

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLVIII

HELSINKI 2014

INDEX

NEIL ADKIN	<i>Some Recent "Improvements" to the Text of Jerome's Letter 52, "On Sacerdotal Lifestyle"</i>	11
NECİP FİKİRİ ALİCAN	<i>Rethought Forms: How Do They Work?</i>	25
LUIGI ARATA	<i>Usi medici dell'Anagyris foetida nella medicina greca</i>	57
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>True Patriots? The Public Activities of the *Augustales of Roman Ostia and the summa honoraria</i>	67
GIUSEPPE CAMODECA	<i>Un nuovo consularis Byzacenae di tardo IV secolo e i Tannonii di Puteoli</i>	93
ANTONIO CORSO	<i>Retrieving the Style of Cephisodotus the Younger</i>	109
LEE FRATANTUONO	<i>Saevit medio in certamine: Mars in the Aeneid</i>	137
SEPPO HEIKKINEN	<i>Copy-paste Metrics? Lupus of Ferrières on Boethius</i>	165
PANU HYPPÖNEN	<i>4π = 12.5? – The Problems in the Vitruvian Hodometer</i>	185
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Two Greek Documents on Bronze (IG XIV 954; IG XIV 955 = IGUR 4)</i>	205
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Some Steps Towards Plato's Ecopolitics in the Laws</i>	211
ANTTI LAMPINEN	<i>Fragments from the 'Middle Ground' – Posidonius' Northern Ethnography</i>	229
JARI PAKKANEN	<i>A Reappraisal of the First Publication of Stirrup Jar Inscriptions from Tiryns by Johannes Sundwall: Photographs, Lost Sherds and the 'a-nu-to/no-di-zo Workshop'</i>	261
GIORGOS C. PARASKEVIOTIS	<i>Verg. ecl. 6,13–30. Mimic Humour in Silenus' Scene</i>	279
ELINA PYY	<i>In Search of Peer Support: Changing Perspectives on Sisterhood in Roman Imperial Epic</i>	295
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Some Published, But Not Very Well Known Latin Inscriptions</i>	319

HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXCII– CCCI</i>	347
PIETRO VERZINA	<i>L'esordio ἦν ὅτε (Cypria fr. 1,1 Bernabé) e le sue connotazioni narrative</i>	415
VILLE VUOLANTO	<i>Children in the Roman World: Cultural and Social Perspectives. A Review Article</i>	435
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	451
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	575
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	581
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	587

**TRUE PATRIOTS?
THE PUBLIC ACTIVITIES OF THE *AUGUSTALES
OF ROMAN OSTIA AND THE *SUMMA HONORARIA* ***

CHRISTER BRUUN

1. The **Augustales* in the Roman world

The *Augustales* constitute an important group in what anachronistically could be called the Roman "middle class".¹ They had their own association in most towns in Roman Italy, and they frequently appear elsewhere too in the Roman West. The titles of the men who belonged to essentially similar local organizations vary somewhat, so that we find *Augustales*, *seviri Augustales*, *magistri Augustales*, *quattuorviri Augustales*, and still other varieties. Modern scholarship commonly makes use of the blanket term **Augustales* as a collective denominator for these several categories.² The term was coined by Robert Duthoy, who is the author of

* Much of my research on Ostia has been supported by a Standard Research Grant awarded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRCC), and my research on freedmen by a SSHRCC Insight Grant, which is gratefully acknowledged. Part of this paper was presented at a conference at the University of Gothenburg in 2012, organized by the "Inscripta" network; sincere thanks are due to the organizers and the other participants. My work was much facilitated by a stay at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae and by its Intendent Simo Örmä. I am grateful to Mika Kajava, Olli Salomies, Heikki Solin, and the referees for helpful comments, and to Alexander Kirby, MA, for improving my English; remaining errors are my own.

¹ I use this term in a purely technical sense here, to denote a layer of population which in social status and probably often financially is situated between the leading *ordo decurionum* and the rest of the population in towns of Roman Italy.

² Duthoy 1978, 1265–6, 1300–1; Abramenko 1993, 11 n. 1, 87–9 for other similar organizations at the local level, such as the *Apollinares*, *Martini*, and *Mercuriales*, the social composition of which was similar to that of the **Augustales*; cf. Mouritsen 2006, 238–40.

a number of still essential studies on these groups.³ The **Augustales* recruited the vast majority of their members from among the wealthy local freedmen in Roman cities and towns.⁴ In some places, such as Ostia, the membership of the **Augustales* almost exclusively consisted of freed slaves, to judge from the surviving evidence.⁵

Besides some literary references in the *Cena Trimalchionis* episode of Petronius' *Satyrical*, the **Augustales* are known almost exclusively from epigraphic evidence.⁶ Latin inscriptions provide evidence for some two thousand individuals who belong in this group.⁷

The position or rank of *Augustalis* first appears during the reign of Augustus, from 12 BCE onwards when the *princeps* became *pontifex maximus*. The *Augustales* were supposed to take part in cult practices, or, to cite a recent brief synthesis by John Scheid, to be in charge of the local cult of the *Genius Augusti*, the *Numen Augusti*, and the *Lares Augusti*. Slightly different views of their role in the field of cultic activities have been expressed in recent scholarship as well,⁸

³ See Duthoy 1978, with reference to earlier works by the same author; cf. note 17 below. Individuals using the plain title *sevir* belonged to a different organization and will not concern me here, as they are not found at Ostia. Abramenko 1993, 13–42 shows that although *seviri* and **Augustales* belonged to different organizations, their social background was very similar.

⁴ *Magistri Augustales*, *Augustales*, and *seviri Augustales* do not appear in the city of Rome; it is thought that in the capital, the *vicomagistri* or *magistri vici* had a corresponding function; thus Duthoy 1978, 1290–91.

⁵ The *Vivir Augustalis* T. Tettius C.f. Lenus in *AE* 1996, 295 represents one of the few examples of freeborn **Augustales* from Ostia; C. Calpurnius C.f. Celer in *CIL* XIV 4562,3 is another, as acknowledged by Abramenko 1993, 228, although on pp. 18, 20 he seems to indicate that there are no *ingenui* among the Ostian **Augustales*.

⁶ Petr. 30,1–2; 65,3–5; 71,12. See also the scholia cited in n. 8.

⁷ Numbers in Duthoy 1976 and Duthoy 1978, 1258 n. 30, who included also the plain *seviri*, who can be difficult to separate from the *seviri Augustales*. Abramenko 1993, 336–9 added some two hundred new inscriptions, and in his tables on pp. 18–9 the number of **Augustales* is c. 1870 (the figure for Ostia is much too low, see n. 18), while the *seviri* number over nine hundred.

⁸ Ostrow 1990; Scheid 1997; Linderski 2007; cf. Duthoy 1978, 1259 nn. 33–4, with reference to Keller 1904, 158 = Ps.-Acro, *ad Hor. serm.* 2,3,281: *iusserat enim Augustus in compitis deos Penates constitui, ut studiosius colerentur. Erant autem libertini sacerdotes qui Augustales dicebantur*, and Hauthal 1866, 278 = Porphyryon, *ad Hor. serm.* 2,3,281: *ab Augusto enim Lares, id est dii domestici in compitis positi sunt, et libertini sacerdotes dati, qui Augustales appellati sunt*.

but the precise cultic purpose and nature of the **Augustales* associations is not central to my paper and does not require a detailed discussion here.

An important fact is that the **Augustales* were involved in many activities, both cultic and profane, individually or as a body. Surveying the whole range of these activities in a particular context constitutes the topic of this paper. This study is part of a larger project aiming at charting civic participation and civic identity in Rome's harbour town Ostia. It has been claimed that Ostia suffered from a deficit of public buildings, allegedly a result of the lack of interest among its inhabitants in the wellbeing and flourishing of their town, to which, so the argument goes, most were newcomers. The wealthier residents felt that they were in transition, as they either hoped to move to the nearby *Urbs* or possibly to return to their place of origin. Members of the elite, who elsewhere in the Roman world during the High Empire tended to shower their community with benefactions, at Ostia were uninterested in spending their fortunes on civic building projects, leading to a relative lack of urban development.⁹

Against this background, the actions and behaviour of the *Augustales* assumes a wider importance, since they constitute a significant segment of the population, for which, moreover, a good number of sources is available. With over six thousand known inscriptions, Ostia provides rich epigraphic evidence on the *Augustales*, in many regards more than is available in any other town in the Roman world. This paper, therefore, aims to investigate the public actions of the **Augustales*, their collective or individual impact on their town.

The common view is that, except for a few early plain *Augustales*, starting in the late first century CE all members of this group at Ostia held the title of *sevir Augustalis*.¹⁰ There is newly discovered evidence which challenges this neat scheme, since some plain *Augustales* now appear to have been active after the appearance of the *seviri Augustales*, but discussing this matter is a topic for a future study as it does not affect the argument below.¹¹

The **Augustales* in the Roman world, being predominantly freedmen, suffered from a serious handicap when aiming for broad social recognition and advancement. The *lex Visellia* of 24 CE did not allow *liberti* to become *decuriones*

⁹ Heinzelmann 2002, 119–20, who detects a trend towards more investments from local residents possibly setting in towards the end of the second century CE.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Meiggs 1973, 217–22; Cébeillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 195–6.

¹¹ In particular, the interesting new inscription in Marinucci 2007 (= *AE* 2009, 192) has been added to the previously known evidence.

and, hence, to have a public career in their municipality.¹² Thus, from Tiberius' reign onwards freedmen could never aspire to become officially recognized leaders of their towns and fellow citizens. Instead, it is thought — and surely rightly — that local associations of **Augustales* came to provide a venue to engage in public life for these self-made men, successful and wealthy. It is of course true that since the *Augustales* appeared before the *lex Visellia* of 24 CE, their existence cannot be seen as a direct response to the law's exclusion of freedmen from positions in local government.¹³ Yet, the local **Augustales* associations may have come to assume the role of safety valve, channelling the energy of upwards moving social strata of Roman society, thereby helping to keep social peace in local towns. As an **Augustalis*, a nouveau-riche freedman could gain social prestige and feel satisfaction and loyalty towards the prevailing social order; any thoughts of invoking sudden changes would have less traction among these men who had already risen above most of their peers. This is the common sociological and psychological explanation for the significance of the **Augustalitas*, and it is quite a compelling one.¹⁴

At Ostia, there is rich evidence for the **Augustales*, which has never been properly collected or discussed in its entirety. Russell Meiggs dedicated a mere six pages to the **Augustales* in his classic monograph on Ostia,¹⁵ while a partial treatment can be found in John D'Arms's monograph on commerce and social standing from 1981, in which he presented and discussed some of the most ex-

¹² The law is documented in *Codex Iustinianus* IX 21; Abramenko 1993, 49. Only freeborn citizens could be elected to municipal magistracies according to ch. 54 of the so-called *Lex Malacitana*, which is a copy of the Flavian municipal law given to a number of towns with Italic rights; see González 1986, 163, 188, 215.

¹³ This point is made by Abramenko 1993, 49–50.

¹⁴ See, for instance, Ostrow 1990, 365, 375–6. However, Mouritsen 2006, 242–3 professes disagreement with the common explanation for the function of the **Augustalitas*, although his own explanation for this phenomenon is not at odds with the standard view; cf. Mouritsen 2011, 259–60. Abramenko 1993, 44–57 set out from the fact that in Northern Italy a good portion of *ingenui* are found as members of the **Augustales*, at least within a century of the creation of these organizations (p. 18). On this basis, he refuted the theory that the **Augustalitas* was intended to integrate *liberti* into the social and political structures of the Principate. The error here is not to realize that these local organizations could equally well integrate a surplus of wealthy local freeborn men who were unable to find a space in the *ordo decurionum*. In many places, the **Augustales* were overwhelmingly freedmen from the inception, and in other places they tended to be recruited from among the *liberti* to an ever larger extent as the Principate advanced.

¹⁵ Meiggs 1973, 217–22.

tensive inscriptions mentioning **Augustales*, while giving a list of 119 members of the organization.¹⁶ Yet, because there are altogether over four hundred **Augustales* from Ostia known by name, D'Arms evidently omitted much material. Robert Duthoy collected all the evidence available in his day, but his general overviews cannot do justice to a single town.¹⁷ Andriak Abramenko presumably had an up-to-date database on which he based his many perceptive and acute comments, but in his statistical tables he did not include all the Ostian **Augustales* either (but only about a third of them).¹⁸ More recently, Henrik Mouritsen presented some controversial views on the **Augustales* and their significance, but it was never his intention to provide a comprehensive discussion.¹⁹ On several occasions, Alfredo Marinucci has published inscriptions which add significantly to our knowledge of Ostian **Augustales*,²⁰ while the recent franco-italian epigraphic manual presents a brief synthesis of the **Augustales* association at Ostia and reveals that further relevant texts await publication.²¹

2. Which actions of the **Augustales* count as "benefactions"? The *summa honoraria* as "evergetism"

In total, some twenty-five inscriptions are known in which we find the Ostian **Augustales* performing some public activity, either as a collective or individually. This aspect of the impact of the **Augustales* at Ostia has to my knowledge not been investigated before.²² It will be done here with an eye to evaluating to

¹⁶ D'Arms 1981, 128–40 discussed many aspects of the social position and professional activities of the *Augustales* at Ostia and Puteoli, without aiming for completeness, with a list of the Ostian ones on p. 177–9.

¹⁷ See Duthoy 1974; Duthoy 1976; Duthoy 1978.

¹⁸ Cf. note 7 above. Abramenko 1993, 18 registered 156 **Augustales* from Ostia with the rationale "Berücksichtigt wurden hier natürlich nur Inschriften, in denen einzelne **Augustales* genannt werden, nicht aber solche, in denen sie kollektiv (etwa bei *divisiones*) auftreten"; cf. 233. According to this definition, also the men listed in the so-called *fasti et alba Augustalium* (CIL XIV 4560–63) ought to have been considered, as indeed they were in Abramenko 1992. See further Abramenko 1993, 227–33 for a chapter wholly dedicated to the Ostian **Augustales*.

¹⁹ Mouritsen 2006; 2011, 250–61.

²⁰ Marinucci 1992; Marinucci 2007.

²¹ Cébeillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 195–6; similarly Marinucci 2012, 43–4.

²² D'Arms 1981, 128–33 focused on the business connections of the known *Augustales* and

what extent the **Augustales* can be found acting as benefactors, i.e. engaging in "evergetism", in the Ostian community.

Before surveying the evidence, some words need to be said about the view, voiced on several occasions in recent years when the topic of private benefactions in the municipal context is encountered, that actions which were required in order to achieve membership among the *seviri Augustales* ("die bloße Pflichtleistung", in Abramenko's words), expressed with the formula *ob honorem* and carried out instead of paying the *summa honoraria* or membership fee, should not be counted as "evergetism".²³ While this issue is of little importance at Ostia, since such expressions almost never appear in Ostian inscriptions, they occur elsewhere in Italy, and for comparative purposes (which will become clear below) it is important to be clear about the nature of such actions.

The background for this view can be briefly sketched. Roman towns required of men who took on leading municipal positions to pay an entrance fee, a *summa honoraria*, for their distinction. That the town councillors, the *decuriones*, did so in most cases is generally assumed, although this issue has not received much attention lately.²⁴ More attention has recently been paid to the *summa honoraria* which the annual magistrates (*duoviri, aediles, quaestores*) contributed to their town's treasury during their year in office. This sum could be used for the benefit of their fellow citizens, for instance, by paying for spectacles. A similar requirement applied to elected holders of high-ranking municipal priestly offices.²⁵ As for the **Augustales*, there are several indications that they were elected by the town council, the *decuriones*, and there are a few texts that refer to the *summa honoraria* which elected **Augustales* needed to pay into the *arca* of the town. We hear about the system only on the occasions when either an **Augustalis* boasted about having been relieved of this financial burden, as a sign

on their ties to various commercial and professional organizations. Abramenko 1993, 142–6 surveyed the evergetism, in South-Central Italy, of what he calls the "municipale Mittelschicht", in which the **Augustales* play the most important role, but he does not focus on Ostia, the discussion lacks details, and some material is omitted.

²³ Duthoy 1978, 1270 n. 112; Abramenko 1993, 142–3. The difference between "real evergetism" and costs connected to officeholding was more recently and forcefully stressed by Eck 1997, 307–9, where, however, the emphasis was on the *summa honoraria* of municipal magistrates; followed by Campedelli 2014, 73–7, without distinction between actions by magistrates and by **Augustales*.

²⁴ Liebenam 1900, 54–5; Garnsey 1970, 311–23 with important distinctions.

²⁵ Liebenam 1900, 54–65; Garnsey 1970, 323–5; Duncan-Jones 1982, 82–8 and 107–10 (North Africa), 147–55 and 215–7 (Italy); Eck 1997, 307–9.

of esteem by the *decuriones*, or when an **Augustalis* is taking credit for some public work or expenditure that he carried out *ob honorem Augustalitat*is (some similar expressions also occur).²⁶

This situation is well known and often commented upon, but to my knowledge it has not generated much discussion in the period of modern scholarship on the **Augustalitas* initiated by Duthoy's still fundamental works. Undoubtedly the terms *ob honorem* and *summa honoraria* occur in some inscriptions concerning **Augustales*, but, as shall be argued here, the **Augustales* were not in the same position as municipal *decuriones* or magistrates when they took on these expenses. I find it surprising that there has been little discussion about the view that such contributions from **Augustales* should not count as benefactions or "evergetism".²⁷

First, it is to some extent an arbitrary decision not to count a *summa honoraria* which an **Augustalis* used for public works (or spectacles) as an act of evergetism. Why should it not be considered as an expense that someone made voluntarily for the benefit of his fellow townspeople? When someone shouldered the responsibilities of a *sevir Augustalis*, this happened because of a conscious personal choice. The person knew that he was expected to contribute a certain sum to the community once he accepted his new rank. This was a deliberate action, different from other situations when someone's money entered the town's or the state's treasury, as, for instance, when taxes were collected, or duties on imported or exported goods were paid. There were laws and bylaws establishing what taxes and duties had to be paid, and these regulations concerned everyone who resided in and/or conducted business in the town; there was no place for personal choice here. In contrast, any person could choose whether to aim for the position of **Augustalis* or not, and it must remain doubtful whether any freedman's livelihood would have been seriously threatened had he chosen not to accept the position of *sevir Augustalis*. Thus, we are truly dealing with a matter of choice here.²⁸

²⁶ For the sources, see Duthoy 1978, 1266–7; Abramenko 1993, 142–54 (including actions that the author disqualifies as "evergetism", as well as examples of *bona fide* munificence).

²⁷ Some vague hesitation about the views expressed in Eck 1997 can be found in Goffin 2002, 11, 24–5; her actual study of evergetism by **Augustales* (pp. 197–201) does not seem to make any distinction between evergetic deeds *ob honorem* and others; cf. n. 23.

²⁸ To illustrate the difference between a tax or customs due and the *summa honoraria* which was expected from a leading **Augustalis*: if someone wanted to avoid paying, for instance, the *portorium* tax, this could only be achieved by changing one's profession from being involved in import/export to something else. A wealthy freedman who declined to perform as an **Augustalis* did not face a similarly existential threat to his livelihood.

Second, a survey of the mechanism behind the system of collecting the *summa honoraria* will show that whenever this term (or a similar one) appears in connection with some public engagement by an **Augustalis*, we must assume that a voluntary expenditure of private funds by the person in question had also taken place, in addition to the established *summa honoraria*.

Current scholarship holds that the election of a new *sevir Augustalis* was supposed to lead to the influx of perhaps 2,000 *sestertii* as an entry fee into the town's coffers.²⁹ This means that the money was then at the disposal of the magistrates of the town, normally the *duoviri* and certain lesser magistrates, and the sum is considered to have been a welcome addition to the municipal funds.³⁰ What, then, would have led the town council and its leaders to forego this income? Where is the advantage in allowing a hopeful new **Augustalis*, in a certain sense still an outsider,³¹ to either offer public spectacles in his own name or carry out public works on his own, which would allow him to take full credit for its completion through a commemorative inscription, albeit while probably adding, at the bottom, the standard bland formula *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* – "by decision of the town council"? Why would the *duoviri* or other local leaders not want to be in charge of the money and the project, so as to be able to add to their own prestige?

Where is the "*quid pro quo*" in this kind of affair? If it was the case that in every town a fixed *summa honoraria* had to be paid for entry into the **Augustalitas*, one must assume that there was a clear advantage for the town in allowing a presumptive **Augustalis* to convert the fee into some activity that had a public impact. He must have been willing to spend more, with the knowledge that by being responsible for public works (or public spectacles) he would gain local authority and prestige – and these are precisely the same motives which drove regular "evergetism" in the Roman world.³²

²⁹ Duncan-Jones 1982, 152 with several examples.

³⁰ Liebenam 1900, 251–68 on the town council and the magistrates making the decisions; Eck 1997, 307–9. The so-called *lex Irnitana*, published in 1986, increased our knowledge of the prerogatives of local magistrates and their interactions with the decurions, see chapters 79 and 82–3 with González 1986, 173–4, 194–5, 225–7.

³¹ Many scholars consider **Augustales* to have been indelibly marked by the *macula servitutis*, a view I do not necessarily share, but in any case they were clearly not yet members of the officially recognized ruling elite.

³² This scenario admittedly sets out from the assumption that membership among the **Augustales* was a desirable distinction. On the contrary, if there was no interest in the **Augustalitas*

It will not do to argue that the organization of Roman towns was often so rudimentary that they were at the mercy of energetic entrepreneurs, as the **Augustales* are supposed to have been, if they wanted a street paved or a basilica repaired. Even if towns had no large work force of their own to employ, any necessary work contract would simply have been put out for tender, surely using the same procedure as an **Augustalis* would do.

3. The activities of the **Augustales* at Ostia

The discussion of what constitutes municipal evergetism is important to the discussion of the Ostian evidence and the actions of **Augustales* elsewhere in Italy which follows. At Ostia itself there are, to my knowledge, no such contentious cases that need to be dealt with. One instance may be represented by the following fragmentary inscription, which leaves us completely in the dark about the action that may have been carried out: [-----] *Maxi[mus ---] / [sevir Aug.] idem q(uin)q(uennalis) co[---] / [---]m ob hono[rem ---] / [---] quinquenn[alitat]is / [-----]* (CIL XIV 384, now in the Vatican Museum); another similar text is also known.³³

Excluding, for obvious reasons, simple epitaphs, the relevant inscriptions are the following ones:

1. CIL XIV 8 = ILS 6154: the *curator Augustalium* M. Cornelius Epagathus in 141 CE dedicates a statuette to the *genius coloniae Ostiensium* and distributes the sum of one *denarius*, presumably to his fellow **Augustales* who are present at the inauguration.³⁴

among the well-to-do population and the town council believed that they needed to coopt new **Augustales*, they may, to be sure, have devised a system whereby freedmen were allowed to carry out various projects, the costs of which were considerably lower than the official *summa honoraria*, instead of paying the fee. Perhaps such a situation developed later in the third century CE, but I presume it was not the case during the High Empire, from which most of our documentation derives. Yet, even in this hypothetical situation, if the **Augustalitas* had become nothing but a burden, joining the college and paying for the membership meant that the person who did so was willing to spend money on matters that benefited the community; this too is akin to evergetism.

³³ Published by Laird 2000, 53, as [co]rporis[---] / C. Clodi[us ---] / sevir Au[g(ustalis) ---] / ob honorem qui[nquennalitat]is ---] / C. Clodi M[---/---]idm[---].

³⁴ This inscription is quoted, translated, and discussed in Bruun (2014). Abramenko 1993, 145 assumes that the whole free male population at Ostia would have benefited, wherefore

2. *CIL* XIV 12: the *sevir Augustalis* and *curator (Augustalium)* A. Livius [---] dedicates a statuette to the *genius sevirum [Augustalium] Ost[iensium]*.

3. *CIL* XIV 33:³⁵ the *Vivir Augustalis* and *quinquennalis honoratus* T. Annius Lucullus donates a *signum Martis* to the *dendrophor(i) Ostiensium* in 143 CE.

4. *CIL* XIV 367 = *ILS* 6164: the *seviri Augustales* decided to honour one of their leading members P. Horatius Chryseros with the erection of a statue, because he had donated 50,000 *sestertii* to their treasury, the interest of which was to be used for the benefit of the *Augustales* and to decorate his statue on his birthday. Horatius Chryseros replied by distributing a gift of money to the town's *decuriones* and to the *Augustales* (this is the term used) at the dedication of his statue in 182 CE, and by taking on the cost of erecting the statue.

5. *CIL* XIV 373: the *ordo Augustalium* honours L. Licinius L.f. Pal. Herodes, a meritorious *eques Romanus* who had held many local offices and is called an *optimus civis*, probably with a statue.

6. *CIL* XIV 431: a long inscription reveals that in honour of a person, whose name is missing, the [*ordo Augustalium*] passed a decree to erect a statue of him (*huic ... [statu]am decrevit*). The honorand, who very likely, as we shall see, was called Q. Veturius (no hypothesis concerning his *cognomen* is possible), responded by donating 50,000 *sestertii* to the treasury (*arca*) of the organization, with the instruction that every year on his birthday, there would be a distribution of money to those present from the interest generated by this sum while the statue would be decorated. The inscription further records that two individuals, Veturia Q.f. Rufina and Q. Veturius Q.f. Felix Socrates, the latter among other distinctions a *decurio* at Ostia, shouldered the cost of erecting the statue (which makes it likely that their father was the honorand), while Q. Veturius Felicissimus, a freedman and *sevir Augustalis quinquennalis* and *curator* of that *ordo* (i.e., the **Augustales*), was in charge (*curante*) of a distribution of cash to the *decurions* and the *Augustales* on the occasion of the inauguration of the statue. The role played by the latter makes it very likely that it was the association of the **Augustales* which bestowed honours on this distinguished person.

7. *CIL* XIV 451 = *AE* 1987, 176a: the [*sevir*] *Augustalis* and *q(uin)-[q(uennalis)]* A. Egrilius Faustus, together with one or two other men, honour

the cost to the benefactor would have been considerable. In my view, it is more likely that the **Augustales*, which still comprised several hundred members, would have been the target of the distribution.

³⁵ Vermaseren 1956, 135–6 no. 285.

Marcus Aurelius while the latter was still Caesar in the reign of Antoninus Pius. The plaque, inscribed on both sides (for the later text, see the following entry) may have decorated a statue basis.

8. *CIL* XIV 451 = *AE* 1987, 176b: in a fragmentary inscription, one M. Au[-] Ma[-], assumed to be a [*sevir Augustalis*] and [*q(uin)q(uennalis)*], honours the emperor Commodus sometime during the years 180/184 by having the plaque mentioned in the previous entry inscribed on the other side. The plaque may have been attached to a statue base.

9. *CIL* XIV 461: on a marble base, probably for a statue, which was dedicated in 239 CE, a total of seven **Augustales* of various rank (one *perpetuus*, three *quinquennales*, and four *curatores*) are listed as being in charge of this public activity.³⁶

10. *CIL* XIV 4293: the *Vivir Augustalis* and [*quinquennalis*] Q. Varius Secundus honours Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, based on a dream (*ex viso*), with the gift of ten statuettes of the Lares, made of silver, on an inscribed pedestal also of silver.

11. *CIL* XIV 4318:³⁷ the *Vivir Augustalis* P. Clodius Flavius Venerandus erects a dedication to the Numen Caeleste inspired by a dream (*somno monitus*).

12. *CIL* XIV 4333: in a very fragmentary inscription, likely from the later third century or the early fourth, it appears that a [*sevir(?) Augustali[s]*] is honouring an unidentified emperor.

13. *CIL* XIV 4341: the [*sevir(?) Augustale[s]*] honour the emperor Nerva in a partially preserved inscription of which no further content survives.³⁸

14. *CIL* XIV 4486a: this fragmentary inscription appears to record that the *sevir Augustales* honoured a *pa[tronus]* of theirs who was a *viator tribunicius*, i.e. an *apparitor* and perhaps therefore a Roman knight, and who had also received some kind of appreciation from the emperor Trajan.

³⁶ The text is discussed by Oliver 1958, 489–90. The inscription does not explicitly state that the men are **Augustales*, but some of them are known from other inscriptions in this capacity, and, as Oliver shows, their ranks are found only among the **Augustales*.

³⁷ Vermaseren 1956, 142 no. 304. There is a great likelihood that the same man is the author of another dedicatory inscription, to *Invictus Deus Sol Omnipotens* and several other deities in a fragmentary inscription found near the same Mithraeum from which the previous text stems; the name of the dedicatory inscription appears as V[enera]ndus (*CIL* XIV 4309).

³⁸ See Meiggs 1973, 219.

15. *CIL* XIV 4559: on a marble *cippus* (as described by the *CIL* editor Wickert; surely part of a larger ensemble), six **Augustales* are listed as acting in concert when the monument was dedicated in 242 CE.³⁹

16. *CIL* XIV 4624a:⁴⁰ the *ordo Augustalium* honours a performing artist, a *p[an]tomim[us sui temporis] primus*, probably with a statue; his father is also referred to with respect.

17. *CIL* XIV 4725: in a fragmentary inscription from 83 CE a *se[vi]r Aug(ustalis)* whose name does not survive clearly performs a public action, as the inscription contains the typical formula *dedic(ata/atum)* followed by the date.

18. *CIL* XIV 5322:⁴¹ the *viator [tribunicius]* and *Augustalis* (C. Iulius) Pot[hus] Nymphodoti l(ibertus) honours Drusus Caesar, called the son of the emperor Tiberius, grandson of Augustus and great-grandson of Divus Iulius, possibly with a statue (*posuit*).

19. *CIL* XIV 5328: the *sevir A[ugustalis]* M. Mar[ius ?] honours the son of the emperor Pius, i.e. the future emperor Marcus Aurelius, perhaps with a statue, in recognition of the success of his own son M. Ma[rius M.f. Pal.] Prim[itivus], on whom the *honor* of the *quinquennialitas* had been bestowed.⁴²

20. *CIL* XIV 5380 = *AE* 1987, 197: jointly with another man who precedes him in the inscription, the *Augustalis* P. Sulpicius Hera erects *sua p(ecunia)* an honorary inscription to L. Aelius Commodus (the future emperor Lucius Verus), the adopted son of the emperor Pius. The date appears to be c. 140 CE.⁴³

21. *AE* 1946, 214: the freedman Agathangelus, a *sevir Augustalis quinquennialis* honours his most worthy (*dignissimus*) *patronus* A. Livius Chryseros, who also is a *sevir Augustalis quinquennialis*.

³⁹ See Oliver 1958, 90–1 for a discussion of the rank of these men, who according to Oliver's convincing argument must be **Augustales*, although this is not explicitly stated.

⁴⁰ For the most recent improved presentation of this text, see C beillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 292–3 no. 88a–b.

⁴¹ The text is edited, with comment, by Marinucci 1992, 172 C 20.

⁴² The name can be restored with the help of the dedication *CIL* XIV 4553, in which the son M. Marius Primitivus appears as *decurionum decreto aedilis II sacris Volkani faciundis*. Since he was freeborn and engaged in a municipal career, the *quinquennialitas* mentioned can hardly refer to the **Augustales* organization, but was likely held in the *corpus traiectus Rusticeli*, with which he is connected in *CIL* XIV 4553–4 and which is also mentioned in the inscription listed here. See also Royden 1986, 93 no. 73, 242 (= *AE* 1989, 125).

⁴³ Thus Marinucci 1992, 201–2 C 65, who also provides a new accurate reading of the text. Earlier, an improved reading had been presented by Royden 1986, 243 (= *AE* 1989, 128). The two men are discussed in Royden 1986, 88–9 nos. 61–2.

22. *AE* 1988, 213:⁴⁴ the *sevir Augustalis* and *quinquennalis* M. Iulius Chrysophorus and his son M. Iulius Aelianus (also called Serapio) and M. Iulius Zosimus (probably his brother) and the latter's son M. Iulius Philippus honour Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Serapis and the Castores (i.e., Castor and Pollux) on account of a vow.

23. *AE* 1988, 215:⁴⁵ the *sevir Augustalis* and *quinquennalis* M. Iulius Chrysophorus and his son M. Iulius Aelianus (also called Serapio) and M. Iulius Zosimus (probably his brother) and the latter's son M. Iulius Philippus honour Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Serapis and Hercules on account of a vow.

24. *NSA* 1953, 299–301 no. 67: fragments of a broken marble plaque reveal that two men, Nymphodotus and Pothus N[ymphodoti lib.] repaired the *macellum*. Scholars are in agreement that we are dealing with the same Pothus as in no. 18 above, where he is identified as an *Augustalis*, as well as with his patron, who it is not known to have been an *Augustalis*.⁴⁶

The public actions of the **Augustales* and of their association, several times called the *ordo Augustalium*, broadly speaking belong to three categories, with a fourth category containing only one instance. There are seven dedications to various deities (nos. 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 22, 23), another seven honouring the emperor and members of his family (nos. 7, 8, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20), and six inscriptions that honour individuals of varying status (nos. 4, 5, 6, 14, 16, 21). Nos. 9 and 15 most probably belong in one of these categories as well. Finally, while the nature of the action mentioned in no. 17 cannot be determined, there is also one building inscription (24).

It has been suggested by Abramenko that also *CIL* XIV 404 provides information about an act of munificence concerning a public building at Ostia, carried out by a *sevir Augu[stalis] idem q(uin)q(uennalis)*, but the fragmentary inscription is in reality an epitaph which records that a man, [?]lius Pri[?], has built, *in area pura*, various structures such as a *portic[us]* that are part of a monumental tomb, which he ultimately leaves to his freedmen with the typical concluding phrase *[liber]tis lib[ertabusque] [poster]isq(ue) [eorum]*.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ See Bricault 2005, 590 no. 503/1129 for this text.

⁴⁵ See Bricault 2005, 590 no. 503/1130.

⁴⁶ See Bloch 1953, 299–301; Cébeillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 156–7, who note that new and as yet unpublished evidence shows that the inscription was recut in the Trajanic age, although the two benefactors were active in the late Augustan period.

⁴⁷ Abramenko 1993, 145. There is a clear parallel to this fragmentary inscription in *CIL* XIV 671, an epitaph also from Ostia, which, for instance, contains the phrase *aream puram cum*

As for the chronological distribution, over two thirds of the inscriptions contain internal evidence (a consular date or the mention of an emperor) which allows a fairly precise dating. The material reflects the general composition of the Ostian epigraphic evidence quite well: two texts are Augustan (18, 24), one Flavian (17), one dates to around 100 CE (13), one is Trajanic/Hadrianic (14), five belong in the middle of the second century (1, 3, 7, 19, 20), two date to *ca.* 180 CE (4, 8), three to the second quarter of the third century (5, 9, 15), one to the late third (16), and one to the late third/early fourth century (12). For the other seven texts a closer inspection of the physical context in some cases allows a closer dating, as with no. 21, dated to the second century on iconographic grounds,⁴⁸ and nos. 22–23, which are dated to the late second or early third century.⁴⁹ An archaeological study of the remaining four monuments might allow us to date them as well. The overall picture would hardly change: the inscriptions overwhelmingly belong to a period from the beginning of the second century to the end of the Severan period.

When evaluating the activities of the **Augustales*, it may also be relevant to study the individuals who receive honorific dedications. Emperors and members of the imperial family obviously play by far the greatest role, and it is well known that they were the objects of veneration from all segments of society that appear in inscriptions. Among the six individuals that the **Augustales* honour, individually or as a collective, there is, perhaps surprisingly, no senator. The highest-ranking honorand is instead an *eques Romanus*, encountered in the following inscription (*CIL* XIV 373 = *ILS* 6141):

L(ucio) Licinio L(uci) fil(io) Pal(atina
Herodi
equit(i) Rom(ano) decuriali
decuriae viatoriae
equestris co(n)s(ularis) decurioni
quinquennali duumviro
sacerdoti Geni col(oniae) flam(ini)
Rom(ae) et Aug(ustorum) curat(ori) oper(um) public(orum)

triclinio and is left by the builder Oceanus *in usu eiusdem Oceani et filiorum eius lib(ertis) libertabusq(ue) posterisq(ue) eor(um)*.

⁴⁸ Bollmann 1998, 337, with earlier scholarship: not before Trajan, perhaps even of Antonine date, on account of the statue that the inscribed base supported.

⁴⁹ Bricault 2005, 590.

quaestori aer(arii) aedili flam(ini)
divi Severi sodali Arulensi
praet(ori) prim(o) sac(ris) Volk(ani) faciu(ndis)
ordo Augustal(ium)
optimo civi ob merita

"To L. Licinius Herodes son of Lucius, of the Palatina voting tribe, Roman knight, a *decurialis* (member) of the *decuria* of mounted attendants of consuls, *decurio*, *duumvir* with censorial powers, priest of the cult of the *genius* of Ostia, *flamen* of the cult of Roma and the Augusti, *curator* of public buildings, quaestor of the treasury, aedile, *flamen* of the Deified Severus, *sodalis Arulensis* (a local priesthood),⁵⁰ first praetor of the cult of Vulcanus, the *ordo* of the *Augustales* (honoured) a foremost citizen on account of his merits."

The inscription is interesting for what it tells us about the public career and activities of the honorand, L. Licinius Herodes. Beginning his career as an *apparitor*, a "civil servant" in the capital, he is a good example of how such a position led to an entry into the equestrian order.⁵¹ The rest of Herodes' career played out at Ostia. Conspicuously, the inscription makes no mention of military charges or indeed of any imperial procuratorships. The contrast to the many honorific equestrian inscriptions found at Ostia is striking, which were erected for imperial equestrian officeholders by a variety of local organizations. The *corpus mercatorum frumentariorum*, for instance, honoured Q. Calpurnius Modestus (*CIL* XIV 161 = *ILS* 1427; mid-second century CE), while the *corpus mercatorum frumentariorum adiutorum et acceptorum* did the same for Q. Acilius Fuscus (*CIL* XIV 154 = *ILS* 1431; the Severan age). The *numerus caligatorum decuriarum XVI collegii fabrum tignuariorum Ostis* likewise honoured P. Bassilius Crescens with a statue (*CIL* XIV 160 = *ILS* 1428; c. 220 CE).⁵² While one might suggest that the

⁵⁰ Meiggs 1973, 340 suggests that the priesthood of *sodalis Arulensis* was instituted after the mid-second century CE.

⁵¹ On the *apparitores*, Purcell 1983 is the classic work; see p. 153 for Licinius Herodes, who was not included in the *RE* or *PIR*².

⁵² The two first examples can conveniently be found, accompanied by commentary and dating, in Cébeillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 233–6. On Bassilius Crescens, see Fora 1996, 33–34, who dates the inscription to 220/224 CE based on the 33rd *lustrum* of the *fabri tignuarii* of Ostia mentioned in the inscription.

Augustales were not prominent enough an organization to grant such an honour to an imperial procurator (though this must remain unproven), it remains a fact that in the case of Licinius Herodes, the person they decided to honour was someone who had dedicated practically his whole career to Ostian municipal affairs. This is an indication as good as any of the civic "patriotism" of the **Augustales* themselves.

As seen above, the most common form of activity by the **Augustales* were dedications to the ruler or a prince of the ruling family, and one must imagine that these inscriptions always accompanied the erection of a statue or at least a portrait bust. Although one might expect that an organization, which in its very name refers to Caesar Augustus and his successors, would be focused on honouring the ruler, it has nevertheless been claimed that such instances are rare in Italy.⁵³ If this is indeed so, the Ostian pattern is markedly different.

Dedications to Roman deities almost equal the imperial ones in number. No clear common denominator emerges, but in some cases one can easily suggest a reason for why a particular deity was venerated, as in the case of two almost identical dedications to I. O. M. Serapis accompanied by Castor and Pollux and Hercules, respectively (nos. 22–23). The Dioscuri and Hercules protected seafarers and the concluding phrase – *voto suscepto reddiderunt* ("having made a vow they discharged it") – makes it very likely that the four dedicators were sailors or traders had been away on a sea voyage and had returned to Ostia safe and sound. Some of the other deities were chosen for reasons unknowable to us, but it is interesting to observe a dedication to the *Genius coloniae Ostiensium* (no. 1), which again is evidence for a certain local "patriotism".

4. **Augustales* participating in other associations

The instances listed and discussed above do not represent every type of activity in which individual **Augustales* engaged. Their organization had an internal life, as all organizations are bound to have, and a series of documents on stone have survived, the so-called *alba* of the **Augustales*, which contain long lists of members. These *alba* also record which members had shouldered particular duties within the organization, adding epithets such as *quinquennalis* or *curator*, and

⁵³ Mouritsen 2006, 241, listing about a dozen cases. For Ostia, the author does not cite any evidence but refers to an unpublished dissertation by M. Laird.

they refer to a number of decisions taken by the organization with the expression *ex decreto ordinis Augustalium* (see, for instance, *CIL XIV 4561,1*).⁵⁴ It is also revealed by these *alba* that by the late second century CE, a number of **Augustales* who were given the title *q(uin)q(uennalis)* had contributed money, surely to the *arca* of their own organization, as shown by the abbreviation *d(ono) d(ato)* following the letters QQ.⁵⁵ But this evidence for internal activity among the **Augustales* is less important when discussing their public commitments and impact. Instead, we find many individual **Augustales* playing a role in other associations, and this must also briefly be touched upon.

Ostia is famous for its many inscriptions illustrating the activities and membership of various professional organizations, called *corpus* or *collegium*. These *collegia* or *corpora* enrolled members who were engaged in professions essential to the functioning of Ostia-Portus as Rome's main harbour. Most of them had something to do with commerce, and **Augustales* are frequently found in leading roles in these organizations.⁵⁶ To restrict the survey to inscriptions found after the publication of the latest volume of *CIL XIV*, one finds **Augustales* engaging in associations such as:

the *corpus lenunculariorum traiectus Luculli* ("the association of ferrymen at the traiectus Luculli" (*AE 1987, 196*);⁵⁷

the *corpus mensorum nauticorum Ostiensium* ("the association of the maritime measurers of Ostia") (*AE 1999, 410*);

the *corpus negotiatorum fori vinarii* ("the association of merchants from

⁵⁴ See *CIL XIV 4560–63*, containing consular dates from 193 to 242 CE, with one very late fragment from 297 CE. For the date of *CIL XIV 4563*, which I believe is much earlier than the other parts of the records, see my "The Date of One Hundred **Augustales* from Roman Ostia in *CIL XIV 4563: Late First Century CE*" (in preparation).

⁵⁵ Abramenko 1992, developing further an hypothesis often advanced previously. The *quinquennales d(ono) d(ato)* were lower in rank than the properly elected eponymous *quinquennales* of the **Augustales*. In *CIL XIV 367* the sum of HS 10,000 is being paid *ob honorem curae* into the treasury of the **Augustales*.

⁵⁶ According to Abramenko 1993, 136, as many as 28 **Augustales* at Ostia can be found holding positions in other organizations; this engagement is exceptional, compared to the rest of Italy (p. 142).

⁵⁷ The Ostian **Augustales* were even more frequently engaged in a similar association, the *corpus lenunculariorum traiectus Rusticelii*. No recent finds have added to our information, but see *CIL XIV 4553–6, 5327–8* and Meiggs 1973, 297, 325.

the wine market") (*AE* 1974, 123a);
 the *fabri navales* ("the shipbuilders") (*AE* 1989, 124);
 the *navicularii maris Hadriatici* ("the traders on the Adriatic sea") (*AE* 1987, 191; 1988, 178);
 the *navicularii lyntrarii* (= *lintrarii*) ("boatmen"; from *linter*, "small boat") (*AE* 1974, 123a);
 the *stuppatores* ("the rope-makers") (*AE* 1987, 196).

There were also more common professional organizations in which the **Augustales* engaged, of the kind one may encounter in any Roman town, like:

the *fabri tignuarii Ostienses*, ("the Ostian builders") (*AE* 1988, 200), and
 the *nummularii* ("money-changers") (*AE* 1974, 123a).

It is indeed not at all uncommon to see an Ostian **Augustalis* among the leaders of these professional associations, as these three short examples show:

T. Testio Helpidiano / sevir Aug(ustali) idem q(uin)q(uennali) / item patrono et q(uin)q(uennali) / corporis treiectus (!) / marmorariorum / IIII Testii Helpidianus / Priscus Priscianus / et Felix fili(i) et heredes / patri dulcissimo.

(*CIL* XIV 425 = X 542 = *ILS* 6170 = *AE* 1994, 319; an epitaph)

A. Caedicus Successus / sevir Aug(ustalis) idem quinquenn(alis) / curator navicularior(um) maris Hadriat(ici) / idem quinquennalis ... (*AE* 1987, 191; an epitaph)

[A. Li]vius Anteros / [magiste]r quinquennal(is) colleg(i) fabr(um) / [tignuari]orum Osti(en)s(ium) lustrum XVII VI(vir) / [Augusta]lis incorporatus inter / [fabros] navales ... (*AE* 1989, 124; an epitaph)

It was undoubtedly important for the **Augustales* to be active in these professional organizations. In this environment, many business opportunities will have materialized, and making money was important for these men. This also means that as members in these professional organizations, the **Augustales* may have taken part in various other kinds of public activities, without this being specifically documented in our sources. This should be kept in mind when evaluating

the overall impact of the members of the **Augustales* in Ostian society, although there is no way to evaluate the significance of the activity.

As to the question of where the primary loyalties of the Ostian **Augustales* lay, that is, whether one of them would have considered himself primarily a *sevir Augustalis item quinquennalis* or a *curator naviculariorum maris Hadriatici* (as A. Caedicius Successus is in *AE* 1987, 191 cited above), this question is irrelevant for the present inquiry. What is at stake here is the dedication of these individuals to the town in which they lived and worked, and it does not matter in which organization or in what capacity they engaged in furthering the cause of Ostia and its inhabitants. What matters is the presence or absence of a "patriotic feeling" in this segment of society.

Concerning the relative importance of a person's membership among the **Augustales*, however, it may be worth offering the observation which, to my knowledge, has not been made before, namely that when more than one duty or charge is listed in an inscription, the **Augustalitas* regularly comes first (*AE* 1989, 124, cited above, is a rare exception; similarly *CIL* XIV 299, 407). It seems akin to what we find in senatorial *cursus*-inscriptions,⁵⁸ when these begin by listing the traditional offices of republican origin, namely, the consulship, a proconsulship, perhaps a priestly office, before providing a chronological account of the person's career. This practice among the **Augustales* is evident proof of the worth placed on their membership.

5. What is missing from the activities of the **Augustales*, and why?

As the evidence now stands, the visible public activities of the **Augustales* as a group or as individual members of the Ostian community are almost exclusively restricted to the erection of public monuments, in most cases statues. It is obviously important to keep in mind that we only can use inscriptions when analyzing the public activities of the **Augustales*, and most of the epigraphic evidence that once existed is undoubtedly lost, but one can only argue from the sources we have. Thus one is bound to conclude that there is one activity in particular that the **Augustales* of Ostia engage very little in: we almost completely lack proof that they participated in more conspicuous energetic activities, that is, in contributing to the physical infrastructure of the town.

⁵⁸ For the now somewhat controversial term "*cursus*-inscription", see Bruun 2015, 212–3.

When their actions directly benefit their fellow citizens, it is most commonly in the form of distributions of money. Even the public banquets or feasts, which can be found in many towns of Roman Italy, and which **Augustales* on several occasions sponsor elsewhere, do not occur in Ostia under patronage of an **Augustalis*. Instead, on three occasions, in nos. 1, 4, and 6 above, there is mention of *divisiones* of cash: the *curator Augustalium* M. Cornelius Epagathus donates one *denarius* (four *sestertii*), presumably only to his fellow **Augustales* (no. 1), while the *sevir Augustalis* P. Horatius Chryseros donates five *denarii* to both the *decuriones* and the *Augustales* on the occasion of the inauguration of his statue⁵⁹ (no. 4). In the third case (no. 6), the donor Q. Veturius stipulated that from the interest of a large donation of 50,000 *sestertii* to the *Augustales*, on his birthday there will always be a distribution of cash to those among the **Augustales* who are present (*in [c]onventu inter praesentes*). In addition, the donor's children Veturia Q.f. Rufina and Q. Veturius Q.f. Felix Socrates shouldered the cost of erecting the statue, while the freedman Q. Veturius Felicissimus, *sevir Augustalis quinquennalis* and *curator* of the association, was in charge of a cash distribution (*sportula*) which again only benefited the decurions, who were given three *denarii*, and the *Augustales* (as he names them), who somewhat unusually received the higher sum of five *denarii*.

As can be seen in Abramenko's survey of actions undertaken by **Augustales* in Italy, there is a greater variety of benefactions, and more examples thereof, elsewhere. What I have in mind is a behaviour that we find documented in many other Italian towns, such as at Suessa Aurunca, where C. Titius Chresimus received conspicuous recognition from the *ordo decurionum* because he had sponsored spectacles for the community: *pro salute et indulgentia Imp(eratoris) Antonini Pii Felicis Aug(usti) et ex voluntate populi munus familiae gladiatoriae ex pecunia sua diem privatum secundum dignitatem coloniae ediderit* (CIL X 4760 = ILS 6296). Another example of how some **Augustales* provided lavishly for their fellow citizens comes from Abella, where N. Plaetorius Onirus is honoured *quod auxerit ex suo ad annonariam pecuniam HS X (10,000) n(ummum) et vela in theatro cum omni ornatu sumptu suo dederit* (CIL X 1217)

Concerning public building, in the central Augustan *regio I* we find cases such as the following from Cales, in which an anonymous *Augustalis* *viam ab angiporto aed[is] Iunonis Lucinae usque [ad] aedem Matutae et clivom ab Ianu*

⁵⁹ In addition, his large gift to the association of the **Augustales* was intended to generate funds for a distribution of money among the membership each year on his birthday. This is an internal event and not a public one, which here is the issue.

ad gisiarios porta[e] Stellatinae et viam patulam ad portam Laevam et ab foro ad portam domesticam sua pecunia stravit (CIL X 4660),⁶⁰ and two identical texts from Cereatae Marianae (Casamari), which record how the freedman C. Livinius Pelasgi lib. Victor *ob honorem Augustalitis* in his own and his son's name contributed HS 2,000 to the repair work on a bridge which otherwise was carried out by decision of the town council (NSA 1921, 70).⁶¹ Also, the *Augustalis* C. Minatius Bithus gave HS 2,000 *ad stratam reficiendam* (CIL X 1885),⁶² while three fragmentary inscriptions by **Augustales* from Puteoli likewise testify to public construction works ([---]p et basilica[m ---/--- ma]rrioribu[s ---], CIL X 1838;⁶³ *idem sua pecunia aedificavit*, CIL X 1887; [c]um epistyl[is ---/---]os tector[ium ---], CIL X 1891).

In the nearby *regiones II* and *IV* there are a number of similar cases. Near Compsa, the *magister Augustalis* N. Bovius N. et M. l. Hilarus *viam stravit* (CIL IX 1048),⁶⁴ at Sipontum, the *Augustalis* P. Memmius P.l. Diogenes *t[ribuna?]l et tectum s[ua] p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit)* (AE 1981, 269), and at Vibinum (Bovino) two relatives, one of which was the *Augustalis* A. Allienus Primus, *podium s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uraverunt)* (AE 1969/70, 165). At Saepinum the *Augustalis* C. Coesius Tertius *plateam stravit a tervio ad tervium* (CIL IX 2476),⁶⁵ while his colleague M. Annius Phoebus *ob honorem Aug(ustalitis) et biselli(i)* contributed to the *macellum cum columnis* (CIL IX 2475). These examples suffice to show the situation, but many more examples can be found in the other Italian *regiones*.⁶⁶ All these examples of public expenditure — whether the inscription labels the money spent as *sua pecunia* or specifies that the funds were derived from a *summa honoraria* or were paid *ob honorem Augustalitis* — we are justified in regarding as evergetism by **Augustales*, as argued above in section 2.

⁶⁰ See Campedelli 2014, 121–3 nos. 11–2.

⁶¹ See Campedelli 2014, 178–9 no. 59.

⁶² The provenance is probably Ausculum; the inscription is also published, in an unsatisfactory fashion, as CIL IX 664.

⁶³ Also cited by D'Arms 1981, 129 as example of munificence by **Augustales*.

⁶⁴ See Campedelli 2014, 184 no. 65.

⁶⁵ See also Campedelli 2014, 212–3 no. 90.

⁶⁶ This evidence, and more, can be found in Abramenko 1993, 146–54, where however all instances of expenses by the "municipaler Mittelstand" is included (such as, e.g., by veterans), not just munificence by the **Augustales*. For evergetism by **Augustales* in northern Italy, see now Gofin 2002, 197–201, with thirty instances.

In contrast, in the exceptionally rich epigraphic material providing details about the activities of the Ostian **Augustales*, all that turns up in the category of evergetism for the purpose of infrastructure improvement and the construction of buildings is the fragmentary inscription no. 24 above (p. 79). That text documents work on the *macellum* of Ostia, undoubtedly a building of significant public importance, by the *Augustalis* Pothus N[ymp hodoti lib.] and his patron Nymphodotus (who may not have been an *Augustalis* at all).⁶⁷ It is noteworthy that the inscription belongs to a comparatively early stage in Ostia's history, before the construction of Claudius' harbour, and much earlier than Ostia's rapid expansion in the second half of the first century CE. This event belongs to a time when the great wave of immigration, which followed upon the construction of the Claudian and, later, the Trajan harbour, had not yet set in. For good reason, no suspicions have been voiced about any lack of civic spirit during this earlier phase of Ostia's history.

The matter is different when we view the Flavian era and later periods. The fact that at Ostia the **Augustales* cannot be found involved in this kind of local munificence is potentially an important issue, at least for the question of "civic identity" at Ostia. If members of this group of well-to-do individuals, representing one important part of the local "middle class", were not using their wealth in a way that visibly benefited their local community from the 70s CE onwards, this would seem to show a remarkable detachment from the fortunes of their own town, including an apparent unconcern with bolstering their own social standing in the community.

It is, however, surely the case that another factor comes into play here, namely, the close connection between Ostia and Rome and the great investments made by the emperor and the imperial administration in the town. There was simply lesser scope for local sponsorship with money and investments flowing in from the imperial treasury. The imperial influence in Ostia has been documented and stressed on many occasions.⁶⁸ One effect of the imperial oversight at Ostia is the very late appearance of a *curator rei publicae*, a centrally nominated official with the task of assisting a Roman town in managing its finances; a necessary course of action as economic problems began to appear in the local context during the second century CE. The earliest known *curator r. p.* is however not found

⁶⁷ The site of the *macellum* at Ostia, long believed to have been at the intersection of the Decumanus and the Via del Pomerio (Reg. IV, Is. V, 1–2), has recently been put into question, see Pavolini 2006, 195–6; Cébeillac-Gervasoni – Caldelli – Zevi 2010, 256–7.

⁶⁸ See, in particular, Bruun 2002, with previous literature.

at Ostia before the late third century. In my view, this is a significant fact which may merit more attention than it normally receives.⁶⁹ Therefore, the relative absence of local sponsorship of public buildings and of road works should not be taken as proof of a lack of "patriotism" on the part of the wealthier segment of the population. The presence of imperial power at Ostia and the influx of resources from the capital to the town made it unnecessary and impossible for the local elite and, as we have seen in the case of the **Augustales*, for the sub-elite, to engage in local benefactions in the same way as they did elsewhere in Italy.

Yet one notices, when studying the actions taken by the Ostian **Augustales* in public, the presence of a strong connection with Ostia and its inhabitants. Sometimes it is the choice of person that they honour which is important (Licinius Herodes), and sometimes it is the deity they venerate (the Genius of the *colonia*). Above all, it is the abundance of statues and memorials dedicated by these individuals that is most striking. Although occasionally we lack information about what the dedicated object represented, we can see, from the surviving inscriptions, that the **Augustales* here behave precisely like their peers elsewhere in the Roman world. Their concern with creating local monuments that dignify the urban environment is a testimony to their own piety and dedication and preserves the memory of their presence in the city. There is no reason to believe that the Ostian **Augustales* harboured any less *amor patriae* than their colleagues elsewhere in Italy or around the empire.

University of Toronto

Bibliography

- Abramenko, A. 1992. "Zu den Quinquennales d.d. in den *fasti et alba augustalium* aus Ostia", *Habis* 23: 153–58.
- Abramenko, A. 1993. *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien. Zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*, Frankfurt a.M.
- Bloch, H. 1953. "Ostia. Iscrizioni rinvenute tra il 1930 e il 1939", *NSA*: 239–306.
- Bollmann, B. 1998. *Römische Vereinshäuser. Untersuchungen zu den scholae der römischen Berufs-, Kult- und Augustalen-Kollegien in Italien*, Mainz.
- Bricault, L. 2005. *Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes isiaques* 2 (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres 31), Paris.

⁶⁹ Bruun 2002, 189.

- Bruun, C. 2002. "L'amministrazione imperiale di Ostia e Portus", in: C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma, 161–92.
- Bruun, C. 2014. "Civic Identity in Roman Ostia: Some Evidence from Dedications (Inaugurations)", in: A. Kemezis (ed.), *Urban Dreams and Realities in Antiquity: Remains and Representations of the Ancient City*, Leiden, 347–69.
- Bruun, C. 2015. "The Epigraphy of the Senatorial and Equestrian Orders. Prosopography", in: C. Bruun – J. Edmondson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, New York, 200–24.
- Campebelli, C. 2014. *L'amministrazione municipale delle strade romane in Italia* (Antiquitas R. I,62), Bonn.
- Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. – M. L. Caldelli – F. Zevi. 2010. *Epigrafia latina. Ostia: cento iscrizioni in contesto*, Roma (revised version of French original, Paris 2006).
- D'Arms, J. H. 1981. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge (MA) – London.
- Duncan-Jones, R. P. 1982. *The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies²*, Cambridge (1st ed., 1974).
- Duthoy, R. 1974. "La fonction sociale de l'Augustalité", *Epigraphica* 36: 134–54.
- Duthoy, R. 1976. "Recherches sur la ripartition géographique et chronologique des termes *sevir Augustalis*, *Augustalis*, et *sevir* dans l'Empire Romain", *Epigraphische Studien* 11: 143–214.
- Duthoy, R. 1978. "Les *Augustales", *ANRW* II 16.2: 1254–1309.
- Fora, M. 1996. *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano IV. Regio Italiae I: Latium*, Roma.
- Goffin, B. 2002. *Euergetismus in Oberitalien*, Bonn.
- González, J. 1986. "The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law", *JRS* 76: 147–243.
- Hauthal, F. 1866. *Acronis et Porphyrius commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum* II, Berolini.
- Heinzelmann, M. 2002. "Bauboom und urbanistische Defizite – zur städtebaulichen Entwicklung Ostias im 2. Jh.", in: C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma, 103–21.
- Keller, O. 1904. *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora* II, Lipsiae (repr. Stuttgartiae 1967).
- Laird, M. L. 2000. "Reconsidering the So-called "Sede degli Augustali" at Ostia", *MAAR* 45: 41–84.
- Liebenam, W. 1900. *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreich*, Leipzig (repr. Amsterdam 1967).
- Linderski, J. 2007. "*Augustales* and *sodales Augustales*", in idem, *Roman Questions* II (HABES 44), Stuttgart, 179–83.

- Marinucci, A. 1992. "Iscrizioni", in: P. Cicerchia – A. Marinucci, *Scavi di Ostia XI. Le Terme del Foro o di Gavio Massimo*, Roma, 163–228.
- Marinucci, A. 2007. "Ara – ossuario", in: S. Pannuzi (ed.), *Necropoli Ostiensi. Lo scavo archeologico per la costruzione della linea elettrica a 150 kV in cavi interrati Lido Vecchio – Casal Palocco*, Roma, 39–40.
- Marinucci, A. 2012. *Disiecta membra. Iscrizioni latine da Ostia e Porto 1981–2009*, Ostia.
- Meiggs, R. 1973. *Roman Ostia²*, Oxford (1st ed. 1960).
- Mouritsen, H. 2006. "Honores libertini: Augustales and seviri in Italy", in: I. Nielsen (ed.), *Zwischen Kult und Gesellschaft: Kosmopolitische Zentren des antiken Mittelmeerraumes als Aktionsraum von Kultvereinen und Religionsgemeinschaften* (Hephaistos 24), Augsburg, 237–48.
- Mouritsen, H. 2011. *The Freedman in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Oliver, J. H. 1958. "Gerusiae and Augustales", *Historia* 7: 472–96.
- Ostrow, S. E. 1990. "The Augustales in the Augustan Scheme", in: K. A. Raaflaub – M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 364–79.
- Pavolini, C. 2006. *Ostia. Guida archeologica Laterza²*, Roma – Bari (1st ed. 1983).
- Purcell, N. 1983. "The apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility", *PBSR* 51: 125–73.
- Royden, H. L. 1986. *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century A.D.*, Pisa.
- Scheid, J. 1997. "Augustales", *Der Neue Pauly* 2: 291–92.
- Vermaseren, M. J. 1956. *Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae I*, Den Haag.