



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Peter I. Wilkins Legates of Numidia as Municipal Patrons

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **23 • 1993**

Seite / Page **189–206**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1088/5455> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1993-23-p189-206-v5455.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

P. I. WILKINS

Legates of Numidia as Municipal Patrons

Numidia, home to Africa's only legion, the Third Augustan, owed a special allegiance to the legion and its successive commanders. Unlike Africa Proconsularis, where urbanisation was both profound and of long ancestry, only Cirta and its dependent *coloniae* and *castella* shared any pre-Roman civic traditions, Numidia's 5 other large communities being founded under the aegis of the legate. Insularity, shared military experience, and the uncertainties of frontier existence tightened the bond between the legate and the veterans and their descendants settled in these towns, many of whom would have children or relatives serving in the army at any given time. In these circumstances, co-optation of the legate as patron by Numidia's new veteran communities, as well as Cirta, where many veterans also flocked, was a natural response, and one which enabled them both to broadcast their continuing allegiance to the forces of law and order, and to advance wherever possible their own security and private concerns. Prior to the change in command structure in the late third century, it is evident that legates dominate the patronal rolls of the six communities concerned.

Epigraphy records 29 legates as patrons of Numidia's 6 largest communities, and 41 instances of *patrocinium* in all.¹ These communities were Thamugadi with 17 legates as patrons, Cuicul with 11, Cirta with 5, Diana Veteranorum and Verecunda with 3, and Lambaesis with 2. Such a high frequency of co-optation over a period of just 160 years (103–262) might lead us to suspect that the practice had become automatic from the very outset. In Thamugadi, for example, the first documented co-optation of a legate (109) occurs only 9 years after the colony's foundation, and thereafter legates appear as patrons for the years 121, 125–6, 134, 141, 143–6, 146–9, 151–2, 158, 164, 167–9, 171 172–5, 197–9, 198–211 and 227–30.² Nevertheless, F. JACQUES has recently rejected this scenario (*Le privilège de liberté*, Paris 1986, 683–4), citing as evidence two long honorific dedications by the *ordines* of Cuicul and Diana, one to the daughters of a legate (Ti. Claudius Subatianus – AE 1911.

¹ See the appendix. A full list of patrons for Africa appears in Volume III of my doctoral thesis *Roman Africa's Municipal Patrons*, 1989, 614–669. All epigraphic references refer to CIL VIII, unless otherwise indicated.

² App. n. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 a, 14, 15, 16 b, 21 b, 22, and 24 a. The date of another (29) can be assigned only approximately (161–235).

107), the other to the legate himself (M. Valerius Maximianus – AE 1956. 124 cf. 1959. 183), wherein no mention of patronage appears. This paper's intention is firstly to cast doubt upon the relevancy of the first text as evidence of non-co-optation and then to show that the second text did in fact name the legate as patron. In conclusion, all other texts from Numidia's six major client-communities, which mention legates without reference to their patronage, are categorised and examined for their value as evidence of non-co-optation.

The dedication from Cuicul to the daughters of the legate Ti. Claudius Subatianus, devotes considerable space to the legate's *cursus* and declares that the senate set up the inscription *ob insignem eius in patriam suam praestantiam*. As a citizen of Cuicul, Subatianus' administration, we may well believe, was one rich in benefits to his *patria*, and fully justified the mention of *praestantia*. Had Subatianus been patron, the failure of the *ordo* to mention the fact is peculiar, given the specific acknowledgement of benefits received, and all the more so as the preceding period is one in which legates are particularly well documented as patrons of Cuicul. Six legates are so recorded during the years 172–5, 178, 183–4, 187–90, 194 and 199,³ the last only some ten years prior to the date of our text (208–10). Admittedly, rare instances exist of African senators who were not co-opted by their *patria*,⁴ although besides a *clarissimus puer* (AE 1969/70. 705), none are attested for Numidia – but these are far outweighed by the very large number of those who were.⁵ Such for example, was a near-contemporary of Subatianus, the legate P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius, recorded as *patronus patriae* at Thamugadi some twenty years later.⁶

³ App. n. 16 a, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 c. 2 other patrons, datable only to the years 103–262, may also belong to this period (n. 27 and 28). Legates continued to be co-opted at Cuicul as late as 262 (n. 26).

⁴ All senators not termed patron on dedications to them by the *ordo* (lacunary dedications excepted) may be fairly considered 'non-patrons'. For Africa only 4 male senatorial 'non-patrons' occur (ILA 297, ILAlg I 536, 11935 and AE 1969/70. 705) and the 3 last are all young (a quaestor, a [*i(u)venis*]) *clarissimus* and a *clarissimus puer*) and may have been co-opted at a later date.

⁵ 68 certain examples exist (excluding females), 53 from Africa Proconsularis: CIL VI 32026, 11299, 823, 971, 989, 1181, 14312, 1222, 15883, 11543, 11933 – 2 patrons, 12291, 14291, 14373, 14559, 15881, 22716 a, 22718, 22719, 23416, 23800, 23831, 24095, 25368, 25525 (and ILAlg I 2162), 25515, 25822, 26579; AE 1958. 137, 138, 1964. 178, 1975. 880, 1979. 657, 1988. 1119; ILA 281, 298, 305, 418 (25367), 4549; ILT 722 – 3 patrons, 768, 1066, 1162, 1259; IRT 544; ILAlg I 280, 281, 283, 2117; ined. cf. M. T. W. ARNHEIM, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford 1972, 157; 14 from Numidia: 2391, 2403 – 4 patrons; AE 1954. 139; ILAlg 614, 630, 633 (and 3604 and 2392), 645, 655, 3446 (and 3605), 4683; AntAfr 25, 1989, 196; and 1 from Mauretania: 21451. The list includes patrons of towns lying in the vicinity of their *patria*.

⁶ App. n. 24 a. He was also patron of 2 neighbouring communities (cf. 24 and 24 b).

The most likely solution for the non-mention of *patrocinium* on the prolix dedication to Subatianus' daughters, is that this detail appeared on a second statue base erected to Subatianus at the same time. In this regard, we may mention two dedications by the *ordo* of Verecunda to the sons of the legate M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus (4228, 4229), which fail to record their father's patronage of the town, although this patronage can be ascertained from another text (18499). Presumably a third statue was contemporaneously erected to Saturninus along with those to his sons, in which mention of his patronage was made explicit. A case in point is the 2 dedications by the *ordo* of Thamugadi, one (2392) to the legate P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus and the other (AntAfr 25, 1989, 196) to his son [P. Iulius Iunianus] Tironillianus, *c.p.* Martialianus is recorded as patron in the first text only. In the second text, even though his son is called patron, he himself is styled simply *cos*.

Although only two clear instances survive from Numidia of dedications erected in tandem by the *ordo* to a legate and to members of his family (and the legate's patronate is mentioned in 3 of the 4 texts), it seems a reasonable supposition that this was normal practice.⁷ This seems borne out by simultaneous dedications to legates and their family by private clients,⁸ as well as by the numerous joint dedications to local senators, equestrians and municipal worthies and their families by the *ordo*. It is just such a series of joint dedications from Thugga (erected by the *pagus et civitas Thuggensis*, to a flamen, to his father, and to his brother), that illustrate perfectly how omission of *patrocinium* on one statue could be remedied by its inclusion on another (26609, 26605, 26604). As with the statue base to Subatianus' daughters, no mention of the flamen's patronate appears on the bases to his father and his brother, yet it is given immediately after his name on the dedication to himself. We know that the bases were erected simultaneously by the repetition on each text firstly of the names of the four *curatores*, and secondly of *ob munificentiam* (referring to the flamen), to which we may compare the *ob . . . praestantiam* in the dedication from Cuicul. Subatianus' patronage of his *patria* is thus highly probable, if not provable, and we may take all such similar dedications to administrators' wives and children by African *ordines*, as a probable clue to the administrators' co-optation by the dedicating *ordo*.

The second inscription upon which JACQUES relies to discard the notion that «le légat était systématiquement nommé patron par les cités numides» (loc. cit., 683), is a very well known dedication by the *ordo* of Diana Veteranorum to the legate M. Valerius Maximianus, a native of Poetovio, whose long and varied career is inscribed down to the finest detail (AE 1956. 124). It is this, as much as anything, that makes the text's omission of his patronate of Diana so surprising. To cite JACQUES again, «Comment penser que le patronat eût été omis alors que les dédicants avaient même indiqué son pontificat à Poetovio, en Pannonie?» In fact, the de-

⁷ App. n. 12a (4599 and AE 1933. 69) and 24a (2392 cf. AntAfr 25, 1989, 196).

⁸ 4600 and AE 1933. 70 (Diana), 2797 and AE 1917–18. 52 (Lambaesis), BACTH 1909. 109, n. 8 and AE 1985. 881 d (Thamugadi).

tail of his pontificate was not – at least in its holder's view – a minor point, since we find it repeated in another text from Diana, erected to him this time by two clients, the Aquilii, in which the only other posts given are those he currently held as legate and consul designate (4600).⁹ More instructive, is the fact that of the 15 known inscriptions on statue bases set up by local senates to legates and *praesides* in Numidia, only this inscription from Diana fails to mention that the recipient was also patron.¹⁰ Some communities elsewhere in Africa did erect statues to their administrators, without making any reference to their patronage,¹¹ but as with our text from Diana, no supporting texts can be adduced to show that such co-optation ever took place. Statues of this type can therefore probably be construed as evidence against the likelihood that their recipient ever enjoyed patronal rights over the community which erected them.

If this is correct, and Diana chose not to co-opt Maximianus as patron, but elected to flatter him with a statue instead, some of the other Numidian communities for whom few patrons are known (e.g. Verecunda), or at least few who were administrators (e.g. Cirta), may have followed suit in co-opting patrons at their own discretion. One would expect, however, in this case, that at least some honorific statues to legates erected by the *ordo* of those communities would have survived, specifically excluding mention of the honorand's patronate. We may add, that even if it can be shown that one or more Numidian community elected not to choose each successive governor as patron, this need not be taken as a blueprint for the behaviour of all. The very high ratios of known patrons to known legates recorded for Thamugadi and Cuicul,¹² and the high incidence of verifiable early co-optation in a legate's term of administration, should caution us against this.¹³

⁹ His wife was similarly honoured by the Aquilii, magistrates at Diana (AE 1933. 70). B. H. WARMINGTON, *The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa*, PBSR 9, 1954, 44 n. 192, F. ENGESSER, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diocletian*, Freiburg 1955, 94, and J. ŠAŠEL, *Tituli V*, 568, erroneously attribute the patronage of Diana to the couple on the basis of these texts. As H. G. PFLAUM, *L'Afrique romaine*, Paris 1978, 83, and R. P. SALLER, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge 1982, 199 n. 52, correctly note, the patronate mentioned concerns only the two Aquilii brothers. J. HARMAND, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1957, adds his own idiosyncratic confusion to the picture, by describing Maximianus as both patron of Diana (193) and of Aquileia in Italy (227).

¹⁰ App. n. 1, 2, 5, 7a, 12a (AE 1933. 69), 18a, 19a, 23, 24, 24a, 26, 27 and ILAlg II 589 and 590 and AE 1980. 240.

¹¹ Africa Proconsularis: CIL VI 1736; ILA 43; 1639, 11332, 12459, 23085, 26580, 26582; CIL X 1684, 3846; ILAlg I 285, 3062, 3063; IRT 480, 531, 561, 565, 567, 568, 574; Numidia: 8328, AE 1911. 112; Mauretania: 9046, 9049, AE 1904. 151.

¹² 17 out of 20 for Thamugadi (or 85 %) and 11 out of 14 for Cuicul (or 79 %). The 6 legates not styled patrons from these towns appear at 17842 (and 17843 and 17892), AE 1934. 40, MEFR 65, 1953, 114–115 (Thamugadi) and 8327, AE 1911. 107 (and 1916. 29), AE 1920. 30 (Cuicul).

¹³ 12 legates (with 18 examples of *patrocinia*) are attested as patrons prior to their promo-

However, there are good reasons for believing that the statue base to Maximianus did describe him as patron after all. Aside from the deliberate erasure of Commodus' name, the long text is blemished by only two small lacunae. That in the centre of the final line has been expanded thus by PFLAUM (*L'Afrique romaine*, 1978, 66): *splendissimus ordo Dian[ensium Veteran.] aere conlato*. An alternative reading, abbreviating the name of Diana, should in fact be preferred, as none of the 21 other inscriptions which give the name of the town, ever add the descriptive term *Veteranorum*, which is only attested in the itinerarium Antonini (cf. p. 462). There is, therefore, room to add the critical word *patrono* which the text so evidently (on comparative analysis) requires. The revised reading can be paralleled by a similar text from Diana (4599) which reads: *patrono municipii ordo Dian. aere conlato*, while another from Calama shows that the word order could be reversed: (5363): *Calamenses patrono aere conlato*.¹⁴ The addition of *Veteran(orum)* would be novel, whilst the omission of *patrono* would be equally novel in the context. The simple solution of replacing the former with the latter (a word of equal length) rids us of two anomalies, simultaneously clearing the principal obstruction to the vista of an unbroken succession of patron-legates in Numidia's five major client communities. Maximianus, already known as patron of Cuicul, is thus secured as patron of Diana, and we may anticipate that he was also patron of Verecunda, a statue erected in the forum there by the *ordo* to his wife being most probably accompanied by another honouring him (4234).¹⁵ Finally, we may add that a text from Thamugadi, in which Maximianus appears supervising swamp drainage (AE 1934. 40), and which also fails to mention *patrocinium*, is of the official dedication type, for which we shall see many examples of omitted *patrocinia* for legates, who are elsewhere verified as patrons.

* * *

The omissions of the patronate of the legates M. Aemilius Saturninus and P. Iulius Iunianus Martialis on the 3 dedications to their sons, are far from being isolated occurrences. In all, a further 7 Numidian legates appear on some 42 non-lacunary texts, all of which fail to record a patronage elsewhere known to have existed. These inscriptions form an additional 4 distinct types to that represented by the dedications of the *ordo* to Saturninus' sons, each of which may be categorically stated to carry no presumption of non-co-optation by the omission of a legate's patronage.

tion to consul *designatus* or consul. App. n. 3 (1), 4 (3), 8 (2), 9 (1), 10 (1), 12, 13 a, 16, 16 b, 18, 18 a, 19, 19 a, 20, 21 (1), 21 a (1), 21 b (1), 21 c (1). Possible additions (the texts are lacunary) are App. n. 1, 5, 6, 16 a, 25.

¹⁴ Cf. also 14291: *patrono Thibiucenses aere conlato* and AE 1971. 510: *splendissimus ordo Cuiculitanae patrono*.

¹⁵ Maximianus also appears on a dedication to divus Commodus from Verecunda. The text is too brief to speculate upon inclusion of patronage (4212).

The table below sets out the 5 categories together with the number of patrons and texts represented.

type	patrons	texts
A Dedications by the <i>ordo</i> to a legate's family	2	3
B Official dedications or authorisations by the legate	5	24
C Dedications by clients to a legate or his family	4	16
D Ex votos of the legate	1	1
E Epitaphs mentioning the legate	1	1

Type B, official dedications or authorisations of building works, statues etc., representing 24 out of 45 (or 53 %) of detectable examples of omission of patronage, is also the most prolific type on which all legates are recorded. The monuments dedicated or authorised by the 24 texts omitting patronage include those erected by the *ordo* and by private benefactors (8 and 3 texts respectively)¹⁶ and also by the military (7 by groups of officers or military units and 4 *per legionem III Aug.*).¹⁷ Comparison with the 47–58 official dedications where the legate's patronate is mentioned, illustrate a fundamental difference. Whereas texts of this type occur frequently where the donor is the *ordo* (16 patrons on 36–45 texts)¹⁸ and occasionally where the donor is a private benefactor (3 patrons on 3 texts),¹⁹ no examples exist for constructions erected through the legion or for monuments privately erected by various military groups.²⁰ It was evidently deemed inapposite – or irrelevant – to mention the legate's civilian function as patron in a context involving only himself and the military. Even after removal of the 11 texts involving the military, a substantial number of type B texts omitting a known patronate remain (13), which conform with type B texts, where patronate is mentioned (47–58). These figures show that 18–22 % percent (13 out of 60–71) of all official dedications by legates of a type conducive to mentioning patronage, fail to do so. This percentage of course concerns only detectable cases, i.e. legates known by at least 2 texts, one of which mentions

¹⁶ 8 – Thamugadi: 17857, AE 1985. 877 a; Cuicul: AE 1935. 45, 8309; Verecunda: 4205, 4210, 18510, 18511. 3 – Cuicul: 20144; Diana: 4582; Lambaesis: AE 1911. 97.

¹⁷ 7 – Lambaesis: 2527, 2550, 2551, 2553, 2558, D 9097, AE 1973. 629. 4 – Diana: BACTH 1932–3. p. 432–3 n. 1–2; Verecunda: 4203, 4204, 18509. In a further 2 cases it is unclear who is responsible for the text (Lambaesis – 18075, BACTH 1918. p. 85 n. 1).

¹⁸ Thamugadi: App. 3 (1, 2), 4 (2, 3), 6, 7 (1, 2*), 8 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), 9 (2, 3*), 10 (1, 2, 3, 4, 7*), 11 (1), 14 (2*, 3*, 4*, 5*, 6*, 7*), 15, 16 b (1, 3), 21 b (1, 2, 3, 4, 5); Cuicul: App. 18, 20, 21 c (2); Cirta: App. 21 (1, 2); Diana: App. 12 a (1), 13; Verecunda: App. 16; Lambaesis: App. 21 a (1, 2), 25. The 9 asterisked references indicate texts with lacunae, wherein reference to the legate's patronage has been surmised by their editors. For another 2 see App. 10 (6, 8) and n. 19 below.

¹⁹ 3 – Thamugadi: App. 14 (1); Cuicul: App. 12; Lambaesis: App. 21 a (3). For a further 10 patrons on 13 texts, the donor is unknown but is probably the *ordo* – Thamugadi: App. 4 (1), 9 (1), 10 (5, 6*, 8*), 11 (2), 13 a, 16 b (2), 22, 29; Cuicul: App. 16 a, 21 c (1), 28.

²⁰ The latter – unsurprisingly – are not attested outside of Lambaesis.

his patronage, and the other (an official dedication) omitting it. Given the difficulty of fulfilling this criterion it can be seen that 18–22 % is very much a minimum percentage, and a projection as high as one-hundred percent is not unwarranted. In fact, the number of official dedications on which the legate acts on behalf of the *ordo* or a private benefactor and is not described as patron or known from other texts to have been so, is relatively small (12–13) and involves only 8–9 legates.²¹

Type C, dedications by clients to a legate or members of his family, is the second most frequent epigraphic type, where omission of patronage can be verified, with 16 out of 45 (or 35 %) of all cases.²² In contrast to type B, no examples at all are known where texts of this type do define a legate as patron. In fact, only 5 African inscriptions erected by private clients mention that the recipient was patron, and in no instance is the patron so known an administrator.²³ 41 texts, all but 3 of which derive from Lambaesis, concern dedications by clients to 23 legates or their family members, none of whom are described or known as patron.²⁴ Clearly none of these bear any inference of non-co-optation.

The same is equally true for all texts concerning legates of types D and E, i.e. ex votos and epitaphs. Only one inscription of each type occurs in which a legate is not described as patron but is elsewhere known to have been so.²⁵ On the other hand, no legate at all is recorded as patron from such a source. Furthermore not one ex voto from Africa testifies to its donor's patronage, while only a small fraction of Africa's municipal patrons (12 out of 295 or 4 %) are so known from epitaphs, none of whom were administrators, or for that matter even senators, nor do any of the texts have as their provenance Numidia.²⁶ A further 21 ex votos from Numidia bear

²¹ Thamugadi: AE 1934. 40; Cirta: ILAlg II 684; Diana: AE 1930. 39; Verecunda: 4199, 4212; Lambaesis: 2598, 18214, 18234, AE 1914. 39, 1964. 196, 1967. 565, 1987. 1067. Possibly in this category too, fall the public works completed *ex auctoritate (legati)* at Cirta ILAlg II 631. However, no inscriptions where the legate is mentioned *ex decreto*, *ex auctoritate*, or *permissu* describe him as municipal patron – cf. 20144 (Cuicul) and AE 1911. 97 (Lambaesis), for certifiable examples of omitted patronage in such cases. Besides the 12–13 texts cited above, note 7 others where it is uncertain whether the legate acted on behalf of the *ordo* – (Thamugadi 2359 cf. MEF 65, 1953, 114–5); Cirtan Confederacy (8208, ILAlg II 393, 557); Verecunda (4195, 4211, AntAfr 2, 1968, 216 n.3).

²² Thamugadi: BACTH 1909 n.8, AE 1938. 143, 1946. 164, 1985. 881 d; Diana 4600, AE 1933. 70; Lambaesis: 2732, 2733, 2734, 18268, AE 1917/18. 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 1939. 38.

²³ 8934, 9368, ILA 568, ILAlg II 614, 630.

²⁴ (1) Diana – AE 1934. 26; (2) Verecunda – 4233?, 4234; (3) Lambaesis – 2747, 18083, 18273; 2738, 2739; 2746; 2730, 2731, AE 1915. 27, 1917/18. 49; 18272; 2749, CRAIBL 1954. 273, 2; AE 1954. 138; 1917/18. 51; 2797, AE 1917/18. 52; 2742; AE 1967. 577; 1969/70. 706; 2737, AE 1967. 578; 2748, AE 1917/18. 76, 2750, 2751, AE 1917/18. 77; 1967. 575; 2753, 18274; 2743, AE 1915. 16, 1917/18. 50, 78; AE 1988. 1123?; 2754; 18276; AE 1982. 956.

²⁵ Ex voto – Lambaesis: 2589; epitaph – Thamugadi: 2428.

²⁶ The 12 patrons appear on 11 texts, 6 from Africa Proconsularis: 11543, 12020, 12065, 26592, ILA 59, ILT 1511 and 5 from Mauretania: 8934, 9048, 9068, 20751, AE 1955. 158.

the names of legates without disclosing whether they were patrons. Of epitaphs, no other example mentioning Numidian legates exists besides that already cited.²⁷

Very few of the texts concerning legates which fail to mention their patronage fall outside the classifications so far discussed. No examples exist for Thamugadi, Cirta, Diana or Verecunda, and the sole example from Cuicul, a lacunary dedication to a legate described by an unknown dedicand as *praeses exempli [rari?/rarissimi?]* was almost certainly erected by a client rather than the *ordo*, legates being frequently termed *praesides* by private clients, but seldom so by the *ordo*.²⁸ The same is also true for a recently published text from Lambaesis (AE 1988. 1123), which although apparently complete, gives no indication of who the dedicand was. The legate to whom the dedication was addressed is styled *praeses iustissimus*.²⁹ Lambaesis presents special problems and requires a fuller excursus.

* * *

With over 1400 known inscriptions, Lambaesis is easily the best documented Numidian community. There is, unfortunately, nothing like a corresponding survival of texts relating to patrons. Over 70 % of Numidia's known legates (47 out of 64) appear on 156 texts from Lambaesis, yet only 2 of these (or 4 %) from 4 texts (i.e. less than 3 % of the total, 156) are known as patrons.³⁰ The insignificance of such

²⁷ Cuicul: AE 1920. 30; Cirta: ILAlg II 530; Lambaesis: 2579 d and 2579 e, 2581, 2582, 2583 and 2588, 2591 and AE 1920. 37, 2615, 2619, 2621 and AE 1915. 28, 1955. 79, 2630, AE 1914. 245, 1915. 26, 1920. 21 and BACTH 1919. CCXI/CCXII, AE 1957. 123, 1960. 107, 1967. 563, 571, 573, 1988. 1122.

²⁸ 8327. Subatianus whom we have seen above, is described by the *ordo* of Cuicul as *praeses clementissimus* (AE 1911. 107). The only other Numidian legate to be termed *praeses* on a dedication erected by the *ordo* was, like Subatianus, of local extraction (ILAlg II 3604, castellum Tidditanorum – *amplissimus prae[s]es*). Legates are called *praeses* by clients on 16 texts – 2737, 2742, 2749, 2750, 2753, 2754, 18274, AE 1915. 16, 1917/18. 51, 71, 72, 77, 78, 1939. 38, 1954. 138, 1969/70. 706.

²⁹ cf. M. LEGLAY, A propos de quelques textes africains, L'Africa Romana 5, 1988, 140 who, in conjunction with this text notes that *praeses* occurs most frequently on private dedications. Another legate from Lambaesis, M. U[lpius] Max[imus], or M. V[alerius] Max[imianus] is described as [*praesi*] di b[enignissimo] by a dedicand whose name is lost in a lacuna (18274). The dedicand was almost certainly a soldier. Both men were honoured by centurions at Lambaesis, the first as *praeses benignissimus* (2753), the second as *praeses rarissimus* (2749).

³⁰ (1) 2546, 2654, 2730, 2731, AE 1914. 39, 1915. 27, 1917/18. 49, 1967. 565, 574; (2) 2736; 18067; (3) 2534; (4) 2583, 2588, 2697; AE 1967. 576, 577; (5) AE 1957. 123; 1987. 1067; (6) AE 1954. 138; (7) 18081; (8) AE 1969/70. 706, 707; (9) AE 1967. 563; (10) 2533, 2609, 2610; BACTH 1904. 202ff.; (11) 2737; AE 1955. 80; 1967. 578; (12) 2579 d, 2579 e, 2694, 2738, 2739, 2740, 18065, AE 1908. 10, 1967. 564; (13) 18270, AE 1917/18. 51; (14) 2743, AE 1915. 16, 1917/18 50, 78; (15) 2742; (16) AE 1955. 137, 1957. 123, 1967. 566, 2681, 18042, 18221, D 9134; (17) 2547, 2582, 18272, AE 1920. 36 cf. ArchVestnik 28, 1977, 352–9, 1980. 952; (18) 2797, AE 1917/18. 52, 1971. 508, 509; (19) 2581, AE 1955. 134; (20) 2615; (21) AE 1964. 195, 196; (22)

percentages appears the more extreme, when compared with Thamugadi, twenty kilometres to the east, whence derives Numidia's second highest yield of texts referring to legates. Although Thamugadi has less than half the number of legates known for Lambaesis (20 cf. 47), all but 3 (or 85 % of them) have their patronate recorded.³¹ 62 texts in all refer to legates in Thamugadi (scarcely more than a third of the total for Lambaesis, 156) yet in all 36 describe those concerned as patrons (60 %).³² Of the remaining 25, 20 refer to individuals whose patronate of Thamugadi is elsewhere attested (32 %), and for 11 of these patronate has been posited in textual lacunae by reasons of space and/or analogy with comparable texts.³³ There remain only 5 texts which refer to legates whose patronate of Thamugadi is unattested, a mere 8 %.³⁴ The contrast could hardly be more dramatic, but as we shall see, the reason lies in the nature of the Lambaesian material, differing as it does in one essential element from the epigraphy of Thamugadi and that of the 4 other major Numidian client communities.

In the case of the latter, the majority of texts for which legate-patrons are known were erected by the authority of the communities concerned, usually expressed by the formula *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)*. Of the 72 inscriptions attesting such patronage, 56 indicate that one or other of the 5 communities authorised their erection, whilst another 13 marred by lacunae probably did so.³⁵ In 2 of the 4

2630, 2637, 2653; (23) 2591, AE 1920. 37; (24) 2746; (25) 2542, 2652, 2693, 2747, 2778, 18083, 18214, 18234, 18273; (26) AE 1988. 1122, 1123; (27) AE 1960. 107, 1967. 579; (28) 2748, AE 1917/18. 76; (29) AE 1967. 571; (30) AE 1982. 956; (31) AE 1920. 21, BACTH 1919. CCXI, CCXII; (32) 2543, 2613, 2778; (33) 2598, 2621, 2698, 2749, 2777, 18274, AE 1915. 28, 1955. 79, CRAIBL 1954. 273,2; (34) 2619, 2750, 2751, AE 1917/18. 77; (35) 2752, AE 1955. 136, 1967. 575; (36) 2634, AE 1914. 245; (37) 2753, 18274; (38) 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, AE 1915. 26, AntAfr 25, 1989, 201–2 n. 10; (39) 2754; (40) 2571; (41) 2692; (42) 18276; (43) AE 1967. 573; (44) AE 1985. 872; (45) 2637 (appears jointly with n.22 above). Note that 2 legates (n.5 and n.16) appear on 1 text (AE 1957. 123) and another 2 (25 and 31) on another (2778). For the 2 patrons see appendix 21 a and 25. They are known from another 22 Lambaesian texts on which their patronate is not mentioned: 21 a (2527, 2550, 2551, 2553, 2558, 18075, 18256; D 9097; AE 1911. 97, 99, 1973. 629; BACTH 1918. 85 n. 1., n. 3); 25 (2589, 2611, 2732, 2733, 2734, 18268; AE 1917/18. 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 1939. 38, AntAfr 25, 1989, 202–3 n. 11).

³¹ (1) AE 1934. 40; (2) 17842, 17843, 17892; (3) MEFR 65, 1953, 114–115 – cf. Cuicul with 3 – (1) 8327; (2) AE 1911. 107, 1916. 29; (3) AE 1920. 30: the Cirtan Confederacy with 4 – (1) ILAlg II 684; (2) ILAlg II 557; (3) 8208, ILAlg II 393, 631; (4) ILAlg II 530: Diana with 2 – (1) AE 1930. 39; (2) AE 1934. 26: and Verecunda with 6 – (1) 4234, 4212; (2) 4233; (3) 4195; (4) 4199; (5) 4211; (6) AntAfr 2, 1968, 216 n. 3.

³² Appendix 2, 3 (1, 2), 4 (1, 2), 6, 7 (1), 8 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), 9 (1, 2), 10 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), 11 (1, 2), 13 a, 14 (1), 15, 16 b (1, 2, 3), 21 b (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), 22, 24 a, 29.

³³ For the 11 texts where patronate has been posited, see n.18. The remaining 9 are – BACTH 1909. 109 n.8, 1932/3. 307–8 n.12, AE 1938. 143, 1946. 64, 1985. 877 a, 881 d, 2428, 17857, AntAfr 25, 1989, 195–7 n. 7.

³⁴ See n.31.

³⁵ See n.19 for these 13 texts.

remaining texts, the legate dedicates buildings erected at the private expense of 2 *flamines*,³⁶ whilst in the other 2 (both dedications to the emperor by the legate) the authority of the community is absent, and it is unclear if public expense was involved.³⁷

In Lambaesis, however, only 7 of the 156 inscriptions on which legates appear make any reference at all to the Lambaesian *ordo*, and in 3 of these the legate is described as patron.³⁸ The remaining 4 are all of a type where the mention of patronate has been seen to have been arbitrary. 3 (concerning 2 legates) are official dedications by the legate of a publicly erected monument,³⁹ while the other is a dedication by the *ordo* to a member of the legate's family.⁴⁰ The latter is in fact the single instance of this epigraphic type from Lambaesis, although 10 other Numidian examples occur.⁴¹ There are only 5 other instances of inscriptions from Lambaesis conforming to a type known to document the patronate of legates, making a mere 12 such inscriptions in all. All 5 texts are official dedications by the legate of benefactions provided by local bourgeoisie (*flamines* and *possessores*). One text mentions that the legate was patron,⁴² and 4 do not.⁴³ A parallel exists from Diana for the omission of patronate in dedications of benefactions.⁴⁴ Arbitrary omission is, therefore, perfectly plausible for all 8 of the 12 Lambaesian texts cited, which fail to describe the legate as patron – 6 legates in all being concerned. There remain 144 Lambaesian texts of the 156 on which legates occur. 132 of these are of a type not known to have attested a legate's patronate, either here or elsewhere in the province. 12 others are fragmentary texts; in 6 instances, honorific statues erected to legates by unknown dedicands; in the remaining 6, texts of a type too fragmentary to define.⁴⁵ 114 of the 132 Lambaesian texts which can be easily categorised fall into 4 types⁴⁶

³⁶ App. n. 12, 14 (1).

³⁷ App. n. 9a, 16b (3).

³⁸ App. n. 21a (1, 2), 25.

³⁹ (1) AE 1914. 39, 1967. 565, (2) 2611.

⁴⁰ 2740.

⁴¹ Thamugadi: AntAfr 25, 1989, 195–7 n. 7; Cuicul: 8326, AE 1911. 103, 107, 1916. 30, 31; Diana: AE 1933. 69; Verecunda: 4228, 4229, 4234.

⁴² App. n. 21a (3).

⁴³ 18214, 18234, AE 1964. 196, 1987. 1067.

⁴⁴ 4582. *Patrocinium* is also omitted for 2 known legate-patrons who appear in an official capacity on 2 other private benefactions. The texts are not dedicated by the legates, however, but authorised *ex decreto* (Cuicul – 20144) or *permittente* (Lambaesis – AE 1911. 97) – cf. n. 21.

⁴⁵ 6 – 18270, 18274, AE 1967. 574, 579, 1969/70. 707, 1980. 952. 6 – 2752, AE 1955. 136, 1964. 195, 1967. 576, 1985. 872, AntAfr 25, 1989, 201–2 n. 10. The last text (an *ex voto*?) refers to a known patron of Lambaesis (App. 25).

⁴⁶ Legates appear in the remaining 18 inscriptions (1) dedicating monuments erected by the emperor – 2653, 2692, 2693, 2697; (2) dedicating monuments erected by persons unknown – 2681, 18221; 18081; AE 1972. 509; (3) ordering a monument's restoration – 2736; (4) on the cursus of soldiers – 2613, 2777; (5) as recipients of official requests from procurators – 2778;

where the mention of patronate has been seen to have been arbitrary, and in fact, 19 of the 114 concern the 2 legates whose patronate at Lambaesis is known. The table below lists the 4 types and the relative frequency of their occurrence in Lambaesis, according to whether they are known as patrons from other texts there or not. Comparison is also made with the aggregate of texts of the 4 types from Numidia's 5 other major client-communities.

Inscription Types not Mentioning a Legate's Patronate

inscription types	Lambaesis			5 major Numidian client communities		
	legates known as patron	legates not known as patron	total	legates known as patron	legates not known as patron	total
(1) Statue to legate (or a family member) by a client	1 (10)	22 (38)	23 (48)	3 (6)	1 (2)	4 (7)
(2) Legate erects an ex voto	1 (1)	19 (26)	20 (27)	–	2 (2)	2 (2)
(3) Legate dedicates a monument erected by members of the military	1 (8)	9 (19)	10 (27)	–	–	–
(4) Legate dedicates a monument erected <i>per legionem</i>	–	9 (12)	9 (12)	1 (4)	1 (2)	2 (6)
Total	2 (19)	39 (95)	42 (114)	4 (10)	4 (5)	8 (15)

NB. Bracketed numbers indicate the total of texts. Due to numerous instances of legates appearing in more than one community, the totals for legates seldom correspond to the total of unbracketed figures in each column.

We have seen that the small yield of legates as patrons in Lambaesis (2) is directly attributable to the paucity of texts mentioning the Lambaesian community and the legate in conjunction (7), or otherwise conforming to a type, where patronate may be provided (5). Of these 12 texts, 4 relate to patrons, 8 do not, but all of the latter are also of a type where parallels for arbitrary omission of the patronate can be documented. The great majority of the remaining legates, epigraphically attested at Lambaesis, but not as patrons, do not appear on texts congenial to mention of the patronate. Although so few Lambaesian texts reveal the interrelationship between legates and the

(6) in Hadrian's *adlocutio* – 18042, D 9134; (7) in dedications erected *pro salute legati* – 2637; AE 1955. 80; (8) erecting statues to the emperor – 18075; (9) authorising benefactions – AE 1911. 97. The last 2 texts concern legates known elsewhere to have been patrons of Lambaesis.

Lambaesan senate or its office holders, we may imagine that the legate's intercession in Lambaesan municipal life was felt every bit as keenly here as elsewhere in the province, if not indeed more so, given the topographic merging of *castra* and town.⁴⁷ There is no need, therefore (contra E. FENTRESS),⁴⁸ to explain the absence of legates as patrons in Lambaesis, with the notion that being most under the legate's direct control, the legate's patronage might be taken for granted, in contrast to Thamugadi (where most legates are recorded as patrons) which felt obliged 'to make a certain effort to attract his goodwill'. The differing nature of the epigraphic evidence apart, Thamugadi was, at only 20 kilometres distance, scarcely far from the legate's purview.

Our paucity of evidence for the Lambaesan *ordo* and townspeople is not only restricted to those inscriptions, on which the legate appears, but is a regrettable fact of Lambaesan epigraphy in general. Only another 9 texts erected or authorised by the Lambaesan senate, for instance, are known for the period 100–268, 4 of which are perfunctory dedications to deities, and 2, indiscernible fragments.⁴⁹ The 3 others comprise a text granting the space for a statue by the formula *l. d. d. d.*; a briefly inscribed statue to an emperor erected by the *ordo*; and finally, a text in which the *ordo* acts as executor of a *fideicommissum*.⁵⁰ The legate's dedication was unessential in the context of any of these 9 inscriptions, and its absence should, therefore, fail to surprise. Thus, notwithstanding the minimal evidence which survives from so large a corpus of Lambaesan epigraphy, it is perfectly conceivable that the co-optation of patrons here was every bit as regular as appears to have been the case elsewhere in the province's major centres, the regrettable fact being, that so little of what is extant is of a type in which patronage is normally mentioned.

We may perhaps digress at this juncture to mention 4 Lambaesan texts not so far described, which provide a rare glimpse of the close working relationship between the legate and the civilian community. The texts are not of a type which normally mention patronage of a community, and no examples at all describe administrators as patrons in Africa.⁵¹ Two of the inscriptions, in fact, refer to a legate already attested as patron of Lambaesis, while the others concern legates for whom no Numidian client-communities are known.⁵² The inscriptions are dedications by private

⁴⁷ On the complex urban structure of Lambaesis, cf. M. JANON, *Recherches à Lambèse*, *AntAfr* 7, 1973, 215–21, who rejects the notion of a geographical division between *castra* and *civitas* (ibid. 220). The poor state of preservation of Lambaesis has, for instance, meant that the location of the forum is unknown (ibid. 217–18), a site favoured for erecting statues to prominent citizens and officials, including patrons.

⁴⁸ Numidia and the Roman Army. Social, Military and Economic Aspects of the Frontier Zone, 1979, 160.

⁴⁹ 2592, 2594, 2617, 3309, 18226, 18346.

⁵⁰ 2677, 2695, 18227.

⁵¹ Two, however, are known for local senators in Numidia (ILAlg II 614, 630), both from Cirta.

⁵² 2734, 2743, 2754, AE 1917/18. 73.

individuals to legates, a type quite frequent in Lambaesis when the dedicands are staff officers or soldiers.⁵³ In these instances, however, the dedicands are members of the municipal aristocracy. One (2743) was erected by a pair of brothers, both *advocati*, to their *patronus*; another (AE 1917/8. 73), also to his *patronus* by an equestrian *advocatus*, *ob insignem eius erga se dignationem*; while the third (2734), to the same legate (again called *patronus*), was erected by 3 individuals, comprising yet another *advocatus* (again equestrian) as well as a *duumvir* and a *flamen*. In the latter text, praise of the dedicand is quite specific – *iu[dicia] eius for[i iustitiamque] tot[ies admirati sunt]*. Finally, a fourth text (2754) appears to have been erected to an anonymous legate at the behest of *duumviri quinquennales* (reading [*instantia(?) II viro(?)*]*rum qq.* in line 21).⁵⁴ It is clear from these texts, that in Lambaesis (at least for the third century, to which all these texts date), the legate's role as *index* was instrumental in the creation of bonds of personal patronage with advocates, and with numerous other municipal officials, who stood no benefit from his decisions. Dedications by municipal dignitaries to legates and their family in other assize centres in Numidia, make it clear that this was not a phenomenon restricted to Lambaesis.⁵⁵ One advocate, in fact, who erected dedications to 2 legates, set up one in Lambaesis (AE 1917/8. 73), and the other in Thamugadi (2393). The influence a legate could exert in his judicial capacity, and his oversight of the financial transactions and building constructions undertaken by the local senate or by private individuals, were of course primary factors, not only in the establishment of bonds of personal patronage, but in co-optation by the communities principally affected.⁵⁶ Certainly the Lambaesian evidence indicates the active intercession by legates in all these areas, thus differing in no wise from that of Numidia's other major centres, except in epigraphic volume.

A corollary attaches to the apparent automatic co-optation of Numidia's legates, which the analysis presented above has tried to establish. SALLER (op. cit. [n.9] 161)

⁵³ See n.22 and 24 under Lambaesis for references. Deducting the 4 texts erected by non-military clients (2734, 2743, 2754, AE 1917/18. 73) the total of all such texts is 44. No dedications by clients from the military to legates are attested outside Lambaesis. Note that the list given by R.P.SALLER, op. cit. (n.9) 195–9 is deficient.

⁵⁴ See H.G.PFLAUM, *Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise*, Paris 1978, 39ff. The text does not appear in B.THOMASSON, *Praesides provinciarum Africae*, *Opuscula Romana* VII, 1969, 163–211. PFLAUM makes no suggestion for line 21; 1812 reads [*– II vi*]*rum qq.* Two other possible clients from this milieu were a *sacerdos* and an *actor et notarius*, who erected dedications *pro salute legati* (2637, AE 1955. 80).

⁵⁵ Diana – (1) AE 1934. 26, (2) 4600 and AE 1933. 70; Thamugadi – (1) BACTH 1909. 109 n.8 and AE 1985. 881d, (2) 2393. The status of another client at Cirta (ILAlg II 658) was undefined. He is perhaps also an advocate or a member of the *ordo*, rather than of military rank.

⁵⁶ For a possible literary reference to a Numidian legate's assistance in the business transactions of a private citizen (an *amicus* of Fronto), see SALLER, op. cit. (n.9) 158–64, citing Fronto, ad amic. 1, 9. SALLER's account of the personal relations between legate and private client (ibid.) is particularly good.

has put forward the view that «the existence of a link between private and public patronage is likely, owing to the personal nature of the governor's administration», although he was unwilling to propose how the process worked. If automatic co-optation be accepted as normal practice in Numidia's six major client cities between the years 100–268, the interconnection between personal and municipal patronage – at least for legates without prior attachments and interests in the region – can only have developed after co-optation, the rôle of private clients possibly tending to benefit one of the legate's client communities over another.⁵⁷

Department of Classics
University of Tasmania
GPO Box 252c
Hobart Tasmania 7001
Australia

Appendix
Numidian Legates Recorded as Municipal Patrons

	<i>name and rank</i>	<i>client</i>	<i>date</i>	<i>reference</i>	W	E	H ⁵⁸
1	L. Minicius L. f. Gal. Natalis	Cirta IV	103–5	7069 cf. ILAlg II 659	165	184	–
2	A. Larcus A. filius Quirina Priscus	Thamugadi	109	17891 cf. D 1055	170	153	193
3	P. Metilius P. f. Cla. Secundus Pon[tianus?]	Thamugadi	121	(1) 17844 (2) AntAfr 21, 1985, 104 cf. AE 1985. 873	166	154	191 409
4	Sex. Iulius Maior	Thamugadi	125–6	(1) 17845b–c cf. MEFr 65, 1953, 114–18 (2) MEFr 65, 1953, 115–18 (3) AntAfr 25, 1989, 192	169	156	191 409
5	Q. Planius L. f. Fal. Sardus L. Varius Ambibulus	Cuicul	132–3	D 9486 cf. AE 1911. 111 cf. 1966. 545	168	198	233
6	anon.	Thamugadi	134	AE 1920. 121	167	155	–

⁵⁷ I would like to express my indebtedness to the helpful suggestions of Professor P. R. C. WEAVER and Dr. P. A. GALLIVAN during the preparation of this paper.

⁵⁸ W, E, and H stand for WARMINGTON, ENGESSER and HARMAND, whose works are referred to in n. 9.

	<i>name and rank</i>	<i>client</i>	<i>date</i>	<i>reference</i>	W	E	H
7	T. Caesernius [T.] f. Palat. Staius Quintius Staius Memmius Macrinus	Thamugadi	141	(1) 17849 cf. MEFr 65, 1953, 118–9 n. 17 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 109 cf. AE 1985. 874 (2) 17850?	173	157	191 296 409
7a	"	Cirta IV	141	7036 cf. D 1068 cf. ILAlg II 623	174	185	191 296 409
8	C. Ulpius Pacatus Prastina Messalinus	Thamugadi	143–6	(1) 17851 cf. 17860 cf. MEFr 65, 1953, 120–2 n. 19 (2) AE 1902. 146 (3) 17893 (4) BACTH 1921. CL III n. 1 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 111 n. 1 cf. AE 1985. 875 a (5) AntAfr 21, 1985, 112 n. 2 cf. MEFr 65, 1953, 119 n. 18 cf. AE 1985. 875 b	175	158	192 296 384 409
9	L. Novius Crispinus Martialis Saturninus	Thamugadi	146–9	(1) 17894 (2) 17852 (3) 17853?	176	159	192 296 398 410 540
9a	"	Diana Vetera- norum	149	AE 1930. 40	177	210	192 296 410 540
10	M. Valerius Etruscus	Thamugadi	151–2	(1) D5351 cf. AE 1899.3 (2) 17854+17856+17912 cf. AE 1954. 151 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 117 n. 2 cf. AE 1985. 876 b (3) 17855 (4) AntAfr 21, 1985, 116 n. 1 cf. AE 1985. 876 a (5) AntAfr 21, 1985, 117– 8 n. 3 cf. AE 1985. 876 c (6) AntAfr 21, 1985, 118 n. 4 cf. AE 1985. 876 d? (7) AntAfr 21, 1985, 118 n. 5 cf. 17923? (8) AntAfr 25, 1989, 194 n. 3?	178	160	192 398 542 546

	<i>name and rank</i>	<i>client</i>	<i>date</i>	<i>reference</i>	W	E	H
11	L. Matuccius Fuscinus	Thamugadi	158	(1) 17858 (2) 2376 cf. AE 1940. 19 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 120 n.2 cf. AE 1985. 877b	179	161	192 410
12	D. Fonteius D. f. Frontinianus L. Stertinus Rufinus	Cuicul	160-1	AE 1925. 23-4 cf. 1949. 40 cf. L. LESCHI, Etudes, 165-7	-	199	192 292 296 398 410
12a	"	Diana Veterano- rum	162	(1) 4589 (2) AE 1933. 69 (3) 4599	183	211	192-3 292 296 410
12b	"	Verecunda	162	4232	185	215	193 296
13	C. Maesius C. f. Picatianus	Diana Veterano- rum	165	18648 cf. 4592 cf. RA Alg 1893. 191-2 n. 198 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 123 n. 6 cf. BACTH 1932-3. 434-5	186	212	193 410
13a	"	Thamugadi	164	17865 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 122 cf. AE 1985. 878	184	162	193 398 410
14	M. Luccius Torquatus Bassia- nus	Thamugadi	167-9	(1) AntAfr 2, 1968, 201-2 cf. AE 1968. 647 (2) 17866 cf. AntAfr 2, 1968, 216 n. 2? (3) AntAfr 2, 1968, 217 n. 4? (4) AntAfr 2, 1968, 217-8 n. 5? (5) AntAfr 2, 1968, 215 n. 1? (6) AntAfr 2, 1968, 218- 9 n. 9 cf. AE 1909. n. 6? (7) AntAfr 2, 1968, 219 n. 10?	-	-	-
15	C. Modius Iustus	Thamugadi	171	2373 cf. AE 1916. 86 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 124 cf. AE 1985. 879	182	163	-
16	M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus	Verecunda	172	18497	181	216	193 292 410
16a	"	Cuicul	172-5	BACTH 1915. 124 n. 1	190	200	193

	<i>name and rank</i>	<i>client</i>	<i>date</i>	<i>reference</i>	W	E	H
16b	"	Thamugadi	172-5	(1) 17869 (2) AntAfr 21, 1985, 126 n.1 cf. AE 1985. 880a cf. BACTH 1910. 123 (3) AntAfr 21, 1985, 127- 8 n.2 cf. AE 1985. 880b	189	164	193 410
17	A.IuliusA.f.Corn. Pompilius Piso T.Vib[ius] Laevillus [-]atus Berenicianus	Cuicul	178	(1) AE 1911. 103 (2) AE 1916. 30 (3) AE 1916. 31	191	201	203
18	M.Valerius Maxi- mianus, M.Valeri Maximiani qq. sacerdotalis fil.	Cuicul	183-4	AE 1920. 16 cf. 1935. 45	193	202	-
18a	"	Diana Vetera- norum	183-4	AE 1956. 124 cf. 1957. sub 117 cf. 1959. sub 247 cf. 1959. 183 cf. 1962. 381, 390.	192	194	193 cf.227
19	Ti. Claudius Gordianus	Cuicul	187-90	8326	197	203	193-4
19a	"	Verecunda	187-90	4230	196	217	193
20	C.Iulius (Scapula) Lepidus Tertullus	Cuicul	194	AE 1917-18. 70	-	204	193
21	Q.Anicius Faustus	Cirta IV	197	(1) 19495 cf. ILAlg II 566 (2) 6048 cf. 6049	198	189	194 292-3 295-6 398 410
21a	"	Lambaesis	197-201	(1) 18256 cf. AE 1967. 567 (2) BACTH 1918. 85 n.3 (3) AE 1911. 99	199	222	194 292-3 295-6 398 410
21b	"	Thamugadi	197-9	(1) 17870 cf. D 446 (2) AE 1894. 44 (3) 17871 cf. AntAfr 21, 1985, 133-5 n.3 cf. AE 1985. 881c (4) 17940 AntAfr 21, 1985, 129 n.1 cf. AE 1985. 881a (5) AntAfr 21, 1985, 131- 3 n.2 cf. AE 1985. 881b	200	165	194 292-3 295-6 398 410 411

	<i>name and rank</i>	<i>client</i>	<i>date</i>	<i>reference</i>	W	E	H
21 c	"	Cuicul	199	(1) BACTH 1916. 232-3 n. 4 (2) AE 1911. 106	201	205	194 292-3 295-6
22	anon.	Thamugadi	198-211	2367	-	166	-
23	L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus	Cirta IV	226	19131 cf. ILAlg II 6518	209	190	194 337
24	P. Iulius Iunianus Martalianus (signo) Leontius	Cirta	227-30	7049 cf. D 1177 cf. ILAlg II 633	211	191	194
24 a	"	Thamugadi	227-30	2392 cf. D 1178	210	167	194
24 b	"	castellum Tidditano- rum	227-30	ILAlg II 3604 cf. AE 1942-3. 7 cf. 1969-70. 692	-	209	194 398-9
25	M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (signo) Arzygius	Lambaesis	247	2611 cf. AE 1951. 121	212	223	194 397-8
26	C. Iulius Sallustius Saturni[nus] Fortunatianus	Cuicul	261-2	AE 1971. 510	-	-	-
27	[---]nus	Cuicul	103-262	BACTH 1911. 110 n. 1.	-	-	-
28	anon.	Cuicul	103-262	BACTH 1915. 134 n. 24	-	-	-
29	anon.	Thamugadi	161-235	2375	-	-	-