitly ; the inscription No. 6 was found in the *thermae* (58). The evidence is clearly too limited to suggest that *patronae* were coopted because of their willingness to construct baths, but it is at least suggestive that the construction of public buildings was an appropriate focus for feminine liberality.

Ob merita, with variations, is the most common formula (Nos. 1 and 11). *Benevolentia* and *liberalitas* (Nos. 10 and 12, respectively) stress essentially the same theme, though the former might be interpreted in a more prospective, the latter in a more retrospective sense (59). In those instances in which the honor is prospective, the lack of specificity noted above is comprehensible, but that it applies also to retrospective situations requires some explanation. First, the most common source of benefaction arose out of administrative activity (60), a service women could not normally provide. What remains then is either intervention with males in such positions or benefactions which ultimately involve capital expenditures.

(57) Because the texts recording patronage are not usually specific about the benefactions of patrons, there is some reason to believe that such detail may have been, especially for senators, considered "Thad taste." This issue is discussed more fully below.

(58) It is most unfortunate that the standard epigraphical publications are so inconsistent about providing information on the context in which a text was found.

(59) On the formulae, see Harmand, 357, who unfortunately lists the variations without providing any analysis of their frequency and distribution.

(60) On this point, see Harmand, 187 and 290 ff.

5.2. *Women as Benefactors*

In the public and imperial domain, it is frequently the case that patron relationships between communities and individual Romans of wealth and status were initiated at a time when the latter held some official position (governor, procurator, etc.) with direct administrative responsibility for a community⁽⁶¹⁾. The benefactions of such patrons were not always or even regularly reckoned in cash distributions or other material "goods" but belonged rather to the category including "preferential," i.e., mediation with the emperor or, at the very least, an unspoken commitment not to exploit the client state. As women did not enjoy the power and prestige associated with direct administration, they clearly did not enjoy the means to confer the usual administrative benefactions. Essentially, their role as benefactors was restricted to direct material transfers and to mediation. As noted above, however, there is not a single case in which any direct connection is made between a specific benefaction and patronage. Moreover, though it is common or even required for a person officially honored by a community to make some promise to the community (the *summae honorariae* e.g. : *honorem flaminicatus colossos duos quos ex HS XXX mil. n. promisit*, *IL* fr. 561), we have no case of *ob honorem patronatus promisit...* The evidence suggests that it was inappropriate to make this kind of connection between patronage and benefaction (62).

There is considerable evidence regarding architectural patronage in the Latin West. The problem, however, is that this evidence is restricted largely to North Africa and to Italy, to precisely those areas which have the most texts and the most cases of feminine patronage⁽⁶³⁾. For purposes of this discussion, it is noteworthy that though there are examples of benefactions in the form of architecture and though women do receive certain public honors for such gifts (e.g., *IL* fr. 561), there is but one case in which this form of benefaction is even indirectly connected to a woman as patron in North Africa : The inscription for Memmia Julia, recorded on a statue base notes that she constructed the *thermae*, but the text makes no direct links of patronage and the benefaction. This connection between Domitia and this

(61) See Harmand's tables for the details and Nicols (2).

(62) G. Alföldy makes the same point in a quite different kind of study, *Reimische Statuen in Venetia et Histria Epigraphische Quellen*, Heidelberg, 1984, 64. Also Warmington, 45

(63) On architectural patronage, see the two lists in Duncan-Jones and T. F. C. Blagg, *Architectural Patronage in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, The Roman Empire in the 3rd Century*, (edd.) A. King and M. Hening, Oxford, 1981, 167

thermae in which the text honoring her as patron was found is even more uncertain.

Other material benefactions (e.g., *sportulae*, etc.) were clearly regular events in the life of Italian and provincial municipalities. Duncan-Jones has provided two useful lists of benefactors and benefactions. These lists do include a number of women (⁶⁴), but not one of the cases cited involves a *patrona*.

Mediation between communities and a variety of officials and potential donors constitutes a source of benefaction open to women. Though we might expect that *patronae* of senatorial status and with consular relatives might have been coopted for successful liaison, there is no indication in the sources that this was in fact done (⁶⁵). If this were the case, and it is not at all improbable, we must also bear in mind that it was inappropriate to specify what exactly had been achieved.

In sum, material benefaction did not always or even frequently lead to *patrocinium*. Indeed, when the relationship was between communities and patrons of senatorial status there is some mutual reluctance to be specific about benefactions. This reluctance applies to *patroni* and well as *patronae*. It is, then, perfectly consistent with the general pattern that the *patronae* of Africa, all of whom have strong senatorial, even consular, ties, are not usually mentioned in conjunction with specific benefactions. Hence, in so far as *clarissimi* or *clarissimae* became municipal patrons, their benefactions were not likely to be listed on the inscriptions honoring them. It may have been considered vulgar or inappropriate to do so. It may also be that one did not wish to suggest that *patrocinium*, like other honors, could be had for a certain price (*summa honoraria*) or that benefaction ceased with that honor.

5.3. *Benefaction and the euergeteia*

There was a venerable tradition of public benefaction (*euergeteia*) in Greece and the Hellenistic World. Moreover, one of the most striking features of benefaction in the urban society in the cities of the eastern Mediterranean in the period 200 B.C.-A.D. 300, is the prominent role played by female members of these civic elites. This role appears to be closely connected with the wealth they possessed (⁶⁶). In the East, then, there was a *viable* tradition linking benefaction, public office and women. This tradition

(64) *Op. cit.*, 89 IT. and 156 ff. ; for an example of the latter, see p. 117, No. 261.

(65) For an example of such benefaction, see Nicols (1).

(66) Van Brennan, *op. cit.*, 224.

was a constant factor in public life in the first, second and third century A.D. (67).

To what extent was this tradition transferred to the Latin West? Then no question, as Duncan-Jones has shown, that women did indeed become important benefactors of the cities in the West (68). Nevertheless, these benefactions did not lead to the kind of civic offices held by women in eastern cities (69). On the other hand, and more directly relevant, the eastern cities did not generally apply the vocabulary of patronage to honor their women (*patronissa* is only rarely used in a public context (70)). This suggests that we must take care not to confuse benefaction, *euergeteia* and the more broadly defined *patrocinium publicum*.

Another significant difference may be seen in the manner in which benefactions are described. It is characteristic of the *euergeteia* that explicit descriptions of gifts are provided; these include the type, size and even actual monetary value (71). In contrast, as noted above, the references to specific benefactions by patrons, in general, and by patrons of senatorial rank in particular, range between the infrequent and the non-existent.

This is, of course, not to deny that there was influence in both directions. On one hand, I suspect that the mention of specific benefactions may have been adopted from Hellenistic practice just as the cooptation of women to municipal *patronae* may well derive from the eastern models of female office holding. In the latter case, we might expect to find some relationship between the existence of municipal *patronae* and the intensity of relations with the Greek-speaking East. In so far as North Africa was concerned, the Punic and Semitic and Hellenistic background of the cities may well constitute a major factor in the tradition of cooptation. That the cities of southern Italy, with their Greek background, did not, in contrast, coopt municipal *patronae* in any recognizable number may be due to the fact that the Greek heritage there dates back to an earlier period and to a different tradition.

5.4. Regional Variations in the Exercise of Patronage

Implicit throughout this discussion has been the assumption that the central features of patronage are recognizable at all times and places. The

(67) Id. 233.

(68) E.g., p. 227-235.

(69) E.g., Phanis, a female archon at Syros in the 2nd century, A.D., = *IG* xii, 5.661 H. W. Pleket, *Epigraphica* II, No. 23, Leiden, 1969.

(70) For example, MacMullen, *Women's power*, *op. cit.* at n. 2.

(71) Van Breman notes several cases, 227.

proposition can generally be sustained by a review of the literary evidence ⁽⁷²⁾. Nonetheless, the epigraphical evidence indicates that there were regional variations in the exercise of the institution. That is, there is a recognizable, if largely overlooked, regional eclecticism in the working of patronage. Some examples may illustrate this proposition. First, as argued here, women regularly became municipal patrons in 3rd century North Africa, but not in any significant way in other parts of the Empire. Second, in 1st and 2nd century Spain, *hospitium* and patronage were regularly combined in a highly distinct manner ⁽⁷³⁾. In no other part of the Empire were these forms so combined. Third, the *tabulae patronatus* of Italy are one-sided statements in the form of municipal decrees ; the provincial *tabulae*, on the other hand, generally incorporate the expressed will of both parties and may only very loosely be described *as* municipal decrees. Fourth, the patronage of *collegia* is very common in Italy, but, in spite of the degree of urbanization, noticeably rare in North Africa ⁽⁷⁴⁾.

We must conclude then that, though the language of patronage (including both formulae and forms) is consistently employed throughout the Latin-speaking West, the actual exercise of the institution — who might be a party to the contract and what other institutions were associated with it — varied from region to region. It goes well beyond the scope of this contribution, but it may well be that these regional variations reflect distinct cultural traditions. That is, the tendency to associate patronage and *hospitium* and to avoid coopting women may reflect preferences that were essentially Keltic. On the other hand, the demonstrated willingness of North African communities to coopt women might be attributed to an intense contact with cities of the eastern Mediterranean. Patronage must then be understood at two levels : There is the Roman and aristocratic model we find in the literary sources and the provincial model with all its variants, which we find in the epigraphical evidence.

Conclusion. Van Breman concludes her argument with an observation that may well be applied to the North African *patronae*. "The families of benefactors, including their wives and daughters, had become essential elements in the dynastic, self-justificatory ideology of these (wealthy) elites" ⁽¹⁵⁾. So, too in North Africa, the prominence of male relatives in the

⁽⁷²⁾ Cicero's *Verines* and *de officiis* are central discussions of the problem ; note also the *many* references in Pliny's *epp.*, discussed at length in Nicols (1).

⁽⁷³⁾ Nicols (3), 551 f. (*op. cit at n. 2*).

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Clementi, 158.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ P. 236.

inscriptions relating to *patronae* serves to re-inforce the dynastic claims of elite families in a given region. The best illustration of this tendency is dedication to L. Accius, to his wife and to his two daughters. Accius himself is both patron and *curator*, and the continuing familial power and benefaction is emphasized by including his wife and daughters in the dedication : *pair perpetuis*.

6. CONCLUSIONS

That women became municipal *patronae* has important implications not only for the study of *patrocinium publicum*, but also for our understanding of the role of women in public life.

Traditionally, patronage belongs to *mos*, but, like other traditions, it had come under Roman law. Hence, *patrocinium publicum* was regulated both by the central and by local governments.

Regarding the concept of municipal patronage, the number of *patronae* is not large and attested *cases are limited*, temporally, to the period A.D. 190-310, and geographically, to communities in North Africa and in Central Italy. In *Africa proconsularis*, where municipal *patronae* are most common, all are *clarissimae feminae* and all are members of consular families. They belong then to the very highest levels of the imperial elite. These family connections are emphasized by the fact that the inscriptions mentioning *patronae* regularly include the names of specific relatives. It is probable that the decision to coopt was based not only on personal benefaction, or future, but on the status, wealth and connections of the family.

As all patrons are at least honorary members of the *ordo decurionum*, *patronae*, too, received the same kind of prominence in the *alba* as accorded their male counterparts. As this status could bring them additional privileges or immunities (all *patronae* are at least of equestrian status) there was no reason to mention any decurial honors in the inscriptions. The same is true for *patroni*.

Consistent with the pattern of *patroni* of the same rank, the texts are generally unspecific about benefactions conferred or expected. We may suppose that a willingness to use family wealth and connections to benefit their clients lies behind the cooptation.

That some areas have a high proportion of *patronae* and others have none is consistent with the regional variations in the exercise of municipal patronage. These variations reflect relative, not absolute, differences.

The pattern associated with municipal *patronae* is consistent with other patterns associated with the role of women in the public life of the Roman Empire. In all respects, the women of the Latin-speaking provinces played a more prominent role in public life in the 3rd century. The honors accorded the women of the Severan dynasty surely provided a model for municipalities to emulate. Indeed, women of the elite acquired at this time titles (e.g., *clarissima femina* and *femina consularis*), the use of which was regulated by the Severan jurist, Ulpian. At the municipal level, the development of the *curator rei publicae* may have allowed *patrocinium* to be defined more flexibly, allowing women to be coopted. Moreover, the epigraphical evidence records that *collegia*, which adopted civic models and forms, began to coopt *patronae* at the same time as municipalities did. Cause and effect are not completely clear. Elements of this pattern may be observed in earlier periods. But, whatever the precedents, it is clear that distinct developments occurred in the Severan period and these resulted in significant changes in the role of women in public life.

In the Greek-speaking eastern part of the Empire, there was a strong tradition which linked women to benefaction, honors and civic offices. These models may have had an influence especially in the communities of Africa proconsularis. Indeed, the marriage of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna might appear to epitomize this connection.

Finally, it has been widely accepted that the women of this period achieved such civic honors because they, more than their predecessors, had *de facto*, if not *de iure*, control over their wealth. *Patronae* did, indeed, confer benefactions and these benefactions were probably tangible ones. The texts, however, suggest that the honors were not so much to recognize individual contributions, but rather to recognize a woman as part of a particularly powerful family. Power then was a function of personal wealth (and generosity) and of familial status. Conversely, it is manifest that the attitudes of the elite male toward the celebration of his family and all its members had, at least in some areas, changed: The prestige of the family was enhanced through honors for all members. Indeed, honors for women and children testified to the power of the family and distinguished it from its less successful competitors.

University of Oregon, Eugene (USA.).

John Nicols.

TABLE A

No.	Name	Evidence	Date	Status	Client
1	Abeiena C.f.	ILS 6655	3rd C.	eq.	Pitinum Pisaurense/Italy
2	Accia Asclepianilla	CIL VIII 1181	3rd C.	sen.	Utica/Afr. proc.
3	Accia Heuresis	CIL VIII 1181	3rd C.	sen.	Utica/Afr. proc.
4	Aelia Celsinilla	IL Afr 414	3rd C.	sen.	Thuburbo Minus/Afr. proc.
5	Aradia Rosci.I.	CIL VIII 14470	3rd C.	sen.	Bulls Regia/Afr. proc.
6	Domitia Melpis	CIL XI 3368	3rd C.	sem.	Tarquintialy
7	Fabia Victoria	CIL VIII 7043	3rd C.	eq.	Cirta/Numidia
8	Gallonia Octavia	CIL VIII 1181	3rd C.	Sen.	Utica/Afr. proc.
9	Julia Memmia	IL Afr. 454	3rd C.	sen.	Huila Regia/Afr. proc.
10	Nununia Vatic	CIL IX 3429	3rd C.	sen.	Peluinu.m/Italy
11	Ostia Modesta	CIL VIII 23832	3rd C.	sen.	Avioccala/Numidia
12	Seia Potitia	IL Afr 511	3rd C.	sen.	Thibaris/Afr. proc.
13	Vibia Aurelia	ILS 388	3rd C.	sen./imp.	Calama/Afr. proc.

TABLE B

No.	Name	Harmand	Engesser	PIR	RE	Warmington
1	Abeiena		No. 833			
2	Accia		No. 64	No. 29		No. 82
3	Accia		No. 65	No. 30		No. 83
4	Aelia	P. 282	No. 91	No. 290		No. 78
5	Aradia	P.282	No. 110	No. 1018		No. 97
6	Domitia		No. 884	No. 184		
7	Fabia			No. 83		No. 205
8	Gallonia		No. 63	No. 52		No. 81
9	Julia	P. 281	No. 108		XV 638 No. 45	No. 42
10	Nummia	P. 317, 343	No. 887	No. 190-1	XVII 1414 No. 45	
11	Oscia	P. 301	No. 140	No. 104	XVIII 1578 No. 2	No. 69
12	Seia	P. 281	No. 97		S. XIV 657 No. 24	No. 94
13	Vibia	P. 166	No. 79	No. 411		No. 63

TABLE C

No. Patrons	Full Name	Identification	Relation	Titles/Rank	Client
1.1 Abeiena	Petinus AnFr	--	husband	quinquennalis/eq.	Pitinum Pis.
2.1 Accia A C	L. Accius Julianus Asclepianus	PIR2 A 27 ; Barbieri 614	father	cos., cur./sen_	Utica
2.2 Accia A C	Gallons Octavia Marcella	PIR 2 G 52	mother		
2.3 Accia A. C	Accia Heuresis Venantium	PIR2 A 30	sister	--	
3.1 Accia H. V	L. Accius Julianus Asclepianus	PIR2 A 27 ; Barbieri 614	father	cos., cur./sen.	
3.2 Accia H. V	Gallonia Octavia Marcella	PIR2 6- 52	mother	--	
3.3 Accia H. V.	Asclepianilla Castorea	PIR2 A 29	sister		
4.1 Aelia	(Agrius) Celsinianus	PIR2 A 464 ; Barbieri 1961	son	cos./sen.	Thurburbo Minus
4.2 Aelia	(Agrius ?)	Barbieri 1960	husband	cos./sen.	
5.1 Aradia	P. Aradius Roscius Rufinus etc.	PIR2 A 1013 ; Barbieri 1970	father	qu. cand. (at least)/sen.	Bulla Regia
6.1 Domitia	Q. Petronius Melior	Barbieri 1126 ; RE XIX No. 47	husband	cos./sen.	Tarquinia
7.1 Fabia	L. Lucceius Hadrianus	PIR2 L 358	husband	rationalis/eq.	Cirta
8.1 Gallonia	L. Accius Julianus Asclepianus	PIR2 A 27 ; Barbieri 614	husband	cos.cur./sen.	Utica
8.2 Gallonia	Accia Asclepianilla Castorea	PIR2 A 29	rialighter		
8.3 Gallonia	Accia Heuresis Venantium	PIR2 A 30	daughter		
9.1 Julia	C. Memmius Julius	RE XV Memmius 25 ; Barbieri 367	father	cos./sen.	Bulla Regia
10.1 Nummia	(M. Nummius Umbrius Primus Senecio)	RE XVII, Nummius 18	father	cos./sen.	Pelutnum
10.2 Nummia	(Vibia Salvia Vari.a ?)	PIR1 V 415	mother		
Oscia	none mentioned or known				Avioccala
12.1 Seia	Roscius Potitius Memmianus	Barbieri 839 ; RE S. XIV No. 25a	son	sen.	Thibaris
13.1 Vibia	Divus Marcus		father	emperor	Calama
13.2 Vibia	Divus Severus		brother	emperor	

TABLE O : RELATIVES OF *PATRONA* BY TYPE

	husband	father	son	brother	mother
sen.	4.2	5.1	4.i	13.2	2/3.2-p
	6.1	2/3.1/p	12.1		10.2
	8.1	10.1			
	9.1	13.1			
eq.	1.1				
	7.1-p				

TABLE E : THE REASONS FOR COOPTATION

No. Patrona	Client	Justification
1	Abeiena Pitinum	<i>ob merita eorum</i>
2	Accia Utica	
3	Accia Utica	
4	Aelia Thuburbo	
5	Acadia Bulla Regia	
6	Domitia Tarquinia	(none given but text found in thermae)
7	Fabia Cirta	
8	Gallonica Utica	
9	Julia &Ma Regia	<i>ob praecipuam opens sui thermarum magnificentia</i>
10	Nummia Peltuinum	<i>benevolentia sua</i>
11	Oscia Aviocala	<i>ob insign elus merita</i>
12	Seia Thibaris	<i>ob insignem eius et innumerabilem liberalitatem</i>
13	Vibia Calama	